

Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – March 4, 2025

Agenda

1. Welcome/Introductions (everyone)
2. Understanding Need for Bylaws and What That Means Once Approved (Ingrid Vargas)
3. Finalizing Draft of Technology Plan — Torria
4. Updates (everyone)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Torria Davis (co-chair), Kim Saccio (co-chair), Hinda Chalew, Christopher Collins, Nathan Jones, Hui Pate, Will Minnich, Sherri Wyatt, Deema (for Rumisa Irshad, ASSC)
GUESTS	Ingrid Vargas, PRIE dean

Agenda Item 1: Approval of notes from February meeting	
---	--

DISCUSSION	n/a
CONCLUSIONS	Nathan motioned to approve; Hinda seconded. Notes approved.

Agenda Item 2: Understanding Need for Bylaws and What That Means Once Approved	
---	--

DISCUSSION	<p>Ingrid provided an overview of history behind Participatory Governance and why there is no oversight. She then explained rationale for drafting bylaws for each committee.</p> <p>Showed College Governance Council website and explained that it is intended to be a model for every committee. All items listed in the navigation sidebar need to be included. Committee websites should be updated every year (with current membership etc.). Ingrid went through CGC bylaws and mentioned that a 50% quorum requirement seems reasonable.</p> <p>She also showed the Participatory Governance website, focusing on the Constituent Committees page. Suggested that we could move to Operational Work Group status so that we do not need to comply with for Constituent Committees page. Explained benefits of Constituent Committee status.</p> <p>CGC is currently revising the Participatory Governance handbook. It is due to be released next year. Ingrid suggests that we hold off on submitting our charter and bylaws until that handbook is released. In the course of conversation, committee members agreed.</p> <p>Ingrid responded to a question from Torria by explaining that DETAC bylaws go straight to CGC for approval (not SPARC). Note: see draft bylaws here.</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>Only committees that are required to follow Robert’s Rules of Order and the Brown Act are those that have elected membership (such as the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate).</p> <p>Definition of “constituent committee”: needs one representative from all four groups: associated students, academic senate, classified senate, management council. Ingrid emphasized that constituent committees have a lot more power than they realize – for example, any CC could bring an issue directly to the CGC.</p> <p>Torria asked if TAC can be changed to “Distance Education Technology Advisory Committee” without submitting Bylaws; Ingrid explained that we can bring our request directly to CGC.</p>	
CONCLUSIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wait until new CGC Participatory Governance handbook is released before submitting bylaws for approval. • Can request change to committee name (DETAC) before submitting bylaws. 	
Agenda Item 3: Finalizing Draft of Technology Plan		
DISCUSSION	<p>Discussed including language in support of “mobile friendly” technologies. Hinda began by sharing her perspective on the need for integrating enrollment and outreach processes into one mobile-friendly app – with the understanding that this would be a district-wide initiative. Discussion included consideration of accessibility to technology. Chris pointed out that currently we offer laptops and Chromebooks to our students; if we move toward mobile-friendly tech, we should consider offering mobile phones and plans as well. This idea was briefly considered but not included in the current draft revision. Hui suggested that we mention something about integrating AI customer service/student support. Reviewed draft and worked in language around “future proofing” technology.</p>	
CONCLUSIONS	<p>Vote to recommend the draft college technology plan to SPARC for adoption by CGC – Nathan motioned; Hinda seconded. Six members approved. (One voting member did not respond and one was not present to vote.) Recommendation approved.</p>	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE