⊞ Skyline College

Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – September 2, 2025

Agenda
1. Welcome/Introductions (everyone)
2. Committee Norms — **Torria**
3. Highlights of 2024-2025 Accomplishments— **Torria**
4. Review Charge, Set Goals, Share-out — **Chris Collins**
5. Technology Projects On Campus — **Torria**
6. Updates from Committee Members (everyone)

Committee Members Present	Torria Davis, ASLT Dean; Chris Collins, DE Coordinator (tri-chair); Yoseph Demissie, IT tri-director, tri-chair; Kim Saccio, DE Coordinator; Nancy Somjit, IT; Chris Smith, dir Web Services; Ron Amos, media services; Ron Chand, PSC, career services; Michelle Hawkins, music faculty; Amir Esfahani, art faculty; Ariel Katz, computer science faculty; Michael Song, Biology faculty; Nathan Jones, English faculty
GUESTS	

Agenda Item 1: Welcome/Introductions	
Discussion	Torria called on TAC members while working through the updated membership list; members introduced themselves, providing role and division. Torria updated the membership list as necessary.
Conclusions	Kim will update the TAC membership list on our website.
Agenda Item 2: Committee Norms	
Discussion	- Meetings are 90 minutes (2:30 to 4:00 pm) - Cameras on while attending meetings - Members will share content of meetings (i.e. meeting notes) with their constituents and solicit feedback - Members will share constituent feedback with committee - Members will participate in workgroups during second half of meeting; with the intention that no work would be needed outside of TAC meetings.
Conclusions	Informational only
Agenda Item 3: Highlights of 2024-2025 Accomplishments	
Discussion	• Updated and streamlined Skyline College Technology Plan 2024-29 – waiting on College Governance Committee (CGC) for approval

	• Tech plan includes info on library services and forward-thinking technologies • Planning to begin drafting bylaws after Participatory Governance handbook is updated and released. • Approved development of a form to allow community to submit agenda items • voted to change name to DETAC (Distance Education – Technology Advisory Committee), but that is on hold.
Conclusions	Informational only

Agenda Item 4: Review Charge, Set Goals, Share-out	
Discussion	Chris framed the discussion by reviewing our charge (available on the TAC web page). Members then joined three breakout groups to discuss goals for academic year 2025-26, which were recorded in associated discussion boards: • Group 1 Padlet • Group 2 Padlet • Group 3 Padlet **Group reports (and Padlet summaries):** Group 1 – • Goal 1: Explore and compare the features, usability, and accessibility of Formstack, Google Forms, Microsoft Forms, and Excel to identify which tool best supports our data collection, workflow efficiency, reporting needs, and cost effectiveness. • Goal 2: Develop an exploratory framework to understand how Zoom, WebSmart, AI tools, Canvas, and instructional technologies interact, ensuring that technology supports rather than complicates teaching and learning. • In the group share out, Chris and Nathan highlighted the shift in focus from equity to data collection within the committee. • They also highlighted the need for a framework to ensure that different technologies, like Zoom and Canvas, work together effectively to support teaching and learning. Group 2 – • Questionnaire – what tech to focus on?– expanding outreach to all community members. Technology needs survey? Separate surveys for classified and faculty? • Instructional Technologist feedback from data collection • Spread awareness of digital accessibility • Training needs survey Group 3 – • Faculty laptop replacement cycle that meets faculty needs. Include external hard drive / backup system and sufficient hardware for instructional needs • The laptop replacement policy is currently unclear and not standardized. Faculty are told they cannot get a new laptop is completely broken, and they have to check out a

	machine from the library. This policy was never discussed or voted on by the tech committee.
	• Faculty with specific needs for their discipline and courses are not able to get appropriate machines.
	• Server for web programming courses and database
	• Fix technology in Building 1, rooms 111 and 115 (project to screen / audio playback)
	• Smartboard / tablet & stylus
	• Student licensing for Adobe Creative Suite, even if limited to 400 art students
	• Kahoot license
	Ensuing discussion:
	• Ariel highlighted challenges faced by faculty regarding the laptop replacement cycle and the need for additional smart boards and software licenses, particularly for Adobe products, which are financially burdensome for students.
	• Chris Smith explained that while faculty and staff have access to Adobe Creative Cloud, students do not. There are currently no plans to provide access to students, given the cost, but ITS is planning to purchase a Canva site license.
	• Michael and Nancy stressed the importance of gathering feedback from faculty, staff, and students to better understand technology needs. They proposed various methods, including questionnaires and department meetings, to assess the effectiveness of current technology.
Conclusions	Informational only.

Agenda Item 5: Technology Projects On Campus	
Discussion	• Torria reminded participants that she needs to know about any issues with classroom technologies (but note that ITS tickets should also be submitted – Kim added the link to new [IT help center](#) in Chat)
	• Media upgrades completed for Library; classrooms in Buildings 4, 5, and 6; event spaces on campus, including Building 12.
	• In Building 6, 12 and the Theater, the focus was on making A/V systems more reliable.
	• Torria described collaboration with the media services team and walkthroughs to identify equipment issues in event spaces and submit a proposal to CIP
	• Discussed development of form for campus community to share needs and concerns
Conclusions	Torria will add a review of our updated Technology Plan to next TAC agenda, to inform and update new TAC members.

Agenda Item 6: Updates from Committee Members	
Discussion	- Yoseph provided updates on the Distributed Antenna System project aimed at improving cell phone coverage. This project is 70% complete, so cellphone service (AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile) is becoming more reliable across campus and inside buildings. - Yoseph also shared progress on network security improvements. New authentication features are being rolled out to secure individual and campus/district data. Wireless network security has been improved; next step is securing wired/Ethernet security on site. - Amir asked about TAC's role in budget discussions and resource prioritization, raising concerns about budget allocation and transparency. He pointed out that student licenses are not currently available for Adobe Creative Cloud because of expense. - Yoseph emphasized that TAC can offer advice on technology purchases that are necessary from an instructional or student support perspective, then we can advocate for these technologies with the District. - Amir shared frustration with perceived misuse of funds (brought up Building 12 for example) while student needs are not addressed. - Yoseph pointed out that Master Plan dictates campus improvements, and there are community forums set up to collect information/feedback from constituents - Michelle asked if TAC advises on the replacement schedule for faculty? Replacement policy is nebulous – the process is unclear. She emphasized that instructors need equipment that is appropriate for their teaching needs. - Torria explained that the Technology Plan describes the equipment replacement cycle, and suggested a future meeting to clarify these processes. She explained that ASLT collaborates with IT to review laptops that are purchased for faculty. - Chris Smith would welcome conversations around transparency levels and priority lists. - CS pointed out that TAC conversations /feedback last year led to Canva for students. He reminded members that District ITS is purchasing a site license, prompted by data showing that students have been spending personal funds for access ($10,000 in student subscriptions). He compared this to earlier District purchases of Panopto and Padlet. - CS urged TAC to continue advocating. He suggested creating an official list with a voting mechanism to document requests, which he can take to the CFO to secure funding. - Regarding the laptop replacement process, Yoseph clarified that establishing a replacement plan schedule is in the works, but there is a process. He suggested that we discuss this in

	upcoming meetings.
	• Chris Collins (from chat): Maybe a goal this academic year can be to demystify the process for computer upgrades, lab updates, etc.
	• Torria highlighted the importance of feedback from teams regarding technology tools identified in a previous survey. Kim explained that the faculty equity needs survey was conducted in early 2024 under the Culturally Responsive Pedagogy grant. There are no plans to repeat that survey.
Conclusions	Yoseph will explain the equipment replacement process at an upcoming meeting.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Update the TAC members page with current membership list	Kim	ASAP
Add review of updated Technology Plan to next TAC agenda	Torria	next meeting
Present equipment replacement process and schedule at next meeting	Yoseph	next meeting