Attendees: Dick Barton, Francis Baylen, Lyn Clemons, Joyce Dallal, Susie Dever, Joe Georges, Dwayne Hayden, Tom Jackson, Donna Manno, Barbara Morris, Dave Murphy, Donna Post, Roger Quadhamer, John Ruggirello, Robin Valle

After introductions were made, Joe Georges described the ATC and its history. He said that the last year of significant ATC activity was 1999-00, when an ATC recommendation led to Partnership for Excellence (PFE) funding for laptop computers for all full-time faculty and computer workrooms for instructional divisions. During the 1990s, the ATC developed a process that allowed each program needing instructional equipment to submit a proposal explaining that need and justifying the expenditure. The proposals were then screened by members of the Committee and ranked according to their perceived merits. After 1999-00, the ATC’s importance diminished because PFE funds were often used for equipment. Those funds were allocated according to a separate PFE competitive application process.

The most recent meetings of the ATC were in May 2002. At those meetings an online academic technology survey was developed and posted on the California Virtual Campus website. Nearly 150 faculty and staff completed the survey. Copies of the survey report were distributed to those in attendance on February 28. The original intent was to follow up the May survey with a more detailed survey during 2002-03. But that plan assumed that there would be equipment funds available during the present year. In fact, there have been no general-purpose equipment funds.

The ATC now functions as a joint Academic Affairs/Academic Senate committee with administrative and faculty co-chairs. It is a subcommittee of the College Technology Committee. In the past the ATC has typically made decisions by consensus, though recommended allocations of equipment monies were made at sessions in which each division had one vote, as did some specialized units like the SRC and Media Services.

Susan Dever asked whether the ATC could continue to function on that basis and there was general agreement that it could.
Reasons for re-activation of the ATC were discussed. The budget crisis is one of them. There are no funds available, for example, for academic software. Funds are limited for supplies used in equipment like LCD projectors. The full impact of the crisis on ECC’s academic technologies needs to be better publicized.

Another reason for reactivating the Committee is voter approval for Measure E in November 2002. There will be an anticipated $60,000.00 available at the end of March, as bonds are sold. Some of that money will be used for instructional equipment during the next few years. Spending plans for this year have already been established. However, as Dr. Quadhamer pointed out, ITS has asked for input from the Deans’ Council on upgrade priorities for the two following years.

It is important that faculty in their diverse programs be involved in the process of establishing upgrade priorities. Many computer labs, for example, are multi-use labs. Their computers are more often than not running Windows 98. Some departments may have specific academic software installed that is used by their faculty and students and that would need to be upgraded to run comfortably in Windows XP. But Measure E funds can’t legally be used for stand-alone software and there is no ECC General Fund money available for such purchases. It would not be a good idea, Joe Georges said, to buy a labful of new PCs using Windows XP, only to discover that a program that had been using the lab for its courses was no longer able to do so. There are complexities involved in upgrading computers and these need to be taken into account. Faculty in the different academic programs using computers need to say what instructional software their programs require and whether that software can be accommodated by Windows XP without purchasing a new version.

The ATC agreed that one action item this spring will be to gather information about departmental software needs for student-use computers being considered for upgrade.

A consensus was reached that the ATC should continue to function as an advisory committee.

The Committee also considered the need for an inventory of A/V resources on campus. Dwayne Hayden emphasized that this has been a long-time need. By the next meeting individuals will compile a baseline list of A/V equipment that exists in their divisions, as well as what software needs upgrading or replacement.

---

Immediate need for inventories of Labs, Software, and Media Classrooms comes from need to have baseline data for Tech Plan revision (due in April) and for recommending academic technology purchases from Bond dollars or other dollars to meet Bond-purchase-related needs or to make the case to PBC to incorporate software/etc. into budget.
Next meeting: Friday, March 14, 2003 - 9:30-11:00 AM, Library 202