The Information Technology Committee serves as the central focal point to examine technology planning and operations at Taft College. The Committee provides a forum for input from all campus constituents and acts as a resource with regard to technology planning and operational effectiveness. The Committee receives input, recommends areas of interest, analyzes technology effectiveness, and makes recommendations regarding technology-related matters including training needs. The Committee leads the development of the Technology Master Plan and provides annual updates to the plan.

Members Present:
Andrew Prestage, Shelley Getty, Mark Gibson, Gus Gonzalez, Dana Hicks, Richard Hudson, Abbas Jarrahian, James May, David Mitchell, David Reynolds,

Members Absent:
Nicole Avina, John Dodson, Aldrin Lubin, Brock McMurray, Tiffany Rowden

Student Representative:
Whisper-Lynn Null

Facilitator:
Andrew Prestage facilitated the meeting.

Recorder:
Dana Hicks recorded the meeting.

Meeting Called to Order:
The meeting called to order at 10:10 am.

1. Review Minutes from September 21, 2018
   - Dana will email minutes from September’s meeting for the committee to review.
   - Committee is to email Dana any corrections -- if any.

2. Charter Update
   - In reference to September’s committee discussion pertaining to faculty membership, Andy stated he will change the membership wording to specify a minimum of two faculty. This change creates an extended invitation for any faculty who wish to attend.
Andy also briefly visited the topic about consensus style decision-making. He checked with Justin who stated that none of the other Governance Counsel Committee charters have language explicitly detailing the use of any style of decision making. Brock’s committee is the only committee who practices the same style of decision-making practiced by the Governance Counsel.

3. Print Study

- The print study has been an on-going study for cost savings.
- There are over 260 printers around campus consisting of about five or six different manufacturers, makes and models. It takes Dana a lot of time to distribute and maintain supplies for these printers.
- Per Andy, quarterly invoices cost the campus several thousand dollars in toner.
- On November 9, the printer subcommittee (Andy, Mark G., David M., Whisper) will be listening 45-minute presentations from each of the selected vendors: American Business Machines, CA Reding, and Ray Morgan
- The vendor presentations should provide a comprehensive plan of complete printer replacement (as if no existing printer / copier stay).
- David R. asked if existing individual printers / copiers will be kept. Andy responded with a yes / no answer. Per Andy, Dr. Daniels wants to move to explore moving to a centralized printing environment. Any individuals wishing to keep their existing individual printers may do so as long as they are aware that the cost of maintenance and toner will be at their own expense.

If an existing printer goes out and a faculty member is located too far to a centralized printer, there may be a decision making process to validify if the faculty member should be allowed an individual printer. If a “yes” decision is made, he/she will be allowed an individual printer but selected from available remaining stock on our campus by our IT and the chosen vendor.

- David R. also had concerns about machine availability due to the various hours held around campus. Per Andy, availability should not be an issue since approximately 36 machines will be strategically placed around campus.
- Abbas also expressed a concern about machine availability and functionality. He recently experienced an incident where he spent an entire day until around 10pm at night utilizing several machines all of which had various issues.
- Mark made a couple statements to address both David’s and Abbas’ concerns. To address David’s concerns, multiple machines will be strategically placed near Science classrooms – one in Science, one in the mailroom, one in IT, and five or six in first floor Admin. To address Abbas’ concern, the contract we sign will specify that when a machine goes down, a technician needs to be on site to resolve the issue within two hours of issue notification.
- David R. voiced that if the campus’s funding is in question then more discussions should be held to see if centralized printing is needed. Andy responded that he actually initiated this study as a way of creating a more fiscally sound campus and he has no data to share
at this time if centralized printing is a good cost saving method. In addition, Andy stated that there is no guarantee that moving to a centralized printing environment will occur.

- An additional point Andy wanted to make about the printer study is by installing Equitrak across campus, the campus can better track print jobs and hold various departments/individuals accountable for their amount of printing done.

- Proposal timeline: The prepared request for proposals will be sent to the three selected vendors on Monday, Oct. 22. The Vendors will have until November 2 to submit their proposals to the campus. Vendor presentations with the Sub-Committee will be Nov. 9. The Printer Sub-Committee will report their recommendations to the ITC on Nov. 16. If the ITC approves the Sub-Committee’s recommendations, then the recommendation(s) will move forward to the Governance Counsel and Board of Trustees for their approvals.

- James May asked if the new printers will be color. Andy responded, yes.

- David M. asked for clarification of a statement made earlier on in the discussion about individuals paying for costs of maintenance and toner if they are allowed to keep an individual printer. Andy responded that if an approval was made for an individual to keep their printer then the expense would be out of the department’s or individual’s allocated funds.

- David R. asked would another option be considered if the centralized printers be color but allow for individual black/white printers. Andy stated this could be an option. The upcoming presentations will be to select the vendor. Other options will be discussed after the vendor is selected.

- The ultimate decision of printer options will be by the campus. The vendor will work for us when the final decision is made.

- James May asked if there was any common courtesy for emergency print jobs. Andy stated that there is no formal emergency printing policy, but IT provides emergency printing services when needed.

- Shelly made a suggestion for a regular printer in addition to a copier at each of the 35 locations for when small jobs (i.e. single copies) are needed. Andy stated that every group around campus will have a chance to meet with the vendor to discuss various options before a final decision is made.

- Final vendor selection will be made based on the best-quality machines at the lowest contract cost. A vendor will not be selected if the lowest bid is with lower quality machines.

- Abbas stresses a need for a printing contingency plan for faculty based on class needs, not based on Administration needs. If he or any faculty can’t print/copy when needed, it would negatively affect his ability to teach. Andy stated that the faculty will be represented as David M. is a member of the Sub-Committee.

- Another option brought to the table to defray cost of campus printing is to impose a small fee such as printing. One problem the fee idea may present is other areas may feel any cause is important to impose a fee.

- Per Andy, this will not be a “10 + 1” decision to be made. There will be room for faculty input. The process, however, will continue to move forward and a recommendation will be made and forwarded to the Governance Counsel and then to Dr. Daniels.
4. **Project Updates**
   - Due to time constraints, Project Updates were not discussed.

5. **Other**
   - Due to time constraints, no other topics were discussed.

6. **Next Meeting: Friday, November 16, 2018**

7. The meeting was adjourned at 11:05am.