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, Nicole Avina, Adam Bledsoe, Shelley Getty, Dana Hicks, Abbas Jarrahian, David Mitchell, David Reynolds, Tiffany Rowden

**Members Absent:**
John Dodson, Mark Gibson, Gus Gonzalez, Richard Hudson, Aldrin Lubin, James May, Brock McMurray,

**Other Attendees:**
Amar Abbott

**Student Representative:**
Whisper-Lynn Null

**Facilitator:**
Andrew Prestage facilitated the meeting.

**Recorder:**
Dana Hicks, recorder.

**Meeting Called to Order:**
The meeting called to order at 1:02 P.M.

1. **Review Minutes from February 1, 2019**
   - There was one change: May was the person who asked about faculty job prioritization, not Reynolds; minus this change, the committee approved the minutes by consensus

2. **Print Study**
   - The committee continued the Print Study discussion from 2/1/2019 in detail.
• The handouts distributed at the meeting included the Information Technology Committee Proposal, frequently asked questions (with answers), listing of proposed machines and locations, and detailed 5-Year Print Study projection.
• The committee reviewed the ITC Proposal and a lengthy, detailed discussion followed.
• Jarrahian inquired if the machines placed in G2 and the Mailroom will be high-speed; Prestage answered yes.
• Abbott expressed a concern about how the print study will handle the printing of confidential materials. To answer Abbott’s concern, Prestage referred to the Frequently Asked question sheet specifically covering security over sensitive documents.
• Jarrahian commented that he didn’t see any actual cost savings and that he’s concerned that the costs of printing will be passed to students. Reynolds interjected that the savings would possibly come in the form of machine efficiency.
• Rowden inquired if it would be possible to install the EquiTrac software and track usage on existing stations for one year. Prestage indicated he would look into this possibility.
• Getty asked if the monthly black and color costs associated with print volumes listed on the 5-year projection sheet (items N and O) are only for copiers or are the costs covering all machines (copiers and MFCs). Prestage responded he will look into the numbers and get back with an answer.
• Reynolds suggested that campus staff be given the opportunity to give input on the study to area supervisors. This input would be a way for everyone on campus to have a say on the study. The supervisors will then give their staff report to Prestage who can then give the report to the committee. Prestage responded he will be giving a presentation on the print study at an upcoming cabinet meeting involving area supervisors. He will ask the supervisors to gather information from their staff and present the information to the committee at a future meeting.

Next Meeting: Friday, February 15, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. (Holiday)

Proposed Next Meeting: Friday, February 22, 2019