

Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – May 5, 2026

Agenda

1. Welcome and approve [notes from March meeting](#) (Chris C)
2. Tech plan update from CGC (Nancy and Kim)
3. Last goals workgroup session* (Breakout Rooms)
 - * Update from tri-chairs workgroup: AI timeline has been under development. How should we promote this to the community next year?
 - Share-out from groups
4. Updates / feedback on TAC goals from committee members (Everyone, as needed)
5. Announcements / reports from constituents
6. Adjourn

Committee Members Present	Chris Collins (DE coordinator, tri-chair), Nancy Somjit (ASLT Instructional Technologist, tri-chair), Hinda Chalew (Marketing), Perry Chen (Counseling), Chris Gibson (Mgmt Council), Brandon Gutierrez-Kitto (Enrollment Svcs), Michelle Hawkins (SSCA), Ariel Katz (STEM), Kim Saccio (DE coordinator) , Michael Song (STEM)
Guests	

Agenda Item 1: Approval of March notes	
Discussion	Hinda motioned, Brandon seconded.
Conclusions	Approved.
Agenda Item 2: Tech plan update from CGC	
Discussion	<p>Nancy and Kim presented the draft technology plan (2024-2029) to CGC in March for the first reading, then returned in April for the vote. CGC approved the plan, so it is now ready to be shared out. The discussion opened into ways to promote the new plan.</p> <p>Hinda: The timing for promoting 24-27 Tech Plan is not good, here at the end of the semester. A couple of things we could do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a synopsis for faculty and staff email (goes out on Tuesdays) to communicate top 2 or 3 takeaways. • Write a Skyline Shines article. <p>Probably not a great time to do a Skyline Shines article. But Hinda also suggested recording a webinar, essentially what we presented to CGC, that could be pushed out to the faculty. Nancy volunteered to work with Hinda on this.</p> <p>Chris G: Could there be a brief announcement on Skyline Opening Day in August 2026, to highlight the new plan, explain how it was</p>

	crafted and approved, and share some key takeaways?
Conclusions	<p>Hinda will schedule time with Nancy to produce the video (Kim will support if available).</p> <p>During the meeting, Kim posted the final tech plan to the TAC home page. View the 2024-29 tech plan here.</p>
Agenda Item 3: Last goals workgroup session	
Discussion	<p>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.”</p> <p>Breakout room participants: Ariel, Brandon, Chris G</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>Breakout room participants: Michael, Pate</p> <p>Goal 4: “Ensure transparent and equitable access to technology by reviewing and recommending procedures that support equitable access to technology for faculty, classified professionals, and students, including standardized laptop replacement cycles, compatible hardware for classroom and labs, and access to educational instructional tools for teaching and learning.”</p> <p>Breakout room participants: Hinda, Michelle</p>
Conclusions	n/a
Agenda Item 4: Updates / feedback on TAC goals from committee members	
Discussion	<p>Chris C shared that some members re-joined the main room a bit early, and expressed concerns that the 2024-27 Tech Plan does not include budgets or mechanisms for equipment replacement cycles, among other details. He explained that this current plan is dramatically streamlined, with only about 20 pages as compared to the previous 2018-22 plan, which had 60 pages and did include budgets, replacements cycles, and other details. The current document does not include that level of transparency because the ASLT dean guided the drafting process with the intent of creating a top-level document that outlines principles rather than the details included in earlier plans.</p> <p>Goal 1 – Chris G shared out. Plan is behind schedule, still need a comparison chart. During the breakout session they followed up</p>

	<p>with Chris Smith, and work will continue in Fall 2026.</p> <p>Goal 2 – Michael S shared out. Chris Smith was guiding this group/spearheading efforts as well. A bit part of this is connecting staff and faculty to what’s going on in ITS. Subgoal next semester is making sure there is more communication between faculty and staff, with TAC and with ITS, as they build the framework. Hui added that they need to work with constituents to create some sort of dashboard to streamline the process.</p> <p>Goal 3 – Nancy and Perry have been working on this goal. Nancy shared that their work has been concluded. PRIE has their questions and will include them in upcoming campus-wide survey.</p> <p>Group 4 – Hinda shared out. Their topic is faculty/staff/student accessibility to technologies, and the conversation has not made much progress. They noted that the newly approved technology plan does not address issues such as equipment replacement cycles and budgeting, how new equipment is paid for, and how faculty/staff access new equipment. She also pointed out that there had been earlier discussions in TAC about including language around AI, but this did not make it into the final plan. Perhaps there is a possibility of amending the plan to include missing information.</p>	
Conclusions	When the ASLT dean returns, we will bring up concerns regarding the 2024-27 Tech Plan, and explore drafting addendums to include the information that is no longer included (such as a budget) plus language around emerging initiatives such as the Innovation Hub, which did not exist when the plan was being drafted.	
Agenda Item 5: Announcements, feedback from constituents		
Discussion	No announcements or feedback.	
Conclusions	TK	
Agenda Item 6: Adjourn		
Discussion	Adjourned at 3:35 pm.	
Conclusions	Informational only.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline