AACC Meeting Minutes – 7/27/01

Present – Anderson, Bowker, Dana, Dignan, Kennedy, Melvin, Nielsen, Pezo-Silva, Ramirez, Ross, Shaffer, Sletteland

Apologies – Brar, Colvard, Harris, Risser

Guests – Chris Broome, Jerry Hanley, Tom Zuur

1) ADA Recommendation – Following up on the last meeting, AACC discussed how to respond to the memo from Will Bailey and Susan Stewart. Bowker cited a need for a campus resource to provide guidance and recommendations to departments so they can ensure their IT resources are accessible. Pezo-Silva, Nielsen and others agreed on the need. Kennedy expressed concerns about legal liabilities and who determines the priorities to address in terms of risk. Should the recommendation be limited to the adaptive technologist or be more broad based? Pezo-Silva suggested endorsing Will Bailey’s recommendation and then addressing these other issues later. Pezo-Silva and Melvin emphasized the need for this position to coordinate closely with campus offices charged with ADA compliance (Disability Resource Center for students and the new unit in Academic Affairs headed by Jean De Costa for employees). Pezo-Silva said CSU is rethinking its legal position and may reissue guidelines on 508, which further supports the need for an adaptive technologist position. Dignan and Ramirez questioned whether the recommendation should specify that the position reside in ITS. Also questioned was the need for making a resolution at this time. Shaffer said the resolution would support a funding request being considered by the campus as a new service. AACC unanimously supports the recommendation for a position to proactively consult with departments to ensure that IT resources are ADA compliant. While the position lives in ITS, AACC recognizes the need for this position to coordinate with all campus areas responsible for ADA compliance. Kennedy will draft a resolution to that effect and e-mail it to the membership for final review.

2) AACC Priorities / Actions / Role for Next Year – Ross distributed and reviewed a handout entitled “2001-2002 AACC Priorities,” mapping ITS projects for next year against the top priorities identified last year by AACC. Members asked how soon the faculty/staff portal would be available? Ross will have a better idea in the Fall, but probably January. Bowker urged Ross to advise departments soon as to how they can interface with the portal to provide information and let their students know how to access it. Kennedy invited each attendee to provide feedback on this topic.

Pezo-Silva said the dialogue with ITS was much improved this year, as evidenced by having such a list at the start of the year. Student Affairs’ needs are being met.

Broome said ITS is changing and strengthening its planning process to be more receptive to change and requirements throughout the year. However, it is likely to come to a point where there won’t be enough money to do everything and ITS will be asking AACC for advice on what not to do.

Melvin passed on commenting as this was her first time attending.

Dignan suggested emphasizing 24/7 in addition to the 90-8-2 model in the section on INDUS. (ITS has a project to build on this.)
Dana passed but on behalf of the IACC representative, he would appreciate it if AACC did not add more meetings since the IACC is meeting weekly as is.

Ross sees AACC as a forum for airing issues among all entities and he values the input he gets. He would like to see AACC meet more often, e.g., every other week. Bowker would not object to more meetings provided there are substantive issues to address. She would prefer not meeting just to hear standing reports and suggested using ad hoc working groups to address specific issues. Sletteland suggested making better use of electronic communications. Dignan encouraged using a newsletter with weblinks to announce significant developments. Kennedy suggested scheduling meetings and canceling if the agenda doesn’t justify a meeting. Zuur said it is important to address operational issues between ITS and the functional units. Hanley suggested every other meeting focus on operational vs. strategic/functional issues, or holding longer meetings less frequently.

Zuur suggested AACC address issues affecting the entire campus. He sees a need for connecting existing processes to improve services to the campus without proliferating and/or duplicating processes, e.g., collecting grades electronically. AACC should look at the big picture vs. responding to an immediate need and analyze requests in light of the overall strategic goal and context of complete services provided to the campus rather than piecemeal. Kennedy added that the real goal is to get technology in place and used. Zuur emphasized the need for everyone to cooperate to achieve the goal and to improve workflow.

Anderson sees AACC as conduit between the users and ITS. Members need to make sure it represents all of the potential administrative offices. There is a lot to do and need to organize to get through it. He sees a need for more or longer meetings, and a need to document results (e.g., minutes) and come to closure and resolution on issues. AACC should communicate needs to ITS and ITS needs to communicate progress to users to ensure accountability both ways.

Sletteland echoed Pezo-Silva’s comments that this list is a better blueprint of what is going to get done. Keeping status and communication going is critical.

Bowker praised Ross and Broome for bringing clarity to projects and priorities. Communication is much improved. She agrees with most of what has been said.

As a client of ITS, Nielsen likes seeing the list, knowing there are many demands on ITS, and being able to share with other people. A newsletter would be a useful tool.

Ramirez passed.

Kennedy suggested understanding the relationship between priorities and actions; a need to focus better on specific issues; maybe some more thought on the AACC role. What are the responsibilities of individual members for speaking on issues and carrying these back to constituents? Bowker said AACC played an important role in making the staff workstation program happen sooner rather than later. Kennedy sees a need to go further, to understand their role and to follow through on it. He suggested bringing discipline to the process by using the three phase model from the IRMPPC: Inform and Advise, Analyze and Explore, Debate and Decide.
Additional issues for AACC to discuss next year:

- Disaster Recovery – How to disseminate and communicate operational unit responsibility in this area, e.g., technical redundancy for LANs.
- Computer Viruses – Education/process for how to handle these.
- Responsible Use – Awareness of Internet access vulnerabilities and resource implications of excessive personal use by staff. Discussion on how it relates to staff as opposed to faculty and students.
- Intellectual Property – How to deal with requests for use of copyright material, e.g., quid pro quo arrangements. Need for educating committee and users.
- TII
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