**COMPUTER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE (2016-2017) MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, November 10, 2015, 5:00 p.m. - 6:30pm**

**Downtown Campus, 101 W. 10th Ave, Room 113**

Members present:

Otto Radke, Micah Sardel, Michael Barrow, Cicely Coleman, Lauren Jerome (nee Russell), Janice Nyland Little, Barrett Avery,

Members absent:

Damon Slye, Jesse Sherman, Mark Davis, Craig Gray, Phillip Robles,

Guests:

* Charles LaBorn, Chief Technology Officer Partnered Solutions IT / Ruby Porter Marketing + Design, guest of Gerry Meenaghan
* Mark Gully, Network Architect Lane County Information Servers, Guest of Brad Welch and nominated by him to Represent Lane County
* Judith Hoffman, Studio Director Zynga Software, Guest of Owen Morgan
* Jeff Jones, Associate Director, Systems & Operations Information Services University of Oregon, Guest of Gerry Meenaghan
* Ken Williams, Director of Technology, Feyman Group, Guest of Gerry Meenaghan

Faculty/Staff:

Dave Oatman, Mari Good, Brian Bird, Joseph Colton, Paul Wilkins, Owen Morgan

1. WELCOME
	1. Michael Barrow, as Chair, brought the meeting called the meeting to order at 5:00pm in the Downtown Campus. The Spring 2016 minutes were reviewed and approved by the committee without change.
	2. Members of the committee introduced themselves and made announcements:
		1. Cicely Coleman announced that the hottest topic at Pacific Source is that they have been expanding and growing in the last 6-months and have entered into a partnership with Legacy Health. Due to the election many people have been calling and asking about implications. Customers are being told that plans will remain the same in 2017 until something changes officially
		2. Mari Good announced that out of 10 co-ops conducted at the U of O last year, 9 of those got jobs. Jeff Jones acts as the responsible liaison for the Co-ops
		3. Micah Sardell is on his way out of the Committee – came to introduce Jeff Jones
		4. Mark Gully stated that he is taking over for Brad Welch
		5. Dave Oatman announced that he is retiring from Lane Community College at the end of the year
		6. Brian Bird discussed his sabbatical project. He is studying agile software development by visiting companies, observing programmers and how they do agile. Would love to come and talk to developers to get a picture of how they are using agile in their process. He would like to use this information to better guide what Lane is teaching to the programming students to better align with what is being done in the workplace.
2. BUSINESS/DISCUSSION
	1. Michael Barrow said that a Vice Chair was needed for the committee. Paul Wilkens stated that the Vice Chair coordinates with the Chair and Faculty POC before each meeting, serves as Chair when the Chair is absent, and then serves as the Chair the following year. Cicely Coleman volunteered for the position and the group accepted her nomination.
	2. A group member asked if a list of all members and contact information could be sent to all members. Members agree that this would be a good idea. [ACTION ITEM: Owen to send out contact sheet to all members]
	3. Mari Good discussed the Program Review.
		1. In fall of last year the CIT department volunteered to participate in this process that lane was developing around database program review. We divided into two groups – CS and CIS side – Mari Good led the CS side, Joseph Colton led CIS side. The plan was to develop a set of questions and then gather data and make decision based on data. Lane doesn’t have systems in place to collect data other than those that relate to enrollment or completion rates –
		2. Question from a group member: ‘How do we gather the data? How do we keep in touch with those students’
		3. Mari stated that surveys could be used and that we need some volunteers who might be willing to do that.
		4. Joseph Colton stated that that a lot of the data we need the college has - but they don’t think we need it because it isn’t important. We would like someone who will review what we are looking at and make sure we are asking the right things. Need someone on advisory board to sign off on the data we need so where we give it to administration, they will provide it.
		5. Michael asked ‘In the past there were concerns about the student data – is that a factor here?’
		6. Joseph stated that as a program lead we have access to student grades – one at a time – but we can’t do analysis of the data – there is no aggregate.
		7. Mari stated that when students enroll they have to say what they are interested in pursuing. About 200 people a year say they are interested, but where are those people that said they were interested in computer stuff and what happened to them between the interests and then they don’t appear in an entry class. I can’t tell them the questions I want until I get to look at the data first. Really what I want is when someone says they are interested I could send a bulk email to them and welcome them and tell them I am there for them, but there is no way to get that information.
		8. Mari stated that her two Important items here are 1) try to find out who people are and 2) convince institution to mine the data in a more effective way
		9. Mari stated that she went to conference last spring about retention and success in STEM programs all of those university had gotten grants to create programs to this end – they all had numbers – many people complained about not being able to get numbers out of the institutions – but some were able to. There are grants – but we don’t have much bandwidth to create the grants right now.
		10. Several people volunteered to assist with the Program Review effort:
			* Janice Nyland Little
			* Micha Sardell
			* Otto Radke
			* Matt Barton
			* Mark Gully
	4. Paul Wikins next discussed Capstone Mentors
		1. We have a capstone project for our programming and game degree students that starts in the winter term and continues into the spring term. Small groups of students build a project.
		2. Several committee members volunteered to mentor these groups. The mentor and groups met initially with a proposal and then met periodically throughout the project. He asked what the mentors thought of the process
		3. Janice stated that she had fun. She would have liked more interaction, the students didn’t seem to understand the opportunity to ask questions of the mentors. This group did a delivery tracking system for McKenzie Mist. I met early, they had a lot on incite already. The biggest incite I tried to give them was if it’s not your job to figure out the business model don’t do it. They already had made this realization. I felt I didn’t need to meet with them as much as I initially thought.
		4. Paul stated that he received overall positive feedback from students. At the winter meeting he will be sending out an email to ask for volunteers for mentors for this year. Looking for people to at a minimum be available for the proposal and presentation of project, but the goal is to meet about once a month for four months to check in with them and provide industry perspective. Hearing from industry has more weight than the instructor. Right now is only programming and game development. Jeff Jones stated he would like to see a similar process put in place for the Networking students.
		5. The following members expressed interest in mentoring:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Networking | Programming | Game Development |
| Janice LittleCicely ColemanMichael BarrowJeff JonesKen WilliamsMatt Barton | Janice LittleCicely ColemanMichael BarrowCharles LaBornOtto Radke | Judith Hoffman |

* 1. Michael asked for follow up on the Outreach to Women in Technology effort
		1. A committee member asked that this discussion be tabled until the following meeting. They stated that in the last meeting one thing Jerry had mentioned was the Tech Savvy UW grant – we had missed application deadline. Jerry mentioned he got the group together and finished application in the Spring. If we are to do this in the future we need engagement from all to get the application completed successfully. They sent an email to Jerry requesting more information
1. GOALS AND IDEAS
	1. Michael stated that he would like to get a better understanding of what is in the courses. As a committee we should understand what is taught and why. I was hoping to get access to this information and work more collaborative to understand.
		1. Brian stated that we should split up the effort by program and have members assist with programs, not entire department.
		2. Paul asked: Do you need program sheets? Course Descriptions in Catalog? Course Curriculum Sheets? What level of detail?
		3. Michael stated that he would like Course Curriculum Sheets with annotations of what we are doing this. IE: Why is math 95 a prerequisite?
		4. Brian stated that we have over a hundred courses in the program – not every member should have to review all them.
		5. Paul stated that we could make a repository of these files available to the committee.
		6. Mari stated that after making data available, we should break into groups at next meeting to discuss. And do this again at spring meeting. This would be very important and timely to do things over the summer to improve courses.
	2. Cicely stated that a goal would be to learn what Lane is teaching students about Big Data.
2. MEMBER NEWS
	1. Michael made a plea for volunteers for the Hour of Code effort in Eugene. It helps kids learn how to code.
	2. Lauren talked going through the RAIN program. People got a lot of value out of. Connection in the community was the most valuable – the contacts I received. Helps those with a business mind-set. Highly recommended. Will discuss with anyone interested.
	3. Dave stated that the Technology Association of Oregon allows faculty and staff to participate in events at low/no cost (as community partner).
3. NEXT MEETING

The next two meeting were scheduled. The winter term meeting will be February 2nd and the spring meeting will be May 4th. The meeting times were changed to 5 to 6:30 pm.