

<p><b>Tech Council Business</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review and approve minutes for <a href="#">November 16</a> meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minutes were reviewed, <b>motion</b> to approve by Kyle and 2nd by Robin - <b>unanimously approved</b>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Reminder - Next meeting is January 18. Subcommittee work is encouraged if desired between now and our next meeting. Also - Boardroom is being remodeled, so we will be meeting in 2/214 1/18 and 2/1.</li> <li>● Any additions to today's agenda? - no additions</li> <li>● Status Updates - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Tech Council Work Plan 2017</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Plan was review by the members of Tech Council and a few update were made.</li> <li>■ In reference to #7 - investigate current college employee Email platform (focus groups?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When inquiring some people were uncomfortable moving to a new platform.</li> <li>● What do we expect to learn from creating focus groups?</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Could someone from Tech Council attend a peer to peer meeting, to find how many people rely on using proxy or some of the other features of GroupWise.</li> <li>■ Letting people know that in the new system there are other ways to do what they are doing in Groupwise.</li> <li>■ One objective would be to learn about the usage patterns of the admins, and other people who do a lot of scheduling.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <b>Tactical Initiatives 2016-2017</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Has been updated but needs the linkage back to the core themes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Resources:</b>  <a href="#">Tech Council Work plan 2017</a>  <a href="#">Tactical Initiatives - Technology Plan 2016-17</a></p>
<p><b>General Business</b>  Attending: Bill, Ian, Barb, Tony, Meredith, Robin, Linda, Kevin, and Kyle</p> <p>Guest: Don Patton</p> <p>Recorder: Leanne Guthrie</p> <p>Quorum (8): 9/14</p>	<p><b>Planned Topics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Updates from <a href="#">GroupWise Email</a> Subgroup? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No update at this time</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <a href="#">Employee</a> Communications Policy Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Committee spent time reviewing the Employee Communications Policy and discussed some of the details on what is required by law.</li> <li>○ Giving an example that uses a specific timeline is better.</li> <li>○ Should we be concerned about gender specific pronouns? (not at this time)</li> <li>○ There has been concern about the use of using the BCC</li> <li>○ When using BCC to email a group, employees are encouraged to include in their email somewhere in the text who is receiving the email and who is sending the email (if not immediately clear from the address).</li> <li>○ Some people think that it would restrict open communication.</li> <li>○ There were concerns about trying to say "it is policy" instead of "encouraged"</li> <li>○ We will always get people that complain about the BCC whether it's policy or not.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- We think the issue might be;
  - People want to say they disagree with what was said. They want to respond back and they want everyone to receive this message. To hear what they have to say.
- Perhaps there is a way to inform staff that not all opinions should be voiced through the LCC email system. It is not the proper avenue for this purpose.
- The faculty union wants to use email as a way to have a group discussion.
- They feel that it is their academic right to use this platform.
- The faculty union wants to make sure that everyone that reads the original email can read all the responses.
- Faculty Union reports that there is a sentiment among some of its members to see who sent it and who received it.
- In regards to the previous policy the reference to “large group”, will that come into question?
  - No, because this is just a recommendation, not an absolute, just a best practice, so they can define large group however they want.
  - Changing the Employee Communication Procedure to Policy is going to help when trying to get employees to check their email on a regular basis.
- Could we say, as professional standard that we expect all staff to check their email on a semi regular basis?
- Another concern is how useful is the policy if we have no way of enforcing it.
- How do we think faculty will respond to this policy?
  - We believe there will be a mixed and polarized response to this policy.
- Should some of the responsibility be put on the sender of the email with follow up emails if no response in 1 - 3 days?
- Is it ok for any staff member to batch their email or only read it once a day?
  - Students expect instructors to monitor email throughout the work day.
  - A 1 - 3 working day time frame is reasonable for a meaningful reply.
  - We do not wish to create a specific static timeline because the situation will dictate the reasonable timeline.
  - Could we use the terms: reasonable, frequent and consistent basis even though it is open to interpretation?
- We are trying to communicate general, professional expectations.
- [Records Management & Archiving](#)
  - [Training video](#)
  - Where does the responsibility lie? With the employee or the IT dept?
  - The email retention policy is based on the content of the email itself.
  - The state archives office suggests that paper copies of all emails that are required to be retained should be printed out, put into folders and labeled according to content and then destroyed after the appropriate period of time.
  - The archives office suggests putting this responsibility on every individual employee.
  - Because of the way the law is written, we might suggest that it be IT's responsibility.

- The recommendation from the state archivist is to get a digitized records management system to keep track and set an expiration time.
- How we would get all the email into the dam we don't know.
  - The state does provide a dam, problem is how to tag the emails by content.
- Based on the quantity of requests we can make a decision.
- We get requests to review employee emails for litigation several times a year.
- Often the emails are not available so what are the consequences of not retaining the records appropriately?
- We need to ask Meg (school attorney) her opinion. Run the policy by her and ask who should be retaining the email information, and for how long?
- It is recommended that text messaging not be used for official business.
  - It's hard to have a text message fall under retention law because it is so short but it could fall under access law which could create a FERPA problem.
- The Tech Council suggested that we have Meg look at the Employee Communication policy before sending it on to College Council. There are significant financial implications if the college had to store all the staff emails for a number of years.
- Bill will look into how other CIO / Colleges handling it?
- Google apps for education has storage capability that may be the answer.
- **Motion was presented by Kyle** to forward the Employee Communication Policy on to the college lawyer and **2nd by Ian. Vote was unanimous. The motion was amended to also send the policy to College Council at the same time just as an advisory to get an idea of what their thoughts are. A second vote was taken and was unanimous.**
- Unconscious Bias Discussion related to Data - Bill report back?
  - Bill met with Greg Evans,
    - Greg has connections with people that can come and give live Unconscious Bias Training.
    - Are there any online Unconscious Bias Trainings? It would be better to have it online so we can track it
    - Bill will follow up with Greg to see if he can locate any online resources.
- Student Messaging Gatekeeper
  - OrgSync
    - Can we restrict how messaging goes out? Wouldn't guidelines be better?
    - Kerry & Christina are the only people that can send out messaging to the entire student body via OrgSync.
    - If you are a member of more than 1 OrgSync group you will get the same message multiple times.
    - The Gatekeeper needs to have a certain skill set to be conscious of things of what Sql query generated this list and is there duplicates.
    - They need to have some level of understanding to be a good Gatekeeper.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Is it ok for a student to not look at their email because they are being spammed?</li> <li>○ Gmail             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Restrict down to only essential information for the students like registration dates, financial aid, account balance... things of that nature.</li> <li>■ Allow the students to be given the opportunity to opt in to other communications and let them be their own gatekeepers.</li> <li>■ Could we send a weekly text message to 1st year students- letting them opt out.</li> <li>■ We don't want to inundate student messaging, giving them an excuse to not read the messages.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Of note: <a href="#">Why are colleges so bad at sending email?</a></p>																				
<p><b>Future Topics:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Continue discussion about Student Messaging and Gatekeepers</li> <li>● College ID Card update (Revisit January 18th)</li> <li>● <a href="#">Digital Signage Guidelines</a> - Work with Alen to develop policy</li> </ul>																				
<p><b>Meeting Schedule (3pm - 4:30pm)</b></p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>October 5, 2016</td> <td>October 19, 2016</td> <td>November 2, 2016</td> <td>November 16, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>December 7, 2016</td> <td>December 21, 2016</td> <td>January 4, 2017</td> <td>January 18, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>February 1, 2017</td> <td>February 15, 2017</td> <td>March 1, 2017</td> <td>March 15, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>April 5, 2017</td> <td>April 19, 2017</td> <td>May 3, 2017</td> <td>May 17, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>June 7, 2017</td> <td>June 21, 2017</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	October 5, 2016	October 19, 2016	November 2, 2016	November 16, 2016	December 7, 2016	December 21, 2016	January 4, 2017	January 18, 2017	February 1, 2017	February 15, 2017	March 1, 2017	March 15, 2017	April 5, 2017	April 19, 2017	May 3, 2017	May 17, 2017	June 7, 2017	June 21, 2017		
October 5, 2016	October 19, 2016	November 2, 2016	November 16, 2016																		
December 7, 2016	December 21, 2016	January 4, 2017	January 18, 2017																		
February 1, 2017	February 15, 2017	March 1, 2017	March 15, 2017																		
April 5, 2017	April 19, 2017	May 3, 2017	May 17, 2017																		
June 7, 2017	June 21, 2017																				
<p><b>Membership for 2016 - 2017:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CIO for Information Technology (1) – Bill Schuetz (co-chair)</li> <li>● Division Dean of Academic Technology (1) – Ian Coronado</li> <li>● Classified (3) – Rodger Gamblin, Denise Brinkman and Robin Geyer</li> <li>● Faculty (2) – Meredith Keene and John Thompson</li> <li>● Managers (2) – Tony Sanjume, Jen Steele</li> <li>● Students (2) – Ken Dinet, vacant (1)</li> <li>● Additional members by position (0-4) – Linda Schantol, Kevin Steeves, Kyle Schmidt, and Barbara Barlow Powers (chair)</li> <li>● Recorder: Leanne Guthrie</li> </ul>																				