

Technology Advisory Committee (SACTAC)

Minutes

Apr. 22, 2026

In Attendance: Alexander Natale, John Steffens, Jennifer Hoeger, Jose Lopez Mercedes, Kelly Nguyen, Adam Morgan, Marvin Gabut, Mark Turner, Lupo Lozano, Jimmy Nguyen, Luis Pedroza, Ron Gonzalves (not present for agenda and minutes votes), Andrew Auh (designee of Mary Steckler)

Absent: Christina Wagner

Guests: Parisa Samaie, Dane Clacken

1. Approval of the agenda [action]
 - a. Moved by: Adam Morgan
 - b. Seconded by: Mark Turner
 - c. Approved unanimously
2. Approval of the [minutes from Mar. 25](#) [action]
 - a. Moved by: Adam Morgan
 - b. Seconded by: Jimmy Nguyen
 - c. Approved unanimously
3. Public comment
 - a. No public comment.
4. [2026-2030 Integrated Technology Plan](#) [2nd read]
 - a. John Steffens walked through revisions since the first read, addressing comments from committee members and input from the Data Solutions Workgroup.
 - i. Data governance: added PD for data governance principles and practices alongside data tools training; changed “data owners” to “data stewards” to align with the data governance AR.
 - ii. External analysis: edited a reference that was external data per Mark Turner’s comment. Removed SAC Student Canvas Training reference per Jimmy Nguyen.
 - iii. Standardization & Resilience: added average cost data (technology refresh recommendations now average \$2.0M after the \$3.25M request), linked SOP for technology replacement, and added “one machine per user when possible” recommendation.
 - iv. Added number of business systems and link to total cost of ownership spreadsheet advocated by ITS; emphasized staff support considerations for new systems.
 - v. Accessibility: reworded to reference Equally Effective Alternative Access Plans (EEAAPs) instead of achieving 100% compliance, per Mark Turner’s feedback. Mark confirmed this addresses his concern. John and Alexander have a meeting with Dr. Krystle Taylor (DSPS) to discuss SACTAC’s role.

- b. Jose asked whether dual enrollment data covered noncredit Dual Enrollment programs. John noted the data came from SAC's Director of Dual Enrollment; noncredit did not have representation on the task force. Jennifer agreed input from counseling and high school subjects departments should be sought. John noted that noncredit feedback on the plan overall was sought. Jose volunteered to contact noncredit Dual Enrollment.
 - c. Luis Pedroza: asked about impact of a third read; praised the task force's work; recommended approving with future revision rather than delaying. Also emphasized better communication with noncredit going forward.
 - d. Three options discussed: (1) approve as-is, (2) table for third read in May, (3) approve as-is with understanding it will go to Dual Enrollment noncredit for feedback with possibility of revision.
 - e. Motion: approve as-is with the understanding that feedback will be sought from Dual Enrollment noncredit for future revision.
 - i. Moved: Luis Pedroza
 - ii. Seconded: Ron Gonzalves
 - iii. Approved unanimously
5. AI Agents in Meetings [information]
- a. John Steffens reported that proposed language for AR 3720 (Computer and Network Use) regarding AI note-taking tools in virtual meetings was presented to TAG (Technology Advisory Group) at the district level.
 - b. John's feedback to TAG: wants "approved" rather than "recommended" for tools handling sensitive data.
 - c. Luis Pedroza agreed "recommendation" is too loose; prefers stronger language.
 - d. Adam Morgan raised concerns about an "approved list" for faculty: communication burden on department chairs, compliance risk for adjuncts using unapproved tools, and limiting faculty's ability to adopt new tools in a rapidly changing AI landscape.
 - e. Alexander Natale noted this could become a 10+1 issue if it affects classroom tool use; Academic Senate would need to weigh in.
 - f. Jennifer Hoeger: need to define "virtual meeting" specifically; distinguish between note-taking, transcription, and AI summary; AI tools change so rapidly that any approved list would need frequent (potentially monthly) review.
 - g. Ron Gonzalves favored "approved" language from an ITS support perspective, drawing a parallel to computing standards; questioned allowing non-district tools for sensitive data.
 - h. Mark Turner (chat): raised broader concern about PII in any third-party collaborative document authoring tool, not just meeting note-taking. John agreed this is a starting point with broader language to follow.
 - i. John and Alexander will take all feedback back to TAG.
6. Reports [information]
- a. ASG
 - i. Lupo Lozano reported ASG elections are next Monday and Tuesday. No technology-related updates.

- b. Distance Ed.
 - i. SOP for Canvas Outage Communication
 - i. Jimmy Nguyen presented the SOP developed by the DE office after a student complaint to the Board of Trustees about a Canvas outage. Steps: (1) confirm outage via status.instructure.com, (2) draft faculty email notification, (3) send email and post Canvas global announcement (3-day visibility), (4) monitor status and send follow-ups, (5) send resolution notification with outage start/end times.
 - ii. Dane Clacken noted ITS already sends district-wide outage notifications; raised concern about redundancy and potential confusion from multiple parties sending status updates.
 - iii. Marvin Gabut clarified the SOP originated from a Board of Trustees request after a student raised the issue; DE advisory recommended a faculty-specific communication.
 - iv. Adam Morgan and Luis Pedroza questioned whether the additional email duplicates ITS communications. Kelly Nguyen asked about notification timeliness from ITS.
 - v. Mark Turner (chat): suggested step 5c read “Indicate to faculty when the outage began and when it was resolved.” Jimmy accepted the wording change. Marvin noted this can be brought back to DE advisory for further input.
- c. Noncredit
 - i. No report.
- d. Library
 - i. No report.
- e. Information Technology Services
 - i. Papercut Student Printing
 - i. Ron Gonzalves reported ITS is upgrading student printing from Pharos to Papercut. Benefits: more modern interface, better privacy/security, lower cost for the district, possible revenue generation. Pharos is becoming obsolete with declining market share and support.
 - ii. Target completion: early June (before summer). Ron to present to ASG at their next Monday meeting.
 - iii. Luis Pedroza emphasized the need for student input and ensuring the new system is at least as intuitive as the current one. Lupo Lozano shared his own confusing experience printing in the library and agreed to coordinate an ASG presentation.
 - iv. Jennifer Hoeger asked about noncredit printing and pricing. Luis confirmed current rates: 8¢/page B&W, 50¢/page color.
- f. Student Information Support
 - i. Starfish
 - i. John Steffens presented an overview of Starfish, noting the administration is considering not renewing the contract. Three primary

functions: case management (centralized student data across systems / programs), early alert (flags for at-risk students via progress surveys, manual referrals, and automated system-raised alerts), and a student portal (service catalog, appointment scheduling, to-do items).

- ii. Usage is up across all methods year over year: faculty participation increasing, alert coverage growing, and system-raised flags (especially Canvas inactivity) have skyrocketed this year. Noncredit also using automated flags for online students not logging into Canvas.
 - iii. Adam Morgan asked about alert routing for inactive students; John explained it depends on cohort membership (e.g., U2 Scholars alerts go to that service area). Faculty can view alerts for their rosters on the Tracking tab.
 - iv. Goals: expand alerts for first-generation and first-year students, build automated alerts for transfer-level English and Math. Work group meets third Tuesday of the month at 11 a.m.
- g. Student Services
- i. No report.
- h. Other
- i. No items.