Technology Advisory Committee (SACTAC)

Minutes

September 23, 2026

In Attendance: Jose Lopez Mercedes, Deanna Jung, Alexander Natale, Kelly Nguyen, Adam Morgan, Marvin Gabut, Christina Wagner, Mark Turner, Jimmy Nguyen, John Steffens, Luis Pedroz (arrived after minutes), Ron Gonzalves (arrived after minutes)

Absent: Jennifer Hoeger

Guests: Adam Howard, Andrew Auh, Parisa Samaie, Michelle Macintyre, Andrea Cristobal, B. Dane Clacken

1. Approval of the agenda [action]
    a. Moved by: Adam Morgan
    b. Seconded by: Jose Lopez Mercedes
    c. Result: Approved unanimously.
2. Approval of the minutes from August 26 [action]
    a. Moved by: Jimmy Nguyen
    b. Seconded by: Adam Morgan
    c. Result: Approved unanimously.
3. Public comment
    a. No public comment.
    b. Members were reminded to request agenda items and reports from the co-chairs at least one week before the meeting. Standing report slots had been removed from this meeting's agenda to allow time for scheduled business.
4. Approval of the Software Evaluation Subcommittee [action]
    a. Motion: Approve the Software Evaluation Subcommittee charter.
    b. Moved by: Luis Pedroza
    c. Seconded by: Mark Turner
    d. The subcommittee will develop software evaluation frameworks, evaluate proposed collegewide software adoption, gather user feedback, and make recommendations to SACTAC. SACTAC retains responsibility for reviewing the subcommittee’s recommendations and may request additional work or user feedback.
    e. Subcommittee members are appointed by their constituent bodies and do not need to serve on SACTAC. The administrative and faculty co-chairs are selected from the subcommittee’s own membership, rather than occupying additional seats. The second-read revisions removed the word “academic” from the faculty co-chair designation and replaced the District ITS representative position with the administrator responsible for college technology. The subcommittee has three administrators, three faculty, two classified representatives, and one student. Discussion addressed the designated counseling faculty seat and encouraged affected users to participate without voting membership.
    f. Result: Approved unanimously.

g. A subcommittee report was expected at the next SACTAC meeting following its first meeting. The SACTAC co-chairs would follow up with CSEA regarding appointments.

5. Approval of changes to SACTAC Charge and Membership [action]
    a. Motion: Approve updates to the SACTAC charge and membership.
    b. Moved by: Adam Morgan
    c. Seconded by: Jimmy Nguyen
    d. For SACTAC itself, the administrative and faculty co-chairs will be selected from SACTAC's own membership rather than listed as separate seats. The revised membership provides three faculty positions: one designated for Academic Affairs and two open to any faculty member, including Student Services faculty. A Noncredit classified representative was added alongside the Credit representative. Redundant "or designee" wording was removed; members' ability to designate a substitute was retained.
    e. SACTAC's charge was updated to reflect the annual technology replacement plan and review of technology resource requests, with detailed software evaluation work assigned to the Software Evaluation Subcommittee and recommendations returning to SACTAC. Accessibility and emerging technologies were explicitly incorporated. The wording changed from "responsible to" to "responsible for," with corresponding changes to the verbs.
    f. Result: Approved unanimously.
    g. The revisions were intended for inclusion in the forthcoming Participatory Governance Manual. Follow-up with CSEA was needed for the additional Noncredit classified representative.
6. Reports [information]
    a. Classroom Technology Implementation Update [information]
        i. The previous spring's classroom technology recommendation had been tabled by Planning and Budget and had not yet returned for consideration. The report was requested to clarify the status and costs of classroom technology projects.
        ii. The report reviewed classroom technology projects and the facilities process affecting cost estimates and implementation timelines, including facilities review, architectural and engineering services, design, DSA review, bidding, and construction. The School of Continuing Education and the I and F buildings were approaching deployment; the D Building and Phillips Theatre were in the design phase, with DSA approval anticipated in November 2027 and construction/deployment expected a few months afterward.
        iii. Discussion addressed the difference between initial technology-project estimates and full implementation costs, delays, inflation, changes in project scope, and the need for earlier coordination with facilities before recommendations reached Planning and Budget. The discussion distinguished the earlier A/S/W recommendation from the A/G/S/W scope in the facilities assessment. It was clarified that a SACTAC recommendation did not itself allocate funding.
        iv. Members expressed concern that prolonged delays and inflation could prevent completion of the planned work. The response acknowledged changes in project scope and the need for flexibility in the plan.
        v. Discussion considered consolidating the remaining major upgrades into one project, followed by primarily like-for-like equipment replacements. Usage-based

replacement was also discussed as a possible future approach. Members requested that a future proposal include costs.

vi. Follow-up: The SACTAC co-chairs, technology presenter, and facilities staff would work toward a proposal for a future action item. Developing estimates for a February presentation ahead of the spring Planning and Budget cycle was discussed.

vii. Disposition: Information only; no project approval or process change was adopted at this meeting.

b. Other