Community
College
of Philadelphia
The Path to Possibilities.

Technology Coordinating Committee
Minutes
June 18, 2008 – Revised by JEB 6-23-08

1   TECHNOLOGY COORDINATING COMMITTEE 2007-2008

Appointees	Alternates	Delegates	Alternates
Bhvesh Bambhrolia	Matthew Shupp	Ruth Baker	Elizabeth Cantafio
Jody Bauer		Frank Bartell	Arnold DiBlasi
William Bromley		Constance Duaval	Fran Lukacik
SK Calkins		Jae Fisher	
Kathy Duffy		David Freeman	
Ellen Fernberger		Steve Jones	
Tom Hawk		Janet Liss	
Sam Hirsch		Kelly McQuain	
Jim Spiewak		Noelia Rivera-Matos	
Tim Sullivan		Karen Schermerhorn	

2   Members Present at the meeting are noted in **BOLD**.

3
4   **AGENDA**
5
6
7   **I.**   **Approval of May 2008 Minutes**
8   *A quorum existed for the meeting.*
9
10   *The committee met on May 21, 2008. A motion for approval of the March*
11   *meeting was received with a second. The Approval of the May 21, 2008*
12   *Minutes was carried.*
13
14   **II.**   **Old Business**
15   1. Review the proposal on the restructuring of Academic
16   Computing.
17   **Motion: To forward a recommendation to the Institution**
18   **Wide-Committee concerning the proposed restructuring of**
19   **Academic Computing.**
20
21   **Proposal**
22   **1. Move the reporting function of the Student Academic**
23   **Computer Centers from the Department of Academic**
24   **Computing to the Learning Lab Department.**

25   **2. Change the Department of Academic Computing to an**
26   **administrative unit located in a new division, Flexible**
27   **Learning Options and Academic Technology.**
28
29   **Guests at the meeting were Dr. Judith Gay, Vice President for**
30   **Academic Affairs, John Pinto, and Don Friel.**
31
32   *The item for the committee's review was opened for discussion. Dr. Gay*
33   *provided background information to the committee on the restructuring*
34   *item presented prior to the meeting via an electronic document.*
35
36   *The rational was summarized by Dr. Gay as one of relating the clustering*
37   *of services within Academic Affairs under leadership for discipline related*
38   *areas, student support areas, and flexible learning options. Since*
39   *Academic computing is not a strict discipline, the intent is to restructure*
40   *into appropriate areas.*
41
42   *John Pinto stated that the Learning Lab faculty were presented with the*
43   *restructuring proposal and agreed to the inclusion of the Student*
44   *Academic Computer labs as an extension of their service. It is seen as a*
45   *benefit to the instructional aides and adheres to the idea of a learning*
46   *commons environment.*
47
48   *The rational for the restructuring of Academic Computing is summarized*
49   *within the document. It should be seen as an opportunity for Arnold and*
50   *Don. They were given options and chose to remain in the new structure*
51   *within an administrative unit.*
52
53   <u>*Question from the floor:*</u> *"Why the delay in presenting this proposal?"*
54   <u>*Response:*</u> *Time was needed to ensure that a logical framework was*
55   *achieved. Due diligence was done with all areas and therefore took many*
56   *months.*
57
58   <u>*Question from the floor:*</u> *"Why is this coming to the TCC? This is not*
59   *normally a committee that deals with restructuring? Why is this going to*
60   *Academic Support?"*
61   <u>*Response:*</u> *This is not clearly defined by the Contract and therefore was*
62   *presented to the committee that would be impacted.*
63

64	*Question/Statement from the floor: Some of the proposal relates to the*
65	*work of this committee but the larger issue exists and therefore it is difficult*
66	*for "us" to consider without more time.*
67	*Response: Since no direct route is defined within the current governance*
68	*structure, perhaps the issue can be split.*
69	
70	*The committee was reminded that we are a recommending body. That*
71	*recommendation would be sent to the next level, the IWC for review. The*
72	*Contract, pages 87-88, references reorganization.*
73	
74	*Question: Again the question of why this committed and not the Academic*
75	*support committee. Concern was raised about the integration of the*
76	*Learning Lab and SACC as a proximity issue.*
77	*Response: John Pinto reiterated that the departments have met and NO*
78	*dissention was noted to the restructuring. This comes following the lab's*
79	*internal audit and fits within the need for new goals and objectives within*
80	*the department.*
81	
82	*The committee was reminded of the Learning Commons strategy and that*
83	*these adjustments fit within that model and the new vision of flexible*
84	*learning options.*
85	
86	**Motion made by Co-Chair Bartell to table the proposed motion until**
87	**all Federation committee members were present and were given**
88	**ample time to review the proposal.**
89	
90	**At approximately 1520, the Federation delegates present asked to**
91	**caucus. This was granted and the Federation delegates present**
92	**adjourned to another room.**
93	
94	**Upon return from the caucus, the Chair was asked to vote on the**
95	**motion made to table. Co-Chair Bauer denied the motion.**
96	
97	**A new motion was proposed to split the two items and vote on each**
98	**separately. A point of order of was called that this item was not**
99	**appropriate for this committee and since the committee has co-**
100	**chairs, a single vote was not acceptable and therefore the motion to**
101	**table was split.**
102	

103   *A vote was requested on the motion to approve Proposed Item #1*
104   *forward. Vote: 7-6 motion approved.*
105
106   *Discussion continued around the Robert's Rules of Order and proper*
107   *parliamentary process.*
108
109   *At 1600 Co-Chair Bauer adjourned the meeting.*
110
111
112 *Meeting adjourned*
113
114 *(Not discussed at the meeting)*
115 *A reminder for all that the* **Committee membership will be refreshed for the**
116 **2008-2009 academic year through appointments by the administration and**
117 **federation.**
118