MOORPARK COLLEGE
Technology – Committee on Accreditation and Planning

Plans, monitors, and evaluates institutional technology including hardware, software, and training needed to support student learning; the Technology Master Plan and Technology Inventory; funding for technology based on an allocation of at least 30% of instructional equipment funding dedicated each year to technology equipment, software, and hardware needs identified in the Technology Plan and annual program plans; The Accreditation Self-Study; and Monitors implementation of Agenda 3C of the self-study relative to facilities.

MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, December 7, 2011 | 1:15-2:30 p.m., A-138

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTEND</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FACULTY NAME</th>
<th>ATTEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair: Vice President, Business Services</td>
<td>Iris Ingram</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Applied &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Linda McDill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair: Academic Senate Representative (1)</td>
<td>Martin Chetlen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>History/Institutions</td>
<td>Jerry Caplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students Representative (1)</td>
<td>Krysten Jones</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Art, Media, Education &amp; Enrollment Services</td>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Cara Celniker</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students Representative (1)</td>
<td>Jon Foote</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Art, Media, Education &amp; Enrollment Services</td>
<td>Digital Media Arts</td>
<td>Timothy Samoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
<td>Riley Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language &amp; Learning Resources</td>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Kara Lybarger-Monson</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language &amp; Learning Resources</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Faten Habib</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Representative (1)</td>
<td>Rick Shaw</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Life &amp; Health Sciences</td>
<td>Animal Sciences/EATM</td>
<td>Jamee Maxey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Representative (1)</td>
<td>Todd Hampton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Life &amp; Health Sciences</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Jamee Maxey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Representative (1)</td>
<td>Dean Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life &amp; Health Sciences</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Norman Marten</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans or Directors (3)</td>
<td>Kim Hoffmans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Chemistry/Earth Sciences</td>
<td>Michael Walegur</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans or Directors (3)</td>
<td>Lisa Miller</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>CNSE/CS</td>
<td>Ed Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans or Directors (3)</td>
<td>Inajane Nicklas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Cindy Reed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans or Directors (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Physics/Astronomy</td>
<td>Balazs Becht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td>Darlene Melby</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Performing Arts &amp; Student Life</td>
<td>ACCESS/LS</td>
<td>Shannon Bowen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td>Ashley Chelonis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Performing Arts &amp; Student Life</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Denice Avila</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td>Learning Resources Supervisor</td>
<td>John Dobbins</td>
<td>Performing Arts &amp; Student Life</td>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts &amp; Student Life</td>
<td>Music/Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts &amp; Student Life</td>
<td>Theater Arts/Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOPIC | ACTION
1. WELCOME! INTRODUCTIONS! | Meeting began at 1:20pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. REVIEW &amp; APPROVE MEETING NOTES</td>
<td>Co-Chair Ingram called for a motion to approve the October 5, 2011 TCAP Meeting Notes. Co-Chair Chetlen motioned for approval. Mr. Norman Marten seconded the motion. Motion carries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. REPORTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T. Update –Mr. Todd Hampton/Mr. Rick Shaw</td>
<td>Mr. Shaw reported that the I.T. Department will be adding enhanced video cards to the thin clients. One of the issues was the inability for the thin clients to support very graphic intensive applications (Google Earth). Brief discussion was held. Dean Lisa Miller requested enhanced video cards for the Geology, Geography, and Environmental Sciences classes. Dean Inajane Nicklas noted that the World Languages classes are struggling with the thin clients because those courses are utilizing very graphic intense programs as well. Mr. Todd Hampton stated that the thin clients have been configured to handle flash and video capabilities and that the issues with the World Languages classrooms have been resolved. Dean Nicklas will follow-up with the World Languages Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Shaw reported that they’ve had some very encouraging feedback with regards to the server suite. There have been latency issues with the VDI, which appears to be a coordination problem with Microsoft. The provisioning time has been cut from hours to minutes. For example, they were able to reboot 25 desktops in 45 seconds, off of a point server in the classroom. Additionally, they are in the process of modifying the server architecture so they are not bottlenecked by the hard drives. All thin client workstations will be affected. It’s in the planning and testing phases now. There will be a limited roll out and they will be tested in a small environment (Oxnard) during the Spring. If all goes well, Moorpark College could see this change occur in the Summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally, Mr. Shaw reported that the Storage Array Network (SAN) was recently down due to a mechanical malfunction. The result was a loss of a day’s activities. The alternative to SAN is a solid state memory on each blade server. These are seen in the smart labs around the campus. Solid state drives historically have had more problems with overwriting capabilities, limited life spans, and added security issues. However, the latest generations can store larger amounts of data and the read/write cycles are faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Kara Lybarger-Monson commented that at the beginning of the semester there were a lot of issues regarding the thin clients in the classrooms she taught in; however, everything is working smoothly now. Mr. Norman Marten hasn’t heard anything regarding the initial concerns raised by his department. Mr. Jon Foote stated that the computers in the PS Building are no longer prompting for updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Shaw stated that success of the thin clients is the ultimate goal because of the value it brings to the enterprise. If there are additional problems, please email the Help Desk immediately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOPIC

- TRAC Update – Dean Lisa Miller/Ms. Faten Habib
  - Updated List of Technology Requests
    Dean Lisa Miller reviewed the 2011-12 Program Plan Technology Requests List with the Committee. She noted that the printed list was filtered and the Committee would not be able to see all of the requests at this time. However, Committee Members do have access to the electronic file, in its entirety, on the meeting webpage and MCShare. She indicated that new columns have been added to the List, “TRAC Member Researching Request” and “Referral”. Brief discussion was held.

Co-Chair Ingram stated that by the end of May or early June, there will be three prioritized lists; facilities, technology, and fiscal planning. Once every committee has made its recommendations and prioritizations, Co-Chair Ingram will send a written report to the President. Sometime in June, Co-Chair Ingram will send all three prioritized lists to each of the aforementioned committee members.

4. DISCUSSION

- Change Management Document
  Mr. Shaw reviewed the “Draft” Change Management document with the Committee and noted that it is a multi-headed piece that incorporates both communication and process. The Change Management document builds-in adequate timelines. The bulleted list drives what we are doing on the server and network sides. All of our server administrators and engineers are required to fill out online forms to document everything they do.

- Instructional Software Requests
  As classrooms and labs are provisioned, faculty will be interviewed to identify who will be using which room/lab. If there is a need for a change or an update, they will work with the faculty on this. They want to make sure that it works and it will not be deployed until they’re told it works. Mr. Hampton reviewed the flow chart titled, “Instructional Software Implementation Flow”. The flow chart depicts the identification, design, implementation, verification, and deployment of new software. Brief discussion was held.

- Service Level Agreement
  Co-Chair Chetlen indicated that the Service Level Agreement is an annual document that will be reviewed by TCAP. He recommended that Committee members review the document. It was suggested to define district issued equipment within the scope. The Service Level Agreements document will be revised once a year. The scope will be addressed as needed twice a year; October and March.

5. ACTION

- Operational Plan – Approval
  Approval tabled until the February meeting.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TECHNOLOGY– Committee on Accreditation and Planning (Tech-CAP) *Committee of Academic Senate* | Plans, monitors, evaluates  
• institutional technology including hardware, software, and training needed to support student learning  
• the Technology Master Plan and Technology Inventory  
• funding for technology based on an allocation of at least 30% of instructional equipment funding dedicated each year to technology equipment, software and hardware needs identified in the Technology Plan and annual program plans.  
• The Accreditation Self-Study  
Monitors the implementation of Agenda 3C of the self-study relative to facilities  
Ed Code 53200(c): processes for institutional planning and budget development | Co-Chairs  
• Vice President of Business Services  
• Faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate Council and is a member of the executive committee of the Academic Senate Council (Proposed change; pending final discussions and decision of the Academic Senate Executive Council)  
Members  
• One faculty member from each Academic Department appointed by the Academic Senate Council  
• Three Deans/Directors selected by the Executive Vice President and the Vice President of Business as appropriate  
• Learning Resources Supervisor  
• One representative from Information Technology  
• One representative from the Accessibility Coordination Center and Educational Support Services  
• One student appointed by Associated Students |