

MOORPARK COLLEGE
Facilities/Technology – Committee on Accreditation and Planning
(T-CAP/F-CAP)
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 12, 2014 | 1:15-2:30 p.m., A-138

POSITION	NAME	ATTEND	DIVISION	FACULTY NAME	ATTEND
Co-Chair: Vice President, Business Services	Iris Ingram	X	Mathmatics & Physical Sciences	Marcos Enriquez	X
Co-Chair: Academic Senate Representative	Martin Chetlen	X		Tom Ogimachi	X
				Michael Walegur	X
Academic Senate President, ex officio	Mary Rees	X	Behaviorial & Social Sciences	Kari Meyers	X
Deans	Julius Sokenu	X		Jack Miller	X
	Inajane Nicklas	X		Lee Ballestero	
Business Services	John Sinutko	X	Enrollment Services, Health & Life Sciences	Christina Lee	X
	Darlene Melby	X		Brenda Woodhouse	X
	Todd Hampton	X		Audrey Chen	X
Associated Students Representative	Victoria Zolfaghari		Business, Languages & Learning Resources	Hart Schulz	X
Guests	Dave Fuhrmann	X		Faten Habib	X
				Kara Lybarger-Monson	
	John Dobbins	X	Performing Arts & Student Life	Traci Allen	X
				Nathan Bowen	X
				Dena Stevens	X
			Visual Arts & Applied Sciences	Howard Davis	X
				Gerry Zucca	X
				Ashley Chelonis	X
TOPIC				ACTION	
1. WELCOME and INTRODUCTION				The meeting was called to order at 1:16 p.m. Co-Chair Chetlen informed the committee that Co-Chair Ingram would be late but to start the meeting without her.	
1. Approval of Minutes January 15, 2014 meeting				The minutes were approved with the changes.	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>2. INFORMATION/REPORTS</p> <p>➤ IT UPDATE</p> <p><u>Mr. Todd Hampton</u>–</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 600 phones have been received and IT is in Phase 1 of deployment of the phones. Phase 2 will begin soon. ○ Co-chair Ingram stated that staff current phone numbers will migrate to new phones. Requests for new phone numbers will be considered for a specific and limited basis. ○ IT is currently getting quotes for phone links for PC's and laptops (district wide) ○ Will be conducting another inventory count this summer. If an instructor and his/her equipment are not here during the count, they will be contacted in the fall. ○ Working on installing a card reader for student printing in Fountain Hall. The student will be required to pay for printing similar to printing in the LLR. The questions still to be answered are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who will supervise the use of the printer? ○ Will there be restrictions to use of room where printer will be located? ○ Will access be granted at any time during the day or only when room is not in use? ○ IT is looking into the possibility of providing wireless printing ○ Per the approved plan, eight student computers will be set up in First Stop open area and 24 computers will be set up in FH-117. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-chair Ingram reminded the committee that the funds for the renovation of Fountain Hall came out of Measure S Funds, therefore no changes will be made the approved plan. <p>➤ INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY – Ashley Chelonis</p> <p>There is a statewide proposal to have a learning management system for all colleges. MC can continue using our current platform at our cost or we can go to the statewide platform for free. The intent of the new learning management platform is to allow students anywhere in the state to take online classes via the statewide system at any community college in the state. All faculty that want to teach these classes will have to use the statewide platform.</p> <p>Co-chair Chetlen stated that there are colleges around the state working on developing this system and identifying the challenges before full implementation. Mr. Fuhrmann is keeping a close eye on the project. Ms. Chelonis then commented on the current problems with Desire2Learn. We have Lync integration now which seems to be good for students but not for teachers.</p> <p>Co-chair Chetlen stated that MC is the largest user of Course Studio in the District allowing instructors to put things out on the internet via Banner. However, the scheduled upgrade to Banner will radically change Course Studio and make it difficult to use. While there is no timeline for the Banner upgrade, it is coming, so Co-chair Chetlen asked the committee members to let the faculty in their departments know about this potential problem. Mr. Zucca suggested that all MC drop Course Studio and force everyone to use Desire2Learn. Co-chair Chetlen responded that there is a lot of faculty opposed to making this change.</p> <p>➤ PROJECTS – Mr. John Sinutko</p> <p><u>Fountain Hall</u> - The balance of the student services departments will be moved into Fountain Hall on February 18 & 19, with the goal of having everyone moved by Friday, February 21. M&O will be working on the balance of the punch list items through March.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-chair Ingram stated that punch list contains items the contractor did not finish <u>not</u> “I changed my mind” items. For those items, departments will be required to submit their change request to John Sinutko, who will look at the cost of the change vs. the original request and a decision will then be 	<p>Ms. Chelonis requested that all concerns about the issues discussed be sent to her. She is also looking for faculty who are interested in being part of the pilot group to find out how difficult it is going to be to continue to use Course Studio once the Banner upgrade is implemented.</p>

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>made whether to approve or disapprove the request.</p> <p><u>Parking structure</u> – They are installing 33 cameras and the SRV parking counter today. The counter will only indicate available student parking. The counters will be located on the Campus Road and South entrances. As soon as the structure opens the overflow lot at the top of the campus will be closed. Mr. Enriquez expressed a concern that the entrances to the structure were going to actually increase traffic congestion rather than improve the congestion. Mr. Sinutko stated that a study was conducted before the structure was built and the choice of entrances was based on that study. Mr. Sinutko did acknowledge that no one will really know if there will be a problem until the structure opens. The only thing for sure was that pedestrian traffic from the bottom of the hill to the top will increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TRAWG Update –Co-chairs Julius Sokenu and Tom Ogimachi Co-chair Ingram reported that TRAWG has requested more time and will bring their prioritization list to the March meeting. Facilities is ready for prioritization now. ➤ FRAWG Update - Co-chairs – Inajane Nicklas and Gerry Zucca Mr. Zucca – FRAWG met to review the priority ranking proposal. As a result, they would like to add a category, “Plan for Need = Future Needs”. Ms. Nicklas added they would like to find a way to simplify the requests form, making it easier to read and input information. There was considerable discussion regarding the process and the problems with some requests that are not appropriate for FRAWG. There was a suggestion that more Deans need to be trained on what is an appropriate request for FRAWG so that mistakes are caught and corrected early. <p>3. Master Plan Timeline/RFP/RFQ Update – John Sinutko Mr. Sinutko stated that the plan is going to be reviewed by the Facilities and Capital Planning Committee at its February 19 meeting. Co-chair Ingram commented that if all goes well the plan will go the full Board of Trustees at its March meeting and we will begin implementation in the Fall. While this is a slight delay, it gives more time for campus wide “Y’all Come” informational meetings. Co-chair Ingram reminded the committee we are following the process that was developed years ago.</p>	<p>It was m/s/p to accept the proposed FRAWG Priority Ranking Guidelines as modified. It was m/s/p to discuss space allocation requests at the April meeting. Co-chair Ingram stated she would send out revisions to committee members next week.</p>
<p>4. Recommendations on Resource Allocation Priorities Tabled until the sub-group can meet.</p> <p>5. Strategic Technology Plan Asked committee to go into link that was sent previously and make feedback comments directly on that link or send them to Iris.</p> <p>6. Recommendation on combined Committee timeline, meeting date and time There was a brief discussion on whether or not the committees should be combined. Co-chair Chetlen pointed out that there is a lot of business that both committees have to deal with at their meetings and there is always a problem completing all business in the allotted time.</p>	<p>It was agreed to discuss this before the prioritization at the next meeting.</p>
<p>7. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.</p>	

Facilities and Technology - Committee on Accreditation and Planning

The Facilities and Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning makes recommendations on college-wide planning and accreditation issues related to facilities for educational programs and student service and those related to campus instructional and administrative digital technology. Monitors the implementation of Standard 3B & 3C of the self-study relative to facilities.

RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
FACILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY– Committee on Accreditation and Planning (F-CAP/Tech-CAP) <i>Committee of Academic Senate</i>	The committee recommends funding for technology based on a general allocation guideline that assumes budget stability or growth. As a rule of thumb, the committee recommends an allocation of a minimum of 30% of the college's total instructional equipment funding assigned each year to technology equipment, software, and hardware. The accreditation component under the purview of the Facilities and Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning is the development of plans to address any self-study advisement or visiting team recommendation that refer to facilities and/ or the needs of digital technology for students, faculty, and staff.	Co-Chairs <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vice President of Business Services• Faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate Council and is, therefore, a member of the Academic Senate Council Members <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three faculty members from each Student Learning Division appointed by the Academic Senate Council• Two Deans selected by the Executive Vice President• Three Business Service representatives selected by the Vice President of Business Services• One student appointed by Associated Students