



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

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

TOPIC	ACTION
1. WELCOME! INTRODUCTIONS!	Meeting began at 1:20pm.

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>2. REVIEW & APPROVE MEETING NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TCAP Meeting Notes October 5, 2011 The October 5, 2011 TCAP Meeting Notes stand as distributed. 	<p>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.</p>
<p>3. REPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ I.T. Update –Mr. Todd Hampton/Mr. Rick Shaw 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TRAC Update – Dean Lisa Miller/Ms. Faten Habib <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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. 	Approval tabled until the February meeting.
5. ACTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Operational Plan – Approval 	Tabled until the February meeting.
6. ADJOURNMENT	Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

HANDOUTS	MEETING CALENDAR 11/12 1 st Wednesday, 1:15 p.m., A-138
AGENDA 12/7/11 – MCShare & Webpage	2011 09/07, 10/05, 11/02 (Cancelled due to Power Outage), 12/07
MEETING NOTES 10/05/11 – MCShare & Webpage	2012 02/01, 03/07, 04/04, 05/02
GOALS 2011-12 – MCShare & Webpage (pending approval)	

TECHNOLOGY - CAP		
RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
<p>TECHNOLOGY– Committee on Accreditation and Planning (Tech-CAP)</p> <p><i>Committee of Academic Senate</i></p>	<p>Plans, monitors, evaluates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 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 <p>Monitors the implementation of Agenda 3C of the self-study relative to facilities</p> <p>Ed Code 53200(c): processes for institutional planning and budget development</p>	<p>Co-Chairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 (<i>Proposed change; pending final discussions and decision of the Academic Senate Executive Council</i>) <p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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