



## 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, March 7, 2012 | 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		
Co-Chair: Academic Senate Representative (1)	Martin Chetlen	X			Business	Felix Masci	
					History/Institutions		
					Athletics/KIN/HED		
Associated Students Representative (1)	Kris Dowling	X	Art, Media, Education & Enrollment Services	Child Development			
				Digital Media Arts	Timothy Samoff	X	
				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)	Todd Hampton	X		Life & Health Sciences	Animal Sciences/EATM		
	Dean Adams (alt.)				Health Sciences	Jamee Maxey	
	Rick Shaw (alt.)	X			Life Sciences	Norman Marten	
Deans or Directors (3)	Kim Hoffmans Lisa Miller Inajane Nicklas	X	Math & Physical Sciences	Chemistry/ Earth Sciences	Michael Walegur		
				CNSE/CS	Ed Garcia		
				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	Mickey Howell	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p><b>1. WELCOME! INTRODUCTIONS!</b></p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 1:27 p.m. However, due to a lack of a quorum it was agreed that the meeting would be informal and that no action would be taken.</p> <p>A quorum was achieved at 1:40 p.m. with the arrival of VP Iris Ingram and Dean Lisa Miller.</p>	
<p><b>2. REVIEW &amp; APPROVE MEETING NOTES</b></p> <p>➤ <b>TCAP Meeting Notes   February 1, 2012</b></p>	<p><b>Moved by Lisa Miller Seconded by Kris Dowling Passed</b></p>
<p><b>3. REPORTS</b></p> <p>➤ <b>I.T. Update –Mr. Todd Hampton/Mr. Rick Shaw</b></p> <p>Mr. Shaw informed the committee that IT is currently plotting network outages to update the network configurations at the Fire Academy and VC. Moorpark College should not be affected.</p> <p>Mr. Shaw reported that IT swapped out the Palo Alto hardware at MC. Found that one retaining clip for the network was broken which is why there were so many problems. IT is waiting for the replacement device and will complete the repair over Spring Break with minimal impact on staff.</p> <p>Mr. Shaw reported that the information regarding the smart phone application was taken to the DAC IT meeting and was favorably received. The plan is to move forward and have the application available to students by Fall 2012.</p> <p>Mr. Shaw informed the committee that the District has been approached by Google to allow Google to create a highly detailed map of the campuses down to the corridor level. The District IT Dept. believes the final decision regarding this application rests with the campuses. Google would need a digital copy of the floor plans of each building to create the maps. All data they collect they will own and could be sold to other companies. Committee members questioned what the benefit would be to the District/campus and the issue of privacy vs. safety. Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hampton both stated they had just been contacted a few days ago and therefore did not have much information. Mr. Chetlen suggested that IT come back with more information at the next meeting, specifically 1) what is the benefit to MC should we agree to this request; 2) What is the benefit to Google?, 3) Is the trade off (privacy vs. security) worth it? Once IT provides the committee with this information, members will take the information back to their departments/groups for feedback.</p> <p>Mr. Shaw reported that Quest training will begin next week. They will start with IT staff and then train college staff. We are going from version 7 to version 7.5 which should result in better performance for laptops. The plan is to begin a gradual migration, while testing performance and reliability, with the goal of having the entire campus converted by end of summer.</p> <p>Mr. Chetlen asked if there were any more problems with Thin Client. Ms. Chelonis replied that the issue with the Thin Client seems to be one of a lack of consistency to perform. She went on to say it is difficult for IT to determine what causes this problem because of the failure of staff to file a formal report/work order with IT explaining exactly what they were doing when the Thin Client failed. Ms. Lybarger-Monson stated that her understanding of the problem is that instructors 'log off' rather than turn off the equipment. She wondered if it would be beneficial to put a reminder sticker on the desk instructing the faculty member to turn off the Thin Client rather than log off? Both Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hampton agreed that log off vs. turn off is a problem, but until IT receives regular reports of when Thin Client is failing it will be difficult to diagnose and fix the problem.</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>➤ <b>TRAC Update – Ms. Lisa Miller/Ms. Faten Habib</b></p> <p>Ms. Miller reported that after the February meeting the TRAC work group took the agreed upon criteria and ranked the received requests accordingly. The document dated March 2 is the result of that meeting. Ms. Miller then pointed out that about halfway through the document there is a gray line. This divides the requests for new equipment (before the gray line) and requests for replacement equipment (after gray line). The second document (dated March 6) contains requests that, for various reasons, have been removed from consideration.</p> <p>Mr. Chetlen asked Ms. Ingram about the budget. Ms Ingram stated that currently the same amount available last year is available for distribution this year. Ms. Melby reminded the committee that they have up to \$300,000 for refreshed equipment and up to \$45,000 for IELM (new equipment). Ms. Ingram went on to explain that where in the past we could refresh everything, this year will probably be different and FY13 will see even more limitations. Ms. Miller then stated that IT has gone through the list to review what needs to be replaced due to the 5-year shelf life. Mr. Hampton stated that the majority of the equipment should be replaced but does not need to be thrown out and a simple memory upgrade will work. In some cases, however, like in COM-151 where the computers do heavy processing, they cannot be upgraded but must be replaced. Ms. Melby stated that this would all have to come out of the same budget.</p> <p>The discussion then turned to whether or not the committee wanted to vote now or wait until everyone has time to review the list and then vote next month. Ms. Ingram reminded the committee that they recommended TRAC priorities be followed when making the list. Mr. Dobbins asked for further clarification on what action the committee could take with its vote. Ms. Ingram stated that the committee could ratify the list ‘as is’, recommend changes to the list, or reject the entire list and give the work group a new set of priorities in which to review requests. Mr. Dobbins then asked if the committee ranks the requests or the work group? Ms. Ingram stated that the work group ranks the requests and that the committee is asked to agree with that ranking. The ranking is the TRAC response to all requests vs. the priority of the individual who made the request.</p> <p>After some discussion regarding the April purchasing deadlines imposed by the District, the committee agreed to accept the recommendations of the TRAC workgroup regarding the prioritization of technology purchases for the Campus.</p>	<p><b>Moved by Tim Samoff Seconded by Denice Avila Passed To accept the recommendations of the TRAC workgroup regarding the prioritization of technology purchases for the campus.</b></p>
<p><b>4. DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>➤ <b>Other - NOTHING</b></p>	
<p><b>5. ACTION</b></p> <p>➤ <b>Ranking of Department Program Plan Technology Requests</b></p>	
<p><b>6. ADJOURNMENT</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 2:07 p.m.</p>

HANDOUTS	MEETING CALENDAR 11/12 1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday, 1:15 p.m., A-138
----------	---

<b>AGENDA</b>   3/7/12 – MCShare & Webpage	<b>2011</b>   09/07, 10/05, 11/02 (Cancelled due to Power Outage), 12/07
<b>MEETING NOTES</b>   2/1/2012 – MCShare & Webpage	<b>2012</b>   02/01, 03/07, 04/04, 05/02
<b>GOALS</b>   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"> <li>› institutional technology including hardware, software, and training needed to support student learning</li> <li>› the Technology Master Plan and Technology Inventory</li> <li>› 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.</li> <li>› The Accreditation Self-Study</li> </ul> <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><b>Co-Chairs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice President of Business Services</li> <li>• 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>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One faculty member from each Academic Department appointed by the Academic Senate Council</li> <li>• Three Deans/Directors selected by the Executive Vice President and the Vice President of Business as appropriate</li> <li>• Learning Resources Supervisor</li> <li>• One representative from Information Technology</li> <li>• One representative from the Accessibility Coordination Center and Educational Support Services</li> <li>• One student appointed by Associated Students</li> </ul>