Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC)
Meeting Notes
September 11, 2015

Chairs:

Jeannine Methe	Norman Buchwald	Scott Vigallon
Chief Technology Officer	Faculty Chair	Classified Chair

Core Representatives:

Tim Dave	Don Miller **(absent)**	Ken Agustin	
Chabot VP or Delegate	Las Positas VP or Delegate	Network Systems and Services Manager	
Mike Seaton	Steve Gunderson	Norman Buchwald	Lisa Ulibarri
Senior Instructional Network Systems Specialist	Senior Instructional Network Systems Specialist	Chabot Faculty Senate	Chabot Faculty Senate
Vacant	Ruth Hanna	Debbie Fields	
Las Positas Faculty Senate	Las Positas Faculty Senate	Faculty Association	
Minta Winsor	Scott Vigallon	Rachel Ugale	Vacant
Chabot Classified Senate	Las Positas Classified Senate	District Classified Senate	SEIU
Vacant	Vacant		
Student Senate, Chabot	Associated Students, Las Positas		

Guests: Wing Kam, Katherine Tollefsen, Victoria Lamica

1. **General Business**

   Open Positions - Norm Buchwald and Scott Vigallon will do outreach at Chabot and Las Positas, respectively, to outreach for student representatives to serve on TCC. LPC Academic Senate will be contacted to identify a replacement for Howard Blumenthal who is serving on LPC Staff Development this year. SEIU will be contacted for a replacement for Chasity Whiteside who recently changed roles at Chabot College.

   Approval of Meeting Minutes - Meeting minutes were reviewed by the group for April 10, 2015 and May 8, 2015. Jeannine clarified for Wing and Victoria the items related to the technology charrette, forms generation and document management. Both sets of minutes were approved.

2. **Technology Sections of Educational Master Plans & District-wide Strategic Plan**

   Jeannine Methe reviewed where to find the information related to technology in the Educational Master Plans and District-wide Strategic plan that has been posted online. Much of what is in the strategic plan and educational master plans related to technology will be topics to be agendized for the TCC to address in forthcoming meetings.

   District-wide Strategic Plan (See Section D6):
   http://www.clpccd.org/education/documents/1CLPCCD_SP_DRAFT_8122015.pdf

Chabot College Educational Master Plan (See Sections H1-H4):
http://www.clpccd.org/education/documents/2Chabot_EMP_DRAFT_August2015_000.pdf

Las Positas College Educational Master Plan (See Section C4):
http://www.clpccd.org/education/documents/3LPC_EMP_DRAFT_August2015.pdf

Scott suggested additionally posting links to the TCC website for the members to locate quickly.

3.   **Accreditation 2015**

Technology Updates - Standard IIIC - Jeannine Methe said information about technology in the college self-study documents are located in Standard IIIC and are consistent, but not identical between the colleges. Jeannine, Mike Seaton and Steve Gunderson provided input to the colleges for the self-studies. Jeannine wanted to make sure the TCC was aware that information on technology funding when the bond ends is addressed in the self-studies.

Alternative Funding for Technology when Bond Ends - She reviewed a handout that was provided for the colleges to use as a response to the accreditation item. Included was information about how the colleges must diligently pursue funding sources when the bond is no longer available. She highlighted that wiring and cabling is included under Facilities. Also, existing equipment should last for years long before any funding is needed for replacement. It will happen gradually as equipment is degraded. Network equipment has a life cycle of 7-10 years, desktops/laptops are 4 years, servers are 5-7 years, printers are 5 years and audio/visual is 5-7 years. Operational funds will be needed to fund replacements moving forward.

Victoria Lamica asked about copiers, with scanning and faxing capabilities, were purchased with bond funds and are on a 5-year cycle. Vendors are soliciting business as the current equipment is reaching the end of its life cycle, and she asked what the plan was to replenish/replace the equipment, whether they are purchased or lease, since bond funding will no longer be available. Are copiers seen as a separate item? Jeannine explained that copiers were not included in the assessment of current technology, although they require some IT support when associated software is involved. She suggested that Victoria add the maintenance of copiers to the list of items covered by Fiscal Services.

Jeannine continued with instructional equipment, saying it will now be handled as deferred maintenance. IT and Business Services identified budgets to support computers, audio/visual and some of the network infrastructure in the new buildings. Those will become an immediate concern for Mike Seaton and Steve Gunderson at the colleges. A portion of the funding for instructional equipment will be used for upgrades. Additionally, each year, needs will be determined for software/hardware at each of the locations and a budget submitted to District Fiscal Services and a budget would be allocated. Those projects will need to be prioritized by the TCC, with information shared out to the college technology committees.

Maintenance was paid in advance by the bond through multi-year contracts and will come due in 2016-17. The new amount will be higher as vendors have increased their maintenance costs. Vice Chancellor Legaspi will be bringing this information to the Planning & Budget Committee to be addressed.

Grants, such as the TEC grant at Las Positas, will also be used to purchase equipment.

One-time innovation funds through the Chancellor's Office will also be available to fund projects.

Scott Vigallon added that this information was also shared at the last Las Positas Town Hall meeting in one of the breakout sessions and was framed as an "Improvement Plan."

2015 Final Update to Current Technology Plan - Jeannine said that supporting documentation and updates for accreditation are listed on the District Technology Services website with a final update posted next week:
http://www.clpccd.org/tech/TechnologyPlans.php

Develop New 5-Year Technology Plan from EMP and DSP Goals - Work on a 5-year District-wide technology plan will begin once the colleges' Educational Master Plans and District-wide Strategic Plans are completed at the end of this year. The TCC and college technology committees will participate in the creation of this plan and be responsible for taking it to the shared governance groups for their input. Anything in the old plan that may not have been done will roll over.

4.   **State's "Online Education Initiative" (OEI)**

Scott Vigallon gave an update on the main things that happened since TCC last met. The Student Readiness tutorials are now available and can be used by any California Community College. Although we can use them without joining the OEI, they'll be more effective to colleges within the OEI because they'll be integrated into courses using Canvas. There are built-in analytics that allow instructors or system admins to get data on students and evaluation tools with these tutorials will also be built-in. The course exchange has been pushed back to start in Fall 2016. The OEI is still working on the business processes associated with students enrolling at other colleges. The OEI is transitioning colleges to Canvas using implementation cohorts that start in October and April so that faculty can participate in training outside of the summer months and instruction can begin at the start of a Fall or Spring term. Cohorts last 15 months, with the first three months dedicated to Canvas implementation. This includes authentication, SIS integration, support setup, branding, training and course migration. The 12 months following allow for campuses to run both Canvas and their legacy CMS in parallel for at least two full semesters. According to the OEI, on August 20, about 15 colleges have selected an implementation cohort for purposes of migration. Regarding OEI funding, while the intent is to fully fund Canvas through 2019, it is understood that the State's fiscal situation is subject to change. While it is unlikely that colleges will be asked to fund the cost of Canvas, colleges could be asked to pay for a portion of the licensing costs. It is being recommended that colleges save 20% of the cost savings from their current CMS license in case of future obligations to fund Canvas locally. The OEI is expected to provide information on what they consider the 20% to be, and it is expected to be an annual cost. If we join in two years, and the original OEI funding is finished, we might not be 100% covered. Those who have already joined the pilot are getting Canvas for free, but it is unknown what the State Legislature is going to allocate for funding going forward. They are saying there will be funding, and much of that will go toward Canvas

licensing. Scott said he talked to a colleague at Ohlone College yesterday and they are moving forward with going from Blackboard to Canvas. He also said it was reported in the news recently that Blackboard was up for sale. Jeannine said the current license is up for renewal next year, and has generally been renewed in two-year increments. Scott mentioned that the OEI is being flexible with dates because they want schools to adopt. Ruth asked what the obligation is for colleges who join the OEI. Scott responded that the college would use Canvas, which provides access to tools and support. Minta Winsor added that the course exchange and the use of Canvas are somewhat separate. If you go into the exchange, the courses have to be using Canvas. But, you could adopt Canvas and choose not to go into the exchange. Minta and Lisa Ulibarri reiterated Scott's earlier point that the OEI hasn't fully figured out SIS integration yet, which is part of what is holding up the course exchange. Debbie Fields suggested joining the course exchange without offering any classes to give students the opportunity to register for these other classes. Scott discussed the effect this might have on enrollment management, allowing students to register elsewhere and losing potential apportionment. Jeannine reminded the group that the recommendation to create an OEI task force should happen in the next few weeks to begin exploring these items. By the end of fall, the task force could report its findings, and by the end of spring, we would know enough to make a recommendation on what would be best for both colleges. Scott said with the rollout of the course exchange being pushed back to Fall 2016, there may not be sufficient information to make a decision about joining the exchange. Jeannine reminded the group that transitioning to a new CMS is not an easy task, judging from past experience, and it took a while to get support up to an adequate level when the District moved to Blackboard. She said she generally recommends not being the first to adopt new technologies and see what other colleges are experiencing and plan around the lessons others have learned from their early implementations. Debbie pointed out that not all faculty use Blackboard, as they are not required to and may prefer to use other CMS systems that are openly available, such as those through textbook publishers. Ruth Hanna asked if there was a pilot group of faculty who tested the system as research before the District moved from WebCT to Blackboard. Scott responded, saying Chabot used Blackboard. Jeannine added that faculty were involved with the selection of the CMS, but the conversion occurred all at one time. Scott asked Jeannine to explain the process to establish the OEI task force. Jeannine said over the Summer, she presented the OEI recommendation along with the forms generation recommendation to the Chancellor, who reviewed and approved both. Jeannine was going to connect with the college presidents and vice presidents to recommend who will participate on these task forces, along with District and college IT staff. She expects that this will all begin after the Accreditation visits. Scott reminded the group that there are individuals who can represent multiple groups on the task force, which could help in keeping the size of the task force manageable. Jeannine suggested looking at how many people are interested initially to see determine how to move forward. Ruth mentioned that it is difficult for faculty to commit to participating in these types of groups unless they know ahead of time what the regular meeting times will be. The few people who need to be on the task force because of their roles will determine a regular meeting time. Jeannine will wait until this is done before soliciting participation from the colleges.

5.   **Forms Generation Software**

Norm Buchwald said the need at the campuses is the ability to fill out forms such as conference requests, and certain types of HR forms. The fillable PDF forms are printed and sent via interoffice mail and staff are unsure of their status. We need a system to be able to submit

forms and know their status without manual intervention. Norm pointed out priorities listed on the recommendation form regarding forms generation that needed to be ranked and could be done by the TCC or a task force. This would help determine what systems out there meet the District's needs. In the May TCC meeting, the group discussed that some content management systems fulfilled these needs, and there may be some crossover with the selection of a new system for updating web content. Jeannine suggested that a good way to get participation on the forms generation task force would be to solicit the college technology committees for volunteers. IT staff who work on the backend would participate as well. Victoria said that she is also working on electronic forms and would like to be on the same page as the rest of the District as the forms generation project moves forward. Wing Kam added that he is using WordPress to create forms that are posted on the Chabot website, such as Prerequisite Override form, that sends an email to the staff person who is responsible for processing. If email is not available, he needs data submitted on forms to write to a database so the staff do not lose access, and WordPress is how he is dealing with that. As the number of these requests for online forms increases, he wants to ensure that the forms generation discussion includes these types of forms that will not feed into larger systems such as Banner. Steve Gunderson stated that this is one small piece of a larger problem, and the task force needs to look at this as a larger District solution. Based on the discussion, Jeannine summarized that volunteers from the college technology committees, District and college business offices and the webmasters will be part of the task force.

6.   **Web Content Management System**

Jeannine said this will be a District-wide initiative that includes the webmasters as part of the evaluation process. The process will not begin until a webmaster has been selected at Las Positas so that person may be included. Las Positas has reviewed demos of web content management systems and have that feedback that can be incorporated into the discussion of selecting a new system. The selection committee may have other vendors that they want to include outside of the six Las Positas has already seen. They will come back to the TCC with their recommendation. The new Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Governmental Affairs will also be part of this process. Wing asked how big the group will be making this decision. Jeannine suggested going back out to the colleges to solicit volunteers who may have experience or interest in helping make this selection. Wing said of the vendors who have done demos for Las Positas, he has experience with some, and he believes in getting 80% approval from the user base in selecting these types of systems as this provides a good starting point. He also mentioned that in the coming week, he's scheduled a demo with a web content management vendor based on the usage he's seen at Chabot. Scott said of the vendors they saw, he believes the users will be happy with any one of them compared to what they use today. Jeannine said she believes the selection committee will be able to narrow the field to three or four vendors and other groups can then provide feedback, approaching it in tiers.

7.   **One-Time 2015-2016 Innovation Funds – Potential Technology Projects**

Item deferred to October 9, 2015 meeting.

8.   **Software Training – Online lynda.com and Onsite Outlook Training by ITS**

Item deferred to October 9, 2015 meeting.

9.   **Enhanced Learning Environment – Classroom Technology**

Item deferred to October 9, 2015 meeting.

10.   **Other**

Banner Document Management System – Item deferred to October 9, 2015 meeting.