

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

---

Technology Committee Meeting Agenda  
Location: PierceOnLine Training Room  
2:00-3:00 PM – Thursday, February 9, 2017

	Notes
Convene regular meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E. Tchertchian and B. Rosky lead introductions around the table.</li> <li>• Meeting convened at 2:00.</li> </ul>
Adoption of agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motioned by M. Henderson.</li> <li>• Seconded by B. Rosky.</li> </ul>
Approval of minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motioned by A. Youhanna.</li> <li>• Seconded by A. Roberts.</li> </ul>
Bond Project/NOM AV Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E. Tchertchian offered a “shout out” to IT and Admin Services for making Uteology happen, noting that the system looks and works great.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that IT is still working with instructors on getting them accustomed to using the rooms, noting that there have been some technical challenges with folks accessing equipment in the cabinet.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that many instructors came to the Uteology training, noting that a link for Uteology instructions was uploaded to the Pierce website.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that wi-fi APs had to be replaced in many NOM locations; he added that the licensing and firewall still need to be updated, though a temporary license from Palo Alto network is incoming.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that IT still has no DCS and has resorted to getting support from DCSs from other LACCD campuses.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that work orders are picking up now that NOM is open.</li> <li>• L. Kraus reported that IT team spent hundreds of hours to get NOM operational and led a round of applause.</li> </ul>

## Technology Committee

Pierce College

<p>IT Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standardization/Refresh</li> <li>• Work Orders Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Henderson introduced R. Nwaogu, a recently hired CNSS.</li> <li>• M. Henderson distributed a work order fact sheet and reported that IT currently has a 40% closing rate on work orders now that NOM is complete; he added that they are still working to transition to a one stop help desk.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that there is a districtwide effort to standardize technology and many of Pierce's custom IT solutions are going away, e.g., emails with more than 50 recipients will need to use Blackboard or a pre-established District mailing list, personal devices will not receive direct support, password lengths will be extended to 9 characters with a special character and number, and passwords will now be changed every 90 days.</li> <li>• W. Bass noted that the password reset requirement ends up locking lots of instructors out of their email over the summer and suggested timing the 90 day cycle so that the required password reset occurs during the spring and fall semesters; M. Henderson noted that the password reset cycle needs to happen in phases so as not to overwhelm the servers.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that @laccd.edu work emails are incoming districtwide; A. Youhanna asked if it will still be possible to see campus assignments; M. Henderson indicated the District is working on a way to group campuses together for campus-wide mailing lists.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that current credentials will have to be used to access Pierce wi-fi.</li> <li>• L. Kraus reported that 36 tickets were completed per tech per month; improved efficiency, number of active tickets substantially down; freeing time for more projects</li> </ul>
<p>Accreditation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing to report.</li> </ul>
<p>IT Department Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Henderson reported that all District IT departments are assessing their networks in</li> </ul>

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<p>response to the Valley breach; he added that any changes will be implemented piecemeal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• M. Henderson reported that IT has implemented a solid segregation between academic and administrative networks in order to protect the District network; he added that this has caused some issues and IT is reevaluating the configuration to follow best practices initiatives.</li><li>• M. Henderson reported that implementing wi-fi best practices has been IT's biggest challenge as custom configurations were developed over time to meet the needs of many diverse departments.</li><li>• M. Henderson reported that IT is now responsible for resetting student passwords, who typically demand immediate response; he added that L. Lopez assesses and validates the need for the password reset before forwarding the ticket to IT, which averages around 50 student password resets a day.</li><li>• B. Rosky asked why a student would need a password reset; M. Henderson noted that students often forget their passwords and safety questions when logging into the SIS; R. Sparks added that lots of students failed to change their passwords when prompted by the District for the new system.</li><li>• B. Rosky asked if the demand for password resets will decrease as the semester goes on; M. Henderson confirmed this is IT's expectation.</li><li>• W. Bass noted that students require access to their LACCD emails in order to get into Canvas, so password issues can delay students from accessing Canvas for up to 48 hours.</li><li>• A. Jiha expressed confusion about experiencing three different portals in Canvas; W. Bass noted there is only one proper portal, warning that Pierce College in Washington also shows up on Canvas.</li><li>• A. Jiha insisted that he has accessed and used two portals in Canvas, and that the main website has not worked; W. Bass noted the other Canvas is the</li></ul>
--	---

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<p>test site, warning that Canvas classes with 3<sup>rd</sup> party integration will not work on the test site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• W. Bass reported that the test site exists because District initially bought wrong url; she added that faculty have been informed of the correct url for Canvas, but they generally do not check emails.</li> <li>• E. Tchertchian reported that M. Perser is scheduling more trainings on NOM rooms in late February or March; B. Gendron asked if IT plans for more trainings, to which M. Henderson replied that nothing is planned.</li> <li>• E. Tchertchian reported that the Uteology training did not include a smart board demonstration; Uteology suggested that IT would have to review smart board functionality.</li> </ul>
Pierce OnLine Training Room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• W. Bass reported that WebFOCUS is down so any students starting Canvas this week will be unable to add; she added there has been no communication from the District on this issue.</li> <li>• W. Bass reported that she sent an email to all online instructors informing them of that she is not sure when the WebFOCUS issue will get fixed and encouraging them to extend student deadlines and due dates; she added that while instructors can take student IDs and manually add them to class, she did not advertise this because of the enormous potential for human error.</li> <li>• W. Bass noted that she received 10 phone calls from faculty who didn't open their email on the WebFOCUS issue; she asked the committee to please encourage their constituents to read their work email.</li> <li>• E. Tchertchian suggested using Facebook to remind students and instructors about the website issues; A. Robinson suggested using Blackboard to send a message to all faculty members.</li> <li>• W. Bass asked the committee if it was in favor of repurposing the unused online training room; C. Gediman suggested the equipment is now obsolete due to Uteology; M. Henderson proposed</li> </ul>

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<p>repurposing some, not all, of the equipment; B. Rosky suggested taking the matter to senior staff; E. Tchertchian suggested the committee support using the equipment rather than letting it go to waste.</p>
Housekeeping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B. Rosky asked the committee to review its list of names and constituency groups, and note any 2016 expirations.</li> <li>• B. Rosky reported on the self-evaluation process, noting that the committee needs to make another tiered wi-fi map now that NOM is complete; he added that the goal of creating a help desk has also not been completed.</li> <li>• B. Rosky reported that the committee has successfully revised criteria for priority list, though the five goals for the current year also need to show progress.</li> </ul>
IT Scheduling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Youhanna brought up the possibility of IT support on Saturdays; A. Robinson added that in addition to scheduled classes, administrators and Student Services staff are also present on Saturdays.</li> <li>• L. Kraus noted that Saturday support is a budget issue since an IT supervisor would need to be present on Saturday as well, escalating costs; he added that the proposed coverage could be vetted through Tech Committee but will ultimately need to be approved through Budget Committee.</li> <li>• A. Robinson asked if the administrative dean on Saturday duty could serve as the supervisor; L. Kraus noted that IT, like Facilities, requires a technical supervisor, so the dean on duty would not suffice.</li> <li>• M. Henderson noted that it is already hard enough for IT to get anything done due to supporting so many summer sessions; he added that IT needs more downtime for extensive maintenance projects.</li> <li>• B. Rosky recommended the committee put a narrative together detailing what support is</li> </ul>

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<p>needed; he added that this narrative could be embedded into the IT APP and then become part of a campus-wide discussion during the RPL process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• W. Bass expressed concerns about accreditation, noting that weekend students should receive the same support services as students during the week.</li> <li>• E. Tchertchian noted that the Center for Academic Success has similar issues where tutoring is demanded on Saturday, but the service is unavailable on weekends because no one is around to supervise student tutors.</li> </ul>
WiFi Network / E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Gend reported having difficulty accessing Outlook on his instructor laptop when connected to "Student AP;" he shared that he anticipates a number of questions about laptops and other wi-fi dependent devices at APC.</li> <li>• M. Henderson reported that this a safety precaution to prevent any breach of the District network; he noted there will only be one or two wi-fi domains total, and the domain will determine if user is student or staff.</li> <li>• M. Gend asked if it is possible to log into a different network with instructor devices; M. Henderson reported that, after this weekend, the firewall will be the "traffic cop" that dictates which machine belongs to which domain.</li> <li>• M. Gend noted instructors received no notification that "Pierce-AP" was being discontinued; R. Sparks noted "Pierce-AP" is in limbo and that IT is still waiting to hear from District how the new wi-fi policies are going to work; M. Henderson added that Pierce IT is trying to "not get in front of the District" on this one.</li> <li>• R. Sparks thought it was a good idea to distribute pamphlets about the wi-fi at the library; W. Bass added that she could post the information on Canvas as well.</li> </ul>

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

IT Core Funding; IMT to CNSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• L. Kraus reviewed an organizational chart for IT, including media services and Uteology support, noting that the department recently got approval for an A-shift Instructional Media assistant; he noted that this individual would be putting together media carts for classrooms without smart classroom tech and maintain the carts in the classroom as a makeshift media system.</li><li>• L. Kraus proposed hiring a CNSS instead on an Instructional Media Tech as the position needs to be filled by someone tech savvy enough to go out and respond to classroom media needs and equipment malfunctions; he added that the difference between staffing an IMT and CNSS is roughly \$25,000 per year and that the additional expense has already been approved by Budget Committee.</li><li>• E. Tchertchian noted there are more people on the CNSS list, so it should be easier to find the talent.</li><li>• M. Henderson reported that the Personnel Commission is changing IMT job description to include proficiencies with smart classroom technology; he acknowledged that specialized support for smart classroom tech is needed, but hopes that the new IMT job descriptions will attract different talent.</li><li>• B. Rosky noted that Tech Committee would recommend whichever position M. Henderson feels is most appropriate for the job; M. Henderson indicated that he supports hiring a CNSS so long as the technical is committed to receiving smart classroom training.</li><li>• M. Henderson noted that the typical CNSS would not have much smart classroom tech experience and would need training anyway; L. Kraus noted there are plans and funds in place for training.</li><li>• B. Rosky noted that a CNSS would have the advantage of understanding how smart devices are networked together; M. Henderson noted that while a CNSS role has more flexibility, a CNSS</li></ul>
---------------------------------	--

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<p>would feel limited if only working with AV equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• L. Kraus noted that the smart classroom tech will inevitably require 3<sup>rd</sup> party support, but level 1 and 2 issues can be dealt with by IT staff.</li><li>• E. Tchertchian noted that there are still lots of projectors and carts still on campus and asked if the CNSS will be able to tend to these issues; L. Kraus suggested T. Saund would still be available to address these issues.</li><li>• L. Kraus motioned, and A. Robinson seconded, the hiring of a CNSS, rather than an IMT, for smart classroom support; the motion passed unanimously.</li><li>• L. Kraus reported that \$200,000 in annual funding are currently allocated to desktop support, but no “core funding” is allocated to server room and network support; he added that a proposal to establish \$125,000 in annual funding for upgrading and maintaining backbone systems (networks, switches, servers, etc.) was approved last week.</li><li>• R. Sparks noted that the concern about network support came up in response to the refresh plan; he added that while backbone systems were part of the plan, it was unclear how these items were actionable if they were not part of the core funding.</li><li>• B. Rosky asked if the proposed cost was for an annual maintenance contract for servers, or the cost for replacing servers and equipment; L. Kraus reported that the funding increase is not for maintenance, but the replacement of the “backbone,” i.e., switches, servers, and network hardware.</li><li>• B. Rosky noted that the tech refresh plan does not address core funding, or a flat dollar amount; he clarified that it is a mechanism for securing funding as items come up for replacement on the refresh cycle.</li></ul>
--	---



Technology Committee  
Pierce College

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B. Rosky proposed that the committee use the refresh cycle to re-budget each year based on what is due for refresh; he added that this would not be an optional cost, noting K. Burke's insistence on changing instances of "should" to "shall" and "would" to "will" in the refresh language.</li> <li>• B. Rosky suggested the master calendar for the budget could account for annual adjustments to pay for any refresh items planned for a given year; L. Kraus explained that he wants to be careful to ensure there is enough funding for more than desktops and that there is room to strategize the spending.</li> <li>• J. Fernandez motioned for the Tech Committee to support L. Kraus's proposal; M. Gend seconded and the committee approved.</li> <li>• E. Tchertchian suggested the proposed funding be included in the refresh cycle; B. Rosky noted the items are part of refresh plan, but the dollar amount should be "chewed on" by Budget Committee.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned at 3:36.</li> </ul>

Attendees:

Tom Anderson  
Wendy Bass  
Jose Luis Fernandez  
Clay Gediman  
Sharon Dalmage  
Michael Gend  
Mark Henderson  
Ahmad Jiha  
Larry Kraus  
Anafe Robinson  
Bruce Rosky

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

---

Amy Sirott  
Randy Sparks  
Eddie Tchertchian  
Jim Theoharris  
Adrian Youhanna

Guests:  
Brian Gendron  
Bob Martinez  
Richard Nwaogu

**2016-2017 Goals and alignment with the Strategic Master Plan ([Click here](#) for a copy of the SMP)**

2016-2017 Goal	SMP Alignment	Explanation of how the goal aligns with the SMP goal
1. Explore wireless security taking into account different constituency need groups.	SMP Goal D.3	Collecting constituency needs for network access is essential in designing a secure network environment that is functional, efficient and secure.
2. Exploring locations for WIFI access	SMP Goal D.3	As campus construction moves forward, new locations for students/faculty/staff to congregate emerge. Collecting data from all campus constituencies is needed to recommend to administration needs of the college.
3. To understand and educate on campus personnel about the IT priorities	SMP Goal D.3	Customer service satisfaction is served by having information relating to how service requests are processed and the relative importance of each request. The committee constituency group input is needed to provide collaborative decisions on what IT projects are most important and highest priority to the college to recommend to administration. Communicating this back to each group allows for the college to manage expectations on requests made.

Technology Committee  
Pierce College

<p>4. To ensure communication on the third party assessment and implementation of Burwood study of Pierce College.</p>	<p>SMP Goal D.3</p>	<p>Campus staff depends on a reliable daily network connection which supports critical job function. As the college continues to assess the IT network and implement corrections, status information is routinely brought to the committee. Committee members are required to disseminate status of college IT projects and initiatives to their constituency groups in an effort to insure information is consistently shared college wide, and obtain feedback for college administrative use.</p>
<p>5. Obtain Student representation on the committee</p>	<p>SMP Goal D.7</p>	<p>Insuring that the student voice is heard through the shared governance process is critical to committee success. Student representation is needed to achieve this objective.</p>