Technology Committee Meeting Minutes Location: PierceOnLine Training Room 2:00-3:00 PM – Thursday, May 11, 2017

Agenda Item			
Convene regular meeting	Meeting convened at 2:00.		
Adoption of agenda	<ul> <li>Agenda approved.</li> </ul>		
Approval of minutes	<ul> <li>Minutes to be approved during next month's meeting.</li> </ul>		
Bond Project/NOM AV Update	<ul> <li>M. Henderson reported that IT is still working out NOM's AV kinks; he noted that IT froze the NOM desktops that control AV, effectively forcing the instructors to reboot and returns the system to its default setting.</li> <li>W. Bass reported plans to remove the smartboard from DE and replace it with one that matches NOM for training sessions; she added that the new smartboard will be funded by Title V.</li> </ul>		
IT Report:	<ul> <li>M. Henderson reported that he sent out an order for another 170 desktops for the tech refresh; R. Sparks noted that IT has now refreshed 75% of all faculty desktops and is finished with NOM.</li> <li>M. Henderson reported that IT is still working on the backlog, though the help desk does take two techs away from closing tickets; R. Schleicher noted the help desk improves efficiency for simpler issues.</li> <li>L. Kraus reported that IT is becoming more efficient: the department used to close only 11 work orders per tech per month, but now is closing 23 work orders per tech; he added that IT is down to 267 active tickets, noting that it had over 700 one year ago.</li> <li>R. Schleicher asked if IT can differentiate between tickets that are for pre- or post-</li> </ul>		

- refresh equipment as this could support the tech refresh as a worthwhile investment; L. Kraus noted that he would look into it.
- M. Henderson reported that a large number of open tickets relate to networking, resulting in a huge backlog for the DCS; he noted that the department currently only has one active DCS.
- L. Kraus noted that the help desk means IT is generating and closing more ticket; he added that the help desk generally means fewer technicians are sent out, though some still escalate to specialists.
- M. Henderson suggested that IT publish end user guidelines related to the help desk, as not all faculty or staff seem to recognize which issues are help desk appropriate; he also noted that help desk requests should pertain to district equipment and not personal devices.
- W. Bass reported that students are still having issues with their email accounts and are getting blocked by A&R, resulting in a number of complaints coming to DE; M. Henderson suggested that A&R needs to validate their student status before directing these students to IT.
- W. Bass noted she has been forwarding student complaint emails to L. Lopez; R. Schleicher suggested including W. Marmolejo in the conversation as he is her supervisor and this is a serious bottleneck.
- M. Henderson reported that staff email resets have a two-day turnaround at District since there are not enough people; R. Schleicher added that around 75 IT related personnel are retiring this year because of the golden handshake, so lots of planning for IT supports needs to happen at district level ASAP.
- M. Henderson reported that Utelogy training

	and smartboard training are coming soon for faculty and IT; he noted that a lack of space has been a major obstacle for the training.  M. Henderson reviewed an action item for a maintenance schedule, which is needed because the phone system is in "dire straights" and in need of an upgrade; he noted that IT has regular Friday maintenance planned beginning in the summer.  M. Henderson reported that the new datacenter needs a 30 amp power supply and a complete shutdown of the datacenter is required; he added that Pierce has been without a disaster recovery solution since the datacenter was hit by a power outage last December.  M. Henderson noted that these new hardware components will allow Pierce to "bounce between systems"; R. Sparks added that Pierce cannot do a live migration to the new datacenter in its current state.  C. Gediman suggested checking when students will be registering for classes before shutting down the datacenter; W. Bass confirmed that the Fall 17 registration rush starts next Monday.  E. Tchertchian suggested the committee conditionally approve the action item; R. Sparks noted that waiting another month means another month without a backup.  W. Bass motioned and M. Henderson seconded approving the maintenance window action item with the exception of the last paragraph; the committee unanimously approved.
Accreditation	Nothing to report.
	M. Henderson reported that project rankings
IT Project Ranking Schedule	will be updated and presented to the
(effective June 2017)	committee next month; he noted that the SIS transition takes precedence right now.

	<ul> <li>M. Henderson reported that the rankings update will include more description of the projects; he added that he will also clearly indicate the ranking criteria used.</li> <li>R. Schleicher noted that the list must include projects that come down from District; he added that he will need to know the top 2-5 projects when he reports to senior staff.</li> </ul>
CFS/Utelogy update	<ul> <li>L. Kraus proposed standardizing the Utelogy platform across campus so all faculty enjoy and become familiar with a common system; he added that block grant funds would need to be used to fund this expensive conversion/</li> <li>R. Schleicher noted the proposal needs to be vetted by the Academic Senate and PCC as well as faculty need to be aware that these funds come from block grant money used for instructional purposes; he added that there may be competing products that Pierce has not considered yet.</li> <li>L. Kraus reported that the Crestron systems currently deployed in CFS are highly proprietary, like Apple, and require outside resources for service; he distinguished Crestron from Utelogy, which is an open system, similar to Android, and easier for IT to maintain.</li> <li>E. Tchertchian noted the cost should be around \$650,000 if completed in one year; he added that a permanent solution is needed for CFS, though a permanent solution may not make sense for NOM Phase 2.</li> <li>R. Schleicher noted that the building planned for the Mall is still a few years out (best case scenario); he added that there is plenty of money in the bond program that could support interim systems for NOM Phase 2.</li> <li>E. Tchertchian noted that the Math department lacks smartboards but does have projectors; he speculated that it may not be</li> </ul>

	too complicated to set up an interim solution similar to LLC.  R. Schleicher asked if Math faculty would be content receiving only "1/5th" of the features and functionality CFS faculty will be getting; E. Tchertchian noted the department understands it will be a temporary solution.  R. Schleicher noted the best utilization of block grant funds could involve renovating NOM Phase 2 first; he noted this proposal needs a wider constituency and recommended a broad solicitation of faculty input on this proposal.  E. Tchertchian motioned to postpone the committee's vote on the proposal until next month; M. Henderson seconded the motion.  M. Gend reported that he would vet the proposal to APC, but noted that there is only one more meeting planned before summer; R. Schleicher noted that a face-to-face meeting would not be required as a faculty vote could be solicited through email.
Committee Self-Evaluation	<ul> <li>B. Rosky reported that the committee needs to complete its self-evaluation and come up with reasonably attainable goals for next year; he noted the committee's current goals have always been on this year's agendas.</li> <li>B. Rosky noted that the committee has been diligent in meeting its goal of having greater ASO representation at its meetings, and completing the technology master plan; L. Kraus noted the development of the master plan encompassed many of the committee's other goals.</li> <li>W. Bass recommended that the committee continue making an effort to share with its constituents; B. Rosky noted that tracking and establishing communications with constituents would be a goal for next year.</li> <li>E. Tchertchian noted that any goals must</li> </ul>

### **Technology Committee**

Pierce College

	align with the strategic master plan; he added that committee members should email any goal suggestions to him and B. Rosky.
Items from the floor	Nothing from the floor.

#### **Attendees:**

Tom Anderson
Wendy Bass
Jose Luis Fernandez
Clay Gediman
Brian Gendron
Mark Henderson
Larry Kraus
Daisy Lam
Mitchell Pumar
Susan Rhi-Kleinert
Bruce Rosky
Rolf Schleicher
Randall Sparks
Eddie Tchertchian
James Theoharris

### 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.
4. To ensure communication on the third party assessment and implementation of Burwood study of Pierce College.	SMP Goal D.3	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.
5. Obtain Student representation on the committee	SMP Goal D.7	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.