## Agenda Item and Presenter(s)

### Meeting Called to Order
- **Time:** 8:40 A.M

### I. Review and Approval of Agenda
- **Discussion:** Agenda approved unanimously with the addition of two new items: Measure A Procurement and Security Cameras.

### II. Review and Approval of Minutes
- **Discussion:** Minutes approved unanimously. Motion by Fabian Banga, second by Mike Orkin

### III. IT Strategy
- **Presenter:** Tony Tortorice
- **Discussion:** CAO Tortorice emailed the draft of the IT Strategy to all the committee members prior to today’s meeting. The draft requires approval from the DTC in order to be forwarded to the PBC.

  The Strategy Plan includes a section on governance that should help with making the district accountable for all the projects that are included in the plan.

  The Plan does not include a specific section about staffing, but there is a section that addresses the need for appropriate staff in order to support each one of the projects.

  The budget on page 7 represents the estimated cost for each project. The following page shows the number of days it will take to complete each project. That is the hard cost.

  One of the themes in the Plan is mobile learning and Dr. Orkin has arranged for a faculty member from Ohlone College to do a presentation on how she uses mobile learning.
### IV. ePortfolios for Faculty and Students

**Alexis Alexander**

Alexis Alexander did a presentation on ePortfolios and how faculty, staff and students can use them.

There are 3 categories of ePortfolios: student work, faculty work and institutional assessment. In California there are several resources such as Educause, The ePortfolio of California (currently being used by SFSU), Chalk and Wire (hosted), Merlot (lots of tools for assessment).

Assessment should be part of what we look for when selecting ePortfolios.

BCC is using Mahara, but has not deployed it yet.

Alexis suggests forming a taskforce to explore uses and resources for hosting ePortfolios and adoption by the district. This taskforce will report back to the DTC at future meetings. Taskforce members are Alexis, Vina Cera, Mark Swiencicki (suggested by Rebecca Kenney), Karolyn van Putten, Fabian Banga will appoint someone from BCC.

The presentation shared by Alexis can be found on the Staff Development website: [http://web.peralta.edu/staff-development/e-portfolio-projects/](http://web.peralta.edu/staff-development/e-portfolio-projects/)

### V. Budgeting for website hosting and (Items V and VI were discussed together).

Educational Services and IT are working together on both projects.
| **support** Mike Orkin | Dr. Orkin is working on creating budget line items in next year’s budget for website hosting/support and Moodle hosting/support. Dr. Orkin would like this committee to revise his proposed budget for these two projects and make a recommendation to the PBC.  

**MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO PBC THAT BUDGETS IN LINE WITH DR. ORKIN’S ESTIMATES BE INCORPORATED INTO THE DISTRICT BUDGET FOR HOSTING/SUPPORT OF WEBSITES AND MOODLE.** Motion by Fabian Banga, Second by Vina Cera. Passed Unanimously  

Memo documenting the motion needs to be sent to the PBC before February 24. | **MOTION TO RECOMMEND PBC THAT BUDGET FOR WEBSITE AND MOODLE HOSTING BE ADDED TO NEXT YEAR’S BUDGET.** Passed Unanimously. |
| **VI. Budgeting for Moodle hosting and support** Mike Orkin | See Item V |
| **VII. “Email to the cloud” task force progress report** Mike Orkin | The taskforce is made up of both district and college participants. They are looking at the two choices for email to the cloud: Google and Microsoft.  
Mark Swienicki shared a document with the taskforce that talks about UC Berkeley and why they chose Google. Next, the taskforce will visit CSU East Bay, which is also using Google.  
The taskforce will spend some time interviewing people who have gone thru the process of changing and then come up with recommendations.  
Concerns were raised about how this change will affect end-users. Need to make sure end-users have the opportunity to provide feedback. Also, need to make sure some of the current issues, like PS integration, are not carried over. |
| **VIII. Multi-Year IT** | In 2008, ACCJC recommended that district come up with a budget allocation |
**Expenditure Planning and the Budget Allocation**

**Joseph Bielanski**

- Each month the PBC looks at this model and looks at things that need to be included.

- At the last meeting, VC Gerhard brought up the issue of including IT in the budget allocation model. In the past, a lot of the IT expenses have been made out of Measure A.

- Right now we don’t have an ongoing sustainable budget for IT. If the colleges continue at the same rate, we will run out of money (Measure A) within the next 18 to 24 months. There aren’t a lot of discretionary funds, but when the financial situation improves we will have in place a sustainable ongoing budget.

- Peralta has a decentralized IT and to VC Gerhard’s knowledge there is no delimitation as to what is the colleges and/or district’s responsibility. Whatever the recommendation it should be time certain.

- VC Gerhard suggests that it will be best if the DTC sets up the criteria and/or standards for the technology part of the budget allocation model. DTC should own the process.

- No action needs to come out from today’s meeting. Part of the response to the PBC can be a timeline as to when the DTC will be ready and the steps the DTC will take in order to get there.

- CAO Tortorice pointed out that there are a couple of projects in the IT Strategy Plan that align with this: the centralization of the IT budget and the end-device management.

- Inger Starks suggest a subcommittee to discuss this in more detail to come up with internal timelines and meet at a later time with VC Gerhard and/or Joseph Bielanski. Inger will take the lead. Other members of this subcommittee are CAO Tortorice, Fabian Banga, Mark Swiensicki (sugested by Rebecca Kenney), Alexis will select someone from Merritt’s Tech Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. Reports from Colleges</th>
<th>BERKELEY (Lee Marrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have not met yet, but will meet pretty soon. Berkeley is reconstituting their tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Reps | committee.
---|---
Still having an ongoing problem with smart-classroom cabling (cables provided are too short), but it looks like they finally got the correct cables.

LANEY (Inger Stark)
Tech committee has not meet formally yet, but they have developed an IT work group.

The next tech meeting is schedule for February 16. One of the items in the agenda for that meeting is the security project. Working on the development of priorities.

ALAMEDA (Manny Uy)
Alameda still has concerns about the computer refresh process and the notify issues in PS (students not having an email or incorrect email). **Manny Uy will like to request for IT to automatically insert the District generated email address in the class distribution list for each class a student signs up for.** CAO Tortorice is working on this last issue.

MERRITT (Alexis Alexander)
Reconstituting the tech committee. First meeting is schedule for next Thursday

### X. New Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) MEASURE A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the time the board sold some of the bonds, project numbers were assigned, but they don’t match the accounting project numbers. Implementing in the middle of the fiscal year is complicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B) SECURITY CAMERAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the DTC brought up concerns regarding the rollout of the security camera project. General Services (GS) is working on the installation of security cameras for smart-classroom. In doing this, the contractor has been given the go ahead to use any ‘unused’ fiber, which is used by the colleges for redundancy. GS is rolling out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a project that greatly impacts college IT departments without consulting with this group.

CAO Tortorice was aware they wanted to use fiber at the colleges, but was unaware that they were moving forward.

Linnea Wren explained that the contractors working onsite at the colleges at the moment are only mounting the cameras to the walls. They have not started to put network on the colleges, but they are asking for the location of the ‘spare’ fiber they can use. Once they take that fiber, the colleges can no longer use it.

IT was asked to participate in this project in summer 2009. Linnea was under the impression that the input given by IT had been incorporated into the design, but that is not the case. Fiber runs from a centralized building to remote buildings and back. The contractor proposes taking some of those pairs from IT and using them from surveillance cameras. Linnea has done some research into the setup at other colleges and most of them are using a shared design. She did not find anything that would suggest the stand-alone design is better.

Colleges are concerned about giving away network, since they are already limited as it is. As it stands right now Laney will lose about 95% of its redundancy.

The time for this committee to act and make a recommendation regarding this project is right now, as the contractor is working on the design and this is what will lock-in the use of the gigabian.

CAO Tortorice met with this group last week and had a hard time trying to convince the contractor to use the shared design. The contractor is insistent that it has to be a segregated network. The issue now is timing, since they will start hooking equipment within the next few weeks.

**MOTION TO SEND COMMUNICATION TO THE CHANCELLOR AND THE PBC WITH URGENT REQUEST TO IMMEDIATELY STOP THE ROLLOUT OF THE SECURITY PROJECT UNTIL COLLEGE IT, DISTRICT IT, AND THE DTC, HAVE ASSESSED IMPLEMENTATION AND MADE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE IMPACT OF THIS PROJECT ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.**
### Motion by Inger Stark, Second by Alexis Alexander.

Motion passes with 1 abstention (Charles Neal)

Charles Neal is concerned about the cost involved in stopping the project at this stage and as to why this is being brought up so late into the project.

Karolyn van Putten explained that this might be the first time this issue is being brought to the DTC, but the issue of not sharing information with all the parties affected has been going on for years. This committee has never been informed of the potential effects to educational technology at the colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjournment:</strong> 10:45 A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next meeting:</strong> March 2, 2012 (9:00am to 12:00pm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minutes taken:** Silvia Cortez

**Attachments:**
- DTC Meeting Minutes – December 2, 2011
- ePortfolio Handout
- Website and Moodle budget for FY 2012-13
- PBC Memo regarding Multi-year IT Expenditure Planning and Budget Allocation Model