Peralta Community College District
PBIM – District Technology Committee - Meeting Minutes
District Board Room
April 5, 2013 – 9:00am – 12:00pm

Present: Fabian Banga, Anita Black, Lilia Celhay, Vina Cera, Jannett Jackson, Calvin Madlock, Antoine Mehouelley, Charles Neal, Mike Orkin, Jo Ann Phillips, Manny Uy, Mark Wilson, Mary Louise Zernicke

Guests: Joseph Bielanski, Adela Esquivel-Swinson, Ron Gerhard, Vincent Koo, Tina Vasconcellos

Facilitator/Recorder: Karolyn van Putten, Evelyn Lord

Absent: Bryan Gibbs, Lee Marrs, Bala Sampathraj, David Sparks

Agenda Item and Presenter(s)	Discussion	Follow-up Action	Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved/Unresolved?)
Meeting Called to Order	9:15 am AVC Madlock introduced Michael Dioquino, new Director of Technology Services. He comes to Peralta with California community college experience and expertise in smart classroom technology.		
I. Review and Approval of Agenda Facilitator	Agenda approved unanimously. Motioned by Anita Black, Second by Vina Cera.		
II. Review and Approval of Minutes from December 7, 2012 Meeting Facilitator	Minutes from the March 1, 2013 meeting approved unanimously. Motioned by Vina Cera, Second by Mary Louise Zernicke		
III. *Update***: Revised DTC Planning Calendar incorporating DTC Goals and Priorities for 2012-13 (Based on PBC Memo re expectations & Planning Calendar)** Facilitator/AVC Madlock	Several things got pushed to later dates and some got removed from the calendar for this year. The main thing that needs to happen this year is the prioritization of the college technology needs and it needs to be presented to PBC at their April 26 meeting. The review and assessment of the IT Strategic Plan and DTC goals got pushed back to the last meeting.		

IV. Create DTC Task Force for collecting and prioritizing IT needs from the colleges and District IT Facilitator/AVC Madlock	A couple of meetings ago we decided to create a task force to work on the prioritization of the IT needs for the colleges. Today we need to decide who will be part of this task force and the list needs to be ready by April 21 in order to be forwarded to the April 26 meeting of PBC. This task force will help integrate all the needs and prioritize them based on criteria/rubric provided. The outcome is to provide AVC Madlock with an idea of the technology expenditures at the colleges, combining some of the needs in order to save, and to show proof for the matching funds that the Chancellor has offered to the colleges and the district. Revisions have been made to the templates as per requested at the last DTC meeting. It would be helpful if the task force has representatives from each college. Members of the task force have to be members of DTC. The task force team will be: Fabian Banga (Berkeley), Antoine Mehouelley (Laney), Manny Uy (Alameda), Anita Black (Merritt), Charles Neal (District), and Mark Wilson (Student Rep). Anita Black feels comfortable with most technical things, but would like to be able to get advice from the college's technical staff. She suggests inviting technical staff from the colleges to be part of the task force: Vincent Koo (Berkeley), Bala Sampathraj (Alameda), and Patricia Rom (Merritt). VP Black and President Jackson asked if this task force should take into consideration any project and/or infrastructures that are needed at the colleges such as new phone systems (VoIP and online counseling). The task force will be looking at the items in the colleges' prioritization lists. Keep in mind that this is for requesting possible matching funds that might be available next fiscal year. We don't know how much money will be available and the Chancellor will have the final decision. Projects like online orientation are district-wide projects that will require funding at the district level. If the projects are not included in the colleges' priority lists, they are not part of the process.		

	DTC could create a space for the colleges to bring forward any issues/projects that require IT support. This body looks at technology district-wide and we need to make a distinction between IT and DTC. There are several district infrastructures, like CCC Apply, that AVC Madlock will be presenting to this body. These projects involve other departments, but require a lot of IT resources. Karolyn van Putten made a point of clarification regarding the task at hand, which is the prioritization of the technology needs. There is a different arena for discussing technology needs.		
V. Review rubric, template and associated documents for prioritizing D-W IT needs from the colleges and District IT – *Clarifying Purpose, Process and Function (Operational)* AVC Madlock/Facilitator	AVC Madlock explained how the rubric and scoring sheets work. It was suggested to group items by project. There were several questions regarding the 'Adequacy of Funding' criteria, since the opportunity is for a dollar-for-dollar match, shouldn't the colleges show proof that they can fund 50% of the project? Funding seems more like needed information, but not a requirement for prioritization. It was suggested to change 'Adequacy of Funding' to 'College Commitment to the Project' and then include a question asking if the college has matching funds. Keep in mind that some project could be funded at a percentage, like the computer refresh. Even if the college does not receive the full amount needed, the funding they get will allow them to purchase some computers. Members agreed that funding should be part of the prioritization since this process is for requesting funds. They also agree with funding being the criteria weighed the lowest, which means that the college with the most money does not necessarily get the higher score. The most weight has been assigned to "Improves Instruction', but needs to take into consideration Student Support Services. Evelyn Lord suggests modifying this criteria to Improves Instruction/Student Support.' Mark		

	Wilson suggest including Student Support into 'Project Impact.' When writing the 'Statement of Need,' keep in mind the students' goals. Is not how well is written, but how many of these goals are addressed. President Jackson has some issues with requesting funding for specific funding and not being sure how much money is available. One suggestion is to allow the colleges some flexibility as to what projects the college decides to fund based on the available funds after the closing of the current fiscal year. The task force needs to have the list ready by April 21. This will give AVC Madlock a chance to review and prepare to present it to the PBC on April 26. MOTION TO APPROVE THE RUBRIC AS AMMENDED. THE TASK FORCE WILL USE THIS RUBRIC TO DEVELOP A LIST OF COLLEGE PRIORITIES. Motioned by Anita Black, Second by Vina Cera. Approved Unanimously.		
VI. *Postponed*: Alignment of college IT needs/priorities with District IT Strategic Plan Projects/timeline (carry forward to AY 2013-14) Facilitator/AVC Madlock			
VII. Developing a process for addressing technology needs that involve facilities planning and execution (coordination with the DFC and/or Department of General Services) Facilitator/AVC Madlock/Banga/Sampathraj	We do not have a process for technology needs that requires work from the Facilities Department. There has been discussion as to who should lead projects that are IT related, but require the support of the Facilities Department. One example of such project is the smart classrooms. This lack of communication between IT and GS has also affected ongoing projects that have to do with facilities' renovations. Is it possible to have a preliminary meeting between district IT and GS when renovations and/or modifications include major IT infrastructure? Where in the process should		

this consultation take place to avoid any blunders? Can DTC make a recommendation? Charles Neal explained that this needs to happen at the beginning of the project and all stakeholders need to be part of this process. After GS completes a project, the college and/or department become the owner of that project and is responsible for it. VP Black mentioned that IT staff was involved at the beginning of the smart-classroom projects, they made recommendations, but the installation proceeded without taking into consideration these recommendations and these issues are still outstanding. Charles Neal explained that in his role as Project Manager he holds meetings with all the stakeholders, but that it is the responsibility of the stakeholders to attend meetings and share information with their colleges/departments. In the case of the smart classroom, the representative from IT attended the meetings, but did not perform well communicating to the rest of the department. The discussion last time was regarding who is in charge of IT in facility related projects, and who gets consulted. Stakeholders need to be at the table and demand participation at these meetings at the beginning of the projects and not toward the end. Maybe DTC could make a recommendation for stakeholders to be part of the planning process. We need to have a structure for managing the projects; and need to establish how communication will happen at the college and district level. If communication does not happen at the college level, it will not make sense at the district level. MOTION FOR DTC TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES CLEARLY ARTICULATES AND CONSULTS WITH THE DISTRICT AND COLLEGE IT REPRESENTATIVES DURING THE INTIAL AND ONGOING PHASES OF ANY BULDING PROJECTS (RENOVATIONS AND/OR NEW CONSTRUCTION), TO ENSURE TECHNOLOGY PLANNING IS INTEGRATED INTO THE BUILDING PLANNING PROCESS. IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED THAT A SIGN-OFF PROCESS BE		

	DEVELOPED. Motion by Jannett Jackson, second by Anita Black. The motion was tabled to allow input from all DTC members.		
VIII. Smart Classrooms maintenance and support: current status and future planning Facilitator/AVC Madlock /Sampathraj	Postponed.		
IX. District IT Reports/Update: AVC Madlock/Banga	a) <u>Email to the cloud (Gmail) project status</u>: This project has been postponed until after the PeopleSoft (9.0) Upgrade. b) <u>PeopleSoft Upgrade and PeopleSoft Resolution Team – timeline, etc.</u>: The PeopleSoft (9.0) Upgrade is on schedule to be implemented on May 20, 2013 c) <u>Financial Aid Module Implementation Plan</u>: This project is out to bid. Five vendors attended a pre-bid conference in order to present their questions. The bid should be completed by April 11. d) <u>New CCCApply Integration with PeopleSoft</u>: This project is the planning phase, but will not start until after the PeopleSoft (9.0) upgrade. e) <u>E-Transcripts</u>: This project will start after the PeopleSoft (9.0) upgrade. f) <u>Java Security Risks and Plan for Addressing same</u>: AVC Madlock and the Director of Technology Services are working on the language. g) <u>Electronic Content Management Project (ECM, *formerly knows as "Document Management System")*</u>: General Counsel is reviewing the contract, if approved it will go to the		

	April 23 Board meeting. h) <u>Computer Use Guidelines (pertaining to AP 3720 – Telephone, Computer and Network Use)</u>: AVC Madlock is working with ENG to redefine further. He will bring it back to next DTC meeting. i) <u>Distance Education</u> (Banga): No report.		
X. Reports from Colleges (Including Smart Classrooms Status) College Reps	No reports from the colleges		
XI. New Business Facilitator	Tina Vasconcellos made a presentation on Laney Online Orientation. This application is completely web based and it does not require support from district IT. The idea is to roll this out to all the colleges, since law now mandates online orientation. Laney has been using online orientation since July 2012. The application is accessible to all the colleges as they see it fir or as a stand-alone tool for Distance Education. Students need to log in in order to go through all the different sections of the orientation and a report will be generated (this report can be submitted to MIS). The Spanish version has been completed and they are currently working on the Chinese and Vietnamese version. The hosting fee is $600 a year.		
Adjournment:	12:07 pm		
Next meeting:	May 3, 2013, 8:30am to 10:30am		

Minutes taken: Silvia Cortez
Attachments: DTC Meeting Agenda – April 5, 2013
                         DTC Meeting Minutes – March 1, 2013
                         PCCD Definition of Technology
                         IT Budget Narrative Form – Planning Model
                         IT Budget Request From – Planning Model
                         AP 3720: Telephone, Computer, and Network Use
                         Rubric to Develop Criteria for Prioritization