



Technology Committee

September 28th, 2009
2:30 pm, Room 1603

Present: Bob Kratochvil, John Gonder, Jeff Baker, Jeannine Methe, Kristy Woods, Scott Vigallon, Heidi Ulrech, Sherman Lindsey, Brian Owyong, Valerie Ball, Steve Gunderson, Elizabeth Noyes

1. Welcome & Introduction

VP Kratochvil welcomed everyone to the September Technology Committee Meeting. He had everyone go around the table and introduce themselves.

2. **Membership Review** The Committee reviewed the Membership list for the committee. Ensuring that voting members were notated and clarified. Notation to add Jeannine Methe to Ex-Officio Members. VP Kratochvil reviewed the listing of members. H. Ulrech suggested that someone call Karen Z. to see if she is to be on the Ex-Officio listing, Heidi does not recall that Karen has attended a meeting in over a year. VP Kratochvil suggested that Amber be removed from the listing unless someone knows if she is to be on or not. There was discussion on whether Amber would want to be on or not. VP Kratochvil said that he would ask the President if A. Machamer would be attending.

3. **Committee Charge Review** VP Kratochvil shared that the Committee needs to review the charge and approve it. The Charge was looked at last spring but not confirmed or decided on. S. Vigallon showed the past charge that was reviewed and decided upon in April 2008, yet that charge was never incorporated. That Charge was put up on the screen for everyone to review. Discussion ensued and notations were made as follows, with the below being the final revision:

Assesses faculty, student and staff technological needs; researches and analyzes options for campus-wide technology and makes recommendations for solutions in the following areas:

- Access
- Staff development and training
- Support
- Prioritization of resources and additional technology needs as they arise
- Collaboration with District ITS regarding District-Wide projects and issues
- Review and recommendations on LPC technology master plan

The Technology Committee will coordinate with other Committees that are impacted by technology-related recommendations.

4. **New Chair Nomination Discussion** VP Kratochvil suggested that the discussion of a new Chair of the Committee be started. It was proposed that John Gonder be the continued chair for PBC. It was voted on as a motion by the Committee and approved.

- MSC: K. Woods; S. Lindsey
- Vote: approved by all, no opposed, no abstentions

5. **Campus Reports Update**

- Steve Gunderson shared the many updates have occurred in the last few months. All instructional systems were updated for the Fall Semester. Voice/Data background was signed off for the new M & O Facility (Measure B). New Equipment installed in Bldg. 200 & 1800 (Geology Lab). Computers have been installed in 804, 805, & 1200, 1st Phase of the 2nd Life Cycle. Putting together equipment lists for the FF&E for the CCA Bldg., and the A/V for the IT Building. Network cable was installed in Buildings 200 – 500 for the Security Master Plan. Project completed in July/August. 1900 has been totally remodeled, rack placements, in preparation for the IT Bldg to come online. The Science project has been worked on most recently. Impact to get cabling into that building is being discussed. Kristy Woods asked when the Document Cameras will come online? Steve shared that updates are continuing all the time and if there is any immediate need, please let him know. 200 and 1800 are hopefully going to be put in the next month. SG will give her a better idea of timetable shortly. J. Gonder asked when the overhead will be replaced in Room 805? Steve G. shared that “It’s already been ordered for 805.”
- Heidi Ulrech shared the Telecommunications Updates. During the last 2 weeks, a new hard drive has been installed on PhoneMail. Usage is better and more storage capacity. Increase in hours to about 70 hours. The channels have increased as well; from 12 to 16 channels have helped. AT&T is due out this week, to extend a 2nd redundancy PR1 line for PBX systems. The phone installs are still continuing for the Security Master Plan. Installation is ongoing, 300, 400 have been done, and 200 is scheduled for this week.
- Elizabeth Noyes shared that at the end of May, the LPC website was converted to a new design, and code was edited for each template. E. Noyes is currently updating the process for uploading template options. This helps updating how things get onto the homepage. E. Noyes mentioned the concept of LPC using Social Networking sites, YouTube, FB, and Twitter to use for our campus. E Noyes shared that she has reserved a Twitter page, but no uploading/posting has been done. She also believes that there is the possibility of a YouTubeChannel for LPC. In addition she has found out that someone had a Facebook listing under LPC, and E Noyes has had herself added to the account as an Admin. She can upload things but has not yet. J Gonder shared as background for new members, in the past the Committee has had discussions in relation to this and realizes that there are already some sites out there. J Methe commented on this subject, by saying that there are groups that use FB, etc. Liability has to be discussed; there is an Oct. 14th date coming up for some training/collaboration in relation to this. J Methe will send the

information to E Noyes about attending that conference. It will go over how colleges throughout the U.S. have used this technology and liabilities involved and how colleges are setting this up. S Vigallon shared that a Distant Education Instructor told him about a YouTube.edu site/channel that other colleges are using. S Vigallon has sent off to open an account, but has not heard back from them yet. S Vigallon shared that there is potential for instructors to use YouTube as a learning enhancement to instruction. Dean Jeff Baker spoke about the knowledge of liability is huge, and how it represents our institution is very important. Dean Baker shared about paperwork that is filled out when you apply, about fitting in with the Path/Image of the institution. J. Gonder shared that it all depends on how YouTube is used by the instructors/students in class. J. Methe shared that it's important that both colleges document and define the use of this new technology. E. Noyes shared that this deserves some timely attention, as there are already a dozen Facebook entries for Las Positas College. Administration of Justice, Clubs, Veterans, students.

- Scott Vigallon updated everyone on Clickers. Clickers are here, and there is a training workshop tomorrow (Sept. 29), and a special one for the math department (Oct. 9) and another in November. New furniture will be arriving into the Innovation Center for Staff Development soon. The west side of the Center will be redesigned, as the IC has also been integrated with Staff Development. The subject of planning was brought up by SV for the Technology Master Plan, which goes until 2009. Possibly incorporating the Distance Education Plan with the Technology Master Plan? Integrating the two? J. Methe shared that it's an interesting idea, that we reference the Distance Education Plan, as being incorporated into the Technology Master Plan. We can add this onto the next month's agenda. (see Steve G.)
- J. Methe shared that her District Updates. There will be a Banner 8/ClassWeb/Zone upgrade. Oct. 6th, a demonstration will happen at Chabot (Sarah Thompson has been asked if they want to have it as well at LPC) S. Thompson will bring it up at the Senate meeting first, and then go forward. Waitlist is a new feature for Banner. There is more behind the scenes updating happening than will affect everyone. S. Vigallon asked if there would be any testing done in regards to Blackboard? VP K asked about the exact date of upgrade. JM shared that the upgrade will happen in late Dec. /early January. New features that will be there. VP K asked for clarification on the impact to registration. J. Methe will update us more next month, but shared that it will impact registration for about 4-5 days. Everything will come down in those days. H. Ulrech asked if there would be an email going out that will explain the changes/updates. JM shared that the transition would be seamless for users. J. Methe also shared that they are working with Laurel Jones, Jeff Sperry, etc. for the Accreditation visit in October. LPC posted their own documents on Accreditation.

6. **INTRANET vs. INTERNET** E. Noyes started the conversation of the Intranet vs. the Internet. There is desire of opening up the Grapevine for off-campus access. E. Noyes shared that John Ruys recently asked her to convert the Staff Development site, and then S. Thompson asked for the Academic Senate site to be converted also to the Internet. E.

Noyes can see the trend continuing from here. There are at least 45 website sections contained on Grapevine. Off-campus access is the big issue; much mention has been made of the lack of access to the grapevine. Adjunct Faculty is affected as well by this lack of access. Originally there were concerns about documents being made available to the public. E. Noyes does not see that anything on the Grapevine should be kept from the public. J. Methe shared that "On the Zone, access was added for grapevine", but E. Noyes shared that it doesn't work. S. Gunderson clarified that it is still password protected. S. Gunderson noted that it is not accessible and needs to be LDAPP'd. J. Gonder shared that it was discussed in the past with no resolve. Who is going to decide to open up the Grapevine? Should it be carried back to the Divisions, the proposal of opening up the Grapevine? S. Gunderson shared that if we open it up, it will be a short period of time before someone asks why don't we have an internal system? The question really becomes do we open it up, and if so, can we? J. Gonder shared that in the past, people are concerned about what documents are on the intranet and internet. J. Gonder asked that everyone take it back to their respective Senates/Divisions to discuss. J. Methe asked that at some point people will ask for a secure place to store documents, etc. Some documents are official and some are deliberative. Shall we divide it up? Maintain 2 sets of documents? Or do we keep logins for certain documents? VP K asked what was S. Thompson's request exactly? S. Vigallon shared that S. Thompson came to him and stated simply that they (Academic Senate) want this, this and this uploaded to the public website. K. Woods believes that this would have to go to Academic Senate, no matter what. VP K shared that Dr P would like this committee's recommendation on the matter. E. Noyes shared that giving the passwords and logins to the Accreditation Committee is a big request. E. Noyes went to Laurel Jones and asked what the background was for the request? Access issues for Laurel, so passwords didn't work. H. Ulrech asked what do other Academic sites do? It's done both ways in other institutions. Is there a way to make part of the site public, and parts of it not? If wanting minutes and details, there could be a password prompt. J. Gonder shared that there are ways to integrate a dialog box to allow for permissions, etc. to allow things, etc. Proposing the ideas to Division is desired. SG mentioned that there will have to be some clear collaborative effort, to make this happen and ensure who has privileges on what part. VP K asked that everyone take it to their Division meetings and that the President would like to take it to the next College Council Meeting. J. Methe shared that a good example is a final plan is something that could be on a public website, but something that is in DRAFT form would not be ready to post externally.

7. **Google Docs** John Gonder would like the divisions to talk about Google Docs and how they would like to use it. 3 different Faculty members have approached J. Gonder recently about how we are going to use Google Docs. Google docs collaboration can only work on outside Gmail accounts. The first step would be to get a handle on it, what do people want to do. J. Methe shared that we cannot use the same address as students. She can recommend a pilot program for Faculty in the future. A separate account/domain would have to be set up for Faculty. For some Faculty, it could be more difficult for those that are not as technologically savvy. Maybe Google docs will only be used by technologically savvy people.
8. **Clarification of Software Purchase Criteria** K. Woods started the purchasing software discussion by asking for clarification on Software purchasing and its role in the Technology Committee as well as approval processes for Faculty in the purchase of new or updated/upgraded software. S. Gunderson shared how things work now in relation to software purchasing, classroom requests, etc. Technology Dept. does pay for Campus-

wide software. We do not pay for these extra items. For example, K. Woods asked, MathEquator would come out of the Department's budget? IT installs it, but does not do anything else. All purchasers need to ask the question "Is there maintenance on this product and how often is it required to be updated/upgraded?" Oftentimes departments will purchase a product but not think about the future impact. K Woods shared that if Keith Level needs to purchase something, that he cannot afford in his limited budget, where does he go, what does he do? VP Kratochvil shared that maybe the Technology Committee would process review of software needs for different people. Then we would report to PBC the recommendation. K Woods shared that for IE requests, PBC has a process. VP K shared that he agrees a new process does need to happen in relation to software needs. For all locations, ITS – District takes care of Banner, Microsoft, but little instructional needs, these are all done by the Instructional Departments. J Methe shared that maybe we should find out how Chabot handles it. K. Woods also shared that a monitoring software might be nice to see what students are actually doing during class. SG shared that we use NetSupport to monitor what goes on, on a student's monitor. We have 125 copies, but have not renewed it. Steve decided to ask the company to bring the price down, and they did, and Steve bought the maintenance package to keep the product running/working. J. Gonder shared that we need to bring it to PBC for discussion. VP Kratochvil shared that the person may have to go to their Dean for alternate funding, if their request was not approved. If we implemented a process like that, VP K shared that it will have to be looked at, designed, etc. Departmental request form could be implemented, or the same IE Request form could be modified for these things. H. Ulrech shared that the form could work, and it would have to be decided whether it merits its own process. How does this process get maintained? VP K shared that we can see how this might work.

9. Other

- Reminder of Accreditation Visit on October 19-22 (VP Kratochvil)
 - Website was brought up and reviewed in regards to Accreditation
 - The Planning Document and Draft Schedule for the week of Oct. 19-22 were brought up for all to review on the screen and discussed in detail.
- Go-Print Printers Maintenance Discussion
 - H. Ulrech shared that the GO-print printer subject was brought up for discussion. It is a student printing interface, that allows them to put in a print fee card and then they can use it. Better way to manage usage, waste, and recoup costs of paper and toner. 8 years they have been used. Career Transfer Center was the beginning of it, then classrooms and Bldg. 700, Bldg. 400, Room 803, 805, etc. Now, there are so many printers all around campus, and not enough people to manage and maintain these. People have gone around to rooms and check toner and put paper in them. This needs to be revisited and discussed in the Technology Committee. HU shared that there is money coming in, but the money does go into the GO print fund. Is it the Technology Dept.'s responsibility to maintain toner and paper for these systems? Question is who is responsible for the monitoring of supplies and paper replacement. K. Woods shared a simple solution idea, is that in locations where there is nobody there, could someone call a person that is dedicated? No staffing to replace a monitor throughout campus. J. Baker shared that Academic Services has requested for this, as they do not have staffing to do these things for everyone. Then, people go to Ricoh and try, etc. J. Methe shared that everyone has printers, in

individual spaces, and where she is located at Chabot and District, everyone takes care of their own areas. V. Ball shared that everyone comes to her to get paper and supplies for the printer, just because it is located next to her. Toners are difficult to decipher if people do not know how to disassemble it, or install it. SG shared that LapTechs could possibly monitor the printer's toner and paper status. J. Gonder shared that this could be a very good idea. SG shared that nothing plugged into a USB port could be monitored. S. Vigallon shared a paperless option might be better, using K. Wood's idea of a paper attached to the GO Printers, that encourage students to print to PDF and upload to your teacher, etc. and not print at all.

**Next meeting is
Monday, October 26th, at 2:30pm, Room 1603**