College Technology Committee
"Because We Are Users Too"
P. O. Box 23069 ● Barrigada, GU 96921
Tel: (671) 735- 5537 Fax: 734-5238

AGENDA
AY2011-2012 Meeting Number 1
September 15, 2011 – 11:00 A.M.

Chair: Patrick Clymer
Co-Chair: Dr. Jay Sunga
Minute Taker: Dr. Jay Sunga

1. Call to order.
2. Acknowledgement of Members Present and those Absent

Name	E-mail	Present	Absent
Frank Camacho	francisco.camacho@guamcc.edu		
Patrick Clymer	patrick.Clymer@guamcc.edu		
Terry Kuper	terry.kuper@guamcc.edu		
John Limtiaco	john.limtiaco@guamcc.edu		
Anthony Sunga	anthonyjay.sunga@guamcc.edu		
Elaine Fejerang	elaine.fejerang@guamcc.edu		
Michelle Santos	michelle.santos@guamcc.edu		
Christopher Camacho	christopher.camacho@guamcc.edu		

3. Acknowledgement of Guests
4. Review/Approve Minutes;
5. Old Business
    a. Update in VoIP and PC bids
6. New Business
    a. FY2011 Technology Fees; rollover requested in order to complete bid award
    b. Selection of new Co-Chairs
7. Things we can't forget about
    a. PCI Compliance
    b. Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising services, and the topic of E-Mail Caching Service potentially from MCV/Kuentos (*on hold pending Banner 8 implementation*).
8. Open Discussion
9. Agenda for Next Meeting
10. Adjournment

AGENDA
AY2011-2012
Meeting Number 2
September 29, 2011 – 11:00 A.M.

Chair: Wesley Gima
Co-Chair: Elaine Fejerang
Minute Taker: Ana Mari Atoigue

Name	E-mail	Present	Absent
Christopher Camacho	christopher.camacho@guamcc.edu		
Frank Camacho	francisco.camacho@guamcc.edu		
Patrick Clymer	patrick.Clymer@guamcc.edu		
Elaine Fejerang	elaine.fejerang@guamcc.edu		
Wesley Gima	wesley.gima@guamcc.edu		
Terry Kuper	terry.kuper@guamcc.edu		
John Limtiaco	john.limtiaco@guamcc.edu		
Michelle Santos	michelle.santos@guamcc.edu		
Anthony Sunga	anthonyjay.sunga@guamcc.edu		

1. Call to order.
2. Roll Call
3. Review/Approve Minutes
    a. Meeting #1
4. Old Business
    a. Year End Report AY 2010-2011
    b. VoIP and PC Bids Update
    c. Campus Wireless Update
5. New Business
    a. Tech Audit/Galaide
    b. CTC Goals for AY 2011-12
        i. Enterprise Architect / ISP
6. Things we can't forget about
    a. PCI Compliance
    b. Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising services, and the topic of E-Mail Caching Service potentially from MCV/Kuentos (*on hold pending Banner 8 implementation*).
7. Open Discussion
8. Agenda for Next Meeting (Thursday, October 13th, 2010)
9. Adjournment

AGENDA
AY2011-2012
Meeting Number 4
October 27, 2011 – 11:00 A.M.

Chair: Wesley Gima

Co-Chair: Elaine Fejerang

Minute Taker: Ana Mari Atoigue

Name	E-mail	Present	Absent
Christopher Camacho	christopher.camacho@guamcc.edu		X
Frank Camacho	francisco.camacho@guamcc.edu	X	
Patrick Clymer	patrick.Clymer@guamcc.edu	X	
Elaine Fejerang	elaine.fejerang@guamcc.edu	X	
Wesley Gima	wesley.gima@guamcc.edu	X	
Terry Kuper	terry.kuper@guamcc.edu	X	
John Limtiaco	john.limtiaco@guamcc.edu	X	
Marlena Montague	marlena.montague@guamcc.edu	X	
Anthony Sunga	anthonyjay.sunga@guamcc.edu		X
Chuck Rios	Galaide Professional Services Inc. (GPSI)	X	
Frank Dumanal	Galaide Professional Services Inc. (GPSI)	X	

1. Call to order at 11:00am

2. Roll Call

   a. Guest: Chuck Rios and Frank Dumanal of GPSI

3. Review/Approve Minutes

   a. TABLED

4. Old Business

   a. Tech Audit review with Galaide Professional Services Inc. (GPSI)

      i. Review of the Enterprise Architecture with GPSI.

      ii. The report will be ready electronically by October 31, 2011. If satisfactory three hard copies will be printed. Committee members were informed by GPSI the document will be electronically updated through their continual review between November 1, 2011, through January 1, 2012. This process will maintain until the 1st of January.

      iii. Frank Dumanal mentioned the ITSP cannot be done as a standalone because it is linked to the Enterprise Architect.

      iv. Wes asked if there was a protocol in which Frank Camacho was the only one being sent the report directly. Frank Dumanal mentioned in the kick off meeting he was informed Frank Camacho was the point of entry into Guam Community College strictly for communication purposes. [Frank Camacho is the point of contact into Guam Community College strictly for communication purposes, but Carmen Santos also receives reports and emails.]

MOTION
ELAINE MOVED TO MAKE A REQUEST TO CARMEN SANTOS, BUSINESS AND FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR TO INLCUDE THE COLLEGE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRIBUTION LIST, MARLENA SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED.

v. Chuck Rios and Frank Dumanal addressed the College Technology Committee's concerns, questions, request to delete untrue statement, clarified unclear terms, statements, etc. on the College Technology Committee's initial review of the Enterprise Architect prepared by GPSI.

vi. The College Technology Committee requested that the transition paragraphs be kept but the actual transition plans be moved to the ITSP.

vii. Elaine mentioned [that the EA and ITSP should reflect the integration of all independent systems] there needs to be a movement to integrate all our systems.

viii. Chuck said he mentioned to Carmen, in the last meeting, there are a lot of modules SunGard is charging that are not being utilized. As a committee this could be something re-evaluated to use such funds toward integrating your systems rather than paying/renewing services for unutilized modules.

5. New Business
   a.

6. Things we can't forget about
   a. PCI Compliance
   b. Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising services and the topic of E-Mail Caching Service potentially from MCV/Kuentos (*on hold pending Banner 8 implementation*).

7. Open Discussion
   a.

8. Next Meeting (Thursday, November 10th, 2011)
9. Adjournment at 12:00pm.

MOTION
JOHN MOVED TO ADJOURN; FRANK SECONDED THE MOTION, MOTION CARRIED.

College Technology Committee
November 10, 2011
MeetingAgenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Wesley Gima/Elaine Fejerang	**Time: Start**	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	**Time: End**	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

Outline		
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	

4.	**Old Business**
	    Updates:
	            Tech Audit Review
	            Enterprise Architecture (EA)
	            Institutional Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP)
	            Campus Wireless
	            VOIP and PC Bid
	            CTC 2011-2012 Goals	

5.	**New Business**
	    Student Technology Fee Policy Review
	    Course Lab Fees	

6.	**Things We Can Not Forget**
	    PCI Compliance
	    Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services
	    E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)	

7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

Preparation			
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**
1.	Determine who prepared the Student Technology Fee Budget	W. Gima	11/10/2011
2.	WiFi Vendor Heat Plan (Physical Copy)	F. Camacho	11/10/2011
3.	Examples of other institution's Student Technology Fee Policy	W. Gima	11/10/2011
4.	Course Lab Fee – Where do they go?	E. Fejerang	11/10/2011

Computer Technology Committee Meeting #5

MINUTES   NOVEMBER 11, 2011   11:00AM   GCC TECHNOLOGY BLDG. 1000, TC1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	WESLEY GIMA AT 11:08AM / ADJOURNED 1:30PM
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	WESLEY GIMA
NOTE TAKER	ANA MARI ATOIGUE
TIMEKEEPER	
ATTENDEES	CHRISTOPHER CAMACHO, FRANCISCO CAMACHO, PATRICK CLYMER, ELAINE FEJERANG, WESLEY GIMA, JOHN LIMTIACO, MARLENA MONTAGUE, & ANTHONY SUNGA

Review/Approve Minutes

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   MEETING MINUTES #3   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Frank submitted, via email, his recommendations to CTC members clarifying statements made during meeting.
2. With regards to clarifications on statements made in review of meeting minutes, the committee has agreed such clarification will be indicated within brackets.
3. Elaine provided a new format for minutes to note taker to help committee members with tasks assigned.
4. The committee agreed to send any revisions to the minutes be submitted to the note taker 3 days before the next meeting.
5. Elaine requested that the motion on providing transparency on page three be clarified as to what kind of transparency is being referred to. Frank mentioned this was in regards to the Technology Fee.

MOTION AMMENDED
Frank moved to provide student technology fee usage transparency on the website,
Second by AnthonJay, Motion carried.

6. Frank requested the meeting minutes be numbered.

MOTION
Frank moved to have any revision on meeting minutes be submitted to the note taker 3 days prior to the next meeting for the note taker to compile all requested recommendation/clarifications for committee members review, any clarification will be indicated within brackets, and approve meeting minutes #3 as amended. John second the motion, motion carried.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   MEETING MINUTES #4   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Elaine requested clarity be inserted under item number 4, a, vii, to read: Elaine mentioned **[that the EA and ITSP should reflect the integration of all independent systems]** there needs to be a movement to integrate all our systems.
2. Frank mentioned we were supposed to have received three documents (EA, ITSP, & Tech Audit). Of the three only two was received (the EA and the ITSP). Wes requested that GPSI be contacted to provide the third document.
3. Frank requested clarity be inserted after the sentence under item number 4, a, iv, to read: **[Frank Camacho is the point of contact into Guam Community College strictly for communication purposes, but Carmen Santos also receives reports and emails.]**

MOTION
Frank moved approve meeting minutes #4 as amended. Elaine second the motion, motion carried.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]	Tech Audit Review/ Enterprise Architecture (EA), & Institutional Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP)	[**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Wes asked the Frank follow up on the Tech Audit Report for the committee to review. The EA and the ITSP documents were provided to all members for review. Wes provided many options for the committee to review and provide input in helping to meet GPSI deadline of January 1, 2012. Whatever recommendations are made by January 1, 2012 for both documents will then be finalized as is.
2. Elaine mentioned talking with Karen Sablan regarding faculty contract if weekly meetings, after faculty end date continues, since this is not part of faculty workload. We need to find out if a carryover is done, what accommodations would be made?
3. John suggested making this a priority to meet the January 1, 2012, deadline.
4. The committee members agreed to meet for a special meeting on 11/17/2011 and 12/1/2011 for an hour and a half in addition to the standard bi-weekly meetings with primary focus on the EA and ITSP. Frank will contact GPSI and see if they are able to meet with the committee for a last review on 12/15/2011 to allow time for any additional revisions before the 1/1/2012 deadline.
5. Marlena provided a copy of Dr. Houston's comments to all committee members present. Marlena suggested tying this into our self evaluation report (ISER) because we are College Technology Committee and it specifically talks about technology resources. In Dr. Houston's feedback he is asking; how and what evidence can we show.   Frank mentioned when he reviewed this with Marlena with regards to the technology resources area. According to Frank, it kind of puts the **ownist[is this correct?]** to MIS to address a lot of the technology resources with no distinction between what is information technology or instructional technology. Frank is letting the College Technology Committee know MIS is not completely charged with every kind of technology on campus. Marlena mentioned this committee answers a lot of the question Dr. Houston has.

CONCLUSIONS	The College Technology Committee will be meeting for an hour and a half on the 11/17 and 12/1. All

Members will be looking at this as a guideline to go through both the EA and the ITSP and be prepared with reviews for

The meetings. We should be ready to meet with GPSI on 12/15/2012 to review/clarify any questions our changes.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Request for the Technology Audit Report from GPSI	Frank Camacho	ASAP

Query the Union regarding Faculty Compensation	Elaine Fejerang	
Confirm with GPSI on meeting Dec. 15, 2011, for last review of EA & ITSP	Frank Camacho	

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   CAMPUS WIRELESS   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION
1. Wes requested the heat plan because it was mentioned in previous minutes and assumed it was for the entire campus but Frank said something about the heat plan only being for building 900. Frank clarified the vendor said they did a heat map on the entire campus. Based on that, they just extracted the one we were trying to clarify regarding building 900 and that's all they provided. A request was made to have them submit the entire campus heat map but they have not responded and was unsure if they would. Since the bid process has been officially closed and they are not obligated to respond since all documents were to be submitted prior.   2. Wes asked why the bid award was not done yet. Frank mentioned based on the evaluation, we have the cost breakdown per building. The vendor can agree to meet our price range by scaling back on certain buildings, however, its procurements obligation to communicate that with the vendor because it's in Procurement Phase.   3. Wes recommended tabling this discussion to a later date since it is the procurement phase.

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   VOIP & PC BID   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION
1. Frank mentioned it has been decided that GCC will not be moving forward on the VOIP with PDS. Keep in mind there is a government wide bid that will be closing soon. According to the CIO of the Government of Guam, Ed Cruz, GCC may be able to piggy back on it because it's an open government bid.   We may be able to get the VOIP as well as the Communication Services out of this bid.   2. Frank suggested removing the PC Bid item as this has been completed.   3. Anthonyjay mentioned he's requesting computers and was told to talk to his Dean about purchasing 2007 licenses. He asked why he needed to talk to his Dean when the Windows 2007 comes with the computer. Frank mentioned that if you're using the bid, you don't have to purchase Windows 2007 because it comes with it. Anthonyjay mentioned he was told otherwise. Frank asked who gave him this information. Anthonyjay mentioned he called MIS. Chris mentioned is the response given because the home or preloaded editions are unsupported.   4. Frank said he has already spoken to Sanford and you will get what you paid for. If GCC is buying a computer, that's already a legitimized system.   5. Elaine asked if, in the bid process, any notebook or PC's being purchased are being purchased with Windows 2007 and Office 2010. Frank mentioned if it's an image that was created with a prior purchase then yes we have it. Frank mentioned there are a few on campus currently using it and it will be in the labs soon.   6. Elaine and Marlena asked what the goal in installing them in the labs is. Frank mentioned based on the first request. The following labs (D2, D3, D10, A27, D4, & D5 (D4/D5 student center open labs) will be upgraded. D8 is being addressed by the Microsoft Office Academy. The goal is for all installations to be done by Spring 2012. Elaine mentioned training for faculty will also need to be put into place. Frank mentioned he's not sure how this will be done. Elaine mentioned this is part of CTC's charge and it needs to be addressed because faculty will come back to a new environment, there, suggestion is to put this in the next agenda.   7. Elaine recommended that a broadcast message be sent out to the campus community informing them the following labs will be upgraded during winter break. Frank mentioned there are four hardware/software upgrades.   8. Elaine's recommendation is that the broadcast announcement read; Microsoft Office 2010 will be in the labs D2, D3, D8, D10, & A27 by Spring 2012. During the course of Spring 2012; adjustments and upgrades will be occurring.   9. Elaine suggested including in the broadcast message to any faculty needing training. John's recommendation is that any faculty needing training be provided to the Dean's. Wes mentioned forwarding this training list to the CGC. Marlena mentioned this goes back to Dr. Houston's feedback document she provided the committee on alphabet b. The institution provide quality training in the effective applications of its information technology to students and personnel.   Elaine emphasized this is the institutions charge whether or not they have the money.   10. As per Wes, the training statement is the only thing removed from the broadcast message.

CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Broadcast announcement forward to PIO Jayne	Elaine Fejerang	

OBSERVERS	
RESOURCE PERSONS	
SPECIAL NOTES	

New Business

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Student Technology Fee Policy Review   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Wes sent the committee members several documents from other colleges for their review via email. It's something we really need to address in terms of how it's used. He recommended having a policy that goes into detail based on plans. Frank mentioned then board would then have to approve it because it's going to be a policy. Patrick mentioned we already have a policy.
2. Wes suggested creating a policy in which we really spell out how the funds should be used. Frank said we can do a recommendation to amend our current policy.
3. Wes asked them to read the documents for later discussion.
4. Elaine mentioned this may be a portion in the ITSP so both should be review.

CONCLUSIONS	This draft will be discussed with the ITSP.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Course Lab Fees   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Wes mentioned Elaine did a little research on the course lab fees.
2. Elaine mentioned in previous minutes, under Technology Fee, Frank mentioned he wasn't sure how the Technology Fee breakdown was done. She spoke with the Comptroller Edwin regarding this and he mentioned it was Carmen. Then he was asked about the course lab fees, specifically with the AS400 and how it's being paid. According to Edwin it's being paid by the technology fee.
3. Patrick mentioned the way it's supposed to work, from his understanding, is suppose to go into an account. This account is then given to the department to pay for expenses like certification, instructional needs for course, etc.
4. Elaine mentioned according to Edwin what happens is the course lab fees go into one account and used to buy supplies for the labs.
5. Frank said the course fee is to take care of any training or needs the faculty have not related to technology. Patrick mentioned there was a board resolution that increased tuition fees and maps out the charges. The purpose of the course fee is to pay for or carry out the instruction for that course.
6. Wes mentioned this was an accounting decision made by Taylor, when he was here, that said programs don't need this course money because it's going into their budget where the course fee comes from.
7. Patrick recommended getting a copy of the board resolution of the student fee increase because it also addresses the

course fees.

8. John mentioned he ask that question before and was told; it goes into a fund. When you need to start up new programs you would do so with this money and not go through grants.
9. Elaine recommendation that Patrick find the resolution. Patrick asked what the relevance is with regards to course fees. Elaine wants to see if it's paying for anything else, such as computer science labs.
10. Frank mentioned he has seen lab fees that were used to pay for special licensing for a particular class.   He also mentioned anything covered by program agreements are not paid by the technology fee.
11. Wes mentioned a lot of programs probably don't know about this as Viscom is one. They've been charging course lab fees from the beginning and have never asked for anything. Not everyone understands that these funds are available to them that's why this needs to be brought out in the open because some take advantage of it because they know about it.
12. Patrick mentioned faculty need to be more pro-active about it. If the department are not asking or don't' know how to ask, all they have to do is talk to Dr. Clare or Barry because they are very aggressive in getting those course fees assigned to their programs.
13. Wes mentioned if you don't know about it, how you can be pro-active and ask for what you don't know.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Obtain a copy of the Student Fee Increase Resolution	Patrick Clymer	

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Computer Supplies   [**PRESENTER**]

DISCUSSION	

1. Wes mentioned a couple of meetings ago procurement administrator Joleen said she was fine with putting out a computer supply bid. Ana Mari started with a list that was sent out to committee members. Frank mentioned he still has the past consolidated list and will forward it to committee members for review.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Forward previous Computer Supply list for committee's review/input	Frank Camacho	

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Interest Based Bargaining (IBB) –
                             retraining/refresher for CTC Members   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	

1. Frank mentioned since the CTC has both new and returning members, he felt it was time for the committee to keep the dynamics going in terms of IBB. Wes mentioned we didn't do this last year and asked for clarification as to what this is.
2. Frank mentioned Karen Sablan was the facilitator of the last training held. He feels it needs to be done to keep the dynamics going as it may diminish if things start to out of the IBB context. Marlena asked what is entailed. Elaine mentioned they share what bargaining/negotiation is all about. So if two people on a committee have a conflict, they both come to an agreeable compromise and collaborate to find out how much each is willing to give in the compromise. Frank also mentioned it's a consensus based environment of discussion with no hidden agendas with what takes place in a meeting. It's everybody's interest on the table with nothing hiding in the back.
3. Wes will talk to Karen and arrange training for next semester.

MOTION
Frank moved to proceed with planning an Interest Based Bargaining Training for next semester, [NO ONE

SECOND THE MOTION] second the motion, motion carried.		
CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**
Check with Karen Sablan for IBB Training	Wesley Gima	

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Novel Network Servers Phase Out Plan   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	
1. Frank mentioned MIS is encountering a lot of issue with our current Novell system not only because of their age. We are not investing anymore in the Novell version because it's an old version and we are moving towards the Microsoft platform as far as the server and possibly the units. 2. Marlena asked what the plan was to implement a file server for the campus. Frank mentioned there are three servers (the DNS, Web Cache, & FTP) that are already in the works which are not application servers. Wes asked if this could be a part of the ITSP and Frank mentioned it is actually part of it. Frank projects it will be completed by Spring 2012. Elaine asked if the intent is for the transition to be seamless. Frank replied; yes as much as possible. Once the server is ready, it will be seamless. 3. Chris mentioned the usage is 40 gigs of data and under 20 users using. Do we really want to move forward since it's so small. Marlena mentioned this is only for now because there's limitations on the server. We actually hope to have a document repository to achieve continuity whether people stay, leave, or come aboard. Frank mentioned there will be a replacement. 4. Frank mentioned the Novell server had many functions before such as a print server, file server, and an application server. Wes asked if there is a transition plan to show this is what's happening, etc. Frank mentioned within MIS there is. We are basically moving from one obsolete approach to another obsolete approach but in a more supported environment. Wes wants to make sure that everyone is aware this is going on. Elaine mentioned the only concern, from the faculty perspective, it to ensure the transition is seamless with no rupture occurs. That's why I asked if you are testing it in a controlled environment to ensure that seamlessness.	

CONCLUSIONS	This was just a "for your information".

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

Open Discussion

[**TIME ALLOTTED**]   Marlena's Apointment Memo   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	
1. Marlena provided a copy of the memorandum indicating her appointment to the College Technology Committee as a replacement for former Dean Michelle Santos.	
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Computer Technology Committee Meeting #6

MINUTES DECEMBER 01, 2011 11:05AM GCC TECHNOLOGY BLDG. 1000, TC1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	WESLEY GIMA AT 11:05AM / ADJOURNED 12:30PM
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	WESLEY GIMA
NOTE TAKER	ANA MARI ATOIGUE
TIMEKEEPER	
ATTENDEES	CHRISTOPHER CAMACHO, FRANCISCO CAMACHO, PATRICK CLYMER, WESLEY GIMA, TERRY KUPER, JOHN LIMTIACO, MARLENA MONTAGUE, & CARMEN SANTOS

Review/Approve Minutes

MEETING MINUTES #5

DISCUSSION	1. Tabled

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

Tech Audit Review/ Enterprise Architecture (EA),
& Institutional Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP)

DISCUSSION	

1. Wes mentioned the original plan was for the committee to focus on the Enterprise Architecture & the Institutional Technology Strategic Plan; however, this is the committee's official last meeting for the semester. At this point, it doesn't seem the committee will be finished with its review. It was mentioned the last time a review like this was done; it was done in the form of a retreat.
2. Frank mentioned this audit is a desk top audit, not intended to be a long drawn out process. The committee is still awaiting GPSI's response to the committee's review of the first few pages and the glaring errors, like the transition into the DE was suppose to be in the ITSP and the GAP analysis is missing in the EA, provided to them to fix.
3. GPSI has confirmed meeting with them on December 15th.
4. Marlena mentioned as a vendor delivering their product, GPSI has done that.
5. Carmen recommended the committee look at the scope of work requested.   Is there anything major not in there that we asked them to do. You may not agree with everything they say but remember this is an outside third party audit. Wes mentioned the committee never saw the audit. The committee has only seen the Enterprise Architecture & the Institutional Technology Strategic Plan. Frank mentioned it was confirmed that the actual Technology Audit report was not part of the deliverable. The only major errors we saw that was missing, as far as the actual deliverable, is the transition plan that was made into the E.A. when its suppose to be in the ITSP and the GAP analysis that was missing from the actual E.A. document.

6. Wes mentioned the focus of the plan seem not to be of the college s a whole but of the information technology geared towards certain parts of the campus. Information technology included all these different areas.
7. Carmen mentioned any tool or course that a program uses should be driven from the curriculum. When the curriculum is updated/revised it will tell him if he needs to update/upgrade equipment, computer systems, etc.
8. Terry asked about instructional technology pertaining to connecting to the network. Frank mentioned in the definition as modified by the committee, what was touched upon was the instructional technology that incorporates itself into the enterprise architecture environment like computers that need to be or have access on the network. If it's a silo type of environment that never touches the enterprise architect then it never becomes part of the E.A & ITSP. Terry mentioned instruction technology that needs more bandwidth, the EA needs to know that.
9. Carmen mentioned there will always be changes with the new technology, however, this audit is a snapshot in appoint in time. This committee will be the one updating these documents. We cannot predict the future. The focus was predicting out the future to include distance education. In the next semester or two we cannot predict we will need more space usage but we can predict a growth. Wes mentioned that's part of what this whole plan is suppose to be about. Every department should be planning out, over the next couple of years, what they plan to be doing and provide it to the CTC to develop a plan as a whole which we aren't doing at this point. Carmen suggested the CTC create some kind of form to have departments include it in their strategic plans then they can submit it to the CTC. It could be used to measure growth for the future. Frank suggested another audit be done that focuses on just that type of technology related to these programs. This will get everybody involved and the audit will also be conducted by someone else who sees it from the outside while gathering the information internally. Wes felt we could do that and felt it was just a matter of getting everyone to think along the lines of where will we be in the next two or three years. He thought the EA was going to be not only where we're at but what the plans are for the future.
10. Wes mentioned it seems the biggest problem with technology on campus is that things pop out of nowhere when a funding source is identified but wasn't initially part of any plan. John mentioned these things come from the department via there advisory committees. Carmen reiterated having the CTC create a form requesting information from the departments indicating what their strategic plan is for the next 5 years related to technology because this committee is tasked with ensuring the capability with the infrastructure and the wireless is there. You can tell them there may be a problem because there is not enough bandwidth/infrastructure to support this.
11. After having the CTC charge read to the committee, as taken from the contract, Frank mentioned the CTC's charge focus is on computer technology and not any other type of technology. Terry mentioned it should be anything that is incorporated into the network. Wes mentioned what he wants it for the CTC to be aware of all that is occurring with technology on campus to keep the campus community informed and not to dictate to the department what they can or cannot buy or do.
12. Wes asked the committee members asked what they would like to do at this point. John recommended waiting for the December 15th meeting with GPSI to look at the revised documents to see what other changes are needed. Wes asked how we are going to address changes. John mentioned it's a living document and we can make the changes as needed because the document belongs to us. Carmen recommended discussing it next semester by coming up with a plan breaking it up by section by semester or think of certain areas that have to be touched every year as a committee and other sections that could be touched only once every other year or so.
13. Terry mentioned we need to look at the scope of work as it was to incorporate the distance learning into the Enterprise Architecture.

CONCLUSIONS	The committee agreed to wait till December 15th to continue discussion.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

CAMPUS WIRELESS

DISCUSSION	

1. Carmen mentioned the wireless network bid is still not awarded. We did ask them to scale back, does this committee have what building to scale back on. The only building the CTC has agreed to scale back was on building 900. Carmen is asking this committee to prioritize the building based on the costing to fall within budget.
2. Chris mentioned any way you cut it, it will cut the campus in half.
3. Terry mentioned we need to have the dollar amount to work with to help decide what buildings to exclude. Chris mentioned the breakdown cost per building was provided in the bid packet.
4. Carmen requested a copy of the abstract bid price summary to be given to the College Technology Committee.
5. The committee members present have agreed to remove the following buildings from the Wireless Network project.

	Buildings 100-$7,618.06, 400-$7,618.06, LRC-$9,827.66, & 2000 (Admin)-$31,368.96; totaling to $56,432.74.

MOTION
Marlena moved to approve the recommendation of removal buildings100, 400, LRC, & 2000 (Admin) from the Wireless Network project. Patrick second the motion, motion carried.

6. Chris mentioned there's a portion in the wireless project that refers to authentication. We were hoping to use the SunGard systems as the basis for that so that's one of the missing links when it gets implemented. Campus wide we are still looking for a solution to the wired authentication. This will amplify that problem because you're going to have another thousand users wirelessly accessing our network which may require an increase in bandwidth.   We are technically doubling our capacity which will take a toll.

CONCLUSIONS	The College Technology Committee has agreed to remove buildings 100, 400, LRC, & 2000 (Admin) from the Wireless Network project.
	Bldg. 100 - $7,618.06, Bldg. 400 - $7,618.06, Bldg. 2000 (Admin) - $31,368.96, & LRC Bldg. - $9,827.66 = $56,432.74

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Will notify MCV of the update.	Frank Camacho	

OBSERVERS	
RESOURCE PERSONS	
SPECIAL NOTES	

New Business

NONE

DISCUSSION	

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Open Discussion

MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	
1.	

CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

College Technology Committee
January 19, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Wesley Gima/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	
4.	**Old Business** • **Establish CTC Spring 2012 Meeting date and time** • **Establish dedicated EA and ITSP focus**	
5.	**New Business** **MIS Concerns/Issues**	

6.	**Things We Can Not Forget**
	    PCI Compliance
	    Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services
	    E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)	

7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**

Computer Technology Committee Meeting #7

MINUTES   JANUARY 19, 2012   11:00AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Wesley Gima
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Wesley Gima
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:17pm
ATTENDEES	Frank Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco, Marlena Montague, & Anthony Jay Sunga

Review/Approve Minutes

<div align="center">REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #5   WES GIMA</div>

DISCUSSION	Frank: #5 on page 2 – Onus – (ownership). Frank clarifies #3 on page 3, PC Bid. [Purchasing Microsoft Windows7 Licenses] not Windows 2007. Correction on #5 as well. Frank clarified #3 on page 5, Motion was made but motion was not seconded by anyone. Clarification [Elaine seconds the motion]. Elaine: Under New Business, #4 on page 4 – [reviewed] Elaine: Under Campus Wireless, #1 on page 3 remove [said something about]

<div align="center">

MOTION
Frank moved to approve meeting minutes #5 as corrected/amended ,
John seconded the motion, motion carried.

</div>

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<div align="center">REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #6</div>

DISCUSSION	**MOTION** **Frank moved to approve meeting minutes #6, AnthonuJay seconded the motion, motion carried**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

<div style="text-align:center">ESTABLISH CTC SPRING 2012 MEETING DATE AND TIME</div>

<div style="text-align:right">WES GIMA</div>

DISCUSSION	Committee members have agreed to remain status quo for the spring 2012 semester.

CONCLUSIONS	College Technology Committee

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<div style="text-align:center">ESTABLISH DEDICATED EA AND ITSP FOCUS</div>

<div style="text-align:right">FRANK CAMACHO/WES GIMA</div>

DISCUSSION	1. Frank has posted the finalized versions in the Technology Committee in group studio under links folder. John suggested posting the documents so that no one can say they've never seen the documents at all. Elaine mentioned others may say they read it but didn't understand it. Frank mentioned the ITSP is going to be made part of the ISMP. John mentioned the attempt to review this document in one semester was made but failed and so recommended to focus on critical items. Critical items would be those that many have questions or comments on. Frank mentioned he is currently going through the whole document and addressing action items referenced in the report. 2. Committee members agreed to have a campus announcement made with a 2 week post for comments with a deadline of February 3, 2012, by joining the Technology committee group to view documents. 3. Committee members agreed to have a "Did You Know" for the day provided by all committee members on such issues as how does the EA professionally impact you by quoting the document for two weeks and schedule to meet with the DC's. Wes mentioned he will compile the questions. 4. Wes asked what does this do as far as accreditation is concern. Elaine mentioned this is our constant interaction and communication to the community. 5. John mentioned the documents are living documents and will always need updating. Frank clarified the documents are already approved with regards to what the college accepted. Elaine mentioned the correct terminology is that the EA and the ITSP has been completed in its form as dated. The CTC continues to adjust and evolve based on the demands and the needs currently and for the future. Wes mentioned every meeting there should be one thing addressed. 6. Elaine asked how we ensure the grants tie in with the EA and the ITSP. Frank mentioned he is currently addressing this with the grant writers. MOTION Patrick moved to create a digital fact sheet for the EA and the ITSP to be distributed; in addition to meeting and informing the DC Council of the EA and ITSP at their next meeting, Marlena seconded the motion, motion carried 7. Wes reiterated the committee members agreed to have a "Did You Know" for the day provided by all committee members. Wes will compile the questions. If there are any questions, the committee will address and attempt to answer, as a committee, at the next meeting for the next two weeks. 8. Marlena asked if anyone has seen the analysis other than the EA and ITSP documents. Frank mentioned the actual technology report was not a deliverable. 9. Elaine mentioned bring up a question at every meeting for committee to discuss to help the FAQ grow. Keeping an item on the agenda for committee discussion. Committee members agreed to keep the item on agenda under Old Business or Things Not to Forget.

CONCLUSIONS	1. Committee members agreed to have a campus announcement made with a 2 week post for comments with a deadline of February 3, 2012, by joining the Technology committee group to view documents. 2. Committee members agreed to have a "Did You Know" for the day provided by all committee members on such issues as how does the EA professionally impact you by quoting the document for two weeks and schedule to meet with the DC's. Wes mentioned he will compile the questions. 3. Committee members agreed to keep the item on agenda under Old Business or Things Not to Forget.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

New Business		

MIS CONCERNS/ ISSUES   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank informed committee the wireless project is currently under protest after the project was scaled back and started. Most of the work has been completed with the exception of mounting equipment and tuning systems. The attorneys are looking at it. 2. Lab upgrades (D2, D3, D10, and A27) were completed with new computers. Student Center has been imaged to and open lab with Window7 as announced on the campus announcement. Library has also changed in terms of the units. Some of the D4 units were moved over there only because not everything on campus has been upgraded to the newest level. Some classroom will continue to use WindowsXP and others have Windows7 as instructors want their student to use. WindowsXP is in the Library and Windows7 is in the student center. These open labs are there for students. There are two labs in the library considered open labs (1 is grant / 1 is technology fee). Lab room 4111 in the library was moved to Room 41112 where the D4 equipment was moved to at the request of the library. 24 units were moved into room 4111 with similarities of D4/D5. 48 computers at the student center and 24 at the library. Adjacent will be a true open lab but with the option the library can still reserve it for their training. All open labs are restricted for being reserved by anyone unless it's a nonschool day where no students are expected. Access to D4/D5 is to MIS as they will be moving from D1/D6 into D4/D5. 3. The CTC has been asked to review and update the bid specs for PC's as the current bid has passed the 6 months period and is considered old. 4. With regards to budget, a lot of items not MIS operations related have been moved to the technology fee. This is the last year for Title III grant so expenses/expenditures related to maintenance of software, professional services, support and soon have been thrown into MIS budget. Surveillance camera to be installed at the library, student s center, and the technology building are being considered which will be paid out of the technology fee as planned. 5. Basic telephone services bid have been announced. The bid opening is scheduled for January 27, 2012. 6. Most of the campus has been transitioned on the apnic ip designation. This allows us to have our own identity without relying on other telecommunication companies. The requirement now is for the college to out on bid for the internet providers. The biggest requirement is that the two carriers cannot be on the same infrastructure otherwise another company may have to be sole sourced because we have to have two links. 7. Although announcement was made ahead of time regarding the change in operating systems, we anticipate complaints. We are aware of the needed adjustments from students and faculty in the new labs as it is a new operating systems. Elaine mentioned she provided voluntary training to try to assist and address any issues with faculty and staff. Frank mentioned other issues to be address are programs that simply cannot run with the new programs. Marlena mentioned the change needs to be made in the course curriculum documents and the Dean's need to be informed. 8. Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan will be submitted soon.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

OBSERVERS	
RESOURCE PERSONS	
SPECIAL NOTES	

OPEN DISCUSSION		

DISCUSSION	1. Patrick will bring up the possibility of purchase NetBooks through a USDOE Grant at the next meeting. 2. Frank mentioned the mobile labs are aging but are tyring to see if we can get another mobile lab. Patrick mentioned the USDOE grant was sited to improve post-secondary education and not limited to purchasing computer but will discuss it further at the next meeting.
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

College Technology Committee
February 2, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Wesley Gima/Elaine Fejerang	**Time: Start**	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	**Time: End**	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

Outline		
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	
4.	**Old Business** • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ – Digital Fact Sheet)** • **EA Topic to Review** • **PC bid specs review** • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** • **Wireless Project Update**	
5.	**New Business** • **CTC Chairperson Announcement** • **Formal Approval of EA and ITSP** • **USDOE Grant (P. Clymer)** • **Edit Technology Fee Policy** • **Edit Lab Fee Policy**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

Preparation			
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**

Computer Technology Committee Meeting #8

MINUTES
FEBRUARY 2, 2012   11:05AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Wesley Gima
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Wesley Gima
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:15pm
ATTENDEES	Christopher Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco, & Marlena Montague

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #7   WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	

MOTION
Marlena moved to approve meeting minutes #7 as is, **John seconded the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

EA/ITSP "DID YOU KNOW" (FAQ-DIGITAL FACT
SHEET)   WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	1. No questions for the FAQ sheet was submitted to Wes, therefore, nothing complied. 2. There were two concerns submitted from the announcements posted asking the campus community for their input. They had expressed their concern for having such a short time to provide input. However, they were responding not to the first announcement posted, but rather, they responded to the second notice reminding the campus community of our deadline. No one had responded to our first campus announcement posted on January 23, 2012. 3. Wes mentioned Carmen said she is waiting for the CTC to approve the EA/ITSP to move on to the next level. In the last meeting the question was asked if we had to approve this but the majority said it is a living document and therefore did not need approving. John recalled the meeting Carmen attended saying this document was a living document and asked how then do you approve it. Elaine mentioned approving it in its current form and review it quarterly or annually noting changes/updates. Elaine recommended approving the document as it is today, then repost to the campus community giving them a continual opportunity for input for next year's revisions. We go back out allowing more time due to concerns expressed regarding the timeline. John mentioned we can compile comments submitted before the end of the semester and use them for the next academic year. Elaine mentioned revisiting this the next academic year and placing the EA on top of the Agenda and address it then. 4. Wes felt the responsibility of the committee is to create policy. John and Elaine reiterated it is the committee's responsibility to make recommendations and not policy. Elaine further explained the EA is the architecture of the infrastructure that we're building; the ITSP is a plan on how to make this

	happen which is all we're doing. Later we'll have to design policies to ensure it's in place. Wes suggested sending out periodic reminders to review since this is a constant thing.
	MOTION **Marlena moved to approve the EA and the ITSP as it is today,** **John seconded the motion, motion carried.** **MOTION** **Marlena moved to repost and extend the timeline for the campus communities review** **and input of the EA/ITSP with a deadline of April 12, 2012,** **John seconded the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

PC BID SPECS REVIEW/BUDGET FOR FY2013
TECHNOLOGY FEE PLAN / WIRELESS PROJECT UPDATE   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank was to provide the specifications for review. 2. Frank is currently off-island so items are TABLED. 3. Chris mentioned the wireless update is still on hold due to protest.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

New Business

CTC CHAIRPERSON ANNOUNCMENT   WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	1. Wes mentioned he has recently moved and been tasked with forming a new department called academic computing. It's to take care of some areas we currently don't cover like distance education, training, and therefore need to step down as chair person as recommended by new administrator as this is the academic counterpart to MIS. 2. John nominated Marlena for the CTC Chairperson. Wes asked for any other nominations, none was made. Nominations closed. 3. Wes asked all in favor of Marlena being CTC Chairperson. All present agreed. Marlena will be the chairperson for next CTC meeting.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

STUDENT TECHNOLOGY FEE / COURSE FEE POLICY	WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	1. Wes had previously sent out to CTC members copies of policies in existence elsewhere in addition to our current policy for review. In his limited research; our policy is very basic and limited whereas there's was much more extensive. Wes has proposed strengthening our student technology fee policy and being more student oriented at our next meeting. 2. Patrick mentioned it was a statement that was made in the student fee policy. 3. Wes mentioned currently there is no policy regulating the use of lab (course) fee. 4. Patrick mentioned the last resolution approved by the board of trustees addressed tuition and lab fees. It doesn't clarify what the fees are used for like the technology fee. 5. Elaine mentioned the challenge Computer Science and Office Technology programs are facing. Our student pay these lab (course) fees and the labs they use don't' have the latest keyboarding pro software for that specific course, no toner for keyboarding class that require a lot of printing. We are told we can't purchase these things due to no money but this is where the lab fee would have covered such cost. 6. Elaine recommended first defining what technology fee is and what we believe would fall under that category as well as for the course fee before we start to divide the ocean. We also need do research and talk to finance and determine how they made that decision and where/what account is it going into and how is it being dispersed and what they believe is the policy in place then we can start moving. Once we start crafting our recommendation then it should go back out to the institution as a draft, we created, wanting their feedback before we send it up the ranks for approval. Marlena mentioned you have will have to define what a lab is. 7. Elaine redefined the lab fee as the course fee. Wes redefined the technology fee as the student technology fee. Patrick mentioned and where those funds apply. I.e. You have a department requested to purchase toner off the technology fee but it's not an open lab. 8. Wes asked if CTC wanted to pursue the course fee policy as well as the student technology fee policy. Marlena felt it tied in with what was written in the EA/ITSP where it mentioned management needs to ensure they secure the resources, including financial, to ensure that we carry through whatever's in the plan. It's built in to the EA and it could be one of the critical things we identify. 9. Patrick recommended leaving it on the agenda for discussion. **MOTION** **Patrick moved to leave the Student Technology Fee and the Course Fee Policy** **on the agenda for further discussion.** **Marlena seconded the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

COMPUTER USAGE POLICY	PATRICK CLYMER

DISCUSSION	1. Patrick suggested reposting, on campus announcement, the Computer Usage policy that was recommended by CTC and approved as a reminder of the computer use policy. Patrick mentioned his reason for suggestion is because of the hard push to create more awareness of FERPA which, he felt, falls in line with this. In addition, he has been asked about the Compass Lab. Back when the CTC was TAC, we had approved the Technology fee be used to purchase laptops for the Compass lab. Now the counselors are asking when is it to be replaced. Frank informed Patrick that it's not on the schedule to be replaced. 2. Elaine recommended posting this at the beginning of every semester. 3. Wes mentioned he plans to develop a 3 to 5 year strategic plan as well as an action plan on academic technology overall. Every department is planned to be visited with the idea of creating a master plan to address what everyone wants regardless of its funding source. 4. Elaine mentioned the dilemma we face is that when we bring in hardware with a grant, according to Doris Perez, we have to build in its sustainability. We don't have a policy in place that says what happens when we don't. **MOTION** **Patrick moved repost the Computer Use Policy every semester** **on campus announcement for students and employees review.** **Terry seconded the motion, motion carried.** 5. Chris suggested putting a link in to have student s click on before moving on the page. Wes requested that it be posted for all to see.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Will look into posting of Computer Use Policy	Patrick	

OPEN DISCUSSION

LAPTOP LOANER/RENTAL   WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	1. Wes received an inquiry from Christine Matson (library). The library has 11 laptops that we would like to be able to check out to students for in-library use. Since a laptop is a sizeable investment for the college, we would like to know what procedures should be in place. We are particularly concerned about a laptop being stolen from a student who has checked one out. There is a big concern because of how a student would be affected by owing a large amount of money to GCC. The student who checked out the laptop would still be responsible for the laptop, wouldn't they? How does the CTC view loaning laptops to students for in library use? If the CTC approves, what sort of procedures and policies should be in place? What happens if a laptop is stolen from a student who checked out the laptop? What about damage to the laptop that happens while the student has the laptop in the library? 2. The question is a policy thing. When people make these kind of requests, are we going to create the policy and forward it on for recommendation? Patrick mentioned this may be addressed with the USDOE Grant. 3. Wes mentioned we have a small percentage of policies people can refer to for questions such as these for a college of our size. We have a lot of new technology on campus that MIS doesn't see is because we don't have a New Technology Adoption Policy. We were able to pull policies of the web, therefore not making it difficult to craft a policy and forwarded it on for recommendation. 4. Elaine mentioned we are designing the enterprise architecture and this is the infrastructure. Part of it talked about new technology and how that new technology is going to plug in. As these things arise, we don't need to sit down and determine the various policies needed. We just set up the infrastructure and when it comes in, then we have a standard policy that provides how they will plug in, here's what's going to happen, and you'll be responsible for, etc. What we are concern is with the hardware. In this case, it's puzzling to know the Library has purchased it to pass it on. Didn't they have something in mind as to how they were going to secure it? In this case, the only policy the CTC can establish is to ensure the hardware meet the required standards for the students needs. Its' a financial policy is not

ours. Patrick mentioned the only thing he would like to see is that it be self sustaining to allow units to be replaced when necessary without burdening the technology fee.

5. Elaine's recommendation to respond to Christine is that this is not a CTC issue as we deal with the infrastructure and the hardware and this becomes a financial issue. Wes disagreed with it not being a CTC issue. Wes mentioned Christine is asking if we currently have a policy regarding rentals on laptops. Patrick mentioned everything being asked is an operation issue. Wes disagreed and said it's a policy that can be and should be developed by the CTC. Patrick reiterated that he felt it was an operation issue at its core since she has already purchased the computers.

6. Chris asked what is their definition of loan. If it's to remain in the computer then how does this differ from any other computer that's already there?

7. Wes mentioned Dean Virginia recommended Christine speak with the CTC. He has asked that all committee members read the policies sited in a previous email to further discuss this matter a the next meeting.

CONCLUSIONS	1. The CTC has nor is aware of any GCC policy regarding the lending of laptops to students. 2. The CTC will have to review this at the next meeting.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

College Technology Committee

February, 16 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montegue/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

Outline		
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	
4.	**Old Business** • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)** • **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)** • **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)** • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** • **Wireless Project Update**	

5.	**New Business**
	• **Policy review**
	    o **Technology Fee**
	    o **Course Technology Sustainability**
	    o **Online Policy and Procedure**
	    o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)**
	    o **Computer User's Policy**
	• **Physical Master Plan feedback**	

6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

Preparation			
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**

College Technology Committee Meeting #9

MINUTES   FEBRUARY 16, 2012   11:01AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:12pm
ATTENDEES	Christopher Camacho, Francisco Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco, Marlena Montague, & AnthonyJay Sunga

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #8   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	Marlena asked that the heading; Computer Technology Committee be revised to reflect College Technology Committee.
MOTION	**John moved to approve meeting minutes #8 as amended, Chris seconded the motion, motion carried.**
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

EA/ITSP "DID YOU KNOW" (FAQ-DIGIAL FACT SHEET)   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. To date, no questions for the FAQ sheet was submitted to Wes. Tabled till next meeting. 2. Marlena reminded members to send at least one point taken from the EA and ITSP that you would like the campus community to know.
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
FAQ Digital fact sheet tabled.		Next CTC mtg.

EA TOPIC TO REVIEW (BASED ON COMPUTER FEEDBACK)		MARLENA MONTAGUE
DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned the announcement went back out on MyGcc but no feedback, other than the two prior received, from the campus community has been received since. 2. Marlena said she will continue the announcement on MyGcc. 3. Wes again brought up the request for information regarding LAPTOP LOANER/BORROWING INSIDE THE LIBRARY and if a policy needs to be created to address this. Marlena mentioned Christine's question wasn't necessarily brought up in response to the EA/ITSP so this should be addressed under New Business; Policy Review. She further mentioned the CTC will keep note of any concerns the campus community may have, however, this is specifically for the EA.	
CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
EA/ITSP announcement to campus community will continue.	Marlena	

PC BID SPECS REVIEW (MINIMUM STANDARDS) / BUDGET FOR FY2013 TECHNOLOGY FEE PLAN/ WIRELESS PROJECT UPDATE	FRANK CAMACHO
DISCUSSION	1. Frank mentioned the only change requested on the **PC Bid Specs** is to give an option of 1 or 3 year warranty from the vendor of. The College Technology Committee would like to stick with the 3 year warranty. 2. John asked how this will affect grants. Frank and Elaine both mentioned this will not affect the grants because they are requesting quotes based on the standard specifications. 3. Frank mentioned the other change was whether we will include the tablets to the Desktop, Laptop, Notebook standards and specifications. Terry mentioned the only reason to discuss including tablets and cell phones with Wi-Fi capability is because it connects to our network affecting our bandwidth. Wes suggested holding off on tablets because there's a lot more research that needs to be done. 4. Frank mentioned another thing to consider as part of our standards is security and how to better secure these forms of technology with regards to physical security. Elaine suggested going back to the tablet and smart phones and mentioned that this committee, in the EA, will need to address the connectivity. The tablets and smart phones should be considered accessories and not considered as part of the bid. We should focus our efforts on hardware tools that make us productive within the institution. The accessories are being used as added value in the classroom and office. It may be a tool I use today and not tomorrow but we want to make sure that our infrastructure can support it. 5. Frank asked if it was the CTC's intent to phase out desktops in the workplace with the laptop initiative because of all the positive benefits, especially with the green initiative. The laptop saves power and it's portable. Elaine recommended leaving the option of PC Desktop and Laptop to the user's preference because every user has different preferences. Patrick recommends those purchasing laptops also purchase a cable lock for security. 6. Wes recommended Frank include Ultra books to the PC Desktop, Laptop, and Net books standards. 7. **BUDGET for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** is to be removed from agenda. 8. **Wireless project update**: According to Frank the protest has been resolved and work is resuming. The new completion date, inclusive of the fine tuning period, is April 6, 2012. The testing and our acceptance need to be done before April 6, 2012. Wes asked if there will be instruction given out on how to use it. Frank mentioned the security (authentication) into the system is still being addressed. Wes suggested there be a plan in place as to how will it be announced to everyone, what areas will be available and not available, how will people be able to log in, etc. Terry recommended the system be fully tested before the final payment is made to the vendor. Frank mentioned there is no warranty but we will ensure everything is tested before April 6. The campus community will also be asked to assist with the testing. 9. Marlena mentioned this item will remain on agenda.

CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Updated/revised Computer Specification (email prior to next meeting	Frank	ASAP
For committee members review)		

New Business

POLICY REVIEW (TECHNOLOGY FEE, COURSE FEE, ONLINE POLICY AND PROCEDURE, EMAIL AMOUNTS (ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTIVE 2006-01), AND COMPUTER USER'S POLICY		MARLENA MONTAGUE

| **DISCUSSION** | 1. Marlena stated the CTC <u>can</u> review the current policies and make recommendations for changes if needed and the recommendations will be forwarded through the governance process like before.

2. Wes volunteered addressing the **Student Technology Fee**. Frank asked that the current expenditures, on the operation side, be considered in this review as we have no other funding source and these things still need to be paid for. Marlena asked if an historical background be done to show how it was before and whether or not it works for us today.   Elaine asked that Frank also list what he believes to be in his budget and should always be included.   Marlena mentioned this will allow up to look at both areas.

3. Marlena mentioned the **course fee** is on here because there is a question. One example is the keyboarding course. There is a new book, new software is needed but the current software in the labs is two versions ago. The assessment report for Office Technology was reviewed and it did show and provided evidence that the software should be upgraded every time there is an upgrade. This is what the students are paying the fees for. Patrick mentioned Carmen held a budget discussion and it was mentioned departments who charge course fees don't get it automatically. You reflect it in your budget and indicate its funding source. Some people maybe think because a course fee is charged they automatically get it back. Patrick mentioned according to Carmen; everyone has access to their fees but you have to request it. If you don't request it in your budget then you will not receive it and then the funds go elsewhere. Wes mentioned not many knew about this. Patrick mentioned this is not new as it's been the way it has been for a while. Elaine said it's something that has been established but has not been communicated and as a result everyone believes that the due diligence is being made to accommodate our needs and when it's not then we say; why? And until it reaches a point, as we are with Office Administration, we're having such a problem. In speaking with someone with regards to a particular course it was mentioned that if learning outcomes are affected a requisition should be submitted. It cannot be a discussion or an issue at the administration side if a requisition was not submitted. Without it there is no argument. Unfortunately this was not communicated to the department chairs. We, as an institution have failed, because we sold a product (our courses) and that's not right. Patrick mentioned the current budget situation is a little different from the overall discussion of how the course fees are applied. Elaine mentioned that as far as our students are concerned, our budget situation is irrelevant as they've paid the course fee. Patrick mentioned the students need to be aware that not all operations are funded by tuitions and fees collected otherwise they will see a whole different tuition and fee level. Elaine mentioned we have students that have paid a fee, who don't know what our background issues are, they just know they bought this and go in to a classroom that is ill-equipped. We can't expect them to understand our budget issue. They bought a product and we need to provide that product. On a separate issue, our focus as a committee is to create a recommended policy for departments in revisiting their course requirement, identifying what's required of it, create a schedule where programs are being forced to review what needs are and then where it goes. Frank stated this scope is beyond this committee as it's beyond technology. Elaine mentioned when you look at Math, Nursing, and Culinary, we recommend they do it as CTC's focus is on the technology side and how it plugs into our infrastructure. The focus would be to look at it from the requirement side, and not the fees collected side , |
|---|---|

considering what it is that technologically is going to plug into the EA. As our primary focus is the EA and we have to consider all the different aspects that impact the EA.

4. Marlena suggested pulling out the verbiage from the EA that specifically talks about sustaining it. If we show the evidence, lay out the fact, they can't say no. Elaine suggested renaming Course Fee to **Course Technology Sustainability (Course Fee- Non-Technology Fees)**. Marlena further explained this doesn't just address the fee but also the training issue with new technology and no one to train faculty how to use it. It's not just the hardware and software cost, but it should also include the people cost. Marlena reiterated; we are not trying to control the money. Elaine also reiterated that the CTC's focus is the Enterprise Architecture.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Draft of Amended Student Technology Fee Policy	Wes	Before next mtg
List of expenses that always need to be included.	Frank	Next meeting

PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN FEEDBACK		MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena informed the CTC Members that the Master Plan has been posted for feedback from the campus. Committee members have been reminded that the 18th is the deadline. 2. Elaine suggested that the CTC review it to ensure it incorporating the housing mechanisms and security.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

OPEN DISCUSSION

LAPTOP LOANER/RENTAL		WES GIMA

DISCUSSION	1. Wes received an inquiry from Christine Matson (library). The library has 11 laptops that we would like to be able to check out to students for in-library use. Since a laptop is a sizeable investment for the college, we would like to know what procedures should be in place. We are particularly concerned about a laptop being stolen from a student who has checked one out. There is a big concern because of how a student would be affected by owing a large amount of money to GCC. The student who checked out the laptop would still be responsible for the laptop, wouldn't they? How does the CTC view loaning laptops to students for in library use? If the CTC approves, what sort of procedures and policies should be in place? What happens if a laptop is stolen from a student who checked out the laptop? What about damage to the laptop that happens while the student has the laptop in the library? 2. Frank mentioned there is a policy that was published a long time ago, on the computers on campus and how the resources are to be used. 3. Wes asked if there was a specific laptop policy needed to be developed for the library. Frank mentioned this should be no different in the way books are currently rented out. John mentioned he felt it puts a lot of liability on the college. Wes mentioned because we don't have a policy on a lot of things, there a lot of wild west stuff going around. He recommended that more policies be made to hold people responsible.

	4. Marlena suggested the discussion be held till New Business regarding Policy review. In research she reviewed the Board Policy regarding Online Policy and Procedures which CTC did send up back in 2009. Under the Board Policy it because Policy 197 which talks about the use of computer resources, improper use of facilities, unauthorized use of services, invasion of privacy. Frank mentioned there are things, like theft or breakage, which it doesn't touch upon.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

MEMO FROM STUDENT   ELAINE FEJERANG

DISCUSSION	1. Elaine provided a copy of a two paged memo from a student about her concern of not having access to the Mac computers in the library. In addition, the student is having students sign with intentions to present it to the GCC President on the Meet the President session. 2. Wes mentioned this memo came after the Mac's became available in the library. Currently the issue is the software is not available for visual communication courses. 3. Chris reminded the committee that the library is different from a regular classroom in that it's a public library that falls under the MIS wing. 4. Frank mentioned when the discussion was ongoing about where MIS is to be, it was the library that requested MIS have their presence there. This was not an MIS discussion to take over. Wes mentioned the library disputes that particular statement. Frank mentioned they asked us to be there because they didn't want to support the open lab environment. 5. Elaine mentioned we need to focus on our students who do see hardware they want to use and making it available. Frank requested for information on all courses that currently use MAC computers. Wes volunteered to provide this information. Patrick suggested giving him the room numbers he can run a report but it will not clarify which is secondary / post-secondary.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Run report for Frank on courses that use MAC computers	Patrick	

College Technology Committee
March, 1 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	
4.	**Old Business** • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)** • **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)** • **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)** • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** • **Wireless Project Update** • **Policy review** 　o **Technology Fee** 　o **Course Technology Sustainability** 　o **Online Policy and Procedure** 　o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)** 　o **Computer User's Policy**	
5.	**New Business** • **Mac Labs** 　o **Statistics** 　o **Student Memo** 　o **Instructor Course Requirements** • **Counseling Lab** • **Network Issues**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** 　**PCI Compliance** 　**Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** 　**E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**

College Technology Committee Meeting #10

MINUTES   MARCH 1, 2012   11:35AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:15pm
ATTENDEES	Christopher Camacho, Francisco Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco, & Marlena Montague

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #9   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	Changes were submitted via email from Elaine and Marlena.
	MOTION **Patrick moved to approve meeting minutes #9 as amended,** **John second the motion, motion carried.**
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	**ALL TOPICS IN OLD BUSINESS WAS TABLED**. 1. EA/ITSP "DID YOU KNOW" (FAQ-Digital fact sheet) 2. EA Topic to review (based on campus feedback) 3. PC Bid Specs Review 4. Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan 5. Wireless Project Update 6. Policy Review (Technology Fee, Course Technology Sustainability, Online Policy and Procedure, Email Accounts [Administrative Directive 2006-01], and Computer User's Policy.)
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

New Business

MAC LABS (STATISTICS, STUDENT MEMO, INSTRUCTOR COURSE REQUIREMENTS)	MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION

1. A memo from Elaine to the College Technology Committee officially requesting to purchase software for the two MAC Labs classrooms.
2. Elaine explained the history with the CS152 class which was a VisCom class with a Computer Science prefix.   The former TSS Dean said it was the responsibility of the Computer Science department which left the department with no preparation or budget to support it. We had a license that was preinstalled for another purpose. The concern was brought up to the DC but identifying funding to purchase it has been a challenge. The Dean suggested taking the request to the College Technology Committee to recommend using the Technology Fee to make this purchase.
3. Marlena mentioned she ran some statistics on how many students have been enrolled in classes taught using MAC computers. Data taken from Fall 2009 – Spring 2012 showed 2,250 students with unique seats (seat count) were enrolled in classes utilizing MAC computers. Different classes such as Criminal Justice, Psychology, Japanese, Chamorro, Visual Communications, Marketing, Computer Science (152), and English Writing use MAC computers. Because a large population uses MAC computers, what are the committee's thoughts, in line with Elaine's request, on purchasing volume licensing for educational institutions. One proposal would be to cover the cost for the two classrooms in Elaine's request using the Technology Fee. A second proposal is to get a site license for Office 2011 for all the MAC labs. The process of bringing the MAC computers into the regular reimaging schedule and part of the established hardware and software replacement cycle needs to begin.   The MAC labs should be included under the technology fee budget and should be addressed like all the College's computer labs. The budget would then reflect "computer labs" and not necessarily "PC or Mac Labs "and will go through the regular cycle for replacements and software updates.
4. Frank mentioned he didn't have a problem with it but needs to work with the numbers as he's been requested by the President to purchase GUDTV for the Student Center Lounge using the Technology Fee.

MOTION
**Frank moved to approve Elaine's request to use the Technology Fee
to purchase the MS Office 2011 Software for the CS152 Course (MAC Labs)
pending confirmation of funds availability,
Patrick second the motion, motion carried.**

5. Marlena requested Frank let her know if there is no money available to purchase the software for the two classrooms in Elaine's request. Elaine mentioned the consequence would be that we literally stop classes because we don't have the resource to run the class.
6. Frank asked if the books were not inspected upon their arrival. Elaine mentioned when we absorbed the class last semester, the book used was also ill-equipped. A Non-Substantive revision was made to change the book at the end of the semester. In addition, the IT Academy's licenses were going to be allocated and everything was prepared before the last winter break. It wasn't till Winter Break that it was discovered that the licenses were not enough for the entire classroom.
7. Marlena reiterated that if there is no money in the technology fee to purchase the software, a memo will be forwarded to the CGC notifying them that the request was approved at the committee level but there is little to no funding to purchase item.
8. Chris mentioned that LION changes everything. (LION is the new MAC OS on the market) LION changes reimaging as well as licensing for all the applications for the MAC.
9. Frank mentioned there seems to be confusion on campus with regards to WindowsXP not being able to run Microsoft 2010. This is not true. Microsoft 2010 can run with WindowsXP.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

INSTRUCTORS COURSE REQUIREMNTS	MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned our goal in CTC is to support student learning outcomes which includes what the instructors and students need in the classroom. 2. Marlena further mentioned there needs to be, at a higher level, a look into the classrooms, courses, and what they're lacking. Why are students complaining they don't have what they need to do the work in class? Why is it that some people have to write program agreements and others get funded by tech fee? How can we standardize it to bring everybody into one? And is the tech fee enough? Elaine commented this goes back to the Enterprise Architecture. As we have new program agreements and grants written, it has to tie in and build in any new kind of technology but with the focus on sustainability. As we build it, it will help determine what the cost would be to sustain it. 3. Elaine suggested having our programs do an inventory on what it actually costs to run their programs. Computer Science is a good example. We have a class that requires the AS400 but we're only charging a course fee of $22/student for a $10,000 product. A re-evaluation needs to be performed to determine how to sustain it as part of the program if the course is to continue. Marlena mentioned there is a task force that has been put together to perform program reviews. In addition she has been asked for data to be used to determine if programs are feasible. The task force is addressing this issue with regards to program sustainability.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

OPEN DISCUSSION

REQUEST FOR MEETING NEXT WEEK AND WEEK AFTER/BANDWIDTH	FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank has requested another meeting before our scheduled meeting in preparation for the Accreditation visit. 2. Frank would like to discuss the "bandwidth" issue as it's becoming a concern as the threshold has been already reached at 100%. The expansion and emergency issue has been completed but it's now a capacity issue. Frank mentioned the audit has addressed this issue. 3. Patrick would like to address managing "social networking" sites at the next meeting. Terry suggested purchasing more bandwidth since it's needed for classes. Frank mentioned, if something crashes, operationally, he will make the necessary decisions. Patrick mentioned his concern is that we will not be able to communicate with Florida regarding the ACCALOG, which is web based. His suggestion is placing hotspots at locations, such as the Student Center Lounge. 4. Marlena asked Chris to provide a report on the bandwidth as compared to other Community Colleges our size and how they manage their situation.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NEXT WEEK MEETING 3/8/2012 AT 11AM.		
Report on Bandwidth use	Chris Camacho	Next Meeting

College Technology Committee
March 8, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	

4.	**Old Business**
	• **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)**
	• **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)**
	• **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)**
	• **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan**
	• **Wireless Project Update**
	• **Policy review**
	    o **Technology Fee**
	    o **Course Technology Sustainability**
	    o **Online Policy and Procedure**
	    o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)**
	    o **Computer User's Policy**	

5.	**New Business** • **CGC Review of EA/ITSP** • **Network Needs Analysis**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**
1	Higher Education Network Issues/Resolutions Research	Chris	03/08/12
2	Tech Fee Analysis and History	Wes	
3	Recommendations on Implementing Course Fees	Jay	
4	Did You Know information from EA/ITSP	ALL Members	

College Technology Committee Meeting #11

MINUTES   MARCH 8, 2012   11:10AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	SPECIAL
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm
ATTENDEES	Christopher Camacho, Francisco Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, & Marlena Montague

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #9   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	Changes were submitted via email from Elaine and Marlena.
	MOTION **Patrick moved to approve meeting minutes #10 as amended,** **Frank second the motion, motion carried.**
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

EA/ITSP "DID YOU KNOW" (FAQ-Digital fact sheet) / Wireless Project Update   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" Update:** Marlena requested the CTC Members to continue to submit their FAQ's as she has only received one to date.
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

New Business

DISCUSSION

1. Marlena informed the CTC members that the CGC has approved the current EA/ITSP with minor changes on 03/07/2012. One change noted was on the EA, page 6, where there was reference made to the 314 acres of land nearby that was lost. They recommended changes, such as these, be made. Marlena said she will send the CGC the word version with this portion removed then the CGC will review it for grammar and punctuations then forwarded to the President.
2. Frank mentioned it is understood to be a living document. Marlena mentioned it will be reviewed and updated annually.

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION

1. Chris mentioned he had difficulty finding Colleges similar in size and budget to compare with. What was common was "open sources software's" were being used to address problems before utilizing funds to expand bandwidth, etc. He suggested we apply these options to our environment. A lot were driven by policy and attached to existing policies. GCC doesn't have existing policies specific to each function. We've been getting by with the vagueness of what existing policy we do have but this will cut the finer line between those policies and simply enforces it. Most of our policy is based on trust and good faith.
2. Chris mentioned the current plan we have is the Gateway expansion. This would expand our existing connection with multiple connections. Frank mentioned this will help us avoid bottlenecks on the network and allow us better tracking/routing. Terry asked if this is already paid for and if equipment was already purchased. Chris mentioned additional equipment will be needed.
3. Frank mentioned most of the phases planned were submitted for the EA. Both the EA/ITSP addressed the network expansion and improvement project (phase 1, 2, & 3) and the other continuing phases 1, 2, and 3 are suppose to set us up for the UOH kind of implementation in support of distance education for the future. Elaine suggested, as you design, you make reference to the section in the EA that applies and tie it in with any alterations discovered that may not be reflected.
4. Marlena asked if it was in the EA/ITSP as this will require funding and will be inserted into the ISMP which will address the next 5 -10years. Any request for future funding will have to be recorded as part of the plan. Chris mentioned a trial period is desired to ensure it does what we want it to do and then add it. Elaine mentioned you won't be able to get funding to try and test it until you tie it in.
5. On page 44 of the EA, Chris further explained that the lightning bolts are the gateway. The inner and outer ring imply internal infrastructure that's not in place. Frank mentioned you're trying to provide multiple connections/paths within the network, even having a third leg coming in. [Frank clarified the 3rd leg as an additional internet line.]
6. Wes mentioned this is a solution but it's not a needs analysis. Because this keeps being revisited his concern lies with where our traffic is now, what is it going to do when it's added in, what is it going to give us, how does it relate to how many people are using it. What needs to be looked at is the solution being provided. Terry asked wasn't the network needs based on the graph of the bandwidth usage because we're maximizing our bandwidth and this was a solution. Frank mentioned there are multiple solutions to approaching the problem. As Chris suggested, we could put in place desktop and network policies so we can start canceling out traffic that are not connected to any SLO's. Chris mentioned nothing will be blocked without any approval. Wes mentioned he would like to know where this will take us as those approving it would also want to know.
7. Chris mentioned no solution is the golden key to our problem. They all work in conjunction

with each other, the gateway expansion in the bandwidth increase. We already see we are peaking longer throughout the day, throughout the school year. It also separates the server traffic from the user traffic, which means you have one pipe for the worldwide web and it won't choke off the connectivity for student users. Whereas today we all go out through one pipe. Wes mentioned we don't necessarily get into the particulars. He would like to see what the problem it, what the possible solutions are, where we're at, and where it will take us.

8. Marlena read page 97 of the EA where it talked about the most pressing issue is the overhaul of the network. It specifically states: it needs to be modified from its current topology into a robust double ring topology, additionally a third high speed internet connection should be brought on to campus. Frank mentioned the needs analysis has already been done and stated in the EA/ITSP. The recommendations are referenced such as page number of document, be linked to the strategic plan.

9. In terms of sustainability of our plan, Marlena asked Chris how the plan continues if he's not there. Chris mentioned there's nothing unusual about this connection. Any CCNA person can do this with provided information (passwords).

10. Marlena asked what the current age of our network was. Terry mentioned the structure of our current network is fine and we are not behind the times. The new addition will add more redundancy to our network. Marlena asked why then is our bandwidth is maxing out. Terry mentioned we are maxing out because we have more users and other things plus we don't want to limit what our students do. The only option would be to go with more bandwidth unless you're going to limit.

11. Elaine asked that the revised write up include the need today, the need tomorrow, and at what point, where the peak will be, will we need to do something, also what the capacity of this new introduction will be. Based on history we will need to see the trend. Wes mentioned the reason the President developed the facilities plan was to be able to do them when funds are found because they are ready to go.

12. Chris mentioned they are keeping track of the bandwidth as a whole. There's no distinction between inside and outside traffic. This set up will allow us to see what is peaking. Elaine mentioned she thought in the last emergency meeting held there was software purchased to help determine that. Frank mentioned software to better monitor the network was purchased. We want to do more with additional tools.

13. Wes mentioned we need to prepare people for things such as needing another line. If this thing is only going to last two years and currently the only solution we can see is to get more bandwidth or one of the other solution is a large line, that along with the cost needs to be in there so when other people start looking at it, they need to know the solution is only good for two years.

14. Marlena recommended all complaints or no complaints are documented regardless of the maximizing of bandwidth usage being seen.

CONCLUSIONS	The committee understands the diagram and how it ties in with the EA but would like the diagram and narrative resubmitted with the tie in to the EA.. The hope is to tie it all in with our historical pattern, in addition as to where you anticipate it today reaching its peak.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Refine and resubmit Network Need Analysis	Chris/Frank	

OPEN DISCUSSION

MAC LAB SOFTWARE W/TECH FEE   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank mentioned $39,000 was saved due to the scale back. $11,516.70 has been identified to purchase the licenses for all the Mac Labs (library, instructional labs, and MIS). Plans for the remaining balance will be to upgrade the bandwidth or purchase additional Mac systems for the library as there are no Mac systems available. This requisition will be submitted today. 2. Frank requested that it be noted the purchase of additional software came from a request from a student's complaint in addition to MIS needing it as they don't have it.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

CTC GOALS   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena was asked by the CGC if the committee goals needed to be revisited since she's the new chair. Wes mentioned it was being discussed but the EA/ITSP superseded it as it became the goal of the committee. 2. Frank recommended Marlena review the committee goals.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

ACCREDITATION   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank recommended all members read the EA/ITSP and be prepared for questions by the Accreditation Committee as some may be called in or visited by a committee member and asked what your participation is now or what your membership contribution is.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NEXT WEEK MEETING 3/15/2012 AT 11AM.		
NEXT MEETING AGENDA: COMMITTEE GOALS		

College Technology Committee
March 15, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	

4.	**Old Business**
	 • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)**
	 • **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)**
	 • **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)**
	 • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan**
	 • **Wireless Project Update**
	 • **Policy review**
	     o **Technology Fee**
	     o **Course Technology Sustainability**
	     o **Online Policy and Procedure**
	     o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)**
	     o **Computer User's Policy**	

5.	**New Business** • **Network Needs Analysis**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**
1	Higher Education Network Issues/Resolutions Research	Chris	03/15/12
2	Tech Fee Analysis and History	Wes	
3	Recommendations on Implementing Course Fees	Jay	
4	Did You Know information from EA/ITSP	ALL Members	

College Technology Committee Meeting #12

MINUTES   MARCH 15, 2012   11:05AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 11:35am
ATTENDEES	Francisco Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco & Marlena Montague

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #11   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	TABLED
MOTION Patrick moved to table review/approval of meeting minutes #11, Wes second the motion, motion carried.	
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

Old Business

PC BID SPECIFICATION   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Some changes on the bid specification were on the RAM capacity (increase) and security.
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

New Business		

NETWORK NEEDS ANALYSIS   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank mentioned he's creating a histogram to show how we've progressed in terms of our bandwidth to include the cost. 2. The count of computer purchases along with anything connecting to the network is also being noted. There are two types of data being tracked. One is the number of purchases being made by year and running a cumulative nodes count. The information unknown is what items have been surveyed and what still exists as active inventory. Frank is working with procurement for this information. 3. Elaine asked if there was an inventory or assessment done of all the hubs and switches that were replaced when the last emergency of the network going down and the upgrade of the Banner system. Frank mentioned this was done and this is how we were able to determine how many needed to be replaced. The system doesn't capture this change because it's a manual entry of the survey form to GSA or property transfer. Marlena mentioned she has a spreadsheet from Theda the IMO, however, the information provided is only from the start of her employment. Marlena also mentioned there is no sort or type of category. Frank mentioned he was able to extract information dated back from 1994 to 1997 from Dynologic due to the switch to banner. Reliance on purchase order to track purchases but nothing to show what is present inventory. 4. Frank mentioned our replacement cycle is 3 years and suggested we start removing things that have reached the cycle. 5. Frank mentioned there are different angles being looked at to address and get a count of what is on the network. Marlena suggested doing a rough average, maybe every two years, with the current information. 6. Wes asked if it includes breakdown per building. Frank mentioned he did have a graph with this information through Solar Winds. 7. Elaine mentioned it would be interesting to see the chart of the bandwidth usage and where it was peaking at a certain amount of time. What would be valuable is to have a snap shot of when we are peaking accompanied with the solar winds report showing exactly where the peak is coming from. This will help us to better management the system. Marlena mentioned this will help us address what the needs are and how to address it.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

OPEN DISCUSSION

QUEUING SYSTEMS   PATRICK CLYMER

DISCUSSION	1. Patrick attended the presentation for the counseling area on the queuing system. It's housed by a company, you enter into their system, you get queued up, and you can tell how long they've been waiting, you can assign them to a counselor via walk-in or telephone. It allows you to also text the next person and logs when the person was called. The estimated cost per queue is $500. 2. Patrick informed the College Technology Committee he has encouraged the counseling department to present this to the committee even though we are not investing any infrastructure or hardware into it. It will be another bandwidth issue. 3. Marlena asked if it was part of our Enterprise Architecture and Patrick mentioned he wasn't sure.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<div align="center">ACALOG / FERPA   PATRICK CLYMER</div>

DISCUSSION	1. Patrick mentioned there will be a demo at 3:30pm show casing the acalog in addition to a sneak preview of the new webpage. 2. We are reaching full implementation of acalog. 3. Patrick will be conducting a FERPA Demo and will later request the computer standards be updated to include FERPA.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
NEXT WEEK MEETING 3/129/2012 AT 11AM.		

College Technology Committee
March 29, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	

4.	**Old Business**
	• **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)**
	• **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)**
	• **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)**
	• **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan**
	• **Wireless Project Update**
	• **Policy review**
	   o **Technology Fee**
	   o **Course Technology Sustainability**
	   o **Online Policy and Procedure**
	   o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)**
	   o **Computer User's Policy**
	• **Network Needs Analysis**	

5.	**New Business** • **QLess** • **CTC Year End Report**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**
1	Higher Education Network Issues/Resolutions Research	Chris	03/29/12
2	Tech Fee Analysis and History	Wes	
3	Recommendations on Implementing Course Fees	Jay	
4	Did You Know information from EA/ITSP	ALL Members	

College Technology Committee
April 12, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

Outline		
	Topic	**Duration**
1.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes** • **#11 March 8, 2012** • **#12 March 15, 2012** • **#13 March 29, 2012**	
4.	**Old Business** • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)** • **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)** • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** • **Wireless Project Update** • **Policy review** o **Technology Fee** o **Course Technology Sustainability** o **Online Policy and Procedure** o **Email Accounts (Administrative Directive 2006-01)** o **Computer User's Policy** o **Privacy Policy** • **Network Needs Analysis**	
5.	**New Business** • **CTC Year End Report due April 30, 2012** • **Purchase Order for Office 2011** • **FY2012 Account Balance Remaining**	
6.	**Open Discussion**	
7.	**Next Meeting Agenda (04/26/12-last meeting)**	
8.	**Adjournment**	

Preparation			
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**
1	Higher Education Network Issues/Resolutions Research	Chris/Frank	04/12/12
2	Recommendations on Implementing Course Fees	Jay	Fall 2012
3	Did You Know information from EA/ITSP	ALL Members	04/26/12

College Technology Committee Meeting #14

MINUTES   APRIL 12, 2012   11:09AM   GCC TC 1210 CONFERENCE ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 12:09pm
ATTENDEES	Frank Camacho, Patrick Clymer, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, John Limtiaco & Marlena Montague

Review/Approve Minutes

	REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #11, #12, & #13	MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1) Meeting #11 Review: page 2, Old Business, Network Needs Analysis
	    #2: delete space between bottle neck.
	    #3: remove "the" in the sec sentence between of and distance.
	    #5: Clarification on third leg. [Frank clarified the "third leg" as an additional internet line."]
	    #6: remove "what" between is and the, and "for" between provided and period in the third sentence. Insert "the" between on and graph ; remove "?" and "small cap "Because between usage and we're; and remove "to the maximizing of our bandwidth" in sentence four.
	    #7: Insert ";" and small cap "The" between other and gateway in the second and third sentence. Change spelling of peek to "peak" in third sentence. In fourth sentence change "of" to "off". Remove "t" in "got" in fifth sentence. Change "it" to "is" on the fifth sentence between problem and what.
	    #8: In the last sentence insert "s" in recommendation and remove "it that the" replace it with "are, add "s" to reference.
	    #10: Change "maximized" with "is maxing out" in the fourth sentence.
	    #11: Correct the spelling of "peek" to "peak".
	    #12: Remove "distinguish" and replace with "distinction" in second paragraph. Remove "out" in the third sentence. Add "d" in purchase in the fifth sentence.
	    #13: There were two #13. Replace one with #14.
	Conclusion: Should read; The committee understands the diagram and how it ties in with the EA but would like the diagram and narrative resubmitted with the tie in to the EA. The hope is to tie it all in with our historical pattern, in addition as to where you anticipate it today reaching its peak
	    Page 4, Open Discussion, CTC Goals, #2; change "she" to "Marlena".
	    Page 4, Open Discussion, Accreditation, change "partition" to "participation".
	
	MOTION
	Frank moved to approve meeting minutes #11 as amended,
	John second the motion, motion carried.
	
	MOTION
	John moved to approve meeting minutes #12,
	Wesley second the motion, motion carried.
	
	2) Meeting #13 Review: Page 3, Open Discussion, #2: remove is and add "ed" to address.
	
	MOTION
	Wesley moved to approve meeting minutes #13 as amended,
	Terry second the motion, motion carried.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

<div align="center">EA/ITSP "DID YOU KNOW"</div>   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned this will be saved for next year.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<div align="center">EA Topic to Review (based on campus feedback)</div>   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned today was the last day for the campus to provide feedback on the EA/ITSP Review. Nothing new has been received other than the first round of feedback from Jose Munoz and Tony Roberto. 2. Wes asked what will happen now that we take the EA/ITSP in its current form. Marlena mentioned; it will then be up to the committee to decided, next year, what will be focused on in the EA/ITSP. We won't know for sure the network improvement, needs analysis results and implementations and recommendations and how we move forward with it. However, everything needs to be tied in to the EA and ITSP. 3. Frank mentioned it's not an end all document. We've given the campus community up until today the option to comment. But input can continuously come in even if we are already making changes. Wes asked if something will then be done on the website to allow continuing comments. Marlena said she will compile those that have been submitted already and will plan for next year's goals and yearend report. We will continue this next year.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<div align="center">Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan</div>   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Frank has put together a preliminary draft based on last year's amount. Finalization pending the confirmation of payments received based on enrollment. 2. Frank mentioned there is about $11,000.00 left over after the purchase of the Mac Licenses. We have received the 40 licenses for the TC Room and Library Computers. A schedule for

	installation of software is currently being worked on.
	3. Frank mentioned he hasn't received any requisition from Bobbie to put a Mac unit to be placed in the student center.
	4. Frank suggested committing the remaining balance to the cost of increase bandwidth.
	5. Elaine's asked for the status of Office Technology's request for funds to purchase the keyboarding software. Marlena mentioned nothing has been received to date. Ana Mari mentioned an email was sent to Sandy to submit her memo of request by the following meeting several meetings ago but has not heard back. Elaine said she would follow up with her department chair.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Wireless Update   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned Frank did send the graphs and asked if anyone had comments.
	2. Frank mentioned MIS has done their own testing. It never dropped. We are live and open only for testing. Authentication method is still coming in. It is stated in the bid specs that the plan is in linking with banner user's security profile.
	3. Frank mentioned if there are no issues, he will sign off on the invoice for payment tomorrow.
	4. Some issues Frank is looking for input on are; were you able to pick up any wireless at all? did you drop while on the wireless in areas covered in the heat map? Or are you receiving connections past the campus grounds? As of right now, someone can sit outside our gate and have access because we are not authenticating yet.
	5. Frank said if he doesn't receive any concerns from the campus community, he will pay the vendor. However, keeping in mind the vendor will still have to respond to any issues encountered within the year.
	MOTION **Patrick moved to pay vendor for wireless project,** **Frank second the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Policy Review   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena sent out an email with the proposed guidelines for the student technology fee attached and asked for feedback.
	2. Frank's feedback is that the 50/50 breakdown is an unrealistic breakdown. It has never happened and don't think it will ever happen. He further mentioned some flexibility needs to be allowed as far as operation s and upgrades. Marlena asked what his proposal in terms of the realistic scenario is. Frank suggested mentioning the 50/50 as a general guideline. Marlena mentioned it is currently a BOT Policy.
	3. Elaine mentioned, in previous meetings, it was requested that Frank take a look at all the operational areas that need to be supported regularly, annually and put a dollar amount. Frank mentioned he did this on the last budget breakdown.
	4. Wes mentioned this thing is to replace, not supplement, what we currently have. Frank asked for clarification. Elaine mentioned we talked about submitting a proposal to change the current tech fee policy several meetings ago. Wes mentioned the first thing to be changed would be the name; to student technology fee. In the new suggested policy, Elaine mentions there were

	specific areas that were to be identified or defined as operation. As the turnover of members comes in, those fees are secured. This will also help identify programs that need to be looked at because a lot of our departments may not have reviewed the program. And the tools need for the program also need to be increased. Frank said Carmen mentioned, with regards to department al budgets being different from the use of the technology fee. Elaine if a portion of the technology fee is being used to upgrade a software or computer specific to a department then maybe the department needs to rethink the course fee specifically associated with the course offered. 5. Wes mentioned this is not how it's been. We want to change away from how it has been implemented in the past where it has been used only to benefit one department. Frank mentioned we want to be able to assist a department that is in need. 6. Wes mentioned its current form is open to interpretation but would like to see something more detailed. Frank mentioned not restricting it to student technology fee as it is a shared resource in the case of the internet. 7. Elaine suggested focusing on the objective to accommodate students by providing the technology that they're paying money for and to keep the institution functional by providing the operational needs to sustain us. We need to take the narrative, define it a little better with more substance, support it by listing line items that we can't forget there's some funding source to sustain it, and also provide for upgrades. The Office Technology is a perfect example in that it was only accommodating them but it was included in upgrades. As a result, that's something in their course fee they need to include so they're replenishing it with the fee the students pay for to complete their program. Taking what we have today, refining it to accommodate today's needs. Wes mentioned the whole idea behind this is to provide transparency. **MOTION** **Patrick moved to make this one of our goals for next academic year,** **Terry second the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	A goal for next academic year.

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

Network Needs Analysis		MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned she attached the spring breaks network snap shoot and has Joel looking into why the usage is still same even though students are not on campus. 2. Marlena mentioned we will review this next meeting. 3. Frank mentioned he will provide the committee with the GCC Internet History and capacity planning.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

New Business

YEAR END REPORT	MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Will be addressed next meeting. We need to come up with our Achievement, Challenges, and Goals for next year.

CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**
OPEN DISCUSSION			

DISCUSSION			
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

College Technology Committee
April 26, 2012
Meeting Agenda

Chair/Co-Chair	Marlena Montague/Elaine Fejerang	Time: Start	11:00 A.M.
Location	TC1210	Time: End	12:00 P.M.
Attendees: Required	CTC Members		
Minute Taker	Ana Mari Atoigue		

	Outline	
	Topic	**Duration**
I.	**Call to Order**	
2.	**Roll Call**	
3.	**Review/Approve Minutes**	
4.	**Old Business** • **EA/ITSP "Did You Know" (FAQ-Digital Fact Sheet)** • **EA Topic to Review (Based on campus feedback)** • **PC bid specs review (Minimum Standards)** • **Budget for FY2013 Technology Fee Plan** • **Wireless Project Update** • **Network Issues**	
5.	**New Business** • **Request for internet port opening**	
6.	**Things We Can Not Forget** **PCI Compliance** **Postini-Google Antispam/Antiphising Services** **E-Mail Caching Service (MCV/Kuentos)**	
7.	**Open Discussion**	
8.	**Next Meeting Agenda**	
9.	**Adjournment**	

	Preparation		
No.	**Item(s)**	**Owner**	**Target Date**

College Technology Committee Meeting #15

MEETING CALLED BY	Marlena Montague
TYPE OF MEETING	End of Spring 2012 Semester
FACILITATOR	Marlena Montague
NOTE TAKER	Ana Mari Atoigue
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting adjourned at 1:00pm
ATTENDEES	Chris Camacho, Frank Camacho, Elaine Fejerang, Wesley Gima, Terry Kuper, Marlena Montague, & Joel Ridgell

Review/Approve Minutes

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES #14   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	**MOTION** **Wes moved to approve meeting minutes #14 as submitted,** **Terry second the motion, motion carried.**
CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Old Business

PC Bid Specs Review   MARLENA MONTAGUE

DISCUSSION	1. Frank provided the minimum standards for PC, Laptop, netbooks, & ultrabooks for committee review. Marlena mentioned the committee, as a whole, decided to keep the bid specifications as is with the only revision to be made on the warranty. 2. The change suggested was from 3 years to 1 year warranty. The committee decided to stay with the original requirement of 3 years. 3. The updated bid specifications include: Office 2010, more memory, and more disk space. An addition to the bid specifications is the locks. 4. Frank mentioned that, at the request of the President and the VP of Finance and Administration, the security cable lock has been added to the specifications allowing you to lock down desktop and laptop units. 5. Wes recommended that the warranty for the ultrabooks be changed from 1 year to 3 years as they will last much longer than netbooks. 6. Wes requested that a single line be included in the specifications to reflect the cost for a single Microsoft license. **MOTION** **Frank moved to approve the PC Bid Specifications with minor revisions,** **Terry second the motion, motion carried.**

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Wireless Project Update   FRANK CAMACHO

DISCUSSION	1. Marlena mentioned we are live and if there were any items remaining on the project.
	2. Frank mentioned the network authentication method is still pending.
	3. Elaine mentioned there was a request made to open internal (network) ports (on the wireless network). Frank mentioned there have been other requests to open up ports, but based on it being a budgeted item, MIS is not able to open up ports for production without having any kind of plan in place that applies to an AUO (Administrative Unit Outcome) or SLO (Student Learning Outcome). MIS also doesn't know the demand that will happen based on one particular port being opened. Elaine understood that with the wireless being introduced, it (the wireless network) was going to be divided into an open Wi-Fi for students and anyone else and another secured section for employees. Frank mentioned that based on what we do from here and the outcome of the presentation he has prepared today, the issue may be addressed. Frank mentioned that MIS cannot just open a port because someone has requested it. Elaine asked if there's a policy established to acknowledge what Frank is stating. Frank said there is nothing right now that is specific to bandwidth and ports but the policy is based on budget. Elaine asked if there was a document that we can reference to show the tangible evidence of this statement. Frank mentioned that a policy is not needed because it is an operational matter. When a request is made, Frank determines whether to say either yes or no to that port. Right now, if it (the request) is not something that is part of an approved document, Frank disapproves it.
	4. Elaine mentioned these questions are from a faculty's point of view. As faculty, we come up with all these creative approaches to enlighten and stimulate students through other creative vehicles. What happens now that faculty/student is using an iPad but cannot connect? Faculty ask MIS to open a port and you (MIS) say, "Nope, show me a document that ties this into a budget, a course, and a course guide." At this point, faculty/student are in the discovery phase. Faculty go through and discover options for student learning; and, what you're (MIS) doing is saying no more discoveries on this campus. Frank mentioned that what he is saying is that you (faculty) can do as much discovery as you (faculty) want but you (faculty) have to consider that first thing is first. Business must happen and operations must take place. Elaine reiterated that she is coming from the academic side. Because education is our business and we are tasked to provide the learning outcomes and to also discover alternate and creative ways to bring in and create the retention, we (faculty) have to go through the discovery phase.
	5. Elaine acknowledges Frank's dilemma and the dilemma of the faculty but would like to find a solution because faculty will continue to ask these questions. Chris mentioned to recall the presentation Galaide (Vendor who performed the Tech Audit) provided. They had processes that identified the pilot programs that have a location in which they can do certain things like discovery. The pilot program needs to be devised before we let loose on the network. It is what is needed. Frank mentioned when you (faculty) have some kind of evidence it allows us (MIS) to justify our request. Elaine mentioned that with Frank's approach and if (Frank's approach) this becomes policy, we're (GCC) going to have a Non-substantive Revision across the board of all curriculum and you're (MIS) now going to be stuck with evidence that says everyone needs all ports. Frank mentioned it is needed to show what is in place. It gives us (MIS) the bullets to help faculty out in opening up ports to allow more services and applications to run and do your (faculty) discovery properly. Chris mentioned we need to gauge the animal as to how wild it is. Wes asked how you (MIS) can do that if you (MIS) don't allow a port to be opened. Wes asked how the pilot program works. Chris mentioned that the parameters need to be established.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Presentation: GCC's Internet and Nodes
Background -Internet & Network Capacity   FRANK CAMACHO
Planning. 1999-2012

DISCUSSION	1. Frank mentioned two separate databases that existed and gave us (MIS) an idea of where to find nodes, potential nodes, or technology that can be made part of the network. There was also three physical inventory conducted, along with purchase orders and MOA/MOUs to assist with our (MIS) data collection. 2. Adjusted actual nodes (connected to the network or potential to connect to the network) were based on actual inventory. 3. As of today there are 1,464 estimated adjusted active nodes. Based on April 2008 inventory of 1548 nodes less the 2005 purchases. 281 is a number that exists, in 2005, as the newly bought units which should have been replaced three years later. 4. The history of the bandwidth. Back in 1999 we had a 54K line. We jumped from the 1.544 era, then 5, then 10, then 20. From the data you can see we are doubling our bandwidth every two years. MCV is giving us 10megs at $225/ GTA is giving us 20megs at $100. The technology fee has paid for this since 2006. Marlena asked if this is something that has to be renewed annually. Frank mentioned we are currently on a month to month and have been increasing our bandwidth without going out on bid. 5. Marlena asked if the APNIC is included in the presentation. Frank mentioned that it is separate as it has nothing to do with the bandwidth. 6. Frank mentioned that the internet is slow at times because every time we increase the bandwidth the demand is there according to the trend. 7. According to Joel, LRC/Student Center is the same connection to the core and is where the labs are and where the wireless first debuted showing the most bandwidth usage. Chris mentioned it was an unauthenticated open MIS deployment of wireless. The data shown is based on March 2012 pre-ruckus (Campus Wireless Project). Elaine mentioned this would be the first place the throttle should be. 8. Some of the issues we have to be concerned about, as far as the trend, are: factors of increases in nodes, increases in internet usage, limited bandwidth capacity and routing, changing usage and user profiles, lack of user's policy and guidelines, and cost of bandwidth. 9. Planning issues are technical, market, competitive, as well as regulatory. Technical meaning now we have the E.A. (Enterprise Architecture) & I.T.S.P. (Information Technology Strategic Plan) in addition to having providers to provide what we want. Market issues such as promoting the internet and bandwidth via AUO/SLO. Competitive issues such as who takes priority of bandwidth. Is it the academic affairs side, the finance side, or the President's office? Is it students versus operations? Regulatory would be what policies the board puts out. 10. Growth planning-the population we are trying to service; changing internet service; changing internet usage. We (GCC) have more network applications than ever before that use more bandwidth and we (GCC) have more intense network use by increasingly sophisticated applications run over the network. In terms of what I've (Frank Camacho) seen, we (GCC) have created a model to balance what you (GCC) have and what the demand is. 11. We don't know when ISPs will change their prices or what kind of infrastructure will be in place. Our (GCC) usage capacity is currently going through a growth trend and will continue to rise over time. The larger the capacity, the more lead time is needed. You (GCC) will also need to change your (GCC) equipment to allow more bandwidth to come in. The bigger the purchase the greater the requirement for capital. 12. Forecasting. We (GCC) see a trend in increasing enrollment every year now. 13. Proposal on the use of the remaining technology fee based on the E.A. 14. Next fiscal year's budget, as per business office, for the technology fee is $341,715.30. 15. Elaine mentioned the presentation touched a little on where the increase was coming from in terms of the absorption of the bandwidth, but felt the committee needed to get a handle on internally segmenting them (the network) off and then taking another assessment to say we still need it. If we believe that the culprit is the student center and other areas, we're increasing it to accommodate their usage. We have the instructional side of it that we are now going to penalize based on that. If we were to first clean up, and section out, then reassess it then we can see where we need to increase. Before we start to grow, maybe what we work on first is getting the tools necessary, if we don't already have them. Chris mentioned that's what was being asked for prior to this deployment (Campus Wireless Project). The request was for the service to be provided; we've done that. It is doing what we forecasted it would do. The Ruckus network is already in place and we will see the exact same thing happen. Without any kind of precaution put in place, it is just going to happen again. Elaine mentioned we are going to continue to absorb it until it's sectioned out to support it. Chris mentioned that's part of the Gateway expansion project with four pipes out and with dedicated services to a particular profile. Right now we are treating it as one big pipe. Currently there are only two pipes, and this is where the multi-homing and APNIC come into play. If one should fail, the other one should fall into place. Elaine commented that what has been said is validating her point. She recommended going with the hardware

	first so we can section the network out and create some sense of organization in terms of the throttle and segmentation, then let's reassess how much more bandwidth. As we grow in bandwidth, based on demand, we'll actually see usage.
	16. Elaine suggested to equally share the bandwidth across the board. Marlena suggested looking at the time courses are offered as this is currently being considered to utilize the buildings and it could also include the use of bandwidth. Elaine mentioned some institutions have put equal bandwidth throughout the entire campus. When one program required more bandwidth, then they or the students had to pay additional fees to get the extra level. Frank mentioned we currently don't have a load balancing software in place to do that. Elaine mentioned she's looking for solutions before we jump in and cash in for a whole lot. She would like to get a better handle on what we have and looking at other options to help us along as we grow. Frank mentioned if you're looking at the trend, regardless, we are due. If we get the additional bandwidth, we can do much more in dividing that traffic with the gateway expansion and equipment that we're also going to procure. We would do a whole lot better rather than trying to deal with the 30 that we currently have as we are already reaching beyond 75% utilization for the majority of the time.
	17. Terry mentioned it goes back to the constraints on education Elaine mentioned earlier. If you have an instructor that has students in the LRC doing some school work but can't because there's not enough bandwidth or it's moving to slow. If you cap them off, you're telling the instructors that is all you're getting, even though you're students are doing instructional work. Elaine said she understood that but felt there has to be a better way to create efficiency. If we are encountering that problem then maybe we should be writing in our course guide to require more funding which is part of our tools. Terry commented that's what Frank mentioned earlier when the question about opening a port was asked. Writing it in your SLO's to open up a port because now you're opening up bandwidth. You need to be able to justify the opening of a port. Frank mentioned with more bandwidth, we would have more wiggle room to do more discoveries.

CONCLUSIONS	

<div align="center">TECH FEE PLAN</div>

| **DISCUSSION** | 1. Marlena mentioned she received a request from Sandy to purchase the site license for the keyboarding software's current version. Terry asked if the current department budget addresses this because it seems everything is being meshed. Is this allowable? Marlena mentioned this is not supposed to replace your department budget. Terry mentioned but its being done and you're setting precedence. Wes mentioned this has been happening as it started with the Tech Fee paying Computer Science's AS400. Terry said it was fine as long as it is uniformly applied amongst everybody. Frank mentioned that no maintenance for the AS400 has been paid for as it is already a dead system to IBM.
2. Frank has recommendations on how to use the remaining funds as tied in with the E.A. Here are some suggestions on the use of the remaining balance and the links to the EA:
   1) Purchase $32,000 worth of equipment and system tools primarily for MIS' new operational role in support of Mac Labs and to better manage PC systems. These will be used to purchase Mac server, Mac computers, and software for Mac Systems' imaging and PC management.
      EA page 65 *Technology IT Architecture (TA)* **PC Configuration**
      Each PC shall have a standard configuration. This "image" shall be stored on the network. Automated software tools shall be used to periodically evaluate the status of each PC on the network. If a PC is in need of "re-imaging" it will be scheduled for an appropriate time and handled via the network. (See TA0012)
      EA page 72. *IT Management IT Architecture (MA)* **MA003 Tools**
      IT Management shall have all the tools (software applications, test equipment) necessary to perform all routine maintenance, troubleshooting, and future planning on every component within the architecture.
   2) Purchase of 500 licenses for MS Office 2010 Professional (Academic), about $32,000.
      EA page 72 **MA007 Licensing**
      IT Management shall be responsible for maintaining all licensed software media (diskettes, CD/DVD's) for tracking the location of each use of licensed software; and for ensuring that licensed software is either renewed or replaced before it expires.
   3) Purchase $32,000 worth of Mac HW/SW to be installed at the LRC and/or Student Center
      EA page 64 **TS009 Availability**
      GCC technological assets shall be highly available. Availability means having information accessible and having a means of accessing it. Availability also means a |

high percentage of "uptime." An application or network connection that is functional only 80-percent of the time is not available. The goal shall be 95-percent availability. Striving for 100-percent is unrealistic and too costly to attempt.

4) Increase Bandwidth at MCV and GTA by 10 Mbps each to the tuned of $30,000.
EA page 32 **GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE EA OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES**
General Overview GCC will provide a unified, secure, efficient and reliable IT infrastructure to address current and future needs. GCC will provide sufficient and cost-effective bandwidth to meet current and future needs.

5) Upgrade D9 Lab for about $32,000.
EA page 64 ***Technology IT Standards (TS)***
The following standards are not in place. In the future, all technology will comply with these standards. **TS006 Hardware Standards** The standard PC and server shall be current industry standard

6) Buy $32,000 worth of Gateway Expansion equipment
EA page 64 ***Technology IT Standards (TS)*** **TS003 Network**
The GCC network shall be highly available and reliable, responsive, redundant, and transparent to the user.

7) Buy software licenses for needed courses.
EA page 72 **MA007 Licensing**
IT Management shall be responsible for maintaining all licensed software media (diskettes, CD/DVD's) for tracking the location of each use of licensed software; and for ensuring that licensed software is either renewed or replaced before it expires.

8) Any combination of the above

3. Frank mentioned the option to purchase whatever can be purchased with the $32,000.00. Terry mentioned the gateway expansion was projected in the budget. Frank mentioned that is the primary plan but this is the secondary plan to utilize the current funds. Terry asked Frank if the gateway expansion could be completed with the $32,000.00. Frank didn't think so. Terry then asked what will this do. If it just to buy partial equipment and not do anything then why purchase it. It has to provide some performance. Frank suggested purchasing a router as we don't have spares on our network.

4. Joel mentioned if the gateway router fails, we don't have a spare. Terry suggested purchasing a spare gateway router since there is no spare because should our current one go down, our campus is dead. Terry mentioned if you purchase it, you need to implement now. Using both routers (new/old) will create some form of redundancy.

5. Chris mentioned this will increase our bandwidth right off the bat. Wes asked if this is also allowing us to purchase the software to better manage the system. Chris said no; it is not enough to purchase the software.

MOTION
Frank moved to approve $30,000.00 to increase the GTA/MCV Bandwidth
and $2,000.00 to purchase the Keyboarding Pro software,
Terry second the motion, motion carried.

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

New Business

DISCUSSION	

CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**

OPEN DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION		
CONCLUSIONS		

ACTION ITEMS	**PERSON RESPONSIBLE**	**DEADLINE**