# BERKELEY CITY COLLEGE – TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES for the Meeting of Friday, March 27, 2015

## 12:30 – 1:30 PM, Room 451A

ATTENDEES: Josh Boatright, Dave Ivan Cruz (ASBCC), Fabian Banga, Theresa Rumjahn, Vincent Koo, Mary Clarke-Miller, Antonio Barreiro, Roberto Gonzalez

CO-CHAIRS: Antonio Barreiro, Fabian Banga, Roberto Gonzalez

## DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Call to order (12:47 PM)**
   1. Fabian Banga called the meeting to order. Antonio will be arriving shortly from a meeting at the District. We met last Friday, March 20th, but did not have a quorum. (The regular March 11th meeting was rescheduled to last Friday due to the Accreditation team visit.)
   2. We have two new ASBCC representatives: Dave Ivan Cruz ([dcruz.asbcc@gmail.com](mailto:dcruz.asbcc@gmail.com)) and Sarah Leven (slevin.asbcc@gmail.com)
2. **Review and Approval of Agenda** 
   1. Fabian Banga suggested we review the minutes from the Feb. 11th meeting and vote on it by email, in order to expedite matters.
   2. Dave Ivan Cruz requested that an item regarding a color printer for the ASBCC be added for discussion about technology requests.
3. **APU Technology Requests** 
   1. Fabian Banga handed out the grid named “APU Technology Requests Prioritization, 3/25/15”.
   2. Antonio Barreiro said he just came from a District meeting where he submitted a technology request for BCC. Linda Sanford had requested the college presidents on short notice to submit this technology request at the PBC meeting today (3/27/2015). Antonio indicated that what he submitted was a spreadsheet containing all of the items on our Technology APU and our Student Services APU. He added columns for our rubric scores and any notes. This is the grid handed out by Fabian. The “Preliminary Score” Notes comes from the OOI APU. Antonio discussed items on the grid:
      1. The top item is Network Refresh for Phase II ($400,000). Antonio said the wireless project component of this was approved by the District on Tuesday (3/24/2015) and Michael Deoquino has already requisitioned it. The whole wireless project should be done by the end of May, and total $200,000 (BCC will pay half). The $400,000 total is an estimate needed for the whole BCC refresh (which includes the wireless project).
      2. The open student computing lab refresh ($50,000) in Rm 125 is for 40 computers, of which half are beyond their 5-year life. So the $400,000 for BCC refresh will cover other computer labs. Mary Clarke-Miller suggested we look at buying new computers to replace computers in labs (such as English lab) with 2 years of life left, and use these 2-years-life-left computers in the open student computer lab to replace those very old computers. Antonio said we have so many computers that are beyond life that it is not really feasible to keep track of all of these varying life computers – it would take too much staff time to do the tracking, purchasing, installation, and maintenance.
      3. Antonio Barreiro said the goal right now for the BCCTC is to endorse this grid at today’s meeting so that we can submit it to the next Roundtable meeting (April 13) since the BCCTC does not meet again until April 17. Antonio said this grid was submitted to the PBC today because they are making many requests right, but we still need to go through the shared governance process at BCC and so we need to submit it to Roundtable especially if there are any changes. Fabian Banga commented that the dates for the technology requests are moved around every year at the District level, and next week is Spring Break.
      4. Roberto Gonzalez commented that there is a bit of a disconnect between what the BCCTC approves for funding for an unknown set of sources in comparison with what the department is purchasing on their own. For example, there are fairly substantial DSPS requests, so what DSPS submitted to the BCCTC may be moot now if the technology request was submitted to the PBC today. So, the BCCTC does not know where the funding is coming from for all of these requests. Antonio Barreiro said we don’t know, but these are our technology priorities and what we have to work with, and we’ve done our job. Then we need to look at what funding is available (when that is known) and re-prioritize based on that funding availability. Roberto Gonzalez said that’s why it is important to remind the Roundtable at the beginning of the fall semester. Antonio said we begin building our budgets in April – the process is okay since we can re-prioritize based on funding sources. For example, if we only have $200,000 for the top item, then that eliminates the network refresh. Fabian Banga said we should not create a list based on how much money we have; it should be based on need and prioritized. He also noted that there will be recommendations from the Accreditation visiting team about this process.
   3. Dave Cruz requested a color printer for the ASBCC be placed on the technology request list. The color printer could be used to produce better quality flyers and handouts for student activities. Fabian Banga said that we may not be able to resolve this here since the item was not put on the list before. Antonio Barreiro said that the ASBCC should talk to Mostafa Ghous about this and to place it on the Campus Life APU which would then come up for prioritization with the other technology requests. Antonio suggested that the ASBCC may use its own funding for the color printer, although the color toner is very expensive and the funding should take into account toner replacement and total cost of ownership including maintenance and supplies. The budget goes through June but purchases have only 2 more business days for this year, so this may happen next year. Vincent Koo said this brings in the issue of IT work load, so IT needs to plan for the extra work. Mary Clarke-Miller suggested using the Printer’s Collective Workshop which has a lower price for non-profits. Dave Cruz said the idea was not to print outside, and to be able to print more flyers for events. Antonio and Fabian suggested this issue be brought up with Mostafa and the results could be reported at the next BCCTC meeting.
   4. Antonio Barreiro raised the issue of ratification.
   5. **MOTION: Fabian Banga made a motion to approve the APU Technology Requests Prioritization list. Josh Boatright seconded the motion. It was unanimously approved. The list will be brought to the next Roundtable meeting on April 13.**
   6. Discussion: Vincent Koo said the Financial Aid did not include refresh of 10 workstations in their APU but it is needed. They need $1750 per workstation, so a total of $17,500 needs to be added to the list. Antonio Barreiro requested an addendum to the motion to add refresh of 10 workstations with a score of 9 for end-of-life replacement. There were no objections.
4. **DRAFT BCC Technology Plan**
   1. Fabian Banga said everyone should have gotten a copy of the draft BCC Technology Plan with the email attachments announcing this meeting. He said we need to endorse it and send it to Roundtable. The plan was prepared last semester and corrections and edits were made to it, with the assistance of Jennifer Kennedy, before the Accreditation team visit. The Accreditation team reviewed it and was very happy with it. One big change is to have a 3-year plan instead of a 5-year plan. This reflects the changing technology climate and allows us the flexibility to plan for equipment and service needs based on what is needed in educational technology. For example, 5 years ago we did not envision the need for an extensive wireless network and our funding sources, and we did not know that we would be in three buildings instead of one. If we remain on our 5-year cycle, we would not be able to modify it until 2020. The idea is to revisit the document the first year and edit it the next year. So we would review and assess in 2017-2018, edit in 2018-2019, and adopt in 2019-2020.
   2. A new part of the draft tech plan goals include creation of a helpdesk and tech support when we get the new building for offices and classrooms, library, and computer labs. But we don’t have any specifics because we don’t know how much the District will do. The District has plans for a central helpdesk. The District also began a task force as a committee to look at how to better coordinate campus and District services. The draft tech plan is a map of what we want to do in the next 3 years. We give it to Roundtable, they may edit it, and this will be our guide for the next 3 years.
   3. Antonio Barreiro said we received good feedback about its professional preparation from the Accreditation team. Antonio recommended two things:
      1. We have the Ed Master Plan finalized first, and then adapt the draft tech plan for the Ed Master Plan goals. So we can wait a little before sending it to Roundtable for ratification.
      2. We obtain the formal recommendations from the ACCJC so that we can incorporate them into our plans. There will be a need for a sustainable budget strategy as indicated in the preliminary visiting team recommendations (district-wide), and we can add this to the front end of our tech plan.
   4. Fabian Banga said one of the Accred visiting team members said our tech plan is a great plan but the District does not have a tech plan yet, just a list of projects. He wondered how our tech plan was going to fit in with their tech plan, so our answer was that we can’t wait for them because our refresh and equipment needs and the planning for future needs are right now.
   5. There was further discussion about tech plan ratification and it was decided to keep it as draft for now and to wait for the Ed Master Plan to be completed. The draft tech plan can then be edited to reflect the Ed Master Plan goals.
   6. Another reason to wait on tech plan ratification is that the Facilities Plan expires this year and will have a recurring 3-year cycle. So this will coincide with APRs (annual program reviews). The timing is correct and decisions are right in context of campus-wide reviews. Also, the 3-year and 6-year cycles coincide with the Accred review schedules.
   7. Antonio Barreiro suggested that if anyone has suggestions, to send them to the BCCTC as a group.
5. **Wireless Network project update**
   1. Antonio Barreiro said the Board approved project Tuesday night. Michael Dioquino made the requisitions on Wednesday, and everything is basically ready to go. But we need the 50% match from District and then the work can be completed by May.
6. **Meeting Adjourned (1:35 pm)**

*(Minutes taken by Theresa Rumjahn)*

**Handouts at the Meeting:**

* The Grid – “APU Technology Requests Prioritization 3/25/15; AB, VK”

**Sent Previously by Email to BCCTC members and BCC-FAS:**

* [BCCTC Agenda for March 27, 2015](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/BCC_TechComm_Agenda_20150327.docx)
* Draft Minutes of BCCTC February 11, 2015 Meeting
* [BCCTC APU Prioritization 2014-15 DRAFT](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/BCCTC-APU-Prioritization-2014-15-DRAFT.docx)
* [BCCTC APU RUBRIC (2)](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/BCCTC-APU-RUBRIC-2.xlsx)
* [Draft 2015-2018 BCC Technology Plan](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/2015-2018-BCCTechnologyPlan_finaldraft.pdf)
* [Draft 2014 Peralta District Distance Education Report](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/DE_peralta2014_draft.pdf)
* [2015 Student Services APU Technology Request](http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/tech_committee/files/2013/04/2015-Student-Services-APU-Technology-Request.docx)