

2/8/21

## Technology Advisory Committee Mtg. Minutes

### Members\Attendees:

- |                       |                        |                    |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| ✓ Matt Donaldson      | ○ Kent Gross           | ✓ Josh Collins     |
| ○ Stephen Schoonmaker | ○ Nathan Rexford       | ✓ Alison Varty     |
| ✓ Darlene Melby       | ○ Doug Haugen          | ○ Jesse Cecil      |
| ✓ Char Perlas         | ○ Axel Hernandez       | ✓ Maria Fernandez  |
| ✓ Melissa Green       | ○ Kelly Groppi         | ✓ Barbara Douglass |
| ✓ Valerie Roberts     | ○ Nancy Coughlin       | ✓ Jason Aronson    |
| ✓ Meghan Witherell    | ✓ Anne-Marie Kuhlemann | ✓ Stephanie Wroten |

### Accomplishments

Matt Donaldson reviewed accomplishments since the last TAC meeting:

- The SSO Restructuring project was completed. All student accounts exist only in the cloud while employee accounts exist in both the cloud and local Active Directory. Microsoft Azure AD is the sole authentication source. The INS domain has been retired.
- The College worked with the CCCCO to obtain its own Zoom sub-account so that Tech Services can manage its Zoom accounts directly rather than going through the CCCCO.
- The College deployed Otter for Business to provide closed captioning capability in meetings that require it.

### TAC Meeting Procedures

Matt Donaldson initiated a discussion of the TAC meeting procedures. He noted that the TAC is not a formal decision-making body and, consequently, is not required to follow formal meeting rules, such as Roberts' Rules of Order. He then suggested the following procedures:

- Minutes would be taken by the chair for historical purposes. These would be emailed to the committee for feedback but there would be no formal approval of minutes from previous meetings.
- Informational presentations and the ensuing discussion would open without any formal procedures to guide them except that the chair would strive to keep discussion within the time frame allotted on the agenda.
- The same would be true with the presentation and discussion of proposals. The committee's recommendation would be a matter of consensus unless there is a request for a formal vote.

It was agreed that these procedures will be adopted until circumstances change or participants wish to amend them.

### Enterprise Application Steering Committee

Matt Donaldson suggested the College create an Enterprise Application Steering Committee (EASC). The difference between TAC and this committee is that TAC would be strategic and cover all technology while an EASC would be tactical and focus on Banner and integrated systems. The EASC would meet quarterly to define the 'Production Calendar,' specifying what maintenance tasks would be performed when. The EASC would also oversee the creation of a Run Book, a document that

describes both automatic and manual processes that are performed to maintain enterprise applications. Finally, it may serve as a forum for departments to coordinate business processes that cross departmental lines.

Several individuals noted that similar committees had existed in the past and were effective and it was generally agreed that this would be beneficial. The proposed participant list was reviewed and it was suggested that Melissa Green be added to provide broader Student Services representation.

Tech Services will prepare a preliminary production calendar and then schedule the initial EASC committee meeting.

### **“Shared ERP System” Initiative Proposal**

Matt Donaldson introduced this initiative, explaining its purpose and the backing of the College president and answered several questions concerning the CCCCO’s effort. There was general consensus to support this initiative.

### **“ICT Accessibility” Initiative Proposal**

Char Perlas introduced this initiative, emphasizing the need to create a process for evaluating proposed software and course material. Matt Donaldson shared results of inquiries to the CISO list-serv on this topic. Only three schools responded, suggesting that many schools still lack formal procedures.

- College of the Canyons has a ‘Software Review Team’ comprised of the IT Director, the DSPS Accessibility Coordinator, the Information Security Admin, and staff from Purchasing\Contracts.
- Sierra College has an Administrative Procedure that stipulates accessibility requirements. They require software vendors to provide a statement indicating that they fulfill the requirements in the AP or describe where they are not in compliance so the district can decide whether to make an exception.
- Ohlone College requires software vendors to provide a VPAT that is reviewed by a committee consisting of the VP of Administration, VP of HR, IT Director, Purchasing Director, Student Accessibility Services Director, District ICT Accessibility Specialist, and the requesting department head that then decides whether to adopt the software.

Maria Fernandez emphasized the importance of meeting this need and her frustration that it has taken so long to address this need. She also expressed concern that the College had moved away from its position of not adopting software unless it had been tested for accessibility to allowing temporary adoption of software until a process is implemented to properly evaluate.

It was decided that a team would be formed to execute this initiative consisting of:

- ADA Coordinator, Melissa Green
- Director of IT, Matt Donaldson
- Director of DSPS, Natalie Bradley
- Distance Learning Faculty Coordinator, Maria Fernandez
- Vice President of Academic Affairs, Char Perlas
- Distance Learning Coordinator, Anne-Maria Kuhlemann

### **“Unified Student Interaction System” Initiative Proposal**

Melissa Green introduced this initiative, providing a summary of the business need. There was discussion about whether SARS could meet this need. It was decided that Technology Services will work with staff within Student Services to more explicitly define the business requirements and then a meeting would be setup with the software vendor to have them show whether SARS can fulfill these requirements. If its determined that it can, then a project proposal to ‘resurrect’ SARS would be submitted. If not, an initiative proposal to evaluate other potential solutions would be submitted. In either case, TAC will provide a recommendation on whether and how to proceed.