

**CERRITOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MINUTES OF
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS COMMITTEE
FRIDAY February 8, 2008
9:00-10:00 A.M. ROOM LC-62**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lucinda Aborn, Lamont Freeman, Debra Moore, John McGinnis, Mario Morales, Wes Nance, Bernie Negrete, Patrick O'Donnell, Harry Riegert, Lee Krichmar, Lamar Mills.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dean Mellas, Bernice Watson

The meeting of February 8, 2008 was brought to order at 9:05 a.m.

Lee introduced two new members of the Committee: Lucinda Aborn, representing ACME and Lamar Mills, representing the students.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2008

The Minutes of January 15 were reviewed by members in attendance. There was one correction: John McGinnis noted that in the last paragraph on page 2 the word "made" should be replaced with the word "main" so that the sentence reads: "John said he would like to use Library Automation as the *main* heading" It was moved by Bernie Negrete, and seconded by John McGinnis, to approve the minutes as corrected. There was no further discussion. The minutes were approved with four abstentions: Lucinda Aborn, Lamont Freeman, Lamar Mills and Patrick O'Donnell.

OUTSTANDING IT STANDARDS ISSUES

Lee explained that this agenda item is a place holder for discussion of any outstanding IT issues each meeting. She reported that the computer replacements on campus this fiscal year total about 500. She also informed the Committee that every year we try to update all the pricing just before we begin replacing large quantities of desktop computers and monitors so we can get the newest technology for the lowest price. Our current standards include:

- [Desktop*](#)
- [Notebook/ Tablet/ Handheld PC](#)
- [Macintosh](#) (we support any Macintosh computer)
- [Printers/ Scanners/ Wireless](#)
- [Software](#)
- [Electronic Classroom](#)

John McGinnis asked if Information Technology replaces projectors and or bulbs in Electronic classrooms and Lee informed him that projectors are the Library's responsibility. John also asked whether flat screen panels in place of projectors would be his area of responsibility. Lee responded that because projectors are Media Service's area of responsibility she believes the LCD would be included as any other TV would be. However, if a LCD connects to a computer and is used simply as a monitor (such as in One-Stop) then

she feels like Information Technology can take responsibility for it. Lee asked for feedback from John and the committee and everyone seemed to agree at the distinction.

Bernie Negrete further commented that LCD's might not be a good idea as replacements for projectors and that it would depend on the kind and on the sizes, stating that 40"-50" range would not be good for a large classroom. When text is displayed, it is more advantageous to have the larger screen.

John McGinnis said that bulbs for projectors are expensive (\$100 to \$1,000). Wes Nance commented that the flat panels also require bulb replacement that is likewise costly. Lee said that some of the warranties for LCD's cover one replacement bulb. If we set a standard for LCD's, we need to consider the warranties and bulbs to receive as much coverage as possible.

Lee asked Lucinda if there is anything from Assistive Technology that would benefit from use of LCD rather than a projector. Lucinda replied that when two monitors are used at the same time for two different applications, this would come in to play, and she described such a situation in the Board Room. Lee responded that in the event of the remodel of the Board Room, each Board member would have a 15" LCD in front of them. They are considering sinking the monitors down into the board table, with digital microphones and other perhaps other types of technology added in. Also, there would be two (approximately 45" LCD's) on the west and east side of the walls for the audience. From Lee's understanding she thought that the exact things would be displayed on both large LCD's. Lucinda explained that if one of the displays could be used for captioning that it would be an advantage.

TECHNOLOGY MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION ITEMS

Lee summarized the following: Agenda Item 3a. (Review of IT Unit & Division Plans) is done; Agenda Item 3b. (Review of Library and Distant Education Division) -- John McGinnis' area, Library automation, was distributed via Email. M.L. Bettino previously provided his Area Division Plan. We are now continuing to review this draft – Agenda Item 3c. (Review of Draft Outline Technology Master Plan).

Lee reported that a review of the Accreditation Report (Agenda Item 3d) did not provide anything new. She indicated she had already included Standard 3C, which is where most of the IT related items are located. At this point we will continue to make the document more comprehensive. Lee suggested that we include some photographs of different items such as electronic classrooms, labs, infrastructure, and requested photographs from additional areas to include in the Master Plan.

Lucinda asked how the Master Plan is updated from the Unit Plan. Lee responded that we took the IT Division Plan (which encompasses the units for Help Desk, Infrastructure, and PeopleSoft) as a starting point. From there, we included the 05-08 Strategic Plan, the goals and priorities laid out on page 14. These are prioritized within the Area Plan for Business Services, which is not yet complete. Once complete, these should be included in the master plan too. Lee stated that providing a 5-year plan for Information Technology is too difficult because of the changing nature of this discipline. So what she is creating is a 3-year plan with updates to be made at least every quarter. A new strategic plan for 09 is also being started. Once those goals are set, this would need to be rolled into the IT Master Plan too.

Lucinda asked how other areas, such as Capital Outlay, would impact IT (because of the dependency on IT to implement), and inquired how these areas get incorporated into the prioritization of the Master Plan? Lee responded that she made the request in Management Leadership Council (MLC) to allow all managers to be able to review all of the Area Plans. An online planning tool is in the process of being developed by IT for next year, but because the technology is not in place yet, the transparency, or the ability for all managers to review all plans is not in place yet. The Area Plans might be published on the research web for this year.

Based on Lucinda's input, Lee said she would add an item to the agenda #3f: Review of the Area Plans as a Group. Then the committee could decide how they want to roll in the area prioritization into the Master Plan. Each time we meet Lee will bring an updated draft of the IT Master Plan to the IT Standards meeting for review. Lee said that after the master plan is closer to being done, Patricia will be asked to review for grammatical errors and spelling.

Lee also mentioned that Jo Ann has given positive feedback with the direction we are taking. John McGinnis asked to go over his sections and Lee said she would email the document to him. Lee's intent is to publish on our Intranet once we get closer to a finished document.

UPDATE FROM FACULTY SENATE MEETING ON 02/05 WHERE TECHNOLOGY MASTER PLAN DRAFT WAS SHARED

Lee reported that through email she put a notice out to the committee to make sure there were no objections to sharing the draft with Faculty Senate on Tuesday February 5. She reported that prior to that meeting, she met with Brian Reece, Dean Mellas, Bernie Negrete, and Jack Wilson to discuss what they would like added to the draft prior to her presentation, such as the areas of responsibility between departments -- who is responsible for what (such as Media Services vs. Information Technology), or within the IT Department and the Library (such as the helpdesk, for the faculty/staff, and the student assistance through ASC). It is a good plan to try to specify within the document the various areas of responsibility and how they relate to one another. Lee reported that the version that went to Faculty Senate included screen shots from the PeopleSoft upgrade (pp20-21), which could be expanded. The ASC will be doing the documentation for the new *Student Center, which is accessed via MyCerritos*, which will be critical to student success in the summer. Lee stated that at the bottom of page 2 of the Index, they changed to Assistive Technology to Universal Access, because that is a more accurate description and it actually covers more. They added procurement as well. Also, place holders are being inserted and some areas may not be complete at this point. Lee received a lot of positive feedback from Faculty Senate. Overall faculty members are pleased when information is shared with them. Lee thinks that because of the criticism across campus that itmes are not shared before they are completed, she feels it is a step in the right direction to share our draft with others and to begin receiving feedback early in our process. Faculty Senate's presentation required a lot of additions to the draft and required a lot of time to get into a more presentable format to share with that group. Lee requested that If there are any areas that anyone feels they could directly add to the various pieces within the document, they should feel free to contribute. She especially encouraged Lamar Mills to contribute anything he feels important to expand on from a student perspective.

STUDENT I.D. LOOK-UP

Debra asked if Student I.D. Look-up also works for faculty as well as for students. This inquiry was affirmed by Lee.

CONFIRMATION OF COMMITTEE MEETING TIME/PLACE

Lee asked for input on where/when to place the meeting. After a brief discussion, the consensus was to keep the meeting the same as before. Therefore, the next meeting will remain at March 14 at 9 a.m. in LC 62.

The meeting was adjourned 9:45 a.m.