

**Technology Planning Committee Minutes**

October 20, 2022  
9:00am – 10:00am

**MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Sorensen, Paul Chown, Tom Cossey, Brian Van Pelt, Jose Ramirez, Leigh Dooley, Darius Kalvaitis, Todd Olson, Stephanie Byrd**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Facilitator** | **Time** |
| Erik called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. | **Erik** | **9:00-9:05** |
| **Define TPC Role in Decision Making**  Erik opened by stating that defining TPC’s role in decision making was something TPC had discussed at last month’s meeting and will continue to discuss.  Paul reported that TPC’s role in program review requests had come up at a recent IEC meeting. There was an assumption being made that TPC was being consulted on resource requests. Paul asked for the group’s feedback on what role TPC felt they should play in resource requests so he could take this back to the IEC. Does TPC want to look at all technology purchases or just program review requests? Paul felt that all technology purchases should have some sort of consultation but acknowledged that TPC does not have control over people purchasing things on their Cal Cards. Paul asked for the group’s input on what they felt is the best process.  Erik agreed with Paul that TPC should look at all technology purchases before they are purchased. Only reviewing program review requests is problematic as people often don’t work on their program reviews until right before they are due. People sometimes make purchases without consulting TPC and then expect IT to make whatever was purchased work, which isn’t always possible and causes frustration on both sides.  Darius said that this has been a talking point in TPC for many years. TPC isn’t going to catch every purchase or every program review. While he doesn’t think we can fix this problem completely, he would like to see a little more collaboration. He felt that if there was a check box somewhere that people had to check stating that they had consulted TPC those kinds of little programmatic reminders would be helpful for program review.  Brian said that we have recognized that part of the problem is Cal Card purchases. People don’t have to fill out a purchasing form or consult with anyone when making Cal Card purchases. He suggested purchasing of technology could be restricted or reduced perhaps by placing a dollar limit on technology purchases made with Cal Cards.  Erik said TPC needs to be able to look at the proposed technology purchases for security concerns and to determine if the technology will work with our system. He would like to be able to manage expectations when people are considering technology purchases. Erik has encountered negative attitudes toward IT and he would like to work to change that. He stated that IT does their best to make things work for people.  Paul said we had tried putting a checkbox on the program review template in the past and some people misunderstood what the checkbox was for and thought it meant they needed a consultation. Other people checked it claiming they had a consultation when they had not. Paul felt that if TPC was going to be involved with consultations for program review TPC should prepare a write up with their recommendation and that purchasing needed to see that write up prior to purchasing rather than just relying on a checkbox.  Jose said if the business office was empowered to decline purchasing that didn’t go through TPC consultation that would enforce the need for consultation.  Brian stated that there were also cultural issue related to Cal Cards. Employees could wait until the last minute to purchase technology and not have to plan ahead and go through the consultation process. He suggested implementing deadlines to submit requests for technology purchases prior to the start of each semester.  Paul stated that there is a perception that IT is being a gatekeeper and are sticking it to people by denying things. But that’s really not the role IT is trying to play. The purpose of the consultation is to work together to figure out the best way to accomplish their goals.  Brian said the culture will only change if it has to change. TPC asking to be consulted may not move people to change the current state of affairs. He suggested that IEC or College Council or one of the higher-ranking groups should require the consultation process.  Jose said some people don’t think IT should have any say one way or another with what people acquire while other people do a good job of consulting. Jose feels that anything that can be done to improve the consultation process would be welcome. He has seen that we make improvements in the consultation process and then we get accreditation blessing and people go back to doing things their own way.  Brian likes the idea of having a form TPC fills out when consulted and the business office requiring this form be turned in prior to approving technology purchases. He also suggested TPC could be more proactive. Rather than waiting for people to come to them, at the start of the semester TPC could reach out to the deans and ask what the faculty’s technology needs are and what they would like to purchase.  Jose agreed with Brian but also said that the deans aren’t always sure what technology their faculty is wanting or knowledgeable enough about the technology being requested by faculty to bring it back to TPC.  Todd stated that he feels this is an administrative issue. When it comes to having policy we are going to follow as an institution it has to be administrative. He said when you put the name “planning” on a committee it has some future element. It’s bigger than individual requests – its implementing and planning. The idea of being integrated is that the institution only has so much money to spend so TPC should be looking at what the priorities are for technology spending. Todd said it is up to the administration to convey that we are going to have this model where TPC is consulted. He suggested we start by asking administration what role they want the committee to play.  Leigh asked if we had looked at what other colleges were doing to deal with this issue.  Brian suggested that IEC could look around at some of our sister institutions to see how they are managing this hurdle. | **Paul** | **9:05-9:20** |
| **Zoom Cloud Recordings**  Brian reported that he has been reaching out to faculty regarding deleting old Zoom recordings but response rates have been fairly low. He has only received responses from about 20% of the people he has emailed. Some people with Zoom recordings are no longer with the district. He is planning to send out another round of communication and give people a deadline to save their recordings before they are deleted. DE recommends, if possible, we have 2 years of storage in the cloud for Zoom recordings. After 2 years the recordings would be deleted. Brian asked the group if an AP update was needed.  Paul said he thinks the two-year storage limit is a great idea. He asked if faculty know how to save their old recordings from the cloud if they want to keep them. He suggested that this may be something they can put on the teaching site.  Brian responded that the initial email instructed faculty to save any recordings they want to keep or to reach out to IT for assistance in saving them. Brian said that he had been told there were some things the District should save that touch on accreditation issues but IT needed the faculty to identify which videos those were.  Jose likes the idea on automated deletion after a specified amount of time but said we do have a limitation on that. There are automatic dates built into Zoom for deletion but the maximum is 120 days. Jose said he can set an annual calendar reminder to delete cloud recordings. But this would have to be with the understanding that we will not single out recordings. Anything older than the date gets deleted.  Erik said there are also certain requirements that the faculty need to be made aware of. Such as, if there are students in a video it can only be saved for a certain amount of time.  Leigh agreed that there are FIRPA and ADA requirements for recordings. For older recordings that are currently stored in the cloud, we want to say they will be deleted by a certain date. Leigh asked the group what date would be good.  Jose said that DE should dictate the date.  Brian asked if we are precluded from deleting the work of people we can’t get ahold of such as those that are no longer with the District. And if we need to modify an AP, can we move forward with deletion before modifying the AP?  Jose said that the AP already states that any digital document has a 2-year retention policy but we don’t enforce that on everything. Email strictly follows this retention policy but in practice, we don’t follow this policy for any other technology. As far as former employees, if they are no longer an employee of the district, the data belongs to the district and the district can do whatever they want with it.  Brian suggested that revisions to the AP might make it clearer. Brian said he would pass on any suggested changes to the AP to Erik and he can put it out to the group.  Brian said the group probably does not need to be involved in the “last chance” email and he will go ahead and send that out. But the group does need to give input on AP revisions.  Jose reported that we are 842% over our allocation and we are basically borrowing storage from other districts. The deletion doesn’t have to happen immediately but we are very over our storage limit. | **Brian**  **9:32** | **9:20-9:35** |
| **Integrations in Canvas/Whitelisting blocked applications/tools**  Leigh reported that the issue had come up that teachers are sometimes using Canvas integrations that teachers and students are able to use from home but not able to use while on campus. She asked what the best approach is to deal with this issue.  Jose explained that we don’t currently have a blacklist for Canvas or integrations. But we are subscribed to multiple security lists that connect to our firewalls. Those are updated frequently. A lot of applications are associated with hosts that make it onto that list. That’s why sometimes they work or don’t work; people are using services that get put on these lists. Jose said these are national lists and not something we gather ourselves. Sometimes we have problems with specific subscription-based services that are no longer working on campus. Those services might start storing information that they didn’t previously, which gives that service a bad security rating. Jose said that there is nothing we can do when a company changes practices and gets put on the list. We can’t exempt that application because that will exempt other things that are a security risk.  Leigh asked what the group would suggest to faculty when they are using things that can be accessed off campus but not on campus.  Brian asked if we can reach out to sister institutions to see how they are handling it.  Jose said some institutions are handling this issue differently. Some are more security minded than others. And staffing and funding issues may dictate how things are handled as well. It’s difficult to compare how one district handles IT security issues to how another district does. Some districts do better with security while others do not. Those that don’t do as good are the ones we are hearing about falling victim to security attacks.  Brian said it is also a matter of perspective as to what is good. Is good that faculty and students can access things or is good that we are secure?  Jose said that the State is trying to streamline things so we are all on the same page. We are fortunately leading the way in a lot of aspects for cyber security. We are very mindful and thoughtful about what we do and how we do it. We are learning from mistakes of other school districts. Some districts have a long way to go and we are further along than many districts are.  Erik said the faculty often find their own tools to do what they need to do to effectively teach. It might be helpful to let them know what applications of our own are available to them so that they can use the applications that we have rather than trying to screen a variety of applications that different faculty have found.  Leigh said a long-term solution might be to curate the tools. She asked if a short-term solution is just more thorough communication. She said can generate a list of specific problems that faculty is having but it sounds like that list can be ever changing.  Jose said we can do a better job of finding out what faculty needs are and giving them enterprise solutions to use. Enterprise solutions do a better job of hygiene.  Leigh agreed that we need to give them those solutions. And that while security is important, there are other considerations such as ease of use. She agreed that tool curation is something we need to work on. In the meantime, we need to step up communication. She asked what the best way is to approach this.  Jose said it is really on a case-by-case situation. Some tools can be quickly resolved. Some can’t. But that if we don’t know what is broken, we can’t fix it.  Leigh asked if she should collect these issues and send them to IT or should faculty send them directly to IT?  Erik felt it would be helpful to have a list of technology that has been vetted and that faculty could put in a ticket if they were having specific issues.  Jose mentioned that a lot of services are hosted on Weebly and that we can’t resolve those until he is told it is safe to access Weebly.  Erik stated that IT wants to help faculty to do what they need to do to help students and that IT would work collaboratively to come up with a solution. | **Leigh** | **9:35-9:55** |
| **Future Agenda Items?**   1. **Teleworking AP/BP.** 2. **What is the process of unblocking websites?** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Adjourn |

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:03 a.m.