

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Technology Coordinating Committee**  
**Feb 17, 2010**  
**2:30 p.m. B2-26**  
**Community College of Philadelphia**  
**1700 Spring Garden Street**  
**Phila, PA 19130**

## **Committee Members Present:**

### Federation Delegates

Ruth Baker	✓
Frank Bartell	✓
Heidi Braunschweig	✓
Arnold Di Blasi	✓
David Freeman	✓
Steve Jones	
Noelia Rivera-Matos	✓
Melissa St. Pierre	✓
Karen Schermerhorn	✓
Mary Ann Yannuzzi	✓

### Administrative Appointees

Bhavesh Bambhrolia	✓
Jody Bauer	
Gary Bixby	✓
Bill Bromley	✓
SK Calkins	✓
Lisa Cooper	
Ellen Fernberger	
Tom Hawk	✓
Sam Hirsch	
Luke Kasim	✓

## **Alternates Present:**

### Administrative Alternates

Aimee Hagedorn	
Linda Konicky	
Maryann Lyons	✓
Peter Margolis	✓
Jim Spiewak	✓
Jermaine Williams	

### Federation Alternates

Connie Dauval
Dominic Isabella

## **Guests Present:**

- I. **Call to Order** Mr. Arnold Di Blasi called the meeting to order at 2:29 PM

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

## Feb 17, 2010 Technology Coordinating Committee MEETING MINUTES – continued

**II. Approval of Minutes** Errors identified by several members present on the following pages: 2, 3, 4 and 5. Corrections were noted by Di Blasi. With corrections as noted, minutes were accepted by Motion made by Frank Bartell, seconded by Heidi Braunschweig and unanimously approved by the members present.

### **III. Old Business:**

#### **a. Discussion: Course Management Sub-committee report**

**Margolis** provided the Sub-committee report for Course Management Systems. The committee continues in detail discussions. An effort is being made to develop a basis to evaluate the available systems. What is a good system? What makes up a good system? Can five things be identified that are liked about the system? Can 5 things that are disliked be identified? There is a broad set of criteria being used in the industry and gaps in the criteria need to be filled. A separate effort is being defined to evaluate how initiatives compare with the most popular packages.

**Margolis** went on to comment, referring to the second charge of the committee wherein a review of the “Procedures documentation” was to take place. Margolis reflected to the distribution of the document to others for feedback and, as yet, has not received a response. He would offer a conclusion must then be drawn that without comment, the document must be okay as is.

**Freeman** questioned that the policy in place, known as P&P 14, has not been revised.

**Di Blasi** responded that suggested changes to that document were considered by the group to be “not substantive”.

**St. Pierre** raised a concern that the document had mixed levels of authority; the last two pages seemed to reflect policy whereas the first ten pages did not.

**Di Blasi** refuted by stating the pages were policy and began a discussion of the difference between policy and guidelines and maintained that guidelines were enforceable.

**St. Pierre** claimed the whole document has not gone to IWC and stated her belief of what the charge of the Sub-committee was defined as.

**Margolis** offered a rebuttal through reading the actual charge: (Refer to Attachment A of the November 18, 2009 Agenda)

*“I. Review the “Procedures, Requirements, and Guidelines for Online Course Conversion Distance (fully online) and Hybrid (online/on campus)” revised February, 2008 for possible updates to guideline and procedure language. These recommendations shall be brought back to the TCC and subsequently forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review.*

*II. Provide a recommendation to the Technology Coordinating Committee for a CMS solution for implementation in 2012 as directed by the Technology Plan (2009-2012) within the Teaching Learning Instructional Resources Goal as noted within Objective I*

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

## Feb 17, 2010 Technology Coordinating Committee MEETING MINUTES – continued

*sub-objective 1, 2, 4, 6, and 9. Please note that the selection of a vendor is at the sole discretion of management but input from the TCC will be welcome in developing a possible bid package if needed. “*

**St. Pierre** challenged the practice of “holding people to a policy not set by Governance”  
**Margolis** responded with a discussion of perception.

**Schermerhorn** participated in the discussion by commenting that earlier versions of the document seemed as if they were policy. Guidelines should be reviewed by the TCC and not IWC.

**Di Blasi** reiterated the actual charge.

**St. Pierre** offered that “people have concerns” and we should address them.

**Di Blasi** stated that when the committee finishes with the document the TCC will review it to determine if part or the whole goes to the IWC.

**Hawk** introduced a differentiation between Guidelines and Policy with continued dialog from **St. Pierre**, joined by **Rivera-Matos**

**Margolis** offered that there is a “great deal of latitude” in their charge and that the implementation of the P&P covers a lot of territory.

**Di Blasi** expressed a question of concern for a possible deadline being established in the light of the imminent expiration of existing CMS contract.

**Margolis** expected to have a recommendation to offer by the end of the semester.

**Calkins** stated the importance of having IT involvement to help explore / define working relationships with a portal vendor.

**Margolis** stated the limitations of the sub-committee in that “they can only do so much”.

**Calkins** stated the IT goal is to help the sub-committee avoid going in a direction that cannot be supported.

**Margolis** – “that time has not yet come”

A consensus of the discussion seem to present that what is available is “pretty standard” as far as systems go. There seems to be an “enormous suite of systems”

### **Action Item:**

Sub-committee will continue to work through the issues, providing updates as they become available

### **b. Discussion: Portal Implementation**

**Calkins** identified the transition as “relatively smooth”. They are aware of one particular problem in that “files” posted cannot be viewed before they are published. There was a series of “built from scratch” and “migrated data” at the last minute which they processed.

**Di Blasi** and **St. Pierre** stated they did not understand “preview”, “publish”, which was not possible previously.

**Calkins** identified the feature as a new feature that a lot of institutions were having trouble with this in their particular browsers. IE6 is no longer supported; IE7 works and IE8 is not supported in Banner 8.

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

## Feb 17, 2010 Technology Coordinating Committee MEETING MINUTES – continued

**Di Blasi** asked how this problem has been and will be communicated.

**Calkins** responded that a “personal message” was sent in the portal.

Several members participated in rapid discussion expressing concerns that communications like this are not effectively “getting out”

**Di Blasi** redirected with questions about whether Gmail functions are disabled.

**Calkins** – “not yet”

**Di Blasi** suggested that this effort should be approved “around the TCC table”

“Enlightening” is possible for those who need it. There needs to be further disclosure of the ramification of “Google Apps”. Di Blasi went on to comment about no “proof of email sent”; no verification and not knowing student addresses; no signature block. He inquired to what can be done to deal with the issues, not just the symptoms.

**Bromley** stated that “E” discovery is an issue. Email in Luminis creates issues with My Courses Groups.

**Margolis** “Whole field is a moving target” any course management system is selected on functionality. A “Holistic approach” is necessary in this process.

**Bambhrolia** ended the discussion stating that “My Courses is not the product for web based instruction”

**Action Item:** There will be a calculated migration from the staff page to the portal

### **c. Discussion: Banner 8 Upgrade**

**Calkins** provided an update on the transition to Banner 8 stating that the enhancement inclusion is under way. Expectations are that they will “go live” over spring break – progressing along as planned. Banner will have limited access through spring break. The faculty will receive a letter confirming dates.

**DiBlasi** commented that during the systems testing faculty should have limited, if any impact.

**Calkins** stated that the new user interface is growing and that Banner 8 WILL NOT be implemented for grading; it will be down all week. Users should call the help desk if there are issues.

**Kasim** asked that a message be sent to students to flag them about the Banner links.

**Action Item:** Highly concentrated efforts continue to implement Banner 8

### **d. Discussion: Accountable printing solution**

**Bromley** reported that the progress has “been slower than anticipated” but that at this point the department has “a good handle on how it all works”. He distributed a handout of the “PCounter” generalizing its content to the members present. (See attached)

**Action Item:** Continue to progress through the process and will update the TCC in the near future.

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

Feb 17, 2010 Technology Coordinating Committee  
MEETING MINUTES – continued

## IV. New Business

**Discussion:** Call for new agenda items made by Di Blasi.

**Action Item:** Members to submit to Di Blasi

**Next meeting announced for March 17, 2010**

- V. **Adjournment** Motion to adjourn by Bixby, seconded by Kasim.  
Meeting adjourned 3:54 PM