

Community College *of* Philadelphia

Technology Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes
of
Wednesday December 16, 2009
Held in Room B2-26, Academic Computing Conference Center

1. Call to Order – 2:40 PM by Mr. Arnold DiBlasi
2. Attendance
 - a. Administrative Appointee: Jody Bauer, Gary Bixby, SK Calkins, Ellen Fernberger, Dr. Tom Hawk, Peter Margolis, Administrative Alternate : Jermaine Williams (Dr. Sam Hirsch)
 - b. Federation Delegates: Ruth Baker, Frank Bartell, Heidi Braunschweig, Arnold DiBlasi, Noelia Rivera-Matos, Steve Jones, Melissa St. Pierre, Alternates: Connie Duaval (Karen Schermerhorn)
3. Announcements
 - a. Gary Bixby volunteered to record minutes
 - b. Arnold DiBlasi asked for overlooked announcements – None mentioned.
4. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Arnold DiBlasi called for the Approval of the Minutes as presented and distributed for the November 18, 2009 Technology Coordinating Committee Meeting.
 - b. Motion made by Hiedi Braunschweig; second by Ellen Fernberger.
 - c. Questions and comments were asked for by Arnold DiBlasi – None were offered

- d. Vote taken and responded with unanimous approval to accept the minutes.
5. Unfinished Business (Old Business)
- a. Update on accountable printing solutions
 - i. Jody Bauer reported, on behalf of the absent Mr. William Bromley, an update of an accountable printing solution. She reported that the server had just been delivered and overall progress was slower than what was hoped for. She recommended that her team should reconvene and provide the committee better detail in future (unspecified) meetings.
 - ii. Ruth Baker, by way of a reminder to the group, mentioned the upcoming leave. She took the opportunity to announce the new Library and Learning Resource Department Head, Jacquelyn Knuckle
 - iii. Steve Jones redirected to Jody Bauer for a “quick summary” of the accountable printing solutions.
 - iv. Jody Bauer responded that the first year is being setup as a pilot where there will be free access for students to print. Students will print from a work station or kiosk and send a “Print Job” to the “Queue” of the desired printer, which could be located virtually anywhere on the campus. The student “releases” the print job from the queue with a valid student ID card, using some kind of card reader. As there is currently no declining balance maintained on the student card, the pilot phase will be free to use. Decisions will need to be made concerning declining balances, requests for print when there are insufficient funds, how to fund the card or how to print without a card.
 - v. Dr. Hawk commented on how a printer will be identified by the student – inferring that the current identification might not be the most intuitive in locating a desired printer.
 - vi. Engaging dialogue resulted and the essence is summarized below:

1. Jody Bauer commented that confidential print jobs of the staff would be secure as all jobs sent to the printer stations have to be released with a proper ID.
2. There is a potential impact on Business Service Center, in theory, as large jobs could be redirected to the Center. This might be an automated evaluation and redirection.
3. Dr. Hawk reiterated that there is a great deal of work to be done to achieve the printing solution
4. Jody Bauer added that there are unique challenges with the timing through registration and Drop / Adds
5. Dr. Hawk commented that “other Colleges” capture revenues through their solution.
6. Steve Jones directed a question to the group concerning how staff and faculty can “find out” what services are being planned and how these service are made known.
7. Dr. Hawk responded stating that the faculty will be surveyed for desired service support and from there it is the intent to offer the services requested. The survey will be available on the web site and will be made known to all.
8. Arnold DiBlasi inquired about a letter which was to be sent to all students regarding the Northwest Regional Center SACC. When was this letter supposed to be sent? SK Calkins replied that it should be during Professional Development or later.
9. A closing comment of this item was that the pilot would first roll out to the Library sometime in January.

b. Update Distance Education Sub-committee

- i. Peter Margolis reported that the committee held its first meeting on December 9, 2009. During the meeting materials were examined and reviewed, guidelines were reviewed and the findings / conclusions were ongoing. The committee is structured in two

halves and each half has been given charge to provide recommendations.

- ii. Melissa St. Pierre questioned the “document” source. She commented that the committee is reviewing a document that is not clear to them as to its validity or appropriateness to the charge given to them.
- iii. Arnold DiBlasi offered an abridged history of “the document” including editing and revising through to the version that now exists which includes Peter Margolis’ updates.
- iv. Engaging dialogue resulted and the essence is summarized as follows:
 1. Melissa St. Pierre, challenged the authority of the updates. How is it tracked or who can make changes?
 2. Peter Margolis response was to reflect on what was done in the past where Department Head and Dean level reviews were conducted and changes accepted.
 3. Steve Jones challenged the process and the authority in Distance Education.
 4. Arnold DiBlasi offered that the Administration must decide whether the document is defined as guidelines or policy. (Unclear conversations erupted as to whether the document was defined as guidelines or Policy)
 5. The document should bear a date of its latest revisions.
 6. Steve Jones offered that the TCC is trying to maintain control of the revisions.
 7. Arnold DiBlasi commented that the committee may not have purview of the document.
 8. Melissa St. Pierre added that the document is denying people which suggest that the document is more than a guideline.

9. Peter Margolis categorically denied that the efforts undertaken have a “course goal” hidden within the effort. The “Goal” is to bring guidelines along to actually solve the problem and then curtailed the discussion with the comment that they will continue to meet but did not report the next meeting time.
- c. Update on MyCCP portal Revision
- i. SK Calkins provided extensive and thorough detail of the new face of the portal. She included milestone dates as follows:
 1. Dec 31st: Students will be fully migrated to “Gmail” which will include “Go Live” support
 2. Dec 27th : ALL end-of-term processing is to be done
 3. Dec 27 – 30th : Students will have access for grades / reports
 4. Dec 31st: Students get a repeat message and go LIVE!
 - ii. Conversations erupted about a 9 AM requirement for faculty to have completed posting with clarifications offered by Jody Bauer and SK Calkins.
 - iii. MyCCP, Gmail announcement sections will be controlled by ITS and “Everything” is “changeable”, what we were seeing is an early draft, modeled after the “staffpage” but not as full. Comments about color choices to match school colors (or Halloween)
 - iv. Ruth asked for clarification on terms “Academics” and “Academic”
 - v. SK demonstrated the portal as an “Employee” with 4 “Tabs” and as a “Student”, limited to two “Tabs”.
 - vi. SK Calkins stated that the portal and its final look should be cleaned up by the fall.
 - vii. Engaging rapid-fire random discussions resulted. Core thoughts are herein attempted to be summarized as follows:
 1. Campus communications vs. personal communication needs to be planned and determined.

2. Heidi Braunschweig asked about critical / important dates
 3. Arnold DiBlasi asked about critical dates and how they compare to the College Calendar.
 4. Dr. Hawk stated that the page needs to incorporate intuitive language
 5. Steve Jones asked about whether students participated in the development to which SK Calkins responded – “Yes” both CIS and Gen Ed students.
 6. SK Calkins stated that the Spring semester will be the real test but the Fall semester will have the actual portal in place.
 7. Noelia Rivera-Matos requested “screen shots” for instruction to students to assist in login training. – SK offered assistance
 8. Ruth Baker inquired about its availability by Professional Development – SK confirmed.
- viii. SK Calkins redirected to the Student page wherein “Channels” are used for simplicity. Students are allowed to move Tabs but not delete them. Links were discussed [SSB; CCP.Edu; and WebSpace]. Grades will be posted in the “First Window”
- ix. Jermaine Williams asked about email notification, e.g., “Groupwise Notifications” to which he was given a response of “No”
- x. SK Calkins explained about critical announcements competing for space and time. The new system will have them in three individual spaces – but controlled.
- xi. SK Calkins provided a condensed demonstration of the Employee view which launched a series of discussion points summarized below:
1. Is there a GroupWise web access and can it be near the top? Answered “Yes”
 2. Ruth Baker asked about whether the page can be customized – “Yes”

3. Jermaine quizzed about timeouts – responses were 20 min for students and 45 for employee.
4. Guest accounts are available for both Student and Employee
5. Dr. Hawk commented that the historic organization by structure may not work going forward. – no closure to this point
6. Steve Jones commented that “Office of” is, in itself, not too intuitive. – no closure to this point
7. Campus resources discussed as possibly being included – no closure to this point
8. “Searchability” was talked through – no closure to this point
9. Dr. Hawk offered that the Mission Statement should be included – no closure to this point
10. Random individual conversations ensued until Arnold DiBlasi called the room to order and suggested that as a result of the late hour, item “d” on the agenda be tabled until next meeting.

xii. The Group was asked for a “nod” to table item “d” until next meeting – a confirming nod was given

d. TABLED – Update on technology for new construction and existing spaces

6. New Business points for discussion
 - a. Password changing will be enforced
 - b. Consolidated Courses through migration – Arnold responded with “Notices to all will be sent out.
7. Motion was called to close the meeting
 - a. Steve Jones made the motion
 - b. Jody Bauer offered a “second”
 - c. Vote taken with a unanimous approval to close
 - d. Meeting adjourned 4:18 PM.