Technology Planning & Policy Committee
March 19, 2015
Minutes

Present: Hernan Bucheli, Hope Blaine, Maria-Grazia De Angelis, Jeanne DeMatteo, Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Peter Greco, Danielle Harmony, Lance Hourany, Pat Kreitz, Michael Nathenson, Julia Odom, Dennis Rice, Jeff Sigman, Elizabeth Smith, Gregg Thomson, Ed Tywoniak, Michael Viola and Larry Nuti

I. Review of the December 11, 2014 Minutes
Peter asked the group for comments, changes or additions to the December minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were approved.

II. Subcommittee Reports
Administrative Subcommittee - Jeanne reported that Fusion software was approved for the Rec Center and Kanexa software was approved for Human Resources. Fusion went live on Mar 8th with the opening of the Rec Center. Peter Chen has been working with the HR team to bring up Kanexa which should go live this week, if it isn’t already. The subcommittee met with Financial Aid to discuss software called SALT. This financial responsibility product was approved and the contract is now in legal for review. We also reviewed the Project Proposal form and Jeanne has provided feedback to Peter and Sheila on behalf of the subcommittee.

(Peter will review it in May or in the fall depending on time. The Project Proposal form needs to provide a statement of the problem that is being experienced and a description of what is needed. Requestors need to have a sponsor that is not ITS.)

ETG - Jeff shared that they discussed some recent collaborations between ETG and Faculty Development. The ETG is cosponsoring some of their presentations. Those are going very well. A presentation is scheduled for later in the semester on flipped classrooms. We had some positive announcements. Some of the previous items approved for the library which were deferred have been completed, including a mobile app for the library catalog, a reporting tool for electronic resources so they can track what is being used to manage collection development funds being spent and another tool which provides for offsite mirroring of electronic content that has been purchased. These items were approved on one form but it took time to gather funds as well as issues that arose with the vendor that caused the delay. Another previous grant that we were collaborating on, a 3D projector for Anatomy, is close to completion. Professor Greg Smith hosted a classroom demonstration about a month ago. A few people from ETG attended. It looked really nice. This was partially funded by the ETG. There are four grants on the books from a small iPad to one that is collaborative between Arts and Science. The ETG discussed the Janterm hybrid pilot, which went exceedingly well. All of the participating faculty were very happy with the help and support from ITS. We had a debriefing lunch during which faculty talked about their experiences. In addition, there was
presentation about collaboration by Barry and Jeff using these tools. One finding was that some students who were reluctant to speak out in class were vocal in the online environment.

There will be one more open forum session with the Hybrid Project faculty presenting a round table discussion that will be open to all faculty. The date is not yet set but hopefully we will schedule it soon. We did talk about policy. More grants are coming to the ETG where faculty want a second device. Whereas iPads have historically been requested now Faculty are asking for second computer. We are working on how to address these types of requests.

ITIS - Peter reported that the group has been enslaved to reviewing policies. They need to be reviewed and revised. It is a tedious process. We are rethinking our approach. We’d like to bring the revised documents to the TPPC for comments and suggestions on a macro level. Not changing the spirit, mostly it involves clarification. Some things are out of date.

IT Update
We are poised now. For nearly three years we've done infrastructure work. Now we are primed and ready to turn the corner. Peter highlighted accomplishments over the past year which include:

- 3D Anatomy is discipline distinctive. It is an example of showcasing faculty expertise, implementing tools using technology to make our mission distinct.
- Classroom VDI. Sessions on classroom computers run off a server. A true sign that we are running down the BYOD path. There is a trend, particularly with faculty, but perhaps staff, to bring their own devices to campus. Would like digital literacy based on their continuing education. Stipend for technology.
- Financial Aid packaging
- Student Success Collaborative
- Document Management: Finance.
- Optics – Peter showed a map of Phase I, completed in 2014. Areas based on how paths run. We did the area where the bulk of academics reside. We upgraded from multimode fiber to single mode. Phase II was in the residential areas. Phase III included Ferrogiaro.
- Indoor WiFi coverage
- App-based firewall and SIEM
- ITSM

Projects currently underway or hoping to begin soon include:

- Focus in May on the Educational Technology Center (Peter thanked Pat for allowing IT to integrate space for faculty.) Pat responded by sharing that Carl and Carmel have been doing a great job working with Library staff. We are trying to extend beyond business hours. There will be a focus on classroom technology.
- Focus to classrooms. We've moved very quickly with other infrastructure needs. We will team up with the Office of Facilities Services and Bill from Scheduling & Promotions to meet all needs.
• Web 2.X - Elizabeth and Sandy are doing a great job. Excited about what we are seeing.
• BPA (Business Process Analysis) or Enterprise CRM (Constituent Relationship Management). Instead of using it solely in Admissions, look at Advancement, Enrollment to Endowment CRM software. We maintain relationship throughout the lives of our students. We want to engage a consultant for business process review to give us a sense of our readiness.
• Retention Analytics
• Fiber Zone 4
• Follow Me printing - We heard loud and clear about printing from the students. We got new printers for the library. Students can release a print job to the cloud then walk to a printer to release a job. We want to try to put printers in more convenient locations.
• Cycle Maintenance - classroom

**Web Planning Committee** - Elizabeth shared that the focus is on the Web 2.X upgrade. There was a good round of feedback from the community following a request via the website. We are now into scoping out underlying pages and the components in the existing system and how they will transition. We are coming alongside the vendor and really mapping what the site will look like. Once that work is done we should have a better sense of when the design will be done and when the roll out period will begin. We will then communicate an update to the campus community.

One of the items to be discussed at the next meeting is .college as a URL and how Saint Mary’s College will respond.

Julia and Elizabeth are working with Francis Sweeney to explore a digital catalog. This would be searchable and more database driven. It consolidates to one pool of data that is served out in numerous, different ways. It will be geared to a mobile first approach. The goal is to make it exciting.

**III. Google Apps Backup/Restore Service Levels**

Our backup/restore process is done through Google Apps. This only affects email and files stored on Google Drive. We are talking about accidental deletion for the most part. Peter showed a graphic with Datto on left and Google on the right to give a sense of our current situation. When Peter arrived at Saint Mary’s, we backed up to 120 days using an in-house email service. The cost is getting exorbitant. As storage increases the price tag increases. Google provides a free service that goes back only 25 days.

In the Tech Use Policy it states that we save content up to 120 days. Can we save $20,790 per year by changing the policy? The group discussed the issues and questions were raised. Following discussion, Peter asked the TPPC is they were ready to vote. No objections were raised.
Therefore Peter asked the TPPC if the Tech Use Policy could be changed with regard to the backup statement of 120 days for all files, to separate email and personal file storage with Google to a minimum length of 25 days.

The request was met with unanimous approval. There were no abstentions.

IV. Section 508 Compliance
Section 508 follows the 1973 Rehabilitation Act. Section 508 was an addition intended to eliminate barriers in IT with respect to persons with disabilities. It was added to open new opportunities for people with disabilities and to encourage development of technologies that will achieve these goals.

We need clarity on what section 508 means for Saint Mary’s College.

1. The IT buyer needs to beware. In our Project Proposal form, there are two checkboxes that address §508 criteria. The committee that reviews the proposals could address the risk level. James Thompson, from IT Services, receives education on this topic annually and knows how to check a technology to see if it is accessible.

2. Professor beware. Be prepared. It is only when a formal accommodation is generated that the College has to respond. If you’re using something innovative and fun, and it targets a particular sense it might need to be adapted.

- Formal request for accommodation would be the catalyst for action.
- Student Disability Services and IT Services are here to help.

This issue does have an ambiguous nature in the way it is described and the way it is played out. A student with a disability cannot be put at a disadvantage due to means of presentation.

V. TUP Digital Signature

Advice from Educause is to associate the technology policy for the institution with the login by requiring a digital signature. It's an awareness issue. This is a private network. This is focused more on students and less for faculty or staff. Students tend to think of it as their home network. It is not.

Peter displayed sample language for digital signature at login page.
“By signing in to use IT resources owned by Saint Mary's College of California (SMC), you agree to adhere to applicable guidelines and restrictions as detailed in the SMC TU Policy, along with any relayed policies. The text for all such policies can be found by searching for "technology policies" on www.stmarys-ca.edu.”

The group discussed the benefits and potential issues with the digital signature including adding links directly to the policy and challenges that might arise.
Peter thanked the group for good feedback. No action will be taken at this time. This might be revisited briefly at the May meeting.

Pat suggested clarifying IT resources to "Saint Mary's College of California IT network and resources". The students will think of it as the network, not the content. There are copyright issues that otherwise might be ignored.

Peter thanked the members and adjourned the meeting at 2:25.

The next meeting is scheduled for May 14, 2015 at 1:00 in FAH 205.

**Handouts**
Minutes, December 11, 2014

**Respectfully submitted,**

Kim Sullivan
Assistant to Peter Greco, CTO