

**RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

[Website: Technology Advisory Group](#)

**Agenda for December 2, 2021**

2:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/94554895244>

1. Technology Project listing, November 2021 (10 minutes) – Forero
2. Approve printer standards (10 minutes) – **ACTION**– Hoang, M.
3. Technology Update – Colleges
  - SACTAC – Steffens (10 minutes)
  - SCCTEC – Rodriguez (10 minutes)
4. Student experience with technology:
  - SAC Student – Angel Michael (10 minutes)
  - SCC Student – Jacob Bereskin (10 minutes)
5. Computer replacement plan recommendations discussion: Updates, hand-off and next steps 2021 (15 minutes) – Gonzalez
6. Approval of TAG Minutes – November 4, 2021 (5 minutes) – **ACTION**– Gonzalez
7. Other (5 minutes)

**Next TAG Committee Meeting:** February 3, 2022

**The mission of the Rancho Santiago Community College District is to provide quality educational programs and services that address the needs of our diverse students and communities.**

Large black & white networked printer (medium department):

CURRENT	NEW
HP LaserJet Enterprise M607	HP LaserJet Enterprise M610dn
 <p>The image shows the HP LaserJet Enterprise M607 printer, a large white and black device with a control panel on top and a paper tray on the front.</p>	 <p>The image shows the HP LaserJet Enterprise M610dn printer, a large white and black device with a control panel on top and a paper tray on the front.</p>
District Cost: <b>\$957</b>	District Cost: <b>\$873</b>
<p><b>Base Configuration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prints 55 ppm</li> <li>• Recommended monthly volume: 5000-20,000 pages</li> <li>• 512MB Memory</li> </ul>	<p><b>Base Configuration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prints 55 ppm</li> <li>• Recommended monthly volume: 5000-20,000 pages</li> <li>• 512MB Memory</li> </ul>

Pagewide color printer (small department):

CURRENT	NEW
HP PageWide Pro 452dw	None
 <p>The image shows an HP PageWide Pro 452dw printer, a large-format color printer with a white and black design. It features a control panel on top with a small screen and several buttons. The HP logo is visible on the front. The printer is shown from a three-quarter view, highlighting its paper tray and output area.</p>	
District Cost: <b>\$460</b>	District Cost: <b>\$</b>
<p><b>Base Configuration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prints 55 ppm</li> <li>• Recommended monthly volume: 750-4000 pages</li> <li>• 512MB Memory</li> </ul>	<p><b>Base Configuration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

	Recommendation	Reasoning	Description	Responsible Parties	Status	Target Completion Time
1	Develop an aging report for computing devices, including AV equipment, covering the full replacement cycle, districtwide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a sense that the device replacement data isn't accurate. Missing, outdated information for administrators who oversee a specific area for computers inventory has been found at times. This has made it difficult for planning</li> <li>• Inventory of PCs to be replaced does not usually break out the details on what buildings, divisions are in scope.</li> <li>• There isn't a standard districtwide tool for computer inventory tracking. Each ITS/Media team handles inventory management differently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report should include location of computers, expected replacement date based on budgeting cycle and indication of no replacement planned due to being a grant purchase.</li> <li>• Report should account for new computing devices being purchased.</li> <li>• Report should provide expected costs on an annual basis, aligned with the Fiscal Year, at least five years out</li> <li>• Report should break out figures by building/division to get buy-in from areas in scope, to have them advocate for computer/AV replacements.</li> <li>• Consider the following to maintain data accuracy on report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure paperwork for inventory moves continues to be properly filled and turned in</li> <li>○ Include inventory update as part of onboarding/offboarding process for Deans, VPs</li> <li>○ Implement an updated inventory management system that can be reported off</li> <li>○ Provide regular reports of equipment ownership to administrators for verification</li> <li>○ Look at cooperating with Purchasing to better track grant funded machines</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ITS</li> <li>• Media Systems</li> </ul>		
2	Ensure funding is centralized at each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RAR/Tech request process doesn't make sense for computing replacements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider that funding for computing/AV replacements sits on its own budget line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SACTAC</li> <li>• SCCTEC</li> </ul>		

	college for logistical ease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some years will have reserve funds due to peaks and valleys in the aging report.</li> </ul>	item under the Budget Offices at the colleges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAC Budget Committee</li> <li>SCC Budget Committee</li> </ul>		
3	Institutionalize the computing device replacement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for computer/AV replacement equipment has been ad-hoc. SCC never had a technology line item on their budget until 2021. SAC has only used carryover funds when they have been available.</li> <li>SACTAC no longer has a vote at SAC Budget committee. This has made it difficult to advocate for funding on computing replacements.</li> <li>Funding for computers has been limited or missing at both colleges in many years.</li> <li>There is a lack of institutional processes established to explain the “why” for computing/AV replacements, which produces rework to explain it every time there is change in leadership within participatory governance.</li> <li>The district has helped fund computer replacements for the colleges in prior years when year-end savings have been available. However, this has not happened in most recent years due to additional operational expenses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Get budget line item added at colleges for technology replacements based on information from recommendations 2 and 3 above</li> <li>Ensure Technology committees that recommend computer replacements to the budgeting areas have voting rights at budget committees</li> <li>Ensure timelines for budgeting are disclosed and available to committees recommending computer replacements. Time computer replacement plan proposals with budget issuance cycle for timely and proper consideration.</li> <li>Ensure budgeting committees have technology replacement as one of their responsibilities within the participatory governance manuals</li> <li>If funding becomes an issue, consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A technology fee to help with computing/AV replacements.</li> <li>A technology replacement bond</li> <li>A sunset timeframe for computers to be permanently removed and not replaced based on age</li> <li>Using lottery funding if fund 13 dollars are not available</li> </ul> </li> <li>It does not make sense for the colleges to rely on one-time funding for annual expenses. There should be a line item ear marked for technology replacements districtwide.</li> <li>Share aging report from recommendation 1 with Budget Committees and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SACTAC</li> <li>SCCTEC</li> <li>SAC Budget Committee</li> <li>SCC Budget Committee</li> </ul>		

			administration at the colleges to determine how much can be funded on an ongoing basis.			
4	Explore Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) with federal/state relief dollars as a pilot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Older computers take more time and effort to support by ITS and give students, faculty and staff a subpar or poor experience. This increases every year that funding for computers isn't available or is limited at the colleges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although this will lower the computer replacement costs, it will increase the operational cost for cloud computing resources. However, it will provide a higher benefit to students and staff.</li> <li>VDI has the potential to eliminate software limitations in the current student laptop loan programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ITS</li> <li>College Operational Workgroups</li> <li>TOW</li> </ul>		
5	Educate stakeholders districtwide on the importance and details regarding the computer replacement plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's hard for people to understand the technology lifecycle. It's hard to understand why a computer/AV device needs to be replaced if it appears to be working fine.</li> <li>There is a sense that every single computer on campus is replaced annually. This wouldn't be effective. Understanding the needs would provide better support</li> <li>There is a lack of understanding on how lifecycle of computers and computing standards are determined</li> <li>The need to maintain computers, just like grounds need to be kept and garbage needs to be picked up is not understood.</li> <li>There is a perspective that the district should be responsible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educate Administrators – Deans, VPs on role of Technology Committees and relationship to Planning and Budget, as well as importance of computer replacement plan</li> <li>Educate stakeholders on the impact and consequences of letting technology age out at the classroom, for faculty and for students, including equity issues for students.</li> <li>Involve student representatives from ASG to advocate for this.</li> <li>Discuss districtwide goals of technology innovation to support the need</li> <li>Have public access to aging report from recommendation 1 to convey the percentage of total computers/AV equipment that are on replacement cycle</li> <li>Report more often on computing/AV replacement status within technology committees (standing item). Progress on replacement, impact to instruction when computers aren't replaced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SACTAC</li> <li>SCCTEC</li> <li>TAG</li> <li>TOW</li> <li>College Operational Workgroups</li> </ul>		

		for funding computer replacements with savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Communicate how the budget funding process works</li><li>• Communicate the following elements and how they drive the computing lifecycle:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Mean Times to Failure</li><li>○ Manufacturer's own lifecycles</li><li>○ Advances in technology – Moore's cycle, keeping up with new operating systems</li><li>○ Enterprise quality needed for supporting volume and scaling.</li><li>○ Consumer devices are not meant to support academic needs at large.</li><li>○ Ensuring that warranty matches the lifecycle but it does not drive it</li><li>○ Consider settings like Management Council and professional development for educating on the above</li></ul></li></ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Technology Advisory Group**  
Zoom Meeting (Invitation shared via Outlook)  
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**Meeting Minutes for November 4, 2021**

**Voting Members Present:** Robert Bustamante, Tammy Cottrell, Jesse Gonzalez, Scott James, Cherylee Kushida, Adam Morgan, Sergio Rodriguez, John Steffens, Angel Michael – SAC Student, Jacob Bereskin – SCC Student

**Voting Members Absent:** Pat Weekes,

**Supporting Members:** Thurman Brown, Dane Clacken, Jorge Forero, Michael Hoang, Tara Kubicka-Miller

**Discussion**

1. Call to Order
  - Meeting was called to order by Mr. Gonzalez at 2:31.
2. Technology Project Listing, October 2021: Tabled for next meeting.
3. Computing Standards
  - Approve desktop and laptop standards: Mr. Hoang conducted the presentation from handout. All come with the 5-Year Warranty to match our 5-year computer replacement cycle.
    - Desktop: HP EliteDesk 800 G5 to G6
    - Laptop (Faculty & Staff): HP EliteBook 840 G6 to G8
    - Laptop (Classroom): HP EliteBook 840 G6 to 640 G8. This is model is \$300 less.
    - Special Use Case:
      - Standard All-in-one Computer for Space Limitations: HP EliteOne 800 G5 24" All-in-one to G6 24"
      - HP EliteOne800 G5 All-in-one TOUCH-enabled: This will be removed. Not enough demand. Any future need will be reviewed on a case by case basis. Pros and cons were discussed.
      - 15.5" Laptop for Classrooms Requiring Larger Screen or 10-Key: Currently none and to propose HP ProBook 650 G8 Laptop
      - Engineering or Resource-Intensive Classes: Currently non and to propose HP ZBook 15 Power G8 Laptop.
  - Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion to approve the new computing standards. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Steffens, seconded by Mr. Morgan and approved unanimously.
  - The TAG website will be updated to incorporate the new computing standards. Mr. Gonzalez shared that ITS is working with our technology vendor to provide a webstore where our standards and special use case will be available. We are in the initial stage.
  - Discussion on non-instructional Operating System standards: ITS directors; Mr. Brown, Mr. Clacken, and Mr. Hoang provided collective insights regarding issues with Mac OS and would like feedback from the committee.

- We have computer imaging standards for Windows but nothing for Mac OS. Some of our standard applications, remote access, print server are not compatible with Mac OS which greatly affects functionality.
- In order to accommodate special circumstances as these, we end up deviating from our standard configuration thus opening additional attack vectors which adds security vulnerability in our operational environment.
- Mac users are growing. ITS staff have no formal training and cannot provide the same level of support for Mac (non-instructional) users.
- Not only they cost more than Windows devices but more importantly, by end-of-life cycle these devices are no longer upgradeable.
- Does virtualization address or mitigate security concerns with remote access? Discussions ensued.
- Discussions on how to address faculty bringing their own devices who are not reliant on connecting to our district network took place.
- Establishing non-instructional operating system standards (Windows, Mac or both): It is crucial to explore what is possible and assess all the use cases and their impact. Knowing how many Mac devices districtwide would be a good start. Mr. Gonzalez detailed on several areas we need to consider.
- How about Mac devices used in the classrooms? This brought up a larger discussion. Clarification was made that this is an exception as our focus for now is specific to non-instructional devices.
- Mr. Gonzalez stated that he is updating this portion of the AR and will provide the acceptable use policy draft for review at a later meeting.

#### 4. Discussion on Technology Accessibility.

- Mr. Gonzalez referenced past TAG discussions on accessibility issues and a number of required resources we currently don't have. This is a liability. The assessment conducted on Section 504 was discussed.
- Mr. Gonzalez has started a bi-weekly cadence with Mr. James and Ms. Kushida to discuss accessibility and data privacy and invited anybody who wanted to participate to join. He stated that they discuss deficiencies on accessibility support and to provide potential recommendations for discussion at TAG.
- Mr. Gonzalez shared that the attachments related to Section 504 are posted on the TAG website.
- Mr. Steffens shared that the topic on accessibility will be an action item at the upcoming SACTAC meeting.
- More discussions to come.

#### 5. Technology Update – College

##### SACTAC – J. Steffens:

- SACTAC endorsed survey of different use cases for Apple devices. Topic on accessibility as one of the action items as well as the approval of SACTAC goals for 2021-2022.

##### SCCTEC – S. Rodriguez:

- Mr. Rodriguez shared that Mr. Brown presented at SCCTEC to discuss the SSO implementation and obstacles that took place. He also conducted discussions on Apple devices.
- SCC has initiated their tech request process.

#### 6. Student experience with technology:

- Mr. Gonzalez stated that they were not able to setup a common time to schedule a cadence with our students at this time. He asked Ms. Michael for feedback on the SSO marketing communication.
  - SAC Student - Angel Michael:
    - Ms. Michael stated that the single sign on experience is positive at this point and has no additional feedback.
    - Students are aware of the SSO implementation. She has not heard any issues with how the information was marketed.
  - SCC Student – Jacob Bereskin
    - Mr. Bereskin stated that he has no issues with single sign on. He just noticed a minor difference in the way to log in but appreciated the login instructions provided on the site.
    - Mr. Bereskin brought up an issue he has encountered with the SCC Wi-Fi connection experienced by others. He asked if this is a recurring issue.
    - Mr. Clacken commented that he has not heard of any reported issues related to Wi-Fi connections. He added that ITS is currently working on replacing all indoor wireless access points across campus starting at SCC.
    - Mr. Clacken asked if Mr. Bereskin can provide specific areas where the connectivity issue is taking place. This will help ITS determine different fail points.
    - Mr. Clacken to schedule an offline conversation with Mr. Bereskin.
7. Approval of TAG Minutes – October 7, 2021
- Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion to approve the TAG Minutes of October 7, 2021 meeting. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Steffens, seconded by Mr. Bereskin and approved unanimously.

### **Informational Handouts**

1. Top 10 Technology Project Listing
2. New Desktop and Laptop Standards and Special Use Case
3. RSCCD ADA Self-Evaluation Analysis and 504 Report and Appendices

### **Next Meeting Reminder: December 2, 2021 via Zoom**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.