

Technology Council  
Minutes  
September 6, 2006  
1:30 PM

The monthly meeting of the Technology Governance Council was held on September 6, 2006 in the Hendrik Meijer Library conference room 167-169 with Kamlesh Sanghvi as facilitator.

### **Welcome**

Kam welcomed everyone and acknowledged the new members Kathy Pollock, George Maniates. Kathy is from the Life Science department and holds a masters in Educational Technology. George Maniates is the Asst. Vice President for Student Services. The council will be enhanced with the joining of these two new member; with Kathy's education and George's experience, both will have a lot to offer.

The name of the committee is officially changed to Technology Council. When the committee first started it was named Interim Technology Governance awaiting the approval the board. The board has now approved. Members on the council will serve for 1 year-fall to fall with the option to re-join. A new chair person will be selected each year. Kam will not be chairing next year. His reasoning is to give someone else an opportunity therefore opening up a much broader discussion. Kam also acknowledged the other new member from custodial services-Mitch Mieczkowski and Gerry Nyland from facilities.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the previous meeting of August 2<sup>nd</sup> was entered for approval and corrections. One correction-Carol noted the name listed should be Hendrik Meijer instead of Hendriks. Change noted by recorder. With no further edits, the minutes was motioned for approval and seconded by Jean Roberts. Minutes so entered.

### **New Council Chair for next year**

Carol Briggs-Erickson will begin as new chair at next month's meeting. Kam welcomed Carol and said he would still be there to assist her in any way.

### **Computer Hardware Recommendation:**

Kam: We are currently using MPC on campus but we are having such a problem with them. This committee will offer recommendation to board and once approved we will begin ordering process.

Scott: Over the past month, we've tested on Dell, MPC, and HP systems in our data center by the I.T. staff. Scott offered document that gave detail summary of the findings from OIT staff as they evaluated the systems from the 3 vendors. Due to time, Scott did not go through entire report but focused on summarizing the differences between the vendors. What we are looking for is a long term relationship. What can they do for us and what can they offer us? The technical reimbursement program is very important. Both HP and MPC offer a spare closet while Dell does not. We are leaning toward the HP desktop both for the system performance and the customer service. There is some

dissatisfaction with the service received from MPC. HP offers a huge price break for college and students. HP is willing to create a web page that is designed for MCC only. MPC was substandard in the areas of service, support, and customer relations. The overall consensus from the OIT staff is to go with HP as they provide a more solid foundation across all platforms to build a good customer-vendor relationship for long-term success.

Question: Do you get the impression that there is a way to take any of the certification training and run it tied to our certificate program?

Kam: Do you want to vote now or read report and vote? If we want to wait, then we should call meeting for next month.

It is the recommendation of IT Council to go with HP as vendor for desktop replacement.

Rosemary motioned

Becky Seconded.

### **Blackboard Upgrade**

We have blackboard and the version is basic. The things we want to do with Blackboard is impossible with current version. Kam asked Scott to share with group what he has been doing to prepare for fall.

Scott: It takes about 1 hour to 2 hours to get courses ready for fall. There is a form on the web where instructors request their course and this is now created manually; one at a time per request. I have to make a list on a spreadsheet, then I have to go to the current ERP system (TIP) run report, massage that Data which takes about an hour and batch create the users, go back and re-massage Data to batch enroll the users. All of this is manual and it takes between 1 to 2 hours. NO way to migrate our ERP system to auto and create courses.

Kam: This is for every semester. In winter we will have to do this again.

Becky asked; "It isn't rather or not we go with Enterprise or stay the same, it's rather we go to Enterprise or a whole new platform?" Kam: Yes and how the money factor plays into this.

Mark shared his report (2 pages) and it shows that Scott is spending about 8 hours a week managing the site especially at beginning of semester. Blackboard manages about 3000 users or less. When we first begin to use blackboard we did not have that many users and now we have over 10,000 users. Not all active but it starts to get cumbersome on the Database side. This semester we have 1942 with 122 courses and that's different sections of classes as well. There is no integration with Datatel even though we move ahead with the student platform. Another disadvantage is students have is there is separate login completely for BB. Basically they will have one email for everything else on campus except for BB. We can't change this unless we go to BB enterprise. One of the advantage is if we move to Enterprise or another system, we will be able to integrate with Datatel and it will automatically populate the courses every night. One thing we want to do is have BB for every course. Instructors won't have to use it if they don't want to. As we move forward; another project is portal creation. and this is something that Dr. Rule is interested in (one place for students to go to sign in. and have access for all of their things webadvisor, BB etc.) Angel and Educator are 2

of the other products being used in Michigan. Angel is a little more robust. Angel's price is about 24k per year for 5000 students. Whatever way we go a new server is needed because we have to have it in house. Right now the blackboard server is in Ann Arbor and the reason is because there was a coalition with different colleges and we are the only college left.

Another positive thing is a single sign on ability which makes it possible for upgrades and maintenance. Any type of learning management system will work well with Enterprise. Also there is a tool which integrates well is for plagiarism software. There will not be a need to go to a different website. Just like Enterprise, Angel and Education don't have Enterprise version. The version you buy will be the version get. They integrate with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party like Datatel, The other thing we have concern about is quality control of our online courses. Right now as it stands it's a lot like the classes we already have put up.

If we move to another platform altogether, it will ensure a lot more quality control. The contract would require training and in that training would require that every class be moved over. There is one downside to this; for every course that is exported from one learning management system to another, we have to pay them \$800.00 so for the 122 classes we would have to pay \$97, 600 which is roughly equivalent to 2 years worth of Enterprise version of Blackboard. If we go with a cheaper content management system like Angel or Educator we will save money up front on recurring cost but we will have the initial payment of 100,000. The biggest advantage will be the quality control because we will be able to train the users right from the beginning.

Mark ended his presentation with quote by Dr. Robert Treadhill he heard at most recent conference; "Major trend of Distance learning is use of blending learning which is integrating some online element into the classroom and the mainstreaming of online learning into the academic establishment".

As students begin to demand more and more forces, we won't be able to keep pace with the version of BB we have now.

Question: What is the cost of BB Enterprise? 28,000. Basic Blackboard is \$10,000. There was a question on Web-CT. Mark said that Web-CT is not a Blackboard product so it makes no sense to move to Web-CT.

\* Kam said it is 24, 500 for the Angel product for 5000 students. The price for Educator is not known.

It is not in our hands to make decision, however, Kam would like to create sub-committee with some of the present Technology council members and some of the outside faculty members as well as administrator to review the different products, learn more about them and make a recommendation as to which one. Would like to have this committee meet once a month and make recommendation to cabinet by Spring and implementation by Fall 2007.

A sign up sheet was circulated and those suggested/signed are: Dr. Sue Meeuwenberg, DE Coordinator, Sandy Osborne, Faculty or Pam Cengiz (these names were submitted by Pam Brown, Nursing Director, Jeff Stipes, Chairperson of Manufacturing Technology. Other suggested members are: Greg Marczak, Tom Donahue, Jenny Klingenberg, Pat Huff, Richard Alexander, Dan Bialas, Duane Schechter, Maria Anderson, Steve Fiorenzo. Kam will invite the above to take part.

The Corporate office will be able to get representatives from Angel, Educator and BB Enterprise can come and present to the group and show you what they have available. They will bring subject matter expert to talk about the pros and cons of going from one system to another. Kam will send email link that will give product comparison. The link is [www.edu.tool.info/item-list](http://www.edu.tool.info/item-list). This page will compare the products by price, functionality and other.

Question: Pam asked if Kam wanted if the need was for actual teachers of online courses. Kam said yes. He will email out the time and place for meeting and discussing.

Question: Jean asked if this will eliminate the issue of some of the students not being able to login to the Blackboard site. Kam said yes because we will have one login for email, blackboard etc. Once they login to Portal the student can navigate to other areas with single sign on.

### **Acceptable Use Policy**

We have been working on this for almost 3 months. We are hoping to wrap it up. This policy has 2 policies within it. Recapping: The only thing we were to do was to separate out the guidelines for community guest and students. Some remaining unanswered questions are: How do we want to treat guest? Should it be the same as the students? Becky said she did not think we should treat the community the same as the students. Rosemary asked if we would ban them from computers in the library forever? Carol's concern was how do we define those who accidentally find something they are not looking for.

The wording for community was discussed and reviewed. One suggestion was to change the sentence "Failure to follow Acceptable Use Policy may instead of will result in the removal of authorization (privileges) to use MCC's computer....."

Jeff suggested that community members should receive a warning- then they are done. George agreed. There is no need to keep going on and on. Question was if a person who violates the privilege will be on a list forever. George said yes, If they blow it they blow it. This adverse behavior is limited to a few. Not every patron will misuse this privilege. Pam noted that we need a plan because we have people coming from across the street and may not follow the rules.

It will read as such; *Failure to follow Acceptable computer use will result in both a verbal and written warning. Consequential failure to comply will result in termination of Guest services.*

Question: Who will be able to give the verbal warning? Answer: George stated that any library staff person can issue the verbal warning and they record who it was and the next day the coordinator can do the written warning. We may not have the address to do a written warning. Carol stated that the library is working on this process. Some discussion ensued on how this procedure will work. Kam said that this is a procedure and can be worked on. Carol questioned point #8 listed under Unacceptable Computer Use at Muskegon Community College. She wanted to know if this should be some placed somewhere else. Others thought it was a privilege can be withdrawn and you can lose this privilege if something is not done.

When the Computer Usage policy is turned in, the Email policy will also be turned in. One other correction is to add a period after #6 under points Unacceptable Computer use.

With no further corrections, additions or discussion, the Computer Acceptable Use Policy project is ready to be submitted to Coordinating council. All Ayes.

Motioned by Sue

Seconded by Rosemary.

### **Announcements**

Reminder: The strategic planning session starts October 18th at 1:30 pm in room 1222 every other Wednesday. Everyone who is on Technology Council is part of session. The actual process starts with survey for faculty and staff on September 30<sup>th</sup>. Kam will email booklet to new members. The next meeting will be on November 1<sup>st</sup> which will conflict with the Technology Council meeting. Carol to decide if council will be cancelled.

Part of the Tech council's responsibility will be to review the strategic plan as well as help in creating the plan.

### **Web Update**

Julie held no meeting but hopes to have update next time. It is noted that the same members as previous year will serve this year.

### **Datatel Update**

Rosemary

We went live on R18, tested all the modules. There were a couple glitches on General Ledger but we have them all cleared up right away. We are continually testings.

\*Training to start next week on budget and report writing. As we get farther into testing we are finding out little things that need to work out specifically with the student modules that work together such as Financial Aid and Registration. Admissions will go live on October 1<sup>st</sup> and we are meeting very closely with them. We're meeting with web advisor in November. At the end of this month (Sept) we will be meeting on Active Apply which is where students can apply online. This is scheduled to go live in January, Admissions will go live Fall, 2007. George would like to see us get something going for fall which means enhancing the payment process.

\*September 13<sup>th</sup>-Technology Show on campus. Right now we have over 20 vendors. We even have computers set up in front for registration.

With no further discussion, meeting was adjourned at 2:30

## Invited Participants

ID	Name	Title	Department	Attend <sup>1</sup>
1	Kamlesh Sanghvi	Facilitator	Information Technology	X
2	Becky Evans	Professor	English Dept	X
3	Connie Mundinger	Clerical	Academic Affairs	X
4	Sue Meeuwenberg	Professor	Business Dept	X
5	Mike Mieczkowski	Custodial	Facilities	X
6	Kelly Conrad	Counselor	Counseling Dept	X
7	Kathy Pollack	Professor	Life Science	X
8	Gerry Nyland	Facilities	Administrative SVCS	X
9	Scott Oneal Non-Voting Member	Network Services Manager	Information Technology	X
11	Carol Briggs-Erickson	Librarian	Library	X
12	Rosemary Zink	Director of Financial SVCS	Administrative Services	X
13	Pam Brown	Director of Nursing	Nursing Dept	X
14	Patricia A Werly Non Voting Member	Systems Analyst	Information Technology	X
15	Theresa Sturris Non Voting Member	Assoc. V.P. of Academic Affairs	Academic Affairs	A
16	Jean Roberts	Director of Registration and Records	Student Services	X
17	Julie Weller Non-Voting Member	Web Master	Public Information	X
18	Mark Porcaro Guest	Instructional Specialist	Information Technology	X
19	Mary Ann Williams Non-voting-recorder	Office Manager	Information Technology	X
20	Jeff Stipes	Professor	Technology	X

---