

# Technology and Telecommunications Advisory Committee

---



## Quarterly Meeting

Wednesday, January 23, 2020,  
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Sacramento  
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

## Attendees

In-person: Tim Kyllingstad, Bryan Miller, Gregg Atkins, Craig Rutan, Deb Barker-Garcia, Geoffery Dyer, Cheryl Aschenbach, LeBaron Woodyard, Jennifer Coleman, Rick Snodgrass, Tim Calhoon, Gary Bird, Steven Duart, Rico Bianchi, Fred Rocha, Gary Moser, Joe Moreau, Susan Chou, Lindsay McHugh, Stephen Heath, David Kendall, Alex Jackl, Russell Grant, Christopher Anderson, Daryl Lol, Erin Larson, Barney Gomez, Paul Feist, Mojdeh Mehdizadeh, Elaine Kuo, Daniel Kaufman

Zoom: Bill Scroggins, Laurie Vasquez, Ben Seaberry, Robert Coutts

## 10:00am – 10:15am | Welcome and Introductions | Bill Scroggins and Cheryl Aschenbach

## 10:06am – 10:08am | TAP Team Update | David Kendall

Brought on to help with project management across the portfolio and standardize. Developed a set of standards that will be provided as support for grantees. Last year, initiated a new approach to grant planning – bringing together CO and grantees to determine outcomes for the fiscal year. More to do, gearing up for doing it again – before May. Plan ahead of fiscal year instead of during fiscal year. Learned a lot this last fiscal year and will continue.

Each of the disciplines is putting together standards; supporting specific projects; working hard to hold CO accountable to our roles.

## 10:09am – 11:15am | Data Governance Discussion | Alex Jackl

Data governance council didn't really exist before a year ago.

Role of Data Governance Council (DGC):

- Support the Vision for Success
- Manage the data universe of the CCC information ecosystem
- Provide guidance to the CO Enterprise Data Strategy
- Being a centralized organizing body of all the feeder organizations
- Acting as supporting body of the CO exec staff on info strategy and data decisions

TAP team did a Maturity Model analysis

- Need a reliable way to assess

Need to build something sustainable over the next 20+ years.

What metrics matter to the colleges and the CO divisions? What are the data elements that are collected? Business metrics will matter the most as we get feedback.

The folks in the system need room to create consistent data policies between:

Local colleges and CO.

DGC and potential feeder organizations

Calendar scheduled out about 6 months

**Action Item: More to come, I'd like feedback for the TAP team from TTAC. Any recommendations?**

## DISCUSSION

Barney: Back in October of last year, hosted incident response activity. Produced a playbook that will increase our maturity level.

Stephen Heath: We had 25 in person and about 40 people online, well attended. Barney and I are strategizing to do something similar in the future.

Bill Scroggins: Data that the CO has, has been used for purposes that it wasn't designed for.

For example, we reported financial aid info (Pell Grants, etc) and then used for other funding. There's often a data element that's dropped on us that hasn't been used before.

For example, Student Centered Funding Formula – gives a definition of students with parents with Bachelor's Degrees. None of that info in the field is reliable enough. Seems like this should be on your list of standards for this group to review for CO and BOG.

Alex Jackl: Agreed. To get to maturity level 2, you have to have a process to create data definitions and a way to track them. **This is a High priority item.**

It's not going to be fast. It's been done division by division. Personal goal, within a year – all changes are vetted with the divisions and the field. Look at the way data is used - for example Pell Grant, the data governance council will need to address. We don't address that right away but have to start with smaller issues first.

**Action Item: TAP Team request: By July 1, our goal is that the alpha structures for decision making processes are identified and that the Data Governance Council agrees to them.**

Bill Scroggins: There should be explicit language on what you mentioned. Gatekeeper role to avoid issues in future.

Barney: It's going to continue to evolve. Especially as the new CO research team is stood up. New research VC starting next month. She will want to weigh-in on this process.

Cheryl: Who is on the council?

Alex: I'll speak to that.

Bill Scroggins: What about owners of data?

Alex: We'll have to have a master data agreement, someone will have to say changes are allowed. All of the colleges have similar problems at a bigger scale. We don't have an answer, but it will definitely be on the table for the council to deal with.

Alex: RP Group, positioned in a weird grey area. They're not a college, but they're not stakeholders either.

Elaine Kou: We represent the interest of all the IRs across the state. RP Group has really struggled with the items implemented, such as success metrics. It was a short timeframe. We didn't feel confident with the data. We are the champions. If we're not included, we can't be evangelists.

Joe Moreau: Thank you for doing this. Now that there's momentum, we have to broaden the scope of stakeholders or we're not going to get buy in.

Alex: The goal would be in the March meeting that all stakeholders involved.

Tim Calhoon: In the past we've talked about TTAC being the governing body. Not good to get grantee approval.

Cheryl: Likely needs to be a difference of constituent members and grantee reps.

Alex: One of the concerns is that we have to overcome a bulky review process. Trying not to include 40 people in review.

Cheryl: But we also need groups to feel that their voice is being heard.

Tim Calhoon: I think 1 rep from each group would be at most 20-25 people.

Barney: What we need to do is get the foundation of the governance council first. Then we can scale out. Still evolving, especially data/MOU requests. How we manage those. We have tons in the queue because we just don't have the staff.

Bill Scroggins: There was fund for basic skills. Colleges weren't focused on accurate representation of their curriculum. Rhonda reported that there are issues with funding formula for DSPS.

Alex: The model I've proposed, includes senior people with day jobs. They might not be the ones crunching numbers. I think we'll need working data groups. I'm not sure clear if the data governance committee should be the umbrella over this group. Maybe TTAC should be that umbrella.

Bill Scroggins: I didn't say sub groups. I said Rhonda Mohr would have sub groups under DSPS, etc that would be the experts.

Alex: I misunderstood. The working groups would have multiple members.

Barney: The data governance council is to help manage MOUs. We're far from the model. We're focusing on how to make decisions on the request of our data from our MIS system. We need to broaden it out.

Craig R: The colleges have to have a voice in the discussions.

LeBaron: It's not about the competition it's about the quantity. Research supports groups of 20 or less. My encouragement keep it smaller. When you start reaching 20, large groups don't form well.

Tim Calhoun: Most of the data, student data exists in a legislative environment. The exec level doesn't recognize the laws. The people that do know that are in CACCRAO (admissions and records) from a regulatory fashion.

Susan: From the fiscal perspective, is it an access or metrics group? So that concerns are brought up that they're not aware of.

Alex: There's work being done for student success metrics. This group does not supersede or replace that. It's filling an empty slot. This group will take the recommendations back. Adding a filter for the CO to look at this work more strategically.

Joe Moreau: As we move through this, as we find leg or regulatory requirements around data, that do not make sense – irrelevant, improper, etc – an outcome should be to push back on this.

Jennifer Coleman: It's important to note that confusion just within the group, so more confusion out in the field. There is a need for guidance for the colleges.

Alex: The reason why I'm presenting this is to get better ways to do it.

Tim Calhoun: Get list of all constituents and go through/mark off who should be included.

Elaine Kuo: Would be good to have definitions of the groups. How we discuss the policy and language is important. At the local level, they're not at the CO. Need translation so people have a clear sense what this group is to do.

Joe Moreau: In light of a student centered funding formula, there's some urgency to this. The stakes regarding the accuracy of our data have never been higher. We would be so much better off if there was some guidance.

Alex: I feel that urgency, I am pushing as hard as it.

Gary Moser: I'd echo, need clear communications. Do not need misuse of data. Be succinct.

## **ACTION ITEM(S)**

Add RP Group and [California Association of Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers](#) , (CACCRAO) to council

Work with Foundation for communications strategy

**TTAC to provide Alex list of all priority groups for possible constituents .Done!**

**Note from Alex Jackl: COVID-19 and the new AVC of Research threw a wrench in all of this. We suspended the last two meetings as people were dealing with the new reality; the new AVC is reviewing our approach**

11:17am – 11:27am | DE Guidelines | Erin Larson

Provide recommendations to the Chancellor about policy and Distance Ed and technology.

DEETAC – reference Distance Education Guidelines – edits made in December

## DISCUSSION

Gary Moser: What is your timeline for feedback?

Erin: Document is under review with the CO exec team. Then have to take it back to 5C. The Consultation Council has already seen it. Bring to BOG as an informational item – BOG does not have to vote on this item. There really isn't a timeline, but we'll wait to get all the info.

Joe Moreau: The field is eager for these guidelines. So we need to get these updated.

Gregg Akins: I recommended taking out your name when you provided feedback.

**ACTION ITEM(S)** RICK SNODGRASS TO ADD DOCUMENT LINKED IN TODAY'S TTAC SLIDE DECK TO CONFLUENCE

DONE SEE LINK:

[Distance Education Guidelines - 2019](#)

RECOMMENDED CHANGES BEFORE NEXT DEETAC MEETING ON FEB 5

## **11:28am – 11:41am | ERP Sub-Committee Report/Update | Tim Calhoon**

Goal to begin work for planning. Basic work to move forward. SAC committed, met last week. Decided to get a charter in place so we don't get too far. Basic items that could be included in the survey, what ERPs are colleges using? When do your licenses expire? How much do you spend on this? Basic survey questions to get going.

## DISCUSSION

Joe Moreau: Been doing some research on different ERP firms for higher ed implementation.

Tim Calhoon: Next step is to draft a survey and get feedback from SAC. Spoke to Enabling Services; they said that they're prodding and getting the survey out.

Joe Moreau: Engage with a firm, ask them to customize the view of the market in relation to the *Vision for Success*. So we can apply the ERP system back to the Vision.

Tim Calhoon: Want an environmental scan outside of our system. What challenges they faced, etc.

Gary Moser: Also this shouldn't take too long.

Tim Calhoon: Trying to push the ball forward as we can. But this is a much bigger discussion. This is how we can get going.

Bill Scroggins: This was a joint meeting. It went over very well. Colleges are facing challenges in having technology that's current, funded, and reliable. Good visibility for the system.

## ACTION ITEM(S)

None

## 11:41am – 11:46am | CDE MOU Update | Barney Gomez

It's an ongoing challenge. Trying to get this in a good place.

### DISCUSSION

Jennifer Coleman: This is specific to AB 705 and multiple measures placement, with CDE. Already have Cal PASS Plus and CCGI data. MOU was signed last April. Been working with them on actual connectivity. Need the right points of data setup. They just build API. Delay in API connection. We're ready to role once we get that set up.

Barney: One might think "why do we need to get into the technicals of API?" But we need to understand the construct of the API. Validate as needed. We did establish a higher-level working group with execs at CO and CDE so we can ensure working. My hope is that we can finalize 90 days to 6 months.

Jennifer: Partnership with CCGI has been great. Great numbers through the service. Hope that CDE fills in the gaps for the high schools that don't participate with CCGI.

### ACTION ITEM(S)

None

## 11:47am– 11:57am | COCI Update | Barney Gomez

We produced a RFP. Did the review and scoring of the responses. 5C, Academic Senate, CO members, Foundation, CISOA, TechCenter, etc

Doing another round of reviews with CO executives. Barney is recommending that the top 2 or 3 vendors should be demoed with specialists at schools. To show what the vendor can actually do.

### DISCUSSION

Mojdeh: Is there a timeline?

Barney: Less than 60 days we'll be ready to get to the next step. It's challenging to get everyone in the room. Travel and semester beginning is hard. 60-90- days. We want to streamline across system. Systemwide approach is to take advantage of economies of scale. Approach things from an enterprise.

Jennifer Coleman: 109 colleges on LSP and tomorrow 110

Gregg Akins: 2 of 4 colleges not part of LSP, will likely be joining. Other 2 have regional reasons not to join.

Barney: Good point, LSP is a good example of a systemwide enterprise.

Gregg Akins: Make it possible for all districts,

Barney: We have to identify what we're doing and how it ties back to *Vision for Success*.

**ACTION ITEM: WHERE ARE WE WITH THE COCI VENDOR RFP SELECTION PROCESS, IF ANY?**

**11:58am – 12:30pm | Lunch**

**12:35pm – 12:48pm | Accessibility: Standards & VRC Modules | Daniel Kaufman**

A couple of years ago, TTAC recommended a standard. The standard needs to be slightly amended. A couple of years ago, the state auditor made 2 recommendations. Recommendations 4 and 5 were direct to the CO – guidance to colleges on establishing policies/procedures for monitoring the accessibility of instructional materials and college websites.

The revised standard was sent out. Changes requested are:

- Periodically monitoring the accessibility of college websites; and
- Periodically monitoring the accessibility of instructional websites and materials

Implementations

- CO recommends that districts establish written procedures for the compliance process for above requested changes

## DISCUSSION

Alex Jackl: Are those all the changes?

Daniel: Update college number and add “district” between CCC parties

Elaine Kuo: Who defines periodically?

Daniel: This whole effort came from TTAC. Identified gaps, ITC accessibility. Should be an institutional responsibility. CO needed to be explicit on expectations. Basically all of it says that colleges and districts need to follow the law.

Laurie Vasquez: There is a staff person at the Accessibility Center who provides guidance to the colleges.

Joe Moreau: The resources in our colleges are not dedicated to faculty and staff support. Accessibility requirements are hard to meet when that’s the case.

Daniel: Well taken point. The working group is really working to build out the training modules on the VRC. 16 training modules being built to raise understanding and awareness of all parties in the system – what they’re expected to do and resources to do this work.

Tim K: You put in here that we’re monitoring the college websites and instructional websites. But we’re not looking at the full spectrum of software and IT. Libraries are being told they’re not compliant.

Daniel: This is really about responding to the state auditor’s office.

Gregg Akins: Make the assumption on our campuses that these guidelines are for all Library items.

Laurie: I do want to note that these modules on VRC will be available systemwide which will help communication of this much easier. For example, our campus is becoming a partner in the VRC portal. The purpose is really to connect us all.

Gregg Akins: LA is fighting a lawsuit and using an outside law firm.

Cheryl: What's the timeline on the VRC modules.

Daniel: First modules this spring, the production cycle is over 2 years. Fully wrapped summer of 2021. There's a matrix of stakeholders, modules, with a scaffolded learning model.

## ACTION ITEM(S)

### Motion to accept changes to Accessibility Standards document

- **Motion: Gregg Akins**
- **Second: Joe Moreau**
- **Unanimously accept standard changes**
- **Daniel to send cleaned version for Rick to post on Confluence**

## 12:59pm – 1:50pm | OKTA Single Sign-On Solution | Fred Rocha/Joe Moreau/Ben Orenca (from OKTA)

Big thanks to Barney. Barney recognized that we could have a big impact in certain areas. We can help colleges and districts with a malware attack. Sharing what we've learned and the value and potential that we see with this solution. All of the colleges aren't funded equitably for security.

Ben from OKTA working on higher education.

Offers a role-based experience.

SSO dashboard, standard across the board, but as a user can move items around. And as an administrator, can control what certain users see. Multi factor included.

Coast Colleges were looking for one platform, secure password management, security with **Multi-factor authentication**, identity application suite adoption and usage rates, and lowest TCO with ability to scale and standardize across CCC system.

## DISCUSSION

Rico: How would SSO work for adjunct faculty?

Joe Moreau: To echo Tim Calhoon, we need a CCC-ID.

Tim Calhoon: But before that we need infrastructure.

Joe Moreau: As a student, you can see all courses in Canvas. Need it for faculty too.

Tim Calhoon: It wouldn't be hard. It's a policy challenge?

Alex Jackl: Is it policy or political?



Tim Calhoon: Faculty fear that you're going to track performance. Would have to have data governance – are you using data correctly?

Joe Moreau: We've had some conversations with CSU. Would like more frictionless transfers.

Barney: This is one of the values we gain.

Mojdeh: It's a per student cost, which is a lot.

Ben: We do it based on the user, so you don't pay per user. Pay per usage.

Tim Calhoon: Thinking about how this works with our systemwide account. A big point is not letting students create duplicate accounts. During the initial setup, something would have to detect that there isn't a duplication.

Ben: Yes, OKTA doing the validation.

Tim Calhoon: Then there's the account recovery process. To make this really valuable, the student's unique identifier would have to go with them.

Barney: We haven't fully baked this. (Half-baked?) But the advantages across the system will help students.

Joe Moreau: This is just a glimpse of how this could align the Vision.

Tim Calhoon: Is OKTA able to pull down the data from Uncommon? The metadata

Ben: Need a third party like Unicon.

Tim Calhoon: I see at the local level the huge advantage. Just want to make sure it works for our current system.

Ben: Just have to determine from local level and how to scale.

Tim K: On your website, looking for a VPAT.

Joe Moreau: Working on it!

Ben: End user experience - WCAG 2.3 complaint, Section 508 compliant, VPAT will be provided with details

Tim K: They're not posted?

Ben: Not yet.

Joe Moreau: We know you'd ask.

Bill Scroggins: My IT security guy, my security measures are only as good as the user complies. What does it have for training, automated processes, automated scanning of user workspaces?

Jack - Rep from OKTA: We're a cloud service so there's no on prem. Putting in other security layers. Leverage intelligence from OKTA, can look at what's happening in the infrastructure and increase questions and security to get access to the resources.

Barney: It doesn't satisfy everything at the local level. There's never going to be a single solution.

Joe Moreau: We don't say this publicly, but you can't fix stupid.

Barney: No, but it does detect bad IP addresses, black listed IP addresses, OKTA offers a monitoring system. This doesn't negate security in layers.

Ben: We also integrate with other technologies like Spunk {sic.} SPLUNK. You can even move people within high risk in OKTA.

Fred: Took about 30 hours to get everything setup. Team members were excited to get adoption. Used the train the trainer method.

Tim Calhoun: Are there any stats from a help desk?

Fred: The password reset was huge for us. The types of calls coming in are different.

Joe Moreau: So Barney, you're going to find money for this?

Barney: I'm going to try. We'll include some colleges and the CO.

Tim Calhoun: Implementing on campus will be easy, but it will be the integration that's difficult.

Barney: It doesn't have to go to RFP process, \$20 million is the threshold, but we have authority not to. – under public code: 6202.

Craig: You may want to look at a District that doesn't have an IT infrastructure.

## ACTION ITEM(S)

DID BARNEY FIND FUNDS FOR OKTA AND WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THIS VENDOR COMING ONBOARD?

## 1:50pm – 2:08pm | OpenGov Discussion | Barney Gomez/Steven Duarte/Alex Jackl

We have 8 web portals right now, including LaunchBoard. It's a front-end portal so you can gain access to all data. The site requires some accessibility updates. The CO is engaged at looking at the concept. Barney has used it for MediCal. It would be one standard portal instead of multiple portals. This would be public, CO, all access to data marts.

Alex: This is our idealistic view. We recognize there are limitations. This would just be the visual access to the data. In the middle of the data rationalization conversation. We will provide recommendations on how to consolidate.

Looking at proof of concept. We'll create an overview of all the portals. Then we'll shop it around to groups like TTAC.

## DISCUSSION

Tim K: We need to get an inventory of the ICT landscape out at colleges. It would give better talking points to all these projects.

Bryan: General survey out to the field.

Tim K: Where will the survey results go?

Barney: It will help drive our decisions. Doesn't make sense to add to Data Lake.

Bryan: We'll generate a report and share.

Tim K: How many districts are on Windows 7 or 8?

Barney: I can't solve everything for everyone at the local level.

Tim K: Is the survey going to help with this?

Barney: This is systemwide, not local level.

Joe Moreau: We do have agreements with Microsoft through the Foundation. So it's up to the local colleges to prioritize.

Bryan: This initial survey could help further surveys.

Joe Moreau: Could a system be operated by the CO system at the local level? Probably not. Might be a distinguished difference.

Bill Scoggins: Is there room in the conversations for systemwide tech solutions that have been piloted at a college?

Barney: I think that's a great question. Let me touch base with you offline.

## ACTION ITEM(S)

WE NEED TO GET AN INVENTORY OF THE ICT LANDSCAPE OUT AT THE COLLEGES. IT WOULD GIVE BETTER TALKING POINTS TO ALL THESE PROJECTS. (FOUNDATION?)

SHARE SYSTEMWIDE EMAIL WITH TTAC CHAIRS

## 2:08pm – 2:20pm | MOU/Data Request | Alex Jackl

On the MOU tracking side, we've completed that task. Automatically triggers general council. Working on putting historical data in it.

## DISCUSSION

Tim Calhoun: There used to be a clause in the MOU that they were supposed to delete data. Is that part of the new system?

Alex: The data request was at the TechCenter.

Tim Calhoun: Who/what is there to make a request?

Alex: There will be a link on the cccco.edu website to a form. We don't process the data request until the form is filled out.

Tim Calhoun: There are levels of requests based on who's making the request. Internal (CO/Foundation) vs external.

Alex: No matter what the source is, they all go through the requests. If it's MIS data, then Todd Hoig needs to determine. If it's something else other people will need to see. For unitary data, you have to

submit a justification document with a templated doc that is filled out. Hoping to get this out the next couple of months. As we approve policies, they can be applied to the process.

XX: Are these public requests?

Alex: Many times yes. Tried to create several streams so they can be as low resource usage as possible. I don't anticipate this is going to be smooth. We're doing internal testing. Trying to balance it all out.

Tim Calhoun: Who is making the form to the data in the Data Lake/

**ACTION ITEM(S)**ALEX: WE'LL SHARE THE "NEAR TO PRODUCTION FORM" AT THE NEXT TTAC MEETING. JUST WANTED TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE THAT THIS IS HAPPENING. TRACKING SHEET IS DONE.

**\*\*SHARE FORM AT NEXT TTAC MEETING.**

## **2:21pm – 2:33pm | Recap and Adjourn | Bill Scroggins and Cheryl Aschenbach**

### **DISCUSSION**

Gregg Atkins: We've come up with OneSearch logo that CSU uses. Each college has access to change logo colors to match college and add college name. We've branded this so that students are recognized across CCC colleges and at CSU. The UCs announced that their remaining 5 colleges will be on ExLibris.

Bill Scroggins: Who is responsible for the Data Mart?

Alex: Todd Hoig and his team owns Datamart. This review will make sure these are aligned. Strong implications for changes.

Bill Scroggins: Sounds like colleges are not following data definitions? Is it really going to be that long to have access to data system-wide? Need to slow down policy.

Alex: That's a conversation for the Chancellor and BOG.

Bill Scroggins: I'd like to reflect on a few years ago where a previous CO leader made some changes without this group. Advisory committees were under scrutiny for adding value, the fact that we're working together to resolve them with a systemwide solution to technology – we all owe each other a vote of confidence with the progress we've made under Barney's guidance. We're thriving with new initiatives on the table.

## **ACTION ITEM(S)**

FOUNDATION TO WORK WITH TECHCENTER/LSP ON PR

110 CCC COLLEGES ONBOARD, BRANDING STREAMLINED TO MATCH CSU, 5 REMAINING UCs TO INTEGRATE WITH LSP

\*\*\*NEXT MEETING IS A 2-DAY RETREAT, TTAC CHAIRS, GARY BIRD TO DETERMINE DATES AND ADVISE RICK FOR LOGISTICS.

DUE TO THE COVID-19 SITUATION, THE NEXT MEETING IS VISTUAL - MAY 18TH - DONE!

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, January 23 at 2:35pm.