RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Website: Technology Advisory Group

Agenda for November 3, 2022
3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83287703267

1. 2022 Districtwide Planning survey results (5 minutes) – Gonzalez

2. Second reading STP Goals for 2023-2024 (10 minutes) – **ACTION** – Gonzalez

3. Student email as primary email in Canvas and grant funded technology sunset policy (10 minutes) – James

4. Technology Update – Colleges
   - SACTAC – Steffens (10 minutes)
   - SCCTEC – Rodriguez (10 minutes)

5. Student experience with technology:
   - SAC Student – Alfredo Orozco (10 minutes)
   - SCC Student – Ryan Felix (10 minutes)

6. Updates on recommendations for computer replacement plan (10 minutes) – Gonzalez, Gonzalves, Chen, Clacken, Steffens, Morgan, Rodriguez, James

7. Cybersecurity one-time funding - $50k per college (10 minutes) – Clacken

8. Approval of TAG Minutes – October 6, 2022 (5 minutes) **– ACTION**– Gonzalez

9. Technology Project listing, October 2022 (5 minutes) – Howard

Next TAG Committee Meeting: December 1, 2022

Because planning is a continuous cycle of improvements, the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) implemented the current planning and decision-making process in 2013. It is overseen by District Council, with the collaboration of five governance committees that focus on human resources, fiscal resources, physical resources, planning and organizational effectiveness, and technology resources. Staff has had a chance to work with the model envisioned for the district. As the 2022-23 academic year starts and prior to new committees start their work, members of the 2021-22 RSCCD Governance Committees were invited to give opinions on this district-wide planning and resource allocation process, as well as the district operations resource allocation.

Thirty-four of the 62 members (55%) from across the district participated (28% from Santa Ana College, 44% Santiago Canyon College, and 28% district operations), with representation from all staff (15% classified, 38% faculty, and 46% management (though we did not receive student participation this year). There was representation from all six governance committees (27% District Council, 19% Fiscal Resources, 19% Human Resources, 19% Physical Resources, 42% Planning and Organizational Effectiveness and 15% Technology Advisory Group). Keep in mind, representations of District Council are made up of co-chairs from the five other governance committees; therefore, the percentage will be more than 100%.

Overall, seven-tenths members of the RSSCD governance committees are familiar with the RSCCD Planning Design, and just as many find the district-wide planning process clear and that it is linked with the colleges' planning processes (57%). The same number of respondents also believe the five committees collaborate to support the work of District Council and two-fifths don't know if there is collaboration among the committees. Also, about four-fifths respondents understand the roles and responsibilities of each of the five districtwide governance committees, including the coordinating District Council.

More than 60% of the respondents stated that they do bring information/issues to and from districtwide governance committees and college committees that they represent. Also, nearly half of the respondents "agree" or "strongly agree" that there is integration between college and district planning.

Among the governance committee membership, about 40% of the respondents stated that the process and prioritization of district-wide resource allocation is clear, that there is coordination between district-wide and college-based resource requests, or that they are satisfied with the current process. There is a considerable number of respondents who "don't know" the district-wide resource allocation process, prioritization, and timeline. In addition, respondents were also not as knowledgeable of the district operations' resource allocation request process and timeline, nor coordination between this process and the college's base resource requests. Please note more than nearly three-fourths of the respondents are from Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College and so they are probably more familiar with their respective colleges' processes.

Because representations to the district-wide governance committees change regularly, it is recommended that new memberships be thoroughly orientated about the district-wide planning and resource allocation processes, as well as member's roles and responsibilities, to ensure effective representation and coordination with colleges' processes and structures.

	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
I am familiar with the RSCCD Planning Design.	34	24%	56%	21%	0%
The district-wide planning process is clear.	34	18%	47%	29%	6%
The district-wide planning process is linked with the colleges' planning processes.	33	15%	42%	30%	12%
I understand the roles and responsibilities of the following RSCCD Governance Committees:					
District Council	34	29%	56%	15%	0%
Fiscal Resources	34	26%	68%	6%	0%
Human Resources	33	24%	58%	6%	12%
Physical Resources	34	24%	56%	15%	6%
Planning and Organizational Effectiveness	34	26%	53%	12%	9%
Technology Advisory Group	34	24%	59%	9%	9%

The committees collaborate to support the work of District Council.
   7% Strong Agree
  43% Agree
  27% Disagree
   3% Strongly Disagree
  20% I Don't Know

As a member of a district-wide governance committee, how often do you take information/concerns back to your college committee that you represent?
  21% I bring information/issues from the district-wide governance committee back to my college committee after every meeting.
  73% I bring information/issues back to my college committee when needed.
   6% I have never shared information/issues from the district-wide governance committee with my college committee.

How often do you take an issue/concern from your college committee to the district-wide governance committee that you attend?
  16% I bring college information/issues to district-wide governance committee to every meeting.
  63% I bring college information/issues to district-wide governance committee to some meetings.
  22% I have never brought any information/issues to the district-wide governance committee.

There is integration between college and district planning.
  12% Strong Agree
  41% Agree
  32% Disagree
   6% Strongly Disagree
   9% I Don't Know

Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district-wide</u> resource allocation:						
	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
The process to identify and prioritize district-wide resource requests is clear.	30	7%	37%	33%	13%	10%
I am satisfied with the district-wide resource request and prioritization process.	30	7%	23%	40%	13%	17%
There is coordination between district-wide and college-based resource requests.	30	7%	23%	40%	10%	20%
The district-wide resource allocation timeline is clear.	30	10%	37%	27%	7%	20%
The district-wide resource allocation timeline is satisfactory.	29	10%	21%	24%	17%	28%

Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district operations</u> resource allocation:

	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
The process to identify and prioritize district operations resource requests is clear.	30	7%	37%	23%	10%	23%
I am satisfied with the district operations resource request and prioritization process.	30	3%	27%	37%	7%	27%
There is coordination between district operations and college-based resource requests.	30	7%	20%	40%	7%	27%
The district operations resource allocation timeline is clear.	30	7%	37%	27%	7%	23%
The district operations resource allocation timeline is satisfactory.	30	7%	27%	23%	13%	30%

<u>Changes to the District-wide planning and resource request process you would recommend:</u>

- Often times, there is a great divide in the district discussing necessary positions in collaboration with and in support of college strategic plans, including fiscal priorities. When the district determines a need for such positions in which the college must fund, this diminished the college priorities in alignment with the college's strategic plans. At times, positions from the district appear out of context and with no consultation with the College Council and Planning and Budget Committees.

- If you do not serve on one of the District-wide planning committees, it is difficult to answer these questions. I serve on one of the committees, but am not able to speak for the others as I am not regularly notified about items such as the district-wide resource allocation (with the exception of some annual updates at Management Council).

- More collaboration is needed. Decision needs to be discussed with all committees and district council cannot do a decision without considering all other committees.

- A process needs to be implemented so that funding can be redirected to support the basic operations of the colleges and support for students. This is particularly needed for Continuing Education which is facing a dire situation due to the lack of funding it receives.
  The District reserves have increased at a very high rate whereas the colleges do not have the resources to meet the most basic student needs. Page 32 of the 2022-2023 RSCCD Adopted Budget shows that the year end balance for the District increased to $60 million. At the same time, page 33 of the RSCCD Adopted Budget shows that SAC/SCC Continuing Education Gross Revenues increased to $44,476,588 ($27,928,127 SAC + 16,548,461 SCC). The same page demonstrates that Net Revenues from SAC/SCC Continuing Education programs increased to $15,679,533 ($10,040,122 SAC + 5,639,411 SCC).
  Comparing this data to page 40 of the 2018/2019 RSCCD Adopted Budget shows that the Gross Revenue from Continuing Education operations has increased by $10,352,258 since the 2018/2019 fiscal year. At the same time Continuing Education Net Revenue has increased by $6,849,702 compared to 2018/2019. 66% of the additional revenue brought in by District Continuing Education operations is diverted to operations outside of Continuing Education.
  Continuing Education has grown significantly but is currently operating with 15% less support staff then it had in 2018/2019 due to mandated District reductions. Continuing Education is not able to meet its most basic needs in supporting students due to the significant budget reductions it has experienced at the same time it has grown dramatically.
  The District's diversion of resources generated by Continuing Education students to other District uses is one of the largest equity issues the District is experiencing as Continuing Education students are also the most economically disadvantaged in the District. The District-wide planning and resource request process needs to address this structural inequality.

- More transparency, involve all constituencies. Be fair to the smaller colleges including non-credit which brings us a lot of FTE's
  The current process does not align with college planning processes. If cabinet decides something should happen, it does. That is not district-wide planning, that is imposing costs on the colleges and making it seem like there is planning.
  The membership of district governance committees to ensure that all other constituencies are not outnumbered by administrators and managers or the planning process will never work.
- Create one process that all requests must go through.
  Let's face it, if the chancellor wants something, he gets it. Doesn't matter who the chancellor is. How many positions does People and Culture need? How many of these new positions are managers versus classified?
- I think our processes are good, but we do not use them appropriately.
  I believe those who are part of our committees do not represent their constituents, and/or share agendas between the district and the college committees.
- Planning should be further integrated so that planning at the college level can help inform planning at the district level and vice-versa. We all do a lot of work updating strategic plans and at the same time are working toward building and updating local plans at the college. Tighter integrations means we work smarter, not harder.
- Have more meetings that cross the committees. A committee retreat would be ideal so that we can all collaborate from management, admin, faculty, and classified staff

Changes to the district operations planning and resource request process you would recommend:
- Be more transparent
- There does not appear to be a relationship to the increases in District Operations to the needs of the campuses. New allocations to the District Operations budget have resulted in additional work being requested of the campuses without additional services being provided. Increases to District Operations seem to correlate to new bureaucratic processes introduced which creates more work for the colleges while at the same time reducing resources to serve students.
- The district seems to be able to request new resources from the colleges whenever they want. The internal allocation of budgeted resources don't come to the committees, only requests for new allocations and they happen throughout the year. Colleges have usually already completed their planning and do not know when a request from the district will come. If the district wants a new position, the request should be at the beginning of the academic year before the colleges do their allocations.

Strategic Theme	Goals 2021-2022	Accreditation Standards Goals 2021-2022	Proposed Goals 2022-2023	Accreditation Standards Goals 2022-2023
1. Student Experience	a. Provide technology infrastructure capacity and technology services to support on-campus and online student support services.	(III.C.1, III.C.2)	a. Promote innovation, provide technology infrastructure capacity and technology services to support on-campus and online student learning and support services.	
1. Student Experience	b. Provide scalable technologies, services and staff to fully support online education	(III.C.1)	b. Provide scalable and innovative technologies, services and staff to fully support online education	
1. Student Experience	c. Provide technology services to align student experience with the pillars of guided pathways. (III.C.1, III.C.4)	(III.C.1, III.C.4)	Keep	
1. Student Experience	d. Enhance internal and external web resources and mobile applications to improve ease of use for students, programs, services and operations.	(III.C.4)	Keep	
2. Standardization	a. Establish an ongoing plan to ensure all technology equipment is replaced on a regular basis to support operations, programs, services and district and college missions.	(III.C.2)	a. Replace and update all technology equipment and software on a regular basis to assure quality and capacity to support operations, programs, services and district and college missions. (part of accreditation standards)	
2. Standardization	b. Ensure that all classrooms, labs and study spaces have standardized audio-visual equipment, networking, hardware and software to support collaborations, simulations, presentations, teaching and learning.	(III.C.1)	Keep	
2. Standardization	c. Develop and update policies and procedures that guide the use of technology and support teaching and learning processes.	(III.C.5)	Keep (part of accreditation standards)	
2. Standardization	d. Continuously improve and establish standardized business processes involving technology to enhance institutional operations.	(III.C.4)	Keep	
2. Standardization	e. Institutionalize technology planning framework and standardize project management including portfolio management, project intake and project prioritization.	(III.C.1)	Remove	
3. Data Driven Decision Making	a. Plan regular updates of technology to ensure the quality and capacity to support operations, programs, services and the mission.	(III.C.2)	Remove - redundant with 2.a. Regularly update and improve data sets to support system analysis and implementation.	
3. Data Driven Decision Making	b. Institutionalize data management and data governance for data-informed decision making.	(III.C.4)	Implement and maintain data management and data governance processes and technology that support data-informed decision making.	
3. Data Driven Decision Making	c. Streamline, encourage and support the use of Business Intelligence reports and reporting tools for the effective use of technology systems.	(III.C.1)	c. Streamline, encourage and support the use of predictive analytics, Business Intelligence and Artificial Inteligence tools for the effective use of technology systems.	
4. Security	a. Continuously improve network infrastructure security processes at all locations where courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.	(III.C.3)	a. Continuously improve network infrastructure security processes, develop and maintain information security plans, policies, at all locations where courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security. (Part of accreditation standards)	
4. Security	b. Develop and maintain information security plans, policies, procedures, practices and projects to assure reliable access, safety, risk management and security compliance at all locations.	(III.C.3)	Remove - redundant with 4.a. b. Implement and maintain security controls in compliance with the Graham Leach Bliley Act (GLBA)	
4. Security	c. Deploy Single Sign-On (SSO) solution for all standardized applications and technology resources to assure reliable access, safety and security at all locations.	(III.C.3)	b. Implement and maintain security controls in compliance with the Graham Leach Bliley Act (GLBA) Keep	
4. Security	d. Perform ongoing information security training to faculty, staff, students, administrators and external stakeholders.	(III.C.3)	Keep d. Perform ongoing information security training to faculty, staff, students, administrators and external stakeholders. Maintain Technology committees apprised on security efforts.	
5. Support	a. Develop and foster Information Technology service excellence, performance feedback and assessment.	(III.C.4)	Keep	
5. Support	b. Provide training and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to academic programs, student services and operations.	(III.C.4)	Keep (part of accreditation standards)	
5. Support	c. Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of technology, services and support provided to students, faculty, staff and administrators.	(III.C.1)	Keep c. Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of technology, services and support provided to students, faculty, staff and administrators. Promote the use of sustainable technologies.	
5. Support	d. Ensure that technology resources at all locations are implemented and maintained to assure compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and all applicable accessibility laws and regulations.	(III.C.3)	d. Ensure that technology resources at all locations are implemented and maintained to assure compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and all applicable accessibility laws and regulations. Prioritize technologies and procedures that promote Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiatives.	

	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	• 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
		• Inventory of PCs to be replaced does not usually break out the details on what buildings, divisions are in scope.
		• There isn't a standard districtwide tool for computer inventory tracking. Each ITS/Media team handles inventory management differently.
			• 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.
			• Report should account for new computing devices being purchased.
			• Report should provide expected costs on an annual basis, aligned with the Fiscal Year, at least five years out
			• Report should break out figures by building/division to get buy-in from areas in scope, to have them advocate for computer/AV replacements.
			• Consider the following to maintain data accuracy on report:
			  ○ Ensure paperwork for inventory moves continues to be properly filled and turned in
			  ○ Include inventory update as part of onboarding/offboarding process for Deans, VPs
			  ○ Implement an updated inventory management system that can be reported off
			  ○ Provide regular reports of equipment ownership to administrators for verification
			  ○ Look at cooperating with Purchasing to better track grant funded machines
				• ITS	In progress	

2	Ensure funding is centralized at each	• The RAR/Tech request process doesn't make sense for computing replacements.	• Consider that funding for computing/AV replacements sits on its own budget line	• SACTAC • SCCTEC		

	college for logistical ease	• Some years will have reserve funds due to peaks and valleys in the aging report.	item under the Budget Offices at the colleges.	• SAC Budget Committee • SCC Budget Committee		

3	Institutionalize the computing device replacement process	• 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.
		• SACTAC no longer has a vote at SAC Budget committee. This has made it difficult to advocate for funding on computing replacements.
		• Funding for computers has been limited or missing at both colleges in many years.
		• 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.
		• 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.
			• Get budget line item added at colleges for technology replacements based on information from recommendations 2 and 3 above
			• Ensure Technology committees that recommend computer replacements to the budgeting areas have voting rights at budget committees
			• 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.
			• Ensure budgeting committees have technology replacement as one of their responsibilities within the participatory governance manuals
			• If funding becomes an issue, consider the following:
			    o A technology fee to help with computing/AV replacements.
			    o A technology replacement bond
			    o A sunset timeframe for computers to be permanently removed and not replaced based on age
			    o Using lottery funding if fund 13 dollars are not available
			• 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.
			• Share aging report from recommendation 1 with Budget Committees and
				• SACTAC
				• SCCTEC
				• SAC Budget Committee
				• SCC Budget Committee		

			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.	• 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.	• 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. • VDI has the potential to eliminate software limitations in the current student laptop loan programs.	• ITS • College Operational Workgroups • TOW	In progress	Summer 2022
5	Educate stakeholders districtwide on the importance and details regarding the computer replacement plan.	• 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. • 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 • There is a lack of understanding on how lifecycle of computers and computing standards are determined • The need to maintain computers, just like grounds need to be kept and garbage needs to be picked up is not understood. • There is a perspective that the district should be responsible	• Educate Administrators – Deans, VPs on role of Technology Committees and relationship to Planning and Budget, as well as importance of computer replacement plan • 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. • Involve student representatives from ASG to advocate for this. • Discuss districtwide goals of technology innovation to support the need • Have public access to aging report from recommendation 1 to convey the percentage of total computers/AV equipment that are on replacement cycle • Report more often on computing/AV replacement status within technology committees (standing item). Progress on replacement, impact to instruction when computers aren't replaced.	• SACTAC • SCCTEC • TAG • TOW • College Operational Workgroups		

		for funding computer replacements with savings.	• Communicate how the budget funding process works
			• Communicate the following elements and how the drive the computing lifecycle:
			  ○ Mean Times to Failure
			  ○ Manufacturer's own lifecycles
			  ○ Advances in technology – Moore's cycle, keeping up with new operating systems
			  ○ Enterprise quality needed for supporting volume and scaling.
			  ○ Consumer devices are not meant to support academic needs at large.
			  ○ Ensuring that warranty matches the lifecycle but it does not drive it
			  ○ Consider settings like Management Council and professional development for educating on the above			

Technology Advisory Group
Zoom Meeting (Invitation shared via Outlook)
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes for October 6, 2022

Voting Members Present: Robert Bustamante, Tammy Cottrell, Jesse Gonzalez, Scott James, Nicholas Quach, Adam Morgan, Sergio Rodriguez, John Steffens, Pat Weekes, Michael Green – SCC Student, Alfredo Orozco – SAC Student

Voting Members Absent: SCC Student

Supporting Members: Derrick Chan, Dane Clacken, Adam Howard, Ron Gonzalves, Tara Kubicka-Miller

Guest: Michael Green, ASG President

Discussion

Call to Order

- Meeting was called to order by Mr. Gonzalez at 3:02 PM. Quick introduction of Nicholas Quack, SAC faculty representative.

1. TAG Accomplishments and Goals: Mr. Gonzalez provided an overview.
    - Review of 2021-2022 TAG Accomplishments: Mr. Gonzalez touched on key details of the accomplishments. It was important to note that Item #5 (Established Accessibility and Data Privacy recommendation) was not part of the established goals but more of a need that is crucial to our institution. This effort was in collaboration with the campus faculty led by Mr. James and Ms. Kushida.
    - Approval of TAG goals for 2022-2023: Mr. Gonzalez detailed on each item and referenced on the importance of these items getting approved and handed off to the right group so that they are executed appropriately. Discussions ensued and corrections were recommended as follows:
        o Item #1 Approve and adopt Districtwide Goals for 2022-2023 (to 2023-2024) into the STP.
        o Item #2 "Maintain computing standards updated" to "Maintain updated computing standards" as discussed with Ms. Weekes.
        o Mr. Rodriguez cited security related concerns and mentioned some recent network attacks that took place at several school districts. Mr. Gonzalez proposed to have as a goal; To ensure the committee is updated on security initiatives and opportunity for feedback.
        o Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion to approve TAG goals for 2022-2023. A motion was made by Ms. Kubicka-Miller, seconded by Ms. Weekes, and approved unanimously with corrections.

2. First Reading STP Goals for 2023-2024:
    - Mr. Gonzalez provided an overview and went over the proposed modifications. There was a recent update to the Accreditation standards, but our technology standards will not be impacted. Discussions and feedback were presented by Mr. Steffens and Mr. James. The workgroup plans to meet for additional discussions and feedback prior to November meeting.
        o Proposal to keep the details on item #3a as is. Will attempt that this goal aligns with SACTAC.

- o Proposal to keep item #4b but adding GLBA compliance as the major subject. Keep the current #4c and incorporate Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) on item #4d.
- o Mr. Gonzalez provided a brief overview of the STP goals to Mr. Green that he may share with the Associated Student Government to seek feedback.

3. First Reading AR 3720 update – personal cloud storage: Mr. Gonzalez referred to previous concerns cited by Mr. Steffens and challenges involved related to accessibility and security.
   - Discussions on larger scope on accessibility and gaps.
   - Support and training resources that faculty (including adjuncts) need on the use of instructional technology. Will security concerns be addressed if we provide adjuncts with district computing device or some type of technology? Adjuncts have access to One Drive and would not require district owned devices to gain access.
   - Mr. Green inquired on the topic of what TAG committee responsibilities are; and if we have a technology that's been verified as accessible. Mr. Gonzalez and Mr. James provided some insights.
   - The colleges and constituents still need further discussion and review of feedback.

4. Approve updated Computing Standards: Mr. Gonzalves provided the following updates. This effort is in collaboration with Mr. Chan.
   - Desktop: HP EliteDesk 800 G6 to G9
   - Monitor: 23" Full High Definition to 24", includes built-in HD webcam and speaker.
   - Desktop (limited space): HP EliteOne 800 G5 24" to G6 24" to HP EliteOne 840 G9 24" All-in-one
   - Desktop Mini: No current standards. Introducing HP EliteDesk 800 G9 Mini PC. Dimension – 6"x6" x 1"
   - Laptop (Faculty & Staff): HP EliteBook 840 G8 to G9. The G9 version is 30% faster and improved security.
   - Special Case: Laptop (Staff and Admin): No current standards. Introducing 2 different models. MS Surface Laptop 4 – 15" with 16GB and MS Surface Pro 8 with cover – 13" with 16GB.
   - Laptop (Student Standard): HP ProBook 640 G6 to G9.
   - Laptop (Student: Special Use Case): Resource Intensive. HP Z-Books 15 Power G8 to G9.
   - Printers
     - o Small B&W: HP LaserJet Pro M203dw to 3001dw.
     - o Multi-Function Printers (MFP), B&W: HP LaserJet Pro MFP 428fdw to 4101fdn. Features eco-friendly and sustainable.
   - Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion to approve the new computing standards. Motion was made by Mr. Steffens, Mr. Rodriguez seconded and approved unanimously.
   - Additional questions from the group: Mr. Steffens asked if there's an alternative to replace staff desktops with docking stations for those that have been issued a laptop. Mr. Gonzalez stated that this is still under consideration, information on the subject is forthcoming. Mr. Green inquired if the district has an initiative on green consumption; Mr. Gonzalez suggested that he attends the November meeting to provide recommendations since we have not finalized the goals.

   Mr. Gonzalez made a motion to suspend the rules and move to approval of the September minutes; motion was made by Mr. Steffens, seconded by Mr. James. Motion passed.

5. Technology Update: SACTAC & SCCTEC. Tabled for next meeting

6. Student experience with technology: Tabled for next meeting

7. Approval of TAG Minutes – September 1, 2022
   - Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion to approve the September 1, 2022 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Steffens, seconded by Ms. Weekes and approved unanimously.
   - Discussions whether Mr. Kubicka-Miller is a voting member. Will consult with members and provide additional update.
   - Other: Mr. Gonzalez made a motion to table items #5, #6 & #8. A motion was made by Mr. Steffens, seconded by Mr. James. Motion passed.

8. Technology Project Listing, September 2022. Tabled for next meeting.

Informational Handouts
1. TAG Accomplishments and Goals
2. STP Goals for 2022-2023
3. AR 3720 Information Resources Acceptable Use
4. Computing Standards
5. Top 10 Technology Project Listing - September

Next Meeting Reminder: November 3, 2022 via Zoom

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.