TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes
February 26, 2021
https://napavalley-edu.zoom.us/j/99311775768?pwd=b1hLYlVSRnh5TkgrNTZjRUcxK1ZhQT09
Meeting ID: 993 1177 5768
10:00am – 11:30am

1.0   Call to Order

Start Time: 10:10am

Present: Melinda Tran, Maria Biddenback, Brian Lym, Jose Sanchez, May Jong, Eric Houck, Regina Orozco, Stan Hitchcock, Karen Smith, Daniel Vega and Robert Parker.

Note: Brandon is still on paternity leave and Jessica Erickson had a meeting conflict.

2.0   Introduction of Guests

Guests joined the meeting later.

3.0   Adoption of Agenda

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Brian Lym, all members agreed.

4.0   Approval of Minutes

4.1   February 19, 2020

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Regina Orozco, all members agreed.

5.0   Public Comments/Announcements

May informed members that the statement created by the District Technology Committee was forwarded to the Distance Education workgroup. The workgroup complimented the statement.

6.0   Discussion Items

6.1   2020-21 Computer Refresh Recommendation

Eric discussed the email he sent on Monday and shared feedback he had gotten in response to building 1800. Robert Van Der Velde wanted to make sure that the Chemistry laptops get added to the count so that they are reflected on the refresh recommendation as well. Typically, IT surveys the area prior to purchasing for refreshes; however, these particular laptops were not purchased through the normal IT process and therefore were not on the radar for refresh. Eric noted ongoing challenges to managing and tracking equipment purchased on campus. Eric asked if any feedback was received from other constituencies. Maria Biddenback asked if the document shared through email

was the most current variation. Eric confirmed and noted that the only change would be adding the 1800 building laptops that were purchased in Chemistry/Physics. Historically, technology purchases have not always flowed back to IT for them to be tracked properly. There have been broader initiatives made in order to track college assets. A few years ago some software was reviewed in order to track assets for all District equipment, however nothing has been fully implemented thus far.

Maria gave suggestions to put a date on the draft and noted that she was not sure what the action item might be for the days' meeting. Eric explained that he was not certain that action could be taken because of not receiving enough feedback. This document has been released to the Committee as a draft for now but will later need to be formally adopted as the recommendation for refreshing equipment. Once approved, it will be dated to indicate what date the document was approved. Maria suggested showing what computers have been updated by perhaps using a different color or slash. This would show overall progress that has been made towards the implementation of the refresh.

Eric asked for other feedback and was not sure if there has been opportunity for members to gather feedback from their various constituency groups. Stan shared that some feedback in his area notes that the computer count may need to be updated. Maria said good job. Eric thanked her for her suggestions and explained the progress made on the refresh cycle over the years.

Eric asked the Committee for more feedback and asked if they would like to adopt the refresh plan with the addition of the 1800 laptop carts. Maria Biddenback motioned to approve the recommended refresh plan with the new additions and Regina Orozco seconded. The current document will become the final refresh recommendation per the District Technology Committee. Eric will continue taking feedback, and asks that people continue to share it.

6.2   Tech Plan Timeline

Eric shared a document which outlines the Integrated Planning Cycle for NVC and continued the Committee's conversation in regards to the tech plan timeline. He noted that the displayed document is part of a larger document that Robyn Wornall is sharing with the Budget & Planning Committee. He believes that the District will have to address this in some way for accreditation. Robyn asked the various District Chairs to update her with any changes or new information relative to their planning processes.

Eric revisited extending the plan out by a year and developing a new plan in the following year. He noted that the pieces in red reflect the potential proposal. Maria noted that other Committee's she was on have extended plans out, but just had to justify the reasoning. We just have to be aware after approving the plan and making sure that fiscal responsibilities do not put limitations on the refresh. There is a concern with tying it in with other timelines and Maria suggested overlapping the tech plan with the other plans instead. Nothing requires them to go by the same cycle. Eric asked the Committee for more thoughts. Stan agreed and noted that it is wise to hold off on the revision, given we are in an accreditation year and he sees nothing broken in the current plan. May also agreed, especially since the Committee is discussing this at the end of February.

Members discussed starting the revision of the plan either at the end of the current semester or at the beginning of the fall and making it a top priority. Eric recognized this concern and noted that it is unlikely the Committee can complete a plan in the timeframe given, but he stressed that he does not want to lose the momentum the Committee has gained thus far. Extending the plan would give the Committee more time to conduct surveys and develop the various parts of the plan. Maria also noted that the extension is also relative to the changes that have happened with the strategic plan. Eric added that we also want to be aligned but a lot of information will be coming from the accreditation process and will help set the direction, not only in areas of deficiency, but by continuing and clearly demonstrating compliance with accreditation standards.

Eric asked for more thoughts. May discussed perhaps creating implementation and/or budgeting recommendations so the plans can be completed. Maria shared that the minutes reflected the plan itself and reviewing the tech plan to make sure the various parts were still relevant enough to stay within the plan. Jose added to Maria's comments. An operational plan is what is needed in order to ensure that the recommended plan gets followed. IT gets users' asking what happened to those "replacement computers" and there is no answer to give. Jose noted that the biggest problem is not having the tech plan operationalized. He does not know if the Committee can fix it, but shared that it is an important part of the discussion. Jose wondered what could be done to help the institution operationalize the tech plan. Maria explained that she does not believe that our plans are meant to be that detailed because it comes out of the Budget & Planning process. She suggested evaluating the current plan; what has and has not been done since it began and figuring out what next steps should be taken from there. Eric explained the challenge of wanting to operational plan to tie back to Planning & Budget, but to Maria's point, it is not an easy task because technology is always changing.

The goal of the Committee was for the Tech Plan to be a living document so that it remains active. It would be good to develop an annual report to add to the plan as a cycle for evaluation. This would be something to include in the next iteration of the plan. Jose suggested noting that the operational piece happens within Budget & Planning, but including the framework for it. Stan read through the Tech Master plan and noted that it gives focus but does not have concrete goals assigned. He noted that he sees the "Operational Plan" as something to be developed by the IT Department alongside the Budget & Planning Committee, instead of being a charge of the District Technology Committee. Jose shared his concerns, "…this is the place where the larger technology issues are discussed, and members of this body have been asked why replacement equipment noted in the plan, has not been purchased. Since we get the 'nuts and bolts' questions here…" The DTC plan gives a high level of what should happen as far as technology and what can be done in Planning & Budget to make it happen.

May suggested looking at the Facilities Master Plan to see if they are very specific, such as does it discuss changing out all of the HVAC systems on campus?" Eric noted that the plan took a higher level approach. Stan shared his view on this topic. The District Technology Committee are the architects that create a plan detailing the Technology needs for the District and the IT staff are the foremen and workers that know what nuances and share proposed solutions. Jose reviewed the current Facilities Master Plan. It notes things like industrial equipment in the 3100 building, numerous problems,

restrooms and compliance as well as stakeholder meetings but does not mention the 'nuts and bolts' . Stan shared that he does not feel comfortable getting into the nuts and bolts of IT's work.

One of the responsibilities of this group as part of the plan is to lead the direction of where the College needs to go. It may or may not be in alignment with the other plans. Maria asked why the Tech Plan Timeline was listed as an action item. Eric would like to know if members agree to extend or not extend the plan. Members will be tasked with reviewing various parts of the plan and bring feedback to the next meeting.

6.3   Faculty/Staff Survey instrument

The Committee discussed survey instruments to be used prior to the next iteration of Technology Master Plan. Eric shared some examples from other places to including, Educause, College of Marin and San Jose Evergreen. He explained that some of the examples take different approaches and asked members to discuss what the general purpose of a DTC survey would be. Members noted that Faculty, nor anyone for that matter would answer a survey of 100 questions. Direction noted in the tech plan might give a sense of what questions should be asked in the survey. Members asked if it was a needs assessment or a satisfaction assessment. Eric explained that IT is interested in all of the topics but that it would be good to group questions together and offer various surveys throughout the year.

Eric sees some value in having survey instruments include, trends of customer satisfaction, and finding out what areas are in need of improvements. Eric asked members for their thoughts. Regina agreed and noted it would be good to know what is important to the users', instead of what is assumed. Brian added that results from the surveys could feed into the revised tech master plan when development time comes. Eric added that it would help guide the next technology plan and the plan will be reflective of the survey results.

Jose noted that survey instruments are tricky when it comes to technology. Previous surveys resulted in many comments in regards to improving the campus Wi-Fi. Going back to this, this survey needs to analyze critical needs of the institution. It took 11 years to finalize the Network Use Policy and almost 10 years to get the core upgrades approved, which without the core upgrades, improvement to Wi-Fi cannot happen. Members do not believe constituency groups see how critical it is to complete these upgrades. Due to small workgroups working on campus issues alike, it results in one or two units getting beat up until a decision gets finalized and changes happen. Members agreed that these new surveys would help others see the concerns that need to be addressed. Jose explained that some of these concerns brought up can not be adequately addressed without foundational technologies being upgraded in the first place. Jose explained that if $75,000 was properly allotted for foundational technology, all of the other areas of concern would be addressed along with that foundational piece. The user does not need to know all of the technology but for others to see, "…this technology cannot be supported until this other foundational technology is taken care of…" There could also be five other things that get taken care of as part of the foundational technology upgrade.

Eric asked the Committee of what directional topic should be included in the surveys. Maria asked Eric to share some areas IT felt would be important. From an IT perspective, topics cover customer support, technology comfort levels, use questions, interests in training and other aspects related to technology as a whole. Eric asked members what they saw as being important for technology. Members shared that program area considerations are needed. Maria suggested splitting the surveys up by topic and including three major areas. Melinda added that maybe people that use technology more would be more willing to answer additional surveys. May shared that the Educational Technology Committee would probably be open to working together on a survey. The ETC decided not to do a survey for Faculty during the current semester. Eric asked members to cherry pick questions out of the various surveys and bring them back for review. Jose agreed and liked all of the suggestions thus far. He added that a needs and prioritization survey would be a good start. The first survey can ask participants to rank their order for technology improvements and the second survey can be sent at the same time. With those results, the Committee can let participants know what it takes to make each thing happen. This would help better explain what is needed to meet technology needs. Jose added to the chat: I have tried to get usability information using focus groups in the past and they are impossible to implement in our institution.

Eric discussed next steps and breaking surveys up into a few smaller surveys. Members will discuss this more at the next meeting.

6.4   New Project Charter

Tabled for next meeting

6.5   Active Projects

There were not a lot of active projects since last week. Eric and IT staff met with Dyntek to review their proposal and ask questions. Implementation is planning to kick-off starting next week. This puts the project on the fast track of being completed by next month. A trial number of staff have already been migrated to Office 365 and Single Sign On pieces are being addressed as well.

6.6   Committee Reports
- *Colleague Core/Student Planning Steering (Jose)*

    The latest version of Colleague is working well. We identified issues and got them resolved. Jose explained that whenever anything is connected with Colleague, 17 servers are involved. One setting on one of those servers had to be changed in order to resolve the issue. Student planning is working awesome and the newest version is coming out. The College stays one iteration behind for more stable builds. He noted that we would move to the newest version in the coming month. It has all of the features needed to fully abandon Web Advisor. Both the student and employee side are working very well. Financial Aid Students are able to see all documents and processing on their forms. Feedback has been positive thus far. The College is hoping to bring one other feature to Self-Service so faculty can add and drop students. Unfortunately, this is a custom-built item. When the

transition happens, faculty may have to submit these on paper so it can be processed in Admissions & Records like before. IT is hoping to bring more Faculty groups on to Self-Service in the summer, with hopes of moving away from Web Advisor completely by spring of 2022.

Maria asked if DocuSign can be implemented in for signing documentation. Jose explained that it creates a gigantic security hole because it would have to integrate with Colleague. Jose suggested creating a Microsoft Form that can write to a secure area onsite. Eric added that there are various solutions for this need and IT would like to work with Maria to figure it out.

- *Educational Technology Committee (May)*

The Committee met but there is nothing to report.

- *Guided Pathways Coordinating Team (Jessica)*

Jessica was unable to attend the meeting.

7.0 Action Items

7.1 2020-21 Computer Refresh Recommendation

Maria Biddenback motioned to approve the recommendation and Regina Orozco seconded in 6.1

7.2 Tech Plan Amendment

Tabled for additional discussion.

8.0 Next Meeting

Friday, March 12, 2021 (10am-11:30am)

9.0 Adjournment

End Time: 11:35am

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Jose Sanchez

Distribution		*Agenda & Minutes Only*	*Bulletin Boards*
Eric Houck – Co-Chair	*Jose Sanchez*	*Eileene Tejada*	*Administrative Bldg.*
Stanley Hitchcock – Co-Chair	*Brandon Tofanelli*	*Martin Shoemaker*	*ASNVC Office*
Maria Biddenback	*Jessica Erickson*	*Robert Harris*	*Classified Lounge*
May Jong	*Brian Lym*	*Amber Wade*	*Faculty Lounge*
Regina Orzco	*Vacant – ASNVC rep*	*Dr. Ronald Kraft*	
Melinda Tran		*Robert Parker*	