NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes

March 12, 2021

https://napavalley-edu.zoom.us/j/99311775768?pwd=b1hLYlVSRnh5TkgrNTZjRUcxK1ZhQT09

10:00am – 11:30am

1.0 Call to Order

Start Time: 10:01am

Present: Stanley Hitchcock, Eric Houck, Maria Biddenback, Melinda Tran, Jose Sanchez, Regina Orozco, Patti Morgan, Brian Lym. Karen Smith, Robert Parker and San Lu.

Notes: Jessica Erickson has proposed that Patti Morgan take her place on the Committee. This is due to having direct conflicts with other required meetings. Patti's placement is still in process.

2.0 Introduction of Guests

Robert Parker, San Lu, Patti Morgan and Karen Smith were guests at today's meeting.

3.0 Adoption of Agenda

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Stan Hitchcock

Patti asked if she should vote or not, the Committee agreed that, she would refrain until her placement was final.

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 February 26, 2020

With slight corrections to 6.2 on page, paragraph three, approval motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Regina Orozco. All agreed.

5.0 Public Comments/Announcements

No public comments or announcements.

6.0 Discussion Items

6.1 Tech Plan Review & Modification

The Committee reviewed the current Technology Plan with a goal of discussing potential modifications as they were looking at the next iteration. The Tech Plan was not official until 2018 with an ending timeline of 2021. However, work started on the plan prior to Eric's arrival in 2017. The plan timeline aligned with the recently extended Strategic Plan. It includes names of members involved with the iteration. The executive summary discusses the basic assumption of the goals of technology as a whole for the institution. In the summary, it notes that funding is also needed to support said plan. The important parts of the plan is intended to be a living document and should be regularly reviewed by the Committee. The plan is designed to be modular and sets high-level pieces. Various projects can relate to it but are not embedded comprehensively. The theme is recognizing student success and technology go hand-and-hand and that it requires technology now more than ever before. The growing expectation is that technology is getting better, faster and smaller. Wireless technology is becoming more common and infrastructure is a big part of that. The overall bandwidth is what supports the technology that can be offered. Eric asked members to share their thoughts as he was navigating through the document.

Eric reviewed the guiding principles and noted that it should align with the rest of the College and their plans. Improving student success is a fundamental component of the plan as well. The goals of the IT department also align with supporting all technology for the entire College. Next, it discusses the linkage between this plan and other College plans. A diagram of strategic goals shows how they relate and work together. Members suggested adding information to the strategic plan. It would be beneficial to point out that the college has transitioned to Community funding instead of being in the process. Maria suggested noting the dates that edits occur as well. In essence, the Tech Committee will make revisions where they feel appropriate, then submit the revised plan to the Budget & Planning Committee for oversight.

The Committee continued reviewing the document. The plan discusses initiatives about standardization and maintaining an inventory of not just computer equipment but all equipment having to do with technology. This includes a series of proposed actions that include developing and maintaining a current inventory of all campus equipment, a technology refresh plan for all technology that is sustainable, as well as utilizing standards for staff, classrooms and more. Some of the standards are linked in the appendix area and some are still in development. Another goal was to identify and construct service-level-agreements for helpdesk, media and procurement processes. Other initiatives include creating the computer and network use policy, and the redesigning of the Website.

Stan is curious if one of the initiatives was to be more cloud-based or to move in that direction and if so, wondered where it would fit in the tech plan. Eric explained that he was not sure if it is discussed within the current plan, or if a section could be added in terms of initiatives because it was not really addressed. This is something that can be addressed in an infrastructure piece but was not addressed when the plan was originally developed. Jose shared concerns about the “cloud-first” approach, where money is not a huge concern. They are also looking at how to roll into a cloud infrastructure, which is ultimately a hosted-cloud environment and can be very expensive. It can also require forklift migrations, which would not work for an institution like ours. Jose hopes we will explore all technologies and that the Committee understands there is all this stuff but it is not what projects are moving forward. Statements about cloud have to disclose what it takes to implement them.

Compared to when the plan started, many things are now referenced that were not before. The next step is creating an operational workflow. Jose added that efficiencies and improvements are high-level stuff and discuss the core principle. Eric noted that the goal is to start recognizing what is going on with technology and if it still makes sense to do it that way. Members asked what is being done now, in order to shift from ERP to the cloud. Jose explained that we host our cloud environment and that it is unique to our environment. In order to move to a hosted cloud, staff would need to be retrained in order to use the tools and their applications. Custom programming would not continue in the same way. The College used to have “Datatel Friday’s”, where staff members could book an hour or two, look at different screens, and learn the functionality, but that has not happened in many years. Jose wondered how something like that would fit within an initiative or bullet point and thought of operational workflow. The Instructional Master Plan does talk about various opportunities and tools for Faculty to be better instructors. Regina added that a lot of learning for Faculty is left to Flex day. Members wondered how online education connects within the Educational Master Plan, due to evolvement of how things are taught. “Your job has changed as we shift to these hosted cloud applications. There is a lot of value in making training available.”

Maria agreed that education is important and needs to be provided to both Faculty and Classified; however, it is unsure if it should be drawn out in the Tech plan.

Should the Tech Plan only emphasize support measures? Various technology classes were offered in the past. The District has to decide if it belongs in the plan itself, or if it is our own responsibility to take said classes. Where are those lines drawn because it is a gray area to support efforts for technology-based trainings? Members wondered if there was some middle ground to identify technology for Faculty and Staff in order to address workflow or operational efficiency or something along those lines. Eric asked for more comments. Melinda agreed with everything being said, and noted that just as a refresh is needed for the computers that people use, a refresh is needed for skills. Thirty minutes does not really help at Flex day. Members do not know how to address having continuous training needed before bringing on new software. A good example of this is Student Planning. In order to keep up with everything there needs to be a resource or plan in place. Melinda suggested sending a communication to managers in various areas that highlight how learning technology takes time and how it would be beneficial to create an action plan for learning the technologies. Jose is comfortable with keeping statements in the "Operational and Workflow Efficiencies" area, but hopes to expand language so it is more actionable and prioritizes this process. Now that the institution is making a shift to a hosted-cloud ERP system, training needs more prioritization.

Next, the plan discusses infrastructure and access. These are things that have been worked on recently in IT. This includes fiber across campus and network switching equipment. These tie into phase one (parts A through C, page 11) of the PlanNet infrastructure assessment. This is paramount, because it is the bedrock of infrastructure and is being used in new ways to support students. Stan suggested leaving it up to Eric to modify. The most obvious parts to modify is the work being done on parts A through C. He may expand on them and on the E bullet. One part not referenced is the main pipe to the campus moving from 1GB to 10GB. This is not listed because it is happening through CENIC and is not an IT-controlled project. The Committee continued to review the document, moving on to "Safety and Security". This covers the emergency and surveillance system on campus. More security tools are being put in place as well. More is still needed to formalize this part of the plan. Eric has conducted "cyber security awareness" training and there is some training on the HR Website. We are consistently looking at new ways to train. Experiences from phishing attacks and viruses have lead the way for more security solutions in place in order to improve our operational efficiencies. Jose suggested adding language for gateway protection being added as an extra bullet because the gateway is different from the endpoint and network security. Endpoint protection; is when spam interacts with the system while gateway protection protects the whole network. Eric asked for more thoughts as he reviewed the rest of the document. Other parts refer to the lion share of information and is the "living document" piece. Appendix parts are being populated and updated regularly.

Eric asked, "Should anything else be added to the plan with respects to equity, beyond some of the language changes and adding information about action plans?" Brian asked how Website support should be addressed. Eric and Jose explained that IT helps with where the Website is hosted, but content moderation falls outside of IT and is managed by the Public Information Officer. Eric addressed Stan's comment about equity and noted that there could be an opportunity for equity and technology to intersect. A section may be added that pertains to equity. Jose noted that the College has provided technology to Faculty, Staff and Students so that they have a more equitable technology experience at Napa Valley College. It is valuable to make a concept relating to equity because it has been an issue for the education sector. It is not a core part of the conversation, but the stay-at-home order completely exposed what an impact technology has on everything. Language should be added that notes that equity is acknowledged.

As next steps, Eric has asked members for suggestions for revising the tech plan and they will review this at the next meeting in April.

6.2 Faculty/Staff Survey instruments

Eric started developing survey instruments that can be used by the District Technology Committee. He noted it is still very rough. He went through the various examples and cherry picked questions to find what survey type would work for Napa Valley College. Eric broke this down into two separate surveys, instead of having one giant survey. The first one is focused on support and customer satisfaction/training. This gets into more of the levels of support by what they have received, types of support etc. Maria commented about the word “terrible” being a descriptive word for support and suggested changing it to “needs improvement or something else”. Jose suggested using a sliding scale. Members agreed and noted that it should be standard throughout the surveys. Stan asked what the Committee hopes to get from the data received by the surveys. The Committee briefly discussed this before, in that it would help us understand how customer support and training options are currently working out and if things are bad or okay. This would help the Committee with setting benchmarks for how we can measure these types of things. Other questions pertain to “how users are doing what you’re doing now. Eric tried to keep the surveys short and adding open-ended questions to obtain more or better feedback. Maria asked users’ need to know what ERP is for the fifth question. This is more for a focused group of users so that everything is covered technology wise. The eighth question starts to ask for details on answers.

A student technology survey sent last spring was through Educause. Eric has conversed with Robyn Wornall about it. From what was said, we could offer an incentive like the Educause system did in the spring. Jose agreed and suggested talking to District Auxiliary Services about café coupons or something that can be offered to participants for completing the survey. To Maria’s questions about number six, perhaps instead of specific language, it could be updated higher-level stuff. Stan agreed and asked why this survey. There is a lot of value in this kind of survey, but the challenge is connecting it back to the Technology Plan.

Another survey in process focuses on general technology usage and satisfaction. The rest of this conversation was tabled for the next meeting. Eric asked members to send him feedback so the surveys can be better refined. Maria agreed and asked if it would give IT the information needed for improving things. Jose posted to the chat: Maybe another parallel that can be created for staff is something similar to step increases for Faculty. Steps are completed with education/training. Jose wondered if this was addressed in the Instructional Master Plan, or elsewhere altogether? Item three is a good example of what I am trying to describe for training, and skills development. It is not saying exactly what product/technology we are implementing, but the bones of the process are described. Actionable language says we are tackling each one of those pieces. San commented in the chat: Will all the survey questions be "required”? Eric added a note to the top of the survey that allow participants to skip questions that do not pertain to them, so they are not all required at this time. This is still being formalized though.

6.3 Active Projects

In terms of active projects, the migration with Office 365 is moving forward. A pilot group is being migrated next week, which involves Administrative Services. This project is underway.

6.4 Committee Reports

- ***Colleague Core/Student Planning Steering (Jose)***

  Jose explained that the institution is moving forward with testing the hosted-cloud solution. Self-Service obtained its first cohort of Faculty. A new update for Self-Service has been released. The last part being worked on for Faculty is having the ability to drop students as well as waivers and petitions. The move to Self-Service may happen by the fall semester and the College can completely move off Web Advisor.

- ***Educational Technology Committee (May)***

May asked Stan to report for the Educations Technology Committee. Due to an increase for the online Distance Education department, an Instructional Designer may be hired to assist Faculty with best practices. This will be a very big help. This has yet to be determined. More information to come.

- ***Guided Pathways Coordinating Team (TBD)***

  Eric does not know if we will continue to get this Committee update, as Jessica is no longer sitting on the District Technology Committee.

7.0 Action Items

8.0 Next Meeting

Friday, March 26, 2021 (10am-11:30am)

Eric is out of the office on this day and opened it up to the Committee to either postpone until April or keep the meeting and Stan would manage it. Members agreed to Postpone the next meeting and will meet again on April 9.

9.0 Adjournment

End Time: 11:32am

Motioned by Stanley Hitchcock, 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	*Brian Lym*	*Robert Harris*	*Classified Lounge*
May Jong	*Vacant – Admin/Conf rep*	*Amber Wade*	*Faculty Lounge*
Regina Orzco	*Vacant – ASNVC rep*	*Dr. Ronald Kraft*	
Melinda Tran		*Robert Parker*	