NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes

April 23, 2021

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

10:00am – 11:30am

1.0 Call to Order

Start Time: 10:06am

Present: Maria Biddenback, Eric Houck, Stanley Hitchcock, May Jong, Brandon Tofanelli, Jose Sanchez, Regina Orozco, Karen Smith, San Lu, and Ryan Poorman.

Note: Melinda Tran, Brian Lym and Patti Morgan were unable to make the meeting. Brandon Tofanelli has returned from paternity leave.

2.0 Introduction of Guests

Welcome Karen Smith and San Lu.

3.0 Adoption of Agenda

3.1 April 23, 2021

Adoption motioned by Stan Hitchcock and seconded by Maria Biddenback. All members agreed.

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 April 9, 2021

Approval motioned by Maria Biddenback and seconded by Regina Orozco. All members agreed.

5.0 Public Comments/Announcements

N/A

6.0 Discussion Items

6.1 Tech Plan Review & Modification

Eric compiled the feedback he received into the revised Tech Plan that he presented to the Committee. A significant change was integrating the approved DTC roles and responsibilities that were in development during the fall semester. The DTC current members were also added to the plan since they are a part of the current editing process. The membership in between was not populated. May and Regina corrected name spellings and Eric revised the plan on the spot. Next, other changes were reflective of the reviewed Academic Senate preamble piece from last year. Since changes are being made to the plan, Eric felt it was the perfect time to integrate it within the plan. Beyond these changes, Stan had suggested a lot of grammatical corrective language which was also included. A question raised at the end was in regards to “implementing” versus “improving” administrative tasks. Members suggested modifying the language to note improving the effectiveness administrative tasks. The Committee wanted to make sure the language they used would be inclusive of everyone throughout the document.

Other changes included redeveloping the graphic which maps the technology initiatives to the strategic initiatives. This was to reflect the addition of the new technology initiative and strategic initiative. The language was also changed on the purple area to note that we are now a community supported District and no longer in the transition period. Stan asked if the blue tab reflects working with educational partners and the gold reflects collaborations between the Community and Civic partners. This will need to be confirmed with the Planning & Budget Committee. Eric asked the Committee if they agreed with how he mapped things out. The basic goal of the chart is to show where technology overlaps with the strategic initiatives. This gives a visual understanding of each aspect. This way, the readers will see how things are interconnected or at least know what to ask about for clarification. Jose noted that the graphic addresses how technology is structured at the planning level. He also noted that the accreditation processes show the cross work of the planning efforts. Brandon asked if there was a description for each intersection. Eric explained that there is not and that it entirely lives within the chart. For the next iteration of plan, members will discuss adding a descriptive paragraph for each initiative correlation. Only textual updates were made to the Tech Plan as of now. Melinda’s suggestions were incorporated in regards to the bullet point that discusses standardization and technology benefits. Eric noted that suggestions from Stan helped sharpen the document.

Eric referred to a suggestion to note that the Public Information Officer is not responsible for the Website at this time, but that it is transition. May asked if the Committee would want to add something stating that the Website is handled with the collaboration of the Office of Public Affairs and Communications. Not a lot of other things have changed, however a lot of solutions have come into pay since the last iteration and is good for future situations. There were also general corrections made. Data Security was added as another bullet to keep it separated from Safety and Security. Jose suggested calling it Cyber Security so that it relates to broader topics for IT.

Finally yet importantly, Eric kept the prior addition of the new initiative for Technology Equity and Access that was added to the initiatives at the previous meeting as it aligns well with the strategic plan. May had some feedback for some of the appendix items but members will focus on the overall plan, then appendix items at a later time. The Committee discussed if the preamble statement should still be linked in the appendix documents now that it is incorporated earlier in the document. Eric will keep this in both places for now. Maria asked where the revised plan would go next, since the Counsel of Presidents already approved the role and mission document. We would bring it to the Planning & Budget Committee first because they oversee all plans in general. Members discussed not being able to bring it to them until May. Members also discussed sending it to the Academic Senate as an informational item for now. Members agreed to adopt this revision and move it out of the District Technology Committee. This was motioned by Maria Biddenback and seconded by Stan Hitchcock. All were in favor.

6.2 Faculty/Staff Survey instruments

Eric discussed survey instruments with the Research Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE) office. He has not received any feedback on the survey questions themselves. Eric reviewed questions with members. The first survey is for Technology Usage & Perception. There are not a lot of changes compared to last time. Stan asked if the statement about being 18 or older applies to our students. One suggested item was to have kind of an explanatory paragraph that notes why we are sending the survey out. The explanatory piece will get embedded within the survey when sent. Maria asked questions about question number nine. She suggested splitting this into two options for work computer versus personal computer. Jose suggested listing expected categories and having other as an option if participants want to explain their situation. Members suggested various options including, "I use my personal laptop because I am unable to bring my office computer home…" Maria added that for meetings she uses her personal iPad because she cannot bring her desktop with her in the field. Jose suggested, "I use my personal laptop because of mobility. Another can be, my office computer runs too slow or doesn't have the software needed..." Karen suggested, "I need the mobility that the laptop provides." Another category might be computer availability since Adjunct instructors do not have dedicated systems on campus.

Regina asked if there was any way to address what type of user they are within the question. Eric noted that in the beginning of the survey, participants are asked to identify who they are by employee type. If many Adjuncts answer then we would be able to get more details around that but it is unsure if we want to ask for those specifics yet. Eric is interested to see what is found with the initial surveys, and then the Committee would have the opportunity to refine it as meetings proceed. Eric asked for more feedback. May and Eric discussed the length of the question and overall survey. May added that it might be good not to have it be longer. Even if the mobility question is never resolved, the "other" option covers all bases. Eric reviewed the survey further. The spectrum from very satisfied to very dissatisfied was also incorporated for number 13.

The Committee reviewed the survey pertaining to Technology Support and Training Satisfaction. There were not a lot of changes because most of them were made at the previous meeting. Maria noted that 11, 12 and 13 should be swapped out and to make sure there was consistency with "No" being a second option after "Yes". Jose added that number 13 should be updated to match the satisfied spectrum. Stan asked if these surveys are built upon concept or variable concepts to the master plan or if they get tied to operational goals. Eric noted that it was a little of both. The Support and Training survey is more for the IT Department. Depending on the results, it can also shift the focus for the Technology Master Plan. All of the information is good for IT to know though as well. Stan noted that results are also useful for the accreditation process to provide evidence around how technology is used. Eric noted that, "At the end of the day, we are hoping to make improvements…" Eric suggested conducting a survey that members like and use it to build out the survey more from there." It will help make the development of master plans easier.

Eric noted that the Committee might receive feedback from RPIE prior to sending the survey out, with hopes of sending the surveys out by the end of the semester. Members were not convinced the surveys would get everyone's attention. The aim is now to get the survey approved by the end of the semester and to initiate them in the fall when everyone returns for the coming academic year.

Maria commented on the timing of getting meeting materials and explained that the Brown Act needs should be followed because people can complain. If anyone takes issue with this, the Committee could be in trouble.

6.3 Active Projects

Eric discussed active projects with the Committee. He noted that the last steps of the email migration to O365are being worked on. IT is working to take some services offline from the physical servers, in order to move them to a virtual box. This will require some downtime in the not so distant future. It is targeted for May 2nd. The Azure cloud migration for SSO is also scheduled a week from today and IT is working with external partners to make this happen. IT is hoping to get the word out through Public Relations and Communications Office. From the migration on, both Office 365 and Canvas will use Azure cloud single-sign-on. The biggest change that users will see is the theme of the login page. Eventually, IT will migrate other services that utilize single-sign-on as well. Brandon asked if the 404 error would be resolved when Canvas is moved to the cloud. Brandon also asked if the DE email would be migrated automatically or if he should put in a ticket. Eric noted that it would be part of the cleanup, which is being worked on now, but that it would not hurt to put in a support ticket. Eric noted that a lot of the accounts that don't have ID's associated have not been used and are very old, so the process is taking longer than anticipated. Creating a ticket may speed up the process for the DE account to be migrated.

Maria asked if people are able to access the old link for the various service accounts. Jose explained that it was hard to link to https://webmail.napavalley.edu and that people should still be able to access them if their mailbox is located on the old servers. Jose also noted that one issue with migrating the DE email over is that it is a shared mailbox accessed by the whole DE team. The account is currently setup as a user and not a shared mailbox. This will change with the migration. It would not be setup as its own delivery mailbox and would go to all of the DE team. More changes must be made so that there is a team based files storage as well. Now that full SSO is in process, workflows for documentation can change and a team workflow can be created. The best-case scenario is that there is a MS Teams-based file storage and have a Distance Education Teams presence. User submits a form of action and the business process will change so documents do not get moved to devices and etc. All of the documentation would live in one place and be accessible at all times. Eric noted that we are in the transition phase and the possibilities for what is able to be done are changing. The migration to Office 365 are the first steps to open up the doors to many more possibilities. More information will come later.

6.4 Committee Reports

- Colleague Core/Student Planning Steering (Jose)

The Colleague Core group has been helping to test within Self-Service. Now users are seeing the latest and greatest. This came with minor changes. The biggest thing was for Faculty to bring all of the features used in Web Advisor to Self-Service. Now we just need to complete testing. The ability to drop students, certify rosters, waitlists have been configured and the last one is to add waivers. Within Student-planning, some of the menu items changed. Jose will write a draft of the changes and share it with the group to report both changes and progress.

- Educational Technology Committee (May)

The Educations Technology Committee drafted a statement in support of the District Technology Committee Refresh Plan. This was approved at the Academic Senate and the President is now taking it to the Board of Trustees.

6.0 Action Items

7.1 Tech Plan Revision

Members agreed to adopt this revision and move it out of the District Technology Committee. This was motioned by Maria Biddenback and seconded by Stan Hitchcock. All were in favor.

7.2 Faculty/Staff Survey instruments

Eric proposed tabling this vote until the next meeting, in order to give more time for adequate feedback. If there is no real feedback, the Committee will move forward with what they have. This was motioned by Stan Hitchcock and seconded by Maria Biddenback.

8.0 Next Meeting

Friday, May 7, 2021 (10am-11:30am)

9.0 Adjournment

End Time: 11:30am

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Stanley Hitchcock

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	*Patti Morgan*	*Amber Wade*	*Faculty Lounge*
Regina Orzco	*Vacant – ASNVC rep*	*Dr. Ronald Kraft*	
Melinda Tran		*Robert Parker*	