NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes

May 21, 2021

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

10:00am – 11:30am

1.0 Call to Order

Start Time: 10:04am

Present: Eric Houck, Brandon Tofanelli, May Jong, Melinda Tran, Brian Lym, Stan Hitchcock, Jose Sanchez, Maria Biddenback, San Lu and Ryan Poorman.

Note: Patti Morgan is attending the MESA graduation

2.0 Introduction of Guests

Ryan Poorman was a guest at the meeting.

3.0 Adoption of Agenda

Approval motioned by Jose Sanchez and seconded by Brian Lym

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 May 7, 2021

Approval motioned by Stan Hitchcock and seconded by Brian Lym May abstained because of missing the meeting.

5.0 Public Comments/Announcements

N/A

6.0 Discussion Items

6.1 Faculty/Staff Survey instruments

The District Technology Committee has not received feedback from RPIE and there is nothing new to share at this time. Maria asked if they were looking at both surveys, (Educause and NVC) or just the one. They are focusing on getting an analysis finished for the Educause survey. Eric assumes that they were okay with everything that everything that asked in the DTC survey. Maria asked if it is something that should be discussed with Counsel of Presidents just so they know that we are waiting for their feedback before conducting the survey. Stan and Eric were in attendance at the Budget & Planning meeting this morning and this discussion item got tabled until the next meeting. The DTC will most likely need to attend one of their meetings when they reconvene in the fall. The Committee will wait until at least September to send the survey out. Eric is thinking of partnering with the RPIE office to present the results of the Educause survey to staff in the summer and Faculty in the fall. They are hoping to have an analysis version with some conclusions or topical things to discuss but it is still in process at this time. This is the firsts time this survey has been conducted at Napa Valley College so it has not been done internally in the past. Eric would like to see this survey conducted on the Napa Valley College campus at least every other year.

6.2 2021-22 Tentative Budget

Eric did not know if anyone got a chance to attend the open forum or seen the slides. Eric reviewed them with the Committee and noted that they came from the Budget Committee last Friday. He did not go over details but wanted to discuss the technology components. One thing that the Planning & Budget Committee was focused on was special funding sources that might be available in the coming year. One piece being considered by Cabinet is leveraging existing technology and infrastructure so that the focus is on using tools we have before procuring new solutions. May asked for an example and noted what if the existing is broken? For example, rather than purchasing a new survey tool of software solution, training on the current systems is needed. The document imaging solution is already past its life span. May commented, "...It seems like no one understands that we have been leveraging…" Jose appreciated May seeing the importance of what has been happening. Maria asked what the Planning & Budget Committee was referencing then. Eric noted that Bob didn't give specific examples at the meeting but wants to make sure the College is utilizing solutions that are on hand. Maria asked if they would look to IT for a list or anything. IT is not consulted on this so he is not sure what decisions are made or how. AV Refresh is highlighted in the tentative budget. Members asked if there was a plan for refresh. It is on the list in order to refresh a portion of the classrooms as far as Audio Visual goes. Eric hopes this will be an ongoing expenditure. To this point, Eric is not sure what classrooms this funding will be intended for. IT would need to meet with the Office of Academic Affairs to see what their focus is for the funding.

May backtracked. So far, you nor IT has been consulted about leveraging existing technologies as opposed to new purchases. Therefore, somebody made that decision without talking to IT and that is very problematic. This is also, what happened with the decision to lease rather than purchase. Phase one of the core infrastructure upgrade is part of a leasing arrangement. Maria asked if the printers and scanners were on a leasing agreement. Eric explained that only the large-scale machines are on a lease agreement. Maria asked who is deciding if IT is not consulted? Eric shared that at this point there is still a fiscal audit going on for last year. Financing agencies cannot be consulted about leasing computers until this is finished. Members asked who decided to improve the technology in the PAC lobby for 90k. Eric explained that they would like to add displays in the PAC lobby so it is ready for both a meeting space and presentation space. It would also help facilitate more information for performances etc. There was previous conversation in 2019-2020 prior to the pandemic. The last conversation did not move forward financially. May added that she was happy to see AV classroom refresh on the list because it hasn't been approved in a while. The PAC Lobby was in their unit plan and approved. May noted that the Digital Art unit was approved for cameras as well. Maria noted added that she is glad they are looking at unit plans. The PAC lobby is a larger space and can accommodate larger groups. If Maria remembers correctly, the PAC lobby has always been limited as far as who can use it. From what is learned at division meetings, the PAC lobby upgrades are to make it more student friendly as well as utilize the space better.

Eric discussed other items on the list that had funding approved. Fiber upgrades for 30k does not represent everything but some of the work/hardware that is needed but does represent some. Various needs include; edge switching, replacing the switching in various buildings. Stan asked is new fiber being pulled through existing ways but not including trenching. Very few places need to consider trenching. Adding fiber to areas on campus where we do not actively have fiber installed can get very expensive. Ryan added to the chat: Yes, to replace existing fiber. Also expanding wireless access points per Eric, not sure what areas will be targeted. There is also a plan to increase and fix the technology in the room to make it more of a common meeting space, and would allow it to be used as a large classroom space if need be. Part of this came from the space utilization study that happened. It is assumed that this came from a unit proposal as well. The Board Room is located in the center of the 1500 building. Jose noted that it serves as an emergency operations center during an emergency.

Lastly, per the Budget Forum, funding sources that have been proposed include; technology fee funds and stimulus package funds as well as funds from the Cares Act and we can assume that a lot of the funding will be directed to technology needs. Maria asked if students get a vote to how the technology fee funds are used. Eric expects they give their yay to how funds are used, but thinks that the challenge related to technology is that they are actually District needs rather than student needs specifically. Various proposals that have come out of IT are yearly expenses that we want to see next year to continue replacing technology as needed. That said, this is an odd year so they are focused on using those funding sources. They will need to look at incorporating this into a yearly budget moving forward though. Maria asked who would do that. What assistance can the District Technology give to assist with this need? It seems that proposals are being funded without IT having prior knowledge of the proposals. Are the fiber upgrades going to affect my building (800) or another? From a Faculty standpoint, there are students who do not have access; there is no place to take a test. HESI testing was split up between three areas and I had to check with IT to make sure a test can be given in the rooms. It would be beneficial for IT and the DTC to have a closer connection with how the budget is developed and we need to have it come from the IT area because we continue to have the same issues. May suggested putting things in the Technology Master Plan that need to be regularly scheduled. Members discussed how somewhere along the line the implementation aspect is a problem on campus. Eric noted that Robert Van Der Velde proposed that one think we need to do a better job of is how priorities are in alignment with the initiatives and how things are aligned with our District Technology plans as well. Brian asked who was in charge. Is the District Technology Committee really the Committee that makes the decisions or is it those that are blessed by the Counsel of Presidents? Jose shared that this has been a concern of his for a while now. Where does the authority rest? We as a District Technology Committee get a lot of information; ideally, we are configured from all constituencies and have experts in the field as well as students. It does not seem appropriate for the proposals from other bodies act as though it needs to be sent to them for their blessing.

Brian shared that he was actively working on write up 2.5 for accreditation and dealing with how decisions get made around technology. They are looking at the governance structure. Unit plans and all of these Committees and program review have all taken some stakeholder input on desired technologies and unit plans put their requests through. All of this should triangulate to this group. Stan and Maria commented; the DTC needs to make a better stand. There are many concerns about what is on the approved list of funding proposals and it is more of a concern because the DTC is unaware of some of these items. Where was the conversation? No one in the Technology area knew about it or had any input. It seems whoever has the loudest voice gets heard, so we need to get loud. Jose added it is all about efficiency and process. We are taking the time to discuss the issues. As a member of both IT and Classified, he can bring workloads, workflows etc. When this type of work gets proposed, all other voices to hear that and bring it back to their constituent bodies. A more focused discussion is needed. The DTC ends up with information that others already have. The same conversation is not needed five times to satisfy one constituency group. A clear delineation of duties is needed and it should be up to the Committee to decide whether to tweak the plan or not. We as a body should not review the same item seven times, when the recommendation moves forward. It needs to go to the Executive and President’s cabinets so everyone sees it and it also needs to be understood. There has been a problem with the communications structure or the various constituencies did not put the time. Our authority as a Committee needs to be clearly defined otherwise we are a waste of time and our time needs to be respected. Eric agreed and noted that everyone was brining great concerns up. Melinda agreed as well. Jose added, “A title without authority is useless.” Eric explained that he is an advocate of transparency and is concerned about the tentative budget as the tentative budget is approved then the campus is on break for a few months. There is no opportunity to look at it and give feedback and this is a challenge procedurally. In the past year, we have been out of the budget development cycle and more cross representation is needed.

Maria suggested adding a discussion item to review both the Technology Committee and the Educational Technology Committee’s roles and confirm that the Counsel of Presidents is the approving body. Their responsibility is to disseminate information and obtain feedback. Brian noted that he never worked with a company like this and would normally make reports to the executive cabinet and that was it. Planning and Budget did vote on it, we don’t approve the budget, we forward it to the President that forwards it to the Board of Trustees. Committee’s do not have the power to approve and disapprove. Eric noted a summer homework plug for the Committee. Members that joined us this year, review the minutes for more discussions around this topic and it will help us hit the ground running when we reconvene.

Also, add Stan’s work with accreditation would further help support the recommendation. Other things that were approved include; replacement of the document imaging solution for Admissions & Records to store student documents. Other parts include E-Books, Inspiration. Brian noted that the E-Books to acquire collections and titles of various E-Books. This would grant access for Ebsco Academic E-Books curated and selected by college librarians. We at colleges have the opportunity to add on through licensing agreements to other kinds of collections available to renew on the platform. It allows us to purchase titles that are viewed a certain number of times. Maria asked if the usage is delineated as to where. Brian explained, “We can see the metrics for what books are used etc. The cost for E-Books is much higher than just getting a book off the shelf. The prices range from $150.00 to $300.00 or more depending on the publisher. Academic publishers have libraries captive and hostage in this scenario. We just license our materials then we purchase E-Books on top of that. There are many rules and it has completely changed the way libraries have done business. Jose added that this highlights a major concern and a big shift in the modern age. Hybrid hosted and you are paying to borrow the titles. Originally, this was financed through the Chancellor’s office and the FCCC, but not all titles are there forever. It is a good thing that digital libraries are not research collections and we are spared that responsibility. This is extremely unhealthy and non-sustainable. E-text book publishers have institutions in a barrel. May agreed with Jose and Brian and explained that Adobe also holds the college hostage. There are also discussions about films on demand. This causes us to subscribe to a very expensive service that can raise the price at any time. Due to this, we are faced with the challenge of changing technology. Jose explained that this requires an evolution to infrastructure so that it can be supported and it takes everything. The next generation of media services is underway. The dedicated screens in LLRC need to make priority distribution of content at all times, but that comes with a lot of cost. OER is on the list as many libraries are looking at this. Maria asked if this would help support textbooks that a program asked to provide a book in the library. Brian responded, “We have been acquiring E-Books for an upcoming English class. We can source and get it as long as it is not strictly Pearson.” True textbooks are really held hostage by the publishers and they do not want to sell traditional textbooks. Libraries jobs are to make things affordable to students. Maria noted that the book bundle for Health Occupations is over $2000.00. In order to make these types of books available for students we would need to invest over $10,000.00 to make a deal with publishers. During the pandemic a number of publishers were taking a look at Biblio U and E-copies of textbooks that could be available to all students. The biggest question is how this issue can be addressed because it is a bigger issue.

Other items that were approved were Strong workforce and Perkins equipment. Some projects are moving forward and others may not. This will include the CTE programs and perhaps some of the LLRC expenditures in regards to media rooms and Sheree has gotten estimates for this. Four of the rooms are to have more of a collaborative configuration. This technology is used in other universities and workplaces. Media requests get approved outside of the District Technology Committee. Eric moved on to the President’s area. They are expanding the NEOGOV solution to include software for benefits, onboarding and etc. Some of this is being funded out of an IEPI grant. Eric suggested that anyone who can review the budget forum to please do so. There was a lot of technology in the approved budget. One positive is that we have some things. This was a good discussion but there is clearly room for improvement.

6.3 2021-22 DTC Goals & Objectives

Eric discussed the DTC Goals & Objectives with the Committee. He noted that at the end of each year, members review goals and objectives that were set in the previous year and start to discuss goals and objectives for the coming year. We obviously had to change gears but think our change of course was a good decision that give more time for development. Not a lot has been done this year. Discussion around IT Governance models and how it can be improved have been great. We have good passion to work with and proposals to make. Please go back and look at discussions from the past. This will help us move further in the fall. Transparency is another area where we need to develop a more formalized way of funding models and new projects. Looking at how things get prioritized and hopefully the District Technology Committee can weigh in on it. Computer refresh is done each year and we still need to build out a software inventory. Another thing to think about is developing a policy procedure around accessibility. This will need to be an official Board and Administrative Policy. The last goal is around developing survey instruments. As we discussed, plan on conducting this survey in the fall and having it inform the next iteration of Technology Plan.

Maria noted that a priority would be the IT Governance piece. The deadline can be the end of September, then the new budget cycle usually starts again. The importance of the DTC and ETC needs to be established. Ryan asked what the correlation between on and off campus, instruction would be. Eric noted that he thinks Dr. Sarah Parker presented information about the fall schedule. Around 30% of classes will be in person but instruction will remain primarily online. There are many discussions happening but our focus is to get back to normal or a desire to maintain positive aspects around the “new normal”. What is really the future of technology and how does it look down the road. This can be discussed further within this body, as this is an ongoing and fluid situation. Eric asked for more feedback. He imagines a lot of the goals and objectives from last year will carry over and more goals/objectives will be set in the fall. Please send any feedback to Eric for the fall.

6.4 Active Projects

There were no a lot of updates. SSO connections have been restored and everything has been officially connected through the Azure cloud. The big challenge has been working with some of the vendors and continuing to triage student tickets for Canvas and Office 365.

6.5 Committee Reports

- Colleague Core/Student Planning Steering (Jose)

  There is no real update. The Faculty drop function is now available in self-service. Another one to add authorization will be going live with testing in the summer and by mid-fall it will be open and all faculty can abandon Web Advisor completely.
- Educational Technology Committee (May)

  N/A

7.0 Action Items

8.0 Next Meeting

This is to be determined. Sheree will be reaching out soon to play calendar calculus to figure out when it will be best to meet in the fall. Faculty may have schedules for the fall, if so please share them with Sheree. Eric thanked members for a good year and for all of their contributions. Maria added that she does not know if the Academic Committee approved Committee assignments yet and she through her hat in to be the co-chair for the Budget & Planning Committee. May is also terming off the Committee. They were thanked for their contributions and members hate to see them go.

9.0 Adjournment

End Time: 11:31am

Motioned by Stan Hitchcock and seconded by Maria Biddenback

Distribution

Eric Houck – Co-Chair
Stanley Hitchcock – Co-Chair
Maria Biddenback
May Jong
Regina Orzco
Melinda Tran
Jose Sanchez
Brandon Tofanelli
Brian Lym
Patti Morgan
Vacant – ASNVC rep

Agenda & Minutes Only

Eileene Tejada
Martin Shoemaker
Robert Harris
Amber Wade
Dr. Ronald Kraft
Robert Parker

Bulletin Boards

Administrative Bldg.
ASNVC Office
Classified Lounge
Faculty Lounge