NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE

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, Sta

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

transition happens, faculty may have to submit these on paper so it can be processed in Admissions & Records