



NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE  
TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING

**Minutes**

**April 9, 2021**

<https://napavalley-edu.zoom.us/j/99311775768?pwd=b1hLYIVSRnh5TkgrNTZlRUcxK1ZhQT09>

**10:00am – 11:30am**

## 1.0 Call to Order

**Start Time:** 10:03am

**Present:** Eric Houck, Melinda Tran, Maria Biddenback, May Jong, Stan Hitchcock, Jose Sanchez, Regina Orozco, San Lu, Patti Morgan, Daniel Vega and Karen Smith

**Note:** Brandon Tofanelli is still out on paternity leave. Patti Morgan is now officially on the District Technology Committee.

## 2.0 Introduction of Guests

Eric welcomed Daniel Vega and San Lu to the meeting and Karen Smith joined later.

## 3.0 Adoption of Agenda

Approval motioned by Stan Hitchcock, seconded by Patti Morgan.

## 4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 March 12, 2021

Approval motioned by Stan Hitchcock, seconded by Regina Orozco, May Jong abstained for being absent.

## 5.0 Public Comments/Announcements

Patti was welcomed as an official member of the Committee.

## 6.0 Discussion Items

### 6.1 Faculty/Staff Survey instruments

Eric reviewed the semi-revised survey instruments that were shared previously. The Committee walked through the changes made to the Support & Training Satisfaction survey, and discussed further suggestions. Eric removed the incentive for taking the survey because it might be hard to facilitate at this time and is better for larger audiences. Jose added that since District funds must be used in certain ways it would also be hard to do. Patti also noted that the “Cash for College” event has to be done with donated funds through the Foundation as well. Regina suggesting adding a statement explaining the reasoning behind the survey including how the DTC is hearing participants clearly and would like to make changes that improve the technology on campus. Eric aimed to include the various employee types as suggested at the previous meeting. The option for “Other” was left on many of the questions so that if people would like to explain in better detail they can. By in large the ranking questions now note “satisfied” scale instead of derogatory language and N/A is also an option. Eric tried to align this throughout both surveys. The Committee hopes to refine the questions so that they are better. The ERP system was delineated as the Colleague system because that is what most users know.

The delineated terms for VP were removed because they were not needed. Other changes included removing the terminology about the Professional Development Center and replaced it with "District ran training" instead. May shared suggestions to number seven where trainings change to campus wide. May also noted the difference between classroom and conference room technologies. Members also suggested explaining it as internal and external training sessions. Stan likes Campus run instead of District run. Patti suggested defining it as, "if trainings are put on by NVC staff members or an outside vendor." Jose suggested, "Attended internal NVC training sessions, non-NVC training sessions and etc." Patti, Eric and Jose discussed this further. Group training sessions led by NVC staff or led by non-NVC/vendors. Groups versus one-on-one training and vendor led versus NVC led. Regina wondered if the question should be asked if whether they did the training on Flex day or on their own. Patti suggested adding, "Excluding Flex day..." Patti and Jose also aimed to stay inclusive and noted to say NVC Employee rather than Faculty or Staff. Jose wondered if it should be more granular. Eric noted that this is the first pass at doing something this formal for surveys. Perhaps removing where the training was held and keeping it broader is the key. Some of the answers from this survey will lead us to ask other questions in future surveys. The goal is to conduct these surveys annually. Clarification on security was provided and Eric stated that training is not mandatory at this time. The Committee looked at question twelve and agreed with it. Jose discussed question eleven and suggested saying, "were you aware NVC provides cyber security training?" Patti suggested removing the note about mandatory training to make the survey more simple. The Committee removed the last question since there is no incentive. Maria suggested to make sure answers are standardized across the board. Eric will make edits and bring it back to the Committee at the next meeting.

The Committee reviewed the survey for Technology Usage & Perception. It is composed of the meat and potatoes that would interest the District Technology Committee. Similar changes were made to this survey. The incentive was dropped, the confidential role was added. Per previous edits, Eric went with the District term. Patti noted that in this case it would be appropriate to delineate District instead of Campus or NVC. Eric also tried to align the satisfied to NA spectrum within this survey. The Committee discussed question seven, which discusses how many times you use your personal computer for work or District owned device. Patti noted that some of her staff are using one of the district computers and one of their personal computers to keep the same setup as they have on campus. Maria asked if percentages could be used instead. It may be hard to do and requires more math in the participants head. Helping people get a quick answer assists with more feedback. Jose added that he uses both his work and personal computer simultaneously to work from home. Web work is on the personal and internal work is done on his work laptop. Melinda looked at the questions and asked if it is supposed to be in a future, pre-Covid or Covid environment. Jose suggested asking the question like, "In a pre-Coronavirus environment, how would you use your personal computer?" The Committee discussed how users must have VPN rights to remote to their desktop. Prior to Coronavirus, there were very few instances of VPN usage. Things have changed because of the remote work environment and things will never be truly normal. The Committee added an option for "other" in case participants want to explain exactly what they need. Members noted if someone feels really strongly about something then they would write it in. Otherwise they might skip the question altogether. Members discussed removing answer D to reduce the number of options. Members also wondered if using a personal device to remote to their desktop can be a security breach issue. Patti added that this might need to be reviewed. Regina was unaware of VPN/Remote Desktop access and is not sure if it is worth including at this point because others might be unaware as well. For the next question, members suggested asking, "Are you using VPN/Remote Desktop on your personal device?" Jose explained that currently everyone is able to use web resources for working remotely. The people that do need to work with the internal systems are provided with laptops and remote access on a case-by-case basis. In other cases employees are using their personal device to remote in using VPN. Daniel added that VPN is a secure method. The end user can technically open a backdoor; however, VPN is a locked door. Yet, there is always a risk because end users still have the ability to bring something through their connection. It is a good thing that our campus has a smaller footprint than others do.

Eric reviewed more of the survey with the Committee. Some of the questions were moved so they made more sense, more services were added. The “satisfied to N/A spectrum” really does not apply in every question to this survey as it does in the other. Number 13 will be changed with Maria’s suggestion. Eric asked for more feedback to see if anything else should be added. One suggestion Brian had made via email was merging both surveys into one survey. Members feel it is best to keep them separate. The next step is to run these surveys by the Office of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness for any additions or suggestions for improvement. Once complete, the surveys can be sent by the end of the semester. Regina suggested sampling the survey with a few people. May asked if the goal was to have the surveys as an action item for the next meeting. Eric confirmed.

## **6.2 Tech Plan Review & Modification**

Eric sent slight revisions to members of the Committee prior to this meeting. They reviewed the additions. Last time the Committee discussed extending the plan for an additional year to give time for building the next iteration. The strategic initiative was added to match the Educational Master Plan. That also helps explain why the Technology Plan is being edited and extended. The chart will be updated so that it matches the strategic plan as well; showing that we have now transitioned into being Community funded. The Equity component was also added under number five, titled; Technology Equity & Access. Eric asked if this was appropriate. Stan had gone through the plan over the break and did some pen and ink changes but wishes he saw the revised copy first. He will go through the current revised document and send additions to Eric so they can be included. Patti suggested adding “providing hardware and/or software to staff” because it is not going away. Members suggested explaining that items are checked out for telecommuting purposes. Eric asked for more feedback. May added that if telecommuting continues, we should ask if people are interested in changing from Desktops to laptops for their work equipment. Conducting evaluations of tech solutions was added to the proposed actions. Jose noted that there are better options than having institutionally managed hardware. We have talked about Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) for a long time, but it is expensive. Through Single-Sign-On (SSO), there is an evolving portal and dashboard presence. Things are integrated in that way. Once this is done, application access is available over the web rather than on hardware that needs to be maintained at all times. Going the VDI route allows users to login once and be one click away from everything they need.

In terms of next steps, Eric asked members to send edits/suggestions to Eric so he can incorporate them by the next meeting. Eric will resend this version and would like suggestions as soon as possible.

Melinda added that since NVC went “mobile”, it has really transformed both learning and teaching. Now everything is online when some classes had never been online in the past. This has opened up many doors for students. More students can attend various classes they need to graduate. This also opened up learning to a completely new population of students we did not have before. Patti added that it forced NVC to move forward more quickly than before and it will continue. This remote move really exposed the shortcomings that have been institutional choices. The hope is to send this version to the Planning & Budget Committee by the end of the spring semester so implementation can take place by the fall. Maria noted that the last membership update on the plan was from 2018. Eric will update to include the current and past members. Stan will look at the document and make his edits using Office 365. Melinda asked if the draft can be shared with others. Eric said sure. Eric asked if when sharing, a little context can be given and that some suggested changes may need to wait until the next iteration of Technology Master Plan.

## **6.3 Active Projects**

Eric has been out of the office and is not completely up to speed on recent project status updates. He noted that some IT folks were on the meeting and that they can provide more insight if needed. There was an outage on April 1<sup>st</sup>, which may have been a part of a larger DNS issue experienced by Microsoft. The IT staff put a lot of time into getting things back up and running and worked directly with Microsoft to resolve. The ongoing migration to Office 365 has continued and there were some challenges around how users are using their email and getting to their email. IT has reached almost everyone so far. We are in cleanup mode now for any straggler accounts. A lot of inactive accounts were found in the Adjunct Faculty ranks. These updates will also help clean things up for the next iteration of Website and its directory components. IT is continuing to work on the next major initiatives. This includes moving Single-Sign-On to the Azure Cloud. The first step to this is moving the accounts. Eric asked for any questions or concerns. Patti agreed and noted that it is much easier to get email on phone because of the Outlook application. Jose added that there is really cool stuff for users within Teams as well. Eric noted that there is an ongoing conversation because the migration does not unlock everything, but allows us to start using those tools. There will be other rollouts as more features are configured for use.

#### **6.4 Committee Reports**

- Colleague Core/Student Planning Steering (Jose)

There has been no Colleague Core meetings recently. Jose did note that Student Planning is working well and the pilot group working with Faculty functionality, then NVC will be able to migrate off of Web Advisor completely.

- Educational Technology Committee (May)

The ETC has drafted a statement in support of the Replacement Plan. It is currently in the approval process and may arrive to the District Technology Committee by May. The ETC will discuss this more at a future meeting.

#### **7.0 Action Items**

#### **8.0 Next Meeting**

Friday, April 23, 2021 (10am-11:30am)

#### **9.0 Adjournment**

**End Time:** 11:27am

Motioned by Maria Biddenback, seconded by Stan Hitchcock

#### **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*