



**NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE**  
**TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Minutes**

**September 10th, 2021**

**1:00pm – 2:30pm**

<https://napavalley-edu.zoom.us/j/99205514123?pwd=dXVFSG1Gek1jNUpYbjdNS2Q4RzQ0UT09>

**1.0 Call to Order**

**Start Time:** 1:05pm

**Present:** Roger Clague, Stanley Hitchcock, Jose Sanchez, Diane Van Deusen, Brian Lym, David Soto Gonzalez, San Lu, Regina Orozco, Daniel Vega and Ryan Poorman.

**Note:** N/A

**2.0 Introduction of Guests**

Stan welcomed our newest student representative David Soto Gonzalez. Ryan Poorman and Daniel Vega were welcomed as guests.

**3.0 Adoption of Agenda**

3.1 September 10, 2021

Motioned by Diane Van Deusen, seconded by Regina Orozco

**4.0 Approval of Minutes**

4.1 August 27, 2021

Motioned by Roger Clague, seconded by Jose Sanchez

Diane abstained from approving the minutes because she did not get a chance to review them, Brian abstained because he was absent. Roger also proposed shortening the minutes because it takes a lot to get them put together as well as them being a long read. This will be revisited after Chris Farmer joins the Committee because the details will be helpful while he is absent.

**5.0 Public Comments/Announcements**

N/A

**6.0 Discussion Items**

**6.1 Technology Plan**

Stan turned the meeting over to Roger. He apologized in advance for anything offending members that helped write it. Moving forward Roger would like the Technology Plan to inspire readers and wishes to make it both aspirational and motivational. The current plan is something to read at bedtime if sleeping is difficult. Currently, the plan seems to be “business as usual”. Roger

feels like the mission statement should be revitalized and the vision statement should be before the mission statement. The first item to add is a vision for the future of technology on campus. The grand vision needs to be discussed. What is our vision of technology in our college?

Roger asked members to think about it so the Committee can make something aspirational. Roger asked for thoughts and comments around the mission. We need a tech plan that wants us to aim higher with our technology. How can our students be better served? Training is mentioned in the Technology Plan, however it just notes that training will be provided and that is doing the bare minimum. This is not favored. Stan noted that these were very valid points. He also noted that the last revision was a fancy edit of the plan so that current technology and initiatives are noted.

Roger would like the current membership to be added. He noted that the update to the plan will include corrected information and it will be re-written in a way that is both inspirational and aspirational. The shared vision should have been listed at the beginning of the plan. The current plan notes goals that can be reached in ten years instead of five. The IT goals should also support the campus vision. We can make it more student centric and student driven. The plan really needs to be something dynamic that includes standardization of technology as long as it is relevant because relevance is more important than standardization. Roger would like to also remove proposed actions. Roger asked if members were okay making it more of a dynamic plan. All members agreed.

Roger will start to build a strawman so we can get input for it. Stan asked if the Alternate Media Specialist should be included. This is being based off of experience with being a fellow at a chartered institute. In addition, the underlying principles that Roger is trying to incorporate into the plan have to do with making our jobs and our Committees fun.

## **6.2 ISER Documentation**

Roger noted that the Committee is a little behind the curve on this. It is a part of accreditation where we explain how we are meeting each standard. If a bad job had been done on the first drafts, then there should be many updates. Roger will meet with Jim and Robyn on Monday. We are unsure of the responses per standard three. He doesn't want to make huge changes so we aren't too out of step. In accreditation we don't want to draw attention to ourselves.

Roger asked for members to share their comments and/or thoughts as they reviewed the document. In a few weeks, the Committee will vote and move forward.

## **6.3 Technology Refresh Plan**

Members discussed the Technology Refresh Plan. This proposal was written a few years ago and approved, however it was never fully implemented. There have been challenges around financing and money had to be spent on other things instead. In the future, it should be something initially approved here, they approved by the Board of Trustees. This would give more strength for funding. The systems that were configured for Self-Service were 14 year old switches and routers so it is not a surprise when these things fail. The switches

and routers running Self-Service should have been replaced six years ago if the plan were followed accordingly.

Moving forward, the Committee would like to come up with a refresh plan that is incorporated in the strategic plan. This means that the refresh will happen. This can also be built into the system expectations so that a refresh is provided for all IT equipment. The aim is to get to 99.9%~ reliability as it will do a huge service to students, faculty, staff and administrators alike. A meaningful plan is needed.

Jose shares his concerns. Adding the refresh plan to the strategic plan was discussed but it was never added to the strategic plan. It can and should say that there is a documented refresh plan and we will stick to that plan and execute according to the plan, but it never got added to the actual strategic plan. From the Classified perspective, when things are better, Classified can do their work better. In five years we need to replace this level of equipment in the datacenter and it can cost this much. When systems work and are maintained, people will work better. Bad planning has been the cause to most of our issues because the budgetary planning number was not set in stone.

IT gets labeled as negative because we said no. It's the fact that we ask questions. Us as the experts understand what is being asked because it relies on its foundation. These switches have to be in place and the backend needs to be configured in order for these features to work correctly. Roger shared that when he moves on he wants the team to be prepared so IT isn't in the same spot again.

#### **6.4 Survey Instruments**

This was tabled for the next meeting and changed to the tech plan can be incorporated into the survey.

#### **6.5 Active Projects**

Roger asked for someone else to take the lead on Active Projects. Roger noted that another 130 laptops will be added to the campus as well as 25 systems procured to upgrade classroom 1833.

IT also has an ongoing project with InfoRev in order to upgrade the AV in various classrooms. All of these projects are leading us to the hope that we will be primarily face to face for the upcoming spring semester. We are aggressively working on this and Facilities has been improving the orientation of the classrooms in order to provide space for social distancing and etc. The infrastructure to support all of this will also be improved. We will not be asking faculty to adapt to new technologies and instead we will adapt the technology to them. Historically, we have asked people to adapt to what can be supported. The phone system is fully upgraded but phone trees are still being built.

We have also re-deployed Tereasa as she has been answering the main lines for Napa Valley College and acting as a live operator. She will be acting in this capacity until the phone trees are re-created.

## 6.6 Committee Reports

- *Colleague Core (Jose)*

The Colleague CORE team is continuing remote meetings at this time. Upgrades to the core system are happening. The transition from Web Advisor to Self-Service is waiting for more faculty to test. With Teams being fully implemented, they have full access on teams and the platform. Jose would like to get everyone on the upgraded Intranet sites so that SharePoint sites aren't used like a document repository like before. The upgraded version connects a lot better. The new Website is on schedule for next year.

In conjunction with that, the Voicemail system has a new software that includes updated features. This will allow a phone to be wherever we are. The Office of Institutional Advancement is spearheading the migration to a new Website platform and it is still on track for a spring deployment.

- *Educational Technology Committee (Stan)*

Stan met with the President of Academic Senate last week and discussed incorporating the Educational Technology Committee (ETC) into the District Technology Committee (DTC). The ETC still has yet to meet and is in limbo at this time. Members also discussed incorporating the Distance Education Group (DE) Overall, there is willingness for all agencies to be brought together in order to work in harmony as well as in a partnership. San Lu brought up the need of having a committee to review technology that is accessible, in order to include a voice for our disproportioned students. Roger called on San to help with including that voice. Jose asked how it would function best. Whether accessibility would work best as a subcommittee or making sure it is a part of the discussion. Jose also added to the chat: I highly support that approach of partnering, over just being a consumer. Recommends what has been approved by the state and provides the accessibility options. Brian added that the library has various contracts with third party vendors. The accessibility of resources come up as a larger community colleges consortium option.

It would be good to find out what resources are being offered prior to purchasing these things. Roger thanked Brian.

## 7.0 Action Items

N/A

## 8.0 Next Meeting

September 24, 2021 @ 1:00pm

## 9.0 Adjournment

End Time: 2:25pm

Motioned by Jose Sanchez, seconded by Diane Van Deusen

**Distribution**

Roger Clague – Co-Chair  
Stanley Hitchcock – Co-Chair  
Diane Van Deusen  
Regina Orozco  
Melinda Tran  
Vacant – Acad. Senate Rep

Jose Sanchez  
Brandon Tofanelli  
Patricia Morgan  
Brian Lym  
David Soto Gonzalez

**Agenda & Minutes Only**

Eileene Tejada  
Martin Shoemaker  
Douglas Roberts  
Amber Wade  
Dr. Ronald Kraft

**Bulletin Boards**

Administrative Bldg.  
ASNVC Office  
Classified Lounge  
Faculty Lounge

**Topic:** District Technology Committee

**Time:** Sep 4, 2020 02:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/95374912990>

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16699006833,95374912990# or  
+12532158782,95374912990#

Or Telephone:

Dial:

+1 669 900 6833 (US Toll)

+1 253 215 8782 (US Toll)

+1 346 248 7799 (US Toll)

+1 646 876 9923 (US Toll)

+1 301 715 8592 (US Toll)

+1 312 626 6799 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 953 7491 2990

International numbers available: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/u/amlABdfVe>

Or Skype for Business (Lync):

SIP:95374912990@lync.zoom.us