FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Technology Committee Meeting

MINUTES

Date: 02/25/16   **Time:** 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.   **Location:** Altos Room (2019)

Attending

Judy Baker, Andrea Hanstein, Kevin Harral, Kurt Hueg, Akemi Ishikawa, Sharon Luciw, David McCormick, Steven McGriff, Sherri Mines, Joe Moreau, Teresa Ong, Paula Schales, Lori Silverman, Janet Weber

Discussion Items

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Review and approval of minutes
3. Announcements
4. Review of Tech Master Plan draft
5. Campus use of new process for proposing new IT tech projects
6. Web redesign update
7. Updates from ETS

Discussion Detail

1. Welcome and introductions
   Committee members went around the room and introduced themselves.

2. Review and approval of minutes
   Minutes from the January 20, 2016 meeting were approved.

3. Announcements
   The Business and Social Sciences Division (BSS) recently purchased a campus-wide site license for Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) with lottery money.

4. Review of Tech Master Plan draft
   a. A 14-page draft was shared. It was clarified that the main body of the document ends on page 8 and pages 9-14 are appendices that consist of a list of current tech projects and initiatives at the college.
   b. It was agreed that projects that will be completed by June 2017 should be listed under the 1-year implementation plan. Other projects listed that will be completed by the end of the 3-year plan should be listed in the appendix.
   c. After hearing suggestions by Andrew Lamanque, we agreed that more needs to be added to the Tech Plan about coordination with other campus plans including Equity Plan and Facilities Plan as well as details about the role of technology planning in participatory governance, program review, PaRC, Academic Senate, and resource allocation process (OPC). More information needs to be added about: 1) technology plans by the Krause Center for Innovation, 2) discussions underway about the possible replacement of our in-

house C3MS curriculum content management program with another product, 3) plans to upgrade our room scheduling software called Resource 25, 4) status of availability of the faculty inquiry tool, and 5) plans to upgrade TracData for reporting on Program Reviews.

d. Because accreditation standards need to be addressed, it was agreed that the outline would be augmented to fulfill that requirement and align more directly with the Educational Master Plan. ETAC has no problem with the change. Joe Moreau will check with De Anza to verify that this change is also acceptable for their tech plan outline.

e. It was recommended that a "Challenges" section be added to the document. Greater coordination and buy-in are part of the goals. Below are some of the challenges observed.

    a. The long list of software and cloud services used by across campus may indicate that better coordination of tech purchasing decisions is warranted.

        i. For example, Advocate (student disciplinary/case management software), Medicat (college health information system) and OrgSync (campus engagement network) projects have been completed by ETS, but the students are not yet benefiting from these systems because no dedicated resources have been allocated to see them through to completion. There is no staff designated to complete the projects.

        ii. Starfish (student success/retention system) was cited as another ed tech system that will rely heavily on faculty buy-in in order to succeed. Student services and faculty will need to communicate and coordinate closely to make it work.

    b. It was observed that many of the planning groups on campus are on varying reporting cycles. Therefore, it can be difficult to schedule realistic due dates for documents that build upon information provided by other college/district planning groups.

    c. Lack of functional support was noted for discussion about specific ed tech purchasing decisions prior to submission of purchase orders. At times purchasing or VPs become the gatekeepers for tech purchases when it would be far more beneficial to have a discussion and plan for total cost of ownership in advance.

f. Small edits for this document should be sent to Judy Baker (BakerJudy@fhda.edu) directly. The existing draft will be revised based on feedback from today's meeting and made available to Tech Committee members via Office 365 for Technology Committee members to edit and provide additional input.

5. Campus use of new process for proposing new IT tech projects
a. In MyPortal, on the Employees tab there is a new channel titled "New IT Project Request." Supervisors and administrators will be able to access this project request form. Joe Moreau provided a demonstration and explanation. (A 25-minute video presentation about the new process was made by Joe Moreau and is available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zG7l2eOWDxo)

b. An email message about the new request process was sent to supervisors, deans and administrators.

c. The wording of the form was designed to accommodate both campuses. For Foothill, "Department Approver" is the immediate supervisor of the submitter, and "Final Approver" will be the VP of Finance (Bernata Slater).

d. The system will be expanded to allow all employees to view the dashboard for ongoing projects.

e. The prioritization process will allow everyone to vote online.

    i. Chien Shih or Sharon Luciw will interview the project lead.

    ii. Voters will be able to rank projects as critical, nice-to-have, low, etc.

    iii. The number of votes and voters for each project will be visible.

    iv. The dashboard will allow users to access some general statistics such as the number of ongoing projects, project status, which project applies to each college, the district, etc.

6. Web redesign update
   a. In early December of 2015, Marketing held focus groups with administrators, classified staff, faculty, students, non-credit and community members. The analytics were reviewed and a site map was developed.
   b. Moving forward, Marketing will have sessions next week with four key user groups consisting of financial aid, instruction, admission and student services.
   c. In May, focus groups will be conducted with students. They will participate by way of a "scavenger hunt" and asked to navigate the website to find information.
   d. The plan is on target for content migration in the fall. This project will be labor intensive for website managers. OmniUpdate will conduct trainings in the fall on how to update pages. Trainings will be available both in-person and online. Content migration will be daunting, but it is an opportunity to clean up and get rid of outdated material.
   e. A web writer may be hired to help the college learn how to write content in a student-centric manner. The website is not currently "user-friendly" in its use of language.

7. Updates from ETS
   a. ETS will be presenting, to the Board of Trustees, at the March 7 meeting, their proposal for the new telephone system.
      i. Sharon Luciw and her team, and Pam Grey and Annette Perez in Purchasing, were thanked for their assistance with this complex project.
      ii. This Cisco based system will integrate phone, email, instant messaging, one-on-one video chat, calling tree, panic alarm features, just to name a few. This will greatly advance our communications system. It will no longer just be a phone.
      iii. Pending board approval, this Measure C funded project will move forward in March. ETS and the vendor will be looking for input from the departments regarding their choice of devices. There will be very few departments that will just replicate their current system. They are encouraged to rethink and redesign their call distribution system to provide better customer service.
      iv. Old and new systems will overlap for a short period. End users will be impacted starting in the spring.
      v. The project should be completed by October 31, 2016.
      vi. The district tech plan will cover implementation of this project.
   b. Joe Moreau has been in contact with Turning Point Technologies which is a vendor for classroom clicker devices, also known as student response systems
      i. Turning Point has no problem with the college setting up its own distribution of existing software.
      ii. Turning Point did not respond when asked for a quote for a college or district-wide license. Joe Moreau will attempt to contact them again for a quote.
      iii. De Anza is currently using a different system, but would be interested in learning about alternatives.
      iv. Judy Baker will make arrangements for faculty to demonstrate and discuss use of student response systems in the spring.