

# IT User Experience Governance Group Meeting: October 17, 2016

**In attendance:** Vito Picicci; Ian Fisher; Trevor Hanekamp; Howard Simkins; James Humphreys; Rod Stewart (meeting minutes); Paul Khangura; Julia Kraveca (chair); Sarah Bernardi; Wes Mathieu; Brian Smith; James Duncan; Michael Evans; Martin de Bernardo; Derrick Millard; John Laugesen; Claire Wollen; Don McCulloch; Ausim Mobeen; Wes Tanney

**Regrets:** Bryan MacFarlane; Brandon To; Jordan Carlson

## Review Action Items

### Implementing multi browser strategy

Brian Smith said that he and Bruce Smith have been working on document and will share it at a future meeting.

**AI:** Brian Smith to present Multi Browser Strategy document at next meeting

### HMC Flip-up Labs

Julia said that Chrome Books were being piloted as a potential replacement for the legacy laptops that were in place in the HMC Flip-up lab. The pilot will conclude at the end of October.

The following concerns were raised in regard to the Chrome Book's suitability as a replacement

- a 'lockdown browser' is not available for Chromebooks (required for testing)
- the full MS Office suite cannot be used with Chromebooks

Julia asked users to forward her any other comments they had about the Chromebooks by the end of October. She will present the final assessment of the Chromebooks to the group following the conclusion of the pilot.

## Agenda

### Login times in classrooms

*Presented by Derrick Millard*

Derrick expressed concern regarding the amount of time it takes to log-in to lab computers – specifically those in rooms A433 at HMC and E204 at the Trafalgar campus. He said it could take over five minutes for users to log-in to computers in these lab locations. He also added that Internet Explorer is the default web browser on these machines and is prone to crashing.

James stated that he and his group were aware of these concerns (with the exception of the IE issue) and were taking steps to identify and correct the issue. He noted that in some of the tests that have been conducted in trying to identify the core issue they found that log-in times for some users were quicker from some locations than others. He said the network team has now been engaged to explore the possibility that this is a network-related issue, and that he and his team were meeting twice a week to address the urgency of this matter.

When asked if there was a strategy in place to replace Internet Explorer, James replied that the Multi-

Browser strategy document that is forthcoming would address this.

**AI:** Julia to provide communication to the users/areas most impacted by the log-in issues and try to provide some workarounds.

### **End User Technology acquisition and next steps**

*Presented by Julia Kraveca*

Julia said that the recommended hardware standards for administrative computers have been provided to purchasing and the next step will be to engage in the process to identify a vendor and acquire the equipment. She said that meetings would be held this week to discuss avenues of pursuit (leasing vs. purchasing).

Julia said that the leasing freeze that was in place over the summer months has been lifted and that next steps/options will be communicated by Bruce Smith to the College community soon.

Derrick asked if there will there be purchasing guidance/recommendations given to users in terms of choosing appropriate hardware.

Julia replied that it was the function of the committee propose and establish hardware standards; not to tell users which standard they should pick.

Vito asked when academic standards would be set?

Julia said a working group would be formed (with a representative from each faculty) to establish the methodology to develop these standards. Derrick stated that he would like to be a part of the working group. Julia asked that any committee member who was interested in being a faculty rep on this working group to contact her.

**AI:** Julia said she would send the group email confirming the standards that were established for administrative computing.

### **Classroom Projection Functionality and Requirements**

*Presented by Julia Kraveca*

Julia stated that there was funding available to replace classroom projectors at the Davis campus and was looking for recommendations from the group. She said there was some urgency to get this done because of funding and purchasing deadlines (decisions and purchases must be made by the end of the fiscal year - March 2017).

Ian said he felt the scope of this was too narrow and that classroom standards overall should be explored to determine how money would be best spent. He said that improving classroom lighting, for example, may be more important than renewing a projection system.

It was noted that projection has many layers—HD vs 4K, for example. There may not be one best solution and any decision made should be tied to the needs of the curriculum being taught in these classrooms.

Julia clarified that we are addressing general purpose classrooms and not labs that have unique/specialized requirements.

Martin said that scheduling is driving where classes are held and they do not have a handle of what

technology is available in each classroom. It was agreed that Scheduling needs an overview of what tech is in what classroom in order to schedule things properly.

Mike Evans said he felt that this is not a solvable problem and that we can't tailor a solution for each faculty member. Mike made the following comments/points:

- Academics need to acknowledge / recommend classroom technology rather than have recommendations come from IT (IT should implement the technology)
- Someone needs to make efforts to help faculty deal with the technology that is in the classroom
- Decisions should not come from a technology position – rather the approach should be ‘what do you want it to do/what do you want to happen in the classroom?’
- There should be dialogue with faculties to help make/force decision

Claire suggested sending a needs assessment survey to faculties. Ian countered that this exercise could be a bottomless pit and that everyone reaches for the moon.

Howard asked what the budget for the projector replacement was and if it would be a lease or purchase exercise. Julia said this was still being determined. Howard added that part of the challenge is the projected lifespan of the equipment vs our renewal process and the projected changes in our future curriculum.

The group agreed the needs assessment process should be focused on usage not specifically on what particular technology someone wants.

Trevor said that he has developed a Classroom Technology Design guide and noted that this guide touches on classroom display systems. He suggested taking some of this information and putting it into a matrix that can be used as a starting point to help users make their recommendations.

Julia said that she was looking for a quick answer to address the immediate need at the Davis campus and that the group could propose a methodology to make assessments more strategic and inclusive in the future. Michael concurred, suggesting that we communicate the new classroom standard to faculty who teach in these rooms while letting them know we're working towards a new process.

**AI:** Trevor will develop a matrix that will be used to incorporate into a communication to Deans and Associate Deans.

**AI:** Mike and Julia will work on a presentation of Deans/Ads to get their buy-in and recommendations for an immediate process and long-term strategic process moving forward.

## **Other Business**

### **Adobe Suite**

*Presented by John Laugesen*

John mentioned that installation of the entire Adobe CC suite is taxing for students in terms of both time and in some cases, available disk space. He wondered if the installer could be broken into individual components.

Howard replied that installer allows users to pick and choose the applications to be installed—installation of the whole suite is not required.

### **Next Meeting...**

- Monday, November 21 from 1-2 p.m. in B364 (Trafalgar Road Campus)