CCSF Accreditation Response Team – Recommendation #9: Technology Resources

**DRAFT Meeting Minutes: Sept. 4, 2012**

**Attendees:** Kim Ginther-Webster, JR Hall, Craig Persiko, Eric Raznick, Doug Re, Carol Reitan, Tim Ryan, Lidia Szajko

**Minutes:** Draft minutes from August 28 were approved with one amendment.

**Next meeting** will be Thursday Sept. 6 from 12:30-2:30 in Batmale 108.

**Handouts:** Summary of Table of Contents that Kristin is submitting as progress report; minutes from Team 9's August 28 meeting; Team 9's August progress report; revised Annual Assessment, Budgeting and Planning Timeline; Technology resources cost summary; COBIT cycle

**Discussion:**

- Our progress report is due by the end of the day on Friday, Sept. 7.
- Steering Committee will have a draft joint report on Sept. 17 of all the workgroups' progress, it will be available on the 18th. Technology Resources is low on the radar at this point.
- We should reread the accreditation report on technology resources to make sure we're addressing all the necessary points.
- Our last progress report followed a specific form. The new one does not have a new format. T. Ryan expects that the kind of information starting on the third page of the old report is probably what will go into the joint report. Our new report will be a narrative rather than numbered items. Some sections will be combined, such as #3 and #5. It was suggested that we start the report with a summary and/or bold paragraph headers in the section so that highlights of the report stand out for quick skimming. The progress report will include various documents such as the Tech Plan recommendations summary and Improved Efficiency with the Expanded use of Insight.
- There were questions about making changes to our submission after Sept. 7, since we may get information from other workgroups that contradict some of our assumptions. The Steering Committee is one opportunity for changes to occur, and if the College wants something different from us we may have to reconvene.
- Need to figure out what evidence goes in our progress report, and how to format references and web links. Some suggestions for evidence are the planning timeline, and Perkins grant information.
- We have questions about where resource review occurs in the timeline. There are some mentions in the Fall and January sections of the grid. We want to forward suggestions that coordination with ITS be included. It is also not clear how all four resources, Technology, Human, Finance and Facilities are integrated in the planning process.
- We will include the Annual Calendar cycle diagram from the revised Annual Timeline and link it to our equipment planning process. It may not dovetail exactly, but it is a useful reference point. We will also include a chart with replacement cycles for equipment.
- There was discussion about linking our group’s ideas on consolidating technology resources to the mention of reducing resource allocations in the planning timeline. The two words are not synonymous, but one of the goals of consolidating computer labs is to reduce the long-
term cost of equipment replacement. We want to be careful about consistent use of terminology.

- The Technology Resources cost summary includes ITS things only, this needs clarification for resubmitting with our progress report. The first page has costs for the bridge plan, it needs more student equipment information. The second page has ongoing plan costs. In addition to equipment costs, we have no information about software license costs beyond those managed by ITS, this will have to come through program review. Some of this information may be in Perkins grant materials. Cost estimates for student labs/centers assumes consolidation that reduces the number of computers from approximately 3500 to 2500. Worst case financing would result in moving to a 6 year replacement cycle.

- Discussion about acquiring used equipment. This is only acceptable in the bridge plan if it is the only way to upgrade some workstations in the current budget situation. Even then, some in our group feel strongly that this is a bad idea. It results in other costs to the institution if staff continue to have inadequate computers to do their work.

- ITS is getting the Argos enterprise reporting system for data management. This will help in data analysis needed to link to our planning.

- Question about whether to include challenges in our progress report. We agreed we should, but not necessarily the same ones that were in our first report. Inventory can come out of the list. One challenge to keep will be how we adapt our plan as shared governance, funding, planning and budgeting all change to meet the other Accreditation recommendations.

- Need a section for grant-funded equipment.

- Discussion about the draft narrative plan based on the IT equipment framework brought up at previous meetings. We have two documents in hand – this plan, and the progress report to the Accreditation Steering Committee. The progress report talks about how we “plan to address the recommendation” while the framework narrative tries to write the actual equipment replace/maintain/update plan the Recommendation asks for. Some confusion about the different uses of the word plan, and whether the progress report contains enough of the details of the framework. Suggested that item 1 on the progress report should be the equipment replacement plan. Members of the group will work on these two documents and see how they fit together at the Thursday meeting.

- The COBIT cycle handout is an example of a standard for IT governance that can be included in our evidence section for planning.

- Information about the CALB Banner changes should go in the Efficiency section of our report.

- The Technology Plan steering committee will meet in October to restart work on that plan.