CCSF Accreditation Response Team – Recommendation #9: Technology Resources

Meeting Minutes: Aug. 7, 2012

Attendees: Kim Ginther-Webster, JR Hall, Monika Liu, Craig Persiko, Carol Reitan, Tim Ryan

Minutes: Draft minutes from July 24 and July 31 meetings were approved without amendment.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, August 21 from 9:00-11:00, place tba.

Handouts: draft minutes from two previous meetings; revised draft of the Annual Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Timeline (dated 2012-08-02).

Agenda and other informational documents displayed as PowerPoint presentation (sent in advance via email).

I. Summary of Activities from July 31 (Matrix, planning and budgeting timeline)

- Still aim to complete our portion of the recommendation by September 15.
- Matrix was sent in on August 2. It has 9 activities on it. The only column not filled in was Evidence, since we are still a little uncertain about what goes into this column. We think it is evidence showing our progress, such as revisions to documents as we work on them. T. Ryan will inquire about this and about the mechanism for getting feedback on our matrix from those managing the accreditation response.
- D. Re and JR Hall gave P. Goldstein some preliminary cost information for replacing 6000 desktops, per his request for budget estimates. Depending on a 3 or 5 year replacement cycle, some rough numbers around $1 million to $2 million were estimated, but data is still being gathered to get better numbers.
- Question about how specific we can be about amounts of money and specific numbers right now in our process. We may not have or need this immediately, but we should be able to come up with a scalable process or two even without specific numbers to start with. We assume there will continue to be a baseline ITS budget as there is now for large systems such as Banner, Oracle licenses and so forth.
- Revised draft of the planning and budgeting timeline: this is reduced from 10 steps to 6. Language about reducing when necessary was added. Discussion of the program review process included whether there are limits to what can be prioritized here, do the requests for resources include considerations of staffing and costs. Those of us who have worked on sections of program review in the past recall that the requests were expected to be fairly detailed. Discussed the need to find out what will be included in future program review. Costs in future may require that technology acquisitions are more strictly limited to items identified in program review than has been the case. Program review priorities are ranked at the levels of Dean, Vice-Chancellor, and Chancellor’s Shared Governance Council. Nobody in today’s meeting was sure what this Council is. There is a question about whether ITS needs to be involved in all unit program reviews to consult on technology.
- Technology plan – existing one does not include costs. Some discussion that this should encompass more general goals without detailed costs, but consideration of staffing and other needs could be included. Communication with Human Resources on planning for staffing for technology will be considered in our planning. This may come through program review or in other planning processes.

II. Technology Resources Response (Outline, ITS guiding principles)

- Outline: Meaning of “Technology Plan Coordination” was unclear. We need to be specific in our discussions about the different plans we are working on – the plan/process to regularly replace, upgrade, and maintain equipment that is recommendation no. 9 is one, and an updating/rewriting of the Technology Plan, which we need to meet the overall standard, is the other. Coordination of the replacement process plan with the planning and budgeting timeline, and with human resources and facilities, should be a section on the response outline. There should be a separate section for discussion of the Technology Plan.
- Outline: Move Academic and Administrative Tech. equipment items up under Technology Systems Overview.
- Outline: Discussion about replacement cycles, which will need priorities such as sustainability. On the question of trickle-down of old equipment, consider that with a regular replacement cycle, we shouldn’t need to move old equipment to other locations. Our current practice of trickle down has often resulted in
differing levels of service. Only if older equipment can be redeployed without impacting service levels should it be factored into a replacement cycle.

- **Outline: Funding Sources and Grants:** Our response should focus on a regular replacement & maintenance & upgrade process with a reliable funding base (e.g. unrestricted funds). But departments will still want to make grant requests that include equipment, so we need a process for communicating about and setting appropriate limits relating to maintenance and replacement on these.

- **Guiding Principles:** the draft will be reviewed in ITS for input. Even though the list as presented is not in priority order, it was recommended that Innovation not be at the top, since the top place is often associated with a high priority. Describe Innovation in terms of how it supports students, not as something to do for its own sake. The principle Leverage Resources refers to sharing facilities rather than having many specialized labs. It was suggested that we rephrase this in a clearer way for a general audience. Although the phrase “support the mission of City College” is in the introduction to the Guiding Principles, we might try to come up with a “support” principle. Finally, the ITS mission might be included with this section. Suggestions for changes to these should be sent to T. Ryan.

### III. Draft Replacement Process (draft flowchart, lab utilization example, computer classrooms, computer centers)

- The draft flowchart is more of a bridge plan to get to a point at which a standardized replacement process can take effect under regular funding. For this chart, the Perkins grant line can be combined with “other”. Lab age in many cases will have to come from the lab owners to ITS currently.

- In a more permanent plan, will a flow chart be necessary? Probably, to show inputs from program review and other plans, and to accommodate a process for when new equipment or unanticipated changes to existing cycles come up. Even in a regularized work flow, slots to show consultation about new or changing needs will be important.

- Factors in a replacement process also include mechanisms for communicating about equipment, software, etc. that is too old to support.

- Technology is very broad now, including building management systems like electronic clocks, access control, security systems. Buildings and Grounds take care of technology that drives a building and works closely with ITS on this. Some systems, like the cameras in some of the libraries, have been acquired under the Technology Plan. Work should be done on clarifying roles, relationships, and communications about who supports different technologies.

- Lab Utilization Example: We need both inventories and a list of managers of existing labs for the bridge plan. Some of this will come through program review this Fall, but we also need to move soon on communicating with department chairs for information. An inventory of computer classroom use is needed, and should be fairly easy to acquire. K. Ginther-Webster will get the R414 schedule and provide hourly usage data for most library open computers. The LAC and Batmale labs are on Accutrak so data should be available from those units. We also should identify sources of equipment usage data.

### IV. CCSF Employees (2, 786 total; 810 full-time faculty; 1075 part-time faculty; 861 classified staff; 40 administrators)

- The numbers of employees listed in the agenda line were reported as current based on the employee directory. Past planning assumed one computer for each full-time faculty member. Some groups such as custodians have not been included in this. Current numbers are useful for determining scale.

### V. Part-time Faculty Technology Needs (Ratio of PCs/Printers/Phones; Replacement Process)

- Ratio of PCs for part-time faculty may be difficult to calculate. At some campuses, shared computers in staff workrooms or lounges serve everyone. Other departments have a designated number of computers for part-timers within the department. We may be able to ballpark something about what we currently provide, but ultimately we’ll want a needs assessment for part-time faculty and classified staff.

- Needs may change as more faculty and staff work on their own devices such as tablets.

Next Meeting will start with a draft of our response. Related documents will appear as links or in appendices.