CCSF Accreditation Response Team – Recommendation #9: Technology Resources

Meeting Minutes: Aug. 21, 2012

Attendees: Cynthia Dewar, Kim Ginther-Webster, JR Hall, Monika Liu, Craig Persiko, Doug Re, Carol Reitan, Tim Ryan, Lidia Szajko, David Yee

Minutes: Draft minutes from August 7 were approved with one amendment.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, August 28 from 9:00-11:00 in Batmale

Handouts: Draft response outline table of contents; proposed broad framework for tech equipment replacement from JR Hall.

Draft response outline and progress report on Team work were sent to the Team via email on Friday Aug. 17 for consideration at today’s meeting.

Discussion:

• We have 3 more weeks to meet our deadline of mid-September to send our response to the other planning groups. Kristin Charles is coordinating the October response.
• The College mission statement is not finalized, but progress has been made. The latest draft statement is in the agenda for the next Board of Trustees meeting. We need to keep our response in sync with the College Mission.
• T. Ryan sent a quick status update to P. Goldstein, who then requested that we send a spreadsheet with our responses.
• Academic labs (classrooms and centers) are up to about 140 now. Perkins grants for CTE programs have done a pretty good job of getting equipment, but there are different opinions about whether we can continue to rely on this funding. We can look into Perkins as an option for money in our bridge plan.
• There was discussion about planning for the cycle of maintenance and replacement and upgrading. Some feel we need to calculate up front costs for a timeline such as 10 years or longer to calculate budgetary needs. Others are discussing a shorter timeline. We need to work out the distinctions between setting up a short-term replacement cycle and longer-term budgeting that can accommodate both growth and shrinking of resources. A lead time of at least 18 months is probably necessary for budgeting rather than year to year.
• It was suggested that we need to figure out the process first, then go to details in order to work out the structure.
• Discussion on how to get more data than the current computer inventory on needs for projectors and other equipment included getting the technology survey of employees underway and asking questions through program review. It was suggested that we use the program review process this semester to find out what baseline technology needs each department has that are ongoing, not just new things that they want. Previous program reviews have not necessarily included items such as “continue to support 20 lab computers.” However, asking for this information now will help prioritize what departments continue to need as well as provide additional inventory information.
• After the meeting it was determined that we cannot add questions to this year’s program review as the template has been drafted, but we can communicate with the planning office and
department chairs and ask that this information be provided concurrently with the program review process.

- We will request that departments consult with ITS to verify inventory and costs and get better information for technology requests in program review.

- In the long term, we want to ensure that consultation with ITS about technology priorities is built into the program review process for better data gathering, budgeting and planning. Aspects of this consultation include helping departments gather information about available technology options and what can be supported, as well as providing opportunities for ITS to notify departments about technology that no longer meets standards and may not be maintainable.

- It is still not clear what kinds of equipment we are including in our recommendation, discussion has focused on things our IT department has historically maintained. T. Ryan will draft a definition for inclusion in our response.

- Staff and faculty computers (Administrative technology) will need a specific plan for replacement since the majority of them are too old, from the rollout approximately 10 years ago. A rough estimate would be replacing 1200 desktops and laptops within the next two years, mostly for full-time staff. A preliminary look at costs for this indicate a 6-year cycle may work best ultimately. We will discuss this further next time. We need to find out what faculty/staff have in more detail. One suggestion was to ask this also during this Fall’s program review. What basis can be considered for replacement? By department? Geographically (e.g. one campus or building at a time)? Oldest first? Needs-based? We need to set up criteria (sample set included in JR Hall’s handout) and complete the inventory.

- Response draft document was briefly discussed and assignments for expanding sections were made. K. Ginther-Webster will draft a statement about the Technology Plan in consultation with C. Dewar and C. Persiko (all three are on the Steering Committee for that plan); JR Hall, T. Ryan and D. Yee will work on the coordination of Technology Resources needs with the planning and budgeting process. T. Ryan will work more on staffing considerations. Comments on any part of the plan may be sent to T. Ryan and the rest of the group.

- C. Reitan will write a draft process as a starting point, and send to the group for further online comment before our next meeting.

- C. Persiko and L. Szajko will write up more on Perkins grants.

- Format of the response document – address recommendation specifically, put related matters (e.g. more discussion on overall Technology Plan) in appendices or evidence

- Consolidation of labs/centers still needs to be addressed.

- What does this group do beyond October 15? It depends on what the response coordinators tell us, but one possibility is to identify things in the Accreditation Technology Standard that may need more work before the March 15 visit.

- Relating to the standard, questions have arisen previously about using technology to improve efficiency. For example, very old email services such as Pine are still used by some members of the college, so not only new technologies should be considered for efficiency improvements, but discontinuance of old technologies. For the area of instruction, C. Dewar will write up a paragraph about improving efficiency through online and hybrid courses.