Notes from meeting on July 24, 2012

I. Introduction and Overview – Gohar explained what we need to do. We must look at more than just the specific recommendation, we need to look at the entire standard and make sure other issues beyond the recommendation are addressed as well. We need to fill out our matrix early. Our work will continually be integrated with other groups. Resources are what we use to inform our planning and put things together, evidence shows we’ve done the work, for instance links in our plan to the College Strategic Plan. After the matrix is done, we’ll probably need to supply a narrative about the stages of progress

Tim commented that we’ll need to look at unresolved technology issues in tandem with the specific needs of accreditation, and some of this examination and discussion will start in ITS.

II. Schedule and timeline – our next meeting will be Tuesday July 31 from 9:00-11:00 in Batmale Hall, at which point future meetings will be discussed.

III. Work Group Dependencies – we looked at a chart showing links among plans, one correction is that the Program Reviews … box should be above the Annual College Plan and Annual Budget box. Any technology plans will need annual reviews, with evaluation criteria, to feed into the college annual plan. We should have rough numbers soon. Previously the annual IT budge has been roughly $1.1 million, but little of this is for equipment replacement, that is estimated to be an additional $1 million. Historically, equipment money has come from IT for networking equipment, other (desktops, etc.) has come from department budgets, bond money, grants, etc. These monies have often been restricted, and different funds have different criteria for equipment use, etc. We may need to make recommendations to change how technology needs are budgeted in the future. For example, computers for administration might come from a different budget area than computers for student use. Main point is that we need to come up with an institutional strategy for acquiring and maintaining computers, not a piecemeal one. We may need to look at issues like use, such as instructional (classroom) labs vs. open labs for planning and prioritization. Currently we have at least 3000 academic-use computers in 110 locations – need to complete an inventory to get a more accurate total. JR Hall, K. Ginther-Webster, D. Yee will work on this. PCs are biggest equipment component for ITS, but servers are another issue, both for applications and storage. Some areas using external cloud storage, others using a CCSF private cloud.

Q: how long does the plan in the recommendation need to be? Discussion about it needing to go through 2016 to match strategic plan, and that it should also be more of an ongoing methodology that is dynamic and doesn’t have a date limit.

Q: will we be able to change this year’s budget with this plan? We don’t know, but given the budget cycle it seems likely that the 2013-14 budget year will be affected rather than this year.
Program review will happen this semester, which will also integrate with the technology planning process.

Security issues are mentioned in the accreditation report, so even though these are not a specific recommendation, we need to be sure we address these also.

IV. Technology Plan Summary – we reviewed the history of the college Technology Plan. The previous one, 2009-11 was last updated in 2010. It was made up of various sections (library, ITS, broadcast media...) but did not necessarily include everything. It did go through shared governance. A steering committee exists to create a new plan, it is still incomplete. Some sections are waiting for an employee survey to provide better needs assessment for the plan. There is some sense that part of what we need to do in this working group is address the larger issue of a full technology plan. The new one is incomplete, and there is an expectation that the Accreditation Team will expect our new one to be in place and integrated by at least next March. How much we can do on this before October, with people only returning in August, is a question. Suggestions were made that we need an overarching process for how we are going to link various technology plans, and we should at least work initially on creating the methodology and structure in which overall technology planning will take place. We need to consult with the budgeting groups to make sure our ideas about methods mesh with theirs.

Criteria for replace/maintain/upgrade need to be developed, and “upgrade” might include adding things we don’t have. Processes we need to delineate include how we get technology into the system, how we maintain it, how we shrink in tight times, how we continually evaluate technology. Then we’ll also need a plan for implementation.

Need to find out who knows total classrooms on campus and their current status, as well as make a list of other data we need to gather.

Another comment was that we have previously managed technology in different silos, without the necessary integration. We have to manage to integrate among these silos, or even get rid of the silos in our results. We need to include consideration of who determines cost of technology in the process, identifying funding sources.

V. Scope of Response – much of the previous discussion was about this. We have to ensure we meet the entire standard, not just the specific recommendation. Need to give some response to the budgeting groups soon, and by Oct. 15 show what we’ve done, hopefully most of the work. We need to submit our matrix (done by Aug. 3 initially), written description of our work, flow charts, how our work fits with other workgroups. By March we need the plan.

VI. Matrix Completion - due August 3, as of today we have three activities on it: inventory academic computers, assess the existing Technology plan, and assess funding sources.