Technology Plan – 2012-2017
Board of Trustees
Assessment & Analysis

Superintendent/President’s Assessment & Analysis:

Major Takeaways

Significant Accomplishments (204-2011)

- Banner Implementation (2006-2009)
- Data Reporting (2011)
- MyCOM Portal proxy for Library (2011)
- Online Registration Payment Plan (2011)
- Online Parking Permits (2011)
- Web Presence (2008)
- Web Accessibility (2011)
- Learning Management System (2011)
- Computer Lab Upgrades (2004-2011)
- Classroom Technology Upgrades (2004-2011)
- EduStream for Video Streaming (2009)
- Faculty and Staff Computer Upgrades (2004-2011)
- Server Infrastructure Upgrades (2008-2012)
- Wired Data Network Infrastructure Upgrades (2009-2011)
- Telephone System Upgrade (2012)

2012-2017 Technology Initiatives

- Continued enhancements to enterprise administrative systems
- Continued classroom technology upgrades
- Utilization of virtual desktop technology
- Continued faculty and staff technology upgrades
- Increased manageability of college’s web environment
- Strengthened technology support infrastructure including training
- Increased business continuity and disaster recovery capabilities
- Upgraded data network and telecommunications infrastructure and services
Potential Policy Implications

- Currently no formal on-going assessment process for identifying and correcting problems that create inefficiencies with the use of the enterprise administrative systems
- Currently not conducting formal periodic review of work processes to ensure staff are running daily exception reports and performing validation checks required to maintain high level of data integrity
- Adoption of single campus ID Card
- Stated goal to equip all classrooms with technology
- Replacement plan to include decommissioning and replacing all computer systems older than 7 years
- Availability and requirement of training
- Currently no disaster recovery plan for mission critical applications

Potential Resource Implications

- Eliminating gaps significantly impacting self-efficiency (6.3.4)
- Internal or external hosting of college web presence (7.3.2)
- Adoption of single campus ID card (8.3)
- Continued upgrades/replacement of computer labs (12.2.4)
- Continued upgrades/replacement of faculty and staff computers (13.3.2.5)
- IT Reorganization (14.1.6)
- Replacement of voice mail system (16.1.2)
- Replacement of network switches (16.3.1)
- Disaster recovery planning (17.3.1)
- Training, training, training

Trustee Treanor Assessment & Analysis

Are there additional policy or resource implications that should be addressed?

- The Board needs to adopt the priorities as outlined in the Plan and then to walk the talk and decide how to fund the various initiatives.
- The scope and cost of the critical initiatives go far beyond the District’s capacities to handle from its annual budget. How does the Board envision fulfilling the initiatives by funding them?
- There is reference in the staff ‘take aways’ to reorganizing IT, but that is not mentioned in the Technology Plan. Is this a priority? Is there a plan? We have been funding some of the IT position with bond funds, is there a sustainable plan? When will we stop using consultant to do what staff could do, or are we already at that point? At least a year ago we received a plan for reorganizing the IT department, but I don’t know what came of it; I suspect we did tweaking of positions but didn’t actually
fund the re-org. We need to discuss in the context of our structural deficit and decide who it fits in overall priorities.

- The Assessment ends with “On-going Technology Planning” and lists six items that need to be evaluated annually:
  - Technology replacement and related allocation of funds
  - Update technology replacement plans
  - Training workshops for faculty, staff and students
  - Survey workshop participants
  - Results of surveys addressing deployment of new applications, technology, e.g. new Wi-Fi network
  - New policies and procedures implemented - What new policies? Any recommendations for policies? Reference to some noted for ‘administrative policies and procedures, but no real references to big picture policy development.

Are the plans to address them reasonable and adequate? What does the Board need to make as far as policy and resource decisions?

- Board needs help to reconcile the information in the Technology Plan with the information in the Technology Assessment Report.
- Board needs to understand we have come a LONG way in the past five to seven years, with Banner and all the implementation and training that has gone into using an integrated system.
- If the Board is to provide leadership to ‘fund’ the vision that is outlined in the plan and to fund the priorities, we have very few figures to work. We also don’t have the priorities prioritized. We need to be able to know what is possible to do within our general fund budget, without fundraising, without another bond, and what we must do through other means. For example, it appears that the need to upgrade the MyCOM portal is a rather important initiative, at least from the results of the survey and the recommendations in the assessment, but there is no way to see that is a priority in the actual plan and the cost associated with it is TBD.

Is more information required from staff?

- How to prioritize and/or combine elements in an order of priority for triaging implementation based on resources
- The Board needs information regarding what was funded under FF&E in Measure C for replacement of computers in classrooms and labs, which was supposed to cover much of what is listed as ‘new’ needs. What actually was used from Measure C for the equipment upgrades?
- How to evaluate information, e.g. “new Wi-Fi Network” says that it is needed, yet no money is defined for it and the project phases indicate that a vendor was to be identified and selected by March-May of 2012 and by May-August 2012 the system was to be operational.
- Is it? What did it cost? Who was the ‘approved’ vendor? Who approved it?

What are the major takeaways from the plan that the full board should consider?

- We were able to do a considerable amount of work in the ramping up technology at College of Marin, but only because of the resources allocated under Measure C. There are limited to no resources available to actually fund the work outlined for ‘next steps’ in the phase of work described for 2012-2017 Technology Plan.
When will the Board discuss funding of technology through another bond?

In all candor, it appears we don’t have the issues defined that the Board needs to discuss to move toward policy decisions. Staff needs to better distill, define and prioritize critical areas needing immediate policy development to provide direction for long term vision.

How will we do that?

Comments on Staff Suggested Major Takeaways: Potential Policy Implications

Currently not conducting formal periodic review of work processes to ensure staff are running daily exception reports and performing validation checks required to maintain high level of data integrity - In the Technology Assessment this seemed like it is a ‘big deal’ that there are real inefficiencies. I took away that the same errors happen because we don’t have a system to report the error and define how to correct it and then to make the correction so that the reports can run without the same issues be repeated. It appears the lack of reporting is causing inefficiencies, wasted time and talent.

Adoption of single campus ID Card - Big Deal in both, but no money defined to meet it.

Stated goal to equip all classrooms with technology - Do we need to say this? I thought we did when we allocated the $10 million from Measure C, plus several additional millions within the FF&E budgets for each building.

Replacement plan to include decommissioning and replacing all computer systems older than 7 years - Is the amount specified in the plan (noted below) to replace equipment purchased with Measure C funds?

Potential Resource Implications

Eliminating gaps significantly impacting self-efficiency (6.3.4) - In the assessment this seemed like it is a ‘big deal’ that we are inefficient and the same errors happen because we don’t have a system to report the error and define how to correct it and then to make the correction so that the reports can run without the same issues be repeated. It appears it is causing inefficiencies and wasted time and talent that could be avoided.

Internal or external hosting of college web presence (7.3.2) – web hosting discussed at II.B.3. as priorities 1.2 and 3. There is discussion about replacing computers with thin-client systems accessing virtual desktops hosted on a central server. Not sure that the plan actually sets a date for deciding if there would be externally hosted web server. The report would indicate that all the pricing is for internal hosting and significant expenses projected, including an expense to be incurred of $105,000 to conduct a pilot in May-June of 2012. The balance of the testing and assessment were to be in June-August of 2012 – did any of this happen? Was the $105k incurred? Authorized? Presented?

The assessment indicates that the COM website is also in need of revamping. The recommendations of staff and the consultants are consistent that we need to shift to a CMS (content management system).
The assessment indicates that it might be more cost effective to outsource that work, which could also address another concern – disaster recovery capabilities.

**Adoption of single campus ID card (8.3)** - No costs defined, yet considered important and must be something that many other community college have in place

**Continued upgrades/replacement of computer labs (12.2.4)**

**Continued upgrades/replacement of faculty and staff computers (13.3.2.5)** - Resource allocation defined in Summary of Costs indicates that it will cost $150,000 for year 1; $70k to $100k for years 2 & 3; and $90k to $135k for years 4 and beyond

**IT Reorganization (14.1.6)** - References in the Assessment, but I didn’t find the specifics in the plan that would indicate what is intended. The reference to 14.1.6 is the recommendation in the Assessment to fund the recommendation received several years ago by another consultant to add several supervisory positions; yet there are no dollars to evaluate fiscal implications. I recall the earlier study did have funds need defined.

**Replacement of voice mail system (16.1.2)** – cost estimated at $52k and 200 hours of IT staff time; but no cost estimates for replacing ’aging’ teleconferencing equipment

**Replacement of network switches (16.3.1)** - This also seems to be a ‘big deal’ in the assessment and it doesn’t have a cost ball parked or defined as a priority to do, but if there are outages or failures, it appears we are quite vulnerable per the assessment.