Thursday, February 9 2012
2-3:30
Room AC108

Meeting Summary

Attendance:


Absent:

Agenda Items:

1) Agenda: Review/revise/approve Meeting Agenda
   Approved: revised time from 10 min to 1hr 20 min for WTC presentation

2) Minutes: Approved 2-2-12 Minutes

3) WTC Initial Meeting: Ginny Schroeder, Anne-Marie Lancaster

Purpose of the work
About WTC
WTC Approach
Assessment Focus
Engagement Teams
Planning Assumptions

- Want a discussion format

Higher education specialists
17 community colleges (serviced)
29-year history
Fact based
Purpose of the work
Develop 5-year tech plan
Address requirement for accreditation
Address sustainable
Understand that this is a component of the ed master plan

Approach (Steps)
1. Form engagement teams
2. Collect and review documentation
   Interviewed the IT staff for relevant info – wanted to find out the details of our tech
47s711414structure
   WTC wants to make sure they understand what we have
3. Start today – develop planning assumptions
4. Other than with IT, WTC has not spoken with anyone else yet
5. Conduct Assessment
6. Develop recommendations & methodologies
7. Develop 5-year Strategic Plan
8. Prepare Final Report

Projected completion End of April

Assessment Focus from RFQ

- Existing tech master plans, standards, infrastructures, and enterprise services
- Viability of existing tech resources
- Current web-based tech and staffing
- Utilization of course management software

2010-16 Tech Plan
Process was to look at the Plan and carry forth – plan was brief as instructed, we are looking for a more detailed plan. We had talked about but not developed standards. There has not been a connection between purchase, training, and user of technology – a problem that needs to be addressed
Re Course Management Software, need to talk to DE committee as well as with faculty as user.
Need to encourage response in a timely manner, surveying faculty regarding CMS and tech usage.

WTC likes conducting focus groups—where they find they can get to the heart of the issues.

Important not to get locked into surveys,

Important to talk with people as well – focus groups presents prompts and more opportunities for more information.

Need to ask students as well regarding tech usage.

If any of the colleges have been in a similar situation with WASC and budget concerns—we can learn from them.

Any technology that we are looking at should be presented to all constituent groups for their view points.

Tech requests exist in Program Review currently – but now we have no $ to process the requests – need to be budgeted so that we can have an affective PR process.

Review – WTC consultants have downloaded info from our tech site.
They prefer focus groups
How will you bring info to all of us, staying abreast with the info coming from all the focus groups.

WTC – will channel through Michael I – web conferences when not on-site – otherwise will provide on a weekly bases, what is going on.
One of the things is that we will be given homework.

- from RQ to recommendation inclusive
  - upgrade, replacement, migration strategies

- Methodologies for addressing
  - Secure student access
  - Promoting collaboration between faculty and staff in respect to administrative systems

What is the communication vehicle for administration tools.
initiative taken, but not complete, e.g. no training
have Moodle rushed in but not nearly enough for all relevant parties, including students
process of decision making is incomplete in that not all relevant parties are included
we often buy the horse while we don’t have the wagon
there is not enough collaboration between parties who have the information
How much bandwidth (referring to staff time) do we have?

Part of the problem is that we don’t efficiently utilize what we have e.g. train individuals and have them be the trainers

Overview needed – begin with ideal – then work within our resources

Upgrade, replacement, migration strategies

Methodologies for addressing

  Secure student access
  Promoting collaboration between faculty and staff in respect to administrative systems
  Providing measurable outcomes to assist in the ability to report on improvements and success
  Introducing new technology

Jeannie: going back to the evaluation to WASC recommendations – there are still some areas not covered yet – will you be addressing that? e.g. recommendation 5 – lack of library resources, ... (Al redirects our attention to #8)

Anne-Marie: the tech plan will impact much more than articulated thus far

Engagement Teams

2 key teams
- Technology Planning Committee which reports to
- PRAC

Q: what is the relationship – how do the two committees communicate?
Sara: 2x mo. TPC reporting to PRAC

Anne Marie: we want to have enough of a coordinated effort that process can be reported every 2 wks, and so at the end there is a continued awareness of progression
We would provide a draft of a structure and this is what we want to accomplish, work with you, update, and then you can communicate to PRAC the iterative process

Al gives reassurance that work will not be for not, that Administration is informed as we go so that we are all on the same page all the way, so that there are no surprises at the end. Everyone takes info back to their constituent groups

Al: TPC to PRAC to College Council to President

If we come to some consensus, it will be reflected in the minutes
Technology Planning Committee
(a subcommittee of PRAC)

Al: If we don’t take it back to management and management objects, then Al should be held responsible if he has not communicated as we go.

Al: If no word of objection comes back from the President then you can assume it is accepted. There will be no formal acceptance process. Acceptance is by default.

Planning Assumptions

Process participants
- individuals
- groups
Distance Ed
ADA workgroups
TPC
Instructional Equipment Committee
Professional Development Committee
Student Access and Success
Facilities Planning
Ed Planning
Lab techs

We need some kind of sustainable plan that doesn’t require bond money, because there will not always be bond money

Communication to all campus – Cathy Summa Wolfe’s office, campus email, press brief, through Portal to students, student emails, college website, ...

Need to include Community Ed – director, Jason Lau in our work group

Technology Scope
Enterprise administrative applications, servers, and storage systems (e.g., financial, HR, student records, email and calendaring, we services)
Smart classroom technology (e.g., projectors, computers, lecture capture, video systems, classroom response systems, management systems)
Distance learning systems (e.g., video conferencing infrastructure, LMS and tech enhancement to LMS)

Who gets what when – a policy issue

Al: A conscious decision has been made by the Board that all our classrooms should be Smart classrooms

On-line learning systems and applications (e.g., course management application, video streaming)
faculty and staff systems and applications (e.g., laptop, desktop, printers, scanners, MS Office, Adobe)
Classroom and student lab systems and applications
Enterprise wired and wireless data networks
Telecommunications systems

Mike: The need for and current inability of the district to supply adequate discipline-specific software should be brought out in this plan.

Al: Tech Plan does not define $, it defines the path only.

Raemond: However plans and budget are closely tied since the tech plan needs to be sustainable and that depends on budget.

Anne Marie/Al: Usually one does not see discipline specific plans

Mike: The importance of following instructional technology needs from the infrastructure to the classroom is necessary. Through examination of Program Review requests and consultation with IT, involved faculty and staff, a clearer picture will emerge.

Need to address the scope of “Technology” in our plan.

Next week: will talk with WTC about the overall structure and what will be our next step.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm

4) NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA: Thursday, February 16, 2012 2-3:30