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INTRODUCTION
Since the development of the Information Technology Plan 2004-2007, the college has made substantial upgrades to its technology resources to improve institutional operations and effectiveness, upgrade available services to students, and provide faculty with tools to effectively deliver instructional content. The college has replaced its administrative data system and support programs, upgraded its web site and related services, added limited wireless connectivity, created an online testing center, provided a course management system (WebCT/Blackboard), and implemented a number of programs to facilitate the matriculation process for students.

Maintaining the currency and effectiveness of computers, systems, and services is negatively impacted by the fiscal crisis in California. It is imperative, therefore, that college leaders think strategically as they decide how best technology can help us address our educational goals. Technology planning is a complex effort, requiring the evaluation, purchase, and maintenance of highly sophisticated hardware and software; the coordinated efforts of individuals across various disciplines and units in order to effectively implement the technologies; and ongoing training for both technical specialists and end-users. A good technology plan must be more than a list of items to purchase or people to hire. It must also be a tactical initiative coordinated throughout the college to identify critical needs. For these reasons, the college identified the development of this plan as one of the three highest priorities in the Strategic Plan 2009-2012.

VISION STATEMENT
College of Marin will have a well integrated, state-of-the-art information technology environment that sustains and enhances teaching and learning, supports the college’s mission and educational master plan, and provides for the communication of timely and accurate information to increase the effectiveness of all of the college’s operations and services.

PHILOSOPHY
1. Technological resources should be made available to support excellent instruction and to facilitate and enhance effective student learning and student development. Technology should serve, not drive the college in its efforts to fulfill its mission and address the goals of the Educational Master Plan. (Success)

2. Students, faculty, and staff should have access to technology that improves their ability to contribute in their respective roles in the institution. (Access)

3. Students, faculty, and staff should have ongoing access to technology training and education. (Staff/student development)

4. Technology planning should include cost effective acquisition and allocation of ongoing resources to support infrastructure, hardware, and software. (Institutional effectiveness)
KEY TERMS

As used here, the term technology refers to electronic or information technology that supports functions and operations college-wide, including some specialized technology unique to and shared by particular disciplines or operations. Included in this definition are office technologies such as personal computers, printers, the telephone system, the email system, and standard office computer applications; instructional technologies such as computer labs, electronic media, and classroom management systems; student support technologies that facilitate orientation, assessment, counseling, placement, enrollment, and articulation; and administrative technology systems that support the administrative and business requirements of the district.

Since the Technology Plan is intended to implement Priority #3 of the college’s Strategic Plan 2009-2012, it employs the same major planning terms. The strategic initiatives are broad implementation goals, which can be divided into more detailed and concrete action steps. The action steps we have listed are only samples, to give the reader a sense of what will be required in order to complete the strategic initiative. They will need to be developed in more detail in the next phase of the development of the plan.

Like the Strategic Plan, this plan envisions that each action step will have a champion. This is the individual, typically an administrator, who is charged with ensuring that the action steps are being addressed in an effective manner.

We have divided the strategic initiatives into two broad categories. Those labeled support of student learning address the needs of programs and services that directly serve students. Those labeled support of college’s technological infrastructure also support student learning, of course, but do so indirectly. Obviously, there is overlap between these two categories, but we want to emphasize their functional differences and strongly emphasize the importance of each to the other.

Finally, we have sought to identify the types and mix of resources that each initiative is likely to require: policies, hardware, software, training, and staffing. As used here, the term policy includes procedures, planning activities, administrative regulations, and protocols.
TECHNOLOGY PLANNING PROCESS, 2007 – 2010

**August 2007- October 2008**
The Technology Planning Committee, created as an official governance committee to replace the ad hoc Technology Committee, undertakes a review of the Information Technology Plan 2004 – 2007 developed by the earlier committee with the help of the Strata Information Group (SIG.)
The following individuals served on the ad hoc Technology Committee in 2007: Ingrid Schreck (Chair), Bonnie Borenstein, Steve Dodson, Harriet Eskildsen, John Hinds, Kathleen Kirkpatrick, Nancy Kutcher, Jim Locke, Mike Lewis, Deb Mindel, Rene Prado, Rainer Wachalovsky, and Derek Wilson. The following individuals served on the Technology Planning Committee from August 2007-May 2008: Victoria Coad (Chair), Susan Andrien, Jim Arnold, Jeff Cady, Win Cottle (through Feb 2009), Frank Crosby, Steve Dodson, Harriet Eskildsen, Joseph Giroux, John Gudmundsson, Andy Haber, Michael Irvine, and Michael Ransom. The following individuals served on the Technology Planning Committee from August 2008-May 2010: Michael Irvine (Chair), Bob Balestreri, Jeff Cady (through May 2009), Win Cottle, Frank Crosby, Alice Dieli, Harriet Eskildsen, Ratnakar Nanavaty (through November 2008), Marshall Northcott, Dong Nguyen (through December 2009), Nathaniel Parker (through May 2009), and Kathleen Smyth.

**October 2008**
The Technology Planning Committee (TPC) begins an update of the college’s computer inventory.

**November 2008**
After beginning work to update an older computer replacement plan, TPC is directed by the Institutional Planning Committee to begin preparing a college wide technology plan.

**January 2009**
IPC receives the new Computer Replacement Plan but asks for more detailed data from the completed computer inventory, as well as from program reviews.

**February 2009**
IPC approves the Computer Replacement plan and sends it to the Budget Committee for consideration. With encouragement from IPC, TPC continues to work on a new technology plan, reviewing the 2004 – 2007 Plan to determine what should be retained.

**March 2009**
IPC directs TPC to develop the Technology Plan 2010 – 2016 according to the schedule listed in the Strategic Plan Actions steps in conjunction with the Educational Master Plan.

**April 2009**
Changes in Program Review enable TPC to gather better information about technology needs. The committee discusses the inclusion of policies, standards, and procedures in the new plan.
August 2009
TPC begins to examine technology plans from other colleges. The interim Director of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) is brought on board as an advisor to the committee.

September 2009
The Program Review Committee implements TPC recommended changes in the Program Review template.

IPC and the Budget Committee are eliminated and replaced by the newly formed Planning, Resource, and Allocation Committee (PRAC), the new parent committee for TPC.

October 2009
TPC assesses the extent to which 2004 – 07 Information Technology Plan recommendations are completed, and determines that except for the establishment of the ERP software, action has not been taken on the recommendations. TPC explores the use of graphic depictions of Technology Plan recommendations, and selects the Skyline College technology plan as a good model.

November 2009
TPC develops a timeline for plan preparation, vision, and philosophy statements, and a template for developing goals and action steps. The PRIE Director serves as resource to the committee and assists in the editing of the plan. TPC determines that there should be a public period during which the academic community at large can look at the progress made on the plan.

January 2010
The Committee modifies the organization of the plan to create continuity with the previous plan and to reflect the organization of the institutional Strategic Plan.

February 2010
TPC refines the plan’s organization, including a matrix with categorical descriptors, and settles on the terms “Strategic Initiatives” and “Action Plans” to parallel the Strategic Plan. Criteria for determining priorities are developed. It also proposes steps to finalize the plan by April of 2010.

March 4, 2010
A draft introduction describing the features and history of the plan is written and approved by the committee.

March 9, 2010
The plan, 2010 – 2016 Technology Plan, Phase 1 is submitted to PRAC.

April 6, 2010
The final version of the plan, which includes prioritized initiatives and detailed action steps, is submitted to PRAC for final approval.
STRATEGIC PLAN 2009 – 2012, COLLEGE PRIORITY #3

Prepare, implement, and evaluate a college technology plan that identifies the policies, hardware, software, and training needed to improve student, staff, and faculty access to the effective use of technology in instruction. (EMP Recommendation College Systems 3)

Strategic Objective 3.1: Champion: Vice President of College Operations
Prepare a College of Marin Technology Plan 2010 – 2016 that identifies the current needed improvements in policies, hardware, software, and training.

Action Step 3.1.1
A. Analyze the status of the 2004 – 2007 College of Marin Technology Plan and other relevant data to identify the remaining unmet needs related to technology policies, hardware, software, and training.
B. Responsible Party: Vice President of College Operations
C. Timeline: October 2009

Action Step 3.1.2
A. Compile the technology requests from all prior year Program Reviews.
B. Responsible Party: Vice President of College Operations
C. Timeline: October 2009

Action Step 3.1.3
A. Collaborate with on-campus IT staff to develop a list of needed improvements to hardware and software.
B. Responsible Party: Vice President of College Operations
C. Timeline: December 2009

Action Step 3.1.4
A. Integrate the lists prepared in Action Steps 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3 and prioritize the needs identified by these two college resources, with special attention to the hardware and software needed to meet the College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2009 – 2019 recommendation related to distance education (Student Access 3).
B. Responsible Party: Vice President of College Operations
C. Timeline: December 2009

Action Step 3.1.5
A. Prepare a College of Marin Technology Plan 2010 – 2016 that identifies the current needed improvements in policies, hardware, software, and training.
B. Responsible Party: Vice President of College Operations
C. Timeline: Draft to be distributed college-wide: March 15, 2010; Completed document: May 1, 2010.