

# CUYAMACA COLLEGE

## College Technology Plan

2004 - 2005

Instructional Technology Council

Technology Plan Committee:

Rik Barnes  
Pei Hua Chou (Co-Chair)  
Connie Elder  
Patricia Newman  
Tim Pagaard  
Dave Raney  
Larry Sherwood (Co-Chair)  
Joe Souza  
Steve Weinert

Special thanks to Cheryl Alvarez  
for production of the spreadsheet

Liaison to the Academic Master Plan Committee:

Connie Elder & Pei Hua Chou

Presented to the Instructional Technology Council on March 12, 2004

**Cuyamaca College**  
Technology Plan  
**2004 - 2005**

## ***Executive Summary***

This year, the committee evaluated technology proposals totaling \$489,28, a 7.5% increase over last year. Requests ranged from routine software upgrades to a new smart classroom. As in previous years, each department proposal was assigned to a committee member, who, in turn, discussed it with the person primarily responsible for the proposal's preparation. The purpose of this liaison-based procedure was to help the committee to fully understand each department's needs and then allow each proposal to be considered and ranked in the overall context of college needs. This resulted in a priority ranking of 1-4 for each request. Two percent of the requests were not ranked because they either already had been funded or they did not satisfy at least one of the committee's funding criteria.

The following table compares prioritized requests for 2003-04 with what has been requested for 2004-05.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Priority 1	\$243,204	66.3	\$124,867	26.0
Priority 2	96,464	26.3	218,186	45.4
Priority 3	27,245	7.4	114,354	23.8
Priority 4	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>23,328</u>	4.9
Totals	\$366,914	100	\$480,735	100.1

2003-04 requests totaling \$257,744 were funded from block grants. This amount covered all priority 1 requests and a few in the priority 2 category. The same level of funding next year would again cover all priority 1 requests plus 58% of the priority 2's. It is important to remember at this point, however, that the block grant funding system is currently under review, so past experience may not be a reliable guide to future funding.

In addition to prioritizing funding requests, the committee reviewed its charge and some of the procedures it has been using to arrive at its decisions. Based on this review, the committee would like to make the following recommendations:

- The college should create a budget category to support the replacement of computer labs and smart classrooms. This recommendation was made in last year's report and is repeated again this year to underline the need. Even if block grant funding continues as before, upgrades for labs and smart classrooms will consume an increasing percentage of available funds. Soon, there will be little left to allocate for new technology.
- A related recommendation concerns the procedures for purchasing technology. Under current procedures, a proposal that is approved for the fall semester can take most of the academic year to process. Given the critical need to upgrade four-year-old computers, it has become imperative to find ways to expedite the purchasing process. The Committee therefore urges the College to consider any procedural changes that would allow for the purchase and installation of approved technology proposals during the summer, so that the new equipment will be available for the subsequent fall semester.
- The Policies and Procedures Committee should be combined with the Technology Plan Committee. Much of this committee's original charge has been fulfilled, and its main job now is to allocate recycled computers to faculty offices. The TPC is naturally aware of most of the computers that come available for reallocation through lab upgrades. Furthermore, when new computers are needed, those requests should be handled by the TPC, which is charged with prioritizing the majority of requests for new equipment and has the knowledge and expertise to purchase the equipment as well.

Finally, we would like serious readers of this report to know that we have revised slightly the guidelines we will be using next year. For example, requests for upgrades and replacements of faculty office computers will be considered. Also, for the first time, we have created a category for data projector bulbs. Each bulb costs about \$400, and we use a lot of them. We have come to the point where money must be set aside to ensure that funds will be there when they are needed. This year the amount is \$3,000. Lastly, we would like to make it clear that, in the future, furniture for computer labs will be considered only when computer labs are first created. Replacement furniture should be requested through the Academic Master Plan and budget process.

### ***Tech Plan Proposal Evaluation Process***

The Technology Committee begins meeting in November, at which time members are assigned disciplines for which they are responsible to represent during committee discussions. The members are expected to meet with their discipline(s) and become very familiar with the needs, available resources, and vision of that instructional area. It is at this time that the Technology Plan for the current year is compared with the available funding for the current year. The chair of the committee typically contacts all department chairs or coordinators to establish that needs still exist and which of those needs are the most critical. The committee reviews the current year plan in light of all available new data and identifies those items that will be recommended for funding.

Meanwhile, the Academic Master Plan Committee (AMPC) is hard at work reviewing all instructional plans and ranking activities on a 1 – 4 scale. By Staff Development Week in January, the Technology Plan has enough information from the AMPC to begin its analysis of campus-wide technology needs. The Technology Plan Committee compiles the technology plans and coordinates its review of them with the concurrent and pertinent rankings of the Academic Master Plan Committee. The discipline expert presents each department's plan, a discussion ensues and priority rankings on a 1-4 scale result.

### ***Criteria and Ranking Categories***

The criteria and ranking categories are given below.

**Criteria** - Technology proposals should:

1. support curricular goals.
2. demonstrate faculty willingness/readiness to implement.
3. be part of a phased-in project already in progress.
4. assist multiple departments.
5. support long-term institutional goals through the use of current and emerging technologies.
6. be cost effective.
7. demonstrate a critical need for state-of-the-art technology.

**Ranking Categories:**

1. Strongest recommendation
2. Highly recommended
3. Recommended
4. Not recommended
5. Not Ranked

It is likely that in 2004 - 2005 requests for technology will exceed the available funds; in anticipation of that likelihood, the Committee has attempted to prioritize through a rigorous application of the funding criteria.

### ***Allowable Tech Plan Items***

Technology Plan requests are generally funded from block grant funds which are Instructional Equipment/Library Material/Technology Funds. These funds are for equipment, related infrastructure and installation necessary for the delivery and preparation of instruction or direct assistance to students. Equipment means tangible district property of a more or less permanent nature that cannot be easily lost, stolen or destroyed; but which replaces, modernizes or expands an existing instructional program. Furniture such as tables, desks and chairs will be considered at the time of initial installation only. Subsequent requests for upgrades or replacement must be routed through the regular Academic Master Plan and budget process. Software which is an integral and necessary component for the use of specific instructional equipment may be included in Block Grant Fund requests. And, starting with the 2005-06 year, Requests for upgrades and replacements of faculty office computers will also be considered. Supply items such as zip disks, CDs, videos, floppies, etc., are considered supply items, and must be purchased from department supply funds.

### ***Planning Software Requests***

Several departments have included requests for software, but have been unable to project with adequate specificity either the particular applications they need or the estimated costs. The Committee has categorically ranked such requests as "3"; although the requests reflect identified needs, they can not be funded until they are more detailed. This represents a difficult problem for faculty who are content experts in their own areas but lack expertise in computer-related issues such as hardware, peripheral devices, and software. The Committee's recommendation is that faculty who lack technical knowledge or are unsure of their software needs should contact the chair of the Tech Plan Committee, who will, in turn, put them in touch with the TPC member assigned to their discipline.

### ***Trends for Technology Use***

While reduced budgets in the near future present serious funding challenges, the overall trend at Cuyamaca College continues to be one of increased reliance on instructional technology. Each year brings additional "smart" classrooms, Internet-based assignments, and more courses offered in either a hybrid or online format. The expanded use of technology is an essential trend in education; in a period of limited resources it is paramount that we rely on careful planning to get the maximum return on our technology investment.