

# CUYAMACA COLLEGE

## College Technology Plan

2005 - 2006

Instructional Technology Council

Technology Plan Committee:

Pei Hua Chou  
Larry Sherwood  
Co-Chairs

Rik Barnes  
Scott Eckert  
Patricia Newman  
Tim Pagaard  
Dave Raney  
Joe Souza  
Steve Weinert

Special thanks to Nancy Asbury  
for the production of this plan

Presented to the Instructional Technology Council on May 13, 2005

**Cuyamaca College**  
**Technology Plan**  
**2005– 2006**

This year, the committee evaluated technology proposals totaling \$475,149. Requests ranged from routine software upgrades to new smart classrooms. 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 better 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 1-3 for each request. Fifteen percent of the requests were not ranked (Priority 4/5) because they either already had been funded or they did not satisfy at least one of the committee's funding criteria.

The following table summarizes the prioritized requests for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Priority 1	\$243,204	66.3	\$124,867	27.3	234,684	49.4
Priority 2	96,464	26.3	218,186	47.7	84,152	17.7
Priority 3	27,245	7.4	114,354	25.0	156,313	32.9
Pri.4/5	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$366,914</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$457,407</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$475,149</b>	<b>100</b>

**2004-05 Expenditures.** Seventy-eight thousand dollars in block grant funds were available this year to fund requests in the 2004-05 plan. As a result, only 62% of the priority one requests could be funded, whereas, all priority one's and some priority two's were funded the previous year. If this trend continues, it is possible that less than half of the most critically-needed technology will be funded from block grants next year.

Furthermore, 91% of the requests were either for lab or smart classroom upgrades. This suggests that the business of the committee has shifted from bringing new technology into the traditional classroom to simply maintaining what we already have.

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 the past two reports and is repeated again this year to underline the need. Even if block grant funding continues as before, upgrades for labs and smart classrooms could consume all available block-grant 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 implementation in fall semester of the following year can take most of that academic year to process. Given the critical need to upgrade older computers, it has become imperative to find ways to expedite the purchasing process. The Committee therefore urges The College to consider procedural changes that would allow for the purchase and installation of the most critically-needed technology during the summer.

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

The Technology Plan 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 Committee 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 liaison 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 2005 - 2006 requests for technology will exceed the available funds; in anticipation of that likelihood, the committee has attempted to prioritize requests through a rigorous application of the funding criteria.

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

Technology Plan requests are generally funded from block grants, which include Instructional Equipment/Library Material/Technology and VATEA 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 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. Requests for upgrades and replacements of faculty office computers will also be considered. 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 cannot be funded until they are more specific. 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 Associate Dean for Learning Resources, 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.

