

March 9, 2006

CUYAMACA COLLEGE

College Technology Plan 2006 - 2007

Instructional Technology Council

Technology Plan Committee:

Larry Sherwood
Stephen Weinert
Co-Chairs

Scott Eckert
Tim Buckles
Tim Pagaard
Dave Raney
Joe Souza

Special thanks to Nancy Asbury
for the production of this plan

Cuyamaca College Technology Plan 2006– 2007

2005-06 Expenditures. The first priority of the committee this year was to consider the priority one requests that were submitted in October 2004. These requests were given priority rankings in February 2005, but funding had to wait until October 2005 when the final budget for technology was known. This amount turned out to be \$90,000. However, \$234,000 in priority 1 requests had been recommended for funding by the TPC based on its evaluation of the requests forwarded to it from the Academic Master Plan Committee. The TPC therefore had to reconsider its earlier recommendations. This was accomplished by working with department chairs to identify only the most critically needed items for funding. This, of course, pushed some of last year's priority ones into this year's requests, which partially explains the large percentage of requests with priority 1 rank this year.

The final purchases were completed in March 2006. The time from original department request to actual purchase ranged from fifteen to eighteen months.

2006-07. This year the committee received requests totaling \$416,967. Below is a summary of the dollar amounts and priority rankings over a four-year period.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>% Total</u>
Priority 1	\$243,204	66.3	\$124,867	27.3	\$234,684	49.4	\$305,066	73.2
Priority 2	\$96,464	26.3	\$218,186	47.7	\$84,152	17.7	\$87,644	21.0
Priority 3	\$27,245	7.4	\$114,354	25	\$156,313	32.9	\$24,257	5.8
Totals:	\$366,913	100	\$457,407	100	\$475,149	100	\$416,967	100

Last year, 91% of the requests were either for lab or smart classroom upgrades. For that reason the committee felt compelled to include the following statement in its final report: "The business of the committee has shifted from bringing new technology into the traditional classroom to simply maintaining what we already have." Overall this year 51% of the requests are for upgrades and replacement of hardware. Added to this ongoing problem is a new concern, that of supporting the new buildings. We have the initial funding for these buildings, but the maintenance costs for the new labs will soon overwhelm the funding sources we currently are using to fill technology needs.

It should also be noted that faculty are now using more software in their online teaching activities, and unlike the cost of hardware, software is generally becoming more expensive.

On a positive note, configuration of smart classrooms has been standardized. This was done to allow for multiple uses by different teachers with a minimum of inconvenience. It will also make support and equipment replacement much easier and cheaper. This year the committee received six requests for smart classrooms or upgrades to existing smart classrooms. A task force was formed to incorporate these requests into a single category called "Smart Classroom." This way all the rooms will have a configuration that will be consistent the new standard.

Recommendations

The committee's recommendations this year are basically the same as in the three previous reports. They are: (1) chronic under funding of our technology needs and (2) our concern over the delay between funding decisions and the arrival of critically needed hardware on campus.

- The college should develop a plan to support the replacement of computer labs and smart classrooms that is independent of block grant funding. So far, we have been lucky because block grants and other one-time grant funding sources have covered our basic needs. However, this may not always be the case. The College should develop a plan to cover our technology needs with a stable source of funding when block grants are not available.
- A related recommendation concerns the procedures for purchasing technology. Under the current procedure, a proposal that is approved for implementation in the 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 of the year when the TPC makes its funding recommendations.

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

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 flash drives, 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 blended 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.