**Technology Committee**
**Meeting Summary**
**Thurs Sept 10, 2009. 1:30-3:00pm, 14-116**

**Members Present:**
Michelle Allaniz
Michelle M Brown
Lorrita Ford
Kevin Henson, Chair
Rene Renard

**Guests Present:**
Eric Raznick

**Agenda Items**
•Containing, Controlling And/Or Shrinking The Total Number Of Machines (And Peripherals) On Campus
•Suggested Guidelines/Standards For Computer And Peripheral Assignments For Full-Time And Adjunct Faculty
•Renewal Cycles For CSM
•District/College Technology Inventories
•Writing The Report/Dividing Up The Work

**Discussion Points**
Total Number of Machines
•We heard from Jim Petromill and Eric Raznick that, for the first time, we may be looking at shrinking the number of machines supported on campus rather than expanding it. Particularly with computer labs.

•Discussion of "VM Ware Machines" that run any OS application. This would make a computer lab "multipurpose."
        •A VM Ware lab can be general use, rather than specific classes needing to use a specific lab.
        •WIth VM Ware, there can be more activities on a computer, so less computers and labs on campus.

•Over the past few years, CSM has also expanded the number of peripherals on campus, including printers, which require ink and supplies.

- Students have abused the ability to print in the labs, using up paper and ink so much that faculty and lab staff now lock up the printer and/or ink. The campus may need to adopt a "pay to print" model for students.

- Another consideration is the fact that a lot of our students now own technologies that they did not own when the labs were built.

- Wireless on campus not always reliable, depending upon location.

Tech Trends
- Think about emerging and dying technology trends.
    - Is there anything to phase out? Anything it doesn't make sense to support. Fax machines and overhead projectors?
    - If we get rid of fax machines on campus, remember that our current Xerox machines can fax (and perform other functions), but those features are not turned on.

- Adjunct Technology
    - The netbook for adjunct faculty to use in the classroom instead of more expensive laptops.
    - Network printing for adjuncts.
    - Fewer high end laptops on campus and more netbooks would be a savings.
    - Every division has a laptop for adjuncts that does not get used much.
    - Most adjunct faculty have their own computers, so they just need something to use when they are in the classroom.
    - In the past, CSM has always bought on the high end. Laptops cost about $2000 each. Netbooks are around $600 (Dell).
    - The college just cannot keep investing in the high end for everybody. We need draw the line somewhere.

Peripheral Assignments
- Printers. Faculty who went out and bought their own ink jet printers have discovered that  the toner cartridges are more expensive than the printer.
    - Network printing for adjuncts.

- CTL gone. Faculty used CTL as a print and copy area. We should replace it. We need to create a new space for that.

- CSM should move to using electronic signatures to eliminate paper waste and the reason for some faxing.

<u>Renewal Cycles and District Tech Inventories</u>
- •Inventories at a macro level are good for our purposes, but won't have absolutely every machine on it.
•What tech is in what bldg and when was it installed?
•Example, B36 is now 3 years old, with everything on a four or five year cycle. How and when do things get replaced? We need guidelines on what to replace and when.
•We do have some computers that just do word processing or simple stuff and will continue to run fine for well after 5 years. But our warranties only extend to 5 years on all CSM computers.

•**ACTION**: Work with Brad Witham on identifying what elements are included in a technology inventory? Do we need to know CPU and OS and all that? Eric says that we have an inventory in ITS that does include CPUs, projectors, etc. It is a spreadsheet that tells processor speed and other info.  Are the inventories accessible and accurate?

•The Tech Committee will give our input to the decision makers.
- •Bond money set aside to renew technology, so some of these decisions will be made pretty soon.

<u>Writing the Report and Dividing the Work</u>
**ACTION** ITEMS assigned to members

**Part 1 Narrative**
(10-16 pages)

A. **Description of the Committee's Planning Process** (**Michelle Alaniz**—Look at CSM Tech Plan Working Final, Skyline Tech Plan, Other Sample Tech Plans) (1-2 pages)
This section describes the participants in the planning processes and the key activities of the planning committee as it developed its plan.

B. **Rationale and Analysis of Data** (Assignment to **Kevin Henson**) (4-5 pages) (See CSM Tech Plan Working Final7  on TAC sharepoint)
This section is a narrative discussion and analysis of the data that support the proposed goals. Data can include information from *the Educational Master Plan*, environmental scans, and findings and themes emerging from the Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews and Division Workplans, as well as other pertinent information and research. This section should include a SWOT Analysis (see below for explanation).

**C. Planning Assumptions** (**Michelle Brown**)
(1-2 pages)—(See [CSM Tech Plan Working Final7](#) on TAC sharepoint)
These are an outcome of the Rationale and contain a synthesis of findings from the data analysis. They help guide the direction of Goals and Objectives.

**D. Linkages to other Plans** (This narrative can be created/summarized from the individual "Goal Templates of Part II)—**All Committee Members**
(1-2 pages) This section should explain how the proposed plan is linked to CSM's *Educational Master Plan*; *CSM's Insitutional Priorities, 2008-2011;* the *SMCCCD Strategic Plan, 2008-2013;* the *SMCCCD Distance Education Plan*; *SMCCCD Facilities Plan, 2006*; and other pertinent college and district planning efforts.

**E. Assessment** (How to measure progress on Goals)
(4-5 pages) (This narrative can be created/summarized from the individual "Goal Templates of Part II)—**All Committee Members**

**Part 2: Recommended Goals and Objectives**

**Goal #1:** Develop a stable, long-term plan and funding source(s) to meet the ongoing need for renewing and upgrading technology resources in campus computer laboratories as well as for faculty, staff, and administrative functions. (The biggie: Total Cost of Ownership. Priority #4)--**Kevin**

**Goal #2:** *Ensure that faculty, staff, and administrators possess information technology competencies that effectively support teaching, learning, and college administrative functions—Michele Alaniz, Michelle Brown, Charles La Mere*

**Goal #3:** Improve access to information competency instruction (including web 2.0) for both on-campus and distance education students. (pulled from self-study)—**Michele Alaniz and Lorrita Ford**

**Goal #4:** Use technology to facilitate effective communications with students, faculty, staff, alumni and the general public. (tied to institutional priority #5)—**Michelle Brown**

**Goal #5:** Develop an annual assessment of the college's future technological needs in light of advances in hardware and software and pedagogy. (keeping an eye on future trends)—**Michelle Brown**

**Goal #6:** Ensure that both long-term and short-term technology planning is integrated into institutional planning at all levels.  (priority #4)—**Rene Renard**


•Eric offered to provide any info/data that we need from IT.

•Deadline for Committee Plan is Nov 9th.

**Agenda for Next Meeting:**
Prepare committee plan for submission.

**Next Meeting:** Oct 22, but members can email their work for feedback or to ask questions at any time.

**Summary Prepared by:** *Michelle M. Brown, Sept 13, 2009.*