Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2016

Name of Department: **Campus Technology Services**

Efficacy Team: David Smith, Todd Heibel, Rochelle Fender

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): CONTINUATION

CTS efficacy is generally measured by two key metrics: 1) the amount of new equipment deployed, and 2) the number of Helpdesk tickets completed annually, presumably to the satisfaction of the complainant. This well-written report gives an overall impression of solid competence, attention to campus trends, and an articulated vision for future needs and service opportunities. Despite staff numbers that consistently lag behind the 75:1 – 150:1 computer-to-technician ratio recommended by International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), the department has been reorganized into a cohesive and centralized unit (formerly fragmented in four "silos," causing hit-or-miss inefficiencies and unused lab spaces.)

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
	Part I: Access	
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*The program provides an analysis of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.* *If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
There aren't numbers to indicate CTS-specific demographic use (but campus demographics are appropriate, as CTS serves the entire campus); however, with 5.6% of the student population having various disabilities, CTS has purchased software to improve accessibility in all open lab areas, DSPS, and instructional labs; all labs do have wheelchair access and appropriate furniture. Software phones for deaf and hearing-impaired are campus-wide. There's been a 30% growth in number of student-use computers since 2012 Program Review, and growth in all three main areas: open labs, instructional labs, and service labs.

Our only concern was that there was not specific demographic data for this department; However, we understand that would be difficult to attain. In future, Program may want to include an intro statement to why their demographic #s are identical to the campus #s.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.* *If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Efficiency is measured by Campus Climate surveys; the satisfaction rates for all groups (faculty, student, managers, classified) are acceptable. It is noted that some survey samples are so small as to skew results, e.g. with only 13 managers responding, 2 less-than-satisfied customers results in a 13.3% rate indicating dissatisfaction. Overall satisfaction regarding computer- and Internet-access, user-friendly web site, and online accessibility are all positive. The area of greatest concern is the offsite helpdesk support services, where long-distance employees don't fully understand our campus. It would have helped if the department's ideas regarding a local campus helpdesk had been explored. In addition, more information about actual (physical) staffing levels during daytime (e.g. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm) and evening (e.g. 5:00 to 9:00 pm) hours on campus would provide a more complete portrayal of CTS services, including shortages brought about by insufficient staffing.

Specific information regarding about Hours of Operation, weekend availability, and Help Desk services would provide better support to this section.

Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	*Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.*	*Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Again, the reorganization (circa 2009) and new housing (portables vacated by Middle School) have centralized services and improved morale. Mobile Internet access is a priority; a third new wireless system is being deployed, providing faster data access. CTS now has its own web page and a FAQ tab. Vendor discounts to students are also offered here.

It is clear that CTS supports the primary educational mission of SBVC within and outside of the traditional classroom. For example, CTS supports classroom-based technologies (e.g. computers, LCD projectors, document cameras, etc.), as well as distance education-based technologies (e.g. wireless networks, website portals, etc.).

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	*Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*	*Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
The report lists eight "Technology Guiding Values" that buttress the departmental mission statement. Productivity is measured based on 1) new equipment deployed (30% increase since 2012) and 2) number of Helpdesk tickets completed annually (11,575 at SBVC in 2015). In addition, students, faculty, staff, and administrators are invited to complete annual Campus Climate Surveys as a further means to assess the level of CTS services. The department is admittedly struggling with staff shortages and a 330:1 technician ratio per computer.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	*The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.*	*The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
The department strives to provide students with universal access to needed computing tools and the needed expertise to fully utilize them, along with thriving community partnerships. This mission aligns with the institutional mission.

Productivity	*The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.*	*The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
The helpdesk numbers are impressive; the director notes that a myriad of requests are fulfilled without tickets; often a site visit will resolve up to 10 un-ticketed issues. An entire summer break was needed to reload software in many labs; only 5 tickets were logged. A 5-year cycle for equipment is recommended as most cost-effective. A supported software list and installation protocols are also highly recommended.

The narrative in this section suggests significant shortcomings of utilizing only logged Help Desk tickets. As previously mentioned, a single ticket may represent significant work on a multitude of projects (e.g. replacing hardware and/or updating software for an entire computer laboratory). Customer surveys typically include feedback for Help Desk staff only. This excludes recognition for the Herculean efforts of the "in house" CTS staff. In short, Help Desk data, while helpful, masks the industriousness of the CTS staff and director.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation	*The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.* *Out of date course(s) that are not launched into Curricunet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.*	*The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: N/A

Part IV: Planning

Trends	The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.	The program <u>identifies and describes</u> major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
The department discusses trends in technology: cloud and mobile computing; the Internet of things; virtualized servers, desktops, applications; electronic books. All SARS machines, library databases, and 2 computer labs have been converted to virtualized desktops. Tablet computing is available in several areas. Importantly, the narrative supports the ever-changing technological landscape of the classroom.

Accomplishments	The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.	The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
All campus copiers are on one centralized lease (one of the ISTE recommendations). CTS is able to leverage bulk buying with many vendors; discounts also flow to the student level. For example, the CTS has cultivated a relationship with the Foundation for California Community Colleges through the collegebuys.org website. Although this specific example is not included in the narrative, it is an example of how bulk discounts and partnerships benefic students, faculty, and staff. Instead of AV material being delivered only upon request, many classrooms now have installed technology in place 24/7. $533,000 is allocated to replace 1/5 of campus computers, which gets all labs and office computers on the desired 5-year cycle.

Weaknesses/challenges	The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.	The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
Challenges include: the 330:1 ratios (too high for industry standards), lack of CTS-owned lab space (resulting in unused lab space by other departments), decrepit old buildings (e.g. lack of electrical and network locations), high-expense equipment needed for new buildings. Desired solutions for each are discussed, albeit briefly.

Surprisingly, grant-supported (purchased) hardware and software that ultimately transitions to institutional support is not mentioned in this section (although it is mentioned elsewhere). This is a chronic, serious issue plaguing the CTS.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate. Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate. Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS
CTS partners with TESS for district-wide technology goals and has biweekly meetings to discuss. Centralized purchasing gives the college bargaining power with three major vendors (Microsoft, Dell, Apple); discounts are passed on to faculty and students. CTS has long-term relationships with over twenty listed vendors, both local and global.

The important relationship with the Campus Technology Committee (and associated liaison with Program Review Committee) is discussed in other sections but is missing from the narrative in this section. In addition, the CTS Director frequently participates in CTE-related industry advisory meetings across campus throughout the academic year. These are important relationships that directly relate to partnerships that create a healthy and robust campus climate.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.	*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no "Does not Meets" in the previous efficacy review): NONE	