



DATE: May 10, 2012

TO: Dr. Robert Bramucci
Vice Chancellor Technology and Learning Services

C: Gary Poertner, Chancellor
Dr. Debra Fitzsimons
Chair, Basic Aid Allocation Recommendation Committee
Vice Chancellor of Business Services

FROM: Tod Burnett, President Saddleback College
Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, President, Irvine Valley College

RE: District Technology Plan 2012-2017 IVC and Saddleback College Recommendations

This recommendation was initiated by the college IT Directors and has been reviewed and recommended by both of the campuses' key constituency groups. It is important to note that there was nothing that was specific to a particular campus, thus the ability to combine our recommendations.

This document directly addresses District accreditation Recommendations 1 and 2.

District Recommendation 1: The teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement both a strategic short-term and long-term plan that is inclusive of the planning at the colleges and that this planning structure drive the allocation of district resources for the colleges, Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP), and the district (IB.4).

District Recommendation 2:

The teams recommend that the district and the colleges develop and implement a resource allocation model driven by planning that includes all district funds and is open, transparent, inclusive, and that is widely disseminated and reviewed/evaluated periodically for effectiveness (Ia.1, IB, and IIID.1, IIID.1.b, IIID.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.b, IIID.3, IV.B.3.c).

The college recommendations are as follows:

1. District Technology Plan
 - a. Each project needs to have detailed costs, scope, implementation plan and outcomes.
 - i. Data and documentation should be included along with the funding requests to ensure both campuses can understand the project costs and scope.
 - ii. Projects that have phases need to be clearly identified.
 - b. The entire Saddleback, IVC and District technology plans need to be incorporated into the District-wide Technology Plan.
 - i. Each college will drive their technology plan.
 - ii. The district plan will be driven by the colleges.
 - c. The District Technology Master Plan should integrate with existing master plans.

2. Projects
 - a. Sponsorship and key stakeholders.

- i. Given that District IT is working on District wide projects:
 1. Each campus requests that a key stakeholder(s) be included from IVC, Saddleback and district services in an equal number.
 2. At a minimum, each stakeholder should be involved in the project scope, kickoff, health review (project performance), milestones and completion meetings.
 - ii. Projects should not deviate from the priority list.
 - iii. Identify the expected life cycle of the project.
 - b. The colleges request a spreadsheet that shows the past four years of district IT project expenditures and a projection of costs through the end of the plan (2017).
3. Funding
- a. Funding will be provided when project costs, scope, implementation plan and outcomes are complete.
 - b. Funding is tied to a specific project where an account will be setup to allow for fiscal review.
 - c. The college's campus IT Directors and executive leadership should, first approve all projects that have ongoing costs assumed by the campuses.
 - d. Projects that require travel and/or classified employee time away from work should include funding to offset Overtime or Substitute pay.
4. Documentation
- a. All project information should be posted to a SharePoint site.
 - b. The Vice Chancellor of Business Services will monitor project expenditures in accordance with these guidelines.

It is our recommendation that BAARC provisionally allocate funding to the District-Wide 2012-2013 priority list, but expenses cannot occur until the above conditions are met for each project.