# Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

## Business Process Analysis Workshop:

### Technology Requests Process and Prioritization Rubric

**March 8-9, 2017**

Jamie Cavaliere, Ph.D., Senior Consultant

Strata Information Group

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## INTRODUCTION

Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) contracted with Strata Information Group (SIG) for a Business Process Analysis (BPA) to address the technology request process at the college (Grossmont College and Cuyamaca College) and district levels including those requests that are part of building remodel or new construction. That BPA was conducted in December 2016. A follow-up BPA workshop was needed due to a lack of adequate time to address all issues.

This report summarizes the second BPA workshop which was conducted across 1.5 days with sessions held at Cuyamaca College. The workshop was facilitated by SIG Senior Consultant and BPR Specialist, Jamie Cavaliere, Ph.D., March 8-9, 2017.

The outcomes of the first workshop included a new, ideal technology request process that could balance the needs of the colleges and district. Questions arose concerning the details of the technology request and how these requests could be prioritized.

Technology request was defined by participants as hardware, software, networks, as well as technology support or technology training. Hence, the follow-up workshop focused on the following objectives.

- Design the ideal processes for:

    ❑ individuals to request technology
    ❑ Technology requests as a result of annual planning
    ❑ Off-cycle technology requests

- Design a standard rubric for prioritizing projects and identify indicators when a more in-depth analysis of the technology request needs to be conducted so that decisions may be adequately informed

GCCCD assembled a cross-functional project team representing leadership from the colleges and District Office, deans, Information Systems (IS), and various IT governance committees and councils. A list of workshop team members can be found in Appendix A. Participants were thoughtful in their discussions and were engaged in all aspects of the work of the group.

## NEW PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS

To provide a framework for discussions "strawmen" documents were developed by Kerry Kilber Rebman, Dean, Learning & Technology Resources, at Cuyamaca College, and Brian Nath, Director, Information Systems, at the District Office. These documents contributed greatly to the accomplishment of work by the group. The technology request forms can be found in Appendix B and the Prioritization Rubric in Appendix C.

Participants also identified those factors that would indicate that a more in-depth analysis of the technology request is needed:

- New technology which is not currently a district standard, a list of standards can be found on the Information Systems website

- The technology is intended to integrate with existing district-wide systems

- The technology requires interfaces with existing district-wide systems

- There are unclear support needs and it is unknown what support will be needed

- The technology is designed to access district-wide networks

- The technology is cloud-based

In addition, concern was expressed by participants questioning whether GCCCD possessed enough resources to accomplish all that was identified as priorities. It was also stated that there are obstacles that need to be considered at the colleges that are not present at the district level. These were captured as Issue Bin items given that these were not active items on the workshop agenda nor was there time to focus on these. They should be addressed in the future to add clarity to the technology request process.

**REDESIGNED TECHNOLOGY REQUEST PROCESSES**

At the December workshop, a high-level ideal technology request process was developed. As a result of this workshop, the ideal technology request process was examined more thoroughly and divided into four types of requests. Included in this report are the first three. The fourth, Building Remodel and/or New Construction will need to be developed.

- Those requested by Individuals (Process 1)

- Those resulting from the annual planning process (Process 2)

- Those that are more ad hoc and off-cycle from annual planning (Process 3)

- Those that are associated with Building Remodel and/or New Construction (Process 4)

The ideal maps for the first three processes can be found on the following pages.

**PROCESS 1:  Individual Technology Request**

| Trigger | User | Chair/Supervisor/ Manager | Campus/ Dist Office/ Technology Contact | Warehouse | Campus/ Dist Office/ Technology Contact | Installation Personnel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**A Technology Need Exists**

Needs computer(s)/ Printer(s)

Validates needs & funding available

Validates
- Nbr of computers/ printers
- Purpose
- Budget
- Configuration
- Ports available/ needed
- Electric needed
- Program needs
- Timelines

Equipment arrives

Enters ticket for install

Installs equipment

Completes e-technology request

(A) Approves e-technology request

e-Notifies Campus/ Dist Office/ Tech Contact equipment has arrived

e-Notifies end user & install personnel

**END**

Contacts user for install appointment

Purchases computer(s)/ printer(s)

(A) Approves e-technology request

Enters ticket

e-Notifies end user & install personnel

**LEGEND**

| Workgroup |
|---|
| Approval |
| Manual Process |
| Electronic Process |
| Audit/Control (A) |

## PROCESS 2: Technology Request as a Result of Annual Planning

**Trigger**

**Dept/Office/Committee**

**Campus/Dist Office/Technology Contact**

**Planning Council**

**Presidents/Chancellor**

**IS/ICS**

**Annual Planning Process**

**CC**
Identifies needs

**GC**
Goes through Program Review to identify needs

**Grants**
Identifies needs

**Off-Cycle**
Identifies needs

Completes e-Technology Request

Scores & ranks request using Rubric

Recommends if Scope of Work (SOW) analysis is needed

Loop with discussion about need for SOW analysis

Sends to ITAC & ATAC, SOW analysis projects list

If Grant, discusses if SOW analysis is needed

Reviews ranked list

(A) Decides which projects need SOW analysis

(A) Prioritizes requests

(A) Approves SOW analysis & may identify others for analysis

Compiles list for SOW analysis

(A) Reviews prioritization - May reprioritize

If college projects, implements

**END**

Completes SOW analysis

Sends results to Planning Council

If projects are:
- District-wide
- Affects District-wide system(s)
- College resources demand IS resources
send to TCC

Go Next Page

**LEGEND**

| |
|---|
| Workgroup |
| Approval |
| Manual Process |
| Electronic Process |
| Audit/Control (A) |

**TCC**

**Chancellor's Cabinet**



(A) Approves or may reprioritize projects

(A) Final Approval

Implements projects

END

**LEGEND**

| Workgroup |
| --- |
| **Approval** |
| **Manual Process** |
| **Electronic Process** |
| **Audit/Control** (A) |

**PROCESS 3: Off-Cycle Technology Request**



| Trigger | Dept/Office/ Committee | Manager/ Supervisor | Dean | Vice President | Cabinet | Campus Planning Council | Go-To Body |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**A Need Arises**

A Approves

A Approves

A Approves

A Approves

Validates that OK to be off-cycle

Communicates to all that need to know (FYI)

A When urgency demands, approves & makes decisions to implement

External entity provides timeline, & funding, college decides to do project
OR
There is available funding & there is time to do project
OR
There is an opportunity with a short timeline & funding

Informs initiator where in process the request is to be inserted

Communicates decision & information

Go to Process 2 for vetting

**LEGEND**

| Workgroup |
|---|
| **Approval** |
| **Manual Process** |
| **Electronic Process** |
| **Audit/Control**   A |

END

## ACTION ITEMS AND NEXT STEPS

### Action Items

As the group discussed and developed the three processes, items were captured that needed to be accomplished to implement the work of the group. These are listed below and are not in any priority order:

- Develop a fourth ideal process addressing facilities, remodel, and new construction: Lorenze Legaspi, VP, Administrative Services, will be lead

- Develop a supporting document that gives examples and directions for the rubric scores

- Vet the new processes with the Faculty Senates at both colleges

- Consider the first implementation of the new processes as a pilot

- Develop a communication plan to inform and keep constituencies current of progress

- Update technology request forms (Appendix B) and prioritization matrix (Appendix C).

- Establish/designate campus and District Office technology committees

- ITAC and ATAC review their respective charges and make recommendations for updates to the Chancellor's Cabinet

- The Web Communication Committee needs to review its charge and make recommendations for updates to the Technology Coordinating Council (TCC)

- Inform the Workforce Development Committee of the new processes and request that members use these for technology requests

- Review the Perkins process inserting technology request processes where needed

- Review the Grants process inserting technology request processes where needed

### Workshop Assessment

Assessment at the end of the BPA workshop revealed that team members felt very positive about the work that was accomplished. They cited the following:

- Strawman documents were well done and helped in articulating what was needed

- The work accomplished provides a prototype pathway for processes

- The goals of the workshop were accomplished

- The rubric will be critical in determining prioritization

- There was consensus among participants

- All participants were actively engaged

Team members also identified how future BPA workshops could be improved:

- Need more faculty involvement

### BPA Workshop Report

A draft report is to be completed and submitted to GCCCD for review. If there are any misinterpretations or errors in the information contained in this report, these are to be corrected by SIG before the report is finalized.

**APPENDIX A:  PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS**

| Cuyamaca College | Title/ Office | Day 1 | Day 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sheryl Ashley | Interim Director, Admissions & Records | √ | √ |
| Sherri Braaksma | Supervisor, Instructional Computer Facilities | √ | √ |
| Cyndy Bourget | Instructional Media Services Coordinator | √ | √ |
| Brian Josephson | Instructional Support Services | √ | √ |
| Nicole Jones | Dean, Counseling Services | √ | √ |
| Pat Newman | Business & Professional Studies Faculty | √ | |
| Kerry Kilber Rebman | Dean, Learning & Technology Resources | √ | √ |
| Jodi Reed | CIS, Distance Learning Coordinator | √ | |
| Ray Reyes | Director, Financial Aid | √ | √ |
| Pat Setzer | Interim VP of Instruction | √ | |

| Grossmont College | Title/ Office | Day 1 | Day 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh | President | √ | √ |
| Wayne Branker | Admissions & Records Supervisor | √ | |
| Michael Copenhaver | Director, Financial Aid & Scholarships | √ | |
| Ken Emmons | Director, Campus Facilities | √ | √ |
| Marsha Gable | VP, Student Services | √ | |
| Lorenze Legaspi | VP, Administrative Services | √ | √ |
| Will Pines | AH Media, Assistant Tech Specialist, DSPS | √ | √ |
| Michael Reese | Dean,Math, Natural Sci, ES and Wellness | √ | |
| Lorena Ruggero | Director, College & Community Relations | √ | |
| Aaron Starck | Interim Sr Dean, College Planning & Institutional Effectiveness | √ | √ |

| District Services | Title/ Office | Day 1 | Day 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Henry Eimstad | Information Systems | √ | √ |
| Ken Emmons | District Director, Campus Facilities | √ | √ |
| Dawn Heuft | Admin Assistant, District Business Services | √ | √ |
| Brian Nath | Director, Information Systems | √ | √ |
| Sue Rearic | VC, Business Serivces | √ | √ |
| Chris Tarman | Associate VC, Research, Planning, & Technology | √ | √ |

## APPENDIX B:  TECHNOLOGY REQUEST WORKSHEETS

**I need some technology.  What process do I use?**

What type of technology or support or training do you need?

1. Employee Computers and Printers
   a. Follow Process 1
2. Software or Hardware (computers labs, smart classrooms, etc.)
   a. Follow Process 2 if within annual planning cycle timeframe.
   b. Follow Process 3 if outside annual cycle (off-cycle) or if non-standard (not currently supported on campus).
3. Building Remodel or New Construction
   a. Follow Process 4
4. New Administrative Systems or Enhancement to Existing Systems – (Portfolium, EvaluationKit, Ed Planning Software, or updates to SARS, WebAdvisor)
   a. Follow Process 3

ADDITIONS – Need to address technology support and training in some way

**Process Descriptions**

Process 1 – Employee Computers and Printers

1. End User to work with Chair/Supervisor/Dean to identify need.  Complete Employee Tech Request Form (form to be created).
2. Submit form to Campus and/or District Technology Contact with need and work with them to identify technology that is supported by the campus and/or district.
3. Order technology (this assumes funding is available) and work with Campus /or District Technology Contact for installation location and timeline.

Process 2 – Annual Tech Request for New or Replacement of Existing Software or Hardware

This is part of the Program Review process.
Examples:  Computer labs, classroom technology, any software that this already installed on campus, computers or mobile devices used in transfer center or career center, etc.

1. End user to work with Chair/Supervisor/Dean to submit tech request through program review process (form to be created – Cuyamaca has one but it could be updated and Grossmont has the Activity Proposal process).
2. Requests are ranked (need rubric) by Campus Technology Committee / District Services entity and recommendations for prioritization are given to Cuyamaca College Council (CCC) / Grossmont Planning & Resources Council (PRC) / District Services entity for consideration and funding allocation. Some requests may require a Statement of Work (SOW) Analysis to determine the feasibility of the project. Campus Technology Committee / District Services entity to recommend which ones may require this.
3. CCC / PRC /District Services entity recommends funding allocations and prioritization to President's Cabinet / Chancellor's Cabinet. CCC / PRC / District Services entity also makes recommendation on whether an SOW Analysis is needed.
4. If approved and funding is identified, President's / Chancellor's Cabinet notifies LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS of funding allocations and prioritization.
   a. LTR dean / Senior Dean of IS works with departments on ordering technology and an implementation plan, which is based on a variety of factors including purchasing, storage, staffing, availability of classroom, etc.
   b. Accessibility concerns are addressed prior to purchasing.
5. If SOW Analysis needed, President's / Chancellor's Cabinet notifies end user and LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS and sets timeline for analysis.
6. Once the SOW analysis is complete, CCC / PRC / District Services entity reviews the request and ranks (need rubric) and makes recommendation to President's / Chancellor's Cabinet for prioritization.
7. If prioritized by President's / Chancellor's Cabinet, go back to #4.

Process 3 – Off Cycle Request for standard or non-standard Software or Hardware.

Examples:  Kiosks, K-114, replacement of a computer lab off-cycle, unexpectedly failing technology, etc.

1. End user to work with Chair/Supervisor/Dean to submit Technology Project Request form (different form than for process 1 and 2) to LTR Dean /Senior Director of IS.
2. Request reviewed and ranked (use draft rubric) by Campus Technology Committee/District Services entity, who forwards recommendation to Cuyamaca College Council (CCC) / Grossmont Planning & Resources Council (PRC) / District Services entity for consideration.  Campus Technology Committee / District Services entity also makes recommendation on whether an SOW Analysis is needed to determine the feasibility of the project.
3. If approved by CCC/PRC/District Services entity **without SOW Analysis** and funding is identified, President's / Chancellor's Cabinet notifies LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS of funding allocations and prioritization.
   a. LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS works with departments on ordering technology and an implementation plan, which is based on a variety of factors including purchasing, storage, staffing, availability of classroom, etc.
   b. Accessibility concerns are addressed prior to purchasing.

4. **If SOW Analysis recommended**, the request goes to TAC (Technology Advisory Committee – new district committee that replaces ITAC/ATAC) for further review and recommendation.
5. The request then goes to TCC for review and TCC determines whether SOW Analysis should be completed.
6.  If SOW Analysis required, TCC to set a timeline for analysis.
7. Once the SOW analysis is complete, TCC ranks the request (need rubric or could use draft one?) and determines funding allocations and prioritization.
8. If prioritized, President's / Chancellor's Cabinet notifies LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS of funding allocations and prioritization.
    a. LTR Dean / Senior Director of IS works with departments on ordering technology and an implementation plan, which is based on a variety of factors including purchasing, storage, staffing, availability of classroom, etc.
    b. Accessibility concerns are addressed prior to purchasing.

Process 4 – Remodel and/or New Construction

- District standards are in place
- Facilities Committee includes IS and/or ICS

**Technology Project Request**

<u>For new systems or updates to current systems</u>

*This is not for employee computers or printers, instructional software or hardware. Use your campus tech request for those items.*

**Date:** _____

**Requestor:** _____

1. Title of Technology Project:


2. Please explain how the technology or enhancement supports the strategic plan.  Please include information on how students will be impacted and/or employees or the college or district overall. Would this be a district-wide implementation?


3. Does the technology or enhancement support a state-wide initiative (Basic Skills, Student Success, Equity, Strong Workforce, OEI, OER, etc.) or is it a legal mandate (Title 9, Title 4, Title 5 etc.) or in support of a legal mandate?    Please explain.


4. How does the data you have support the implementation of the technology or enhancement?  (This can be qualitative or quantitative in the form of surveys, observations, SLO or other assessment data, institutional research data or other reports and data).


5. What are the consequences if the technology or enhancement is not implemented?


6. What type of resources are needed to implement the technology or enhancement? Please list as much information as you can. If deemed appropriate, District IS and/or Campus Technology will conduct a Statement of Work analysis and provide input on items such as time to implement, employee hours, number of individuals needed to implement, the need for a campus and/or district project manager, vendor cooperation, integration with current systems, etc.


7. What is the estimated cost of the technology or enhancement, including one-time implementation costs and on-going support and maintenance including staffing?  Actual quotes from vendors are preferred.


8. Has funding been identified for the project or enhancement?  If yes, what is the smartkey or funding source (Equity, General Fund, Perkins, etc.)?


9. How do you plan to evaluate the technology or enhancement once implemented?


10. What is your preferred timeframe of implementation?


11. Is there anything special about this technology or enhancement that will contribute to the ranking?

Those items that were identified to be included are listed below.

- New technology not currently a district standard, a list of which can be found on the Information Systems website

- The technology is intended to integrate with existing district-wide systems

- The technology requires interfaces with existing district-wide systems

- There are unclear support needs and it is unknown what support will be needed

- The technology is designed to access district-wide networks

- The technology is cloud-based

**Tech Planning – How to assess a Technology request**

Assessing a Technology Request

1. The goal is to collect all the necessary data about a request to facilitate the decision rubric on where this request should go next.
2. What should the decision rubric be on where to move the request after the data is collected ?
    a. What paths should a request take after the initial technical assessment
3. With the necessary data collected, should we consider putting together something like an SOW – Statement of Work identifying
    a. Estimated Costs
    b. Estimated Timeline
    c. Required Human Resources
    d. Mini project plan
4. How do we assess and collect all the necessary data for a request?
    a. What data and human resources are needed to assess a request
        i. How to collect the data – a form ?
        ii. Human Resources available to assess
            1. ICS / IS – who should initially assess every request
    b. Create a (TRAC) "Technology Request Analysis Committee" - at each college, or one for District
        i. What requests need to go to this committee, and when ?
        ii. Could still use ITAC and ATAC, ITC, TTLC ?
5. Which requests even warrant the discovery or analysis process
6. Which requests need to be tied to a plan – and how is this expressed – what plan(s)?
7. Where do the following fit in the process – before or after data collection
    a. College / Institutional priority
    b. District priority
    c. Ex. Portfolium – at what point should IS/ICS take time to discover the true impact of the implementation
        i. It is cloud based , Cuy brought it to ITC and would like it discussed at ITAC
        ii. IS has not yet spent any time determining and answers to following questions that could make this a bigger project or an easy project – i.e., the typical quote "little or no IS time needed"
            1. How do users authenticate
            2. What data needs to be sent to vendor and how often
            3. Who is identified at each college to maintain the system ?
            4. Does it require staff to keep the content relevant
8. Ideas on how to refine the data elements needed and the collection process
    a. List all the types of requests we know of to see what data should be requested
    b. List Examples of non-optimal purchases to see lessons learned and test our thoughts
    c. Create a template – push thru every request type we know of and see how it might flow thru "ideal" process

Data needed to assess a request

1. Funding Source
    a. Dept budget
    b. Special funding SSSP, Student Equity, Perkins
    c. Does who controls the funding matter?
2. When is the item needed or desired?
    a. Timeline for implementation
    b. Example needed before start of Term X
    c. What if due date is cannot be met?
    d. Expected time frame to implement
        i. Person hours

   ii. Days, weeks, months, years
  e. Individuals needed to implement
3. For whom (how many) and how will it be used – Effect and Scope – Cost/Benefit analysis
  a. Department
  b. Individual
    i. Staff
    ii. Faculty
  c. Lab
  d. All staff
  e. All faculty
  f. All students
4. Resources Needed beyond the request
  a. Resources needed to:
    i. Design the solution?
    ii. Assess the product and solution
    iii. Install and implement
    iv. Training
    v. Support
    vi. Maintain
  b. What additional hardware or software resources are needed to supplement existing systems to implement?
    i. Hardware
     1. New servers
     2. More disk storage
     3. Infrastructure
      a. Wireless access points
      b. Network Switches
    ii. Software
     1. New licenses
     2. Additional management software
5. Quantity of item(s)
  a. Buying one computer for an individual vs 30, or hundreds for labs, etc.
6. Cost estimate – what thresholds will dictate a different approval process
  a. Is knowing the dollar amount simply a bid limit issue
  b. Probably tied more to – what resources are needed to install, support, and maintain… as opposed to cost?
  c. < $1,000, $1,000-$5,000, $5,000-$30,000
  d. $30,00 < Bid limit, Over Bid limit
  e. CMAS/WSCA available
7. Will the system need to integrate or be accessed by the network
  a. Wifi
  b. Ethernet cable – on premise
  c. cloud
8. Type of hardware being requested
  a. PC
  b. Printer
  c. Laptop – Dell
  d. Laptop – Surface Pro
  e. Mobile Device state type
    i. Chromebook
    ii. Ipad
9. Software
  a. Administrative System
  b. Lab – server based

       c. Install on individual desktop / laptop Computer or multiple
       d. Cloud based

10. Resources needed to implement
       a. ICS
       b. IS
       c. Support Staff
       d. Vendor
       e. Are the resources available and identified
       f. Who will manage the project implementation
       g. Who will manage the project after implementation

11. Resources needed to upkeep / maintain
       a. College staff – who specifically
       b. District staff – who specifically
       c. Are the resources available and identified

12. If cloud based
       a. How will folks authenticate?
       b. Are we being asked to send a 3$^{rd}$ party vendor staff or student data?
       c. FERPA/Security issues addressed

Request Examples

1. Buy a computer for my staff
2. Buy 10 computers for my staff
3. Buy a printer for individual staff
4. Buy a printer for a department or for multiple people and usage
5. Mobile devices (Surface Pros, iPads, Laptops, etc.) for individuals or classroom or student services)
6. GC Theater building
       a. A point of sale (POS) system
       b. Concessions
       c. Electronic menu's
       d. Digital Signage
7. CC Exercise Science remodel
       a. Exercise machines tied to flat panels and mobile devices
       b. Classroom with potential future use a computer lab
8. GC Geography Request
9. Tech requests from Gafcon Projects
10. Request for streaming video
11. Request for TV channels
12. Request for Chromebooks to be checked out to students
13. Request for Information Kiosks
14. Portfolium
       a. Portfolium, Inc. is an American social networking platform company that allows university students and recent graduates to connect with businesses and employers and present their previous academic work and projects to supplement their resumes. The company was founded in 2014 and has its headquarters in San Diego.
15. Respondus – software to prevent cheating for online exams
16. EvaluationKit – online evaluation software
17. CC TVs for Student Center
18. Distance learning technology (cameras, microphones) for Automotive
19. Smart Classroom technology
20. Computer Labs – upgrade to existing or new
21. GradGuru
22. Intellireponse
23. Year end purchases

        a. Sit in storage for a year or so, just because we need to spend the money and

        b. We do not have the resources to deploy or install in a timely fashion

**APPENDIX C:  TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION RUBRIC**

| Points | Relationship to Strategic Plan | Mandate OR Support State-wide Initiative (Basic Skills, Student Success, Equity, Strong Workforce, OEI, OER, etc.) | Criticality / Justification / Urgency | Total Cost of Ownership (Human, Dollars, etc.) | Data-informed Technology | Resource Impact (Timeline, SOW, etc.) | Funding Impact (How much does it cost & from where are the dollars coming) | Evaluation of Technology |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | The technology clearly supports the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plan. | The technology clearly supports a state-wide initiative or is a mandate. | The consequences of not supporting this technology are significant. (Such as security concerns, loss of FTES, mandates, accreditation, etc.) | The technology can be maintained with existing funding sources & staffing | The implementation of the technology is clearly supported by qualitative or quantitative data, e.g. surveys, observations, SLO or other assessment data, institutional research data, or other reports or data. | The technology is straightforward requiring minimal resources to implement. (Time to implement, employee hours, nbr of individuals needed to implement, need for campus/ dist proj mgr, vendor cooperation, integration with current systems, etc.) | The technology requires minimal funding to complete or funding has been identified. | There is a clear plan for evaluating the proposed technology. |
| 2 | The technology somewhat supports the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plans. | The technology somewhat supports a statewide initiative. | The consequences of not supporting this technology are moderate. | The technology will require moderate increases in funding & staffing. | The implementation of the technology is somewhat supported by qualitative or quantitative data. | The technology will require a moderate amount of resources to implement. | The technology requires somewhat significant funding to complete &/or Partial funding has been identified. | The plan for evaluating the proposed technology is somewhat clear. |
| 1 | The technology has little or no support for the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plan. | This technology has no relation to a statewide initiative and is not a mandate. | The consequences of not supporting this technology are relatively minor. | The technology will require significant increases in funding & staffing | The implementation of the technology is not supported by qualitative or quantitative data. | The technology will involve a significant amount of resources to implement. | The technology requires significant funding to complete &/or Funding has not been identified | There is no plan for evaluating the proposed technology, or the plan will not achieve desired evaluation results. |
| Weighted | X3 | X2 | X2 | X2 | | | | |