Strategic Capabilities Follow Up
ETAC, FH TTF, DA TTF
April 15, 2015
Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
    a. Presenter – Jan-Martin Lowendahl
    b. Educational Technology Advisory Committee Members
    c. Foothill College Technology Task Force Members
    d. De Anza College Technology Task Force Members
    e. Other participants

2. What did people hear this morning about the use of …
    a. Strategic capabilities as a technology planning vehicle?
    b. The use of strategic capabilities to better align college and district technology planning?
    c. Specific strategic capabilities on which the colleges/district should focus?

3. What might we do with this insight?
    a. Develop strategic capabilities statements?
    b. Structure technology planning documents on a strategic capabilities framework?
    c. Modify annual technology planning processes to align with strategic capabilities?

4. How should we proceed?
    a. Additional discussion with campus/district stakeholder?
        i. Which stakeholders?
        ii. On what timeline?
    b. Development of an overall technology planning structure
        i. Is this a singular process or a general structure with college/district customization?
        ii. What governance process should vet and approve this?
            1. Recommendations developed by TTFs and ETAC
            2. College councils, Chancellor's Advisory Council
            3. Other governance bodies
    c. Timeline for implementation?
        i. All tech plans are coming up for full renewal in the next 24 months

5. Next steps

Strategic Capabilities Workshop
Notes
April 15, 2015

Recommendation from Jan-Martin Lowendahl - technology plans should be 20 pages or less.

Strategic capabilities as a technology planning vehicle

All divisions need to be involved, the entire district and colleges need to work together, not in silos.

The process should take a broad view and become progressively more granular. The process should look at high education, then the California Community Colleges, then at FHDA. Decision making should follow accordingly.

IT is a team activity. Planning cannot be individual by college or the district. The colleges and the district should find a common model to map expectations in a common language and common framework.

The colleges/district might consider using the Gartner hype cycle to help evaluate technology – new, emerging, and mature. Planning bodies might consider placing things on the hype cycle to identify the gap in understanding of project/initiative readiness.

We may be too concerned about zeroing in on return on investment (ROI) and the impact on user expectations. Things are much more complex and dimensional. Our current processes may provide too much reliance on anecdotal evidence. Are we collecting input from uninformed stakeholders? Is there a more efficient way to collect input?

For lack of a better methodology, we should consider utilizing an existing best practice approach to get further along in decision making and planning. We have to start somewhere.

Alignment of college and district technology plans

We need alignment, but we also need to be able to be agile. This is not a trivial challenge.

With the commonalities we heard, it is important to articulate common goals between the colleges and the district. We need to map commonalities for goals and priorities.

Being able to articulate why resources were allocated to projects is very valuable.

If college initiatives are not clear, then alignment is a challenge especially when trying to apply technology to those initiatives.

Connecting the dots. Previously we have focused to much on specific objectives. What other requirements exist to support a singular initiative? What other things do we need? Initiatives need to be explicitly linked.

If we are going to focus on Strategic Capabilities, what might they be?

We should make sure the current technologies work reliably and effectively before we talk about bringing new stuff into the environment. We may not want to make current things work. Maybe we should just move on.

We should assess what we already have. Do we keep it? Phase it out? Discontinue it in favor of something better? We should use our technology plans to be purposeful in evolving our environment.

We should shift our focus to what technology is supposed to be doing, not on the specific technology. What do we want to accomplish? Let's not focus on "solutions looking for problems." What is the end game? This needs to be the measure of why we choose the technology we select.

Some people are definitely looking at the bigger picture. Some are looking at specific technologies.

Noting all the complexities, some students may have only one technology such as a smart phone.

The district has a reputation for which the reality does not support. Using a common language will allow us to apply the right technologies and will bring reality to reputation.

Within the context of our current processes at both the colleges and the district, the process of getting things done takes too long.

Some departments have resources better than others. Some departments don't have the basic technologies needed to what they need to do. How can we assure more equity in the distribution of technology resources? We work hard for equity for our students. We should have equity of resource availability for departments.

Success is in our context is defined by retention, transfer, graduation. Some projects will have a high return on investment, but will have high value to students.

We need to maintain a consistent commitment to technology training. In order to accrue maximum value from our technology investments, training must be a high priority

Technology should have the qualities of ubiquity, availability, ease of use, and be intuitive. Our planning efforts should help us make technology personal.

How does project prioritization (or changes in priority) get communicated to the stakeholders?

We need more data easily available to stakeholders for reporting and accountability. Data informed decision-making should be the norm.

Let's keep the big picture in mind and then discuss which technologies support the big picture.

All technology solutions need to be mobile device friendly and employ responsive design and pervasive access.

A lot of learning is becoming much more intuitive. For example, many people are searching for instructional videos and watching on demand to learn how to do something.

Our technology should enhance student collaboration and their experience with college, student to student engagement, and student to faculty engagement.

Keep in mind of the differences between full time and part time faculty. Self-service technologies can effectively serve stakeholders in both classifications.

Developing Strategic Capabilities Statements

Yes, we want to develop capability statements, but what is the sequence?

Should we say what we should NOT do?

ETS can provide leadership, develop the description of the big picture. What are the big objectives, what are the critical steps? What is the commonality? What are the critical success factors?

How do you present the big picture to individual departments and make it relevant?

The original Foothill technology plan was written in a silo – not enough input, not aligned with De Anza or Central Services. Can all three entities agree on a common framework?

What is the charge of the planning bodies? Can we iron that out during the rest of the academic year?

What are the realistic limits of what we can do?

Can we agree on some baseline assumptions about capabilities?

We need to plan more quickly. This can stem the tide of work-arounds. Agility is the key to success. Agility needs to equate with strategic planning to engage more stakeholders.

Common language and expectations are important.

Capabilities can focus on interests, individuals, and systems.

A technology service catalog, "procurement" catalog, and a service portfolio would be extremely helpful.

Technology plans should "dial down the jargon." The language of the technology plans should be a familiar language.

What are the common "sound bites" or capabilities for students, faculty, and staff.

Structuring the tech plans

The planning bodies have a preference to be consistent. This could help us better see commonalities across the board.

We need to make it easier to update our technology plans.

Keep plans brief and concise.

Use technology to leverage the process.

Technology plans should ben dynamic, layered, accessible, mobile friendly.

Annual technology process
Connect to program review. Annual update process may be much less effort.

Should we get input from the new chancellor?

More frequent updates might help us be more agile.

If we intend to update things frequently, the design has to reflect that.

We should list all things considered and articulate what is not going to be done and why.

We should assess the outcomes of the process, changes to the plan. Why are we changing our mind? What are the consequences of change? What is the cost/benefit?

Reviewing more often will make assessment easier.

No point in doing five-year plan since technology and user need change so quickly.

How should we proceed?
Consult with the senates.

How do we involve students?

Each college needs to have an owner – the TTF. Can the TTF shepherd the process though governance?

What is the planning model governance path? What is the plan governance path?

Timeline
Report back on to TTFs and ETAC on today's outcomes in May and June

By June, have a decision on how to get started? What is the sequence?

By December, decide on the planning model and calendar.

Synchronization with program review? Synchronize with other expectations? Be realistic about the full consequences of choices.

Plan for the inevitable "annual surprises" from the system and the legislature. Should we have a "reserve" for unforeseen needs.

Let’s move away from planning based on procurement and crisis management as a planning vehicle.

Our planning bodies should consider reading the book “Nonzero: The Logic of Human Destiny”