**College Recommendation 7:**

**Develop an assessment methodology to evaluate how well technology resources support institutional goals**

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop and use an assessment methodology to evaluate how well technology resources support institutional goals and use the result of the evaluation as a basis for improvement. (III.C.2)

**[Reviewer’s comments are in bold-italics] *You have already done a great deal of work on this! I think it would be stronger with a direct link to named institutional goals. I found the term “institutional goals” mentioned several times but in a general way. What or which institutional goals are you referencing? I think it needs to be more specific.***

**Progress in Addressing Recommendation**

The college response to recommendation #7 was to work with the technology committee (ISIT) and come up with some acceptable methods for evaluating the college technology resources. The committee came up with three different methods for assessing technology resources and using the assessment results to guide future technology decisions. The evidence document called “7.1 TechnologyProcesses.pdf” is a visual representation of how the technology processes work at Bakersfield College. The technology processes document includes the link to Annual Program Review and Assessment and demonstrates visually the link to an ongoing integration of assessment that guides future decisions (7.1).

***Early on there needs to be a clear link or explanation of “technology committee (ISIT)” if only to state what ISIT stands for (paragraph 1).***

The first assessment method provides a very immediate and targeted assessment for new hardware and software technology implementations. For example, if a new smart classroom is implemented, after a period of about six months or one semester, a follow-up survey or focus group is conducted to determine if the new technology meets the needs of the department and if it helps the students, faculty, classified or administrative user of the new technology better meet the institutional goals of the college. We have already administered three surveys to demonstrate the effectiveness of this assessment tool (7.2).

***The section on assessment methods and surveys was a little confusing because they each use numbers, e.g., “the first assessment method,” “ the first survey.” Maybe keep that language but indent or use alpha designation for the three surveys under the first assessment method? Especially since the third assessment method is also a survey***

The first survey was targeted to faculty using nine new smart classrooms that were recently upgraded as part of a STEM grant. The survey results are included as evidence in this response to the recommendation. By viewing the “7.1 TechnologyProcesses.pdf” diagram, you can see those results then go back to the technology team, consisting of the IT Management and the college technology committee (ISIT), to be used as guidance for future technology decisions (7.1,7.2).

The second survey was targeted to assess an upgraded and redesigned student orientation room (referred to as SS-151, the room designation at the college). The room previously had no technology. The survey was targeted to the Student Services staff that uses the room. Again, the questions asked were to determine if the technology upgrade aligned with institutional goals. The results of the survey then go back to the technology team to be used as guidance for future technology decisions (7.2).

The third survey targeted the assessment of a new software improvement. A need for a consistent location for tracking the various committees, agendas, notes and supporting documentation was identified by the Accreditation Steering Committee. The committee solicited a technology solution from the technology committee. The end result was a new web site at <https://committees.kccd.edu> that allows easy uploading of agendas, meeting notes and other supporting documents pertaining to various committee meetings. The results of the survey then go back to the technology team to be used as guidance for future technology decisions (7.2, 7.3).

The second method for assessing technology and determining if it meets the institutional goals is to integrate an assessment section into our Annual Program Review form. Although we have not gone through a Program Review cycle since the accreditation visit, the technology committee has worked with the Program Review Committee to get language inserted into the program review process for assessing technology as part of program review. The evidence demonstrates a possible way a technology assessment might be included in the program review process. Evidence is the original Program Review form and the new proposed addition to the Program Review form. The Program Review Committee is evaluating the new proposed addition and has agreed to include some variation of the proposed addition. By including a technology assessment as part of program review the college is making a deliberate decision to integrate technology assessment as part of the annual college process of program review. The assessment from the Program Review process will come back to the technology team to be used as guidance for future technology decisions (7.4, 7.5).

***In the paragraph on the second method, it sounds as though the new language has already been inserted in the Program Review and the next sentence says it is proposed. The two sentences seem to contradict each other.***

Finally, the third method for assessing technology is a very broad annual survey that will go out to all college stakeholders. The survey is much broader than the targeted questions of the first method mentioned above and casts a bigger net for assessment than the second method mentioned above. The next annual assessment will not happen until sometime during the Fall semester but questions have already been identified and are submitted as evidence for this recommendation. Again, the results of the survey will come back to the technology team to be used as guidance for future technology decisions.

 (7.6).

***In the paragraph on the third method, I think the language “will not happen until sometime during the Fall semester” needs to be a little more specific. Perhaps worded in a positive form, like “the next annual assessment will occur in the fall semester”?***

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the three new assessment methods provide a very well rounded assessment of the college technology allocation and implementations. All assessment results go back to the technology team, consisting of the IT Management and the college technology committee, for review and to guide future technology decisions. The assessment results will also be used to guide the development of the college technology plan. Additionally, as part of each assessment method, there are questions asked about training on the technology. In addition to going to the technology team, the assessment results for the technology training questions will also go to the staff development committee (SDCC) for review and to guide future staff development decisions.

***In the conclusion, the sentence that begins with “additionally” and talks about training is unclear.***

**Future Plans**

Upon completing the assessment methods that the technology team incorporated for looking at technology effectiveness and usage across the Bakersfield College campus, the team determined that this three-pronged approach to assessment enables the College to make more effective technology budget-based decisions. Working with those individuals or departments who are directly using the technology or are using various software applications – by either survey or face-to-face focus groups, the technology team can more effectively prioritize and budget for the campus needs. Incorporating the assessment piece into the Annual Program Review will enable the College to gain a historical perspective on where departments are at with their use and assessment of technology. This will also be a valuable tool for providing departments with the ability to integrate effective best practices with other areas. The broad annual survey will continuously provide the technology team a barometer of technology effectiveness and the support of the technology at the College. Of course, there will be a continual refining of the survey and focus group questions as the technology team learns what questions need to be asked and how they should be asked.

**List of Evidence**

7.1 TechnologyProcesses.pdf

7.2 ISIT\_SurveyResults\_2013\_Final.pdf

7.3 committees-screenshot-16apr13.pdf

7.4 APR Instructional Form 2012-13 web.pdf

7.5 APR-AssessmentAddition.pdf

7.6 BC Annual Technology Needs Survey\_Draft.pdf

***I think it would be helpful to cite the Program Review Committee minutes/notes for the discussion on including the questions in Program Review.***