

**San Bernardino Community College District
Distributed Education and Technology Services
Report on the DETS Executive Committee Survey, August 2010**

Introduction

To begin to assess the effects of the July 2009 reorganization of Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS) governance structures, the Executive Director asked all 21 members of the DETS Executive Committee to respond to a brief online survey in August 2010. Respondents were asked how much and in which direction (better or worse) DETS services had changed since the reorganization, in clarity, coordination, quality, and responsiveness at the colleges and in District operations. Twelve committee members completed the survey by the deadline, for a response rate of 57 percent.

Results

Quantitative results indicated that respondents judged services somewhat better overall, particularly in District operations, as shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Quantitative Ratings

Service Aspect (N=12)	Mean	Label
Clarity of technology service roles at the COLLEGES	3.67	Somewhat Better
Clarity of technology service roles at the DISTRICT	4.00	Somewhat Better
Coordination of technology services at the COLLEGES	3.75	Somewhat Better
Coordination of technology services at the DISTRICT	4.33	Somewhat Better
Quality of technology services at the COLLEGES	3.67	Somewhat Better
Quality of technology services at the DISTRICT	4.17	Somewhat Better
Overall DETS responsiveness to the needs of the COLLEGES	3.58	Somewhat Better
Overall DETS responsiveness to the needs of DISTRICT-level operations	4.50	Much Better
Overall Mean Rating	3.96	Somewhat Better

Respondents were asked to identify a specific example if they had seen improvement for a service aspect; highlights included the following (see Table 2):

- Communication among DETS committees and with users
- Improved explanation/reduced confusion of roles
- Involvement of managers and researchers on DETS committees dealing with data
- Team approach to problem-solving
- Specific projects: Copier contract, Schedule 25

An error in the question requesting specific examples if respondents had seen poorer service probably reduced the number of responses to that question, but respondents also identified some weaknesses in their answers to the improvements question (see Table 2):

- Some remaining confusion of roles
- Must go through help desk with problems, and help desk system is still not very functional
- Centralized approach is not responsive enough to college needs
- District needs trump college needs

Table 2: Examples of Improvement and Decline by Service Aspect

Service Aspect	Examples of Improvement	Examples of Decline
Clarity of technology service roles at the COLLEGES	Information sharing in DETS committees, frequent emails to users	
	explanation given of roles of Sims/Garnick/Bogh/Hrdlicka	
	Service roles are not black and white yet.... although its better because there aren't any road blocks. We can get the job done regardless of who's service role it is.	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	
Clarity of technology service roles at the DISTRICT	Information sharing in DETS committees, frequent emails to users	
	explanation given of roles of Sims/Garnick/Bogh/Hrdlicka	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	
		Never quite sure what service(s) are available to district operations
Coordination of technology services at the COLLEGES	There's a centralized approach but it's not particularly responsive	
	Copier contract	
	College managers and researchers seem to be more involved in committees where data related procedures and practices are defined and refined. The technology coordinators seem to be working with DCS to coordinate hardware technology functions.	
	Bringing the technology together as a team has increased the technology service, however our current help desk system is not very functional	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	
Coordination of technology services at the DISTRICT	Very much improved. Good communication with constituencies.	
	DCS is very responsive to our needs	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	
Quality of technology services at the COLLEGES	It's okay, but it is not as responsive as it could be.	
	Again quality has increased because instead of one individual trying to work out a problem you have a team working out the problem.	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	

Service Aspect	Examples of Improvement	Examples of Decline
Quality of technology services at the DISTRICT	Much improved. Good process for reviewing and prioritizing projects.	
	Excellent As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	
Overall DETS responsiveness to the needs of the COLLEGES	Very open and transparent process.	Can longer go directly to DCS staff with problems without going through the help desk referral process.
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	I putting down somewhat worse only because of the help desk system that has been provided to our college. The help desk system only provides the machanics and really not a solution. I think there shuould have been more thought process behind choosing a help desk system.
	Schedule 25	
Overall DETS responsiveness to the needs of DISTRICT-level operations	District-related needs continue to trump actual needs at college level	
	Excellent	
	As the structure is still new and roles are changing, there is still some confusion, but it is getting better. This is true for all of these.	

In their answers to the two broader open-ended questions, two respondents praised particular people, while four others offered criticisms or concrete ideas for improvement (see Table 3):

- Excessive cost of the copiers
- The need to become more proactive in helping users, and more positive in responding to user needs
- The need for improved role definition and project follow-through
- The need for regular communication with the colleges

Table 3: Suggestions and Additional Comments

<i>If you have any specific suggestions for improving the responsiveness of DETS services to the needs of the colleges or of district-level operations, please enter them here.</i>	<i>If you have any other comments about DETS services, the reorganization, or this survey, please enter them here.</i>
Keep up the good work. It's good to involve people at the site level in the planning.	Everett is doing a great job of keeping everyone updated.
My only complaint right now is about the cost of the copiers. This was supposed to be a cost savings to the colleges, not an extra expense.	
What is the DETS team doing that is pro-active at the user level? I still have the overall perception that the reactionary nature of DETS services and that there is an inability to be "agile" when it comes to campus and/or enterprise needs. Which mantra best describes DETS: "Let's roll our sleeves up and find a way to get this done because it's critical to the student experience" or "We have a backlog of projects, don't have the resources, and have other projects prioritized by the District office."?	The quote below should be a driving force in DETS beyond simply looking at projects on a one-by-one basis: "It is not a question of how well each process works, the question is how well they all work together." - Lloyd Dobens
We need to define specific roles, example would be the innovative library system role.... The system was updated but the services provided failed to follow through with the update process.	
Some type of regular communication letter to colleges.	
	DCS has excellent leadership through Dr. Kuck.
	I was not able to attend many of the DETS exec meetings due to schedule conflicts.

Conclusion

These results indicate that those people most involved in the planning and direction of DETS services perceived some improvement in those services as a result of the July 2009 reorganization. However, they also indicate that they perceived room for further improvement, especially in responsiveness to college needs, and confirm the need for a similar survey of the wider user community at the colleges and District offices.