

Campus Technology Policy

November 27, 2006

1:00 – 2:30 pm

DeGarmo 551

Present: Bob Aaron, Sam Catanzaro, Dan Hayden, Trish Klass, Alan Lacy, Jim Moon, Brent Paterson, Bob Rariden, Beth Schobernd, Mark Walbert, and Shari Zeck

Absent: Sara Campbell

Mark welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Old Business

Strategic Plan

Mark asked for feedback on his suggested edits, additions, and deletions to the IT Strategic Plan. There was discussion regarding the suggestions Mark had e-mailed the committee before Thanksgiving. The group agreed to the following additions or changes:

Goal 1 - Add Action 10: Facilitate the adoption of exemplary uses of IT to support teaching and training by hiring additional instructional developers. CTLT will provide coordination and facilitate training and communication among instructional developers housed centrally (in CTLT) or within departments, colleges, or divisions, whose job it is to help faculty and staff apply fundamental principles of instruction to the use of IT in courses or in training. [Wording not finalized.]

Goal 2 - Change Action 6: strike the word “reserve”.

Goal 3 - Change Action 2: strike the word “central”.

There was a long discussion regarding Goal 3. At this time, we do not have a revised distributed support model. There was discussion regarding the possibility of developing a model now. They questioned how much time the Council would want to invest developing a model and taking the time to get the necessary buy-in from the campus community. The committee discussed if a CIO position was created where that position would report to and if that position would sit on the President’s cabinet. Many felt this position would have the ultimate responsibility but would also need the authority and funding to be able to make those decisions. This position would be the single locust of responsibility for decision-making on campus for technology. Some felt the Vice Presidents will not want this position to sit on the President’s cabinet. Mark explained that typically CIO’s report to either the President or Provost in most universities, but titles varied. There was discussion about a CIO position putting the governance structure we would have for IT against shared governance. Many felt a CIO position would have to have the ability to tell the Deans and Vice Presidents what is being done, thus having control, authority, and communication and some felt the plan would not succeed if that position does not have that ability.

Several Council members noted that:

- The Council has been charged with looking at IT and its role is currently advisory to the President’s Cabinet.
- The CIO would also serve as advisory to the Vice Presidents since they are ultimately the ones holding the purse strings.

- We need to cast the CIO in positive terms as someone who provides leadership, coordinates, is responsive to the university's needs, and provide a vision for technology.
- We need to concentrate on the positives rather than the negatives. As a Council, we can only set the stage, but cannot dictate what is going to happen.
- This is about a structure, a culture, and has nothing to do with control.

Dan questioned if the Council as a whole supports the idea of a CIO with a single locus of responsibility and a central IT Office. Mark then explained that he had editorially changed the title to CIO from "single locus of responsibility" and "central IT office" since it read better. It was discussed that the committee has talked about this many times but perhaps did not call it CIO but rather other terminology. A committee member voiced their opinion that this person would have to have the sanction of the President and that we should not leave it vague since this position may need to report to the President.

Mark asked the group to give feedback on the rest of the items in his e-mail that they did not find time to discuss.

Voice Mail Upgrade

Mark announced that Scott Genung will be sending out a letter on the new voice mail (438-4000) for switch over in January. Mark encouraged committee members to announce to their areas to dial in to 438-4000 before holiday break to record new greetings for voice mail.

High-Performance Internet Access

Mark asked for feedback on this document that was distributed at the last meeting.

Communication Technologies Constituency Committee

Mark asked for feedback on this document that was distributed at the last meeting.

Update on Meeting Maker migration to Exchange

This discussion was tabled for the next meeting. Meeting Maker software license is currently paid until June 30, 2007. Mark did announce that Meeting Maker will have an annual software licensing cost of \$34,000 per year [and an FY08 cost of \$42,700, with \$8,700 for new hardware. — ed.]. He added that he would like the members of the Council to send Dan feedback on his proposal before next Monday's meeting.

Williams Outstanding Technology Award

Georgia announced that there are now nine nominations for the award. The committee will be meeting December 12 to select the recipient.

NEW BUSINESS

E-Mail Trash

Mark distributed a proposal regarding a new initiative to have e-mail trash dumped on a monthly basis to save storage space. This was tabled for discussion at the next meeting.

Next Meeting

December 4, 2006

STV 401

1:00 – 2:30 pm