

Campus Technology Policy & Planning Council
Retreat
January 30, 2006
Noon – 4:00 pm
DeGarmo 551

Present: Beckie Benner, Sara Campbell, Sam Catanzaro, Trish Klass, Jim Moon, Brent Paterson, Bob Rariden, Beth Schobernd, Mark Walbert, Jeff Wood and Shari Zeck

Absent: Dan Hayden

Mark welcomed everyone to the brainstorming retreat. One of the tasks today is for the group to review the basic goals they have agreed to and decide if they are what we really want. Mark announced that he has been working on a draft of the strategic plan.

Mark distributed handouts. The first handout illustrated the questions we asked ourselves when we started the strategic planning process: Who are we? Where do we want to be? Where are we now? How will we get there? How will we know how well we are doing? The second is a copy of the VP's charge to the Council to serve as a reminder of what the VP's expect the Council to accomplish with the IT Strategic Plan. The third was his draft of the table of contents for the Information Technology Strategic Plan 2006-2009.

Mark asked for feedback on the topics covered in his draft of the table of contents. Mark also recounted a brief history of IT on campus. The Council suggested that it be added as a new topic in the IT Strategic Plan. There was some discussion regarding how long each section in the report should be. We hope to be able to give the Vice Presidents a clearer idea of what technology is all about on campus. The structure of the Table of Contents was discussed. It was decided to remove the *Technology Services Provided by Decentralized Units* section and have a *Centralized* and *Decentralized* under each of the subcategories.

The group agreed that knowing what has been spent on technology on campus in the past would be important to know. Mark shared that he will be asking Bill Cummins to revisit the budgets in order to share with Mark where technology dollars are spent. The historical perspective is something that the Vice Presidents will need.

It was noted that it may be helpful to have the history of technology on campus at the beginning of the document even if it is just referring to past documents. Mark has written a history from late 1988 on. There is a set of books entitled *The 14th Decade* that would have some useful information regarding the 1990's in it that Mark will reference.

Mark asked for feedback on the section *Strategic IT Goals and Action Items*. It was noted that the initial charge to the Council required an annual revision of the IT Strategic Plan.

Feedback on the Goals included:

- We need to make a commitment to gather information and assess where we are and what we are doing.

- We need to identify what those needs and wants at all levels under *Respond to IT Client needs*.
- There are several help desks all over campus.
- Communication is needed to set goals. Asking, responding to IT needs, educating, explaining, & justifying could all be a part of each goal. Another component can be telling people what they need. Monthly newsletters from the Council and/or the Vice President for Technology may be a good idea.
- We need to identify needs for others. This may fit under response category but there could be several action items so that both sides of that equation can complement each other.
- We need to survey the campus to see if certain things are going well and to get feedback. We then need a mechanism in place for the feedback on policies and procedures that support client needs. We need to have creation and reexamination of current policies as well as new policies with appropriate constituent input.
- We need education and training with better communication about IT policies and procedures.

Goal I:

Design a plan that will capture or identify the need, decide what the action will be for that need, communicate the need, identify the critical responder, and communicate the decision that was made.

Goal II:

Mark announced that the request to have a student charge-based fund for IT was denied. The Board of Trustees in May decided there shall be no fee increases until such time as the university can provide operational increases for persons in those fields. No pot of money from charges (tuition or fees) can be earmarked for anything specific. We will have to use a different approach when asking for funding. Mark shared that he has asked his Directors to do their annual reports and add a category for budget needed just to maintain what they are doing. We need to add the Board decision in Goal II since this is the environment we find ourselves in. It may be helpful to draft a funding model for each college/area then a lump sum to cover the top level while making a statement that we cannot do it without additional funding. We may need to make clear what resources are necessary on campus. Perhaps an annual statement regarding what is necessary, what is expected, and the initial ongoing costs for technology to the University for IT needs from this Council would help educate and communicate needs.

The external scan focused on other universities strategic plans. Perhaps it would be helpful to have a statement regarding where we stand relative to the aspirant schools. Mark stated that we could have some sort of comparisons and the *Educause* survey will allow us to compare many things. Mark stated that we do stand out in networking but that is the only place.

One action item would be to create and submit a budget to maintain what we have, with funds for further growth. We need more people since we are barely maintaining status quo. Students are very leading edge of where we need to be. Online forms and databases to back them up is needed.

Goal III:

The group decided that the name of goal 3 would be changed and discussed who our clients are. It may be helpful to begin with a broad picture and then narrow it down with various action items. Do we need to determine what each of these client needs are? When we ask for resources from Illinois, it could help to have this information. Examples of responsiveness are important to the entire process. Goal 3 talks about restructuring IT . This will be the third time that there has been campus-wide planning for this. Mark asked if we were going to design an organizational structure that would get things done, what would that structure be and described what he has learned in his research about other universities, while noting that almost all universities have only one person in charge (either as Vice President for technology who reports to either the President or an Associate VP reporting to the Provost).

The group discussed centralized versus decentralized support and noted that distributed support is different than decentralized. It was noted that there needs to be a balance in this climate. Some things can be better done centrally and some things can be better done de-centrally.

The group asked what authority and philosophy would a CIO position at the Vice Presidential level have? There are many advantages to having a Vice President for Technology including:

- Without someone in charge, things could be very costly.
- Rising demand and increase in costs.
- Someone from the Campus perspective who can save the University money. There are some basic services that are provided for everyone and then there are some educational levels that have specific needs.
- We need more money with a better funding model.
- This person could research and recommend what will work with this campus. The articles "IT Governance and Who Decides" that Mark sent out had an exercise in it that may be of interest.
- The distributed support model needs to be appraised by someone centrally, because of policies & procedures.
- Assurance that the different areas in University community would use an existing help desk, an existing server, guarantee training, etc. instead of developing their own.

There was a suggestion to do an organizational chart and talk over what kinds of things would be on it. Mark showed an example of an organizational chart. He will send a copy of the organizational chart to everyone on the committee.

Mark announced that he meets with Provost Advisory Council and Chairs Council tomorrow. The group will continue with this discussion at the next meeting.

Mallard Update

Mark shared with the group that Donna Brown has written that University of Illinois has given her Mallard. One department here at ISU has expressed an interest in running it locally. Mark asked if the Council would consider the request and decide if we should let that department run Mallard (in which case others could follow) or if we say no one can run Mallard. There could be a potential increase of costs if we allow this for several areas on campus.

Meeting Maker Update

Mark noted that the Council needs to decide if the university is going to support exchange or SUN for email & calendaring. He indicated that he has already obligated the University for another year of Meeting Maker software but it was noted that the sooner we make a decision, then the sooner training could begin on new software. We may be looking at an effective date of July, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Because of several absences next week, the next meeting will be held

February 13, 2006

DeGarmo 551

1:00 – 2:30 pm

Submitted by Georgia Bailey.