

Steering Committee Actions On IT Strategic Plan Issues Raised

Does the draft IT Strategic Plan need to be changed/updated to respond to the following questions raised?

[Steering Committee review comments and actions in green]

Changes Made In IT Plan Based on Feedback

Mission

- ABA suggested changing Mission Statement as follows:

California State University, Sacramento will use its information technology resources for furtherance of the university's strategic mission, ensuring a continual focus on support of access to education, excellence in teaching and learning, the quality of the student experience, and effective administrative processes, systems, and services. ~~customer services.~~ [modified change in green adopted]

Introduction, Vision Statement and Values

- ABA suggested changing the second paragraph of the Vision Statement as follows:
We will increasingly provide the best in teaching and learning technologies to ~~our~~ faculty and students both in and outside ~~our~~ the classrooms, increasingly provide the best administrative technologies to staff, and provide the support and training required to use these technologies. [similar change made in fourth bullet instead: Sacramento State will be recognized for its efficient and effective use of administrative technology for the improvement of business processes for its students, prospective students, faculty, and staff, as well as for the provision of support and training for use of those technologies.]
- [ABA] Administrative technology and its critical role in supporting the campus receives too little attention when compared to the teaching/learning and student issues. Specifically, Section III needs more attention. (comment was that SP emphasized faculty and student needs and de-emphasized staff and administrative technology; also that training needs to be made available when there are major software upgrades). [Committee agreed that campus-wide administrative IT issues could be more clearly addressed. Three wording

changes were made in the document including in third paragraph of introduction, fourth bullet of vision statement, and by adding a final value].

- [ABA] New value suggestion:
We value...providing effective and efficient campus administrative technology.
We will therefore... provide necessary resources to support CMS and related software implementations and on-going performance, year-end process requirements and reports, and campus business processes.
ABA later revised this suggestion to ‘...support administrative processes that meet CSU requirements and provide enhanced services to our students, faculty, and staff.’

[The Committee accepted the new value, but thought the first suggested ‘We will therefore’ section was too specific. The Committee noted that the ‘CSU requirements’ issue was addressed in Section III and was too specific for the values section of the strategic plan. Compromise language was adopted as: *...work together to both identify inefficiencies and to provide enhanced services to our students, faculty, and staff.*]

General Changes

The role of auxiliaries...

- [SA] Directors of auxiliaries wondered if there needs to be more explicit mention of the role of auxiliary groups, but also wondered if this would open the door too much to other groups wanting to be specifically mentioned.
This is a well written document and I don’t have any strong objections to what is presented. However, the goals really don’t address the co-curricular programs such as Residence Life, Student Health Center, Union and others. The primary focus is academic which I understand, however, in order for us to continue to advance to improve efficiencies, access, service delivery, and communication (not to mention regulatory and accreditation requirements) we are incorporating technology into all of our work processes....under this IT plan, we would not only be competing for resources but also for project prioritization which will limit and slow our growth potential. This could significantly impact our business performance.

[The role of auxiliaries was highlighted in the third bullet of the vision statement by adding reference to auxiliaries in ...student, faculty, staff, and auxiliary populations. Also, ‘...and auxiliary functions ... was added to the fourth paragraph of the introductory page, to ensure better recognition of the role of auxiliaries in the plan.]

Assessment isn't defined broadly enough...

- [SA] How will the success of the goals of this plan be assessed? Most felt that an assessment process would be important and should be mentioned. Especially in areas where IRT is providing service to internal customers. It did appear that there would be surveys for faculty and students in order to collect needs, but there was not a reference for collection of needs and assessment of goals by other internal customers.
- An individual comment indicated that assessment of learning outcomes needed to be addressed more specifically in the plan.
- [AA] Should the plan address who oversees the accountability of whether IT projects and the plan are working?

[The Committee felt that assessment was addressed throughout the document. At the suggestion of AITC language was clarified at IA2a,b,c,d to address the use of multiple methods and metrics for assessing outcomes, as well as communications of results of assessments to all campus units. In addition, language at III1c was clarified by adding 'peer' to CSU and Educause standards.]

Online learning is not addressed...

- Should online/distance learning be more specifically addressed?
[The Committee agreed that online learning is not adequately addressed in the draft plan; language has been added as new section IA1c:
 - a. The campus should develop technically flexible options for course offerings that, as appropriate, take advantage of emerging hybrid and fully on-line approaches to learning.]

Accessibility is not defined well enough...

[AITC] IA1e The principle of 'universal design' should be cited.

[Language was changed as follows:] "e. Systems for delivery of teaching materials to faculty and learning resources to students should be developed that are flexible, based on universal design principles, and that allow use by those with varied teaching and learning styles."

[AITC] Equal access references should cite both ADA 504 and 508 compliance issues. Item was added at IB1e: Equal access should be provided to all students through ADA 504 and 508 compliant accessibility of all learning resources.

Centralization/Decentralization...

- [AA] Should we specifically address the issue of centralization/decentralization?

- [SA] Central IT staff often try to provide solutions without truly understanding the department's business need. If existing technology is inadequate to meet department needs, *departments are often asked to change their business process vs. looking for a solution that will meet their needs* [italics added]. This appears to be done because of a lack of understanding in central IT of the true department IT needs and their impact on staff and students.
- [AA,SA] Should the strategic plan address procedures for assessing and responding to local unit needs (e.g. colleges, departments)?
- [SA, ABA] Should more attention be paid to how conflicts between CO mandates and campus needs should be addressed?

[The Committee felt that too much emphasis was placed in comments on the dichotomy of centralization v. decentralization. The Committee agreed to address the issue of *institutionalization* rather than centralization/decentralization by pointing readers towards the Organizational Models for IT and FAQ documents on the IT planning website (www.csus.edu/irt/strategicplanning). Specifically, the following language was added in the Scanning Our Environment section of the plan: "Finally, in early 2009, the IT Steering Committee informed the campus that the draft *IT Strategic Plan* was available for review, solicited written feedback from across campus and held a series of open forums on the draft plan. Documents detailing both the feedback received and the Steering Committee response to that feedback can also be found at www.csus.edu/irt/strategicplanning. Of particular interest are the documents *Institutionalization As An Organizational Model for IT* and *Frequently Asked Questions*, as these items provide the Committee viewpoint on a number of key planning issues."]

Section I

[ABA] IB1a Suggestion for change to second bullet:

[Adopted as shown] Work with other divisions to develop specific services ~~should be developed~~ to assist students with academic processes such as orientation, registration, financial aid, fee payment, and employment services.

[AITC] IA2a.

[Suggestion adopted, with minor changes] ~~a. Regular surveys of faculty, staff and student needs for the use of academic technology should be conducted and the resulting data used to adapt and improve academic technology services.~~ Multiple methods for collecting data from faculty, staff, and students will be established to determine the needs and uses of academic technology and the data collected be used appropriately to adapt and improve academic technology services. Adopted as:

- Multiple methods for collecting data from faculty and students regarding academic technology needs should be conducted and plans developed for translating those needs into effective IT services.

[AITC] I2c c. **Suggested change:**

~~Satisfaction with academic technology services and the effectiveness of those services in assisting teaching and learning should be regularly assessed and results reported to the campus.~~ Metrics should be developed for the regular assessment of satisfaction and effectiveness of academic technology services as it is used for teaching and learning and the results clearly communicated to all campus units.

[Adopted as IB2d: Metrics should be developed for the regular assessment of satisfaction and effectiveness of student technology services and the results clearly communicated to all campus units.]

[AITC] IB2e, Suggested wording change:

~~d. The use of experimental and innovative methods for student use of information technology to enhance learning and student life should be emphasized. When appropriate and effective, the use of experimental and innovative methods for student use of information technology to enhance learning and student life should be emphasized.~~

[Adopted as:

- a. When appropriate and effective, the use of experimental and innovative methods for student use of information technology to enhance learning and student life should be emphasized.]

Section IA3

~~a. A practical five year plan should be developed for the design, enhancement, maintenance and support of flexible technology assisting classrooms including identification of funding sources. [...technology assisted learning spaces...]~~ A practical five year plan should be developed which includes the identification of potential funding sources should be developed by all campus units associated with instructional spaces to prioritize the design, enhancement, maintenance, and support of these spaces.

- b. *Rationale:* The language has been changed to insure inclusivity. It also reformats the language used to identify “classrooms” so that it includes all types of spaces used for instruction.

[The Committee agreed that broader language than ‘classrooms’ should be used and adopted “adopted ‘technology assisted learning spaces.’ The Committee did not change the language to reflect issues of ‘all campus units’, as it is not appropriate for the IT Plan to address department spaces controlled by particular divisions.]

[AITC] I4, Suggested addition:

A distributed and connected system of instructional technology support shall be defined, with coordination of services both centrally ~~and at the college/department level, as well as other campus units.~~ [Adopted as ...and with all campus units.]

Section II

[ABA] Suggestion for change to II1b,c:

Procedures will be developed to provide these tools ~~as broadly as possible~~ to faculty, staff, and other planning groups involved in the enhancement of recruitment, retention and graduation.

Enrollment reporting and analysis tools should be provided ~~as widely as possible~~ to faculty advisors, colleges, and departments.

Page 10 – 1b and 1c – Both bullets have statements such as “as broadly as possible” and “as widely as possible”. Those caveats seem to already setting up reasons not to complete the bulleted item. It doesn’t seem appropriate for strategic goals.

[This confusing language was dropped as suggested, as the intention was rather to cite the need for the broadest adoption by all.]

[AA, ABA] Should we give a higher priority to academic data handling needs?

[Academic data handling is included in many aspects of the plan, but the Committee felt that more attention was warranted. Item II1b was revised as: b. Procedures will be developed to provide these tools to the President, Strategic Planning Council, Futures Initiative, divisions, departments, the faculty, staff and other planning groups involved in the enhancement of recruitment, retention and graduation.

Item II1c added reference to ‘faculty and staff ‘

Item II1d was newly added: d) Data to facilitate student self-management of their academic and campus service needs should be provided directly to students.”

Also, item IB2c was added: “Plans should be developed to both assess student satisfaction with the administrative processes they use and to improve those processes.”]

[AITC] Suggestion for removal of Section II3c: ~~A campus-wide web advisory group and steering committee will be established to enhance campus web communications.~~

Language was revised to: A campus-wide web steering committee will be established to enhance campus web communications, supported by a web advisory group to ensure inclusiveness and partnerships in web development.

Section III

[ABA] Suggestion for heading of Section III:

EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE USE OF LIMITED IT RESOURCES *limited implies that there are limited resources to be applied towards the items in this section.*

[The Committee believes this was not the intention of the language, but agrees that use of the word 'limited' is unnecessary. Language related to limited resources is found in the last paragraph of the introductory page as " ... be proactive rather than reactive in planning for use of our limited information technology resources." In addition, a sentence was added to the third introductory paragraph: "The steady decline in state resources as a proportion of higher education funding, along with the current economic recession only add to this challenge."

[ABA] Suggestion for changes to III2:

- 1) Implement sustainable assessment processes for monitoring and evaluation of business processes, to ensure effective IT-based customer services and provide mechanisms for using feedback to improve those processes and services.
 - a. Assess ~~priority~~ business process needs for information technology across all divisions on an annual basis **as prioritized by each Vice President.**

[‘priority’ was deleted. However, this statement refers specifically to the process of taking a campus-wide approach to analysis of business processes, making the addition of a statement about prioritization by individual areas non germane.]

[ABA] Suggestion for change at III2b:

Review with the IRT Steering Committee division priorities for customer service enhancements for those identified business processes on an annual basis and develop a prioritized list of business process and customer service improvement projects. *There were many questions regarding this process and concern that committee is not qualified to prioritize; suggest Vice President’s priorities as referenced in a. defines IRT priorities for special projects.*

[As with previous issues, the Committee treats this as an institutional plan – not a division-specific plan. There is no intent for the Committee to address internal division priorities, only to compare them to campus-wide resource availability and other campus priorities. In fact, the Committee feels strongly that divisions and other units need to carefully address their own internal processes for IT priority setting. To clarify, the word ‘division’ was dropped from III2b, with other changes resulting in: “b. Review priorities for customer service enhancements for those identified business processes with the IT Steering Committee on an

annual basis and develop a prioritized list of business process and customer service improvement projects.”]

[ABA] Section III5 Comment made in regard to building ‘best practices’ into sections I and II:

Best practices should also be incorporated on the academic and student sections of plan: recommend finding appropriate places in sections I & 2.

- 1) [The Committee agreed and added such language at Ia4: “A distributed and connected system of instructional technology support shall be defined, based on recognized best practices, with coordination of services both centrally and with all campus units.

[SA, ABA, AA] Training and support needed for CMS upgrades and similar... Goal III Item 3 - Resources for mandated implementations and upgrades

[SA] Director’s thought this area could be expanded to include more collaboration with departments affected by the mandated upgrades. This issue causes a tremendous burden on department staff reducing their ability to perform standard operations and serve students. If you would like to expand this area, Dennis Geyer and Craig Yamamoto

[As stated, this is largely an issue of the relationship between the university and the Chancellor’s Office in regard to CMS management. This relationship is itself hard to capture in a campus strategic plan. CMS issues are being aggressively addressed at this writing in several other CSU venues. The Committee does agree that staff training and support for IT in general is not adequately addressed in the document. Therefore, language referencing staff training needs was added at IA4c, IB1d, II1b, III1c, III3a, III4a].

Committee Review Comments On Other Suggested Changes

We don't fit into the vision...

- SA Directors were concerned that their departments don't fit specifically into the vision for IT. They believe strong collaboration will be needed with [central] IT but the vision does not speak to strong internal collaboration.
- [SA] Most directors see themselves as customers of [central] IT services, but don't feel that the 4th vision bullet captures the service role of IRT.
- [AA] Should community engagement be specifically addressed?

[The Steering Committee agreed that the vision statement is not intended to address specific organizational issues; no specific unit or division is noted in the vision, nor are inter-organizational relationship issues addressed. Issue of collaboration will be emphasized further through wording throughout document. Community engagement should not specifically be addressed, as it is assumed the tenets of the plan regarding collaboration apply to all functions of the campus. Singling one such function out is not needed or desired.]

Governance

- What should the ongoing role of the IT Steering Committee be?
- Should we be more specific/complete about how we plan to obtain faculty input and communicate with faculty?
- Should the plan address how local IT staff are included
- The role of faculty is being dismissed in favor of a top-down approach

[The future role of the Steering Committee has not been defined yet, except to say that the Steering Committee will continue to be the focal point for campus-wide IT planning. The IT Strategic Plan simply says that planning should be inclusive of all constituencies across campus, that various methods should be used to gather data, and that feedback on outcomes should be regularly provided to the campus. Specifics of how each constituent group will provide input or participate are too specific for the Strategic Plan. Governance issues are not within the purview of either the Steering Committee or the IT Strategic Plan.]

[AITC] The Committee is of the opinion that the summaries of the Open Forums, in some cases, did not accurately restate all the concerns that were voiced during these forums. The changes below suggest a different strategy that incorporates these concerns. The proposed changes focus on the need to more specifically address issues of transparency, communication, and inclusion.

[This item required no action by the Committee, since it simply provided framing for later input from AITC. The Committee did note that most members were present during open forum discussions when all of the issues noted were raised.]

[AITC] Academic Affairs remains the decision maker for Academic IT to push forward the teaching and learning and academic program themes and goals of the Campus Wide Strategic Plan. These suggested changes also attempt to integrate into the Plan the need for a process which would lead to an underlying structure for information management and technology decision-making.

Rationale. Academic Affairs and its systems of IT governance – such as the Senate AITC committee and sub-committees, the College IT Committees, and the Provost – should consult together to plan Academic IT provision to “optimize the use of technology to enhance academic program quality” (Campus Wide Strategic Plan). These mechanisms provide for the necessary internal collaboration of faculty, academic departments, colleges, deans, and local IT providers, and are essential to a functional model of IT Governance.

The principle is consistent with the intent specified in the introduction to section I in the strategic plan, which quotes from the “Organization of Information Technology on Campus,” report from the CIO of the California State University to the Executive Council of Presidents of the CSU (March 2005).

“...IT resources that are unique to teaching and research programs require special attention. Therefore the CIO will work with deans, department chairs, and faculty to ensure support for these resources is integrated into the information technology Plan.”

[The Committee noted that the IT Strategic Plan takes an institutional approach and thus does not cite the role of particular divisions or organizations in the document. The focus is rather on taking a campus-wide approach to planning, focusing on partnerships, inclusion and collaboration. The issues of ‘internal collaboration’ within Academic Affairs are issues for that division and not an appropriate issue for the IT Strategic Plan.]

Section I [AA]

- Do we need to define the process for making decisions about how classrooms are improved?

[The IT Strategic plan does not address implementation processes, nor does it define decision-making about particular issues.]

Academic Chairs Questions

- On the services side, what can we do to make clearer the channel by which to report and deal with problems encountered by campus IT users?
- How can we assure quality faculty and staff input into IT decisions?
- What is the status of labs on campus – conditions, general vs. targeted use, student/faculty utilization?
- Where are we in the constant move to improve quality use of CMS on the academic side of the house.
- The “data warehouse” issue has been around for some time. Where are we with that project?
- What are our plans to increase the number and quality of smart classrooms on campus?
- Is there a place by which to monitor IT projects and progress?

- Can we improve email communication to students in our courses and the utility of class rosters within an email framework?
- What are the cost and outcomes of the campus laptop loan program; is this a priority use of resources? What about mandatory student laptop purchase?

[The Committee unanimously agreed that the above issues were either already adequately addressed in the plan, were too specific for a strategic plan, or were focused on implementation rather than on strategic planning. In addition, the CIO has provided written answers to the questions listed above directly to the chairs.]

Section IA2a

~~[AITC] b. The results of annual surveys of faculty and student needs should be clearly communicated back to campus.~~ The methods used to create this data as well as its end results will be clearly communicated back to all appropriate campus units [green adopted].

Rationale: It is important for the appropriate campus units to understand how the data is being collected to determine how it can be appropriately used (and misused). This is not a statement of “trust” rather it is a commitment to data transparency and allows innovative ideas to come from sources that are not continuously involved.

[The Committee agrees that communication of the means used to gather data should be communicated as well as the data itself. However, this issue is too specific for the plan. As with the information published after the IT survey in 2007, the Committee will continue to publish complete and transparent information for campus review.]

[AITC] Section IA2e (new)

(New) e. The identification of academic technology priorities and needs should be adequately researched and agreed upon by invested bodies for all new and renovated buildings.

Rationale: It has been proven that empowering users with the knowledge to understand the advantages and disadvantages of “decision paths” completed by Administrators to determine needs are much more reliable and accurate and saves money in the long run. This statement is included to make sure all new and renovated buildings are part of the consultation planning process.

[The Committee agreed that the IT Strategic Plan is not the appropriate place to address issues of academic priorities or governance of building processes. There is a Facilities Planning Committee with broad representation to address capital planning issues, as well as planning processes used for individual building projects. We are committed to encouraging the broadest consultation possible on all issues.]

Sections IA3b&d

~~[AITC] (REMOVE) b. A practical five year plan for the provision of effective computer lab resources for faculty and students should be developed and funding identified.~~

~~(REMOVE) d. A plan should be developed for the provision of enhanced student learning spaces for study outside the classroom~~

Rationale. Development and specification of these planning needs should be initiated by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs with close collaboration with IRT.. and not the other way around.

[The Committee unanimously agreed that the two sections should remain in the plan, as enhancement of both labs and general learning spaces is critical to student needs. The IT Strategic Plan makes no statements as to which particular organization on campus is responsible for which action or aspect of planning. The assumption is that planning will occur through partnerships across divisions, not within particular divisions.]

Section IA4a

~~[AITC] a. Support and training for faculty use of technology for teaching should be enhanced through development of specific programs designed to flexibly meet identified faculty needs.~~ Identified faculty instructional needs will be used to develop and enhance faculty training and support programs and will be managed by the Academic Technology and Creative Services.

Rationale: This re-prioritizes the action that the support and training programs will be created out of “identified” faculty needs rather than generic programs that are flexible enough to meet needs. The Academic Technology and Creative Services should be the manager on how these programs are developed, enhanced, and administrated.

[Section IA1 carefully addresses issues of methods for identification of faculty needs. The Committee believes it’s inappropriate to assign responsibility for particular aspects of the plan to particular campus units.]

Section IA4b

~~[AITC] b. Support and training for student use of technology for learning should be enhanced through development of specific programs designed to flexibly meet identified student needs, with special attention to development of services through a Student Technology Center.~~ Identified student instructional needs will be used to develop and enhance student support programs, with special attention to development of services through a Student Technology Center.

[As noted for the above section, methods for identifying student needs are already addressed in the plan. The capitalization of Student Technology Center was removed in the document, to eliminate emphasis on a particular organizational unit.]

Section IA4c

~~[AITC] c. The Help Desk should provide a single place for faculty, staff and students to be connected with seamless services from both institutional and local~~

~~support.~~ The Help Desk, Academic Technology and Creative Services (ATCS), along with local IT support areas will provide the necessary distinctive support vehicles needed for faculty, staff and students to connect with quality instructional technology support. *Rationale:* This statement officially recognizes local IT as another important support vehicle for faculty and staff to go to. The statement will put to rest any rumors of centralizing IT.

[The Committee noted that this section was intended to focus on the need for an easy-to-use single point of contact for IT services for faculty and staff. This responds to the following weakness noted by the campus: Communication about IT is lacking on campus and there is a resulting lack of awareness about information technology services, with many on campus not knowing where to go for IT help. The language was changed to better reflect this intent, with reference to a specific organizational unit removed (i.e. Help Desk).]

Section IA4d (new)

[AITC] (NEW) d. A system of protocols for specifying how faculty, staff and students communicate urgent and non-urgent needs to IT support should be established, routinely reviewed, and adequately communicated.

Rationale: Changes in technology and the methods in which it is supported and maintained have constantly changed at Sac State. Adequately communicating protocol has always been a weakness at this University. This item recognizes this weakness and addresses it in the strategic plan.

[The Committee agreed that it did not understand the meaning or intent of a ‘system of protocols.’ IT support for faculty and staff is so diverse that it would be inappropriate for the campus-wide IT Strategic Plan to define one set of protocols for each unit.]

Section II

- Student Experience – Administrative Software Issues

The focus on the student experience seems to focus on access and teaching/learning. While these are important, their experience with administrative processes that perform in a sub-standard manner (i.e. slow system response time or cumbersome tools for administrative processing like graduation evaluation) also impact the student experience. However, a focus to improve this type of experience not explicitly mentioned.

[The Committee agreed that the draft plan did not provide enough specific emphasis on student administrative issues; language was added at II1d and reference to student use of data was also added in several other locations in the plan.]

[AITC] (REMOVE)b. ~~Campus electronic communications will be made more reliable and consistent through consolidation and coordination of email communications, further~~

~~development of text messaging and web messaging, and development of personalized communications tools.~~ No rationale provided.

[Committee members were unanimously opposed to removal of this item from the Plan. The need for improvement of campus-wide communications is cited in Destination 2010 documents, the campus Strategic Plan, in accreditation documents and by WASC itself. In addition, improvement of email and web messaging was widely requested by academic chairs during a recent discussion of strategic issues for IT (see bullet item beginning with "Can we improve email communication to our students....")]

Section II3c

~~[AITC] c. A campus-wide web advisory group and steering committee will be established to enhance campus web communications.~~ [in partnership] A balanced and equitable campus-wide advisory group and steering committee for communications will be established to seek out new methods of campus wide engagement and to ensure compatibility with other non-IT strategic goals.

[The Committee unanimously agreed that the requested language relates to campus-wide engagement and communications, which is not within the purview of the IT Strategic Plan. The Committee also decided that the issue of web communications is of importance to most units across campus; therefore, this item will not be removed from the document. The language of this section was, however, changed to reflect the need for partnerships across campus related to web activity (see section II3c in first section of this report)].

Section III

Section III1

~~[AITC] 1) Implement a sustainable, campus-wide budget and funding model for information technology.~~ Create and sustain an organizational structure and culture that recognizes the subject-matter expertise and vision of faculty and IT support staff in the planning and decision-making stages.

[The Steering Committee did not approve a change in this item, as it was noted that the item addresses a long standing criticism of IT planning on campus. That is, this section addresses several previous weaknesses of IT planning at Sac State, including 'inadequate planning for replacement of IT equipment,' lack of 'alignment with pedagogy,' and 'Little previous planning for IT and little coordination and collaboration, with no clear focus on IT outcomes. This section is also consistent with the planning and budgeting model fostered by UBAC, wherein divisions coordinate issues on a campus-wide level and build sustainability into spending plans. In addition, the Committee noted that the substitute item suggested seemed to be a campus governance issue rather than an IT issue appropriate to the IT Strategic Plan.]

Section III1a

[AITC] a. ~~Planning and budgeting for information technology should be coordinated at the institutional level to ensure alignment with strategic planning, the minimum amount of duplication, and the greatest efficiency in the use of limited resources.~~

Steps will be taken to insure that a balanced and equitable advisory group and steering committee is tasked with the duties of campus-wide planning and priority setting for IT initiatives including the review and recommendation of campus-wide IT policies.

Rationale: Faculty and staff do not have enough input in Information Technology Planning. The top committee levels that set the campus-wide priorities for IT do not represent the consultative and collaborative environment that Sacramento State values. There are many faculty and IT staff available to serve at the highest committee levels that have the vision and expertise to help set the campus-wide strategic policies and address strategic IRT issues. I also cite Sacramento State's Strategic Priority #3: "Enhance campus-wide engagement...in the planning and implementation of campus policies." *Rationale:* The strategic plan needs to strongly emphasize its commitment to faculty, staff, and students on gaining full participation of the campus community through communication and consultation. This will provide one more successful vehicle toward convincing faculty, students, and staff of the importance of their involvement and that the IRT and its committees are absolutely committed to serving the needs of the campus.

[One of the key values received broad support across campus was "...working collaboratively to promote increased efficiency and effectiveness, in order to carefully coordinate our resource planning for information technology campus-wide, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and cost and improve efficiency and effectiveness of services." This item directly addresses that value and therefore will not be removed. Inclusiveness in IT planning is addressed throughout the document, with special emphasis on measurement and feedback processes for faculty. Prioritization of IT projects and plans will be within the purview of the IT Steering Committee, which has representation from across campus. The IT plan is not the proper place to address issues of campus governance and resource allocation, nor should intra-divisional decision-making and resource allocation be addressed in the IT plan.]

Section III1b (new)

[AITC] (New – add as b. and renumber) Regular public forums will be established to allow for deliberation and commentary on topics as well as presentations of new ideas regarding campus-wide information technology.

[The Committee feels that the language at III1a and b, suggested by AITC, is broad enough to include public forums and many other types of means of communications. Addressing specific forms of communication is too granular for the plan.]

- Do we need to identify where resources will come from to improve technology for teaching and learning?
- Who will make decisions about allocation of resources for teaching and learning?

- Do we need to address where cost savings will come from?

[The Committee agreed unanimously that resource allocation decisions are not part of the strategic plan.]

- [ABA] Suggestion to eliminate or make major change to III1:
Implement a sustainable, campus-wide budget and funding model for information technology.
 - Planning and budgeting for information technology should be coordinated at the institutional level to ensure alignment with strategic planning, the minimum amount of duplication, and the greatest efficiency in the use of limited resources.

Suggestion that this bullet should not be included in *IRT's strategic plan* [italics added] in that it is perceived to be targeted at UBAC and other divisions' resources. Suggest alternate wording: "Coordination of planning and budgeting should consider all funding sources under IRT which includes Trust Funds, All University Expense accounts, applicable auxiliary accounts as well as possible outside funding such as capital funding." The original wording seems to be directed at UBAC in regards to All University Expense accounts as well as other division's resources.

[The Committee feels that this comment confuses the campus-wide IT strategic plan with planning for IRT-division specific budget issues. This statement was intended to say that IT budgeting should explicitly be looked at from an institutional perspective. The statement does not refer to either UBAC or to IRT-specific budgets. The above statement reflected the intentions of the Committee in regard to IT budgeting.]

- [Student Affairs] In summary, I think most of the director's questions and concerns center around confusion as to whether this plan is IRT specific, or whether it explicitly includes non-IRT departments (and their IT staff – for those that have IT staff). Some of the statements appear to be IRT specific, some of the statements appear to be campus-wide. Thus, they are not sure how they fit, how they would collaborate to identify needs and priorities and how the goals of this plan would be assessed.

[This seems also based on a misunderstanding that this is an institution-wide plan, not an IRT plan. The plan does not focus on any specific unit on campus, although certain functions may be naturally focused within the purview of one unit or another.]