Information Resources Committee (IRC) Meeting

October 1, 2009, 10:00 p.m.-11:30 p.m., AB5 309

Summary

Present: Oistad, O’Connor-Benson, Bernardo, Bryan, Jaeger, Snyder, Vines, Banks, Britton, Kirsch
Absent: Greene, McBride  Guest: Paul Snyder

Student Technology Fee:

Kay Oistad reported that the President’s Cabinet has approved the recommendations for current obligations totaling $1,125,464. Committee members asked questions of Paul Snyder regarding distribution of the funds and next year’s process. Paul stated that the tech fee will backfill for E&G dollars that were already cut. There are no funds for new initiatives. We will see what next year brings.

Strategic Plan for Technology:

Paul Snyder encouraged committee members to visit the strategic planning website and complete the questionnaire. He reviewed the schedule for the planning process. The mission and vision reaffirmation and the environmental scans (internal and external) are being completed simultaneously. Strategic goals and directives will then be developed. These three pieces will be reviewed by the BOT at their January 19 workshop.

Committees are developing the individual reports to provide a university wide perspective and an oversight body. He is looking for a plan with specificity; a plan for IT for a campus of 15-20,000 students. He posed the questions: how would you grow the current structure and how would you sustain the growth?

Paul suggested that the Committee begin by creating a list of questions which would/could then be answered in the plan. Then we need to decide if we want to continue as a whole, or divide into groups. He suggested the following questions:

1. What new services and tools should be considered….or modified….or eliminated?
2. What do we do to remain competitive with our peers to attract students, faculty, and staff?
3. What is the best organizational structure
4. What needs to be scalable?
5. What are the resources needed?
6. How do we become more productive?

The initial draft should be completed by the end of February/early March. The final draft should be completed by the end of March. We can seek feedback from the PBC along the way.

Paul was asked about the 1996 technology plan. He responded that the plan is outdated, but we could take parts that might still be relevant and create a new plan with more specificity and a shorter time line; i.e., 5 years and 15,000 students, with thought given to how to position ourselves to support 20,000 students.

There is no document format, but Paul is looking for:
- Goals & Objectives
- Action Plan
- Benchmarks
- Timelines
- Recommendations

After Paul left the meeting, the Committee reviewed the questions that Paul had posed and the timeline. Pat O’Connor-Benson distributed an article from Educause Quarterly titled Strategic Planning for Technological Change. She suggested that we could use some of the points in the article to create an outline. The committee decided to proceed by compiling a list of questions which should lead to the creation of an outline. Kay agreed to post Paul’s questions in the shared folder, and committee members agreed to add and initial questions of their own. We will review the questions at the next meeting and decide on next steps.

**Meeting Schedule:**

The next meeting is scheduled for October 15, 10:00 – 11:30; AB5 210