

Summary of Conversations with Information Technology and Facilities Conducted by the College Academic Master Plan Committee Presented to the College Academic Senate on May 26, 2011

Introduction

In March and April of 2011, the College Academic Master Plan Committee conducted interviews with representatives of the Information Technology and Facilities groups. The representatives interviewed were:

Information Technology: Andy Hillberry (Chief Information Officer) and Chuck Flagg (Director of Client Technology Services)

Facilities: Dan Cherewick (Director of Physical Facilities), Kim Hugelier (Southeast Campus Facilities Manager), and Jay Seewald (Orchard Ridge Campus Facilities Manager)

Each group was provided with a set of questions and requests in advance of the interview. The primary question for both groups was, "How do the college's Academic Master Plan (AMP) and Strategic Plan (SP) influence your group's planning and purchasing?" Additional questions and requests included:

- What areas of the AMP and SP seem to you to be most relevant to your group's mission?
- Please provide a copy of your group's current master plan.
- Please provide an example of a current or upcoming project or purchase that you believe illustrates influence by the AMP and/or SP.
- Describe the relationship between the college-level personnel of your group and your group's personnel on each campus. How is the college level informed of campus-level needs, and how does the college level address campus-level needs?

What follows is a summary of the key points of each interview and a set of recommendations by the committee.

Information Technology (IT)

- IT developed a Technology Master Plan in 2003/2004 with input from both faculty and administrators. This plan was reworked in 2009. It is annually updated by A. Hillberry after incorporating information from the following sources: the Technology Management Committee, decisions made by the College Equipment Task Force (CETF), the campus AMPs, campus presidents' requests, college senate resolutions, and requests from discipline and program representatives. This plan guides IT purchases.
- The initial planning cycle developed by IT and the College Planning Council (CPC) in 2003/2004 envisioned a College Academic Master Plan providing the input that would guide the annual revamping of the Technology Master Plan. The process outlined in the previous bullet point has evolved in the absence of such a plan and in the context of frequent administrative turnover at the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor level.
- IT ideas and input need to be regularly incorporated into academic planning somehow. A positive example of such input is IT's contribution to the redesign effort.
- Academic planning needs to include recommendations for changes to academic technology uses (e.g., changes to the use of Datatel). Academic planners should take input from IT when formulating these recommendations.
- If campus planning groups desire IT input in their planning processes, college-level IT representatives like Chuck Flagg and Kayla LeBlanc (Director of Academic Technologies) should

be invited to attend campus planning meetings.

Facilities

- Facilities planning is largely reactionary to requests made at the campus level. There is no college-level Facilities Master Plan, nor is there much college-level direction given to Facilities planning.
- Facilities requests and initiatives are reviewed to determine their academic impact and adherence to a campus' AMP. An example given was the H building renovations on the OR campus. The SE and OR representatives reported that a close relationship exists between their facilities and campus academic planning groups. It was unclear if a similar situation exists on the AH and HL campuses.
- Facilities reps recommend performing a review of service redundancy. Examples given included ceramics programs and library services, though the latter must remain in compliance with state and federal regulations.
- Faculty involvement on campus facilities groups is crucial. Campus facilities meetings should be scheduled at a time when faculty can attend, and faculty should be encouraged to attend and participate. SE has seen positive results from mandating that a representative from each department be present at campus facilities meetings. This mandate comes from the campus president's office.
- Facilities reps have developed a multiyear timeline of necessary deferred maintenance on its current properties. This timeline also includes visioning for desired and potential changes to its properties.
- Facilities reps believe that the academic planning process should regularly involve a facilities impact study. For example, the recent decision to create an English 1510 competency requirement for college-level courses did not take into account that most English 1055 and 1060 courses use computer labs. More of these labs will need to be built in order to accommodate the larger number of 1055 and 1060 sections needed as a result of the new policy.
- Facilities reps should be present at campus academic planning meetings, especially those involving the development of new initiatives.

Recommendations

1. **More college-level planning direction.** Both groups reported, at best, a minimal amount of college-level input from either the Strategic Plan, which is new and poorly understood and/or communicated, or the College Academic Plan, which exists only in the form of goals approved in 2007.
2. **More cooperation between academic planning and other college groups.** This cooperation could manifest in several ways: academic planning groups soliciting other groups for planning initiatives; academic planning groups researching the impact of initiatives on other groups; representatives of other groups serving on academic planning groups.