PROJECT GOAL

The goal of this project is to develop a Campus Technology Plan using a formal discovery & reporting framework employed in prior consulting engagements with higher education institutions. This framework identifies thirteen specific subareas of Information Technology and Business Systems. Project leaders will assign individual Working Groups to address each area. The planning process includes external and internal environment analysis, project development, and review of policies, procedures, and organizational structure, plus the presentation of recommendations for the future.

REASON FOR UNDERTAKING THIS PROJECT

Technology has become a leading cost center in the campus budget which reflects both administrative and instructional support realms. Technology change and equipment obsolescence are reflected by the increasing demand for ubiquitous networking connectivity, computing system refresh, online course management systems, Instructional Design and Support services, along with student training and staff professional development. The constantly changing IT landscape provides challenges for the students, faculty and employees. Documentation of institution’s IT history, accurate inventories of equipment and the auditing of capital and operational costs provide a foundation for project proposals and future IT budgeting. In this instance the Campus Technology Plan is Supporting Institutional Operations for the end goal of Helping Students Learn. Without effective Student and Management Information Systems, one could not Measure Effectiveness since data collection and analysis is dependent on IT systems where institutional data is collected and analyzed. Failure to plan is a plan to fail.

ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS AFFECTED

Every student, faculty & staff member is affected by campus technology. Four areas will have primary responsibility to for managing the process: Management Information Systems (MIS), Campus Computing and Networking (CC&N), Instructional Design and Media Services (IDMS), and the Davis Library. The directors of each of these areas will serve as co-chairs of the project. The new Campus Technology Committee (formed as a result of a former Action Project—Committee Effectiveness) has standing members including the Dean of Students, Campus Compliance Officer, VP of Human Resources, Deans’ Council (Provost & Deans) and representatives from the faculty and the campus administrative offices.

KEY ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES

New – Campus Technology Plan. To develop the plan, each of the working groups shall conduct both an External and Internal Environment Analysis; provide a Trend Analysis, inventory current technology, document current budgets for capital and operating costs, and researched proposals for new projects or purchases/services. The draft of the initial Campus Technology Plan will be submitted to the University President, President’s Cabinet, Academic Affairs Committee and external legal counsel as necessary for review & revision before publication and adoption.

Revised – Campus Technology Policy and Procedure Handbook. The revised handbook will include external compliance laws and guidelines, Human Resources Policy, Student Code provisions and any rule or strategy which requires documentation and adoption as accepted practice.
A: The Campus Technology Plan is a process designed to take about one year to accomplish. Due to the Academic Calendar and the timeframe for budget submissions, faculty will conclude their involvement portion in early April, just 8 months of engagement. The review & editing of the final document will involve the 12 month administrative staff along with those faculty who wish to commit to active participation past Commencement in early May. The final document and the dynamic updating of the Campus Technology Plan will continue indefinitely, but the initial information gathering and writing will be completed within the 8 month timeframe.

6: PROJECT SUCCESS MONITORING

A: The Campus Technology Committee will meet bi-monthly to share progress reports to assure coordination between the Working Groups. Each Working Group will include at least one of the project co-chairs and is responsible to the President for assuring progress in each focus area. Once completed the Campus Technology Committee will review and revise the plan annually.

7: PROJECT OUTCOME MEASURES

A: The AQIP Steering Team will consider this project a success if, at its conclusion, there is a full portfolio of Technology Project Proposals and budget requests which reflect the future needs of the institution. Plan components should include:

- Portfolio of technology proposals with both capital & operational budgets including Total Cost of Ownership and Return on Investment projections
- Ten year budget plan for technology capital and operational budgets
- Equipment replacement/refresh schedule
- A revised handbook of policies and procedures which clearly states how technology supports the institution and its stakeholders
- Listing of all laws and regulations for which the campus must maintain compliance
- Proposed organizational structure reflecting operational efficiency and accountability
- Professional development and training program proposal to improve Information literacy and skills

Project Update

1: CURRENT PROJECT STATUS SUMMARY

A: 1. General Project Status: **X** In-progress
   
   Original Project Start Date: 09/01/11
   
   Originally Projected End Date: 04/01/14
   
   Anticipated Completion Date If Not Completed: 12/01/14

   The Campus Technology Plan Action Project was proposed to formalize the process of strategic planning and distributed governance for a complicated set of processes that change rapidly, but are most centralized as a foundation requirement of administrative and instructional activities. Considering the Total Cost of Ownership and the quick depreciation of value on technology equipment, the University sees the benefit from documentation and systemic implementation of strategic planning across all campus stakeholder groups.

   The first draft of the Campus Technology Plan was submitted to the former University President, Dr. Barbara Gellman-Danley by the mandated April 1, 2014 deadline. Despite her announced departure from her Rio Grande position, Dr. Gellman-Danley completed a review of the plan and provided editing notes for the Committee authors.

   All recommended edits are completed and the current draft has been submitted to Dr. Richard Sax, Rio Grande’s new Provost who started July 1, 2014. His insights and editing comments will be made before the team submits the plan this fall to the incoming President, Dr. Michelle Johnston.

   The Campus Technology Plan Committee respects the change of Rio Grande leadership and anxiously awaits the resubmission of the edited plan document for consideration. Proposed Action Items needing attention by the campus leadership are currently deferred to the President’s Executive Cabinet for approval and adoption.
## ORIGINAL PROJECT GOALS AND DELIVERABLES

### A:

Prepare written documentation of campus technology history, current status and future proposals.

Publication of a Campus Technology Plan with timelines and narrative shall be considered as completion of the Action Project. The draft plan was submitted to Dr. Gellman-Danley and will be edited further and resubmitted to new campus President, Dr. Michelle Johnston by the established deadline. Achievement of goal shall be attained when the President receives the plan, reviews and responds with general feedback.

The plan shall be updated bi-annually to keep information current. Plan updates shall be first presented to the Provost who shall be considered as the Vice President responsible for Campus Technology.

The President’s Executive Cabinet shall review the document and review each bi-annual re-publication.

This goal will be achieved when the Provost receives the plan, reviews and responds with general feedback, edits are completed and the plan is resubmitted to the President and the Executive Cabinet.

The plan shall request a Campus Technology Committee charged with responsibilities as defined in the plan’s Executive Summary.

The Provost has established a Campus Technology Task Force as a temporary working group prior to the new President beginning her position and agreeing to the creation of a new standing committee under the structure proposed. Achievement of the goal shall be attained when the Campus Technology Committee is established, faculty & staff engaged and monthly meetings held as outlined and minutes filed.

Further attainment of the goal shall be measured by the degree governance shifts from department leadership to include participation & involvement by students, faculty and staff as technology stakeholders.

Strategic planning frameworks and recommendations for new projects shall be committed in writing and submitted at the time of budget requests (February).

The President’s Executive Cabinet and Budget Committee shall review each proposal and budget request and respond with questions or further discussion in a Budget Hearing format as necessary.

Achievement of the goal shall be attained when the Executive Cabinet and Budget Committee formerly acknowledges and responds to each proposal with justification for either approval or disapproval.

The overall goal of the Campus Technology Plan is to move the strategic planning and operations to a more distributed and formal campus process.

Achievement of the goal shall be attained when the Committee is established and participants are engaged in continual plan updating and the annual submission of proposals with formalized responses for approval/rejections and budgeting.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER THE PAST YEAR

### A:

Publication of the Draft Campus Technology Plan was completed by the stated submission deadline established by President, Gellman-Danley. The draft plan was also archived and provided to all University President candidates leading to conversations during campus visits and interviews. Allowing new leadership to receive draft copies and taking each section through further reviews and re-writes permits the committee authors to better focus the recommendations summarized in the Executive Summary. University Provost Sax took the first recommendation and established a Campus Technology Plan Taskforce to serve as a working group until the President and Executive Cabinet can review and take action on all recommendations including taking the technology working group to full campus committee status.

## INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT

### A:

The original Campus Technology Plan Action Project group consisted of four department heads, who drew from their distributed departmental positions and years of experience. Each representative strongly supports this urgent need for strategic planning and interdepartmental coordination. While many informal involvements are reflected through the historical narrative included in the draft
plan, the formalization of a Campus Technology Committee is still the most urgent action item awaiting approval.

5: EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

A: Capable and responsible technology department leadership and staff have adequately met most requests for services in networking, computing, instructional technology, information technology and administrative business systems. Changes in institutional leadership resets progress gained for broad institutional knowledge of processes and longer range strategic planning. Without the creation of a Campus Technology Committee and the institutionalization of the project proposal process, much would be lost with changes of staffing at the departmental level.

Despite the lack of the written plan and a representative committee of stakeholders, recent projects have followed the processes outlined in the Campus Technology Plan, but without formal adoption of the representations and processes proposed for implementation. It is the intent of this Action Project that proposals and recommendations regarding technology not be submitted and shelved alongside other Taskforce and Committee Reports, but that the processes proposed become formally adopted and fully implemented.

6: ANTICIPATED CHALLENGES TO PROJECT SUCCESS

A: The new campus President and Provost are likely to be overwhelmed with their orientations to campus operations, each with numerous opportunities for institutional change. The Campus Technology Plan Action Committee members acknowledge that the most serious concerns get addressed before items of less critical need. The activities of campus technology operations are not broken, but the formality of distributed governance and strategic planning should come as a welcomed proposal for immediate approval and adoption. It is critical that this Action Project receive prompt review and acceptance as a recommendation long overdue and easy to implementation.

The Action Plan team members believe strongly that the plan, even as a draft document, is an easy project to implement and will receive early acceptance from the campus community.

7: PLANNED NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Campus Technology Plan delivery to Provost Richard Sax</td>
<td>October 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-edit and submission to University President Dr. Michelle Johnston</td>
<td>November 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of Action Project</td>
<td>November 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the Report and Acknowledgement of Recommendations by President’s Executive Cabinet</td>
<td>December 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Technology “TaskForce” Confirmed by President’s Executive Cabinet</td>
<td>December 19, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Technology “TaskForce” Workgroups Established and Begin Monthly Meetings</td>
<td>January – May, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Technology “TaskForce” Defines Committee Charge and Scope of Responsibilities</td>
<td>January – May, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Technology “TaskForce” Changed to Standing Committee with Formal Representation and Procedures</td>
<td>August 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Technology Committee Begins First Year of Representation</td>
<td>Fall Semester 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Working Groups Submit Annual Project Recommendations to Provost for Consideration by President’s Executive Cabinet</td>
<td>Spring Semester 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Executive Cabinet Offers Review of First Year Progress and Effectiveness</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Year Two of Campus Technology Plan Operations</td>
<td>August 2015 – May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, QUESTIONS, OR CONCERNS

A: As the Rio Grande campus welcomes a new Provost and President, having the draft Campus Technology Plan documents represents a strong attempt to implement a strategic planning process with an outlined annual timeframe for representative planning, proposal submission and integration of the review and approval stages with the annual budget process. In this way, there will be no surprise requests for funding and Rio will have a longer term view on technology refresh and adoption of technology processes as they apply to instruction, academic/instructional research and administration of business functions.
The Campus Technology Plan reviews both campus technology history and outlines the current state of operations. The plan’s recommendations must be adopted to assure the document moves past a historical narrative to a strategic process benefitting the longer term planning and budgeting process.

Formal conversations with Provost Sax and informal conversations with our future President Johnston are extremely favorable of the immediate adoption of the plan’s recommendations. It is the responsibility of the plan authors, as department heads, to implement the proposals quickly and to continually push for formalization of the processes. As responsible stakeholders of our respective areas of technology use, the institution needs our efforts to assure that this continues as an active initiative.

Update Review

1: CURRENT PROJECT STATUS SUMMARY

A: This project address several of the new AQIP categories, specifically Category 4, Planning and Leading, and Category 5, Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship. Given the comprehensive nature of this project, in many aspects all of the AQIP categories would be impacted. A key aspect of high performing organizations is their agility and responsiveness to change in their environments. Formalizing the campus wide technology plan should enable the institution to be highly responsive to changes in the higher education environment, well also being able to meet the needs of its many external constituencies.

2: ORIGINAL PROJECT GOALS AND DELIVERABLES

A: While the campus has been slightly delayed in the final implementation and adoption of the plan due to changes in the leadership of the institution, the overall components of the AQIP action plan are in place and ready for full implementation. If it has not already built benchmarks into the plan for implementation the institution may wish to look at establishing additional benchmarks/performance indicators to measure the effectiveness and adoption of the plan across institutional processes.

3: ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER THE PAST YEAR

A: Given the complex and systemic nature of the technology plan, the composition and charge to the Campus Technology Plan Task Force will be important for the overall success of the implementation and ongoing review/updating of the plan. The mix of technique expertise as well as end user knowledge will be key to an effective Task Force. The campus will also need to consider the rotation of the Task Force membership to keep an appropriate level of historical knowledge available.

4: INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT

A: The campus should look to broad-based involvement of the campus and its various divisions/departments in the composition of the new committee. As previously noted, it will be important for the implementation and ongoing review and revisions to the plan to hear multiple constituencies and assess and evaluate their needs. A strong user base representation on the committee will help with this endeavor.

5: EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

A: Since all of higher education copes with the push and pull of effective, efficient and current technology needs your colleagues would benefit from the campus sharing this AQIP project broadly. Once such forum would be the annual meeting of the Higher Learning Commission. In writing or presenting on your project it will be important to share not only the triumphs but the set-backs as well.

6: ANTICIPATED CHALLENGES TO PROJECT SUCCESS

A: One of the principles of high performing institutions is having the appropriate amount of leadership support for critical processes. This is true not only for Presidents of institutions, but for other leadership as well. Since the Provost of the institutions has had the opportunity to read and edit the technology plan, it will be important for the Provost to join with the technology committee in stressing
the importance of the adoption of the technology plan with the new President.

7: PLANNED NEXT STEPS AND TIME LINE

A: The planned next steps as outlined above are appropriate for this project and speak to a high level of planning by the current task force. As the plan moves forward the same level of commitment and planning that brought forth the completion of the plan will assist the campus in its implementation.

8: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, QUESTIONS, OR CONCERNS

A: As the draft plan is adopted by the campus, it is assumed that this part of your AQIP action project will be closed. The campus may want to consider a second, shorter-term project related to the implementation of the plan. This would help keep the plan implementation on task and a central focus for the institution.

Project Outcome

1: REASON FOR COMPLETION

A: The project was created to make the Campus Technology Plan project more formal and to enlist a broader representation of campus constituent groups to the process. The Campus Technology Plan was delivered to the University President on March 30, 2014 and has been returned to the writers for editing and revisions. Since the revision and re-write process could be never ending in the spirit of making the Plan a living document, the writers wish to close the project and will encourage the University President and Vice Presidents to follow the recommendations outlined in the Executive Summary and move forward. Should the recommendations lend themselves to a new AQIP Action Project, that possibility could be considered later.

2: SUCCESS FACTORS

A: Getting the first draft of a large project completed and committed to print has been a tremendous undertaking and has permitted each Department Director as writers to formally document history, procedures and proposals.

As a planning document, its value is only strong if the Plan is reviewed by others and embraced by the organization as a strategic plan and regularly updated. Specifically, the Campus Technology Plan strongly recommends the formalization of a Campus Technology Committee with broad campus representation. The Plan calls for biannual updates of the written document and annual submissions of project recommendations prior to budget submittals and a longer ranged 5 year sustainable budget plan adopted to address the project proposals submitted by the Campus Technology Committee. By formalizing the Committee, requiring Plan revisions every two years, formalizing the project submission process, and linking it to budget submission procedures, it is expected that Campus Technology will become an organizational process rather than a marathon writing project of a few selected Departmental Directors. Completing the Campus Technology Plan as a first draft is a significant step in a positive direction towards strategic planning.

3: UNSUCCESSFUL FACTORS

A: The writers wished there had been greater participation in the input process. While it is understood that the Departmental Directors involved in writing the plan hold the related institutional knowledge and have ownership of their respective operations and past accomplishments, it is still an idealistic goal that many diverse parties and individuals will converge for the collaborative writing process.

The Campus Technology Plan writers feel strongly that reports and plans should involve follow-up by campus leadership. The follow-up must assure that change occurs as a result of the Plan’s recommendations and that the proposed two year re-write/update cycle falls upon a wider institutional committee which makes the Plan’s vision of a representative Campus Technology governance structure and process a reality.