

CIO Follow-Up Meeting

Convened December 9, 1998

Chaired by Barbara Horgan

Notes by Cynthia Golden

VENDOR PARTICIPATION IN CIO LISTPros

- Nice to have vendors and their input in the list discussions

Cons

- People won't be as honest, especially with regard to their opinions on certain vendors and/or their performance

Suggestions:

- Set guidelines for vendors
- Vendors can't use list as marketing tool
- Can't use listserv for follow-up such as "why did you say this about me?" – they must go to individual in cases like this
- Periodically send guidelines for list users about list etiquette
- Action: Bradley U. to post their guidelines to list, Mark Luker to follow up

SUMMARY OF TUESDAY MEETING

A summary of the Tuesday CIO meeting will be posted to listserv by Bill – six topics covered included: TCO, Strategic Planning, Role of CIO, Portfolio of CIO, Net Security Issues, Distance Learning, and How to Support and Encourage Faculty to use Technology

TOTAL COST OF OWNERSHIP (TCO)

It was suggested that this is a good topic for the Net.edu group. Discussion followed about TCO vs. Benefits. Comments were made that "Assessing the Academic Networked Environment: Strategies and Options," a CNI publication by Chuck McClure and Cynthia Lopata is a good tool to use to assess benefit of network services and that the Gartner TCO model is probably not too workable for higher education.

Some attendees commented that they use TCO data to help with the "awareness" issue and the need life - cycle funding, and providing help in making the resource tradeoffs we all have to make.

The discussion continued with the question – "is there good quantifiable way to show we're getting benefit form our investment?"

Attendees from the UK pointed the group to the ISTM Value of Money Study

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk>

The Value of Money Study and other strategic planning documents that discuss how every university in UK was asked to develop an information strategy (not technology or systems strategies.) The process was facilitated by IT, but it is an institutional, not computing strategy

PLANS

The group discussed impediments to developing a plan, as well as reasons for success of the planning processes. Buy-in on the part of the university community was mentioned as an important factor. It was noted that many times many of us have IT strategic plans in absence of overall strategic university plans.

The following points were made in the discussion

- A plan is ongoing nature, must be flexible and changeable
- IT Plan must be part of an overall Academic Plan at UNC Charlotte
- Plan can be a vision document (short,) but can drive a lot of decisions
- Annually – one should develop a tactical plan that supports the strategic plan
- The US Constitution was cited as a good example: few amendments
- Example: "Technology any time, anywhere" is the short plan or vision, it is general
- The tactical piece comes from the "solutions du jour" to move in that direction (Again, on an annual basis, review how to meet those aims)
- Use the plan to direct funding -- where money lies, hearts and minds follow

Many of us have no institutional vision, so how should we build an IT plan?

The following points were made in this discussion:

- You've simply got to do it
- In the UK – every University has 5 core strategies. IT& HR are enabling strategies
- At Baylor. IT Planning has to fit under the specific University goals, and fit within total mission of University. IT has obligation to be looking at things people don't know about yet (like a séance) and keep them informed.
- At Mississippi IT advises on IT issues, but is not the driving force in University planning
- In absence of institutional plan still need to do technology, strategizing take advantage of opportunities

EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

How to institutionalize emerging technologies and who has 'official' R&D groups?

- Baylor has a 'venture capital' fund for unanticipated IT costs
- Loyola Maryland – has an Advanced Technologies group
- Oxburg, Minnesota – has an IT projects group. They look at what's on the fringes, have a modest but growing budget, see as their mission kick-starting new stuff
- Wisconsin – keeps R & D separate from organizational structure. WebCT, IMAP e-mail both went through small pilot process in this group
- Are others stretched too thin?
- R & D are often not separate in many places. Some institutions made a separate group because day to day demands were so great
- R & D & professional Development must be protected
- One institution tries to distinguish what is specialized R& D. A committee evaluates proposals (PARC method)
- S. Dakota made a decision not to pursue "bleeding edge" due to resource and financial constraints
- When deciding what we do vs. don't do, do a few things very well, don't do some things (ex. Close down modem pool)

THIS LEAD TO A MODEM AND ISP DISCUSSION

- Still at S. Dakota: 60,000 people, 1600 modems (50:1 Ratio for 28.8 service) or refer to ISP (negotiated a price for faculty/staff). Modem service at ISP is a time-based charge, inverse to telephone high cost at night, low day. With ADSL, this model may change.

- U Kansas Medical Center: In 1994 outsource dial-in services for 2500 students. 96 modems 100% cost recovery
- Why are we doing this? – to provide better access
- Set Boundaries as service limits as part of planning process

HOW CAN EDUCAUSE HELP THE CIO GROUP?

- Gather best practices documents, policies
- Make them easily accessible
- Also serve as a central source for documents for academic/administrative practical use (Grade book template timesheets)
- Help us learn who just did what?
- Example: who's gone to gigabit Ethernet