

TSPC Meeting Notes

04/19/2006
10:00 AM
West Conference Room

Meeting called by:	Dr. Allen Henderson	Type of meeting:	Technology Strategic Planning
Facilitator:	Marcus Kerr	Note taker:	Alma Kleckner

Attendees:	Senior Management Allen Henderson, Provost	Internal constituents Cynthia Fountaine, School of Law - Absent Betsy Alexander, Schl of Arts & Sciences Sameer Vaidya, School of Business Carlos Martinez, School of Education Debbie Roark, Staff John Gonzales, Students - Absent Glen Goodspeed-Visitor Jose Ortega-Visitor	Key decision makers/support personnel Bill Bleibdrey, VP Finance and Admin Chuck Hollingsworth, CIO and Alumnus Marcus Kerr, Facilitator Jason Neal, Academic Technology and Web Services Cindy Potter, University Librarian
-------------------	--	--	--

----- Agenda Topics -----	
Review of Meeting Minutes	All
Review of Events Since Last Meeting	SW Hollingsworth
Questions and Concerns	Open Floor
Final Review and Committee Signoff	All
Identification of Next Steps	Allen Henderson

Open Floor Discussion

Full, print versions of the University Technology Strategic Plan will be available in four different locations for access and check out, a copy in the Historic Campus Library, in the Office of the Provost, the Chief Information Officer's office and a copy in the School of Law Library. A public access version of the plan will also be posted on the Provost site: <http://www.txwes.edu/provost/tsp/>. It was determined that sensitive information will not be posted on the Web and some information posing a security risk should not appear in print versions.

The committee members agreed that an Executive Summary should have to be added to the plan. There were discussions on how the plan will be communicated to the rest of the University. It was decided that Mr. Bleibdrey and Dr. Henderson would present the plan to the Executive committee and Board; an overview would be presented to the faculty at the beginning of the next academic year by Dr. Henderson; and Mr. Hollingsworth would present an overview of the plan to both staff and students. Each school representative would also present their goals and objectives to their colleagues to further emphasize the importance of understanding the plan. A communication plan was also being put in place to reach students, staff and faculty, administration, alumni, and the board through various mechanisms.

It was asked if the significant technology needs of each school had been addressed in the University plan. After discussion, the answer was that some of the needs at the school level were being addressed in the University plan; however, the reason for having school-level plans was to ensure that those issues not addressed at the university level would be addressed at the school level. It was mentioned that not all the schools are on schedule to submit their technology plans to the Provost and that those plans will contain that needed information. The plans are due on August 15, 2006.

A question was raised as to whether funding for project 6.4 would come from the general operating budget since it dealt directly with acquiring external funding for projects. After further discussion it was agreed that it would fall under the general operating budget, as the only associated cost was the salary of the Director of Grants. It was then requested that a chart listing each individual's tasks and due dates be created and decimated to each individual. It was also requested that the time of when the user and survey information was compiled be noted within the plan.

Dr. Henderson requested that the Student to Computer Ratios identified in the plan be categorized into general access labs and teaching labs/computer classrooms. He also asked for clarification of student to lab PC ratios (How were they calculated?). After discussion, it was agreed that clarification should be added at the bottom of the charts.

A question on project 6.6 was raised regarding when the funds would be decentralized to accomplish the project objective. Mr. Bleidrey stated that the sequence would be one-by-one, based upon the successful completion of departmental/school technology strategic plans (i.e., when the plan was approved, funding for the projects would become available to the school/department based on the project timeline). I was also mentioned that each technology project would have to be reviewed and approved prior to being funded. If a project was not in their technology plan (i.e., was not specifically identified in the action plan of the school/departmental technology strategic plan), the project manager/supervisor would have to request that the priority of the project be changed, through the Provost (schools and academic departments) or CIO (administrative departments), to subordinate other identified projects.

A vote was taken to determine if the current draft of the University Technology Strategic Plan, with the requested modifications, should become the operating technology plan for the university. The vote tally is as follows:

Name	Stakeholder Group Represented	Vote
SW Hollingsworth	Alumni and Information Technology Services and Support Personnel	Yes
John Martin	Graduate Programs	Yes
Cindy Potter	Library Services and Support Personnel	Yes
Elizabeth Alexander	School of Arts and Sciences Faculty	Yes
Sameer Vaidya	School of Business Faculty	Yes
Carlos Martinez	School of Education Faculty	Yes
Vickie Rainwater	School of Law Faculty	Absent
Allen Henderson	University Administration	Yes
William Bleidrey	University Budget and Finances	Yes
Deborah Roark	University Staff	Yes
John Gonzales	University Students	Absent
Jason Neal	Web Development and Academic Technology Support Personnel	Yes
Marcus Kerr	Facilitator	As facilitator, this individual serves as a neutral, non-voting member of the committee

Final vote tally: 10 for, 0 against, 2 absent

The final version of the plan, with requested modifications, will be made available on April 20th.

Identification of Next Steps

- Open to the university community for review.
- Communicate the key components of the plan and prepare and deliver presentations to stakeholder groups.
- Questions and concerns can be referred to the stakeholder representative, ICT, or ATW.

The committee will reconvene for the first bi-annual plan assessment meeting, project updates and plan review in October 2006.