

*Strategic Planning Committee Meeting
January 31, 2006*

Attendees: (see attached list)

Steve Director: Steve opened the meeting.

- Steve Director reported on the meeting that he and Mike McKay attended with the two Executive Vice Presidents. He indicated that both Executive VPs support the strategic plan including the proposed IT governance structure.
- Steve stated that the establishment of the proposed governance structure will help lead future initiatives and strategic directions recommended in the strategic plan.
- Steve is hopeful that the governance structure can be implemented by the Fall, 2006.
- Other areas already being planned/addressed:
 - There has been approval to move forward with the implementation of the General Ledger project. This project is being championed by Steve DiPaolo, University Controller.
 - Mike McKay and Karen Kavanagh have already started discussions to identify funding for classroom upgrades. Possible funding sources included student computing fee dollars and capital/facility dollars.
- Steve stressed that it was important for the strategic plan to move forward with the support of the entire University community – faculty, staff and students. The plan provides a roadmap of where we need to go. Steve stated that we need to do it to ensure improved operations and services at the University – not for the sake of OIT.
- It is recommended that a five-year rolling budget be developed to support the strategic plan.
- IT is estimated that 4-5% of the overall University budget is computing related, and approximately 50% of that is in OIT.

Rick Falk – Governance Sub-committee:

- Rick stated that this sub-committee reached out to CIOs and colleagues at other colleges and universities to learn more about what they were doing in some of these areas.

- They also wanted to identify methods for reducing ‘duplication of efforts’ throughout the University and how ‘technology’ could help in this area.
- They learned that in order for IT plans to succeed you must engage senior administrators throughout the entire process. The proposed governance structure will be a great asset in this area. It also provides a mechanism for obtaining budgetary/funding support.
- The formation of the Information Technology Coordinating Committee (ITECC), a five year rolling budget plan, and support models were the major recommendations from this sub-committee.

Doyle Knight – Research Sub-committee:

- Doyle reported that overall his committee identified 18 recommendations. The recommendations crossed five different areas – education, networking, grants, system support and video. These recommendations are outlined in the appendix. These recommendations are not in priority order.

Doug McCrea – Public Services and University Life Sub-committee:

- Doug reported that some of their recommendations are not easily identifiable in the plan, there were common themes and points and recommendations were combined with those of other sub-committees. These include:
 - Reduce duplication of efforts across the University
 - A single interface for services, e.g. a web portal (this is included in the report)
 - Communication – Develop common standards for University business processes (this is represented in the report).

Don Smith – Teaching and Learning Sub-committee:

- Don stated that like other committees, this committee felt there was a lot of overlap and duplication of efforts at the University.
- Don reinforced comments made earlier by Steve Director that everyone must support this plan so that it can be a success! This includes senior administrators as well as faculty, staff and students.
- Don expressed the importance of this support to ensure a ‘rolling budget’. The University cannot continue to live on one-time funding and must consider the true cost, including staffing, support and training.
- One of this committee’s issue/concern was that classrooms are not set up to meet the minimal needs of students and professors. The University must develop

standards for learning space and maintain that level throughout all classrooms.

- Another issue was wireless. It needs to be moved out to more buildings and put in all new buildings.
- On-line courses were also important to this sub-committee. Don stated that Rutgers is behind peer Universities in this area.

***Rosa Rivera* – Business Services and Enterprise Systems Sub-committee:**

- Rosa stated that this committee was responsible for reviewing several areas that included:
 - Financial applications/systems
 - Student applications/systems
 - Security Framework
 - Networking
 - Video
 - Email and calendaring
 - Voice
 - Desktop
- The committee did surveys to obtain information from the University community on financial applications and voice services. In addition the SIFT committee provided input to identify any gaps within the student systems.
- Key recommendations included:
 - Integration of systems.
Security: Balance access with the need to secure and protect data.
 - Voice services: Look at the current funding model for voice to identify a means to provide central funding for evergreening/improvements.

Mike McKay: Mike closed the meeting.

- We need a mechanism to ensure an on-going process for managing all recommendations and implementation of the same. The IT governance structure should be very helpful in this area.
- Mike indicated that although it has been recommended that the CIO be included in the President's cabinet to present strategic vision/direction – there is no initial agreement to implement this at Rutgers. Mike stated that if this doesn't occur – we will identify a point of access to ensure the leverage and access we need to communicate the vision at these levels.
- Mike stated that he will work diligently to ensure good coordination and obtain the consensus needed to move forward. He stated “influence is not necessarily

where you sit, but how influential you are within the University community.”

- Mike spoke about the two IT Project Governance Committee (ITPGC), and the two subcommittees, that were established almost two years ago and how successful these committees have been.
- Mike reported that his organization has a person responsible for ‘vendor management’. This will help to ensure that all departments within the University get the same pricing from common vendors. There are many instances where this is not currently the case.
- Mike stressed the fact that this will be a ‘living’ document. It will be reviewed annually to ensure the university is continuing to move forward with technology.
- The Office of Instruction and Research Technology (OIRT) was established to ensure greater collaboration with academic units, student fee funds have already been directed to support technology in the classrooms.

Other Comments:

- Greg Dilalo expressed concern about the accuracy of information in some of the sub-committee reports. Steve responded by stating that if anything is found not be factual – please comment on Sakai or send an email so that it can be re-visited and corrected if necessary. There may be sections that you do not agree with but are factual. In these cases, no changes will be made unless there is strong objection by a majority.
- An introduction to the appendices will be added.
- What happens with feedback after it is widely distributed? The feedback will be shared with the sub-committee chairs. If there is a case where it is specific to one sub-committee the chair will seek input from the sub-committee.
- Steve Director, Mike McKay and all of the sub-committee chairs thanked everyone for their participation and efforts.

Timeline:

Before the final draft copy is circulated in February/March, it will be shared with all committee members. Changes will be highlighted for easy referencing.

February – March: Circulate the document. Steve and Mike take the document to the Newark and Camden Provost, the Executive Committee of the Senate, the Administrative Counsel, student organizations, and other groups and individuals.

The University President will send the plan out University-wide with a cover memo.

April/May: update the documents and finalize the plan.

May: Submit final document to Executive Vice Presidents.

Attendees:

Helen	Berman
Marie	Botticelli
Jeanne	Boyle
Mary B	Daisy
Diane	Davis
Gregory	Dilalo
Steve	DiPaolo
Steve	Director
Rick	Falk
Devin	Fensterheim
Bob	Gerdes
Bernice	Ginder
Gary	Golden
Colleen	Gordon
Tom	Grzelak
David	Gwalthney
Cheryl	Harth
Chuck	Hedrick
Les	Kennedy
Doyle	Knight
Judy	Lige
Marie	Logue
Ann	Martin
Douglass	McCrea
Mike	McKay
Camie	Morrison
Lynn	Mullins
Michael	Mundrane
Gheorghe	Muresan
Richard	Novak
Angela	O'Donnell
Rosa	Oppenheim
Delia	Pitts
Sam	Rabinowitz
Jean	Rash
Rosa	Rivera
Brian	Rose
Joe	Sanders
Pam	Sisco
Don	Smith
Tim	Stein
Gayle	Stein
Shawn	Taylor
Aida	Torres
Thomas	Vosseler

Matthew Weismantel
Dorothy Williams
Donald Woodward
Galen Work