

HIGHLIGHTS FROM CONSULTATIVE MEETINGS

Between July 12 and November 15, 2004, IET held separate meetings with each of the deans, vice provosts and vice chancellors. A summary of those discussions, structured around the three main objectives for those meetings, follows.

1. *Discussion of IT projects identified in 2003-04*

The deans, vice chancellors and vice provosts were given a brief overview of the projects identified in 2003-04. In particular, updates were provided about each of the top campus IT priorities (i.e., projects in the planning/analysis phase). Participants were informed that implementation and budget proposals for four of those seven projects (IT Security, Faculty Merit and Promotion, Electronic Research Administration, and Webcasting) were developed by the sponsoring units and submitted in October 2004 for the Provost's review and approval.

The project to identify a document management solution for the campus was the focus of much discussion. Several deans and vice chancellors emphasized the importance to their units and to their staff of finding a cost-effective solution to document routing, review, approval and storage. Some units reported having put development efforts on hold pending analysis of recent implementation efforts and investigation of Web-based options.

In addition, some participants indicated strong interest in seeing the campus move forward with several of the projects "for future consideration". These include enhancements to Banner, the development of an online graduate admissions system, the further development of campus wireless networking, and the provision of computer forensic services.

On the topic of educational technology, there was general agreement that the project to identify teaching and learning tools requires further development. One suggestion was to conduct an analysis of best practices and top IT issues in higher education, with the goal of identifying a few issues of particular relevance to UC Davis and using those as a starting point for campus discussions. Several participants commented on the need to get faculty actively engaged in this project, from the identification to the discussion and prioritization of teaching and learning tools. Specific topics suggested for this project include the next generation of course management tools, and e-portfolios for students.

2. *Identification of new projects for campus consideration*

The following items were discussed as possible additions to the list of IT projects for campus consideration:

Student data:

Several deans reported difficulty obtaining student data (both undergraduate and graduate) and generating reports they need or are asked for. The importance of clarifying what information is/is not available, and where/how to access it, was mentioned on several occasions. An update from the Institutional Research Committee, which is already looking into some of these issues, would be helpful. In addition, a decision support tool could be made available, through the Data Warehouse, to enable campus departments to easily access data stored in Banner.

Central Internet Payment Gateway:

Office of Administration suggested adding the provision of a central Internet payment gateway to the list of projects already underway. OOA will provide a description for the IT Plan.

Central Email Exchange Service:

The joint development by IET and Office of Administration of a central email Exchange service should be added to list of projects. OOA and IET will develop a description for the IT Plan.

Space Management System:

Office of Administration suggested adding the development of a space management system to the list of projects for future consideration. This project will include developing an RFI to identify software options. OOA will supply a description to be added to the IT Plan.

3. *Feedback on the campus IT planning process*

The first year of the IT planning process was received positively. Deans, vice chancellors and vice provosts were very appreciative of the series of campus consultations. The community discussions, as well as the open and transparent nature of the process, were seen as a great start. Some suggestions were offered for further refinement, including the addition of the AdMan Executive Board to the list of groups to be consulted, and the need to more actively engage the Academic Senate and Academic Federation in the identification and prioritization of educational technology needs and projects.