

IT Strategic Transformation Committee Meeting – November 23, 2005

Attendees: Dave Costello, Ray Dannenhoffer, Chuck Dunn, Elias Eldayrie, Nancy Kielar, Mike Levine, Scott Morris, Brian Murphy, Bruce Pitman, Barb Ricotta, Peter Rittner, Steve Roberts, Mike Ryan, Kathleen Stuber

1. Potential Opportunities Status

There are now 55 opportunities, sorted into 12 categories. Chuck distributed the most recent version (a working draft). The team is working diligently to complete all of the cells. A discussion occurred on the wording of each potential opportunity and decided that the wording should not be changed, so as to not change the original meaning. Efficiencies are articulated in the detail. Chuck shared the document that he prepared on the *workstation support concept* to show how the efficiencies are being developed. There was a discussion about the generalist vs. the specialist model. There was a comment that we have to understand the dependencies and the prerequisites as part of this process.

Bruce publicly thanked the team for doing all of this work and noted that there is so much spelled out in this document that we have to work with; our best ideas and issues are articulated and supported.

Next steps – Chuck will email the document to the group for comments to be incorporated into this draft for next time.

2. Information Technology Bill of Rights

Peter Rittner led the discussion, and passed out 2 versions of the Bill of Rights that have been drafted. One version is the latest iteration of the original concept (started in Bruce's subcommittee developed with input from that committee and the ITSTC). The second was drafted based on comments from the ITSTC. It includes a statement about making a commitment to review the Bill of Rights every 3 years as a lead-in statement, and a purpose statement that brings the document into alignment with other IT Strategic Transformation happenings. Others feel that possibly the document should be transformed into an action/check list (a third point of view).

Elias led a discussion of how to effectively balance the concept of keeping things open (to not get boxed in to specifics) and the concept of being specific enough for Deans and Vice Presidents to understand completely. Several comments were noted; specifics are a moving target, it is very time consuming to discuss specifics, a bill of rights should act like a constitution and the specifics should be looked at maybe annually, people will be content with the general statements, and a concern that the governance won't be utilized effectively. Elias showed an example of what he means by getting more specific with each task, and reiterated that this is a 'what' list, not a 'how' list.

Overall, the group should pay attention to the concern of ensuring that Deans and Vice Presidents have what they need to do their jobs effectively, but keep the document to established principles. The set of examples to be presented as part of the presentation will be sent out to the committee for comment and discussion.

It was suggested to rework the document so that the important items (the actual bills) are more in the forefront and the focus.

Both documents will get circulated for next week's discussion.

3. **White Paper – Instructional Support**

Steve Roberts distributed his white paper on instructional support and presented. It was found that leading institutions across the country all are dealing with the same issues, and that in most instances, UB is doing a good job of getting things out on the table to be dealt with. The research shows that many institutions are devoting more money to building infrastructure than they are making the infrastructure useful and effective. The benchmark data shows that we are in the ballpark. There are no surprises with the trends found.

Observations/comments – everything happening in instruction/teaching involves IT. A potential opportunity was recommended out of this document... information literacy on assessing the research that students are doing. There was a discussion on this topic.

4. **Town Hall Agenda** – the group agreed to postpone the town hall from 12/2 to 12/16 to have more preparation time.