



**TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
MAY 18, 2011
9:30 A.M.**

**BOARD ROOM
WELLS FARGO PLACE
30 7TH STREET EAST
SAINT PAUL, MN**

Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.

Committee Chair David Paskach calls the meeting to order.

- (1) Minutes of April 19, 2011 (pp. 1-4)**
- (2) Information Technology Update
- (3) Report on ITS Annual Conference(pp. 5-6)
- (4) Students First Report (pp. 7-8)
- (5) Service Delivery Strategy (pp.9-23)

Members

David Paskach, Chair
Christopher Frederick, Vice Chair
Cheryl Dickson
Jacob Englund
Phil Krinkie
James Van Houten
Michael Vekich

Bolded items indicate action required.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 19, 2011**

Technology Committee Members Present: *Christopher Frederick, Vice Chair; Trustees Cheryl Dickson, Jacob Englund, Philip Krinkie and James Van Houten*

Technology Committee Members Absent: *David Paskach, Chair and Michael Vekich*

Other Board Members Present: *Scott Thiss, Board Chair, Chancellor James McCormick, Trustees Alfredo Oliveira, Duane Benson and Louise Sundin*

Leadership Council Committee Members Present: *Vice Chancellor Darrel Huish and President Judith Ramaley*

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Technology Committee held its meeting on April 19, 2011, at Wells Fargo Place, 4th Floor, Board Room, 30 East 7th Street in St. Paul. Vice Chair Christopher Frederick called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

1. Minutes of March 16, 2011 Technology Committee

The minutes of March 16, 2011 were approved as written.

2. Information Technology Update

Vice Chancellor Huish reported the completion of the last technology item on the Office of the Legislative Audit. The customer satisfaction survey was finished in February. The survey results are posted on the Information Technology website. This information will be used to improve the user's experience and planning.

In March, a Quarterly Chief Information Officer meeting was held at Minnesota State Community and Technical College in Detroit Lakes. In addition to this Vice Chancellor Huish conducted five more campus visits and participated in South Central's information technology program review.

Vice Chancellor Huish reported that the ITS Conference will take place April 21 and 22. This event provides technology staff with opportunities for professional development in order to keep up with changes in technology and best practices. Trustee Englund praised leaders for bringing the technology community together, this is a phenomenal way for staff to learn from each other, collaborate and share best practices. Sharing the results of this conference with rest of the board would be beneficial.

Trustee Van Houten inquired if President Ramaley would provide information on the student laptop program that was implemented at Winona State University

twelve years ago. President Ramaley affirmed that the university is maintaining the e- Warrior Learning Program and that an assessment of the program was recently completed. President Ramaley would be pleased to present this information to the trustees at a future meeting.

3. Students First Report

Jonathan Eichten, Director of Students first provided an update on the student loan acceptance and certification process. Shannah Moore-Mulvihill, Director of University and System Relations from the Minnesota State University Student Association and Jessica Medearis, Associate Director from Minnesota State College Student Association assisted in presenting information on this shared services initiative.

In recent years, as students have assumed a greater percentage of total educational costs, student loan borrowing has increased. At the same time, staffing in financial aid offices has either remained level or been reduced. The result of these two dynamics, on many campuses, has been a backlog of Federal Direct Student Loan applications. This project will provide much needed relief for both the students waiting for help and the financial aid offices providing these services.

There are three parts to this project. First, the web based application where the students submit their data. The financial aid staff uses the second piece to view student's data and complete the internal calculations. Both of these components will move into the pilot phase by the end of April and into production by the end of May. The third part of the project, which generates the student loan certification, will be complete by June.

Jonathan Eichten praised Joanne Chabot who has been instrumental in moving this project forward and Debbie Schadewald's architecture efforts, which have been pivotal to the success of this project

Jonathan Eichten presented a demonstration of the web application. Currently the student loan process is manual; implementing this web based application process will save over 200,000 pieces of paper.

Shannah Moore and Jessica Medearis described the benefits of this project. Today students fill out a form on paper, then send the form to the financial aid office. The financial aid officers enter the information into the system to certify the loan. The students may wait six weeks or more to receive the status of their paperwork. The web-based process will provide students with a fast and easy way to complete and track their loan application. This process will free up staff time allowing them to meet with students with greater need. It will reduce the amount of errors in the process and provide students with the information they need to make informed decisions about loans.

Trustee Van Houten inquired if the accounting or billing links connected. Jonathan Eichten confirmed that the links are integrated into the system on the business side, in addition to this there is a connection to the federal government's system.

Trustee Englund expressed excitement for the Student First project. How does the system address the autonomy of the campuses student loan process? Christopher Halling System Director of Financial Student Aid responded that each institution is individually licensed with the federal student aid program. For those students that attend college at more than one institution a home institution is assigned. The financial aid is released to the home institution. The system has a blanket consortium agreement to allow students to receive financial aid while attending multiple institutions. This process is manual and awkward, but the Single Bill Single Payment process should resolve might of the issues.

Trustee Dickson inquired if information was available on how the system is addressing the issue of Federal Pell Grant fraud. Christopher Halling responded that the system is taking a proactive approach to the issue and working with campus and the federal government to track perpetrators. The system is required under federal law to report any fraudulent activities.

Vice Chair Christopher Frederick thanked the student association representatives for the presentation.

4. Service Delivery Strategy

Vice Chancellor Huish introduced Chief Information Officers (CIO) Ken Ries, from Pine Technical College, and Chris McCoy from Metropolitan State University, to assist in presenting the Service Delivery Strategy. A process of collaboration with groups like the Leadership Council Technology Committee and a CIO workgroup was used to develop this document.

The CIO perspective letter is a record of information that describes the current situation. This information will change over time and as such does not need to be included in the document.

The Service Delivery Strategy is a description of the intentional decision-making process, which will be used to determine which technology services will be provided centrally and which services the campuses may retain. Implementation of this strategy will take up to five years.

This document describes the finite set of services that will be provided centrally, examples are the Integrated Student Record System, Desire to Learn (Instructional Management) and Data Communications Network.

The campuses will have defined areas of responsibility and innovation to provide distinguishing services. A bidirectional life cycle will allow the system to expand

on innovations that are successful, offering them centrally. This will also provide us with a means of ending centrally provided services that diminish or become obsolete, thus freeing up resources.

Ken Ries provided a review of the Service Delivery document, pointing out the merits of creating a comprehensive service delivery strategy. One goal is to create a comprehensive service catalog with service level agreements, so that campuses know what services are available and where they exist. This will reduce duplicate efforts and create a framework for talking about opportunities to leverage activities and create efficiencies.

Another goal is to clearly define a process of identifying innovation, which often takes place on the campuses. Those that are successful may expand; an example of this is ImageNow, a document management service. Mankato State University provides this service to twenty-five institutions.

Chris McCoy presented the matrix on appendix B. This document addresses the need to describe the complexity of the information technology infrastructure and the services throughout the system. The matrix depicts the major services, as they exist today, the placement of responsibility, convergence (how similar the services are) and the level of investment. Some services reside at the system level others take place on many different levels. The information on the chart will assist technology leadership in discussing opportunities for collaboration or innovation.

Darrel Huish reported that many are already seeing the benefits of creating the Service Delivery Strategy. This document provides leadership with a vocabulary that would not otherwise exist, which will be used to decide on the strategy to implement changes. Trustee Dickson thanked the presenters for their presentation it will assist this committee by providing them with the language they need to discuss the complexities of technology and provides a clear picture.

Vice Chair Frederick thanked those that developed and presented the document and indicated that this strategy be placed on a future agenda for further discussion.

Vice Chair Christopher Frederick adjourned the Technology Committee meeting at 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Benner

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Technology Committee

Date of Meeting: May 18, 2011

Agenda Item: Report on ITS Annual Conference

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

The Trustees requested that information on the ITS conference be presented at the May meeting.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Darrel Huish, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Background Information:

The ITS Conference was held April 21 and 22. This conference provides technical staff with the opportunity to keep current with emerging technologies, changes in the system and best practices.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

INFORMATION ITEM
Technology: ITS Annual Conference

BACKGROUND

The ITS Conference was held April 21 and 22. This conference provides technical staff with the opportunity to keep current with emerging technology, changes in the system and best practices. The Trustees expressed appreciation for the conference and interest hearing more information.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Technology Committee

Date of Meeting: May 18, 2011

Agenda Item: Students First Report

Proposed
Policy Change

Approvals
Required by
Policy

Other
Approvals

Monitoring

Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

The second goal implemented by the Technology Committee is that the Trustees will monitor progress on the Student First initiative.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Jonathan Eichten, Students First Director

Pat Carmody Registrar, Southwest Minnesota State University

Debra Mitlyng, Assistant to the Dean of Arts, Letters and Sciences, Southwest Minnesota State University

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Background Information:

Jonathan Eichten will provide a report on the Students First Initiative. Debra Mitlyng and Pat Camody will assist in sharing information on how the waitlist has enabled universities and colleges to be more efficient at managing courses offered and to improve enrollment management practices.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

INFORMATION ITEM
Technology: Students First Report

BACKGROUND

Debra Mitlyng and Pat Carmody from Southwest Minnesota State University is pleased to share her perspective on the Students First project waitlist with email communication. This project provides great benefits for students as they search for needed courses. Equally significant has been the impact of the waitlist on university and college enrollment management practices. In this time of budget constraint, the waitlist has enabled universities and colleges to be more efficient at managing courses offered and to improve enrollment management practices.

Full project detail may be found on the Students First website:
<http://www.studentsfirst.project.mnscu.edu> .

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Technology Committee

Date of Meeting: May 18, 2011

Agenda Item: Service Delivery Strategy

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

One of three goals adopted by the Board of Trustees Technology Committee is that the Trustees will sponsor the development of a strategy for delivery of technology services so that these services can be provided efficiently while also sustaining an institution's ability to innovate and differentiate student and community services. There will be a presentation of draft Service Delivery Strategy and an opportunity to obtain feedback from the Trustees.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Darrel Huish, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer
Ken Ries, Chief Information Officer, Pine Technical College
Chris McCoy, Chief Information Officer, Metropolitan State University

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Background Information:

Vice Chancellor Huish presented the Service Delivery Strategy to the trustees at the April meeting. The trustees requested that this document be brought back to the conference for further discussion.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

INFORMATION ITEM
Service Delivery Strategy

BACKGROUND

Vice Chancellor Huish presented the Service Delivery Strategy to the trustees at the April meeting. The trustees requested that this document be brought back to the conference for further discussion.



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

WELLS FARGO PLACE
30 7TH ST. E., SUITE 350
ST. PAUL, MN 55101-7804

ph 651.201.1800
fx 651.297.5550
www.mnscu.edu

Service Delivery Strategy The CIO's Perspective

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system is in many ways a young and evolving organization. The breadth of our involvement in the State, as well as the variety of the respective missions of our institutions, makes for exciting challenges in the application of information technology. Because of our relative youth, many areas of information technology are being done from a historical perspective.

However as we look to the future, it is expected that the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system will continue to experience strong fiscal pressures in the form of increased overall enrollment coupled with flat or declining levels of public support as well as stable rates of tuition. As a result, the Division of Information Technology Services (ITS) could reasonably expect to face no-growth or declining budgets for the next several years. It is therefore envisioned that ITS will focus increasingly on a portfolio of core enterprise (mission-critical) IT services. These services will receive a high-priority commitment to sustaining high availability and high reliability.

In addition to this, we know that higher education must continue to change to be responsive to the educational needs of the country. Minnesota State Colleges and Universities has a large responsibility and opportunity to serve the people of Minnesota. Information Technology will be an integral part of the changing approach to meeting this critical need.

In this situation, ITS acting alone will not be the primary source for IT service innovation. To a large degree, innovation will take place on our campuses. The overarching intent of this service delivery strategy is to be explicit about what will be done once for the entire system and what other services will be done multiple times by consortia or individual institutions. While there is much to be gained from the Service Delivery Strategy document in its current form, it is not the end of the process but the beginning. It is very important to recognize our shared governance structures will be used to create an intentional and collaborative process to further develop and implement this strategy.

Sincerely,

Darrel Huish
Vice Chancellor Information Technology Services

DRAFT

Service Delivery Strategy

Information Technology

Date: April 6, 2011



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Context and Introduction.....	2
Strategic Vision, Values, Assumptions and Strategies	3
The Current Situation.....	4
Objectives.....	4
Priorities for Change (action plan)	5
Appendix A: Execution and Anticipated Contribution Outcomes.....	6, 7
Appendix B: Placement of Responsibility.....	8-9
Appendix C: References.....	10

DRAFT

Service Delivery Strategy Document

Context and Introduction

This strategy is intended to describe our rationale for delivering IT services either centrally, regionally, or at an individual campus. The overall long-term aim of the strategy is to create a well-understood rationale and method for locating and funding IT services. This strategy is being developed in response to a goal established by the Technology Committee of the Board of Trustees for the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. The goal is: “The committee will sponsor the development of a strategy for delivery of technology services so that these services can be provided efficiently while also sustaining an institution's ability to innovate and differentiate student and community services.”

This strategy is intended to specify an end-state that will take from 3 to 5 years to achieve. The strategy development process is being led by the Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Services in collaboration with the Leadership Council’s Technology Committee.

This strategy is intended to align specifically with MnSCU 2011 – 2014 Strategic Direction and Goals. The execution and anticipated contribution outcomes for this strategy are specified in Appendix A.

DRAFT

Strategic Vision:

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities will be intentional as we position IT services to contribute to our strategic goals. This means that a finite set of specific IT services will be provided system-wide by a central service provider for the common good of all. Three current examples are the data communications network, the Instruction Management System (D2L), and the enterprise system of record for student and financial data (ISRS). It is expected that all campuses will utilize these centrally provided services and will not establish alternative local methods of providing them.

At the same time, we will be intentional in identifying IT services that campuses will deploy and support using their own unique methods and resources. Some current examples are business workflow automation, institutional and student E-mail, institutional web presence, printing services, and desktop computer workstations.

At any given time, there will be IT services that are at various stages of a bi-directional lifecycle of discussion, experimentation, local (pilot) implementation, service standardization & consolidation, system-wide centralized implementation, and ongoing operation. We will have processes in place so that when IT services move from one stage to another governance and funding models change as well.

Assumptions:

- Enabling student success and supporting the teaching/learning process is the primary reason for having IT services
- Campus service differentiation comes fundamentally from business process change not from deploying unique-to-campus technology solutions
- Effective strategic planning is not an episode; it is an iterative process
- It is important to balance operational efficiency with fostering collaboration and innovation
- Enterprise decisions should be based, as much as practical, on the enterprise data contained in our systems of record
- Different institutions have different breadth and depth of technical expertise
- Experiments and pilots with new or emerging IT services should be intentional; communicated broadly throughout the system; with a defined beginning and end; and possessing predetermined success criteria
- Many levels of governance must be taken into account in making decisions with system-wide implications. Existing governance structures will be used to support the decision-making process

Strategies:

- The various IT service providers among Minnesota State Colleges and Universities will move from a loose affiliation of autonomous activities to a planned, coordinated effort
- Simple, standard and reliable IT services will increase system-wide quality of service and promote cost efficiency
- System-wide services will be standardized wherever possible. Unique or non-standard technology will be deployed only as an intentional exception to this default mode

DRAFT

The Current Situation

- The service inventory is not complete or published
- There is, on occasion, a lack of trust among campus CIOs regarding Office of the Chancellor completing timely delivery of centralized services
- There can be tension or confusion concerning which services will be offered and what the process is for engaging with others that are providing similar services
- Campuses struggle to align with informal or undocumented “standards”
- The ITS division in Office of the Chancellor can be slow to respond with emerging technologies creating pressure on Colleges and Universities to seek autonomous solutions
- It is unclear whether “cost savings” is a sufficient reason to position services centrally
- It is unclear if it is acceptable for an institution to opt-out of a centralized service
- The average budget for central computing in our two-year institutions is \$1,198,531. The national average for like institutions is \$5,678,889. The average budget for central computing in our four-year institutions is \$7,040,000. The national average for like institutions is \$18,978,369. This data indicates that centralized IT services are saving more than 100 million dollars a year for our system. (Data source: 2009 Campus Computing Project National Survey of Computing and Information Technology in America Higher Education)
- Sometimes pilot projects are launched without a process or framework to evaluate, discontinue or expand the service. This increases complexity and reduces agility for the system as a whole
- There is a lack of governance for converting pilots to system-wide services
- This is no roadmap or framework for sharing single campus technology initiatives horizontally across the system
- Staffing levels and responsibilities are not consistent from campus to campus
- Many campus CIOs use valid (but individualized) rules-of-thumb such as “if it is academic technology and not D2L support it at the campus level, if it is an administrative technology, look at what is offered at the system level, if not offered, the campus can/should do it. Finally, if my local organization can provide a service to others that can be distributed at a lower cost, provide that service.”
- Regional consortia and other ad hoc collaborative efforts are operating with success
- The shared services model, as is being formed with the Campus Service Cooperative shows promise and is gaining acceptance throughout the system

Objectives: What we will do over the next 3 years.

To accomplish the vision, the following would have to take place:

- Create a comprehensive Strategic Plan for IT within and throughout the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System; this plan will be aligned with the Board of Trustees System Strategic Plan as well as the institutional strategic plans
- Develop an ongoing process to update the IT Strategic Plan
- Create an understanding of what needs to be uniform across the system (e.g. transactional systems that automate common processes or common reporting requirements)
- Define the systems and services to be delivered centrally for the common good

DRAFT

- Develop a service catalog that includes pertinent data on enterprise services, services shared between institutions and individual campus services
- Create an environment that encourages everyone to participate in seeking new IT services or policies to support current and emerging business strategies
- Develop a services lifecycle that includes a process to fund and implement new services, a process for identifying and migrating technologies from campus-wide scope to enterprise-wide, and a process for discontinuing support for antiquated services

As a result:

- Enterprise-wide services will be mapped to the business processes or strategies they support
- All IT service providers will be operating from a documented and well-understood roadmap of experimental, emerging, established, and obsolete information technologies
- Stakeholders will receive value because IT services are planned, focused, aligned, and cost effective

Priorities for Change (action plan)

- Produce a project plan to identify scope, resources, and timeline
- Produce up-to-date inventory of services
 - Office of the Chancellor (system-wide enterprise infrastructure and applications)
 - Consortia/collaborations
 - Campuses
- Identify candidate services to become enterprise-wide services to avoid confusion and create cost efficiencies
- Identify 2 or 3 styles of service positioning
- Establish an ongoing process for reviewing service positioning
- Publish Enterprise Architecture roadmap
- Identify gaps or misalignments in service delivery, resources and funding
- Prioritize projects to address gaps
- Agree on overall financial plan and incremental finance rules
- Identify decisions to be made and process/responsibility to decide and act
- Plan and execute an effective change management process including executive level support

Draft: April 6, 2011

DRAFT

Appendix A: Execution and Anticipated Contribution Outcomes

Strategic Direction 1: Increase access, opportunity and success.

By planning and execution of aligned actions, IT services selection and placement will contribute by:

- a) Reducing unnecessary duplication of service expenditure through tiers of services that optimize the effectiveness of value delivery while minimizing expenditures (goal 1.3)
- b) Minimize the use of personnel resources to accomplish similar outcomes while providing sufficient cross system depth of resources and experience (via selective standardization and training) to minimize operational risks (goal 1.3)
- c) Position services and system to best facilitate the focus on student graduation or transfer (goal 1.4).

Strategic Direction 2: Achieve high-quality learning through a commitment to academic excellence and accountability.

By:

- a) Measuring delivery value success will be based on a criterion that includes the locating and funding of IT services in signal or multiple efficient and effective delivery options that best deliver value for education programs and student services. The selection of which optimize the overall system delivery value while supporting initiatives and flexibility needed to achieve regional or local educational objectives (goal 2.3).
- b) Using approaches that build and sustain capacity in technical talent that bring and maintain service knowledge currency, professional skills and cultural competency to facilitate the overall delivery to student's educational outcomes (goal 2.4)

Strategic Direction 3: Provide learning opportunities, programs and services to enhance the global economic competitiveness of the state, its region and its people.

By:

- a) Locating and funding IT services that facilitate workforce education and training that are recognized (as measured externally) as leading in the higher education field on delivery outcomes (goal 3.1).
- b) Creating assets that support regional viability objectives where justified (goal 3.2).
- c) Selection of appropriate ties of services and funding models that optimize individual institutions ability related to overall expenditures that allow attention to developing other capacities of value to their region and interest in meeting employees needs (goal 3.3).

Strategic Direction 4: Innovate to meet current and future educational needs.

By aligning leadership activity for academic and operational outcome effectiveness via IT services locations and funding:

- a) Deliver on needs today while being future-focused (goal 4.1),
- b) Fully utilize talent and sharing of personnel resources to have an aligned approach to addressing system, regional and local challenges (goal 4.2)
- c) Develop accountability methods to optimize system positions and personnel resources to focus on outcome efforts that leverage the combined benefits of balancing innovation and stability.

DRAFT

- d) Routinely examine and improve structures, technologies, policies and processes to support strategic system outcomes (goal 4.4)

Strategic Direction 5: Sustain financial viability during changing economic and market conditions.

Through:

- a) Fiscal stewardship and prioritization of core mission priorities. Identify centralized, regional, campus or outsourced approaches where expenditures deliver high value outcomes (goal 5.1)
- b) Rigorous reduction of unnecessary expenditure (goal 5.2)
- c) Develop and leverage alternative relevant funding sources to supplant revenues from state appropriations, tuition and student fees (goal 5.3)
- d) Partner whenever possible with other institutions, including the University of Minnesota, to share resources, services and purchasing processes.

Appendix B: Placement of Responsibility

This is a representative but incomplete list of services as of April 6, 2011.

Category/Component	System	Consortium	Institution	Program	Convergence	Investment	Current Technologies
Enterprise Resource Planning							
Course Management	●	●	●	●	●	●	ISRS
Degree Audit	●	●	●	●	●	●	Degree Audit Reporting System
Finance	●	●	●	●	●	●	SWIFT
Human Resources	●	●	●	●	●	●	SCUPPS
Student Information	●	●	●	●	●	●	ISRS
Learning Management							
Learning Management System	●	●	●	●	●	●	Desire 2 Learn
Streaming Media	●	●	●	●	●	●	Media Mill, "U of M partnership"
Email Solutions							
Student Email	●	●	●	●	●	●	Live@EDU, Gmail,
Faculty & Staff Email	●	●	●	●	●	●	GroupWise, Exchange, Live@EDU, Gmail
Web Services							
Public	●	●	●	●	○	●	Various
Private	●	●	●	●	●	●	SharePoint, etc.
Application	●	●	●	●	●	●	Various
Identity Management							
System Identity	●	●	●	●	●	●	StarID
Local Identity	●	●	●	●	●	●	Active Directory
Applications							
Resource Scheduling	●	●	●	●	●	●	Resource 25
Document Management	●	●	●	●	●	●	ImageNow, Knowledge Lake
Enrolment Management	●	●	●	●	●	●	Hobsons
Procurement							
Commodity Hardware	●	●	●	●	●	●	Dell, Hewlett Packard, Lenovo, etc.
MCA	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Software	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Supplies	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Communications							
Wide Area Network	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Local Area Network	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Core Network Services	●	●	●	●	●	●	DHCP / DNS / WINS
Telephony Services Support	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Broadcast Technical and Engineering Services Support	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Digital Signage	●	●	●	●	●	●	

Appendix B: Placement of Responsibility Continued

This is a representative but incomplete list of services as of April 6, 2011.

Category/Component	System	Consortium	Institution	Program	Convergence	Investment	Current Technologies
Security							
Security Cameras, Door Access, and Systems	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Network, Server, and Desktop Security	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Payment Card Industry	●	●	●	●	●	■	
End-user Support							
Help Desk	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Workstations for Staff	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Administrative Application Support	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Forms and Software Development	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Hardware Repair Center	●	●	●	●	●	■	Raiser's Edge, Knowledge Lake etc.
Instructional Technology and Support							
Classroom Technology	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Instructional Design Support	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Technology Training and Professional Development	●	●	●	●	●	■	
Acronyms							
Key	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inappropriate/not applicable ● Fringe, experimental/localized/pilot/high risk/no guarantee of availability/inadvisable ● Secondary, developmental/limited/distributed/exploratory/under consideration/low risk/moderate availability ● Primary, production/mainstream/enterprise/preferred/adopted/low risk/high availability/funding priority ● High convergence ● Moderately high convergence ● Moderate convergence ● Low convergence ● No convergence ■ High investment ■ Moderately high investment ■ Moderate investment ■ Low investment ■ No investment 						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHCP- Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DNS- Domain Name System ISRS- Integrated Statewide Records System SCUPPS- State College & University Personnel Payroll System SWIFT- Statewide Integrated Financial Tools WINS- Windows Internet Name Service 						

DRAFT

Appendix C: References

- *For interesting and elegant technology principles, see Brown University IT Strategic Plan pp. 9-11 http://www.brown.edu/cis/about/itsp_v2.pdf*
- *For discussion of interplay between centralized services providers and campus service providers see Washington State Community and Technical Colleges' Strategic Technology Plan p. 15 http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/docs/strategicplan/strategic_technology_plan.pdf*
- *For an example of a plan with specific delineation of campus and centralized service provider roles see http://www.vccs.edu/Portals/0/ContentAreas/ITS/VCCS_ITStrategicPlan.pdf*
- *Also of interest is http://cs.uwsa.edu/documents/CommonSystemsRoadmapVI_2.pdf*
- *For information about the Campus Computing Project see <http://www.campuscomputing.net/2009-campus-computing-survey>*
- *For detailed report of ITS 2011 Customer Satisfaction Survey see http://www.its.mnscu.edu/documents/Final_Draft_MnSCU_ITS_Survey_v4.pdf*



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

WELLS FARGO PLACE
30 7TH ST. E., SUITE 350
ST. PAUL, MN 55101-7804

ph 651.296.8012
fx 651.297.5550
www.mnscu.edu

INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY SERVICES
DATE



The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System is an Equal Opportunity educator and employer.
This document can be made available in alternate formats upon request.