

Strategic Plan Committee Meeting
Goal 2 – Objective 2 – Action Strategy 1

Date: January 20, 2004

Present: Sandra Swanson (Co-leader), Robert Wehrman, Ron St. John (Co-leader),
Margaret Phanes, Jeffrey Marzluft, Clyde Sakamoto (Responsible Party)

Discussion: Most of the discussion revolved around preparation for the shared governance “retreat” on January 30.

Thought Shift:

The committee agreed that the most important item for discussion is the “mindset change” discussed at the previous meeting. There was some concern that some administrators and faculty’s technological naiveté would prohibit them from embracing the new ideas. However, the committee agreed that most on-campus people embrace technology – even if they do not know how to use it properly.

The proposed change proposes that the university look at technological goods (specifically computers and hardware) as depreciable goods requiring upgrades and replacements instead of as capital goods which are regarded as one-time purchases.

Everyone agreed that this proposal goes beyond an accounting change and represents a paradigm shift in the way the university views technology.

Training Issues:

Next, we discussed the technology training issue. It was noted that there has not been an increase in computer support for several years – outside of the hard work of volunteer faculty. In fact, due to the Banner implementation, there has actually been a decrease in computer/technology training personnel. Our committee felt that it was within our purview to recommend that the University “institutionalize” a training person.

Although it was acknowledged that some of this discussion may bump up against Team H’s mission, Sandra indicated that in conversations with Team H’s leaders – they would welcome any input our committee gives.

Financial Considerations:

When Clyde entered, the committee summed up our two recommendations. He agreed that technology is a wide ranging issue and will cross over into several points of the strategic plan. He charged the committee with finding sustainable solutions to technology funding. He recommended that we find a strategy that makes a funding stream predictable.

The university is against lab fees – per se. Two alternatives to this were proposed.

1. We can recommend re-allocating tuition funds (i.e. 15%) to be dedicated for technological supplies and equipment. This will require some number crunching.
2. The university makes the culinary students and nursing students purchase their own equipment. What about technology students?

Other discussion:

The committee spoke about a mandatory lap-top program. Is it feasible? Could we get help from a national or local company? What about ways to help students pay for it?

Webmaster Position – Someone has been found to fill this position.

Conclusion:

The committee will present two ideas at the Shared Governance meeting on Friday, January 30, 2004.

1. The university needs to shift its organizational and philosophical mindsets when it comes to technology. We need to see technology treated as depreciable (light bulb model) and not capital goods (table model).
2. The university needs to increase and institutionalize a technology training person.