Attending: Raj Khandekar, Chris Randell, Lisa Ortiz, Janine Flores, Jeff Helton, Janos Fustos, Ben Zastrocky, Dave Ruch, Miguel Garza Wicker, George Middlemist, Rick Beck, Mike Hart, James Lyall, Tim Bond, Ed Jacobs, Andrew Holt, Jesse Altum, Peggy O'Neill

I.   APPROVAL OF NOTES

- It was moved by Lisa Ortiz, seconded by Janos Fustos to approve the notes from the previous meeting.

II.   RESULTS OF SURVEY/ANALYZING DATA

- Raj Khandekar presented the results of the survey. Out of 897 responses, only 12 people did not want to participate in the survey and registered for the I Pad drawing. The text responses on the positive characteristics of IT were reviewed. The data is not yet in stakeholder groups; there may be patterns once the comments are separated. This will allow input on vision and may find new products and services that would like to see offered.

- There was a large response to the survey from academic and administrative computing. The analysis will map the responses on the function and services of the units. There will be a pre-analysis so time won't be wasted at the retreat. Overall patterns could give us new initiatives. Raj has developed a site on Wiki to analyze the data, which includes a sample vision statement. Vision and mission statement differences were discussed.

- Ben Zastrocky, Mike Hart and James Lyall met with JVA to discuss the proposal. They have a qualitative research group that has the expertise to set the specific topics for the retreat. The committee discussed JVC's involvement with the data. JVC is generating a proposal for the cost to synthesize the data to build the agenda.

- Once the initiatives in in place, the strategic plan writing should be easy. Raj and Sandra Haynes will review the data for analysis.

III.   SUBCOMMITTEE FOR DATA ANALYSIS

- The committee discussed separating the responses into categories of student/staff/faculty and services. The subcommittee will consist of Janine Flores, Ben Zastrocky, Janos Fustos and Raj Khandekar.

IV.   DISCUSSION OF AGENDA & OUTCOMES OF RETREAT

- JVC would like to get the data before setting topics for the agenda. The pre-analysis and the raw data will be sent to JVC.

V.   DISCUSSION OF DRAFT SHARED GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

- The Provisional Shared Governance Committee presented their draft document, which includes a list of information and instructional technology committees that have been involved in the shared governance task in Appendix A. This list was completed last spring as part of the IT^3 committee work.

- The Governance group discussed the unique things about MSU Denver in the area of governance. There isn't an institution owned library, no formal research entries that affects the infrastructure, and no formal policy development process. The document is meant to be less confusing than previous examples. There are strategic questions with regard to the structure of the department, e.g. who can be contacted with a great idea? This structure should not replace existing communications and other mechanisms for working with IT.

> Sometimes people are left out of the loop. The proposed governance structure would represent all the different groups.

- This type of structure would be representative. As an example, department chairs will need to reach out to their groups; the subcommittee would like to see department chair representatives on all the key groups. The objective is to be inclusive. There are Banner Managers, but nothing is in place for the enterprise system. A communication channel must be established; having processes that each committee follows to receive feedback. There will be a forum for ongoing communication.

- Each committee needs the appropriate institutional representation. There will be more than just the committees for communication; there will be other avenues for communication.

- There is not a structure currently in place and there is urgency if Tech Services is going to change and provide a consistent and sustainable mechanism for partnering with the campus community.

- In summary, 1) There will be communication between committees; 2) The structures will need to have processes; the minutes of committees will need to be stored and available; 3) Bylaws need to be created so they can be part of the strategic plan; 4) In the case of strong disagreements between committee(s) and top IT leadership, the VPs and Cabinet can deal with major issues. 5) The Provisional Shared Governance committee will start developing short set of bylaws for membership / representation, and for communication from and between committees.

VI.   ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. The next meeting will be Friday, March 1, at 11:30 a.m. in SSB 440A.