HACC Assessment Record

Department/Campus: ITS

Assessment Start Date:	December, 2012
Goal: *(Campus, department or unit)*	**Goal 2: Institute a formal IT governance process to improve communication and to align the adoption of technology with the goals of the College.**
Objective: *(Measurable)*	**Objective 1: Design and develop a process for IT Governance, and obtain cabinet approval to implement. [February 2013]** **Objective 2: Implement the new governance process. [April 2013]**
Alignment to Strategic Plan: **ITS-to-Strategic Plan Matrix**	**SP Goal I: Teaching and Learning Excellence** Objective 1: Create a comprehensive plan to maximize enrollment Objective 7: Expand innovative use of technology to improve teaching and learning **SP Goal II: Organizational Excellence** Objective 8: Improve collegiality, civility and trust throughout the college Objective 11: Increase access to and support for professional development and training **SP Goal III: Operational Excellence** Objective 13: Adopt best practices in higher education for financial planning and management Objective 14: Enhance Virtual College Operations Objective 17: Identify, implement, support and evaluate innovative use of technologies Objective 18: Enhance the College's technology infrastructure Objective 19: Strengthen and improve the College's commitment to sustainability

Sources of Evidence to be used:
(Measures that would point to achievement of goal/objective. Examples: databases, focus group feedback, surveys. See p. 10 of Guide.)
	• *HACC Information Technology Review and Recommendations*, conducted by Celeste Schwartz, VP for Information Technology and College Services, and Joseph Mancini, Executive Director, Technology Services. Montgomery County Community College. [December 21, 2012]
	   o Interviews and focus groups of ITS department staff, as well as external stakeholders, include faculty, staff, and students. [See pp. 38 – 39 of Report.]
	   o Document Review:
	      ▪ *Datatel+SGHE: Digital Campus Health Check Findings for HACC*, February 24, 2012

	▪ *Technology Review: Findings and Recommendations,* December, 2011
	▪ *Clifton Larson Allen Financial Audit,* October, 2012
	• Independent Validation conducted by Interim CIO. [January 2013]
	    ○ Consultations with key stakeholders, leaders of affinity groups (app. 40 of 60), Instructional Designers, Campus VP's
	    ○ Observations over 6 weeks
	    ○ Study of Project Priorities and Statuses
	    ○ Informal Interviews

Type of Assessment : • **Information– Gathering** *(needs assessments, inventories, establishing baselines)* • **Performance–Evaluating** *(How well are we doing? Have we improved?)*	Performance-Evaluating

*IF ASSESSMENT IS PERFORMANCE-EVALUATING:		
*Benchmarks and Performance Targets are critical when evaluating performance. They may or may not be as critical when gathering information, although a rubric may be developed to organize categories under consideration.	**Benchmarks or Standards** (See pp. 11 – 13 of Guide)	**Performance Target** (See pp. 13 – 17 of Guide)
	• # and source of complaints • Missed deadlines, deviations from timelines • Project backlogs	• Representative, criterion-based decision-making • On-time completion • Presence of priority status and agreed-upon criteria

Findings: *(What did we learn from this assessment? What did the evidence say?)*	ITS performance against benchmarks was poor/unacceptable, primarily because of poor planning and oversight. There was no governance of priorities. Too often, the "squeaky wheel" was getting attention rather than larger institutional/learning priorities.
Decision-Making: *(What changes of practice are indicated? What budget priorities are established? What accomplishments should be celebrated and showcased?)*	• A College-wide ITS governance structure has been proposed, approved, and is being presented college-wide. • CEO has approved the request for a Faculty Chair. • Main body of committee is defined to be representational. • ITS governance body to be ready for full implementation Fall 2013.
Assessment Closing Date:	February 28, 2013
Notes:	Supporting Documentation: • Celeste Schwartz Report and Recommendations • ITS Governance Report To be reassessed in approximately one year.