

CONCLUSION

In at least three respects, this year's *Measures of Success* (MOS) reports a shift in focus on how the Integrated Technology Strategy (ITS) is used to serve the information technology needs of CSU campuses.

ITS EVOLUTION: The ITS has been the orienting framework for providing IT resources and services in the system for the past 10 years. Buildout of the campus physical infrastructure has been the primary concern during those years since it is a prerequisite for achieving both the academic and administrative initiatives launched under the ITS. As of June 30, 2005, appropriately 61 percent of the baseline physical infrastructure (pathways, spaces, wiring, and electronics) has been installed systemwide, including nine campuses that have completed construction of their intra-campus networks. In addition, a robust inter-campus network continues to evolve as the CSU has joined the CENIC CalREN statewide telecommunications network.

The CSU continues to make steady progress towards meeting minimum baseline standards for access and quality in other infrastructure components. The greatest success occurs in the area of network connectivity where 73 percent of the baseline standard has been attained. With regard to the workstation environment (hardware and software), approximately 65 percent of the targeted goal has been achieved systemwide. IT support for students, faculty, and staff now stands at roughly the same level, and IT training for the three groups is at about 57 percent of baseline.

This infrastructure underlies the four overarching goals of the ITS and the academic, student services, and administrative initiatives designed to achieve them. Three of the first-wave initiatives (One Card, Procurement Process Improvement, and Student Friendly Services) have been “retired” from the MOS reports because they have been fully implemented. Twenty-one campuses have implemented one or more modules of all three Common Management System applications.

Significant advances have been achieved in the academic initiatives. The MERLOT multimedia repository enjoys national and international prominence. Among the library projects, collaborative resource sharing has become both a curricular asset and an economic model for resource management in the system. The percentage of online teaching and learning remains a small but growing portion of overall instruction.

An important development in the ITS framework is the initial implementation of the four new systemwide academic technology initiatives adopted in 2004. Though not part of the formal MOS reporting structure, evaluation metrics for these initiatives will be adopted once their full scopes are defined through campus pilot studies.

CAMPUS FUNDING GAPS: Currently, ITS initiatives are funded through a combination of capital outlay, systemwide general funds, and campus resources. Despite considerable progress as documented in the MOS report series, there remain areas of campus need that have not been adequately funded, some of long-standing duration. Many of these “funding gaps” have been noted in the previous sections of this year's MOS report. Some of the unmet needs are due to regulatory requirements (e.g., assistive and adaptive technologies), some result from emerging technologies (e.g., wireless and smart classrooms), and still others reflect specialized disciplinary needs (e.g., for instructional designers) or the perennial challenges of refresh cycles and IT training.

Over the past year, the system has made a major attempt to identify and document the size, nature, and costs of these funding gaps and to develop options for closing them. The funding gap study used six sample campuses for extrapolating dollar figures to the system as a whole (using, in most instances, FTES as the base). In 2003–04, about \$288 million were spent on all forms of information technology. Roughly \$153 million of this was devoted to academic technology versus \$135 million for administrative technology, and \$216 million was centralized spending versus \$72 million decentralized or distributed.

The study suggests the system needs \$42 million in one-time costs to close the funding gap for all areas of unmet needs and \$8 million for implementing (at the system level only) the new academic technology initiatives. In addition, \$80 million above current spending levels are needed annually. Beyond this, there are unknown costs associated with middleware and with campus operations related to the four new academic technology initiatives.

Within the context of a public state system like the CSU, funding alternatives are limited to:

MOS VII: Conclusion

- Existing campus institutional budgets
- Existing system budgets
- New state revenues
- New non-state revenues
- Some combination of the above

In the final analysis, funding strategy decisions depend on at least three factors. First, what is the size of the funding gap that must be closed to achieve and maintain a minimum baseline capability? Second, given the nature of the technology need, what is the most appropriate source or sources of funds? Third, what specific strategy is feasible from both a fiscal and political perspective? There is probably no single funding source for closing the gap on all IT baseline needs; a “mix and match” package may be required, and that is expected to be a continuing focus of executive and IT leaders over the next few years.

CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING: The ITS is one mechanism for informing IT strategic plans at the campus level and for aligning them with campus goals and priorities. A significant portion of the campus baseline infrastructure is in place, and many of the systemwide academic and administrative initiatives have been fully implemented or are well advanced. In addition, campus unmet needs and funding gaps have been identified. Now, attention is turning to three local concerns:

- Alignment of IT strategic plans with broader institutional, academic, enrollment, facilities, and student services plans on the campuses
- Models of IT organization and governance
- Best practices in IT strategic planning generally, and identification of model programs and projects

A major study of these issues was launched in fall 2005 and, where appropriate, findings will be highlighted in next year’s MOS report.