3.4 Housing and Dining Services

Major Issues: 1: How can the relationship between HDS and ITS be enhanced? 2: How might we improve IT involvement in the enhancement/expansion of Residential Colleges (from planning initiatives to implementation)? 3: Major Issue 3: What are the major IT needs or initiatives for HDS and its customers?

A. Background/Rationale

HDS and ITS have provided shared critical services to students living in the residence halls most notably for telephony and networking. The desire to increase residential academic programs will increase the joint reliance on an effective relationship between HDS and ITS. Past friction areas point to differing sets of business drivers and principles within the two departments. As such, to enhance the relationship HDS and ITS leadership will identify and communicate a shared set of principles that guide the relationship. Through a shared set of principles both departments will have a shared understanding of business needs and how those align with Campus goals. Based on a shared understanding both departments will jointly seek solutions to meet business needs, jointly seek to make the most effective and efficient use of technology in a financially responsible manner for both departments to meet business needs, and collaborate on new technology.

Campus governance, HDS, and ITS need to be clear and open about funding models and IT costs. For example, there exists a perception that ITS network funding model can not be changed since it was mandated from the CFO whereas HDS sees the network funding model inequitable and out of sync with other institutions. Hence, HDS is asking ITS for an alternative solution that is less costly for both HDS and ITS. The lack of clarity results in the potential for conflict or poor decisions. Specific funding issues that must be resolved include the network funding model and educational technology for Residential Academic Programs (RAPs).

As the campus moves forward with Residential Colleges funding, policies and standards will need to be addressed. Questions regarding funding and oversight for RAP classrooms will need to be resolved through campus leadership. Since the same faculty and students will be using academic technology inside and outside of the Residential Colleges, common solutions and processes should be in place. Failing to do so will be both inefficient and confusing to HDS and ITS customers.

ITS and HDS have a jointly vested interest in providing fast and reliable network service to student residents that does not adversely impact academics and research. Additionally, ITS and HDS have a vested interest in providing open and up-to-date information about network performance and service issues.

Students find it difficult to get good reception in some areas of the residence halls and many other residential areas (i.e. Family Housing or Bear Creek Apartments) on campus. Additionally, students would find improved IT support within the residence halls highly desirable.

Residence halls security relies on CCure locks on all external doors. Students need access to their residence hall buildings 24/7. As such, all units supporting card access systems (HDS - Buff OneCard, Housing Facilities Management, and ITS) need to ensure that systems are available. There exists a perception among students that Buff OneCard needs to be made more
durable so that students do not have access issues after hours or have to purchase new cards. However, data indicates that the cards are highly durable and this information needs to be better communicated with the residence hall students. This same need for better communication can be identified for other ITS or HDS services.

Future issues such as smartcard technology have been proposed by RTD and other campus areas and will require analysis and coordination of campus areas involved. There is a need to meet and discuss such possible card changes, costs, and benefits. Additionally, the new ISIS system is requiring changes to interfaces for all systems accessing or uploading SIS data. Such changes will impact all other downstream IT related systems.

**Action Plan**

**A. Explicit Assumptions**

Housing and Dining services will be represented in some form as part of the developing governance structure (e.g., as a member of an administrative computing committee)

**B. Specific Recommendation**

1. Establish a set of core principles to guide the relationship and business decisions, for example:
   - We understand that both organizations have a set of core competencies which are recognized by both organizations
   - Clearly defined business needs will drive business, service and technical decisions
   - IT investments will seek to make the most effective and efficient use of resources throughout the life-cycle of the service
2. HDS and ITS will work to identify administrative computing services or technologies that can be shared or pooled so as to gain efficiencies. An example, is Kronos which while not used by all employees is used by departments to support business needs.
3. The creation of a monthly program or service review meeting with HDS and ITS to discuss challenges related to services to enhance communications. Key issues are, academic technology, smart classrooms, networking, telecom/phone, security, smartcards, ISIS interfaces, digital signage, emergency notification, web development, e-commerce, cell signal strength planning, IT processes and procedures development and establishment of standards and policies. Additionally, a quarterly leadership meeting with the CIO and HDS executive director, and their direct reports, should be established. The purpose of the meetings will be to review tactical and strategic plans as well as challenges and opportunities in the HDS/ITS relationship. Such a meeting could potentially mirror discussions ITS currently has with external partners. Lastly, active participation by HDS in campus IT governance will help to ensure that policies, strategic plans, and business needs are addressed early on.
4. Campus governance, HDS, and ITS need to continue to work collaboratively to develop mutually acceptable funding models that are well understood and transparent.
5. Active participation by HDS in campus IT governance discussed in section 4.1 will help to surface the needs for IT resources (e.g., bandwidth) required by Residential Colleges and student residents. By surfacing such needs, potential IT governance support can be garnered for joint identification and funding solutions that would address what are currently competing interests.
6. It must be recognized that wireless networking is considered a necessary infrastructure component to support residential academic computing. As such new wireless technologies (e.g., 802.1n) can no longer be considered an augmentation to existing wired network service.

7. Cell phone reception needs to improve especially given the increased reliance on cell phones for both personal and emergency communications. A plan needs to be developed to improved this infrastructure with milestones and deadlines.

8. An effort to evaluate the feasibility of replicating the walk-in service center at Norlin Commons in additional locations closer to students (C4C or Williams Village) or courier service for warranty work through the Bookstore.

9. Buff OneCard has an established advisory group whose relationship with broader IT governance should be understood and formalized. Buff OneCard should share processes of their services and interface connections with campus groups. A process needs to be developed for coordination of Buff OneCard systems processes that impact campus departments. For example, should the campus move from magnetic stripe cards to smart cards it would require coordination between HDS, ITS, PDPS, and Facilities Management. Such a process would also address service issues such as network availability requirements for card access systems.

10. HDS and ITS need to formalize the process for identifying new academic technology equipped classrooms, determining funding, and support requirements.

C. Long & Short Term Objectives/Timeline

- Residence Halls network bandwidth service level agreement - 1 to 2 years
- Establish common principles and regular service review meetings - 1 year
- Communicate and share Buff OneCard roadmap - 1 year.
- Develop strategy for cell phone coverage on campus - 1 to 3 years.
- Develop strategy for improved walkin IT support for personally owned equipment within the residence halls - 1 to 3 years.

D. Possible Risk

E. Resource Allocation

Cost of the project: Recommendations for additional collaboration, such a regular leadership meetings, do not represent additional direct cost to the University. Other items in the recommendation section will need to be evaluated to determine the cost and sources of funding.

F. Responsible Parties

Campus leadership, Campus IT Governance, CIO, HDS Executive Director

G. Evaluation

Potential evaluation criteria include:
- Student satisfaction survey
- Cost savings
- Number of jointly commissioned and completed projects