Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-2012
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 3</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: As needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: fluctuates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Requests for Consultation responses: (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</td>
<td>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year -- None</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year -- None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Requests for Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None

Issues considered by the committee:
- Campus Committee Email Report
- New communication system (e-mail) launch
- Online Degree Certification Proposal (PPM 200-45)
- Pre-Purchasing System Review
- Campus Asset Management Planning & Information System (PPM-245)
- Review: GradHub Concept (PPM-245)
- Review: GSM Registration & Payment System (PPM 200-45)
- UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
- Strategies for the Academic Senate Office to communicate with its members, but especially students
- Automated Course Evaluations

Committee’s narrative:

The committee met on average one time per quarter during the 2011-2012 academic year. During these meetings, we discussed issues that are part of the normal consultation process for the Academic Senate (AS) such PPM 200-45 reviews but also issue that came up because of campus events, such as the capability for the AS to communicate rapidly with students and other groups on- and off-campus about recent campus events. One of the responsibilities of the CIT is to provide advice to the Executive Committee and Representative Assembly on new IT systems being proposed. To that effect, the committee has used the following criteria, developed by Paul Gepts, Chair of the Committee: The points are not listed by order of importance, but can be used for future evaluations as well as new IT systems are proposed.
1. What is the need? How was this application prioritized among the activities of the unit?
2. What can be improved over existing systems, i.e., added functionalities?
3. Are there off-campus alternatives?
4. Who/what is the focus? Who are the “stakeholders”? 
5. Who will be developing the application? What is their record?
6. Who will provide the budget? And for how long?
7. Who will administer the application/system after its release? How will it be improved?
8. How well is the application integrated with the other relevant applications?
9. What is the status of the application? At the concept stage, development, or implementation stage?
10. What will encourage potential users to adopt this application?

The committee has had several interactions with CCFIT; the chair of CIT is an active member of the CCFIT executive committee.

Among the topics to be discussed for next year are the online course evaluation system and the use of clickers.
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