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IT plan has been poorly communicated to faculty. Clear information about mission /
budgets / timetables needs to be widely disseminated.

Communicate progress on initiatives; be honest about which are being completed on
time, and which cannot be completed within the projected timeframe (especially those
being performed over the summer in anticipation of the coming school year).
Communicate initiatives that are conducted on an ad hoc basis (e.g., phone system
rewiring). Rewiring done over the past summer severely inconvenienced many faculty
and staff.

Current outsourcing budget needs to be reviewed - has it saved the expected amount of
money and produced the desired results?

The system for requesting and purchasing hardware and software is obviously broken.
Making equipment requests through the Help Desk is ineffective. In the past year, ITS sat
on a request that was eventually denied. The CSE Dean agreed to purchase the
equipment as an alternative.

Three-year computer replacement cycle appears to be on-hold. Has the Board of Trustees
stopped progress on IT deployment, pending a “needs assessment”?

Wilkes has created Smart Classrooms. Instructional technology is often missing from
laboratory spaces.

Academic instructors should be surveyed concerning their perception as to the
effectiveness of changes already made so far as supporting our educational mission and
responsibilities.

Can Wilkes employ a site-license manager for software where the number of seats is
below the number of computers? Doing so would allow greater flexibility of scheduling
since particular courses having unique software requirements would not be tied to a given
lab.

Inadequate number of computer labs, especially for courses that have 30-35 students
enrolled. If we reduce the number of labs on campus, what happens to those courses?

Last year, Physics was assigned to SLC 1. Primitive technology for using that space was
not supplied by Collegis. Dean had to walk projector over to room.

Wireless hubs go down and are not replaced in an effective manner.
There is widespread concern that work orders are often closed when the problem has not been solved. It appears that if the customer can't be reached after a couple of phone calls, the work order is simply closed.

Students are having problems linking to servers, resulting in class assignments that cannot be completed.

All projection equipment in smart classrooms should be reviewed to ensure that they truly effective. Document camera in Breiseth 106 is too dim. Projector in SLC 359 likewise throws a dull image. Projector in SLC 349 shuts down every 20 minutes for a 5 minute recess.

A couple of years ago was to give budget managers across campus were successfully trained in use of Banner forms and reports to make the management of their budgets more efficient. For example, instead of calling the Finance office to get information about the purchase order for a line item expenditure that showed up against your budget, you could view it on line. These improvements were apparently undone in the last Banner upgrade, and that budget managers have now regressed to having access to exactly 2 forms, which means that they once again have to call the Finance office whenever they need information – resulting in inefficiencies.

Students complain that they do not receive prompt and courteous service from the help desk.