

# 1999-2000 Institutional Effectiveness Report

**Department:** Information Systems

**Submitted by:** Zulema S. Garza

## Unit Mission Statement

---

The Department of Information Systems is dedicated to improving the College's administrative processes through the use of technological solutions while providing comprehensive stewardship of information resources and exceptional customer service.

---

### List of Clients:

- Students
- Other departments
- Faculty
- Staff
- Administration
- Board of Trustees
- Community
- Reporting Agencies
- Software Support Organizations (SCT, UT-Austin Computation Center, Compaq/Digital)
- Fellow IS employees
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-

## Intended Outcomes

Department: Information Systems

---

Intended Outcome: 1

Clients will be satisfied with quality of services

Intended Outcome: 2

Use of most current and effective technologies

Intended Outcome: 3

Improved utilization of IS resources

Intended Outcome: 4

Intended Outcome: 5

Intended Outcome: 6

Intended Outcome: 7

Intended Outcome: 8

Intended Outcome: 9

Intended Outcome: 10

## Performance Indicators

Department: **Information Systems**

Outcome: 1 Clients will be satisfied with quality of services

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>A</b>	Dependable timelines
<b>Performance Standard</b>		75% requests will be completed on or before the scheduled date of completion
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		Steps have been taken toward using the ITS Help Desk in the Information Systems request process. Last Fall (1999), IS developed work-flow diagrams and met with Client Services (CS) to discuss the proposed plan, determine its feasibility, and develop an implementation plan. IS collected information on CS needs to support the IS requests. After thorough analysis, we concluded that we should migrate our data from an obsolete request system to Track It!, a Request Management System used by CS. Once the IS data was under Track It!, we needed to develop an interface system for the Help Desk Operators. We concluded that a web-based request system was the best solution. Since IS processes different types of requests (i.e. IA access, production runs, maintenance, development, implementation, etc.), and each has its own requirements, we decided to pursue each type as an individual module. The first module we addressed was the web-based request for access system. We met with the different data owners (or designees) to determine the requirements and design the system, for both SIS and FRS. We debuted the SIS portion of the system at the Technology Fair in last August. Cli
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		We learned that to achieve dependable timelines, we must first have the appropriate infrastructure in place. This is a longer-term project and will be included in our upcoming plan for 2000-2001. The performance indicator itself and its standard will be revisited as they may not be the most appropriate.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>B</b>	End-product satisfaction
<b>Performance Standard</b>		75% respondents will be satisfied with quality of IS services
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		Tony del Angel, Applications Manager, and I met in Fall 1999 to discuss the plan of action. Tony had been on the job roughly one month and was still getting himself acquainted with our systems and processes. We developed diagrams that show the process that we wanted the staff to follow in servicing requests. We assessed our each staff member's strengths and weaknesses, and evaluated them against the needs and demands of the College. We decided to change the way we distributed requests, assigning them on project complexity and skills required instead of by system (i.e. SIS, FRS, etc). This is a fundamental change in the way our staff work, as it means working with new people, new processes, new file structures, and new data. We introduced it slowly, and allowed time for staff to adapt to the idea before actually making the change.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		The next step is to get the right input into the process, and establish a quality control function to ensure that we produce the right output. This will be included in our upcoming 2000-2001 IE Plan. We have begun visiting web sites, and collecting information to develop our own forms and processes.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>C</b>	
<b>Performance Standard</b>		
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		

## Performance Indicators

Department: **Information Systems**

---

Outcome: **1** Clients will be satisfied with quality of services

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> D	
<b>Performance Standard</b>	
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	

## Performance Indicators

**Department:** Information Systems

**Outcome: 3** Improved utilization of IS resources

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> A	Increased programmer productivity
<b>Performance Standard</b>	50% reduction in requests from the Business Office to restore reports from backup cartridges
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	Requests for restores from Business Office are nearly extinct! By recording the reports on CD, the Business Office has them at their fingertips. While this has been successful, it is not the optimal solution since it requires some human intervention to produce. A better solution is to install a server where IS will securely load all their reports and make them accessible to only those whom Business Office authorizes. Business Office has agreed to purchase the server.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	This is standard is no longer applicable, and will not be included in our upcoming plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> B	Increased Operator productivity
<b>Performance Standard</b>	Produce a system-generated list for distribution of reports
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	Done! The performance standard should really have read something like "50% reduction in time required to prepare the daily distribution log" instead of "produce a system-generated list for distribution of reports." Nonetheless, the outcome was achieved! We increased operator productivity significantly by reducing preparation time from two hours to thirty minutes. It is not only faster, but more accurate as the electronic distribution list doubles as a reconciliation list of all the reports the operator ought to have.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	This is standard is no longer applicable, and will not be included in our upcoming plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	
<b>Performance Standard</b>	
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> D	
<b>Performance Standard</b>	
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	

## Performance Indicators

Department: **Information Systems**

Outcome: 2 Use of most current and effective technologies

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>A</b>	Timely implementation of TOSes
<b>Performance Standard</b>		No more than one month lag on TOSes released by Texas Connection (SCT)
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		Done. We designated one programmer to be responsible for the implementation of TOSes in each of FRS, HRS and SIS. TOSes are reviewed on a regular basis and applied. SIS has a large number of TOSes and we found that implementing a TOS within one month of its release is not the thing to do, because at times, the TOS that fixes one thing may break another, or it may not work as universally as SCT intended it. We were using the most "current" technology, but not the most effective. By delaying their implementation from one month to three and sometimes more, we implement better solutions.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		We have a good handle on keeping up with TOSes and new releases, and we are meeting the needs of our clients. We will continue maintaining the in-house TOS database to track implementations, however, this is no longer an issue and will not be included in our new year's plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>B</b>	Hardware migration
<b>Performance Standard</b>		New hardware will be installed and implemented within six months of arrival
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		we migrated from our Alpha 2100 system (Kaipna) to the Alpha 4100 (Apono) in Fall 1999. We upgraded the firmware and operating system on the 2100 for Y2k compliance and brought in the new year without incident! A key staff position, Systems Programmer, was filled last Spring, thus freeing resources on the applications (IA) side of the house. Two IS staff attended technical training and four attended conferences and/or seminars to educate ourselves on the latest technologies. During the Spring and early summer, we developed the configuration and technical specifications for our cluster as well as the implementation plan. The STCC Board of Trustees approved the purchase of the equipment in July 2000. After resolving bonding issues with the vendor in August, the equipment arrived on Thursday, September 14th, 2000. On another project we embarked on, we purchased a Dell Server (Hubbell) to support the IS web applications in May 2000. The server arrived in July and was implemented in August. It is currently online and supporting the Web Request for IA Access system and the Information Systems web site. One IS staff member will attend Windows 2000
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		The cluster will be implemented during the week of September 18th-22nd, and testing will begin soon thereafter. Our Systems Programmer will attend cluster management training in October 2000. We plan to operate the cluster in a test mode through January 2001, and migrate in the Spring. This performance standard no longer an issue and will not be included in next year's IE plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>C</b>	
<b>Performance Standard</b>		
<b>Actual Outcome</b>		
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>		

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	<b>D</b>	
<b>Performance Standard</b>		

## Performance Indicators

Department: **Information Systems**

---

Outcome: 2 Use of most current and effective technologies

Actual Outcome	
Implications for Next Year's Plan	

## Performance Indicators

Department: **Information Systems**

Outcome: **3** Improved utilization of IS resources

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> A	Increased programmer productivity
<b>Performance Standard</b>	50% reduction in requests from the Business Office to restore reports from backup cartridges
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	Requests for restores from Business Office are nearly extinct! By recording the reports on CD, the Business Office has them at their fingertips. While this has been successful, it is not the optimal solution since it requires some human intervention to produce. A better solution is to install a server where IS will securely load all their reports and make them accessible to only those whom Business Office authorizes. Business Office has agreed to purchase the server.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	This is standard is no longer applicable, and will not be included in our upcoming plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> B	Increased Operator productivity
<b>Performance Standard</b>	Produce a system-generated list for distribution of reports
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	Done! The performance standard should really have read something like "50% reduction in time required to prepare the daily distribution log" instead of "produce a system-generated list for distribution of reports." Nonetheless, the outcome was achieved! We increased operator productivity significantly by reducing preparation time from two hours to thirty minutes. It is not only faster, but more accurate as the electronic distribution list doubles as a reconciliation list of all the reports the operator ought to have.
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	This is standard is no longer applicable, and will not be included in our upcoming plan.

<b>Performance Indicator:</b>	
<b>Performance Standard</b>	
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	

<b>Performance Indicator:</b> D	
<b>Performance Standard</b>	
<b>Actual Outcome</b>	
<b>Implications for Next Year's Plan</b>	