

# HACC Assessment Record

Department/Campus:

ITS

<b>Assessment Start Date:</b>	December 2012
<b>Goal:</b> <i>(Campus, department or unit)</i>	<b>Goal 1: Realign and strengthen ITS functional areas to improve operational effectiveness, provide necessary expertise, and improve customer service.</b>
<b>Objective:</b> <i>(Measurable)</i>	<p><b>Objective 2: Expand IT Help Desk services to provide more timely resolution of end-user issues through realigned staffing assignments to the help desk, expanded hours, and additional training and resources for technicians.</b></p> <p><b>Objective 3: Conduct project management and team building training for IT personnel so that end-users at any location will receive seamless service and more-effectively run projects.</b></p>
<p><b>Alignment to Strategic Plan:</b></p> <p><a href="#">ITS-to-Strategic Plan Matrix</a></p>	<p><b>SP Goal I: Teaching and Learning Excellence</b> Objective 1: Create a comprehensive plan to maximize enrollment Objective 7: Expand innovative use of technology to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p><b>SP Goal II: Organizational Excellence</b> Objective 9: Continuously improve the organization structure. Objective 11: Increase access to and support for professional development and training.</p> <p><b>SP Goal III: Operational Excellence</b> Objective 13: Adopt best practices in higher education for financial planning and management Objective 14: Enhance Virtual College operations Objective 17: Identify, implement, support and evaluate innovative use of technologies</p>
<p><b>Sources of Evidence to be used:</b> <i>(Measures that would point to achievement of goal/objective. Examples: databases, focus group feedback, surveys. See p. 10 of Guide.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>HACC Information Technology Review and Recommendations</i>, conducted by Celeste Schwartz, VP for Information Technology and College Services, and Joseph Mancini, Executive Director, Technology Services. Montgomery County Community College. [ December 21, 2012]             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interviews and focus groups of ITS department staff, as well as external stakeholders, include faculty, staff, and students. [See pp. 38 – 39 of Report.]</li> <li>○ Document Review:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Datatel+SGHE: Digital Campus Health Check Findings for HACC</i>, February 24, 2012</li> <li>▪ <i>Technology Review: Findings and Recommendations</i>, December, 2011</li> <li>▪ <i>Clifton Larson Allen Financial Audit</i>, October,</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	2012	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent Validation conducted by Interim CIO. [ January 2013] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultations with key stakeholders, leaders of affinity groups (app. 40 of 60), Instructional Designers, Campus VP's</li> <li>○ Observations over 6 weeks</li> <li>○ Study of Project Priorities and Statuses</li> <li>○ Informal Interviews</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Type of Assessment :</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Information– Gathering</b> (<i>needs assessments, inventories, establishing baselines</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Performance–Evaluating</b> (<i>How well are we doing? Have we improved?</i>)</li> </ul>	Information-Gathering	
<b>*IF ASSESSMENT IS PERFORMANCE-EVALUATING:</b>		
* Benchmarks and Performance Targets are critical when evaluating performance. They may or may not be as critical when gathering information, although a rubric may be developed to organize categories under consideration.	<b>Benchmarks or Standards</b> (See pp. 11 – 13 of Guide)	<b>Performance Target</b> (See pp. 13 – 17 of Guide)
	NA	NA
<b>Findings:</b> ( <i>What did we learn from this assessment? What did the evidence say?</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There were high levels of complaints, and anecdotal evidence that many were not using the Help Desk because they didn't experience resolution.</li> <li>○ There was a lack of metrics.</li> <li>○ There was no existing protocol to establish priorities.</li> <li>○ Service-level guidelines did not exist.</li> <li>○ More than 100 tickets were not closed.</li> <li>○ There were no Standard Operating Practices.</li> <li>○ There was no oversight of Help Desk operations.</li> </ul>	
<b>Decision-Making:</b> ( <i>What changes of practice are indicated? What budget priorities are established? What accomplishments should be celebrated and showcased?</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A new Help-Desk Coordinator has been appointed.</li> <li>○ A priority-system is being developed.</li> <li>○ Service-level guidelines are being articulated detailing priority actions and response timelines.</li> <li>○ New groups for call triage are being established.</li> <li>○ Phone menus have been changed.</li> <li>○ All job descriptions for user support technicians have been rewritten, emphasizing customer services and addressing and closing process footprints.</li> <li>○ Help Desk hours have been expanded from M – F, 8 am – 5 pm to M – R, 8 am - 8 pm, and F, 8 am – 5 pm to better serve evening classes and needs.</li> </ul>	
<b>Assessment Closing Date:</b>	March 1, 2013	

**Notes:**

Supporting Documentation:

- [Celeste Schwartz Report and Recommendations](#)

To be reassessed in approximately one year. Metrics need to be considered, identified, tracked, and gathered throughout the year.