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Opportunity (Purpose or Primary Reason for Project):

• ICC has made a significant financial investment in R25/S25 software
• Implementation of the software and processes will impact efficient use of staff time for scheduling and best space utilization

Business Case (Budget Information):

• ICC continues to pay licensing fees each year, even if the software is not being used to provide value to the college
• Implementation of this long-standing project will give value to the licensing fee, provide staff time savings, increase space utilization and provide data for future decision-making

Goal (Expected Outcomes, Deliverables, and/or Results):

Organize and manage implementation team to:

• Implement software for Spring 2012 pilot (process occurs in Fall 2011) and Fall 2012 full implementation (process occurs in Spring 2012)
• Design process to maximum staff efficiencies and space utilization while meeting instructional needs
• Integrate tracking mechanisms to evaluate effectiveness and improvement of process

Scope (Constraints, Boundaries, and/or Key Risks):

Implementation includes instructional space scheduling as is currently done in conjunction with the Spring schedule (done in Fall) and the Summer/Fall schedule (done in Spring). Events are already scheduled through R25 with an existing process.

Timeline (Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control):

• Pilot for Spring 2012 (process is run in Fall 2011)
• Full implementation for Fall 2012 (process is run in Spring 2012)

Primary Measures:

• Pilot and full implementation on-time
• Percent Use (as compared to baselines established by Room Usage teams)
• Placement of classes to meet instructional needs
• Scheduler satisfaction with process
Other (Additional Resources Needed, Critical Considerations, and/or Initial Concerns):

Supporting Data & Process Map(s):

Room Usage Baselines from Computer Lab and Instructional Space Projects (Room Usage Baselines have not been established for Specialty Use Labs (Chemistry, Biology, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>2096</th>
<th>2103</th>
<th>2106</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Projector</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>12.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Lrng</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>16.93%</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
<td>16.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Room</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>20.95%</td>
<td>16.04%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Classroom</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
<td>17.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia</td>
<td>11.95%</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
<td>14.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Room</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
<td>25.23%</td>
<td>24.82%</td>
<td>23.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.05%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.19%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2096 = Spring 2009

2103 = Fall 2009

2106 = Spring 2010