Chapter III

The Politics of Information Management

Lisa Petrides
Teachers College, Columbia University, USA

Sharon Khanuja-Dhall
Teachers College, Columbia University, USA

Pablo Reguerin
Teachers College, Columbia University, USA

INTRODUCTION

Developing, sharing, and working with information in today's environment is not an easy task. With today's technological advancements, the management of information appears to be deceivingly easier. However, building and maintaining an infrastructure for information management involves complex issues, such as group consensus, access and privileges, well-defined duties, and power redistribution. Furthermore, higher education institutions are continuously faced with the need to balance the politics of information sharing across departments, whether the administration operates in a centralized or decentralized manner.

The need to develop, share, and manage information in a more effective and efficient manner has been proven to require a challenging shift in the norms and behavior of higher education institutions as well. This shift does not have as much to do with the actual use of technology as it does with the cultural environment of the institution. Davenport (1997) notes:

Information cultures determine how much those involved value information, share it across organizational boundaries, disclose it internally and externally, and capitalize on it. (p. 35)

Depending on the history, people, and cultural environment, each organization faces its own dilemmas around the task of compiling and sharing information.

This case details one institution's attempts, at a departmental level, to develop an information system for planning and decision making. It looks at the department's effort to manage and track students and to design a management tool that would help departmental faculty to function more effectively. It examines the challenges faced in managing information and the behaviors that drive new information management processes with the increased use of technology.

CASE QUESTIONS

- Whose responsibility is it to lead information systems integration in higher education? Who will or will not benefit from this?
- How do certain behaviors and group norms help or hinder the effective design and implementation of information systems?
- How can decentralized organizations negotiate and balance the competing demands and goals of the institution?

CASE NARRATIVE

Background

Midwestern University (MU) has an enrollment of approximately 15,000 students. Since it was founded, the mission of MU has been to provide world-class leadership in teaching and research. Within MU there are 15 academic departments and several administrative units. University administration had historically taken a very centralized approach to program enrollment, recruitment, financial aid, and general administration of student-related matters. However, more recently, top-level administration has encouraged individual departments to take more local control of their planning, ranging from student administration to budget setting. The push for local or departmental control has not been accompanied by the requisite development of reliable information systems necessary for both short- and long-term planning. This decentralized approach has placed departments at a distinct disadvantage due to increasing levels of accountability at the department level.

Historically, information such as student enrollments and financial aid allocation flowed downward from central administration offices to the departmental level. The upward flow of information consisted of a set of checks and balances associated with departmental graduation requirements. In addition, data that were specific to the department level did not flow upward (e.g., faculty advising lists and student progress reports). Administrative divisions were centrally managed with multiple databases tracking data in functional units. For example, enrollment data were maintained and controlled by admissions, but the graduate studies office controlled doctoral student data. Many of these systems were run with old and outdated software, and the university struggled with the lack of a coordinated information system that managed all data collected throughout the university. This resulted in issues of data integrity, redundancy, and accuracy, with a low level of trust concerning the interpretation of data.

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/politics-information-management/6300

Related Content

IT Application Maturity in China: How Do You Manage It?
Jianping Peng, Peiwen Guo, Meiwen Guoand Guoying Zhang (2020). *Journal of Global Information Management (pp. 99-122).*
www.irma-international.org/article/it-application-maturity-in-china/252161

The Benefits of Continuous Health Data Monitoring in Cardiovascular Diseases and Dementia
Aikaterini Christogianni (2025). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Sixth Edition (pp. 1-22).*
www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-benefits-of-continuous-health-data-monitoring-in-cardiovascular-diseases-and-dementia/318042

Virtual Learning Networks in Higher Education: The Case of Egypt's Regional IT Institute
Sherif Kamel (2000). *Journal of Global Information Management (pp. 34-41).*
www.irma-international.org/article/virtual-learning-networks-higher-education/3543

Generic Attributes of IS Graduates: A Comparison of Australian Industry and Academic Views
Robert Snokeand Alan Underwood (2001). *Journal of Global Information Management (pp. 34-41).*
www.irma-international.org/article/generic-attributes-graduates/3555

Social Structures for Access, Use, and Development
Sarah Parkinson (2008). *Global Information Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (pp. 2495-2505).*
www.irma-international.org/chapter/social-structures-access-use-development/19126