INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS, STRATEGY, MANAGEMENT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Abdullayev Umid Muratbayevich
Teacher of Specialized Subjects at Chirchiq Technical College No. 1

Obidova Mahliyo Ikromjon qizi
Teacher of Informatics at Chirchiq Technical College No. 1

Abstract
Information technology systems support teaching, administration, communication, and the development of professional skills in technical colleges. Their effectiveness depends on the alignment of institutional strategy, management practices, and infrastructure with educational needs. This article examines these relationships in the context of computer science education in Uzbekistan's technical colleges. It adopts a conceptual approach to explore how hardware, software, networks, data resources, and technical support can be coordinated to strengthen institutional performance and practical learning. Particular attention is given to infrastructure planning, cybersecurity, staff development, system maintenance, and the responsible use of financial resources. The analysis considers challenges associated with limited budgets, uneven connectivity, aging equipment, and differences in digital competence among users. It also examines how practical laboratory activities can connect classroom instruction with workplace requirements through network configuration, database administration, troubleshooting, and information security exercises. A phased approach to technology development is proposed, beginning with an assessment of existing resources and educational priorities, followed by targeted improvements and regular evaluation. The article offers a framework for understanding information technology as an interconnected institutional responsibility and provides practical considerations for teachers, administrators, and technical staff seeking to develop reliable, accessible, and sustainable digital learning environments.

Keywords: Information technology systems, IT strategy, IT management, digital infrastructure, technical education, computer science education, network administration, cybersecurity, digital competence, system maintenance, resource planning, digital learning environments.

Introduction

AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARI TIZIMLARI, STRATEGIYASI, BOSHQARUVI VA INFRATUZILMASI

Abdullayev Umid Muratbayevich
Chirchiq shahar 1-son texnikumi maxsus fan o'qituvchisi

Obidova Mahliyo Ikromjon qizi
Informatika fani o'qituvchisi

Annotatsiya

Axborot texnologiyalari tizimlari texnikumlarda ta’lim, ma’muriy boshqaruv, muloqot va kasbiy ko‘nikmalarni rivojlantirish jarayonlarini qo‘llab-quvvatlaydi. Ularning samaradorligi muassasa strategiyasi, boshqaruv amaliyoti va infratuzilmasining ta’lim ehtiyojlariga muvofiqligiga bog‘liq. Ushbu maqolada mazkur yo‘nalishlarning o‘zaro aloqadorligi O‘zbekiston texnikumlarida informatika ta’limi nuqtayi nazaridan ko‘rib chiqiladi. Konseptual yondashuv asosida texnik vositalar, dasturiy ta’minot, tarmoqlar, ma’lumotlar resurslari va texnik yordamni muvofiqlashtirish orqali muassasa faoliyati hamda amaliy ta’limni takomillashtirish imkoniyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Infratuzilmani rejalashtirish, kiberxavfsizlik, xodimlar malakasini oshirish, tizimlarga texnik xizmat ko‘rsatish va moliyaviy resurslardan oqilona foydalanishga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi. Tahlilda cheklangan budjet, internet aloqasi sifatidagi tafovutlar, eskirgan uskunalar va foydalanuvchilarning raqamli kompetensiyalaridagi farqlar bilan bog‘liq muammolar ko‘rib chiqiladi. Shuningdek, tarmoqlarni sozlash, ma’lumotlar bazalarini boshqarish, texnik nosozliklarni bartaraf etish va axborot xavfsizligiga oid mashqlar orqali amaliy laboratoriya mashg‘ulotlarini kasbiy faoliyat talablari bilan bog‘lash imkoniyatlari yoritiladi. Mavjud resurslar va ta’limning ustuvor ehtiyojlarini baholashdan boshlanib, maqsadli takomillashtirish hamda muntazam baholash bilan davom etadigan bosqichma-bosqich texnologik rivojlanish yondashuvi taklif etiladi. Maqola axborot texnologiyalarini muassasaning o‘zaro bog‘liq vazifalari doirasida tushunish uchun konseptual asos yaratadi hamda ishonchli, foydalanish uchun qulay va barqaror raqamli ta’lim muhitini rivojlantirishga intilayotgan o‘qituvchilar, rahbarlar va texnik xodimlar uchun amaliy jihatlarni yoritadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: Axborot texnologiyalari tizimlari, AT strategiyasi, AT boshqaruvi, raqamli infratuzilma, texnik ta’lim, informatika ta’limi, tarmoq ma’muriyati, kiberxavfsizlik, raqamli kompetensiya, tizimlarga texnik xizmat ko‘rsatish, resurslarni rejalashtirish, raqamli ta’lim muhiti.

Introduction

Information technology has become an essential component of technical education, shaping how institutions organize learning, manage information, and prepare students for professional practice. In computer science education, technology serves both as a teaching resource and as an object of study. Students use digital platforms to access materials while also learning how software, networks, databases, and computing devices operate. This dual role requires technical colleges to approach technology systematically. Purchasing equipment alone cannot establish an effective learning environment; institutions also need clear objectives, coordinated management, reliable infrastructure, and opportunities for teachers and students to develop the skills required for meaningful use.

Information technology systems consist of interconnected hardware, software, data, procedures, and people. Within a technical college, these components support activities such as student registration, timetable preparation, assessment, communication, and laboratory instruction. Their value depends on how effectively they work together. For example, a computer laboratory may contain capable devices, yet its educational usefulness can remain limited if software is outdated, network access is unreliable, or technical support is unavailable. Understanding these relationships helps administrators and teachers identify underlying problems instead of treating each malfunction as an isolated event. It also encourages planning around educational services rather than individual technology purchases.

Strategy provides direction for the development and use of these systems. An institutional information technology strategy should connect technological decisions with curriculum requirements, staff capabilities, available funding, and expected learning outcomes. For technical colleges in Uzbekistan, this connection is relevant when designing practical computer science activities that reflect workplace responsibilities. Students need opportunities to configure networks, maintain operating systems, organize databases, troubleshoot faults, and apply basic security practices. Strategic planning can help institutions prioritize resources that support these activities, establish realistic implementation schedules, and distribute responsibilities among academic leaders, teachers, and technical personnel through transparent and achievable institutional development plans.

Management translates strategic priorities into everyday practices. It includes allocating resources, maintaining equipment inventories, scheduling maintenance, managing user accounts, supporting users, and reviewing service performance. Effective management also requires decisions about information access, data protection, software licensing, and the replacement of aging equipment. Infrastructure provides the operational foundation for these responsibilities through computers, servers, network devices, internet connections, electrical systems, and physical learning spaces. These elements should be considered together because weaknesses in one area can affect others. An unstable power supply, for instance, can interrupt lessons, damage equipment, and complicate data recovery even when software and connectivity are adequate.

This article examines the relationships among information technology systems, strategy, management, and infrastructure within technical college computer science education. Its purpose is to develop a conceptual basis for planning digital environments that are reliable, accessible, educationally relevant, and financially sustainable. The discussion considers how institutions can assess existing resources, identify instructional priorities, strengthen technical support, and integrate cybersecurity into routine activities. Attention is also directed toward teacher development and the use of laboratories for authentic practical tasks. The central question concerns how coordinated institutional decisions can improve the conditions under which students acquire and apply computing knowledge and professional skills.

Methods

The methodological approach adopted in this article is a conceptual analysis of information technology systems, strategy, management, and infrastructure in technical college education. It examines relationships between these areas and their implications for computer science teaching. The analysis does not involve surveys, interviews, experiments, or measurements from individual institutions. Instead, it develops a structured framework for examining institutional technology needs and possible responses. References to technical colleges in Uzbekistan establish the educational context without implying that all institutions share identical conditions. Accordingly, the resulting propositions should be understood as analytical interpretations and planning considerations rather than empirically verified research findings.

The framework organizes the subject into four interconnected dimensions. The systems dimension covers hardware, software, data, users, and operational procedures. The strategy dimension addresses educational objectives, investment priorities, implementation schedules, and institutional responsibilities. The management dimension considers maintenance, user support, access control, procurement, and performance review. The infrastructure dimension includes computing facilities, network connections, power availability, equipment security, and laboratory arrangements. These dimensions are examined separately to clarify their functions and jointly to identify dependencies. For example, introducing a database course requires suitable software and computers, but it also requires teacher preparation, maintenance arrangements, and an appropriate allocation of resources.

Educational relevance serves as the principal criterion for assessing each dimension. The analysis asks whether a technological arrangement supports curriculum delivery, enables practical exercises, and remains usable within institutional constraints. Additional criteria include reliability, accessibility, maintainability, security, and financial sustainability. Reliability concerns continuity of access during teaching activities. Accessibility concerns whether intended users can participate effectively. Maintainability addresses the availability of technical knowledge, replacement components, and support procedures. Security concerns safeguards for systems and information. Financial sustainability considers recurring expenses alongside initial purchases. These criteria provide a common basis for comparing possible arrangements without assuming that one solution suits everyone.

Illustrative scenarios connect the framework with everyday educational activities. These scenarios include preparing a networking laboratory, managing shared computer accounts, maintaining classroom software, and protecting instructional files against accidental loss. Each scenario is examined through the same sequence: identify the teaching objective, specify necessary resources, establish operational responsibilities, consider potential disruptions, and identify an observable indicator of performance. Such indicators might include laboratory availability, successful completion of practical exercises, or the time required to resolve reported faults. These examples demonstrate how the framework could guide institutional assessment; they do not represent observations collected from an actual college or student group.

The final analytical step combines the four dimensions into a phased planning approach. Initial assessment establishes what resources exist and which educational activities require support. Prioritization then considers instructional importance, operational dependencies, implementation effort, and continuing costs. Proposed improvements are linked to responsible personnel and review criteria. No numerical weights or statistical comparisons are assigned because institution-specific evidence is unavailable. This limitation prevents claims about the prevalence of particular problems or the effectiveness of proposed interventions. Subsequent empirical work could apply the framework through equipment inventories, classroom observations, staff consultations, and service records to evaluate its usefulness in specific settings.

Results

The conceptual analysis identifies institutional coordination as a central requirement for effective information technology use in technical colleges. Systems, strategy, management, and infrastructure are interdependent: decisions within one area influence the usefulness of resources elsewhere. A curriculum requiring practical network administration, for example, creates requirements for suitable equipment, teacher expertise, laboratory scheduling, and maintenance. Considering these requirements together produces a clearer planning structure than evaluating equipment independently. This finding is a conceptual proposition derived from the framework, rather than a measured relationship. Its practical implication is that technology planning should begin with educational activities and the conditions necessary for delivery.

A second outcome is the identification of functional suitability as a more informative planning criterion than equipment quantity alone. The availability of computers does not establish whether students can complete the tasks required by their courses. Relevant considerations include software compatibility, device condition, access permissions, network configuration, and opportunities for individual practice. Within the proposed framework, an institutional assessment therefore connects each resource to its intended instructional function. This connection makes gaps easier to describe: a laboratory may support introductory programming but require additional arrangements for virtualization exercises. Such distinctions provide a basis for targeted improvements without assuming universal requirements.

The analysis also identifies routine management as a necessary link between installed infrastructure and dependable educational services. Equipment inventories, maintenance schedules, account procedures, and fault reporting arrangements clarify how resources are supported throughout their use. Defined responsibilities provide a route for addressing disruptions when they occur. The framework therefore treats technical support as part of educational provision rather than an occasional response to equipment failure. It also connects security with ordinary administrative practices, including appropriate access permissions, software updates, and recoverable copies of important files. These relationships indicate areas for institutional review, without establishing the effectiveness of any particular intervention.

Another outcome concerns the relationship between infrastructure and practical competence development. The framework identifies opportunities to align laboratory arrangements with tasks such as configuring local networks, managing databases, diagnosing software problems, and restoring files from backups. These activities require environments where students can practice with suitable supervision and clear boundaries. Consequently, instructional requirements extend beyond access to operational computers and include time, guidance, and appropriate practice settings. For Uzbekistan's technical colleges, the framework offers a way to examine these requirements against local curricula and available resources. It does not establish that existing facilities across the country meet or lack them.

The final output is a phased planning model supported by observable review criteria. Assessment links existing resources to teaching needs; prioritization identifies gaps and dependencies; implementation assigns responsibilities; and review examines whether the intended activities are supported. Suggested indicators include laboratory availability during scheduled lessons, completion of planned practical tasks, maintenance completion, and fault resolution time. These indicators are proposed assessment tools, not reported measurements. The analysis provides neither numerical improvements nor comparative institutional rankings. Its contribution is a structured account of what colleges could examine and how the resulting information could inform technology decisions within their specific educational circumstances.

Discussion

The conceptual findings suggest that effective technology development in technical colleges depends on the relationship between educational purpose and institutional capacity. Equipment becomes useful when teachers can incorporate it into lessons, students can access it, and support arrangements keep it operational. This interpretation shifts attention toward the conditions surrounding technology use. However, the framework does not establish which condition has the greatest influence on learning outcomes. That question requires evidence from particular institutions. Its immediate value lies in helping colleges examine interconnected requirements before committing resources and identify why available technology may fail to support the activities envisioned during planning.

A key implication concerns the balance between expanding facilities and maintaining existing services. New equipment may enable additional learning activities, while maintenance can preserve access to activities already included in the curriculum. Choosing between these priorities requires information about device condition, instructional demand, support capacity, and continuing costs. The framework supports such decisions by linking proposed expenditure to a specific educational function. Nevertheless, functional suitability should not become an argument for indefinitely retaining inadequate equipment. Colleges need criteria for recognizing when repairs, upgrades, or replacement offer the most appropriate response to the requirements of teaching and practical assessment over time.

Teacher development introduces another important consideration. A technically capable laboratory cannot guarantee meaningful practical learning when instructors lack preparation time or confidence with its tools. Conversely, knowledgeable teachers may adapt available resources creatively but remain constrained by unreliable services or insufficient student

Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal
webofjournals.com/index.php/4

access. Institutional planning should therefore consider professional development alongside infrastructure provision. In computer science courses, this could involve guided preparation for network configuration exercises, database administration tasks, and troubleshooting activities. These examples describe possible applications rather than tested interventions. Their suitability depends on course objectives, teachers' existing knowledge, and the resources required to sustain classroom use after training.

Application in Uzbekistan requires sensitivity to differences between individual technical colleges. The article's regional focus does not justify assuming uniform budgets, connectivity, staffing, or student preparation. Each institution would need to establish its own starting conditions and determine which improvements are feasible. A phased approach could support this process, although sequencing involves tradeoffs. Addressing urgent service problems first may postpone opportunities to introduce new learning activities, while pursuing expansion too quickly may create support obligations that exceed institutional capacity. The framework makes these tensions visible but cannot resolve them without local evidence and the participation of those responsible for implementation.

The principal limitation is the absence of empirical validation. The analysis identifies plausible relationships and proposes review criteria, but it cannot demonstrate improvements in achievement, service reliability, or financial efficiency. Future research could examine how the framework operates across colleges with different resources and organizational arrangements. Combining inventories and service records with classroom observations and staff consultations would help distinguish operational availability from educational usefulness. Student perspectives would also clarify whether access translates into sufficient opportunities for practice. Such investigation should examine unintended effects, including additional staff workload, and determine whether proposed improvements remain sustainable beyond their initial implementation period.

Conclusion

Information technology systems, strategy, management, and infrastructure form an interconnected foundation for computer science education in technical colleges. Their educational value depends on the coordination of resources, responsibilities, and teaching objectives. This article has developed a conceptual framework for examining those relationships within the context of Uzbekistan's technical colleges. Its central conclusion is that institutional technology development requires sustained attention to how systems support learning activities. Hardware and software are essential resources, but their usefulness also depends on planning, technical support, teacher preparation, and operational arrangements that allow students to practice relevant skills consistently throughout their courses and training programmes.

Strategic planning should begin with clearly defined educational needs and an assessment of existing capabilities. Colleges can use this starting point to identify which services support current courses, where limitations interrupt instruction, and what improvements would enable additional practical activities. Investment decisions should account for acquisition, maintenance, training, and eventual replacement. This approach encourages institutions to consider the continuing responsibilities associated with technology purchases. It also provides a basis for selecting achievable priorities when resources are constrained. The appropriate sequence of improvements will differ between institutions because curriculum requirements, equipment conditions, staffing arrangements, and available funding must be assessed locally.

Management connects institutional priorities with the everyday availability of educational services. Clear responsibilities for maintenance, user support, account administration, and information protection help establish an organized basis for technology use. Teachers and technical personnel should contribute to planning because they encounter the practical requirements and difficulties associated with classroom delivery. Students' experiences also matter when assessing whether facilities provide sufficient access and opportunities for practice. Reviewing these perspectives together can help institutions distinguish between the presence of equipment and its instructional usefulness. Proposed indicators should therefore address both operational conditions and the learning activities those conditions are intended to support.

For computer science education, infrastructure planning should create opportunities to apply knowledge through purposeful laboratory work. Network configuration, database administration, troubleshooting, and file recovery illustrate activities that connect technical concepts with practical responsibilities. Their inclusion requires suitable resources, supervision, and preparation rather than equipment availability alone. Teacher development should accompany changes to facilities so that new capabilities can be incorporated into instruction. Within Uzbekistan, the proposed framework offers colleges a structure for evaluating these requirements according to their own circumstances. It should be adapted through institutional assessment rather than applied as a uniform prescription for every programme or educational setting.

The article's conclusions remain conceptual because no institutional measurements or participant data were collected. The framework cannot establish the extent of existing problems or demonstrate that its proposed arrangements improve educational outcomes. Its contribution is to organize the questions that colleges should examine when planning and reviewing information technology provision. Further research should investigate its practical usefulness through institutional assessments that combine operational evidence with teacher and student experiences. Such work would clarify which arrangements are feasible, effective, and sustainable in different settings. Coordinated planning, informed by local evidence, provides a foundation for developing technology services that support technical education.

References:

1. International Organization for Standardization. (2018). Information technology—Service management—Part 1: Service management system requirements (ISO/IEC Standard No. 20000-1:2018). Publisher's page
2. International Organization for Standardization. (2022). Information security, cybersecurity and privacy protection—Information security management systems—Requirements (ISO/IEC Standard No. 27001:2022). Publisher's page

Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal
webofjournals.com/index.php/4

3. International Organization for Standardization. (2024). Information technology—Governance of IT for the organization (ISO/IEC Standard No. 38500:2024). Publisher's page
4. ISACA. (2018a). COBIT 2019 framework: Governance and management objectives. Publisher's page
5. ISACA. (2018b). COBIT 2019 framework: Introduction and methodology. Publisher's page
6. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x
7. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). Teachers and leaders in vocational education and training. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/59d4fbb1-en
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023a). OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en
9. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023b). Shaping digital education: Enabling factors for quality, equity and efficiency. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/bac4dc9f-en
10. Pascoe, C., Quinn, S., & Scarfone, K. (2024). The NIST cybersecurity framework (CSF) 2.0 (NIST CSWP 29). National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.CSWP.29
11. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020, October 5). "Raqamli O'zbekiston—2030" strategiyasini tasdiqlash va uni samarali amalga oshirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida [On approving the "Digital Uzbekistan—2030" strategy and measures for its effective implementation] (Decree No. PF-6079). LexUZ. Official legal text
12. Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu (Y. Punie, Ed.). Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770
13. Souppaya, M., & Scarfone, K. (2022). Guide to enterprise patch management planning: Preventive maintenance for technology (NIST Special Publication 800-40, Rev. 4). National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-40r4
14. Swanson, M., Bowen, P., Phillips, A. W., Gallup, D., & Lynes, D. (2010). Contingency planning guide for federal information systems (NIST Special Publication 800-34, Rev. 1). National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-34r1
15. UNESCO. (2018). UNESCO ICT competency framework for teachers (Version 3). Publisher's page
16. UNESCO. (2022). Transforming technical and vocational education and training for successful and just transitions: UNESCO strategy 2022–2029. Full publication

17. UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? Publisher's page
18. Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The digital competence framework for citizens—With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/115376
19. World Bank. (2023a, June 7). Project information document: Uzbekistan Digital Inclusion Project (P179108). Publication record
20. World Bank. (2023b, November 30). World Bank to support Uzbekistan in developing the digital economy and creating new jobs in the information technology sector [Press release]. Official publication

Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal
webofjournals.com/index.php/4