

University Council on Technology

February 4, 2000 Minutes

3:00 p.m. to 5:00.p.m.

309 KSC

Kent Campus

Present: Cathy Bakes, David Cannon, Lowell Croskey, Peggy Doheny, Rosemary DuMont, Paul Farrell (chair), Pam Grimm, Barbara Hanniford, Judy Hirschman, Mike Kreyche, John Kerstetter, Bruce Petryshak, Dave Saunier for Bernie Reynolds, Greg Seibert, Roberta Sikula, Don Tolliver, Darrell Turnidge, and Denise Zelko

Absent: Ray Craig, Stephen Cabaniss, Alan Evans, David Fuety, Alice Iden, Larry Jones, Pam Mitchell, Pam Ramey, Arden Ruttan, Drew Tiene, Carlos Vargas-Aburto and Kevin West

Guests: Tom Klingler, Terry Kuhn, Steve Tapp and *Mary Tipton*

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

Paul Farrell (Chair) welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m.

II. Approval of 12/03/99 Minutes

A motion was made and unanimously approved to accept the minutes as submitted with the exception of typographical errors submitted by Cathy Bakes for 12/03/99.

At this time reordering of the agenda was discussed. It was decided to take item IV. New Business first.

III. New Business

A. Information Systems Budget

A background of what UIS has been through during the 90's was presented. The most significant technological changes to the University have happened during the last eight years during a flat budget. We have managed to wire the campus, wire utilities, installation of the SIS system, two mainframe upgrades and software upgrades. Groups have been created, Network Services being an example, to support that infrastructure. This is what has led to these new discussions. There are several needs that need to be addressed and to be focused

on.

Greg Seibert presented where we are and what we have been doing in terms of preparing budget plans. An internal technology task force has been set up with the first focus on budget analysis and budget requests for the coming fiscal year. In time its duties will be an evaluation and appraisal of technologies and technology directions. For the past month it has concentrated on budget issues and projects that are felt will be required for the next fiscal year. It has also looked at the strategic plan and mission and how they are linked, and what the requirements would be. Necessary requirements and projects for funding next year have been solicited. An analysis, proposal, solution and a budget line have been created for each of these projects and they have been grouped into four different areas.

Committed - Those that are committed, large expenditures projects that have been committed to without any funding that are legal or contractual with no way of getting out of them. The Microsoft License is an example of this, this is a commitment without funding. Another is the Internet 2 support with grant monies running out in the next year with the University having to self fund for the coming years.

Critical - Those that are critical to fulfilling the University mission. If we don't carry forward or if we delay it will create a negative impact. An example is an ADA exposure in that we don't have a lot of accessibility in our computer labs. It is critical that we have one fully accessible workstation that could accommodate a variety of disabilities. Refreshing of the PC labs around campus is another. There is no project or program to do these. There is no ongoing funding and eventually they will be so outdated that they won't be supported.

Provision of University Services - There is no line item to provide refresh for Moulton Hall technologies in that building. Another area is information services, data warehousing, University statistics and reporting needs and Institution Resource area .

Things we would like to do - We would like to expand our services to the University community. Staffing needs and expansions are needed.

The first two items should be taken to UPBAC after being internally reviewed. A narrative will be put on the other areas as to what the consequences would be without funding.

Don Tolliver stated that the UCT will be asked for comments before these items are presented to the EO's and UPBAC. It was also stated that he hopes the EO's have a plan for UPBAC to review and balance out the needs across all the divisions and go ahead with one budget plan.

A comment was made that when a piece of technology is added on campus there is no budgeting for replacement or maintenance of it. Labs require long term commitment, but no there is no formal acknowledgement in University planning of this fact. Don stated that both he and Dave Creamer are in agreement that IS needs a budget to support these kinds of activities. It will take time to get it to a realistic level but we are working in that direction.

Greg Seibert stated that the initiative being done by the task force has developed a rationale and talking points to try to secure some of these line items. This would be made public so the

University community could see that there is reallocation or additional monies stating this is what it is doing and that every three years pc's will appear or every so often this will happen, we know what the dollars are.

Rosemary DuMont stated that one of the means by which technology has been deployed is by way of purchases made with one time House Bill money. There is never a guarantee that House Bill money will be available again and despite this we have used it as an on-going way of funding technology. It has been advantageous because we didn't have any other source of money and disadvantageous because of its impact on long term planning.

Terry Kuhn stated that all the deans met and made budget presentations addressing this as an issue facing them. Many proposed that continuing dollars be built in just for this reason. It was stated that this type of thinking is necessary. When the lab was put in four years ago students would come in and say "wow". Now they come and say these are so slow. We can not afford to be lagging.

Paul Farrell stated the key is to hold monies over is because it doesn't make sense to re-equip a quarter of your lab every four years because everything is out of sync. A good strategic planning practice that you stick with is needed.

All students using all labs was discussed. The Colleges of Business and Education, labs, even though funded by those colleges, are open. A number of departments have their own graduate student's labs and those are definitely closed. The six public labs housing 308 machines are in high demand and heavily used. These labs are funded and maintained primarily by Academic Computing and are open to everyone.

Lowell Croskey asked for conversation regarding students and laptops. A question was raised about what is it that we should be buying. If laptops were required at major lectures, the designs would be made under different criteria. Bowman, Van Dusen and McGilvrey Halls are in the process of being renovated, should ports be put at each station if there is no commitment to require students to have laptops. Is money being wasted by doing this? Direction is needed from the capital side.

Comments were made that power is obviously needed but not necessarily a network connection unless on-line testing would be done. A comment was made regarding creating team stations versus individual students. It was decided to pass this on to the Integrated Technology Review.

II. Old Business

A. University Policy of Web pages

Paul Farrell stated that from what Ray Craig has heard departments will not be required to use the look and feel however the colleges will.

B. Discussion of Integrated Technology Plan

Don Tolliver stated that he had a setback on getting a chair, and asked for names or

nominations of someone from an administrative office, having office support, some time and a strong academic interest, to serve as chair. It was stated that a chair should be in place before continuing with appointment of this committee.

Names or ideas should be sent to Don Tolliver during the next week.

C. Activation of Standing Committees

Paul Farrell stated that there is currently one active standing committee, Learning Technologies. It was asked if anyone else would like to set up committees. Greg Seibert stated in his area there is an informal lunch group that meets and most of the members that supports the gets together regularly and could commit to a standing committee.

Membership is needed from the UCT as well as outside for the Administrative Computing standing committee. Nominations should be emailed to Paul Farrell.

D. Centralized Training for Technical Support Student Employees

Rosemary DuMont stated, that although still in process, a formal training program is being put together for the students whom ACT hires. This will be a model program for students recruited to staff general purpose labs.

Greg Seibert stated that there is a series that has been developed on Networking, particularly on the new network technologies. This is given about three times a year.

It was also stated that Dave Futey has a training program for the students that work in the residence halls.

II. New Business

Reordered as the first agenda item.

III. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Computing

No report given

B. Administrative Computing

Bruce Petryshak stated that the Y2k effort, installation of the e-mail platform and Lotus notes was successful. The activities that are happening right now are catching up on the maintenance of the SIS system and DOS tapes, web for student activities, revision of hardware and software.

C. Learning Technology Services

The student evaluation teaching form was discussed, it was stated that this needs to

completely redone, additional questions added that would encompass technology or the addition on a supplementary form. A pilot study with optional questions on technology that faculty could use on a voluntary basis is being put together. A web site will be created for a central location to collect questions that might be used in this development.

A handout was distributed regarding the multimedia open house on March 10, 2000. Discussion occurred regarding moving the UCT meeting to Moulton Hall. Judy Hirschmann will check on the availability of room and will email the council.

D. Network Computing

The telecommunications project should be successfully installed late spring and completed by summer. One question which then arises is "How to present video to the university?". Expenditures have been made and a lot of technology is coming on board. We have developed extensive expertise with demos. Packaging and availability needs to be developed to integrate these technologies successfully where they would be of benefit. This is the key to successful employment of this technology.

The Front Page server is up and running on Linux with three different servers being used for different uses. There are a few of the attributes of Front Page that will not work on the Linux server. However there is no Front Page server currently available to faculty needing to post class notes - they are all for administrative use.

A. New Media Services

No report given.

A motion was made and it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Remaining meetings this semester:

March 10, 2000 at 3pm in 317 Moulton Hall

April 28, 2000 at 1pm in 316 KSC

CC: President Cartwright

Provost

VP Information Services