

University Council on Technology
November 5, 1999 Minutes

3:00 p.m. to 5:00.p.m.
309 KSC
Kent Campus

- Present: Cathy Bakes, Peggy Doheny, Rosemary DuMont, Paul Farrell (chair), David Fuety, Pam Grimm, Barbara Hanniford, Judy Hirschman, Alice Iden, John Kerstetter, Terry Kuhn, Bruce Petryshak, Pam Ramey, Roberta Sikula, Don Tolliver, Carlos Vargas-Aburto and Denise Zelko
- Absent: David Cannon, Stephen Cabaniss, Ray Craig, Lowell Croskey, Alan Evans, Larry Jones, Mike Kreyche, Pam Mitchell, Bernie Reynolds, Arden Ruttan, Drew Tiene, Mary Tipton, Darrell Turnidge, and Kevin West
- Guests: Paul Albert, Tom Klingler, Greg Seibert and Steve Tapp

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

Don Tolliver welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 3:15.

II. zUniversity.com

Don started the meeting by introducing “zUniversity.com” stating that for the past several weeks there has been negotiating going on in the Alumni Association, primarily the Alumni Board considering an e-commerce site for the Alumni Association.

Alumni has signed a letter of intent with zUniversity.com for e-commerce with approximately five months to look at the potential and draw up a contract for the Alumni Association only. However, there is a good chance the University may want to go along with this as well as there is no risk to the Alumni Association or the University. If everything goes to plan a three year contract would be signed.

A handout was distributed showing which Universities have signed letters of intent. This group acts as an agent linking buyers and sellers offering preferential prices and services with various businesses. The revenues generated at the site and shared with the vendor with the alumni association or the university. Once we sign they develop contracts with various businesses then students and the alumni can use the e-commerce shopping mall and a University focused site. The alumni Association would gain a revenue stream, an opportunity to develop a data warehouse and information regarding the purchasing habits of their members. A handout was distributed showing what the home page would look like with the icon to be clicked on.

Any questions or issues should be emailed to Don Tolliver and will be forwarded to the people looking at this.

III. Draft report of the subcommittee to review the Networking and Information Systems and Academic Computing ACS/NISS Draft Report

Copies of ACS/NISS Review were distributed and because of new members to the Council Paul Farrell presented some background information.

In February 1999 the UCT discussed the issue of the integrated plan. A subcommittee was created to review the status of the ACT/NISS recommendations and report back to Council by the April meeting with an interim report. The committee consisted of Cathy Bakes, Ray Craig, Alan Evans, Paul Farrell, Alice Iden and Roberta Sikula with additions being left to add others as necessary. Rosemary Du Mont, Bruce Petryshak, Greg Seibert and Judy Hirshmann were resource people for this committee. The subcommittee was charged to submit an interim report for the March meeting and a draft for the April meeting. This did not happen because of other issues.

The committee met regularly breaking into subcommittees considering various parts of its charge. A web site was opened and two meetings were held for anyone who wanted to comment.

Today's handout is an Executive Summary which summarizes some of the things that happened during the last four or five years. This is still a draft report and one of the major things the committee wishes to obtain today is what the council as a whole considers the important issues and developments over that period.

Comments are as follows:

We formally adopt what the tremendous investment the university has made in the networking and technology and the classroom infrastructure and realize that this has to be recognized as a utility and expand by saying we have a wonderful research vehicle.

There needs to be a direct link to the UCT home page from somewhere formal.

There are inaccuracies in terms of dates and who had responsibility for what and what title.

There needs to be an introduction at the beginning and a conclusion at the end.

Put a charge and composition of the committee and the methodology used.

Paul Farrell stated what he thinks the subcommittee is trying to get out what the summary conveys. Corrections were asked for where wrong and asked if this conveys that.

Management organization policies on planning - the main idea is to convey how much change has there has been.

To convey the council has established but has not fully embraced the role in being consulted on things like prioritization of initiatives in the Information Systems.

There hasn't been an integrated process for Strategic Planning for technology.

Don Tolliver suggested that each paragraph should be studied individually then email comments to Paul Farrell.

Paul asked for issues that are still outstanding to identify those that need to be addressed by an integrated plan. All the successes and positives developments that have not been addressed. There needs to be a balance between the positives and the negatives.

It was asked if there were going to be any major developments within the next month because there needs to be a time freeze because this report cannot be constantly revised for each meeting.

The Microsoft Agreement and Technology Challenge funding were mentioned as positives.

Paul stated that he would like to formally ratify the report by the December meeting but be actually finalized before that.

It should be stated that copyright systems have been centralized.

The reference to Dell contract and now null and void. Dells plan now the same to anyone in Ohio.

Training is still a major issue for staff. Progress has been made with training and attendance high in technology training.

What is still missing is we are going to expand the funds to train people in specialized tasks.

Copies of any reports on technology are needed, who did it and who owns it.

Certification and specialized training is not widely available in certain areas.

The last sentence on page five needs to be softened changing to substantial or major purchases.

Paul reviewed various issues.

SIS:

Problems of customization

No general access

Data warehousing – recommendation of consultants to be looked at

Instructional Research:

Faculty refresh was a success

There is a need to access the success of it and where it hasn't

Classroom:

Not suitably equipped for using technology in the classroom

Support Staff:

Dominant issue

Fragmentation of Support for Instructional Technologies Academic Computing

Difficult for faculty to find how do I do this or find the right person

Need for a single point of contact

Networking

Successful because it is a high priority utility

Contrast with the phone systems, still waiting for faculty to have phones

Resources and Equipment

There are no maintenance budgets for equipment

Faculty Refresh

Questions about CBU and non-tenure track be included – they will be included this year it includes chairs and directors, tenure faculty and one staff person per unit. It is no longer faculty refresh it is technology refresh. Regionals are completely separate.

Specialized Needs

Research computing

Kent VM migration

Other

How to fund all this technology

Paul asked for comments as to where we are wrong, where there is factual inaccuracies, if we have missed important things. The committee will try to put something coherent that reflects between now and the December meeting.

IS Goals for this year

A handout was distributed with the goals for this year showing what we are trying to do and we have identified and where we are and we hope to complete these by June of 2000.

Progressing Drafting the Charge for the Integrated Plan

A request was made in October for volunteers to participate in the committee to refine the charge of the committee who will be drafting the integrated technology plan. The committee got together and talked about some of the ideas regarding the charge this handout reflects those thoughts from that conversation. Input from the Council is needed to help up get a sense of what the charge should say. Where the University is going as an institution and that technology should be in harmony with what this University wants to do regarding its mission academically, instruction and research rather than talk technology.

It was stated that there is a severe reservation about the way University's Strategic Plan is articulated because the points made in are probably the least important things. The most important thing is the preamble which says these are just additions to our normal plan which is we are a research and teaching institution which is important then go on to say points which are being articulated as the strategic plan. This was pointed out to the Faculty Senate that it is important not to identify the later things as the important things. The main objectives are aiding, research and teaching.

A comment was made that to ignore what the University is using for all the thinking would be foolish. All the divisions are working from the statements, this is what sets our thinking structure, we have all be asked to use them, this is the ways the goals will be presented to the Board. If we ignore it we have lost an opportunity and a wasted effort.

The outcome is to address the perceived problems among the university community which are outlined here, lack of support support, training, classroom facilities, etc.

Where is this charge coming from and where is it going. It is unclear whether this is a subcommittee for Council on Technology or a committee being charged by the V. P. for Information Services. This needs to be clarified first.

A key issue is the plan will have to be sold to the Executive Officers as well as the community at large. This point was strongly made by the IBM facilitators.

Paul Gaston and Don Tolliver have developed a charge by December 1999 and will have established a committee by January 2000. The procedure probably is that they will ask the subcommittee to develop a charge and that the Council on Technology to approve and then take it to the other Executive Officers or the President. This is normal procedure.

The draft needs to be done by December 3, 1999.

A motion was made and unanimously voted on to adjourn the meeting at 5:35.

C: President

Provost

V. P. Information Services

