

Information Technology Committee
Minutes
October 27, 2009
Kepner 1050

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Called to order at 3:36pm
- II. Roll Call
 - a. Nick Eastham in attendance for David Kendrick.
 - b. Present: Valerie Middleton, Jay Lightfoot, Robert Brunswig, Helen Reed, Michelle Quinn, David Diggs, Bret Naber, Ryan Rose, Paul Sharp, Jeanette Van Galder, Pamela Newberg, Charmayne Cullom, Mark Fetkewicz, DJ Cox, Cody Stone
 - c. Absent: Scott Schuttenberg, Tobias Guzman, Nolan Oltjenbruns, Jeanie York, Libby Prueher, Tom Smith, Ronna Johnston
- III. Announcements or Requests to Change the Agenda
- IV. Old Business
- V. New Business
 - a. Student Tech Fee – will share Powerpoint with those not in attendance
 - i. Tech fee is used for equipping new smart classrooms, staffing & maintaining computer labs & providing students access to academic software
 - ii. Charge assessed dependent upon the college that the student belongs to – differential. Average \$9.06 per credit hour or \$271 per 30 credit hours. Flat fee required a vote – we were in a budget crunch & needed to pass quickly. Did not want to change student behavior so University College (undeclared) is a little above HHS fee.
 - iii. History
 - 1. The University used to have a tech fee that we started collecting in the early 90's. \$3.00 per credit. Final year collected 1.8M. 800,000 went to recurring costs (lab refresh, software maintenance, student lab employees, printing). Remaining 1M was used to fund 1 time expenses that were requested by campus from the ITECH Committee. Weren't set up for refresh funding. Could buy something but never set up a way to refresh it or keep the technology current. Needed support personnel for these new technologies that weren't allowed with old tech fee, along with maintenance contracts.
 - 2. Philosophy changed to "no fees". Incorporated all of fees into tuition. \$800,000 moved into the IT Lab Budget – paid for same things. 1M went back into the University's general fund.
 - iv. FY09 – why do the tech fee again? Budget woes, increasing support costs, aging smart classrooms, reliance upon Blackboard & its recurring costs, demands for more technology.
 - 1. Tech Fee Rules – money should be spent for direct student benefit and students should be able to see what they paid for. Developed Tech Fee logo to brand rooms, technologies, etc. Haven't heard students asking where tech fee money goes, so believe it is working.
 - 2. 1M reallocated to University general funds. Tech Fee 2.2M – increase of 1.2M to IT budget.

- v. FY10 increased tech fee to 2.5M due to increase for Blackboard licensing & hosting, specialized lab refresh, support & refresh of new classrooms.
- vi. Tech Fee Usage
 - 1. 55% hardware – classroom maintenance, new classrooms, lab 4 year refresh, specialized lab refresh, Xythos & Softgrid maintenance
 - 2. 29% personnel – 300K lab consultants, just under 300K Smart Classroom support staff, 100K Learning Management System (Blackboard) support staff
 - 3. 8% hosted services – Blackboard & Presidium (help desk software) both split funded since students are not the only ones who use these services
 - 4. 5% software – Microsoft Campus Agreement, SAS, Miscellaneous academic software (Adobe products, Geometry Sketchpads, etc.), Symantec Antivirus, SPSS licenses, Mathematica, Xythos (Beardrive) split funded, ESRI GIS software, LabStats, Sophos Antivirus (Mac servers)
 - 5. 3% printing – 80K per year to support printing
 - a. Decided to implement pay for print because printing & costs were continuing to go up each year. In order to contain costs & encourage less waste, we implemented a pay for print structure. The 80K funds fixed costs (maintenance, replacement, etc.). The remaining Pharos budget is used to support variable print costs.
- vii. Challenges
 - 1. Rising Costs
 - a. Vendor hardware/software maintenance contracts
 - b. University employee salaries
 - c. Student employee salaries
 - 2. Future Needs
 - a. Other software
 - b. Classrooms
 - c. Computer labs
 - d. One time requests
 - e. Support needs
- viii. How do we make decisions & plan for the future?
 - 1. Information to Drive Decisions (LabStats, Crestron RoomView (AV equipment stats), Computer inventory, Software inventory, Network stats, Parature ticket stats, Industry best practices – Educause, Gartner, Forrester, InfoTech, etc.)
 - 2. Committees (more campus involvement, more diverse population to review challenges & recommend solutions, better testing before deployment, better understanding of academic needs)
 - a. ITC
 - b. Project Management Committee – helps IT prioritize, report writing, combining data sets
 - c. Innovative Technology Committee – broad representation (academic, CETL, TSC, support units) – framework for implementing new technologies – www.unco.edu/it/aboutus/innotech.html

- a. Visited with CETL but CETL does not have the capacity to train students also at this time.
- b. IT has attended FYE courses as guest speakers to educate students about the different technologies that exist on campus & that are available to them. We are starting to be looked to as a reference.
- c. We can lean on our vendors – they want our students to be users of their products and may offer trainings that students could attend.

xi. If you see waste, have questions, etc. please call it to our attention.

VI. Other Substantive Proposals

VII. Next Meeting Date & Time

- a. Move November meeting to early December & cancel late December meeting.
- b. Topics
 - i. Will dig into LabStats document. Will share what talked about with VP's & Academic Council & their feedback.
 - ii. Blackboard LMS Advisory Group will meet Nov 10. Very pleased with work the Faculty Review Taskforce has done. Will be information to share with ITC at next meeting from these groups.

VIII. Adjourned

- a. 4:40pm