

**IT Council Minutes**  
**Carrington Hall 314D**  
**October 2, 2012**

**Members Present:** Jeff Morrissey, Greg Rainwater, Sue Ingram, Sarah Caldwell, Mark Putman, Thomas Peters, David Hough, Kevin Piercy, Jordan McGee

**Members Absent:** Ken McClure, Earle Doman

**Guests Present:** Angela Barker, Dave Caravella

The IT Council meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. and the Council Chair determined a quorum was present.

Minutes from the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed. David Hough moved to approve the minutes; Greg Rainwater seconded the motion. All approved. Motion carried.

**2012 Title III Grant Update** – Jeff Morrissey

During the latter months of 2011 through the first several months of 2012, representatives from the Office of the Provost, Administrative and Information Services, and Lighthouse Consulting developed and submitted a Department of Education (DOE) Title III grant proposal. The proposal focused on improving and expanding upon the blended/online courses and associated support services offered at Missouri State. If received the grant award would secure \$400,000 a year over a period of five years to total \$2 million.

This was a particularly challenging competition because of the small number of awards. The DOE received 208 proposals for this competition; however, 57 proposals were not read. This is because 20 were duplicate submissions, 20 did not comply with technical requirements (e.g. too many pages, font too small), 9 were received after the deadline had passed and 8 applicants failed to establish basic eligibility.

Awards were announced by the DOE in September 2012. In a new twist to the competition, applicants could earn extra points in the application process for providing moderate (2.5 points) or strong (5.0 points) experimental evidence of the efficacy of planned grant proposal activities. The cut-off was initially 102 points and due to budget restraints, only 14 colleges and universities were funded.

To save effort, the Department did not actually review all of the research components provided by applicants. Only those proposals that scored high enough in the initial reading to be in a potential funding band (97 points and above) had their research component reviewed and scored. Our grant proposal score was 96.

The DOE has not yet determined if it will solicit additional proposals next year or continue to fund down the slate for the proposals solicited this year. More information will be provided as we hear about the DOE plans for next year's award process.

**Next Generation Network Implementation Update** – Jeff Morrissey

In support of the University's long-range plan a multifaceted replacement, upgrade, and expansion plan for its networking infrastructure was developed. Three of the five components of the networking infrastructure have been upgraded thus far, which are bandwidth capacity, distribution devices, and core routers. The two remaining components requiring upgrades are wireless access and edge devices.

**IT Council Minutes  
Carrington Hall 314D  
October 2, 2012**

Wireless Access

The wireless access objective contained in the University's long-range plan states that Missouri State will achieve 100% coverage inside all buildings (not including residence halls) located on the Springfield campus by 2016. Funding to reach the 100% objective was identified and approved by IT Council in March 2011. At this point-in-time 75% of buildings on the Springfield campus have wireless access with the expectation that 95% coverage will be achieved by July 2013.

Edge Devices

The remaining component required to complete the University's NGN are the edge devices contained in the networking infrastructure. This component consists of approximately 850 old devices spread throughout 90+ buildings on the Springfield, West Plains, and Mountain Grove campuses to be replaced with approximately 600 new edge devices.

Two main benefits of upgrading the edge devices are:

- (1) A ten times increase in speed from 100 megabit to one gigabit service to file servers and desktop computers; and
- (2) Critical vendor support will once again be available as the current devices are out of support and the University must attempt to resolve any issues without outside assistance.

**Student Technology Requirements Committee Discussion** – Tom Peters

This committee is charged with the development of recommendations for an operational policy that articulates the range of technology that students at MSU might be required to purchase for taking a particular class. Further, the committee should outline procedures for academic departments to gain approval to make the use of specific technologies or devices a program or course requirement for students.

The members of the committee were Tom Peters (chair), Christopher Herr, Ryan Deboef, Jeff Morrissey, Christopher Craig, Brittany Donnellan, Barbara Bushman, Carolyn Cardenas, and Joanna Cemore-Bridgen.

Major issues raised by IT Council members during this discussion were centered around device criteria and ramifications of "forcing" students to purchase specific devices. Tom Peters explained that standards will need to be put into place with each college so students will not need to purchase different devices for courses in the same major. Software applications requirements were also discussed and it was recommended that instructors should list out software application requirements for classes to let students find the one that is compatible with their current devices.

**Blackboard Course Management System Discussion** – Jeff Morrissey, Kevin Piercy

1. Training is being utilized and has helped to boost overall usage, including advanced usage. We have seen a 300% increase in faculty usage on Blackboard and feel it is attributed to more effective training initiatives.

**IT Council Minutes  
Carrington Hall 314D  
October 2, 2012**

2. The software license invoice for next year has not come through as of this meeting. We are up to date with the service patches. SCUF covers the cost for this software, which goes up 7% per year. Online classes do not count toward SCUF since these students do not pay this fee.

**ITAC Update** – Angela Barker, Dave Caravella, Kevin Piercy

1. Committee Activity Update – Angela Barker
  - a. New charges have created three new sub-committees: room classifications, standards for tech rooms, support services. Groups will meet this month and bring forward standard ideas to the next IT Council.
2. Lifecycle Investments for Technology-Enhanced Classrooms – Dave Caravella
  - a. Handout: (Excel spreadsheet, no title). Discussed the possibility of standardizing all tech rooms and presented costs associated with such.
  - b. Projectors need to be replaced especially since most are analog and the PC's are digital. Once PC's stop supporting analog signals, the projectors will not function. Bulb replacement costs are decreasing while number of replacements are increasing, balancing out with previous replacement costs.
  - c. Jeff Morrissey asked ITAC to look into standardization of equipment and exactly what is needed in these classrooms. He also posed the question "What will it take to get us well and what will it take to sustain after that?" ITAC will analyze and return with recommendations.

**SCUF Carry Forward Investments** – Jeff Morrissey, Greg Rainwater

Jeff Morrissey asked IT Council members to keep in mind the following when contemplating what to do with the \$600,000 one-time money:

1. Money is for one-time investments only with no recurring costs being provided by the SCUF budget.
2. Investments should be student centric and impact the student population at large.
3. Investments should be long-range plan centric.

Jordan McGee moved to adjourn; Greg Rainwater seconded the motion to adjourn. All approved, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 3:59p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Vikki Fencil  
Administrative Assistant II  
Computer Services