

## IT Council Minutes CARR 203- 1/4/11

**Members Present:** John Catau, Sarah Caldwell, Kevin Piercy, Greg Rainwater, Jeff Morrissey, Ken McClure, Tammy Jahnke, Eric Shade, Earle Doman, John Maddux, Carey Adams, Suzanne Ingram (via ITV)

**Guests:** Josh Stuppy

Minutes were approved from the last meeting. Meeting called to order at 3:31 p.m.

### **Instructional Technologies Advisory Committee Update (see handout)**

Jeff stated that the grant will be targeted at 3 different components: enhancing the university's classroom technologies and support services, online and blended course offerings, and networking infrastructure. The handout was discussed. The Instructional Technologies Advisory Committee (ITAC) has been formed and will be meeting weekly for the next couple of months. The ITAC has been charged with working through the seven step process for classroom technology and how to utilize and support technology classrooms. The committee will meet again next week. Their charge is listed on the bottom of the Title III Grant handout sheet. They are beginning by inventorying existing resources. The Distance Education Committee will also work to identify major initiatives to put on the table for the grant writer. There was an inspection of the existing networking infrastructure performed by CISCO and they will come back this month or next and talk about the next five year's direction, i.e. sharing ideas about where we need to go in the form of expanding our network over the next five years. If we display that we have done research and talked with experts in the industry it will give more credence to the grant proposal. April is the time for grant submission and we will know the outcome sometime in July. If the grant is awarded to us, we will get the first of the money by October 1<sup>st</sup>. There will be a conference call with the consultant later in January to make sure that the grant writer, Mike, gets all his questions answered and for him to answer questions from us prior to the development process. It will take two and a half months of development process. 30-45% of the grant is already written since a grant was submitted last year. A comprehensive development plan is what will be worked on.

### **Networking Bandwidth Status Update**

We have been working on a 3-phase plan--last semester we were having bandwidth issues which was a short-term issue. Ken and others discussed this with Dr. Cofer and he agreed to give us another 100 meg. which tapped out equipment in core infrastructure. We are now up to 410 inbound and 210 outbound. We have gotten all we can get out of the existing equipment. Since residence life wanted more, we have designed the architecture to split campus networks into residence life and academic/business usage. When phase 2 is complete (maybe around spring break or later) we will be able to recover some bandwidth--25-30% swing will come back from residence life. Phase 3 will get completed as we complete the 5 year plan and grant initiatives. With the networking component of the grant we expect to be able to fund bandwidth expansion as we need it over the next five years. We have negotiated with Morenet and we have a good price for the next two years on bandwidth. The contract is in place and Morenet is ready to turn it on when we're ready. Intrusion detection has been put through procurement process and in good shape, packet shaper is out and awarded and should be coming any time and firewalls have been ordered. There is also an upgrade to routers that would allow for not purchasing new routers and wireless equipment.

### **Networking Advisory Committee (wireless access)**

The provost is interested in and the president supportive of all faculty having access to wireless networks. Wireless access is dependent on how many access points we have and how many people plan on using it. Faculty who want wireless go through departments for \$5/month. There are only 84 faculty members that have wireless capabilities. If established too hastily this may start pushing people towards a wireless network that doesn't have the capacity to handle demand. The networking advisory committee reports to the IT Council. In February the committee will provide recommendations regarding capacity, timeline, and an organized approach. We have to consider a funding model as we move forward to provide the most reasonably priced service, and which investments we need to make for the next five years. Have to get estimates, priority, highest demand, etc. and get direction for team to go where the most need is and get them serviced first. There are security needs regarding wireless that must be addressed as well. The provost would like a recommendation at February's meeting regarding this issue. The Networking Advisory

Committee will bring a draft plan back at next meeting for IT council to review and decide if it's ready to go to the provost. It was stated that the plan should be about creating a wireless campus which includes faculty. It was suggested that there should be an administrative decision which states university policy regarding office connections/machines connecting to wireless. These are issues that will be addressed by the committee. Jeff requested that John Maddux recommend a student from SGA to serve on the committee. It was also suggested that a faculty member serve on the committee as well as a distributed support staff member and an instructional designer. Carey recommended Andrew Cline from MJF. Jeff will ask Chantal for a rep from her area.

**FY '12 SCUF Proposal Solicitations (see handout)**

The SCUF FY 2012 proposal timeline was discussed. Committee approved of timeline as is. It was stated that it is important that everyone understands how to submit a proposal. Ongoing contractual obligations include BlackBoard licenses and Microsoft Campus agreement, etc. Some colleges will not submit proposals since some are shutting down labs, etc. There are generally very few new things funded by SCUF. Funds typically go towards improving services that are already offered. There are four SCUF funded positions- two for computers for learning and the other two report to computer services. Signatures on proposal forms were discussed. It was stated that the good thing about requiring the committee chairs' signatures on the proposal forms is that it allows for faculty input. The council recommended leaving the proposal forms signature requirements as they are. Proposal solicitation will go out January 14<sup>th</sup> as well as the redistribution plan for summer 2011. Reminders will be sent out to colleges and the IT Council website will include this information as well (forms will be e-mailed and on website.) There is a sub site on the MSU website that has an outdated form which will be taken down this year.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jaime Ross  
Administrative Assistant II  
Office of the Provost