

**IT Council Minutes**  
**Carrington Hall 203**  
**03/01/2011**

<b>Members Present:</b>	John Catau, Eric Shade, Tammy Janhke, John Maddux, Earle Doman, Carey Adams, Ken McClure, Jeff Morrissey, Greg Rainwater, Kevin Piercy, Sarah Caldwell, Sue Ingram (via ITV)
<b>Guests:</b>	Mark Harsen, Josh Stuppy, Jason Lee, Tim Kilpatrick
<b>Motion of Adjournment</b>	Moved by John Catau; Seconded by Dean Janhke
<b>Called To Order:</b>	3:02 p.m.
<b>Adjourned:</b>	4:38 p.m.

**Action Item:**

- Minutes from January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011 were approved.

**Blackboard 9.1 Transition Update (handout): Kevin Piercy**

In order to bring IT Council up-to-speed on the transition to Blackboard, Kevin presented the Blackboard 9.1 Transition Update handout, which outlines how we will communicate technical and policy changes regarding the transition that will be implemented for the summer 2011 semester. Key date to note is May 21<sup>st</sup> –the “Official Go--Live” date. This is when the University will actually turn off student access to Blackboard 8.0 and switch over to Blackboard 9.1. The timeline in the handout shows that information will be distributed all way up to September 1<sup>st</sup>. Kevin pointed out that a short document is under development to be distributed to all faculty members that will provide instructions on how to migrate Blackboard 8.0 content to Blackboard Learn 9.1. This document will be distributed via a link in the March 17<sup>th</sup> Provost Communiqué. The focus of this transition plan is to most effectively target faculty. Kevin also mentioned that some faculty members have been in a pilot program and these individuals can provide feedback on Blackboard 9.1.

**Notes from Question & Answer Session Following Presentation:**

- Faculty can build in Blackboard 8.0 now and then move it across to Blackboard 9.1.
- Per Kevin, a list of faculty who are in pilot group for Blackboard 9.1 will be provided to Dean Janhke.
- The synch between banner and Blackboard is automatic, and will be handled programmatically to determine which faculty members are using Blackboard so that only their courses are available.
- Banner integration will automatically build the course shell but each faculty member will have to move their own course content.
- John Catau stressed that we should work as much as possible with Faculty before commencement.
- Jeff stated he welcomes any feedback on this plan and Council members can provide such to either Kevin or Jeff.
- West Plains is affected by Blackboard and Sue has her materials.
- Jeff will present this transition plan to Academic Leadership Council, Wednesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup> where 21 copies of the handout will be distributed.

**Wireless Expansion Proposal (handout): Tim Kilpatrick**

In response to Dr. McCarthy’s request to centrally fund wireless access for all faculty members, IT Council formed the Networking Advisory Committee (NAC) and charged them with bringing forth a recommendation.

The NAC consisted of the following individuals:

- Tim Kilpatrick, Director of Telecommunications, (Chair)
- Josh Stuppy, Senior Network Analyst
- Jason Lee, Network Analyst
- Margaret Weaver, Professor, English
- Kayse Malone, Student
- Austin Kramer

Challenges to the campus-wide expansion proposal:

- Must retain the University's wired network.
  - Campus demand too high to be served totally by wireless.
  - Greater information security capabilities exist within the wired infrastructure.
- Limited wireless access coverage and capacity in some facilities on campus.
- Limited staff available to increase wireless coverage and capacity.
- Wireless is less secure than wired.
- Determine if we should limit centrally funded access to only full-time faculty.
  - Should we consider part-time and supply instructors?

Tim stated that the Springfield campus will stay with our current networking architecture to deliver expanded wireless services. Using the model of installing large cell towers is not viable because wireless users may have multiple components and require different protocols, and per Mark Harsen we need to provide coverage to all tools.

The NAC presented a proposal that would:

- Work with stakeholders to identify wireless expansion requirements.
- Establish a priority listing for wireless expansion.
  - Limited by available capital and human resources.
- Develop a 12 month tactical plan: building surveys, wiring technician schedules, other telecommunication/networking projects, etc...
- Procure needed equipment to support the tactical plan (allows for volume purchasing).
- Execute tactical plan.

The costs associated with the NAC proposal are:

- Students:
  - One-time - first year only      \$100,000      (funded from SCUF carry forward)
  - Recurring annually      \$35,000      (increasing by \$5,000 to \$50,000 cap)
    - Recurring Students costs over five years - \$220,000
- AIS:
  - One-time – first year only      \$50,000      (funded via Networking budget)
  - Recurring annually      \$100,000      (funded via Telecomm budget)
    - Recurring AIS costs over five years - \$500,000
- Provost:
  - One-time - first year only      \$50,000      (TBD)
  - Recurring annually      \$47,700      (Covers all full/part-time faculty)
    - Recurring Provost cost over five years - \$238,500
- Total Estimated Costs for 100% Wireless Coverage on the Springfield Campus by 2016 :
  - \$1,158,500

John Maddux put a motion on the table to accept the NAC proposal to expand wireless coverage, which was seconded by Dean Janhke. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

## **FY11 SCUF Proposal Overview (handout and presentation): Kevin Piercy**

Kevin presented an FY 2011 SCUF Funding Overview and provided a handout. Kevin explained that SCUF is funded through the Equipment & Facilities Student Services Fee and discussed how those fees are assessed and the percentage of those fees that funds SCUF. Kevin also discussed how SCUF funding is projected for each fiscal year and gave a comparison between FY 2010 and FY 2011. It is difficult to determine how much SCUF funding will be available to fund proposals because, under the current model, the fee assessment depends upon both the number and type of credit hours taken. There was much discussion about how the percentages and SCUF allotments are determined.

Kevin also explained how the SCUF funds are awarded. SCUF funding is awarded through a proposal system, with the SCUF committee reviewing proposals submitted by campus units. Any funding awarded must be spent in accordance with the proposal or be returned to the central SCUF fund. The SCUF committee votes internally on a funding recommendation to bring forward to the IT Council for approval. The IT Council can determine the goals and priorities that the SCUF committee uses as guidance in preparing their recommendation.

The goals and priorities for FY 2011 were discussed and the IT Council agreed that these goals and priorities for FY 2012 should be retained in full as the following:

- Fully fund the SCUF reserve
- Salaries and benefits for the full-time positions currently funded by SCUF
- Contractual obligations on software
- Student Worker Funding
- Ongoing Commitments and Lifecycle replacements

### **Action Items:**

- John Catau recommended the SCUF committee give guidance to those individuals reviewing proposals.
- John Catau will contact any colleges that didn't prioritize their proposals and have them do so.
- IT Council reviews more closely the fee structure and who is paying into the fees to determine if a restructure or increase is needed next year.

At the next IT Council meeting recommendations for proposal awards from the SCUF Committee will be presented.

### **Other Business**

No other business brought forward.

Respectfully submitted by,

Carol Green  
Administrative Assistant II, to CIO  
Computer Services