

# **University Council Technology Standing Committee**

Minutes January 24, 2013 2:30 pm

MEETING CALLED BY	Laura Spray, Chair
TYPE OF MEETING	Monthly Meeting
FACILITATOR	Mary Hardin
NOTE TAKER	Margaret Canzonetta
ATTENDEES	Members Present: Linda Barrett, Mary Hardin, Chris Kuhn, E. Stewart Moritz, Phyllis O'Connor, Jim Sage, Anthony Serpette, Alicja Sochacka,  Guests: Margaret Canzonetta (recording secretary), John Savery and Dr. Scott Randby  Absent with notice: Aimee DeChambeau, Alvaro Rodriquez, Laura Spray, Susan Testerman

# **Agenda topics**

## **CALL TO ORDER**

DISCUSSION	Mary Hardin called the meeting to order. The December 18, 2012 meeting minutes were approved with no changes. The minutes have been posted on the UC Sharepoint site.

# STUDENT TECHNOLOGY SUB COMMITTEE

	Jim suggested that the Student Technology Subcommittee engage with Jim Tressel to
	make sure they are providing technology for recruiting and training. He also felt that
	they need to do a better job with effectively communicating with PC support across
DISCUSSION	campus. It was suggested that a news hub be created, websites get updated, and
	postings be made to social media sites to make everyone aware about what's going on.
	He is working with institutional marketing and the web team on how to push info to
	web sites. Also, they are finding a way to fund a small group of students to do R&D

and skunk works. For example, Windows 8 -- some students really know it well. We need to expand on this opportunity.

Jim also spoke about the way-finding application which is a touch screen primarily for new students. He is already talking with Parking Services about a gps and a bus locator. John commented that there is an accessibility issue for those using a wheelchair. They are working with the digital signage committee on the issues.

There was also a discussion about the poor performance of DARS. Jim will talk with Tressel and Sherman to see if we want to do something with this problem.

Jim suggested that maybe the emerging technologies group should be put together with the library group. Phyllis reported that the library group has released a blog. Phyllis will let them know that the library group is out there and perhaps they could meet in the emerging technologies room at the library.

# ADVISORY PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

# DISCUSSION

Mary reported that Aimee met with the project management committee once and is trying to understand how it all works. Jim noted that when he started at the University, IT was trying to decide what to do so an advisory committee was formed to decide which projects we would be doing and when. Jim believes the committee works well. The committee in turn reports to a steering committee.

## ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY SUB-COMMITTEE

## DISCUSSION

Scott Randby, representing CCTC, attended the meeting as a guest to discuss the charges of the Academic Technology Subcommittee and the CCTC. He indicated that he felt the two groups needed to get the charges worked out. The academic workgroup is doing to same thing as the fully functioning CCTC should be doing. We need to figure out how they fit together. Jim indicated that CCTC was formed before the University Council and the thought was that all academic matters should stay with the faculty senate. University Council is intended to focus on academic support matters. There is a gray line between what we are doing with academic technology. Jim felt that it may make sense to take the academic work that we are doing and give it to CTCC. Scott indicated that they had a meeting yesterday and they would like to make sure faculty has the technology that they need, have a uniform way to get it, keep it up to date, and get it if they don't have it. If we need to look at the structure of the CCTC, they will go to Faculty Senate to get it. He would prefer to work with more technology folks. He has no suggestions right now. John indicated that they are trying to meet faculty needs with textbooks, ebooks, teaching. They have an idea

for faculty byod. Jim noted that byod is clearly a trend. It would be nice to know what the faculty thinks about this. We should support their decisions. Stewart responded that the faculty might have no idea what you are talking about. It is something CCTC wants to look at it. Jim stated that he has not been active with CCTC and felt that he needed to reengage and John should also be engaged in the committee. It was agreed to take a subset of each group and take the charges, tweak it and take it back to UC steering committee. The CCTC charges should also be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Scott will be organizing a meeting for February 13. The whole committee will be there. Mary will send Scott a list of the academic committee members that will be attending the meeting.

#### MISCELLANEOUS NEW BUSINESS

Mary reminded everyone that they are invited to attend University Council steering committee meetings.

Chris asked if there were any new developments on the street facing displays discussed at the previous meeting. Jim indicated that there was nothing new and that the digital signage committee will probably be working on the wayfinding program at this time. Kiosks will be replaced but there is a lot of pressure with managing the budget.

Jim indicated that there is a lot of work engaging with all the colleges, identifying which courses and certificates they want to put on line. They want to first serve traditional students to help with retention, and then secondarily to serve audiences off campus. MOOC work is being done by the colleges. IT functions as the enablers and supporters.

## DISCUSSION

Jim reported that there is a lot of talk about data warehousing. We recently purchased software from Oracle.

The part of technology that concerns Jim the most is the network. The demands are exploding. Today there are approximately 15,000 people connected with multiple devices which automatically grabs wifi. Also, there are many buildings like in Wayne College and the Student Union where there are dead zones. They are considering putting data systems in buildings that have these problems. They would also like to convince cell providers to build something closer to campus. The city engaged a group called One Community to help with the issue and it failed. They thought they could put technology on telephone poles, but First Energy would not allow it. They are not sure how to mount the technology.

There is also a lot of talk about shared services in Ohio. There are 620 high school systems and 22 information technology centers that provide services. We are talking with Neonet on how we can all work together. There is the possibility of building a network operation center with Neonet that would share with cities, counties, schools, universities.

Jim also indicated that he would like the University to be more proactive when there are warning systems of network problems. IT lost some network staff and Jim was told that he could fill four positions within the entire IT department. IT spending has been flat and headcount is down. We are looking at benchmarking with other universities. Chris asked about upgrades to the network. Jim told leadership team that the network needs to be very powerful. Agile Networks are building wireless all over state. Fiber optic is going to be replaced by wireless.

John reported that Springboard had some issues with performances with the new upgrade. It was fixed with hot fixes and they are sending patches.

Jim spoke about two pockets of activity to increase revenue and sales. A framework for colleges has been created to generate revenue. Dave Cummins is working on ideas to lower costs.

Mary suggested that the Committee should try to be involved in some of the decision making of IT initiatives. Jim suggested he could get copies of the rfps and members could get involved with whatever they interested in doing.

Phyllis indicated that the Digital Assets Steering Committee has recommended to the Provost that we purchase epress, a publishing platform to highlight faculty publications. The law department is currently using it. The Provost response was to organize a presentation to publicize and get feedback. The CCTC should be invited to give feedback.

The next meeting is February 21, 2013.