## Information Technology Advisory Committee

November 16th, 2018 (11a-12:30p, Library 209)

### Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckles, Jennifer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver, Ethan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Liedtka, Theresa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denniston, Terry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Loveless, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest, Tyler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Matthews, Matt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman, Yancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron, Dennis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Rumbough, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gao, Lani</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wilferth, Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain, Hemant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wood, Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Parsley, guest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donny Behneman, guest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agenda for Meeting:

- Review of Minutes
- Announcements
- ITAC charge approved by ELT, 10/24/2018
- ITAC web site preview: [https://webtest.utc.edu/information-technology-advisory-council/](https://webtest.utc.edu/information-technology-advisory-council/)
- Other
- UTC IT Strategic Plan - All
- Discussion of priority objectives
- Technology Training Task Force – All

### Summary of action items from previous meeting:

- All - read the draft Strategic Plan in detail (October meeting)
- TL/DG, seek ITAC Charge approval and discuss draft Strategic Plan (October meeting) – completed and approved
- TL/DG/Tyler discuss making service catalog available now, with some suggested purchase guidelines (October meeting)
- TL/DG/MM, discuss and put forward suggestions for other ITAC charter documents (August meeting)

### Summary of action Items from today’s meeting:

- Campus IT - provide refresh model re planned technology life spans (November 2018)
● Campus IT in partnership with Academic Affairs - fix the comprehensive inventory of campus learning spaces (November 2018)
● Campus IT – provide clear definitions of campus learning spaces (November 2018)
  ○ TL note: Should this be assigned to Academic Affairs as well?
● Campus IT – draft sample Classroom policies for ITAC to consider (November 2018)
● Learning Environment Committee - surveys around learning space needs (November 2018)
● Governance - talk at Deans Council/Heads Meeting re: room ownership and support (November 2018)
● Campus IT / ITAC – create a “classroom refresh: budget proposal, for recurring funding, to include in 2019-2020 budget process ahead. Due: 12/17/18. (November 2018)
● Tyler – create and provide a breakdown of how the Student Technology Fee and Online Fee are distributed and spent. (November 2018)
● All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address the upcoming discussion around IT organizational structure as it relates to Partner and Central IT support. (November 2018)
● All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address technology purchasing across the campus. (November 2018)
● All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address the issues of: campus technology training, lecture capture, portfolio use, room and classroom reservations, digital signage and wayfinding. Suggestion made to consider smaller task forces to address these topics and create a recommendation that would flow through the ITAC to the ELT. (November 2018)

Notes from Meeting:

● Announcements:
  ○ Minutes approved & will be posted.
  ○ Charge approved as drafted by Executive Leadership Team.
  ○ Shell of a website is available to review
  ○ Purchased Curriculog (old system through March, training in interim, adopt for ‘19-’20)

● Next Steps on IT Strategic Plan:
  ○ Plan is very drafty at the moment - suggested goals from workshop
  ○ Goals under purview of this body:
    ■ Refresh for classroom, tech, lab, meeting rooms
    ■ Review all IT org, structure, relationships
    ■ Review of IT budget
  ○ What do we need to make effective recommendations around these goals?

● Classroom Technology Refresh:
  ○ List of Rooms (Tony’s Power BI report)
    ■ 452 spaces are from within EMS + Central IT supports
    ■ 193 are “learning spaces” (which are “official”?)
    ■ 83 are general use
      ● Office, Academic Classrooms, Art, Auditorium, Computer Lab, Lab
      ● Meeting Room, Multi-Purpose, Office, Pool, Seminar Room, Special Room
      ● Storage, Theatre
    ■ Academic Classroom - general use anyone can teach there
    ■ General Use - owned by Records
Meeting Rooms - tend to be “Seminar Space” (couches/sofas in room defined by state)

- List of Room Content
  - Some of this stuff Campus IT knows about, but not all things
  - The question of what’s missing per room per building across campus
  - Do a scan of high traffic areas every year to make sure technology works

- List of Last Refresh
- List of Owner
- Support model, physical maintenance, time of need assistance
- Support model, financials
  - What is the first funding from project funds
  - What is the first funding comes from a department

- Agreed upon “refresh schedule”
- Budget needs
- What can Governance do?
  - A policy around refresh?
  - Determining what’s centrally owned & tied into central payment?
  - Locally funded

- Tyler:
  - UTK - if room is not centrally managed, it isn’t centrally funded
  - Not sure if it’s a written policy or not (was told in a meeting)
  - Differential tuition has helped some with technology
  - How do “recurring” funds contribute toward expedited needs?
  - $150k per year for furniture refresh (Kenny T. building toward template model)

- Matt:
  - How is Fletcher funded? Tyler - the gift.
  - If open to other departments, then centrally funded
  - For a dean, it’s about what they can do for funding
  - Opt-in vs. opt-out for departments
  - Do we ask deans now about funding now vs. later

- Donny:
  - For all of these spaces, if the pool is low, what rooms get priority?
  - A need to determine priority of metrics.
  - Furnishings or furniture (podiums, classroom for desktops)
  - Slightly different per room
  - Setting up expectations around costs for that
  - Is that Facilities?

- Dennis:
  - Policy that describes a process for doing it year to year
  - Decide it on a year by year basis

- Theresa:
  - Whether a department wants to fold into a central process
  - Whether a department wants to fund their own refresh on a quicker turnaround
  - Are there enough classrooms to go around to serve the needs of the campus
  - Campus IT will need to provide list of refresh models per type of technology
  - This list will provide basis of financial model
  - Campus IT/Partner IT & relationship therein, distribution of support
- Adding new capital investments & IT to existing list
- A lot of onetime money funds things vs. base budget gets used
  
  **Tony:**
  - Making sure the support model gets looped in upon decisions
  - Will need to rely on others to help inform what goes in rooms in future
  - Learning Environment Committee
  - How support models factors into when things break (off-cycle of refresh)
  
  **Hemant:**
  - Needs to tie to campus budget model
  - Start banking money every year
  - How to get to needs of each department & uniqueness
  - Info + Questionnaires
  
  **Ethan:**
  - How to get at historical budget to get a broad sense?

**Action Items:**
- Campus IT - provide refresh model re planned technology life spans
- Campus IT in partnership with Academic Affairs - fix the comprehensive inventory of campus learning spaces
- Campus IT – provide clear definitions of campus learning spaces
- Campus IT – draft sample policies for ITAC to consider
- Learning Environment Committee - surveys around learning space needs
- Governance - talk at Deans Council/Heads Meeting re: room ownership and support
- Campus IT / ITAC – create a “classroom refresh: budget proposal, for recurring funding, to include in 2019-2020 budget process ahead. Due: 12/17/18.

- Review all Technology Budgets & Purchasing
  - Review: online fee, tech fee, usage (parameters)
    - Online fee by college is easy to get data for
    - Tech fee - 2.8 millions, $58k to library, rest goes to Campus IT
      - Two Walker positions
      - That would require drilling
      - Has moved from shifting positions to infrastructure
      - Matt - typically it’s about the balance left
  - Informational purpose might lead to recommendation from this group
  - Tyler: no resistance to tech fee, but did take a look at online fee
    - $900k of reserves are going into network upgrades
    - Be careful of what the role is

**Action Items:**
- Tyler – create and provide a breakdown of how the Student Technology Fee are distributed and spent.

- Partner Vs Central IT/Organizational Structure
  - Partners: SIM, Library, EMCS, RCOB, Walker, Housing, AuxServ, Facilities, AA, Other?
  - Missing from list: Nursing, Marketing & Communication, Campus Rec/Arena
  - Matt: there should be a baseline of policies/process
○ Theresa: my goal is an equal technology playing field for all faculty and students, regardless of which College they are enrolled or and/or which classroom is used.

○ Disparity/Inequity: support/service vs. things

**Action Items:**
- All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address the upcoming discussion around IT organizational structure as it relates to Partner and Central IT support.

- **Purchase procedures & practices**
  - **Action items:**
    - All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address technology purchasing across the campus.

- **Projects:**
  - Ton of projects (hard IT/infrastructural issues will be recommendations from them)
  - Student Faculty Public Intensive:
    - Training
    - Lecture Capture
    - Portfolio Software
    - Room & Classroom Reservations Systems
  - Technology driving practice/policy rather than the other way around

- Missing:
  - Digital Signage
  - Door Signage
  - Wayfinding
  - Device Management (old task force)

  **Action items:**
  - All – continue conversation and create a plan on how to address the issues of: campus technology training, lecture capture, portfolio use, room and classroom reservations, digital signage and wayfinding. Suggestion made to consider smaller task forces to address these topics and create a recommendation that would flow through the ITAC to the ELT.