UAA University Technology Council
Meeting Minutes
November 22, 2019
8:30 am – 10:30 am
SSB 120

Attendance:
Present: Joe Fugere, IT Services; John Zetterman, IT Services; Andrea Miller, IT Services; Veronica Howard, ACDLITE; Dan Anteau, College of Arts and Sciences; Ryan Belnap, Prince William Sound Community College; Ian Bushell, Kodiak College; Joel Condon, Community & Technical College; David Fitzgerald, College of Business and Public Policy & UAA Faculty Senate; Brad Myrstol, College of Health; Kim Riggs, College of Engineering; Mike Robinson, Consortium Library; Alyona Selhay, Student Affairs; Paul Wasko, Academic Innovations & eLearning

Excused:
Absent: Jennifer Pederson, Kenai Peninsula College;

1. Meeting called to order – 8:31 am
2. Review and approval of agenda
   a. Reviewed and approved
3. Review and approval of past meeting minutes
   a. Approved
4. Discussion items
   a. Interim CIO – Andrea Miller
      i. Ben Shier was announces as interim CIO. Ben starts on December 2nd
   b. STF Budget Draft – Veronica Howard
      i. Estimated budget:
         1. Revenue estimate is based on the decline in enrollment. Fees have not changed, but student tech fee received is effected by declining student enrollment
         2. Carryforward cannot be swept into the general fund
         3. Projection is in the red, and it is a very tight budget
         4. Opting not to fund innovation grants, or equipment lifecycle. Equipment lifecycle is offset this year by recycled ER equipment
      ii. Historic information:
1. This budget has struggled over central services, which is the bulk of the allocation. If we reduced the allocation to central services, it would affect services.

2. STF was previously used to provide block grants to individual groups and departments to use on student related technology. FY18 and FY19 also had the Innovative Student Technology Fund (ITSF), a program that fosters innovative uses of technology to benefit students. ITSF was funded from STF carryforward and is currently discontinued due to declining funds.

3. In the past the committee has discussed what is appropriate and student focused

   iii. Discussion and questions:

   1. Contractual services are increasing in cost over the years. We can only predict that these services will continue to increase over the years. With decreasing funds this creates more challenges, and line items previously covered are being eliminated. Because the predicted revenue is low, it may be a time to discuss what items to adjust or remove from the budget entirely.

   2. Which items are tied up in contracts: Microsoft Campus Agreement, Kaltura, and Blackboard

   3. Tech spend on our campus is low compared to national average

   4. Tech Support Center (TSC) – is that a flat amount? How is that number decided?

      a. The allocation covers about 50% of the TSC budget and started around FY11 to support students directly and faculty who are supporting students There have been discussions on combining the three lines.

      b. The extended hours and priority support line was supporting the idea that broader hours were needed. Priority class support was based upon online teaching – can jump to the front of the line for expedited service.

         i. A lot has changed since then. The TSC now have Tier 3 support to do priority support for classes. There may have been some software support but it is now primarily people.

      c. Looking at FY21: restructuring the three line items to one. It is a possibility – one item and define the services associated.
Merits and drawbacks: three line items highlight different services with that source of funding, but with the three separate line items it invites discussion on whether the individual services are needed.

Request for IT to provide reports on what the funds were spent on. Information for some expenses are available for committee to review.

Discussion on whether to keep TSC line items separate

- Line items may not match what is actually provided. If the spending can be broken out, it makes sense. However, if not, updating the lines to reflect current usage.
- Descriptions are incorrect. Committee would like to review wording at next meeting.
- Does having the items separate make any difference on how IT makes operating decisions? If we cut the 8-5p, IT will make decisions to operate but not necessarily cut 8-5p services. When we change these lines, we are steering a barge. We will not know for another year or so what the outcomes will be.

Comment that the committee is being asked to make decisions on an abstract idea of spending. We do not know exactly what the impact is on students for each line item.

Enrollment trend is going to continue to decline. We can expect continued challenges with enrollment.

There could be changes on how IT on this campus is funded and managed. It would behoove us to understand how these monies are spent.

- There has been a lot of change on campus. It is hard to assume that the line items on the budget translate to the same service as they did years ago. How did each line item help or hurt students. Would it be possible to have at each meeting one or two of the groups provide reports on what they do is translating to the monies that they are receiving?
  - Metrics for TSC are available and Joe will be presenting on them at a future meeting.
  - Library funds originally to pay for web-based databases instead of CD-ROMs. Since then the funds have been reallocated to a
set of online tools for student success. 60,000 eJournal titles and eBooks, search function on library home page, etc. Thing selected that were very student facing and tools.

i. How do you measure the investment was successful? Survey that goes out to library users. Hard metrics are tricky

ii. Is there any comparison data available of other institutions spending on Library services? There is data on the spend on IT services in libraries, but it is tied to hardware. The Library has not seen any data with such granularity. We do okay as a university overall on the online services the library provides

iii. The STF allocation is only about 20% of the total costs and goes towards a specific set of tools

8. All of these items relate to the idea asked at the beginning related to the need of an orientation and greater understanding of these items

9. It seems like over the last few years the figures seem fixed, although the revenue is not. Suggestion for the items to be proportionally allocated

10. Projection for spring is currently down almost 18%. Realistically we have to be conservative budgeters. We should be considering revising the budget. We can hope enrollments pick up, but we would be naive to think they will

a. Projection could use a better calculation – Andrea open to feedback on how to get a more accurate revenue projection

b. If the University is in a spiral, we can help that by lowering costs now and being able to carryforward the funds into next year. Not against being conservative. Expected revenues are going to be lower than what is projected on the budget.

c. If we are having lower enrollment, so would there be less calls to IT? At the same time, IT is underfunded, so is this an opportunity to provide better service. Do we lower funding and continue to provide the same level of service or provide more?

d. We do need more data, but being able to wait to get the information and make a later decision on spending that effects department’s ability to run

e. Point that committee has historically voted on line items, and waited for more information on others
f. Opinion that the safe place to be in budget projections, is $24k less than what is currently projected

iv. Review of line items:

1. IT Open Computer Labs:
   a. There are two IT ran labs: one in the Library with 24 computers and one in SMH with 16, which are staffed by student workers. Staffing does not cover all open hours
   b. Previously we had five labs, a few years ago the number of labs decreased to two to decrease costs
   c. Expense goes to staffing and management of student workers, and lifecycle replacement of computers every five years. Line item includes portions that go towards the five-year replacement
   d. There are also supported labs ran by departments across campus. Are there opportunities to share the services? The Supported Lab service provided funds to open the labs to use outside of the department

2. TSC – three line items – covers about 50% of the running costs of the TSC. There is a great deal of upper administrative pressure to not decrease those services. Those services are going to remain, and are more static. These services are critical to our students
   a. Address the idea of lower enrollment means lower calls. Students do not like to get on the phone. 25% of calls are students. However, in the spring we are rolling out live chat, which is what students prefer. We are expecting to see an increase in tickets when that occurs
   b. We are also focusing on “shifting left” or having more issues resolved by the TSC with first call resolution rather than being done by more expensive technicians
   c. For the techs that are freed up, they are able to focus on more proactive projects than reactive projects
      i. How do you see proactive advanced techs working?
         1. Right now, we use committees such as UTC and ACDLITe to get feedback
         2. We have a project board for projects such as improving the network speed, and others that directly affect students and teaching
3. We are kicking off a customer experience (Cx) project to get feedback directly from our students, faculty, and staff on needs and wants

4. On infrastructure side: The College of Engineering is piloting a virtual lab where students can access the lab environment from remote locations

d. Forecasting that IT will not see calls decrease. At the point we see program changes, yes we will probably see lowered calls, but in the interim we are projecting to see an increase

e. Question on Bring Your Own Device (BYOD): IT supports BYOD for students

3. DSS – towards tech for student accessibility

4. Electronic Library Services – would like to come revisit due to how critical it is

5. Managed print services – provides access to printing for students

a. Fees go to support hardware: printers, toner, paper, and labor to set it up and support it. Fees pay for those printers. As students use these services, a portion of those fees go back into the program

b. 75% of students who receive the fees do not use it. However, 25% of students use university printing, and are high intensity users

c. What would happen to the program if the STF allocation was zeroed out completely? Students would have to go home to print, prices would need to be increased, or IT would have to partner with a company, like Kinkos, to get printing on campus

d. There are 56 stations including community campuses. We have looked at the data for printer usage and operating costs, as well as geographic differences, i.e. how difficult is it for a student to print if there is not a printer in PSB. There are places we could merge print stations that are located near each other

e. Is there a way to run the program for less, such as lowering the allocation credit to student?

i. IT is for reducing footprints of the program
ii. The biggest improvement in printing is not the availability of printers, but the ability to print from their own device

iii. Of the expense, the majority is spent on equipment and toner

f. If this line item was decreased to $30k, what would IT do? IT would remove print stations. It is a good start to the process, but IT would want some guidance from the committee to know how to proceed with reductions

i. Multiple low use computers in the same area – volume and location

g. Move to lower budget for Managed Print by $5000. Seconded. None opposed

h. Start thinking about implications of lowering student allocation and what that would do to utilization and revenues

6. Formal vote on the budget: Move to approve budget as amended. Seconded. None opposed

c. IT Consolidation Status (Information Technology Council) – Andrea Miller

i. No current updates. Message from Beverly Shuford, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, is that consolidation is currently on hold, and Chancellor Sandeen needs IT at UAA to properly act as CEO of the University. There has been no additional movement to consolidate IT

d. Seawolf Tech Portal Launch – will be covered at the January meeting

e. Supported Lab Program – Joe Fugere

i. These are labs ran by departments that meet certain criteria and receive regularly lifecycle equipment replacement and sometimes additional spending allocations

ii. Utilization reports are ran every semester. If a lab does not meet thresholds it is placed on probation for the semester. If it does not pass at the end of probation, it is removed from the program

iii. Labs usage is declining. Many labs have been removed from the program due to low utilization. There are six labs currently supported

iv. This allocation goes toward lifecycle replacement every five years. The line item for lifecycle did not pay completely for the replacement but would go towards it. Operating allocations were used in other areas of operations

v. Question as to if this program should be sunset.
1. This would hurt the labs who are up for lifecycle in the next two years.

2. We do have a solution for this. There are labs in the University Center and Eagle River Campus that have been or are scheduled to close. The computers in these labs are less than two years old. What we propose is to use these computers to lifecycle upcoming labs and give them notice of the discontinuation of the program.
   a. 36 all in ones and 44 desktops

3. The expense cut would go to the subsidy to the lab. It is not cutting the lab.

4. Question if all students should be subsidizing specialty computer labs used by specific students
   vi. Motion to follow recommendation to move towards discontinuing service. Seconded. No opposition.

5. New Business
   a. Three items requested for future meeting:
      i. Questions about Bb access to non-credit courses
         1. Veronica has information on this from ACDLITe that she can send
      ii. University decision on licensing for the Adobe Creative Suite and Acrobat 12
         1. Request to investigation into Adobe Acrobat being the gold standard of accessibility. Another department has switched over to BluBean Revue If looking into the licensing, compare to alternative
         2. Registrar’s office has found that making PDF forms fully accessible are tremendously labor intensive
      iii. Differential distant course fees between community campuses and main campus. Our students pay considerably more than community campuses students. Interested in metrics and data
   b. Request information for meetings sent ahead of time

6. Meeting adjourned – 10:39a

Action Items:
- Put together information on actuals spending on FY19 - Andrea
- Set up times for different areas to report on their spending: ITS, DSS, and Lib - Andrea
- Send out data ahead of time - Andrea

Future Meeting Dates:
- January 24, 2020
• February 28, 2020
• March 27, 2020
• April 24, 2020