University Council on Technology

University Council on Technology
1/31/97Minutes
3:00 p.m. to 5:00.p.m.
319 Kent Student Center
Kent Campus

<u>Present:</u> Catherine Bakes, Johnnie Baker, David Baumgartner, Ali Bliss, James Boyd, Dave Cannon, Helen Carpenter, Raymond Craig, Lowell Croskey, Rosemary Du Mont, Peggy Doheny, Alan Evans, Paul Farrell (Chair), Barbara Hanniford, Alice Iden, Larry Jones, John Kerstetter, Bob Griffith for Terry Kuhn, Dewitt Latimer (Secretary), Pamela Mitchell, Bruce Petryshak, Pam Ramey, and Darrell Turnidge

<u>Absent:</u> Roberta Sikula and Denise Zelko

I. ***Dr. Paul Farrell (Chair)***, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.
II. **Minutes:** The minutes of the December 13, 1996 meeting were approved as submitted. Past Council minutes and agendas can be found at http://www.kent.edu/UCT.
III. Informational Items
   a. SPSS Campus License - this information can be obtained from the webpage. If access is not available to you it can be copied from one of the student labs.
   Peggy Doney stated that she tried to get it and it was not on the web
   Dewitt Latimer confirmed this but stated that it will be.
   b. Update on dial-up services - **Bruce Petryshak** stated that 96 more ports were going to be ordered soon in addition to the 96 they already have. The additional cost is approximately $1,000 per port capital cost and $350.00 per port per year in operating costs. ***Paul Farrell*** asked if the T1 lines are more cost effective. ***Bruce Petryshak*** stated that the T1 lines carried a slightly more expensive up front cost, but when you considered the support cost associated with managing a large pool of lines they are actually less expensive in the long run.
   c. Update on backbone project - ***Paul Farrell*** asked about the current status. ***Paul Farrell*** talked with Ilee Rhimes and said that there was no problem getting the internal intra-building committee reports.
   d. Faculty Senate Executive Committee minutes - the minutes relating to the composition of University Council on Technology were distributed.
   e. The Distance Learning Policy Report was distributed to and will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and then be distributed to other groups.
   f. ***Dewitt Latimer*** distributed a letter from the Telecommunications Study Committee. Compass Consulting International Inc. has be retained by the

University to draw up a RFF and develop a RFP. Every department will be interviewed. Margie Malone would like this Council to help. **Paul Farrell** said that the deans will select 5 to 10 people from their college for input.

Pam Ramey asked to what extent the regional campuses were involved. **Dewitt Latimer** stated that it only involved the main campus phone system because their contract with Ameritech expires. They are looking for the most cost effective company to go with. Dewitt also stated that Compass has worked with other universities. **Greg Seibert** stated that regional campus has their own contracts and they are not replacing equipment at the regional campuses. A separate study for video conferencing will be done and it will include the regional campuses

IV. New Business
  A. Role of Council - **Paul Farrell** went over the philosophy of the Council **Dewitt Latimer** asked how we felt we were doing, too fast, too slow. It was stated that the Council has a strong role to the strategic plan, strong support to UPBAC and the EO's. There is a need for a clear, concise plan in order to obtain funding for new technology **Rosemary Dumont** stated that she felt the commitment to technology was outstanding. **Dewitt Latimer** stated that there is very good verbal communication. **John Kerstetter** stated that a group this large can make impact on independent groups, John questioned how the information would be funneled. **Paul Farrell** stated that the information would be funneled to the standing and ad hoc committees reporting to UCT and from these to the Vice Presidents.
  B. Role of Standing Committees - **Dewitt Latimer** stated that one coherent, creditable plan needs to be brought together. **John Kerstetter** stated that a short term as well as a long range plan is needed.
  C. **Lowell Croskey** stated that he recently received a call to begin capital planning for 1998. Now is the time to get the plan focused and ready for submission. A recap of the work in progress on campus backbone is needed and then a decision on how to proceed with phase three and where to go from there. Private and local funds are available, but we can't tell how much money we should be asking for because we need a focus and strategic plan for new initiatives to be funded. **Bruce Petryshak** stressed that operational expenses are critical and need to be put in. **Lowell Croskey** stated that capital was easy to get, but how to are we going to maintain for 3, 5 and 7 years with no way to upgrade. **Rosemary DuMont** stated that are we just going to have rooms with no equipment. **Lowell Croskey** stated that moveable equipment is not considered. Capital money cannot be spent on equipment that lasts only 3 to 5 years. **Rosemary DuMont** stated that we can have rooms and servers but no equipment. **Lowell Croskey** said that the Regents won't allow money to be distributed unless they have the equipment needed for be functional for operation. Lowell stated that he doesn't know how things merge together and has no idea of what goes together. There is no way of accessing work being done. Ilee updates on what is or has been done. We need long term planning instead of asking what has been done and where we are going.

  Points of both NISS and ACS studies need to be put on the web page Capital requests need to be handled separately. A placeholder needs to be in effect in University budgeting process and decide what to do later. We

need answers with logic backing it up. We need to know where we are going. Identification within technical areas needs to be made.

The minimum capital basic renovation is $500,000. We should be prepared to ask for more than the $500,000. Instead of thinking of this as being on-line for phase 3, we need to be thinking phases 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Paul Farrell asked how we initiate this. **Lowell Croskey** suggested that we be told what Kent is doing. Too much is being done over every ones head. We need to have plans brought in and shown to us so we know where things stand and what has been done. We need a full understanding of classrooms that have been converted, we need to know which department is ready next because they don't know.

Academic Computing needs to neatly present progress on this. They need to know when it is going to be done and importantly where we are going without time lapses. **Dewitt Latimer** stated that we are ready to go. Lois is sending out notices with $800,000 in house bill money, $400,000 to instructional technology and$400,000 added to match. **Rosemary DuMont** is looking for suggestions to fund technical grants.

Paul Farrell stated that we need to identify where we are by March 14, 1997. Rosemary DuMont , Dewitt Latimer, Bruce Petryshak and Paul Farrell will get together to find out. In summary we need drafts of what is done and what needs to be on the web page. There was discussion on the roles of the different committees, standing committee to look at reports and review the procedures and priorities, and e-mail as a positive step to communicate. We need to brainstorm.

V. Old Business
   A. Bylaws -- It was put into a motion and accepted without any objections that a motion could be made and voted on at the same meeting since the bylaws have not yet gone to the Board of Trustees for approval.
   B. Ad-hoc committee on remote access -- Reviewed and approved Bruce Petryshak's proposal to establish an ad hoc task force to study and propose funding and service model for dial-up remote access. The membership was amended to include the chairs of the three standing committees.
   C. Ad-hoc committee on networking -- **Paul Farrell** stated that is might be better to have an ad-hoc committee. He asked if the UCT felt that it is worthwhile to break out the network component from the UIS. This committee would take up where other committees such as the intrabuilding wiring committee leave off. It was agreed that an ad-hoc committee for networking should be established.
   D. Ad-hoc committee on technology training -- **Barbara Hanniford** discussed the background that lead to this proposal and noted that she had spoke with Tom Jones, co-chair of the Faculty Professional Development Center planning committee. Council members were concerned that the committee's scope could be too broad and that a focus on basic computer applications would be the most manageable.

   It was put to a motion and voted on unanimously to change the recommended structure of the committee to include the following:

- Barbara Hanniford (chair)

- 3 faculty members *nominated* by Faculty Senate

- 2 representatives of academic units, appointed by the Provost

- 1 representative from each other University division

- 2 representatives from UCT

- 1 regional campus representative

- 1 representative from Library and Media Services

- 1 representative from Human Resources Development

- Director of UIS (ex-officio)

- Director of ACT (ex officio)

- Director Distributed Learning (ex-officio)

Barbara Hanniford will post to the listserve an amended version of the proposal with the change of scope and change in structure indicated. With that understanding, the Council approved the motion to establish this ad hoc committee.

- E. Ad-hoc committee on research computing -- This was tabled until the next meeting.
- F. Standing committee on Distributed Learning - It was put to a motion and voted on unanimously that a standing committee on distribute learning be established. Membership will include Rosemary Dumont as Chair with open membership and the current membership of distributed learning-faculty development committee.
- G. Standing committee on Information Systems - It was put to a motion and voted on unanimously that the membership will include two UCT members and add the 3 ex officio members,
- H. Standing committee on Academic Computing -- Tabled until the next meeting.
- I. The membership was amended to include two representatives of the University Council on Technology as members and the chairs of the standing committees as ex-officio members on all committees.

- VI. Spring Meeting Schedule

  March 14, 1997 3:00 p.m. Room 319 KSC

  April 25, 1997   3:00 p.m. Room 319 KSC

- VII. Adjournment

  A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

c: Provost Myron Henry

VP Ilee Rhimes
President Carol Cartwright