

ITCC Meeting Minutes October 8, 2015

Attending: Thomas Vojta, Roger Weaver, Maggie Trish, Dan Utrecht, Cheryl Ahrens, Al Crosbie, Mark Bookout, Don Howdeshell, Meg Brady, Barbara Rutter, John Singler, Nathan Bookout, Warren Wray, Anthony Petroy, K. Krishnamurthy, John Bax, Jee-Ching Wang, Daniel Tauritz, Fatih Dogan, Ayodeji Alajo, Maciej Zawodniok, Andreas Echert, Walt Branson, Robert Marley, Lori Duncan

Meeting called to order at 4:01 PM.

1. Student IT Fee & how it is used

Started in 1990. Created by UM when they realized it was lagging behind in technology for students.

“Should be used for the expressed using of” Originally it was only charged to on-campus students, but was expanded in 2004 to online students as well.

a. Question: Why is some of the fee being taken away from IT?

i. Answer: *Because of the growth of the student enrollment, our concern is whether or not an increase in students necessarily means the fee for certain services needs to increase as well. Original decision was to hold the IT Fee flat. However, we have decided to put all of the IT Fee revenue into IT. But, this will probably lead to a decrease in IT's overall general funds (GRA).*

b. Question: If IT is already considered underfunded, why are we taking more money away from them?

i. Answer: *We may need to work with IT to reprioritize the needs to determine what really needs to be funded.*

c. Question: Could we be considering funding more base functions & not just strategic funding?

i. Answer: *Certainly*

2. Should IT fund positions in Marketing

Positions were planned to be housed in the colleges. I wouldn't call them marketing positions, but more web development & support. No one is being hired to market the university with IT Fee money.

a. Question: Where did this idea originate?

i. Answer: *Greg Smith's original idea was to hire ~20 students to help with the web support. The disadvantage to this is it would inevitably lead to a lot of inconsistencies, among students & among the colleges.*

b. Question: Where would these positions sit? (outside of IT?)

i. Answer: *No decision yet, but there would obviously be a strong dotted line between the Provost's office, Marketing & IT.*

c. Question: We keep talking about updating our web presence, but it never seems to materialize. Who's accountable for this? How do we monitor it going forward to make sure it actually happens this time? Can it be put in writing?

i. Answer: *Marketing takes the lead, but each unit seems to handle it differently. We are hoping that hiring these positions will help with this.*

3. Grant overhead & IT research support

Research support on this campus is extremely lacking compared to many other universities.

a. Question: Shouldn't some part of the research overhead be dedicated to research support, especially since IT is already over budget?

i. Answer: *Everyone is out to protect their own overhead. If some of it is given to IT, then someone else has to be shorted. We need to possibly reconsider what our distribution looks like. We already have a lot of unfunded mandates, so it's a balancing act.*

b. Suggestion: We also have a problem hiring quality personnel to support Research. Perhaps offer more salary to get them here & hopefully keep them here.

4. Effects of EdTech move on IT budget
 - a. Question: Will moving EdTech effect IT's budget?
 - i. *Answer: If the funding for EdTech stays in the IT Fee, it shouldn't be a problem. But, if that funding changes, it will definitely have a negative effect. We are still working with Dr. Petroy on that.*
 - b. Question: Faculty are concerned that this was done very rapidly & without apparent notice or input from faculty. Why was this move even done?
 - i. *Answer: This was part of the Strategic Plan, Lever 4.1.2. This is what was driving this move. This has been part of the strategic plan for quite a while. Perhaps a refresher communication would have been appropriate.*
 - c. Question: Another concern is that a large part of EdTech's work seems to be on-campus, so does that create a conflict of interest to move it into Global which is focused more on on-line.
 - i. *Answer: We are working on an announcement to clarify the reporting structure.*
 - d. Question: How will the savings from the efficiencies be reallocated?
 - i. *Answer: We are still working on that, but would like to actually see the efficiencies first. We should be able to give much better service.*

5. ITCC input on budget priorities?
 - a. Question: May the ITCC provide input on the budget priorities & how soon would you need that input?
 - i. *Answer: We would need it by December. Walt Branson can be available to attend the next few meetings.*

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.