

Scheduled meeting – 10:00 – 11:00 in RTH 456

Agenda 1: Call to order 10:04 am

Attendance: (6)

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Wyatt Watson | Ken Wester | Brent Drake |
| Amy Pennington | Jessica Holloway | Nathan Kraft |

Via – Conference Phone (0)

Not in attendance: (8)

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Laury Fiorello | Matt Pipkins | <i>Clinton Hall</i> | Jeff Robertson |
| Kelli Bates | Asim Shrestha | Sandra Cheffer | <i>Jessica Brock</i> |

Visiting: (1)

Steve Milligan

Agenda 2: (Review Previous of Minutes/Meetings/Activities)

Mr. Wester asked about the review of the Minutes from the February 2020 meeting. **Mrs. Holloway** motioned to approve the minutes as written, and this was second by **Mr. Watson** with non-opposed. February 2020, minutes approved.

Agenda 3: (Discussion of the Technology Consideration Matrix)

Mr. Wester started the discussion with a review of what the matrix was for and how he has gone about creating it. He then began to go through the latest version (R2) located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2020\February\Review and describe the methods of scoring and the results of that scoring. There was a lot of discussion on the Pros and Cons of what to score and how to score and if even scoring was necessary beyond a certain point. **Mr. Watson** suggested that the final scoring be broken into three categories with an emphasis on the University perspective.

1. Should we do this
2. What is the Priority from the University
3. What are the costs both real and soft

He would also like to change the Go-No terminology to this specific item/product vs. item as listed on the Go-No Tab currently. This started the additional conversation on whether the Committee should be concerned with which product was chosen, but only with the fit into the Technology Budget and Impact.

Mrs. Pennington suggested that the decision of which product was with the Functional Area, **Mrs. Holloway** stated that in many of the products, the RFP process was used to determine which product and would not be within the prevue of the Committee to consider. **Mr. Wester** agreed and stated that

Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
2/26/2020 – RTH 456 and via WebEx kdw

IT did not want to get into the decision outside of priority, impact, and cost concerning any product. Products belong to the functional users, and only they can determine if it is the proper solution for the process/purpose being addressed.

Mr. Wester would add a column to the spreadsheet, notating if an RFP process had been used.

More discussion, review, and viewpoints need to be considered as there was not enough attendance to create a quorum on the overall subject.

The group reviewed several of the products in the d spreadsheet discussion, and **Mr. Wester** asked to move on to the next item on the agenda due to time constraints.

At this point, it is a start and puts into focus a Go, No-Go review, and overall score to evaluate.

Mr. Wester moved on to the Software Contract Review-Draft-R1 Spreadsheet located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2020\February\Review and asked everyone to please take some time and look at the items on this sheet and using column L to identify the immediate review need by April 2020 as these products marked in the color as expiring and up for review before this budget period ends. Most of these items have a minimum of 30 day notices for termination or reduction in qty/users etc.

| | | |
|------------------------|--|----------|
| Review For Continuance | | FY 19/20 |
| | | FY 20/21 |
| | | FY 21/22 |

Mr. Wester asked the representatives present to look at their ownership of these products and discuss with their respective areas to determine if changes are needed or if the termination is possible.

Mr. Watson said he was looking at SAS under the AAINEQ line as a possible item to revert to the departmental budget.

Mr. Drake asked about Clean Address, and several stated that it was more widely used that just Advancement areas.

Agenda 4: (What if no fee increase occurs)

Mr. Wester stated that he submitted a comment to the Budget Advisory group on the impact of the Technology Budget not receiving the requested fee during the 20/21 period. This is that response:

If Technology's request for a fee for 20/21 is not approved, the following would need to be taken into consideration.

The Technology Budget is mostly a budget for recurring subscriptions and maintenance (many functional area products), and they are contractual. These items have a natural and progressive increase each year, similar to the cost of living increase "COLA." These increases vary by product from 0% - to 8% and some products up to 25% (rare, but we have one now), to support these increases with no budget increase means something else on the budget has to give. There are only 4 or 5 discretionary lines on the budget, and they are related to IT (Networking, Security, DataCenter and Systems Maintenance, Storage and Wireless) and Campus Security Systems. These lines are to provide ongoing maintenance and identified replacements during a budget cycle, and if funds have to be reduced on these lines, then more deferred maintenance and non-replacements occur and eventually build up into

Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
2/26/2020 – RTH 456 and via WebEx kdw

a core systems issue. The lack of appropriate funds also increases pressure back to functional areas to decrease technology use that may be assisting efficiencies in their respective areas.

The effect also impacts saving monies through balance transfers into reserves for emergencies and building funding for larger projects such as the ERP Equipment and Core Network replacements (Capital Planning).

Mr. Wester explained to the Committee that the Technology Budget Contractual items have a yearly increase and that the budget could not support the continued absorption of that increase and continue to expect the items on the spreadsheet not to be affected and an eventual decision to reduce the items on that spreadsheet and that this situation makes the reviewing of renewals and user counts even more necessary than before. He also explained that the only discretionary spending lines were related to IT systems that are deferred if not addressed with funding.

Mr. Watson asked if we should split this budget into a contractual budget and an IT budget for simplicity. **Mr. Wester** stated that is how it started years ago, but under the direction to create the scenario to identify funding for all items and to create a long term funding model, it was this budget that begun that process, and it is in his belief that if we were to split the budget back out, the funding for these items would dissipate from consideration and we would revert to traditions on no identified funding sources for these IT lines.

Mr. Wester also stated that the Maxtrix for funding change supported the requests for Emma, NuCloud, and Blackboard Ally, but we would need to review once we know for sure if the fee change is approved or not and what the budget savings from 19/20 might look. So any decisions on these items are tabled for now.

Mrs. Pennington asked if Student Affairs could submit additional information on EMMA as they were listed as one of its users. **Mr. Wester** stated yes and that he would add the information to the February review folder.

Agenda 5: (Roundtable)

Nothing additional at this time

Agenda 7: (Close) Meeting closed at 11:10 am