Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
1/27/2020 – RPL 325 kdw

Scheduled meeting – 09:00 – 10:00 in RPL 325

Agenda 1: Call to order 9:00 am

Attendance: (7)

Wyatt Watson	Kelli Bates	Ken Wester	Asim Shrestha
Sandra Cheffer	Jessica Holloway	Nathan Kraft	

Via – Conference Phone (4)

Laury Fiorello	Matt Pipkins	*Clinton Hall*	Jeff Robertson

Not in attendance: (3)

Amy Pennington	Brent Drake	*Jessica Brock*

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

Mr. Wester asked about the review of the Minutes from the November 2019 meeting and if everyone was ok with moving forward with them as written. **Mr. Watson** motioned to approve the minutes as written, and this was second by **Mrs. Cheffer** with non-opposed. November 2019, minutes approved.

Agenda 3: (Discussion of the Technology Consideration Matrix)

Mr. Wester talked over the purpose of the need for the matrix and that we still have a lot of work to do in determining a set of values in determining if an item should be considered for funding by the Technology Budget. There are so many aspects for consideration in deciding. **Mr. Wester** has entered a few more GO/NOGO parameters in the spreadsheet for consideration. **Mrs. Holloway** suggested a GO parameter of 80% or more on serving the campus population and more definition on population. *(Documents located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2020\review)*

See the November 2019 Minutes for additional attributes under consideration and discussion.

Mr. Wester asked if everyone could review the Matrix Spreadsheet and the 2017 document for other ideas or changes and suggestions. The budget should be out by March 31, 2020, and we would need this to assist in determining what is added or moved from the budget lines.

Agenda 4: (Discussion on Banner ERP Equipment Options)

Mr. Wester went over the possibilities for the ERP Platform change out and reported that a decision with Administration had been made. IT would move towards the continued implementation of Banner on the On-Premise DELL/VMWare platform, and no new monies would be available unless monies where received from the Governor's requests for additional one-time funding requests. We would proceed with the identified funds from the IT Reserve, 19/20, and or 20/21 allocated budgets in either

doing as much as possible of until the approx. 400K from debt service could be returned to the IT budget for that purpose. $133,000.00 would have to be identified on the Technology Budget to extend the IBM Maintenance, noting that if we finished early, then IBM would return any unused portion.

Mrs. Holloway asked as to why we did not consider moving forward with the Ellucian Proposal. **Mr. Wester** stated two reasons; the 650K continuing cost and the 2026 expiration of Ellucian Banner Agreement would require a decision in 2023 to move away from or stay with Ellucian. The U of A should have the SIS within Workday completed by that time and may be considered as an option. **Mr. Wester** also stated that we did not choose the VMWare Amazon solution due to the costs 1.1M for Amazon hosting and no way of currently funding that possibility. He stated that moving in the direction of DELL/VMWare did allow for future consideration on a Cloud Hosted Solution for all or part of the installation at a later time. The memos are in I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2020\review

Agenda 5: (Current items under consideration for funding)

Mr. Wester identified 3 funding requests that had been sent to the committee for review.

    EMMA – Marcomm (**Mrs. Phillips**) submitted a request dated January 6, 2020, requesting funding of approximately 8269.00. There are still several questions concerning this particular request around whether it is just a funding request or if the transfer of ownership is also requested. **Mr. Wester** is working with **Mr. Carnahan** on verifying usage requirements and if other options exist to accomplish the same tasks as it is indicated in the request that Marcomm is no longer using EMMA as a marketing tool. **Mr. Wester** requests no committee action until additional information is obtained. **Mr. Watson** stated this use to just be done by the departments needing to send mail, and if tracking was not a primary need, we could revert. **Mr. Wester** stated that to be true, but there were limitations (25 name email groups etc.), There had been some policies on mass emailing students and faculty, and when Marketing needed a more significant tool with tracking EMMA was procured and implemented to better track the marketing emails. **Mrs. Cheffer** inquired as to other products that might be available and if funds move with the request. **Mr. Wester** stated that everyone is looking for ways to free up current funds within their budgets and identify products or services that may not relate directly to their mission.

    NuCloud – Marcomm (Mrs. Phillips) submitted a request dated January 7, 2020, requesting funding of approximately 4000.00. We have had a digital campus map for some time, and in 2014, Marcomm went through NuCloud to produce a more accessible map and to improve ADA compliance allowing various overlays. It was noted and **Mrs. Cheffer** confirmed that a Leadership Tech Group is attempting to use the map to create a showcase of accessible building entrances, sidewalks, and accessible parking across campus. **Mr. Wester** stated he was not aware of the current map use or how future access to design and overlays would be accomplished. **Mr. Wester** will reach out to **Mrs. Phillips** to determine if this is just a funding request and how we can show additional University use models and if those would cost service or licensing funding. **Mr. Watson** stated that he believed this to be a marketing and web service and should remain under Marcomm as the map has always been a part of the web site (digitally anyway), **Mrs. Holloway** stated that it had been part of Campus Safety as the map was generated on paper and in brochures as part of the campus parking and building identification**. Mrs. Cheffer** stated that she had also worked with others from Marketing on the paper version. **Mr. Wester**

stated this is one of those examples of a gray area of funding choice as we do currently fund OU Campus (the web site software) and SiteImprove (ADA Web Compliance) and it is used by many different campus users and facilitates both the digital and paper versions of the Map. Although the functional area of Marcomm has oversight of the forward-facing web, its marketing view and has made decisions overtime on what products support that effort. Never cut and dry, Mr. Wester will discuss with Mrs. Phillips further and get back with the Committee.

Chatbot Technology – **Mr. Wester** brought up the discussion of chatbot technology and its possible use within the web sites. **Mr. Wester** stated that he supports the technology, and a number of other universities are using them effectively, but to understand they take a considerable effort in his opinion to be accurate. Although the system that was reviewed was specifically written to Higher Education and contained considerable pre-positioned content that would require less knowledge input.

Mrs. Holloway suggested an RFI (Request for Information) if the University was to proceed forward with such technology.

Mr. Wester states he brought this forward because he was asked to look at if the Technology Budget could fund the initiative. **Mr. Wester** stated he had reservations of funding ability, although if the Technology Fee request of 1.40 was approved that the .40 cent would be to fund that initiative.

NOTE: After the meeting, **Mr. Wester** received communication that the funding request had been recently removed from the Technology Fee request and that if the initiative were to happen, it would be funded from the specific area using the technology.

Agenda 6: (Round Table)

Time ran out.

Agenda 7: (Close) Meeting closed at 10:05 am