

Scheduled meeting – 10:00 – 11:00 pm in RCB355

**Agenda 1: Call to order by Mr. Ken Wester 10:03 PM**

**Attendance: 9**

Mr. Ken Wester	Mr. Brent Drake	Mr. Wyatt Watson
Mr. Matt Pipkins	Mrs. Jessica Holloway	Mrs. Amy Pennington
Mrs. Laury Fiorello	Dr. Jeff Robertson	Dr. Johnette Moody

**Not in attendance: 3**

Mrs. Sandy Cheffer	Mr. Clinton Hall	Ms. Hinkle
--------------------	------------------	------------

**Agenda 2: (Review/Approval of Minutes)**

**Mr. Wester** asked if everyone had a chance to review November minutes. **Mr. Wester** requested that we take time to review the November Minutes and affirm them at the next meeting.

**Agenda 3: (Chair Recommendation on AssestWorx on December 18)**

**Mr. Wester** started the conversation with a review of the history of the recommendation request, the voting/review process and the eventual recommendation from the Chair back to Mrs. Suzanne McCall, Controller.

They were discussions on why this request came to the IT PIC and delayed for agenda item 5.

**Agenda 4: (Discussion of the Technology Budget Estimate for 19/20 and current budget)**

**Mr. Wester** started the conversation by covering an overview of the issues of how money moves in and out of the Technology Budget, items concerning proration/depreciation schedules and that He was having a meeting with Budget and Accounting in concerns of these processes.

**Mr. Wester** provided information on the budgeting process, how it is funded, how this budget spreadsheet was created and adjusted in the past and how the reserve allocations were being done.

**Mrs. Holloway** also spoke to this spreadsheet and the previous methodologies of allocating funds to and on the sheet.

All said, Mr. Wester made the point that the budget is fluid, difficult to review and that He was working with Budget and Accounting to work out some details on processes and documentation that controls the inputs and outputs of this budget.

Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee  
1/18/19 – RTH456 kdw 2/14/19 Approved by Committee -kdw

**Mr. Wester** said he would also be providing additional information on where IT money is funded from and what budgets to uses.

**Mr. Wester** requested that all members review the EST 19/20 spreadsheet in the January 2019 folder on the I Drive. Look at what is on it, costs and take note the shortfall that would have to be adjusted for.

**Mr. Wester** also commented on the recommendation to the Fee Committee on relocating the 1:00\$ additional fee for IT collected in 18/19 via E&G to the 19/20 AFTSEM/AFT60% budget.

**Mr. Wester** also commented on the recommendation to review the 2015 IBM Bond issue as a possible source of additional funding in 21/22 as it completes its payout.

#### **Agenda 5: (Discussion of the ATU IT PIC Guidelines)**

**Mr. Wester** continued the conversation that started with the review of the Assetworks review. He noted that there is a document (DRAFT) in the 2019 folder on the I drive from 2017 that began to outline a guide and decision conversation on the responsibilities and review processes for the committee. **Mr. Wester** requested that everyone take an open look, understanding that it was a draft from 2017 and make recommendations and comments on how the committee might set some standards and decision flow on what, when and how to review proposals.

**Mr. Wester** asked based on a discussion from information provided on the AssetWorks proposal if the group would desire that He filled in some preliminary information on the review sheet to help better understand the proposal from an IT and budget impact standpoint. **Dr. Robertson, Dr. Moody** both stated they would appreciate the perspective in advance. **Mr. Wester** stated that he would start doing this with diligence to not inject opinion into the review.

#### **Agenda 6: (Round Table)**

**Mrs. Holloway** brought up an example of a review for Priority and Impact that didn't necessarily request funding from IT but should be reviewed by the committee. The Travel Software example would be an appropriate item for review, **Mr. Drake** also commented on where in the University Software/Hardware decision process does the IT PIC committee need to step in to say it needs review and help prevent a lengthy search if it is not likely to receive full approval or has a negative impact. **Mr. Wester** said to review the guideline draft and make a recommendation; He also stated that OIS's review process was also flagging reviews that might need committee review as well. Mr. Wester also brought up an example of software The Link that was under consideration for change, that in his opinion would require review because of its long term history and Staff, Faculty and Student impact concerning change.

Mr. Wester discussed possible additional meeting times and there we no further discussions noted.

**Meeting closed at 10:53 am**