Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee 11/13/17 - RCB355 md-kdw11/15/17 – approved 12/12/17

Scheduled meeting – 2:00 – 3:00 pm in RCB355

Call to order by Mr. Ken Wester 2:02 pm

Attendance: 8

| Mr. Ken Wester | Ms. Bernadette Hinkle | Mr. Brent Drake |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Mr. Wyatt Watson | Mrs. Sandy Cheffer | Mr. Matt Pipkins |
| Dr. Debra Hunter | Mrs. Laury Fiorello | |

Not in attendance: 6

Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman Mrs. Amy Pennington Mrs. Jessica Holloway Mr. Clay Moore Mrs. Niki Schwartz Mr. Chris Rambo

Agenda 2: (Review Minutes)

Discussed minutes from previous meeting and passed the written minutes around for additional review at 2:58 pm received a motion from **Mrs. Cheffer** to approve the minutes as written, second by **Dr. Hunter**. So Moved and Approved by All in Attendance.

Agenda 3: (Review of Blackboard SaaS Proposal)

Mr. Wester - opened the discussion and talked about the proposal from the General Technology Committee and that IT was looking for a recommendation of an identified need and to send on to Budget Advisory as one of the Committees Priority Items. The purpose was to move Blackboard to the cloud to provide redundancy, 24x7x365 access and provide class continuity for when the campus was not operational. The cost of moving to the cloud is approximately 30K in new monies; there is an offset in about 20K of not buying additional hardware to support our current installation and about a 20K value in recovered storage and processing power to the VMWare Virtualization Systems.

Mrs. Cheffer requested we reserve the priority level until we see all priorities this committee would be recommending.

Dr. Hunter wants to be sure we were not recommending the method of use (Classic vs. Ultra), just the need and IT Priority.

Mr. Drake asked to make sure legal was on board with the Cloud Storage of BB Data.

Mr. Watson said he was aware that we had been discussing this for some time and understood the purpose and asked that we go ahead and vote on the recommendation to prioritize and add to the Technology Budget for Budget Advisory review. Motion received, second by **Mr. Drake** So Moved and Approved by All in Attendance.

Agenda 4: (Computer Systems Refresh)

Mr. Wester presented a new spreadsheet (Located in the Committee Working Folder) on a what a VP Area for Computer Refresh would look like. This included the breakdown of Warranty, when new computers would need to be purchased, the \$280.00 per computer surcharge to reserve and the budget over time that it would take to achieve 100% replacement on an ongoing basis.

Ms. Hinkle – was pleased with the information and found it to be helpful from a VP perspective, especially incoming/new as to the computer and budget levels of their area. She requested that we look at breaking this down to department level and provide this information to all VP areas. **Mr. Wester** stated that IT would work on that, although it might take some time.

The group overall was good with this information. There was no further discussion on the budgeting for computer refresh at this time.

Agenda 5: (Round Table)

Mrs. Cheffer and the group wanted to ensure we reviewed the entire 18/19 budget sheet before it goes over to Budget Advisory. **Mr. Wester** stated that would be the full subject of the December 14th Meeting. **Mr. Wester** also stated that there would be continued work with Budget, Procurement and IT on this budget prior to the next meeting.

The group expressed a desire to set a scale for recommendation (1-5) as part of the vote on a product/item to develop a scoring system to be used for Prioritization. We will work on a model and present at the next meeting.

Dr. Hunter asked that we continue to do a thorough review of proposed items to prevent any misunderstandings later on what a product/item was actually for, who it affects and its features before a recommendation becomes finalized.

Mr. Wester recommended that we might consider the time allotment for these meetings based on the agenda; it can be difficult to cover concisely the information needed to recommend in an hour. The committee also needs to attempt to review the materials on the products/items more before the meeting and ask questions that are addressed and then brought to the meeting.

Meeting Closed 3:07 PM