Scheduled meeting – 4:00 – 5:00 pm in RCB355
Call to order by Mr. Ken Wester 4:05 pm

Attendance: 10

Mr. Ken Wester	Mrs. Jessica Holloway	Mr. Clay Moore
Mrs. Niki Schwartz	Dr. Debra Hunter	Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman
Mr. Brent Drake	Mrs. Amy Pennington	
Mr. Wyatt Watson	Mrs. Sandy Cheffer	

Not in attendance: 1

Ms. Bernadette Hinkle

First meeting for 2017/2018.

Agenda Item 3 – Discussion of general description, purpose and procedures

Discussed the location and purpose of the Blackboard Org for this committee and recommendation of an I Drive Space for sharing documents for reviews and etc. *Mr. Wester* will develop these areas. Handed out the Draft of the General Guidelines and Procedures document dated 8/31/17 for general discussion, review and comment.

General discussion on all items within the document from all members.
Discussed budgets in general and how they were funded for 2017/2018
Discussed how the Fee Structure may be funding these budgets – more information needed from a
    budget prospective to be sure of allocations.
Discussed that the Technology and Telecom budgets are separate and distinct for their purpose and that
    funds do not move between them. That the reserves associated with them are also specific in their
    purpose.
Discussed that these are budgets not funds to request items from and this committee would be make
    recommendations on items to be added for 18/19 to be reviewed by the Budget Advisory and that
    we needed those recommendations in December 2017 for inclusion.

Major Points:
General Consensus – This committee cannot evaluate packages, services and etc. If a request for
    recommendation comes, it must come with documentation and may require the requestor to
    provide written or verbal justification for risk, cost, and impact.
General Consensus – OIS should be evaluating and only the things of high impact should make it to this
committee. – **Mr. Wester** – OIS already does a significant evaluation of software and hardware
purchases if the requestor follows the process located at https://ois.atu.edu/hardwaresoftware-
purchasing-best-practices/ and requires the completion of a request
https://ois.atu.edu/hardwaresoftware-purchase-application/ . OIS will adjust these procedures and form
to include a check/recommendation that the request will need to go to/through the IT Prioritization and
Impact Committee for recommendation to move forward. - **Mrs. Holloway** - . I also agree that OIS
should evaluate as stated above and things of high impact and/or cost should make it to the committee.
jh 9-1-17

Mrs. Holloway – stated there are many gaps in the process and provided information that last year approximately 800K was spent on software package purchases and many items are bought with a PCard. This causes many small items slip through that may have impact on the University.

Mr. Wester – stated that this was true, but OIS was getting many more requests than previous times and the requesting form areas was improving, although things do and will slip through.

Dr. Abdelrahman –
Need decisions on how and what items get to this committee.
Need refinement on specific procedures and guidelines
Who and how does the Yea/Nay recommendation of items flow back.
> Yea – To requestor, cc – Procurement, OIS, Legal others?
> Nay – To requestor and supervisor of the requestor, cc – Procurement, OIS, Legal others?
VP of Academics and VP of Admin/Finance would be receivers of items affecting the Technology and
> Telecom Budgets.

Dr. Hunter – would like to see more examples of what kinds of things this committee would make recommendations on.

Mr. Watson –   Computer/Technology Replacement plan for departments. Would be willing to give back some budget monies if there was a procedure and budget for providing replacement equipment on a scheduled basis.   Generated good conversation and brought up the additional conversation on the University Computer Replacement Plan that needs to be addressed by this committee. Mr. Wester shared that it would take approximately 700K per year to facilitate a 3-year replacement on Mobile, 5-year replacement on Desktops systems and do this for the entire University.

Mrs. Holloway –   How procurement is being affected daily on software and hardware purchases. Concerns on software purchases that are not being evaluated, but does not want the committee to be tied with all these evaluations. Gaps?

Agenda Item 4 – Meeting Times
Suggested date of every 3rd Thursday from 3:30 – 4:30 PM would not likely be a good time.   Several days where identified as possible conflicts days for other committee meetings.   *Mr. Wester* said he would evaluate other standing committee and general meetings and determine additional sets of times that might work for this committee.   *Mr. Wester* will suggest some dates and times for the September meeting and then the committee will decide on a standing day/time later.

Agenda Item 5 – General round table.
General discussions on various topics concerning needs, purchasing and processes for evaluation and reviews. *Mr. Wester* stressed that we wanted this committee to have a voice and moving forward will be an improvement on items concerning prioritization and impact review. This is an important and relevant process.

Meeting closed at 5:25 PM - kdw