Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
9/15/17 - RCB355

Scheduled meeting – 1:00 – 2:00 pm in RCB355

Call to order by Mr. Ken Wester 1:04 pm

Attendance: 8

Mr. Ken Wester	Ms. Bernadette Hinkle	Mr. Brent Drake
Mr. Wyatt Watson	Mrs. Jessica Holloway	Dr. Debra Hunter
Mrs. Amy Pennington	Mr. Clay Moore	

Not in attendance: 3

Mrs. Sandy Cheffer
Mrs. Niki Schwartz
Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman

Agenda 2:

Discussed minutes from previous meeting and received a motion from Mr. Watson to approve the minutes as written, second by Dr. Hunter. So Moved and Approved by All in Attendance.

Agenda 3: 1:11 PM

Mr. Whorton came in and presented the Kauli Ready Business Continuity Software:

Major Points:

$9500.00 per year, paid from Public Safety – No Setup Fees

Supports existing initiative to get critical units into a University Continuity Plan

Cloud Based with two disparate storage locations

Walks user through the process from a template

Support through the Emergency Managers Office

Available to all departments even though concentrating on Critical Units first

Designed for Universities Specifically

Good discussion and questions from the group. All members pointing out or asking questions on the how's, what's and why's.

Closed questions on the report and Mr. Whorton left.

Mr. Watson - asked a question in concerns of general voting on items if the vote would fully commit his office to use a package.

Much debate over this and assurance that all packages need to be reevaluated to ensure fit and usability after the install. Many times, it is not possible to determine issues until full use of the product is in place. All packages should be reviewed from time to time to allow comment on current usefulness and fit from the original purpose. **Mrs. Pennington** – discussed policies on use would have to be in place to settle some differences.

Mr. Drake - asked if policies needed to be put into place to drive a software package like this first, was it too soon to buy if policies weren't in place. Should we wait until these policies were defined?

Group discussed and the overall consensus was that the software in the case was an immediate need to address the Universities Business Continuity needs and yes there would need to be policies drafted to address inter-operability and other areas, but the software would allow the move forward of the process.

Agenda 4:

Mr. Watson - motion to vote on recommendation of this product and purpose. Second – **Mrs. Pennington.**

Yea – 8 – all members present

Nay – 0

Motion Pass – **Mr. Wester** – will draft a recommendation from the committee to Mr. Whorton and Procurement.

Mrs. Holloway – suggested that this was a good example of a product review for the committee

Agenda 5:

Time was short; **Mr. Wester** - asked the group to continue reviewing the Guidelines and Procedures and to use the I Drive location to make adjustments, suggestion and comments on the document.

Agenda 6:

Dr. Hunter - suggested looking at the second Thursdays for standard meeting times. **Mr. Wester** - said he would create a doodle for the next several months to determine a fit for the times.

Agenda 7:

Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
9/15/17 - RCB355

Mr. Wester – read **Mrs. Cheffer's** email to the group on time suggestions and if there was an expectation to have the fees explanation to the committee for Octobers meeting. The committee suggested yes and **Ms. Hinkle** – agreed.

Group discussed on items would come to the committee to be considered for review for the budgeting process. **Mr. Wester** – talked about this General Technology Committee and its role in submitting projected needs to this committee. We also discussed Ozarks role and how we might be making decisions that would be affecting Ozark but Ozark has no representation on this committee. **Ms. Hinkle** stated she would look into this issue.

Mrs. Holloway – brought up how we might consider having items come to this committee for review before a RFP committee was established, **Ms. Hinkle** - agreed that this committee might need to establish a recommendation for need before releasing to RFP committees. **Ms. Hinkle** expressed concern that we needed to identify how the user committee submits items/suggestions – an avenue for recommending products and services to be reviewed for possibilities. She also noted that the budget review for 17/18 would be starting soon.

Mrs. Holloway - also suggested we might want to recommend that a member from this committee sit on RFP committees. Needs review and discussion.

Meeting Closed 2:14 PM