Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
11/18/19 – RPL 325 kdw

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

Agenda 1: Call to order 9:00 am

Attendance: (9)

Wyatt Watson	Jessica Brock	Ken Wester	Jeff Robertson
Matt Pipkins	Brent Drake	Sandra Cheffer	Jessica Holloway
Asim Shrestha			

Not in attendance: (5)

Bernadette Hinkle	Clinton Hall	Laury Fiorello	Amy Pennington
Kelli Bates			

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

Mr. Wester discussed that since the last meeting was some time ago, the minutes would stand as written, and they have been posted to the Standing Committee Site and are also in the Committee Folder.

Agenda 3: (Review/Discussion of IT Budget for 19/20 and 20/21 and Technology Consideration Matrix)

Mr. Wester started the conversation by discussing the 19/20 budget and the necessity to allocate 160K from reserves to shore up the budget if required, and we wouldn't know for sure until we get closer to the end of the year. **Mr. Wester** stated that this is certainly not how we wanted to work the budget, but with the cuts and identified expenses, there was no other solution for this year. *(Documents located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2019\Budget 19-20)*

For 20/21, **Mr. Wester** is unsure of meeting the identified increases and needs with the uncertainty of how the budget base budget would fall. Additional funds were requested via fee increases, but that ability is unknown at this time. *(Documents located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2019\Budget 20-21)*

Mr. Wester re-introduced a document from 2017 concerning the guidelines for the committee and a new consideration of creating a Technology Product/Service Matrix that we could use to review existing spreadsheet items and any new requests as we continue forward.

This matrix would consider a number of possible situations where items would be considered for inclusion into the University Technology Budget. Some of the discussions where: (Courtesy of **Mrs. Cheffer**)

- If there is a product or service on the spreadsheet that affects one department or working unit, that item should be transferred to the department and managed by the department.

- Items that serve multiple departments or the entire campus (es), then it should be in the IT budget.
- Number of departments the item serves
- This committee does not justify whether or not the product is valid.
- Compliance, regulatory, or Tech core
- Can the department pay for new item initial purchase
- Are there funds to pay for the item for ongoing years
- What is the life of the product, not only licensure but use as well
- Is the university going to continue to grow…for example, the total number of users to be able to project ongoing costs for those items that are per-user costs. (how are the costs assessed by the company?)
- (named users)
- Yes/No Values: Should some of the scores be yes/no, not a value? (**Mr. Watson**)
- ROI: Attach return value from the investment (**Dr. Shrestha**)
    - (have done a few times, but that responsibility has typically been on the requestor)
    - Would ask the requesting department to supply an ROI
- Cancellation dates/life cycle of the product and can the item be
- One time funding vs. ongoing item

Mr. Wester asked if everyone could review the Matrix Spreadsheet and the 2017 document for other ideas or changes and suggestions by Friday the 22nd. After making any changes, Mr. Wester would send back out the spreadsheet for one last review and then use it to review the Technology Budget with the matrix. *(Document located at I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2019\Nov\Review)*

Agenda 4: (Discussion on Banner ERP Equipment Options)

Mr. Wester went over the possibilities for the ERP Platform change out possibilities. The University has been completing an IBM Hardware refresh every five years for the past 40 years. In 2015 the refresh cost approximately $1.5M. It is time to determine if this is the best cause of action with the necessity to better support recovery operations and cloud possibilities.

Mr. Wester suggested that there were currently three options under consideration:

1. Stay with IBM and refresh for another 5 years – status quo with a cost of approximately 1.5M
2. Move to DELL/VMWare and split the systems between the cloud and on-premise to increase our Virtual Platform while supporting the ERP and moving the DR to the cloud addressing the Active Up-Time and DR needs at approximate 2.1 – 2.8M over 5 years.
3. Move to the Ellucain Cloud – moving the entire ERP into the cloud addressing the uptime and readiness issues. 3.2M over 5 years.

#2 and #3 are significant increases (approx. 200-250K per year) to the current budget. But they both offer significant availability, scaling, and productivity to the University.

There could be cost savings under both #2 and #3, but we should consider the full costs.

In any of the cases, it will be necessary to fund a 125K warranty extension on the IBM Equipment to be able to study and determine the most productive course of action.

There were concerns from **Mrs. Brock** and **Mr. Drake** concerning the performance hit of moving to the cloud.

Mrs. Holloway asked if the cloud move was inevitable. **Mr. Wester** stated that all software companies are moving in that direction and would eventually push for that model. UCA is holding back and doing so Hybrid solutions while ASU is moving the entire system to some version of Hosted or SaaS models of the Ellucian Cloud.

There was some discussion on how cloud is structured and billed (FTE vs. Named Users vs. Other types) and how if the University dips in enrollment or spikes how that affects subscriptions.

Mr. Wester is getting with the Administration to attempt to get a possible direction in this area. Can the University fund an initiative? If Ellucian Banner expires in 6 years, how do we want to proceed with that in mind? (New ERP Choices by then?) More conversation and discussion needed.

Agenda 5: (Discussion on IP Streaming)

Mr. Wester announced that Housing had acquired Apogge IPTV Streaming services and have plans to implement within housing sometime in January 2020. With this purchase, the University Administrative areas will get streaming for free. Outside of the residence halls there is believed to be about 52 cable feeds to various areas. OIS will be sending out a survey to determine exactly who has and is using cable at this point and arrange to determine the best way to provide the Apogge service to those areas. Coverage will include the Ozark Campus.

Also, a part of this installation, TECH, will be able to feed TECH TV into a streaming feed and will have access to push streams as we currently do with Graduation and other events.

Agenda 6: (Round Table)

No additional topics

Agenda 7: (Close) Meeting closed at 10:01 am