

## **SIUC Computing Advisory Committee**

**SIU Student Center – Vermillion Room**

**May 5, 2015**

### **Opening**

The regular meeting of the SIUC Computing Advisory Committee was called to order at 10:00am on May 5, 2015 in the Vermillion Room of the SIU Student Center by Bill Bruns.

### **CAC Members and SIU IT Employees in Attendance**

- Bill Bruns, Chair (Civil Service Council)
- Tom Imboden (ISAT)
- Rich Beach (Library Affairs)
- Themistoklis Haniotakis (Graduate Council)
- JP Dunn (AP Staff Council)
- Michelle Zhu (Computer Science)
- Scott Bridges (CIO, Information Technology)
- Kris Guye (Information Technology)
- Shannon Newman (Information Technology)
- Arden Lockwood (Information Technology)
- Jim Jones (University Auditor)

### **CAC Members Not in Attendance**

- Narayanan Iyer (Faculty Senate)
- Norman Carver (Graduate Council)
- Tom Furby (Law School)
- Jason Phillips (Civil Service Council)
- Dimitrios Parhas (Graduate Student Association)
- Andy Wang (Dean's Council)

Tom Imboden presented on the proposal by the Undergraduate Tech Fee Subcommittee.

# Computer Advisory Committee

## 2015 Tech Fee Analysis

### As of April 14, 2015

---

Based on the March 31, 2015, request of the Computer Advisory Committee (CAC)'s 2015 Tech Fee Analysis Subcommittee, the Project Management Office (PMO) conducted on-site interviews to refine the understanding of the current **56 requests** for Tech Fee funds to support computer technology. While one interview is scheduled for April 15 and several individuals did not reply to the invitation for these meetings, all other requesters and/or their representatives participated in the meetings held since April 6.

The CAC Subcommittee asked the PMO to prioritize potential recipients using the following criteria:

1. Academic units over other units
2. Replace XP and older technologies
3. Upgrade existing hardware over purchases, as possible
4. Distribute fairly across the campus

Additionally, it was clarified that the Tech Fee is paid by the Undergraduate students, so preference should be given to Undergraduate student use. Each lab's accessibility represents whether the intended users are associated with a Department, College, or the entire University.

Based on the information gathered by the PMO and IT Purchasing as of today, **the total estimated equipment costs equals \$565,600 for the allocated \$400,000.**

The attached recommendations suggest that the **top 27 requests** could be fulfilled at an estimated **cost of \$371,500. Another 7 requests** of lower priority could also be fulfilled by cascading equipment from these proposed purchases to the requestors. Please note that the recommendations may represent **a partial fulfillment of the request**. Thus, **at least 34 requests** could be at least partially fulfilled, for a **61% rate of fulfillment**.

The proposed fulfillment strategy represents the following number of requests for each College/Unit:

- CASA: 7
- COLA: 6
- Education: 2
- Library: 3
- MCMA: 4
- School of Medicine: 1
- Science: 9
- Student Services: 1

The School of Medicine and Student Services fulfillments utilize cascaded equipment based on other fulfillments.

The existing Engineering technology is perceived to be significantly advanced relative to the other requesters' current technology. By focusing on the Subcommittee's priorities, no Engineering requests are currently proposed for even partial fulfillment.

### **Suggested Next Steps**

1. Communicate to all requesters that their participation was appreciated, and that it looks like nearly 2/3 of the requests will be at least partially fulfilled
2. Allow the CAC Subcommittee to review the 2015 Tech Fee Analysis data and proposed fulfillments, verifying or refining the Replacement Priority
3. Identify who/how the discussions will be held with requesters regarding partial fulfillments
4. Authorize the IT Purchasing Manager to gather more formal quotes for each of the top 27-30 requests, as needed to appropriately spend the budgeted \$400,000
5. Determine which steps can be completed before or during the April 28 CAC Subcommittee Meeting scheduled at 2 pm
6. Determine which steps can be completed before or during the May 5 CAC Meeting scheduled at 10 am to authorize the funding of the approved requests
7. Determine who/how/when the approvals will be communicated to the requesters
8. Determine who/how/when the authorized purchases can be initiated through the IT Purchasing Manager to meet the end of Fiscal Year purchasing requirement
9. Determine who/how/when the equipment will be communicated, distributed, installed, and cascaded

Dr. Haniotakis expressed his extreme displeasure over the fact that the College of Engineering had not been awarded any computers. It was explained to him that the Engineering computer labs already had very good computers and in conversation with them, they were unwilling to provide them as hand-me-down computers to labs in other parts of the university, and therefore had not received any computers from this fee.

Dr. Haniotakis also proposed that the College of Engineering should be a priority over other colleges because their computing needs were greater. It was also pointed out that computing needs were not part of the charge that the CAC had given to the subcommittee. Those were:

1. Academic units over other units
2. Replace XP and older technologies
3. Upgrade existing hardware over purchases, as possible
4. Distribute fairly across the campus

The Subcommittee agreed to meet again to see what could happen if Dr. Haniotakis would be able to get a 1:1 exchange of usable equipment (for hand-me-downs to other units) from the College of Engineering. Dr. Haniotakis agreed to meet with the Dean of the College of Engineering and report back at the next meeting.

There not being a quorum, the meeting was adjourned at 10:28am.