

SIUC Computing Advisory Committee

SIU Student Center, Vermillion Room

May 14, 2015

Opening

The regular meeting of the SIUC Computing Advisory Committee was called to order at 10:04am on May 14, 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)
- Narayanan Iyer (Faculty Senate)
- Andy Wang (Dean's Council)
- Michelle Zhu (Computer Science)
- Scott Bridges (CIO, Information Technology)
- Shannon Newman (Information Technology)

CAC Members Not in Attendance

- Norman Carver (Graduate Council)
- Tom Furby (Law School)
- Jason Phillips (Civil Service Council)
- Dimitrios Parhas (Graduate Student Association)

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

Scott Bridges reported that the amount available was now \$425,000 and confirmed that this fee is intended for student facing technology.

Computer Advisory Committee
2015 Tech Fee Analysis
As of April 14, 2015
With Updates as of May 6, 2015

Based on the CAC Committee meeting held May 5, 2015, the representative of the College of Engineering indicated that their existing computers could become available for sharing to other undergraduate student uses. This new information changes the priority of conditional partial funding of two Engineering computer labs and would allow for the existing Engineering technology to upgrade other requests on campus.

Additionally, the **available IT Tech Fee Funds now equal \$425,000**, rather than the previously understood \$400,000. Within these parameters and using the CAC Committee funding strategy documented on April 14, below, it is estimated that nearly **70% of the 56 requests will receive Technology support**, either as Funded, Partially Funded, or Upgraded Technology that is a “hand me down” from another campus location. At this point the To Be Determined (TBD) recommendations will NOT receive Technology support, unless purchasing costs fall further than anticipated or other on-campus Technology becomes viable.

The May 6 proposed fulfillment strategy recommends the following fulfillments for the requests for each College/Unit. **CASA:** 2 Fund; 6 Partial Fund; 1 TBD

- **COLA:** 1 Fund; 3 Partial Fund; 3 Hand-me-down; 3 TBD
- **Education:** 2 Hand-me-down; 1 Tech Support/Hand-me-down; 3 TBD
- **Engineering:** 2 Contingent Partial Fund; 4 TBD
- **MCMA:** 2 Fund; 2 Partial Fund; 1 TBD
- **School of Medicine:** 1 Hand-me-down
- **Science:** 3 Fund; 3 Partial Fund; 3 Hand-me-down
- **Auxiliary Services:** 1 TBD; 1 Withdrawn
- **IT:** 1 TBD
- **Library:** 2 Fund; 1 Partial Fund; 1 TBD
- **Student Services:** 1 Hand-me-down; 2 TBD

The following findings were 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, as determined at an earlier meeting of the CAC Committee:

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.**

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.

Dr. Themistoklis Haniotakis again noted that the College of Engineering and Computer Science are not getting priority due to their demanding computer requirements, and requests that someone from this committee contact the Dean of the College of Engineering to discuss this fee and the expectation that “usable technology (where possible) be offered on a 1:1 basis to supplement other labs not needing new purchases, but hoping for a modest upgrade.”

Scott Bridges, Bill Bruns and Tom Imboden agreed to contact the Dean of the College of Engineering to explain the process that the CAC has undertaken.

The proposal was submitted by Tom Imboden, and seconded by JP Dunn. All voted in favor, with no abstentions and no one voting nay.

The meeting was adjourned.