Present: Mary Bryans, Rebecca Damron, Darlene Hightower, Joyce Hise, Heidi Hoart, Ashwin Kumar, Robin Leech, Kaitlin Loyd, Steve Marek, Nicholas Materer, Maria Moccia-Wolff, Jason Nichols, Nick Rose, Emma Steele, Victoria Thomas, Penny Thompson, Daniel Wang, Denise Weaver

Absent: Cole Griffin, Aaron Hu, Rafi Montashirur, Sally Pendleton

The meeting of the OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee was called to order by the co-chair, Nicholas Materer, at 1:36 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda. A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

2. Approval of Minutes. A motion was made to approve the 11/19/2014 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

3. FY 15 Budget Status Update. Darlene Hightower reviewed the FY15 Budget and Project status handout. This document shows the status of the FY15 projects. We had about $3.1 in total budget. The majority of the FY15 projects are complete. The ongoing expenses such as payroll, phone bills, and maintenance items, will continue to be paid through the end of the fiscal year. We have a balance of approximately $325,000, which includes the reserve.

4. FY16 Proposed Budget/Maintenance Spreadsheet. Darlene Hightower reviewed the UTSF proposed budget for FY16. The anticipated revenue is close to $3.1 million. This figure is estimated by Institutional Research based on their estimation of enrollment. We project a carry forward of $246,929 for a total of approximately $3,367,000. Ongoing expenses, which have been approved by this committee in previous years, are listed such as salaries and wages; supplies and materials, which are used for tech fee supported computer labs; maintenance items; network services; memberships; etc. If we stay with an 8% reserve will have $887,802 to spend on new projects. The reserve was at 10% for a number of years, but was lowered to 8% in the last couple of years. The 8% gives a good cushion.

5. Software Utilization Reports. Charles McCann reviewed the software utilization report, which shows information for the Fall of 2014 and Spring of 2015. This report lists the product and the number of times it was accessed in the computer labs. The second sheet shows the number of downloads for the different products. After that there is a breakdown by lab of the
products. Darlene mentioned that the Browser and Office continue to be the leading software packages that are accessed. This report is presented to help the Committee see the utilization of software and the printing in the computer labs.

6. Review of Process for Consideration/Approval of Requests. Darlene Hightower reviewed that the reason for this meeting is to look at the requests for funding from the UTSF account. The charge of this committee is to look at the projects to see which of them benefit the student body as a whole. Project requestors were invited to talk about their requests and answer questions.

Before reviewing requests, the maintenance spreadsheet was reviewed. These are the products that we paid for last year. Maria budgets for these renewals, adding a 3% increase in most cases. The item referring to the Library computer lab is an annual expense to transfer funds to the Library. This is to support a computer lab that was moved from the Student Union, during renovation, to the Library.

7. Presentation of New Requests for Funding/Questions

16-001 Wireless expansion – Department of Wellness. Robert Ketron and Karissa Lowe reviewed the request, which is to help support wireless efforts in the Colvin Center. The center was renovated in 2004 and the wireless has not been expanded since that time. Access points are only available on the base/main level. They wish to upgrade and add to the access points to handle the extra load. Students bring in devices to entertain themselves while they exercise and also a portion of the building is leased to the College of Education. They wish to add approximately 15 more. The Colvin Center is funding $18,000 for the next fiscal year. The UTSF Funding would help fund additional access points above and beyond this.

16-002 General Network Upgrade – Mike Kerntke explained that this request is to update the second half of the network. Last year we replaced the first half of the network distribution routers. This equipment connects various buildings to the network itself. Each router will connect up to 20 to 30 buildings. The routers control the network traffic from the buildings to the network itself. This equipment usually lasts six to seven years. Some of the equipment that is being replaced is ten to eleven years old. If the project is not funded, the issue would be capacity. The current, older equipment is not able to handle the amount of the traffic coming in. We could probably buy another year on some of these, but the risk of shutting services down is likely.

16-003 Data Center Network Refresh – Mike Kerntke explained that this is to allow us to upgrade the internals within the Data Center to allow faster access for the servers that reside in the Data Center. It also allows us to reuse a good amount of space in the Data Center due to the decrease in the amount of cables needed. This is another one of the projects we had attempted to accomplish in three years, but funding was not available last year, so this is the final portion we need to complete.
16-004  Border Upgrade – Mike Kerntke explained that we are re-architecting how we connect the OSU network to Onenet and the outside world. Previously we did get the funding to implement a new border router, called an ASR. It is state-of-the-art to supply the bandwidth to propel us up to the amount of data that we anticipate coming in and out of the campus. We have one border router upgraded, this is for the redundant border router to be put in place which would provide a fail-over system should we lose the current system. This is a one-time cost.

16-005  Wireless Refresh – Mike Kerntke summarized the project. He indicated that this year we are asking for two different types of wireless updates in funding. The first is to provide outdoor coverage for areas that do not have good coverage today; such as the Colvin Center to Monroe, and the corridor that will be behind the Food Processing Center for the new University Commons Apartments. This gets us access in the areas where students are traveling around campus. The second is to continue to replace the dated access points we have across campus. This is an ongoing process. We try to rotate the older equipment out, so that new equipment is brought in. Equipment is good for about five years; some of our equipment is seven years old.

16-006  Remote Print Stations – Charles McCann presented information on the project. He stated that in 2007 we were asked to put some printers out in the common areas such as Griffith and Family Resources Center to give the students a location to print. Those printers were installed and it is time to replace the units. We have asked for five--four to replace current printers and one backup.

16-007  Video Streaming – Tina Meier explained that our Real Audio contract ends in July of 2015, and no contract extension is available. We are requesting funding to provide another video solution that will be supported and allow authentication and other features as outlined by faculty members.

16-008  Residential Wireless – Jon Hunt explained that the project is to request year two expenditures for wireless service to the residential areas. Last year most of the family grad housing was completed and Patchin Jones completed. Many more buildings are left to complete. It is expected to get half of what is left completed this year. Res life is matching whatever is approved from Tech Fee about two to one.

16-009  Project was recalled.

16-010  General University Classroom Upgrade & Maintenance – Chair Nicholas Materer reviewed the project which is to replace and upgrade multimedia equipment in General University classrooms.

8.  Discussion/Approval of FY16 Project Requests

16-010  GU Classroom Upgrade/Maintenance. It is imperative to keep the classrooms maintained and up-to-date. Students and faculty are directly affected by this work. **Motion was made to approve $303,680 for this project. Motion seconded and approved by voice vote.**
The question was raised that if projects are not approved, is other funding available to move forward with the project? Most times, if the project is not approved, the work will be deferred. Occasionally other funds have been made available, but that is the exception rather than the norm. It is possible to partially fund projects, depending on the project. The gap between the budget and what is requested is about $82,000.

16-007  Video Streaming. This budget number is purely an estimate. The information regarding this contract was only received a week ago. It is a major application and if they decide to go to the cloud it could turn into an annual figure. IT staff did call a couple of the major players for video streaming to get some estimates. This video streaming cost may be shared with the other campuses if they use the service. There is a committee being formed to review and decide which vendor will be used. **Motion was made to approve up to $85,000 as a budgetary item, a placeholder, and allow IT staff to identify appropriate software; no annual commitment will be made until further information is gathered. Motion seconded and approved by voice vote.**

16-002, 16-003 and 16-004  General Network Upgrade, Data Center Network, Border Upgrade. Discussion that these projects are critical to the backbone of IT services. These projects are on a 50/50 cost share with the IT Department. **Motion was made to approve these projects 16-002 for $42,327, 16-003 for $17,016, and 16-004 for $60,638. Seconded and approved by voice vote.**

16-006  Remote Print Station. This project directly benefits students. **Motion was made to approve $17,800 for this project. Seconded and approved by voice vote.**

16-001  Wireless Expansion – Dept of Wellness. This project directly benefits students. **Motion was made to approve $10,000 for this project. Seconded and approved by voice vote.**

16-005 and 16-008  Wireless Refresh and Residential Wireless. These projects were discussed. It was felt both projects were important and wireless technology is becoming more in demand. Partial funding may be the best solution. **Motion was made to split the difference of the remaining funds between the two projects (16-005 for $175,670 and 16-008 for $175,670). Motion was seconded and was approved by voice vote.**

**A motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by:  Joyce Hise

Approved:  11-17-2015