# OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee

March 28, 2005

224 Student Union

Meeting Minutes

**Present:** Birne Binegar, David Bosserman, Jerry Bowen, Gina Causin, Norma Earp (Substitute for David Thomas), Karalyn Eyster, Courtney Hentges, Darlene Hightower, Tom Jordan, Alex Kolpakov, Douglas Needham, Kevin Murphy, Shiretta Ownbey, Anne Prestamo

**Absent:** Stephen Barnes, Timm Bliss, Monica Dudley, Angel Kymes, Jim Lish, Ryan Royse, Marlene Strathe

The first meeting of the reconstituted OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee was called to order by Birne Binegar at 5:35 p.m.

1. Darlene Hightower opened the meeting by asking the members present to introduce themselves and state what area of campus they are representing. Permission was asked to audio tape the committee meetings for use in preparing minutes.

2. David Bosserman summarized the process that was involved in reconstituting the committee. It was planned to have the first meeting earlier in the semester. But, when the process began to put this committee back together, it became harder than anticipated. The committee was reconstituted fairly close to what it used to be. But, because it was a Student IT Committee, a co-chair relationship between the students and the faculty was put into place. Because we were late getting the students nominated, it did not give the SGA time to select and appoint a student co-chair. Dr. Binegar has been kind enough to chair this first committee meeting. The Charter, which was developed for the committee, intentionally does not include the term limits of the members. This was done so that the committee could discuss and decide this item. Dr. Bosserman proposed that before the initial meeting in the fall, he would go back to those that are authorized to appoint the members and ask if the representative should be reappointed or appoint a new member. The terms will be based on fiscal year (July 1 through June 30), and then the members are subject to reappointment. No members of the IT department or Dr. Bosserman's office are on the committee, except in ex-officio status.

**A motion was made, seconded and approved by show of hands to have one-year term limits with succession authorized, no limit.**

Dr. Bosserman stated that another provision when this committee was re-established was that we would go back to the point when it was disbanded and bring you up-to-date on what has happened since that day. Later in the meeting, Darlene Hightower is prepared to present information for FY 2003 and 2004, the current fiscal year, and then propose the budget for your consideration to implement for FY 2006. The information for FY 2003 and 2004 is for information only. For FY 2005, if there is something that the committee wants to modify and it can be done within the rest of this fiscal year, that will be discussed. For FY 2006, once this committee approves the budget, it our intent to take that budget to the committee in September and the committee would have the authority to ask for it to be rearranged. It is intended to be a living budget, not locked into place. There will be some items, of course, which will need to be completed this summer (such as classroom support). Once the FY 2006 budget is approved, it is our intent to bring up a website so that anyone can see what is currently happening with the budget. We plan, for the remainder of this year and all subsequent years, to post the budget as approved. Then, as the year progresses, we will have a budget adjustment column which will show actual costs as well as budgeted costs. This will address the issue from the last few years of people not knowing what was going on and real-time information not being made available. It is the intent to report often and stay up-to-date. Dr. Bosserman asked the committee to communicate if something comes up. Feel free to deal directly with Darlene if you have a question, if you need more information, etc.

The schedule of meetings was discussed. It was suggested the committee meet at least four times per year: Late September where priorities/criteria would be defined; end of November to address requests for funds; proposed budget presentation in February; and then a final meeting where the next year's budget is approved sometime in April. Subcommittees can be formed to handle specialized work. Special meetings can be scheduled by the chairs as needed.

The budget that will be presented to you keeps a 10% reserve and the meeting on using that reserve would take place in the spring after we see that everything is working. The rest of it is budgeted so you will see a budget that consumes most of the resources. The other issues are the balances in the Colleges' Tech Fee accounts. The University's Tech Fee money has been spent right along. The balance of the University Tech Fee at the end of February is $1.8 million; whereas the Colleges have $4.6 million unspent. We need to talk about challenging the Colleges to put the fees on the technology issues.

**The motion was made, seconded and passed by show of hands to hold a full committee meeting at least twice a semester; tentatively set in September, November, February and April; special meetings may be arranged if called for by the chairs.**

3. Darlene Hightower reviewed the FY 2003 and 2004 budgets. Under "salary and benefits," in 2003 CIS had 13 full-time employees that a percentage of salary and benefits were paid from the University Tech Fee; and in 2004, CIS had 12 full-time

employees that a percentage of salary and benefits were paid from the University Tech Fee. The percentages varied depending on what their job description identified as work for student-related services. We also have three computer labs that are managed by IT and funded by the University Tech Fee: Bennett Hall, Kerr-Drummond (formerly in Willham), and the Student Union. These labs employ approximately 30 employees paid $5.15 an hour to keep them open 24-7 for most of the semester. For 2003, 2004 and even 2005, that salary has been pretty consistent at approximately $400,000.

Under "professional services" in FY 2004, IT was doing some professional contracting for Active Directory and Exchange. Most of those professional services were paid to Dell during that time. Professional services in FY 2003 were paid to our Physical Plant for projects such as the wireless project cabling, and the remodel of three rooms in Ag Hall. There was quite a difference in Supplies and Materials from FY 2003 and FY 2004. The only explanation that can be determined is that much of the paper and toner charges for the three University Tech Fee labs were taken out of the IT Technology Support budget in FY 2004. Furniture charges in FY 2003 were for labs in the Colleges. The various hardware items are detailed in the FY 2003 Expenditure Detail. Much of the hardware that was purchased in FY 2004 was for the new storage area network and servers to prepare for the Exchange and Active Directory deployment. Miscellaneous expenses in FY 2003 listed several transfers that documentation was not readily available. The records, due the volume of information involved, have been purged from the mainframe. *Action Item: It was asked that information be provided on the FY 2003 journal entries in the amount of $177,972.79, $35,000, and the two transfers to HES for approximately $141,000*. In FY 2002, the committee approved the expense of one-time money in the amount of $150,000 to help equip a lab in HES and it would be open to the general student population. This may explain the HES transfer. Also under "Miscellaneous," there are charges for door access, which are for card swipes in the interior and exterior of the doors to the University Tech Fee labs. The pager rental charges and also long-distance for support personnel are not carried forward. When these personnel left CIS, the charges dropped off. Phones for support personnel and modem charges you will see drop off in FY 2005 also.

Discussion was held regarding the funding of projects in the Colleges. How should these requests be prioritized and funded? A coordinated effort is needed in this respect. In the past, it was common to split the costs 50/50 by the Colleges and the University Tech Fee. It was suggested that when considering requests from Colleges that receive their own Tech Fee money, they must show how they are spending their money. Then they should articulate and justify further need based on a general university purpose. The question was then raised if a College financed a lab upgrade in the College, whether the usage could be restricted to their College's students only. Through discussion, it was determined that, currently, the Colleges viewed that access in different ways. Some excluded non-college students, some did not.

A charge in FY 2004 titled "Network Infrastructure Transfer" represents 100% of those expenditures. Previously 51% were allowed to be paid from University Tech Fee. The FY 2004 Maintenance Account transfer of $275,000 was made to the IT Maintenance Account. The charge in FY 2003 for 51% Network Fee funded by STF from 1998-2003 in the amount of $1,665,785.38 was discussed. The network account was apparently allowed to operate in a deficit for several years, then in 2003 CIS supplied the Tech Fee Committee all of the network expenditures and the Committee approved to have 51% of all of these expenditures transferred over. Previous committee members present were not aware of or recall the agreement to pay 51% of the network costs. *Action Item: Minutes from the previous meetings which document discussion regarding the decision to cover 51% of network expenses will be brought to the next meeting.*

The FY 2005 budget was summarized by Darlene Hightower. In 2005, there are 11 full-time employees who have a percentage of salary and benefits are paid by University Tech Fee, with the same number of students as in the past two years. Therefore, we will not expend the $400,000 that was budgeted. Supplies and materials were budgeted at $42,000. The furniture expense for $6,000 is for chairs for the lab in Kerr-Drummond. Two of the priorities for IT in the fall of 2004 were to create a healthy network and to create redundancy. CIS had too many single points of failure in our network. When IT implements a service, we want to be redundant in some way. For example, if we purchase something for a webpage, we want that to go into the web cluster so that if one server drops off, then the other servers are there. One other problem we have also encountered is the lack of test environments that we have. The programming for SCT has a test environment, so the programmers are able to apply the changes and test it and verify it with the users before it is applied into production. We have not had that in our networking environment. Many of the hardware purchases listed are server purchases that have been encumbered by IT. One-half of that is requested to come from the University Tech Fee because the servers all have to do with student services, i.e. Active Directory, Exchange, the Web Cluster, etc. The detail report for FY 2005 has been inadvertently left out of the handouts. *Action Item: The FY 2005 detail report will be sent to the committee members.* It shows the expenses that have already been posted to the University Tech Fee and a lot of them are for software expenses incurred. The main one is the Microsoft Campus Agreement for the students in the amount of $325,000. Also the Student Union computer lab was renovated. The question was raised as to the plan for wireless services. That cost is incorporated into the FY 2006 budget. The desire is to extend wireless across the entire campus and also the Greek living areas--budgeted at $600,000. Some of the other projects in FY 2005 are following (dollar amounts included are what are being requested from the University Tech Fee):

1. General University Classroom Multimedia program—$223,131
2. Classroom Rotation in Kerr Drummond—$119,500
3. Spyware/Malware software for students—$38,500
4. Server Rotation and Testing Environment—$116,527
5. Residential Life Printing and Print Metering—$42,050

6. Intrusion Prevention hardware and software—$100,000
7. Anti-SPAM software—$100,000

Discussion was held regarding the situation of matching funds requested from University Tech Fee money. It was suggested that the requesting department/college's funds should be spent first, and the University Tech Fee money would be spent last. That way, if all the funds are not required for the project, the excess/leftover would go back to the University Tech Fee account. The commitment of funds is there, but when the bills are all paid, the original fund will be exhausted first, and then a draw from the University Tech Fee funds would be used. Tech Fee funds (University or College) can be rolled over from year to year. The question was raised as to how Colleges can build up a balance to use for a major project if they are expected to spend their money first. If the colleges wish to save up College Tech Fee funds to use for a major college project, they would submit that information in their proposal for University Tech Fee funds so that the plan for the commitment of funds would be documented. It is expected that tracking on these carryovers will be done so that there would be confirmation that the plan was followed through.

Darlene presented information on network services expenses. This is the same account that was paid 51% by University Tech Fee funds from 1998 through 2003. This year we have used the balance of $568,000. We have a purchase request waiting for approximately $231,000 to expand services in our data center. Right now we can no longer add servers to our network and we need new routing equipment first. Darlene is asking the Committee, based upon the understanding when this fiscal year began that IT would have full control of the University Tech Fee budget, that the entire $800,000 for network services be approved so that we can purchase hardware needed in the data center. In FY 2006, the network budget amount requested is back to $400,000 and the IT budget will cover the other $400,000. Network services expenses were discussed and are detailed in the handouts.

A question was asked regarding the reason for the carry forward adjustment for FY 2005 in the amount of $74,947.21. We have not been able to determine why the carry forward was not $292,092.21. That discrepancy is still being researched. *Action Item: Information regarding this carry forward adjustment will be provided.*
Discussion was held regarding approval of the FY 2005 budget. The use of the reserve was discussed. It was suggested that the reserve should be carried over to FY 2006.

**A motion was made, seconded and passed by show of hands to approve the FY 2005 budget as presented.**

4. Darlene presented information regarding the FY 2006 budget. Major projects were reviewed by the committee and are listed below with funding amounts requested from the University Tech Fee:

**Multimedia for General University Classrooms** – This is a request from the Provost to catch up on classroom support. Amount requested from University Tech Fee is $382,888.
**Student Computer Lab Rotation – Bennett** – Same lab set up as what was done for Kerr-Drummond. Amount requested from University Tech Fee is $117,500.
**Server Rotation and Testing** – This is also for new servers. We are going to need servers for the Oracle environment for the student portal and the applications for Oracle. We have two that we want to replace. The total cost is $150,000. University Tech Fee is being asked to fund $75,000.
**Intrusion Prevention-continued** – It is not known if additional funds are needed, but it is desired to have an additional $200,000 committed to this project if needed. IT would encumber $150,000, and the University Tech Fee is being asked to dedicate $50,000.
**Assistive Technology** – A couple of purchases are needed to improve our assistive technology services, one being video-captioning. A grant is being written for this, but in case the grant does not pan out, we need to have this. Secondly, testing software for web compliance and voice recognition is needed. Amount requested for these two purchases from the University Tech Fee is $57,500.
**Disk Storage and Enhanced Backup Capabilities –** Since expanding the quotas, usage of the email services has increased. Additional storage to support new users is needed. New versions of BlackBoard and WebCT are being implemented and more storage is needed to support these services. The quote for these improvements is approximately $600,000. The University Tech Fee is asked to dedicate $200,000 of this amount.
**Virtual Labs –** The students want to be able to access the software in the labs from remote locations. The University Tech Fee is being asked to dedicate $150,000 for this service.
**Login Procedures for Student Computer Labs** – This is a Faculty Council recommendation. The University Tech Fee is being asked to dedicate $100,000 for software LDAP services and single sign-on capabilities.
**Networking Projects** – A three-year rotation is needed for the OSU/A&M network switching and routing equipment. Replacing one-third of the devices will cost $1,485,475. IT is committing $595,158; the University Tech Fee is being asked to commit $295,159; and auxiliary units will be asked for $595,158.
Device registration is recommended by the IT Security Report. The purchase of a software program for this is expected to cost $167,500. IT will fund one-half and the University Tech Fee is being asked to fund one-half at $83,750.
Wireless technology is budgeted at $600,800. IT will commit $240,758; University Tech Fee is being asked for $119,284; and auxiliary units for $240,758. (Auxiliary units are described as Ledger 2 funded units.)
**OSU Portal Project –** The cost of the hardware is included in the Server Rotation project, and the additional disk storage. It would be expensive if we were to pay for this project on a case-by-case basis.
**Oracle Campus License --** We need to get a campus site license for Oracle. The first expense is $1.28 million. After that, we would need to pay the maintenance and renewal of the software from year to year. University Tech Fee is being asked to commit

$100,000 of that one-time expense. Other sources will come up with $1.8 million. This service will be for all the campuses and they will be asked to share in the cost.

Further information requests from the Committee regarding the FY2006 projects were:

- State how these projects benefit/support the students.
- More information is needed on the device registration project. The concern was that it not be intrusive. Wireless will need to be included in some way. Address multi-user machines and what operating systems will be supported.
- More information is needed on the OSU Portal Project, Intrusion Prevention, Virtual Labs, Login Procedures and Oracle Campus License.

To allow some of the projects to be started this summer, the committee decided to discuss and vote to approve specific FY 2006 major projects.

**A motion was made, seconded and passed by show of hands to approve that several of the FY 2006 projects may be voted on as a package.**

**A motion was made, seconded and passed by show of hands to approve the following five projects from the FY 2006 Major Projects report:**

**Multimedia for General University Classrooms -- $382,888**
**Student Computer Lab Rotation-Bennett Hall – $117,500**
**Server Rotation and Testing Environment -- $75,000**
**Assistive Technology – $57,500**
**Disk Storage and Enhanced Backup Capabilities -- $200,000**

Process for future meetings was discussed. Main communications will be done via email. A confirmation of email addresses will be sent out before the next meeting. Requests for funding from the University Tech Fee should be emailed to CIO@okstate.edu. The issue of substitutes attending meetings and their voting rights was discussed. Concern was addressed to the time it would take to bring substitutes up-to-date on the issues. It was decided that the designated members of the committee should be responsible for bringing the substitutes up-to-date. Substitutes should be designated in writing by the appointing authorities who are listed on the official committee charter.

**A motion was made, seconded and passed by show of hands to approve that if a committee representative is not able to attend a meeting, the appointment authority will designate in writing a substitute to attend and vote in the representative's place.**

Discussion was held regarding whether the meetings were considered open meetings. The meetings are open and guests are welcome to attend. Committee members were

encouraged to discuss the issues of the committee with the constituents they represent and to report committee activity appropriately within their areas.

Meeting times and days were discussed. The 5:00 pm time worked for most. Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays presented conflicts this semester with some of those present. A meeting in April will be scheduled taking these issues into consideration.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Joyce Hise

Attachments (11) (Committee members received separately)

(#1) Committee Charter
(#2) FY 2003 and FY 2004 Expense Summary
(#3) FY 03 Expenditure Detail
(#4) FY 04 Expenditure Detail
(#5) FY 2005 Expense Summary
(#6) FY 05 Requests for Payment
(#7) FY 05 Major Projects
(#8) FY 05 Network Expenses
(#9) FY 2006 Expense Summary
(#10) FY 06 Requests for Payment
(#11) FY 06 Major Projects

Minutes approved by the UTSF Committee on April 26, 2005