OSU Student University Technology
Services Fee Committee

April 19, 2010
106B Whitehurst
Meeting Minutes

Present: Lee Adkins, Pasha Antonenko, David Bosserman, Andrew Breshears, Satish Bukkapatnam, Brad Duvall, Darlene Hightower, Joyce Hise, Heather Hughes, Marc Krein, Nicholas Materer, Megan McCool, Aravind Seshadri, Marlene Strathe, Don Turton

Absent: Darshon Anderson, Heidi Hoart, Sanjay Kapil, Mark Legg, Ben McLaughlin, Merideth Miller, Maria Moccia-Wolff, Dana Pentecost, Anne Prestamo,

The meeting of the OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee was called to order by Brad Duvall at 5:03 pm.

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. The 4/05/2010 minutes were included in the handouts for the meeting. **A motion was made and seconded to approve the 4/05/2010 minutes as presented. Motion was approved by a voice vote.**

3. Report on Software Utilization – Charles McCann summarized a report that was compiled showing software used in IT managed labs during the period of January 1 to March 31, 2010. The "times accessed" column represents the number of sessions in which the software was accessed. For example, if a person logged in and used AutoCAD twelve times that would count as one. But, if someone logged in and used AutoCAD, logged out and logged in again and used AutoCAD again that would count as two. All the duplicate users were taken out and it was condensed to unique individuals who used the product. This information is useful when professors are consulted to see if software is still needed in the labs. Also, it indicates if older versions of software are being used instead of new versions. Practice is to have no more than two versions of software installed at a time. The virtual labs are not included in this report. We expect to include the virtual lab information in the near future. This information is specifically focused on the computer labs managed by the IT Department, not the college labs. This information is presented to the committee for informational purposes.

4. Continue Discussion/Approval of FY11 Project Requests

    a. <u>11-008</u> – SPSS AMOS License Maintenance –This project requests software licensing for structural equation modeling. Darlene Hightower talked with the

vendor and determined that the software can be put on any computer here on campus. The professors can also take it home. Students cannot use it for home use. It is not licensed for OSU-Tulsa. As long as we put it on computers located on this campus, we won't have an issue. She talked with the vendor and determined that there were no issues with administering the licensing.

b. 11-009 – LabView – Kristi Ehrlich reported that the software is used in the labs by the students, much of which is for research. Currently there are licenses held by seven departments in Engineering and two by Physics. Students from Business, MIS, Chemistry and CIS have asked if they can use the license. Currently the licenses are for the department only so it cannot be shared. Kristi reported that the use is for the Stillwater campus only and to be used on university machines only. Kristi reported that she has had eight requests by students for the license over the last six months. The question of the hardware needs was discussed.

c. 11-011 Rev. – Student Union Lab Relocation – Charles McCann reported that a location for 45 computers from the Student Union computer lab has been identified in the Library. The Macs that are located in SU lab will be relocated to the Classroom Building. The handout in the meeting packet summarizes the expenses considered for determining an annual expense of $30,000 for operating the SU lab. It costs approximately $96,000 to replace the SU lab every four years. The renovation in the Student Union does not allocate space for a computer lab. The Union will have, on the second floor, a few print stations and internet stations to check email. The Library building hours are longer than the current SU lab hours so the students will have more access in the new location. The cost to expand the electricity ($40,000) in the Library is being covered by Dr. Strathe. The $30,000 funding request is an annual transfer to the Library to cover operating expenses. No labor costs have been included.

d. 11-016 – CPS Classroom Responder Technology – Dr. Greenwood introduced this project, which is to purchase the licenses for the CPS Classroom Responder project. The idea was that once there was a standardized product, we would be able to finish up the process by centrally managing the licensing for the software. There are two components to the service, the licensing component and the hardware component. The students currently purchase the hardware component (clicker). The problem is with the license fee. So far the faculty members who have adopted the product pay the license fee piecemeal. It was the hope that the license fee could be consolidated at the university level. A lot of faculty members have been inquiring about the product, but the way the license fee is currently handled is a deterrent. It is felt the use would expand if the licensing process was handled on a university level. Two different payment options were offered by the vendor. Option A is an $11 per student per semester activation fee and a $30 per student lifetime activation fee. These costs are billed 50% in August and the remaining 50% to be billed after close of semester drop/add for accurate totals. Option B is a site license fee paid once per year. Charges would be based on estimated usage per year. If the actual usage goes

up or down for that year there is no adjustment made for the current year. Currently around 1500 students are being affected by clickers. The funding request was based on a site license for the actual number of students currently using the system: 1478 students at $11 per clicker. It was recommended that Option B be selected because an overage would be free for this year. The costs would increase in future years if usage increases. ITLE is currently managing the software.

The Committee discussed how to spend funds available in the budget ($123,465) and acted on the projects as follows:

Project 11-008 -- $9,558 (SPSS AMOS License Maint) – **A motion was made to <u>approve</u> Project 11-008. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

Project 11-009 -- $30,000 (LabView) –Concern was expressed regarding the hardware component and the recurring expense for 10 years. The committee feels there are still questions about how many students and classrooms would be impacted. The committee was also interested in whether a cost share would be an option. **A motion was made to <u>deny</u> Project 11-009 as presented. Motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote.** The committee indicated it would consider this project again if more information was presented to answer the questions above.

Project 11-011 Rev. -- $30,000 (Student Union Lab Relocation) – **Motion was made to <u>approve</u> Project 11-011. Motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.**

Project 11-016 -- $16,390 (CPS Classroom Responder Technology) – **A motion was made to <u>approve</u> Project 11-016, using Option B. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

<u>A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion was approved by a voice vote.</u>

Meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Joyce Hise

Minutes approved by the UTSF Committee on November 17, 2010.