TAB meeting, February 23, 2011

Attending: Brandon Remmert, Burton Peake, Michael Wirth, Scott Studham, Robert Fuller, David Ratledge, Gina Phipps, Joanne Logan, Jonee Lindstrom (for Chris Cimino), Sally McMillan, Louis Davis, Mark Alexander, Robbie Churchill.

Review meetings from February (Gina Phipps): please comment by Friday for changes and clarifications; will post to Tech Fee website

College awards process for FY 12 (Gina Phipps):

· Logan: college has never really assessed IT, who does it, what's in the classrooms, non-registrar controlled classrooms not surveyed; identifying faculty who are tech users and what their needs might be in 5-10 years.
    o College always puts in for the same things; trying to get more long-term thinking
    o Going to do a walkabout
· McMillan: synergy between TF awards and classroom upgrade committee; looking at teaching styles? Answer: Yes, but majority of faculty only lecture.
· McMillan: should we consider more holistically? No specific recommendation, but lots of conversations about trying to change how instruction delivered to be more in tune with today's students. Strong technology component. Question to Wirth: is it possible to consider TF requests in isolation or should it be part of a larger conversation? Answer from Logan: Should be more than just TF. Comment from Phipps: Looking at making classrooms more active.
· Ratledge: Library just bought iPads for all faculty, get them to start using for instruction. Considering TF request to use iPads for checkout.
· Logan: discussing database or clearinghouse of technology use on campus; the "bleeding edge" faculty examples.
· Wirth: committee working on ???.
· Phipps: impression is that colleges have either a person or a committee working on technology in general.

Banner status (Scott Studham)

· Technology Advisory Board directs use of a tax levied on students by students for IT projects that weren't centrally funded. E.g., Banner is not Tech Fee.
· This group works on what students spend student money on.
· Going to ask for use of crisis funds from Student Tech Fee for Banner.
· Success determined by being successful: Banner is great, $10M project, 10 years, very successful. However, we are at crunch time; some concerns about ability to finish up this term with Banner.
    o DARS went live today in Banner: can do degree audits, but some issues such as transfer credits. Didn't have enough testing to confirm 100% accuracy, but had to go live today. There was a bug; couldn't find the bug; brought in every consultant possible including the person who wrote the product. Found and fixed, but not enough testing.
    o Transcripts: stress about ability to have transcript system working by end of term.
    o End-of-term processes: We learned things from start-of-term, like the new bill sent each time a class added or dropped. This was a nuisance; students not graduating would be catastrophic.
    o Concern about doom-and-gloom briefing, but will ask for input on student willingness to allow use of reserve funding to finish project this term. Hopes never to ask that again. But, for example, consultants run $200/hour, and that's a LOT of money. Not all of that would be attributable to student funds, but would like to consider permission to use some.
· Crisis status decided on January 24.
    o Started tracking on January 24; for first two weeks new tasks kept being added.
    o Not looking at cost of consultants; looking at hitting scope on schedule so students can graduate.
    o Upper left corner is all tasks to be done by end of term.
    o Lower right corner is the highest priority, "TIGER" tasks. If we don't get those done, we'll be back in the newspaper.
    o Even the red, we don't know how to do this, tasks have to be completed by end of year. Includes:
        § HOPE Scholarship GPA calculation and report
        § Academic standing calculations – Banner out of the box doesn't have the function UT uses (UT more complicated). Having to be programmed. Person who can program that has been exclusively focused on DARS and Transcripts. These people have worked every single day since Christmas.
    o Question from Logan: Are other schools our size going through this sort of thing? Studham: Yes, and of all the ERP projects he's been on, this has been the smoothest.
· If TAB agrees to partner, will continue to provide updated reports.
· Tiger Teams
    o DARS: still issues: no what if scenarios.
    o Spring 2011 transcripts: to keep comments appropriate (internal comments only visible to advising are kept from public view) but public comments (e.g., student withdrew from university) must show. SunGard doesn't support that; their modification won't be delivered until June and implemented until August. Trying to write on own. Other

highly skilled programmer working on in, in COBOL, about 200 hours of work. Will not be paying SunGard for this. Contingency plan is to port back to mainframe.
- o Departmental reports: outside the Banner team, most of the stress among faculty / staff comes from reports (e.g., who's in class; which student athletes have moved house).
- o User input: the logout issue. Confusion about how to log out. When log in to MyUTK and click on Banner, MyUTK logs you into Banner through SSO; need to log out of Banner AND MyUTK. The MyUTK logout button has been changed with a "how to log out" set of instructions. Issue was advisor having student log in to Banner, then killing the window, and then finding Banner still logged in to first student. First plan is to educate; second plan if necessary is to kill Single Sign On.
  - § Logan notes that her list of advisees still includes people who graduated.
- o Term Start-Up: mini, summer, and fall. Advisors starting to clear student flags.
- o End of Term: Most risk. DARS and Transcripts were high-focus; now focusing on end of term: academic standing calculations, how to enter grades, etc.
- o Contingency planning: Professional pessimists
- o Financial Aid / Accounts Receivable: no progress on Title IV or Lottery
- · Status:
  - o DARS in production; risk of student getting wrong information.
  - o Transcripts: waiting 200 hours for programmer to write.
  - o Personnel burn-out. People have worked every day since break.
  - o Lottery tracking
  - o Title IV data collection and report
- · User input
  - o "Don't know what it is, but I hear it has problems." Logan notes that the old system had issues, too.
  - o Logging out
  - o Missing reports
  - o Manual business processes
  - o Adjustment
- · Question from Davis: How did we reach this situation that is so grave? Did Banner have to be launched this semester? Were these things just not thought of? Since we had a functioning system, did we just not look at it?
  - o There were things that we just didn't realize we'd missed, e.g., transcript comments.
  - o DARS was a bug that couldn't be solved until late.
  - o Without those two things, the last two months would have been focused on end-of-temr processing.
  - o Why was project initiated? To drive statewide standards; all other campuses already implements. UTK has a mainframe that costs about $1M / year that we can turn off. Also, new features in Banner that weren't available in homegrown solution. When move from homegrown to product, have access to new services: richer analytics on data, characteristics of successful student.
  - o Question: Why launch before end of term solutions solved? Answer: Transcript and DARS weren't on the radar, and that delayed.
- · Question from Remmert: what are you looking for from students? Answer: given that student funds are not supposed to be used for things like Banner, ask for support just to get the TIGER issues solved.
- · Question from Lindstrom: Would we need to request an exemption from TF bylaws? Answer: Tech Fee is at CIO's discretion but only for student requests; TAB provides advice to CIO. CIO is asking for students to request this project, and fund from TAB reserves. Does not want to discuss amount of surplus, but it's "a lot".
- · Worst case projection at this point: needing $200,000 to $400,000 from TAB reserves, if TAB will request this project. Would only use TAB money after using all other possible sources. Can't justify using Networking and Telephony reserves.
- · Question from Alexander: Could this be a loan, to be paid back? Answer: No, not viable budgetarily.
- · Question from Remmert: what's deadline? Answer: Today.
- · Peake: this is important to students; we want to graduate.
- · Studham: How about, you request the project, and Studham and Remmert will meet to discuss specific costs and uses.
- · Question from Churchill: Can we have a point at which we will say "this much is too much" – can we say no more than $X? Answer: Yes, absolutely.
- · Peake moves that we support the Banner project as a student-directed project, with a limit of $300,000; any additional funds to require additional approval. Motion carried.

BATS: Big Awesome Terminal Server, where students can access any lab software from any lab on campus

- · Scope: OIT Managed Labs (not college-funded labs)
  - o 33 Windows labs, 5 Mac labs; 1,000 desktops and 80 laptops
  - o 6 PC images, 2 Mac images
- · Lab management: Mainframes and thin-client terminals
  - o Allows Mac users to run Windows apps: uses CITRIX to run a Windows OS; don't need to run parallels

- o Maintains a single installation of each app rather than one per image
- o Rapid app deployment (hours instead of weeks)
- o Easier migration from one version of Windows to the next
- · Student driven concept from 2009 TAB
  - o 2009 Concept
  - o 2010 Pilot, Contracts, and Plan
  - o Delayed major deployment because Citrix software was going to be half the total cost; now down to 20% of total cost.
  - o 2011 to date Have negotiated with vendors, have money available to go
  - o Ready to buy HUGE terminal server: several hundred CPUs, multiple GB of RAM, half a Petabyte of storage.
  - o Phase I
    - § iPad running Windows
    - § Transition from PCs to thin clients: Cost savings (hardware – they costs about $150 each – and electricity) and greener; reduce downtime from hardware failure. Concern from Logan about number of people able to access server and software at same time; issue with GIS in past hanging up if too many logged in. Studham notes that risk exists: if a lab becomes isolated due to network failure, apps will stop running.
    - § Eventually allow users to access lab apps from their own devices, including iPads and phones.
    - § Increase flexibility for faculty in scheduling labs for teaching since all apps will be available in every lab
  - o Question from Logan: Does this mean faculty can't buy standalone licenses? Studham: No; can always buy standalone licenses, but most won't need to.
  - o Question from Churchill: This makes sense for big programs like Adobe; what about programs only used by small numbers of students? E.g., ISIS in chemistry only used by about 50 students. Answer: Departments can buy licenses and put in a college lab or put on the BATS and limit access to specific students. Question: Would this alleviate last minute inability to get access to a license? Answer: It would be a department issue; how many licenses are they willing to buy. But departments can pool licenses. Comment from Logan: Might be able to increase capacity at lower price by using server licenses.
  - o Question from Davis: How does licensing work? Answer: Every vendor is different. We have a team that does nothing but manage licenses. Question: Will this give us an advantage? Answer: Yes, absolutely. And will benefit students by giving access to University owned site licenses (e.g., MS Office, Adobe Photoshop). Some vendors allow for concurrent licenses; some require named user licenses.
  - o Question from Ratledge: Would this be only Library Commons, or all Library machines? Answer: At this point, only OIT managed labs. Question: If OIT provides the image, but the machines are owned by the Library, would this be available? Answer: Technically, no, but if it's the exact same hardware, it wouldn't cost us more money.
  - o Question from Alexander: can we get information about hardware so we can buy same machines as OIT labs using.
- · Phase II
  - o 2013 allow mobile access
- · Timeline and costs
  - o Phase I: Summer 2011, OIT managed labs and volunteer departmental labs
  - o Phase II: Remote access to OIT lab apps for all students
  - o Budgeted in TAB
- · General agreement to continue with project

Student prioritization for FY12

- · Students approaching consensus but not quite there yet
- · Remmert: Looked at each item for cost / schedule / scope. Want to prioritize for reaching out to most students. Costs should align with number affected and whether TAB was appropriate source of funding. Have one issue still hanging.
- · Phipps: Should we do this remotely between now and March, or come together in March? Suggestion from Studham: Should provide information to all of TAB as soon as possible.
- · Question from Churchill: Did Phipps get notes from Tech Fee? Actually just hung up on one item. Comment from Davis: Phipps will look up something and provide definition and more information. Once get that information, will have decision in next few days.

Meeting adjourned