

MINUTES OF STUDENT TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Date: April 28, 2017

Location: 605 Hodges Library

Attending: Mark Alexander (Asst VC), Ernest Bernard, Tim Boruff (for Mark Alexander), Andrew Capps, Dakota Cauthen, Bill Dunne, Samson Girma, Jennifer Gramling (for Robert Hinde), Sherilyn Hammonds (Co-Chair), Eric Hampton, David Mendez, Leigh Mutchler, Jacob Rogers, AJ Schroder, Cory Tacosik, Brittany Wright [**bold** indicates present]

Attending, ex officio: Larry Jennings, David Ratledge, Joel Reeves (Co-Chair) (**bold** indicates present)

Guests:

Minutes by: Charlene Laughlin, OIT

Agenda	Description	Follow-up																																			
Welcome and Introductions	Last Tech Fee meeting of the year																																				
Updates	<p>Equipment Rental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment Update – get PP from LJ (chargers in library for check-out) • Power adapters – some lost and never recovered, students will be locked out of renting again • David handles these check-outs • Low cost investment – Joel shows the usage report, clearly popular • David noted that a library hold is placed on persons failing to return borrowed equipment <p>Aug 2016 - Present</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="466 1214 1778 1471"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Loans</th> <th>Returned Late</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Apple 85W MagSafe 2 Power Adapter</td> <td>Undergraduate</td> <td>793</td> <td>121</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Special Undergraduate</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Graduate</td> <td>33</td> <td>3</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Faculty</td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Staff</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>841</td> <td>124</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Loans	Returned Late		Apple 85W MagSafe 2 Power Adapter	Undergraduate	793	121	15%		Special Undergraduate	4				Graduate	33	3	9%		Faculty	8				Staff	3				Total	841	124	15%	
		Loans	Returned Late																																		
Apple 85W MagSafe 2 Power Adapter	Undergraduate	793	121	15%																																	
	Special Undergraduate	4																																			
	Graduate	33	3	9%																																	
	Faculty	8																																			
	Staff	3																																			
	Total	841	124	15%																																	

Agenda	Description					Follow-up
	Apple 85W MagSafe Power Adapter	Undergraduate	642	119	19%	
		Special Undergraduate	7			
		Graduate	52	4	8%	
		Faculty	4			
		Staff	1			
		Total	706	123	17%	
	Dell 90W Power Adapter	Undergraduate	201	19	9%	
		Special Undergraduate	1	1	100%	
		Graduate	5	3	60%	
		Faculty	1	1	100%	
		Staff	2			
		Total	210	24	11%	
	HP 4.5mm to 7.4mm converter	Undergraduate	5	1	20%	
		Total	5	1	20%	
	HP 90W Smart Power Adapter	Undergraduate	139	25	18%	
		Graduate	9	4	44%	
		Total	148	29	20%	
	Magsafe to Magsafe 2 Converter	Undergraduate	174	44	25%	
		Special Undergraduate	1			
		Graduate	7			
		Total	182	44	24%	
Total		209				
Total		2	345	16%		

Agenda	Description	Follow-up
<p>Review of College or Unit 2017 Tech Fee Requests</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spreadsheet with various unit tech fee requests and OIT recommendations were distributed on Wednesday, April 26, 2017 for committee review. • Additional information about unit accomplishments and goals is on the secure (Sign-in required) part of the Tech Fee website at techfee.utk.edu • Committee members were asked to review the requests prior to the meeting and make any notes about suggestions or questions. • FY 17/18 – budgeted 1 million (try to target exact amount) • Adobe licenses will be subsidized by OIT with end of 16-17 tech fee money (not part of this budget); proposed budget of \$1,012,600.69 taken from the \$2,217,636.19 requests • Spreadsheet shows details broken down by college • A lot of discussion that went into the proposal, appropriateness of funding, priority order and benefits to students; overall trying to take everything into consideration • Question: Bernard – licenses, are those routinely requested every year? Reeves: Not necessarily; it all depends on what departmental needs • Comment: Some were small amounts, some colleges are strapped financially • Discussion on line item #2 Respondus LockDown Browser: Jennifer: just covering browser this year; this tool is used by all departments • Line item #3 iThenticate: Mark: meant to be used beyond classroom, every grad thesis/dissertation reviewed by iThenticate. It's a requirement. Unlimited? Departments (large) like Engineering, seem to be pleased and not run out. Ernest – unlimited and cost was \$30-40k (one year actually \$25k), grad school licensing campus wide. Larry – access to cover letter? Yes, (at least UTK campus); not going to plug into Canvas (not for undergrad). Suggested we do one year of it. • Line item # 5 - (committee approved 3 out of 5) • Line item # 6 – standing request for Architecture lab machines (approximately ¼ of the lab); recycle machines every year • Line item # 7 – Arts and Sciences Apple iMac computers; refresh approximately 1/3 of computers in photo lab • Line item #8 – as mentioned earlier, Adobe to be funded through OIT (remaining tech fee from 16-17 budget) • Questions? Line item # 23 – instructional laboratory equipment; legitimate equipment needed but does it fit in Tech Fee Program? 	

Agenda	Description	Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee agreed Chemistry requests were not a fit for Tech Fee Program. • Suggestions for reallocating monies? Arts and Sciences, Music and Geography Department probably more appropriate recommendation for funding (give them all a fair shake). • Line item #193 - Disability Services – Joel explained he removed this request and was working with Student Life in relation to DAS facility in space under Fred Brown. When this is approved, OIT will take care of Disabilities Services lab (removed item from college Tech Fee funding request) • Discussion: Line #40 Math request for computers for GTA's. Central Administration puts money for computer refresh (faculty/staff), these were beginning to trickle down to teaching lecturers, and etc. regarding line #40 – CUP program went to a five year refresh, eliminating trickle down of useable computers to GTA's and lecturers. Joel is working with Finance Administration to go back to four year refresh to re-enable departments to trickle down useable computers • Committee agreed to approve line #40 this year but reevaluate next year. Departments can show justification for lecturers (one time deal); note to give closer examination next year. • Line item # 44 – again replacing old computers along with a network printer • Question: What's impact for modern foreign languages, line item #42? Foreign languages lab or tool? (Timecenter reservation data). Explanation given lacked adequate information. • Mark: back to line item # 44 - probably measuring the impact of use of equipment (clearly a technology request, just not clear on intended use of 25 iPad Pros. After further review and clarification provided, the committee agreed to approve. • Jennifer: Line item #64 - That is truly a compliance issue. Monitor piece so students can engage in recording, requested through Academic Affairs but most heavily used by College of Business. Jennifer suggested they request this through Tech Fee. • Bill: College of Business, instructional spaces are high tech; at no point did university agree to pay for the upgrade. He says the room management system is a facilities item. • Joel: The requested amount is considerably less than amount to cover the expense. They are funding a large portion of the expense themselves. • Joel: Does collaboration help the university and education? No doubt. • Bill: Reserving rooms (clearly technology) but there's a lot more requests to consider. • Question: Setting a precedent? Joel: Yes, it could be applied to any building. After further discussion, committee decided not to award this request due to fact it is a facilities related request. • Bill: it's a facilities capability and it accounts for 16% of overall Tech Fee Funding for one building. Could easily wipe-out Tech Fee funding with similar requests. 	

Agenda	Description	Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joel reminded group: Facilities Fee doesn't cover technology anymore. Facilities Fee gives OIT money to manage classrooms and classroom technology. • Bill: Some value from this to the rest of the campus (precedent argument is scary); trying to hold it just to the AV (this could be similar situation) • Joel: Agreed that setting this precedent is not a good thing. regarding line item #61 – Hypersign is new campus standard for digital signage. HCB looking to replace room reservation system using Hypersign for user interface). Classrooms can be opened up for general purpose use when not occupied for classes. The goal is to integrate room reservation system with current campus standards (AdAstra (room scheduling) and Cardax (building access)). • Question: truly student related? Joel agreed to reject but reminded committee it was HCB's number one request (current system is out dated and deemed a security risk). • Set this money aside for later discussion, open for discussion. • Eric: You mentioned that College of Business was taking the brunt of the start-up expense, which would help the university. Does it mean that College of Business will be taking brunt end of a project that will soon be adopted by the university? Larry the way HCB is building this reservation system, it could easily be implemented across campus (using two centrally managed systems: AdAstra and Cardax system). Joel: Hypersign, Ad Astra and Cardax are all centrally managed systems. So you still have system controls that OIT does support and then you have this front-end interface which is most of what this request includes. Front end development of this room manager could be deployed to other buildings on campus. • Joel: back to first impact statement noted for line item #61 replace student room reservation and kiosk system (avoiding keys). It is technology related. Joel showed the detailed breakdown of request for committee to review. • Mark: Recommend higher level discussion about how this should work. Other groups may not agree. • Joel: HyperSign is a standard, AdAstra is the room management system and Cardax (all of campus will eventually adopt), and so UTK and OIT do have a big stake in it. • This part recognizes the netIDs (identifiers), checks to see that room is available through AdAstra and determines if room can be reserved through the netIDs (checking the central room scheduling system) and checking with central alarm to confirm room is available, not locked down for some reason (all three components centrally used to support it). • Joel: Registrar can change the room status without calling HCB; Central Alarm can lock the building down when deemed necessary without having to call HCB. • 	

Agenda	Description	Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and Human Services – did great job of prioritizing requests; first seventeen items (yes) skipped 18 – reason: clicker purchases are through bookstore like textbooks. • Joel – for committee discussion in coming year, want to bid out clicker system next year; Included in bid would be evaluation of enterprise wide license, eliminate student’s having to pay annual maintenance fees for clickers. • Line items #85-87: Deemed research needs not technology related. Decided to revisit. • Line item # 97: Veggie meter (similar to Chemistry request we are cutting?) Decided against. • Engineering – this list has been scrutinized already • Joel: Anything that we rejected that we need to discuss? • Comment: Possibly consider the departments that requested Comsol? • Line item # 149 - Abaqus – this year only one department and fairly low priority (Note: Abaqus– offered already, available on apps.utk.edu) • Law School – gave them number one priority • Comment (David): mentioned considering other library requests (line 182); so adding some other library requests with reallocated funds. • Priority printer for library (serving everybody all the time) • Studio – graphic design (expert people on hand too) • No objections to adding these for library. • Moving along (but Joel says we will come back to the library if any other funds left) • Nursing – adding simulator • Student Life – already talked about testing center (so approved second priority) • Joel: Anything else we need to look at? • Ernest – mentioned hoping to add things to students (cameras for check out, etc.) • Joel: only three left for library that we didn’t approve • Comment: maybe we should allocate some of remaining funds to Art, Music and Geography • Comment (Eric): Line items 127 and 128 – open computer lab serves a lot of students (Engineering Fundamentals Department is web based). Homework system is exemplary. Old computers in the lab – request was broken down into three parts. • Line item # 9 for Arts and Sciences – Projectors for photography classes? Approved. • Committee agreed to allow College of Business to re-submit request • Libraries – 3D printer serves libraries on the Ag Campus (extremely inconvenient not to have it) what they have now requires it to be turned over to staff (to process). Serves a lot of students. But maybe revisit other requests first. • Anything else? 	

Agenda	Description	Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to updated spreadsheet for details on Committee decisions regarding these requests. • Joel: Appreciates the service of all committee members, end of term for some. 	
FY18 College/Department Award Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 28 – TAB review/approval • Early May – Colleges/Departments receive award notification 	
Meeting Adjourned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you! 	