INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 1, 2005

[In these minutes:
VoIP, Twin Cities General Purpose Classroom Technology Upgrade Update. Technology Fees]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT:
Andy Lopez, chair, Nancy Herther, Mark Sanders, John See, Dale Swanson, Jeff Johnson, Stephen Cawley, Eric Celeste, Linda Jorn, David DeMuth, Alan Ek, Lynda Ellis, Douglas Ernie, Jim Waddell, Tun Jie, Mahmoud Sadrai

REGRETS: Greg Laden, Stuart Speedie

GUESTS:
Linda Deneen, director, UMD Information Tech Systems/Services; Chuck Bosell, information tech professional, UMD Information Tech Systems/Services; Steve Fitzgerald, director, Office of Classroom Management, Lincoln Kallsen, director, Office of Budget and Finance

OTHERS: Bernard Gulachek, Nancy McGlynn, John H. Miller, Shih-Pau Yen

I). Professor Lopez called the meeting to order.

II).
Chuck Bosell of UMD Information Tech Systems/Services provided members with information on Duluthπs VoIP (Voice-over Internet Protocol) phone system. He highlighted the following:
- Pros:
  - Once the system is installed, the day-to-day adds, moves and changes are quite simple.
  - The system is able to converge voice data and video.
  - UMD Information Tech Systems/Services does not need to be involved in moving phones.
  - Many services e.g. weather services, food services, etc. can be added to the system.
- Cons:
  - Training is an issue because the system has so many features, which users are able to adjust themselves.
    Users frequently require more than one training session, particularly for features that they do not use on a regular basis.
  - The system is so complex it is virtually impossible to diagnose a problem without assistance from a vendor.
  - Wireless IP phone access points do not permit the system to roam fast enough.
  - Users that move their phone to another office without telling Information Tech Systems/Services cause 911 problems.
  - Reliability issues. Redundancy needs to be built into every aspect of the system. There are several points of failure present in the system.
  - The VoIP service will not work during a power outage without an uninterrupted power source (UPS)/emergency generator.
    It costs a significant amount of money to bulletproof the power supply for VoIP.

- While the basic VoIP phone system is relatively inexpensive, maintenance costs, software licensing and all the other add-ons are very expensive.
    - Security can be a problem e.g. phone conversations and voice mail can be hacked into.
- The VoIP phone service at UMD currently consists of 87 IP phones.
- UMD is piloting two VoIP phone systems, Nortel and Cisco Call Manager.
- UMD has found the VoIP phone system to be a costly endeavor.

In closing, Mr. Bosell cautioned others considering installing VoIP to ensure strict testing parameters from vendor(s).
He also noted that many of the vendors are so busy, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to get adequate customer service/technical assistance when attempting to resolve a problem.

III).
Director of the Office of Classroom Management Steve Fitzgerald provided members with a report on the Twin Cities General Purpose Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan. Mr. Fitzgerald highlighted the following:

- The Office of Classroom Management was established in the fall of 1999. At this time general-purpose classrooms were tremendously deficient in the classroom technology resources that facilitate faculty members ability to teach and students ability to learn. As a result, the Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan emerged.
- Goals of the Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan include:
    - Establish a projection capable classroom standard as the baseline for technology infrastructure in all UMTC general-purpose classrooms.
    - Install technology that is affordable, useable, reliable, flexible and user-friendly.
    - Establish an effective faculty support structure.
    - Fund life cycle maintenance and replacement costs.
- Phases of the Technology Upgrade Plan:
    - Raise baseline technology infrastructure in all general-purpose classrooms to that of a åprojection-capable classroomπ.
    - Facilitate student connectivity/networking.
    - Install low-end asynchronous video streaming.
- Examples of projection capable classroom standards were shared with SCIT. These include but are not limited to:
  user-friendly laptop interface, smart control system with networking option, ≥Hotline≤ phone for instructor, flexible growth potential, standardized operating protocol familiar to University faculty, etc.
- Second generation projection capable classroom features include:
    - Network projectors.
    - Network control systems.
    - Ability to monitor the system from a remote location and respond to problems without sending a technician to the classroom.
    - Theft notification sent directly to UMPD dispatcher.
- The Technology Upgrade Package provides for basic technology infrastructure only. The Package does not address facilities and infrastructure issues in classrooms.
- As of spring 2005, 77% of central classrooms on the Twin Cities campus are technology equipped and meet the Projection Capable Classroom Standard.
- Technology infrastructure progress to date:
    - This plan has allowed for rapid and dramatic improvement in the quality of classrooms in which teaching and learning occur.
    - Technology Upgraded/Projection Capable Classrooms have a proven track record of performance, reliability, cost effectiveness and ease of use.
    - Feedback from faculty and students is very positive.

- In addition to the over 220 central projection capable classrooms, various departments and colleges have purchased another 100 systems for their own spaces.
  - Projection capable classrooms provide for economies of scale in terms of maintenance, training and operation, etc.
- Technology upgrade challenges include:
  - Funding limitations have pushed back the technology upgrade completion date from FY04 to FY06.
  - Recurring funding requirements for lifecycle maintenance, equipment replacement are lagging.
  - Dependence on one-time funding for lifecycle replacement and sustainability.

In closing, Mr. Fitzgerald referred members to two diagrams:
- The Universityπs projection capable classroom system.
- The Universityπs central classrooms networked automated management system.

Questions/comments from members:
- Is the University of Minnesota unique in how it handles technology in its central classrooms? To an extent, yes.
  According to Mr. Fitzgerald, because the scale of the Twin Cities campus is so great compared to many other institutions, OCM had to approach its technology enhancements in classrooms in a much more synergistic way from the very onset of this project. He added that even though other colleges may have a lesser amount of technology in their classrooms, many have installed computers, which require a large technology staff to provide support.
- Can visiting faculty connect to the network when on campus? Yes, as long as these individuals are sponsored by a department and registered through DHCP. The system is engineered to operate with DHCP registered users.
- In the future will there be a time when connectors for handheld devices will be available so it will not be necessary to carry a laptop?
  It is OCMπs goal to be able to interface all computing devices that are brought into classroom environments.
  However, before doing so the infrastructure needs to be in place to interface with all these various ubiquitous computing devices, which undoubtedly all faculty and students will have at some point in the future.
  This is the direction that OCM wants to go rather than managing unique, often expensive devices on a small scale.

IV).
Lincoln Kallsen from the Office of Budget and Finance provided members with information concerning technology fees.
He noted that students in the Institute of Technology brought the idea of technology fees to the administration in the early 1990πs.
These students approached the administration requesting they be assessed a fee in order for their college to be able to purchase more and better technology.
Not long after, other colleges followed suit and also started assessing fees. Mr. Kallsen distributed the most recent 2004 -2005 Technology and Collegiate Fee (per semester) Schedule. He pointed out the following:

- Up until recently, only colleges with higher technology needs assessed higher fees but this has changed.
- Some colleges are assessing collegiate fees. Collegiate fees are assessed for technology and other general expenses.

Mr. Kallsen went on to explain the process.
He noted that colleges bring their proposed fees forward through the budget process on an annual basis. In

determining fees, each college is supposed to solicit student input. Once the colleges have set their fees then the Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences approves them. Finally, the fees are presented to the Board of Regents along with the rest of the University budget for approval.

Mr. Kallsen distributed a handout illustrating technology and collegiate fee revenues on the Twin Cities campus from FY99 – FY04 and noted that technology and collegiate fees have grown substantially over the years. At this point, Mr. Kallsen solicited comments and questions from members:

- How do colleges coordinate their fees when a student from one college takes a course in a different college? Fees, with one exception, are charged to the studentπs home college. The exception is IT and this is due to the high-end systems that are used in certain courses. If a student takes one of these courses, he/she pays the IT fee along with his/her home college fee.
- What level of oversight/accountability exists in the process? Any fee that increases over 3% automatically gets reviewed.
  Once the administration has approved the fees, it is the collegeπs responsibility to oversee the appropriate use of these funds.
  The administration expects that the rate and use of fees by the colleges are set within a student-guided context.
- The Committee should consider drafting a resolution to have a universal technology fee as opposed to each college assessing its own fee.
- The Library, because it is not a collegiate unit, does not have access to these fees other than through its efforts to engage colleges to be supportive of certain Library initiatives. For the Library these collaborations with colleges represent one-time money and must be justified as service for that collegesπ students. It is very difficult for the Library to get the recurring funding that it needs to maintain a basic level of service for the entire University community. CLA was singled-out and complimented for working with the Libraries on various initiatives; however, it was noted that this is not the case across all colleges.
- The University fee, which is separate from technology/collegiate fees, helps cover infrastructure and administrative support costs in a wide variety of areas e.g. classrooms, WebCT, Library, etc. There is pressure from students on the administration to be more accountable for how these monies are spent.
- There exists a lot of confusion around all the fees that are assessed on students. Most of the complaints received from students are on the wide variety of fees, which they are being forced to pay, but virtually no complaints about the adequacy of technology on campus.
- The Committee should draft a recommendation to bring order to technology fees, and align technology spending with the Universityπs expense strategies/strategic planning efforts.

Professor Lopez noted that at next monthπs meeting, the Committee would continue this discussion. Questions for members to consider include:

- Should collegiate fees continue to be assessed?
- If so, should fees be set and controlled at the local level by the colleges themselves?
- Should fees vary from college to college, or is this a bad idea from a student services perspective?

In closing, Mr. Kallsen volunteered to return in April and share with the Committee information on how the technology/collegiate fees are being spent by each college.

V). Future agenda items:
March: Continued discussion of technology/collegiate fees and Storage Area Network.
April: WebCT – conversion to Vista.

Other agenda item ideas: Breeze

VI). Hearing no further business, Professor Lopez adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate