Preview of PBA—Laura previewed the draft of the proposed PBA presentation and reiterated that this is a draft. It is an attempt to form a reasonable solution that will work in most areas. This material was previewed to the Central IT staff on 9/30/2010, and after the ATSC has prioritized the items and provided feedback, it will be presented to Moh El-Saidi, with potential further conversations with deans, etc. A subcommittee task force was used to gather input on area tech support and media classroom support. Whether IT is done centrally or de-centralized is based on trying to achieve a balance of efficiency and responsiveness. Laura thinks we can do this by working together, and that a balance can be achieved whether the function is centralized or de-centralized. The issues that roll up to the VPs have been discussed by ATSC. Laura mentioned the successes that have been accomplished this past year. These included the instructional media technology for the 72 centrally scheduled classrooms and the Woodbury Business building, the academic IT area technician that serves Wasatch Campus, National Guard, Community Education, etc., the Digital Measures implementation, active directory, and faculty workload. Our challenges stem from our growth and the complexity of our business processes and systems. We have had an increase in PC purchases of 45% for a three-year period. We have multiple devices per employee and the expectation to deliver academic content anywhere at anytime. We have had phenomenal growth in the number of students we need to support with wireless, in labs, etc. as well. For the area technicians we need to find a way to normalize the workload and find funding to put the career ladder in place for academic IT as it is already in place for central IT. We need additional media-enhanced classrooms and a plan for replacing aging equipment/systems. We also need to frame a procedure for reasonable, yet responsive support for faculty. Other areas of perceived needs are academic IT staffing, live interactive/hybrid course delivery, training for faculty and staff, an increase in central funding for new faculty computers, active directory expertise and added resources, as well as increased system deployment efficiency for academic labs and faculty and staff desktops. It has been suggested in discussions with Kathie Debenham that we might want to consider putting a broadcast room in every building. Laura would like assistance in prioritizing the list. We need to show demonstrable need. Laura has anecdotal data, but not everyone is tracking their work, and we don’t know how many devices are out there. We do track labs, but this doesn’t have all the data either.

Area Technician Support Discussion—After discussion with sub committees and looking at some outside data, Laura has come up with a standard ratio for area techs based on the number of employees, the skill level of employees, the number of computers and devices, the complexity of systems, and the number of specialized labs, servers and systems. The standard Laura is using is 125 to 1 desktop support tech or 6 labs to 1 manager (recommend 300 to 1 for someone like Jake or Cam) based on current job description. It was suggested that Laura add the number of students served to the equation. It was also suggested that we may not want to have a standardized number. It might be better handled at the Dean’s level and worked out with their support. Laura stated that she wants this number to be a guideline, but the discussion with the Deans still needs to take place. Laura clarified that the College of T&C and Woodbury School of Business have been able to strike a balance with their technician staffing, because they have a higher amount and complexity of technology within their curriculum. This makes it a priority for the dean. If any proposed guidelines are helpful to those deans, they may use them. The guidelines will be helpful for the committee and other deans who are in need of help in knowing how to measure what they need in the area of support for their technology. We
have the need for more help and this will help us to better identify what the level of the need is—lab assistant vs. area technician. Laura explained the slides of area support metrics. Jake is also covering other needs besides Education. We can’t just look at the number of employees, we have to look at the complexity of programs, etc. As far as lab stats are concerned, not all computers are reporting into the lab stats software. We could look at the number of incidents closed, but we have some areas who are not using the system (Magic) like it should be used. Due to the lack of data, Laura will not be using these charts in her PBA presentation to Academics. There was some committee discussion on whether it should be a Dean’s resource decision vs. standard for all areas. It was noted that we need to account for growth—there is no formula to handle growth. Some concern was voiced about having a standard number and the Dean’s only considering the number and not the other factors. We need to look at the number of devices being supported but we don’t have a good inventory tracking system. Dave increased 67% on number of computers he supports in last three years. It was suggested that Laura create a list of things that should be done, but are not being done, so that we can get the data we need. It was also suggested that we see if Magic can go mobile. Why should a support person have to go back to desk their desk to enter data about a ticket or access a ticket? We also need to look at how we define what we are inputting in the system—2 work orders or 70 work orders depending on how you count it. Do we know about iPads. They have no inventory tag and there is a question on bandwidth. Laura suggested the tech take down the UVID and ask for the asset tag. This will better allow for tracking of assets as well.

Proposed Future AST Models—Laura has created a model of starting criteria taken from current job descriptions so that we can coordinate efforts. There was some discussion about concerns that the guidelines would become policy. If we publish it out, we can’t control if it becomes policy. We would like it to just be used to make recommendations for hiring and for departments to make decisions on what type of person they will hire. These decisions also play into the career ladder structure. Educational opportunities for staff also need to be considered. No matter where a person reports, we need to increase our coordination within the groups. Laura is going to recommend supporting Career Ladder requests and has developed a slide with approximate costs. She will also be recommending better coordination with the HelpDesk and to fund and leverage ongoing tools, such as Magic. There is a training and certification recommendation and it follows that there should be a commitment to give the technician time for training. We need to delineate between the area support function and curricular technology support—Science/Health, Arts, HelpDesk in priority order. It was suggested we do a survey on why people are not calling the HelpDesk instead of getting (2nd tier support person) area techs to help them with simple problems.

**Media Classrooms**—Laura discussed the upgraded media rooms. We were able to upgrade most of our remaining centrally-scheduled classrooms last summer, but we probably have ten more rooms, estimating $12,000 per room. We need a replacement schedule of equipment and rooms, such as the replacement of projectors in the CS building. Laura wants to start putting an aging cycle together. Let Laura know if there is a need in a room that is not centrally scheduled so that it can be communicated, and make sure your dean is asking for it in PBA. Otherwise, the classroom request will only include centrally scheduled rooms.

As far as support goes, we need to make it easy for faculty to know who to call and when. We have problems with adjuncts that bring their own laptops and don’t check out what they need in advance. Area techs would like Travis to provide an image and then they will add theirs or vice versa. We also need to have carts available. We need more options available for the first five minutes when the tech is standing in front of the faculty with an issue. There is also a training issue for faculty. Starting in Spring semester, there will be training for media and faculty/staff won’t be able to log in until they take the
quiz. It was also suggested that we include how to get on the wireless network. Another suggestion was to have supplies available for swap out. Laura will ask JoAnn for numbers on what it would take for evening and weekend support of adjunct and will take bulb support off slide.

**Other**—Faculty laptop funding was discussed. It was determined that the Dean should decide who should get laptops. The budget office currently reimburses up to $1000 for new position computers. It was recommended that this be increased to $1700 per computer. LMS—still in process of making the decision. An RFP will go out. We have multiple LMS on campus but this should be an exception. Laura reviewed the summary of proposed requests for PBA. Please give comments to Laura.
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