Campus Technology Officers Meeting Minutes
May 22, 2003   3:00-5:00 pm
Reno SCS 47, Las Vegas SCS 304,
Elko GBC 128, Carson City WNCC 308

Present: Van Weddle, Chair; Joni Flowers, CCSN; Garry Heberer, GBC; Don Moxley, WNCC; Alvin Rains, NSC; Becky Seibert, SCS; Lori Temple, UNLV; Steven Zideck, TMCC; Steven Zink, UNR

1. Chancellor's Technology Task Force Mandate

Van reviewed the Chancellor's mandate to the Technology Task Force, soliciting input from the CTOs about their role in each of the five items.

1. *"Assess the current state of technology at each institution and system-wide. How well is technology serving the mission of each institution, particularly with regard to students, instruction, research and outreach to Nevada?"* The consensus was that this preliminary report of critical needs prepared by the CTOs is a first step toward fulfilling task number one. It should be completed and forwarded to the Task Force with the following caveats:
    1) For most campuses this assessment of needs represents the view of the CTO. Additional input should be sought from the campus community—faculty, administrators and students. The need for validation will vary from campus to campus depending on how the needs were identified by the CTO.
    2) The impact of the stated deficiencies needs to be included. The CTOs can provide some information about the impact, but more needs to come from those who use and benefit from technology rather than from the technology providers.
    The Technology Task Force should solicit validation of the stated needs and data about the impact of deficiencies from their campus communities.

2. *"Study current and potential state-of-the-art use of technology to advance the missions of higher education within Nevada."* The CTOs suggest that the Technology Task Force review the current top IT issues identified by EDUCAUSE. See "Fourth Annual EDUCAUSE Survey Identifies Current IT Issues", EDUCAUSE QUARTERLY, Number 2, 2003, http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EQM0322.pdf.

3. *"Create a vision and plan for optimal use of technology within UCCSN, differentiating among institutional types as appropriate."* All campuses have processes for academic and strategic planning. The vision for IT should be tied directly to those processes. The CTOs suggest that the Task Force response propose a process that ensures IT involvement in and response to strategic campus planning. The group did not discuss how system-wide coordination might be included.

4. *"Design a timeline for reaching the goals set."* No comment from CTOs.

5. *"Study funding mechanisms for technology used across the country in higher education and, based on your plan and timeline, recommend strategies for Nevada."* SCS is

providing some research based on the peer institutions identified by the CTOs. In September there will also be some data from EDUCAUSE based on their ongoing Core Data Survey.

2. Finalize Most Critical Issues Documents

The group agreed that we should make some revisions, combine the current two documents into one and forward it to the Technology Task Force with the caveats mentioned above. It needs campus input and validation, and it needs impact statements.

The references to the demise of the Estate Tax are no longer relevant. This legislature has agreed that the state will assume the responsibility for funding the current Estate Tax budget. The CTOS expressed strong concern that, first, the legislature may not be able to fund this, given projected state income, and, second, administrators may mistakenly believe this solves the technology-funding problem. The CTOs want administrators to realize that funding Estate Tax items does not mean increased funding for a very inadequate existing technology budget. Estate Tax references will be modified and will include a comment that the funding problems remain.

The document to the Task Force will be considered preliminary because of the need for further input and impact information. It will begin with summary information. "Comprehensive Problems" will come first and will highlight funding and staffing problems. The individual campus listings will follow. The UNR section will contain a statement to be supplied by Steve Zink showing the URL of the full UNR plan.   Becky will send out the revised version for CTO review before sending it to the Task Force.

It was decided not to include the information provided by the Vice Presidents in response to Vice Chancellor Curry's request. That information could be included when the Task Force solicits additional input.

3. Status of Peer Institution Survey

The CTOs reviewed the list of peer institutions and made one correction. The universities want information from the University of Idaho rather than from Idaho State. Van asked the CTOs to respond to the survey themselves so that UCCSN information could be included in the database with the peer information. There were some questions about exactly what information would be collected. These questions will be resolved after the CTOs have seen the survey. It was suggested that the data collected match the data being collected by EDUCAUSE in the Core Data Survey. This would allow for useful comparisons in the future.

4. WebCT Directions

Roberta Roth asked for an update on Campus Edition implementations at each campus. CCSN is using CE and will soon move to CE 4.0. UNR will put CE into production in the fall. UNLV began using CE for the summer sessions. TMCC will begin using CE in the fall. GBC and WNCC are using CE 3.8 and have no current need to move to 4.0. NSC is using CE 3.8 and

plans to move to 4.0 this summer. TMCC, GBC, WNCC and NSC are currently running under a combined SCS license.

Roberta reported that SCS is currently cleaning up duplicate student user IDs on the Pioneer and Fallon platforms. UNLV has requested that SCS work with them to put a process in place whereby students and faculty all have unique system user IDs loaded into SIS and that ID changes are properly propagated throughout all systems. They plan to use the IDs for a variety of purposes. Lori Temple will send a copy of her request to the other CTOs for information. Roberta said the faculty part couldn't be implemented until the new HR system is in place.

SCS is doing some research into the WebCT Vista product. Will the architecture meet our needs for a centralized implementation with distributed control? What are the capacity requirements? What are the costs for cluster licensing? Lori is researching sites to visit. Someone from UNR will be visiting a site in Canada this summer. There was discussion about whether to make an enterprise Vista implementation a priority for the 05-07 biennial budget request. This will require more discussion. It was noted that if this is desired, work must be done next fall because that is when the first plans for the budget are laid. This might mean that site visits should take place this summer. When asked whether it will be a priority for the coming biennium, some said yes; some said they weren't sure because Campus Edition is a big improvement and might be adequate for a longer period than they had anticipated. It was suggested that the Task Force discuss this. It was also pointed out that an enterprise implementation might be popular with the Regents because of its implications for common course numbering.

5. **Sharing Campus and System Information with Web Links**

Van asked that the group look into linking campus and system IT pages and newsletter pages. There wasn't enough to time to continue this discussion in this meeting.