



Information Technology Committee
March 26, 2026 - 11:00 a.m.
Virtual Microsoft Teams Meeting
Minutes

Opening

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Matt Smith.

Attendees

Voting Members Present	Non-Voting Members Present
Dr. Ethan Languri	Jennifer Chavez
Eric Brown	Will Hoffert
Dr. Julie Baker	Cody Bryant
Dr. Lenly Weathers	Tyler Farsoun
Dr. Eunsung Park	David Hales
Braxton Westbrook	Allan Jones
Matt Smith	Angie Vick
Dr. Susan Wells	Brandon Walls
Dr. Michael Allen	Dr. Mike Renfro
Dr. Mustafa Rajabali	Triston Martin
Caitlin Dodson	Rebecca Gooch
	David Garrett
	Hunter Kaller
Voting Members Absent	Non-Voting Members Absent
Dr. Jason Beach	Greg Holt
Sandra Bohannon	
Dan Warren	
Elizabeth Williams	
Dr. Thomas Payne	

Review of Agenda & Minutes

Matt Smith called for a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

- Motion: Braxton Westbrook
- Second: Dr. Julie Baker
- Vote: All members in favor; none opposed.

Motion approved.

Matt Smith requested a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting, which had been distributed in advance by Angie Vick.

- Motion: Dr. Julie Baker
- Second: Braxton Westbrook
- Vote: All members in favor; none opposed.

Motion approved.

ITC Chair Election

Matt Smith opened the floor for nominations for the Information Technology Committee Chair for Academic Year 2027.

- Nomination of Dr. Susan Wells by Dr. Julie Baker
- Second: Braxton Westbrook
- Dr. Susan Wells confirmed willingness to serve if elected.
- With no additional nominations, Michael Allen moved to close nominations.
- Vote: All members in favor; none opposed.

Dr. Susan Wells was elected ITC Chair.

Angie Vick clarified that the Chair term will begin July 1, 2026, with the first meeting of the new academic year anticipated in late summer or early fall (August or September).

Subcommittee Updates

Spending Subcommittee

Angie Vick provided an overview of ITC-approved projects and current spending status with a summary slide detailing both completed and ongoing initiatives:

Completed/Closed Projects:

- College of Fine Arts (including iPad purchases and other carry-forward items)
- Counseling (carry-forward from a prior fiscal year)
- College of Business Grammarly implementation

Projects Still in Progress:

- Nursing computer labs
- Engineering classrooms (Clement 405, 406, and 409)

The in-progress projects will be carried forward into the next fiscal year.

Matt Smith noted a pattern where several projects were budgeted at a higher level than ultimately spent. He recalled prior Spending Subcommittee discussions indicating that unspent or remaining funds would be redirected toward academic classroom technology enhancements where feasible.

Dr. Julie Baker confirmed this understanding.

Jennifer Chavez requested coordination between Angie Vick and Will Hoffert to ensure that remaining funds are intentionally allocated and tracked, particularly given the timing of the fiscal year close.

Angie Vick indicated that some remaining funds may need to be carried forward unless they can be encumbered quickly.

Will Hoffert confirmed ongoing collaboration with Hunter Kaller to identify opportunities for classroom refreshes, including multimedia classroom renewals. He also noted that a future Spending Subcommittee discussion may include Vivi wireless presentation hardware renewal, which has been deployed in select classrooms and labs.

Wireless Access Points & Campus Wi-Fi Discussion

Braxton Westbrook asked whether any funding had been specifically allocated to replace or maintain wireless access points in high-traffic areas on campus. He noted that he and Jennifer Chavez had previously discussed concerns related to wireless performance and wanted to confirm whether access point replacements or maintenance efforts were included in the current budget.

Jennifer Chavez responded that wireless access point replacements are not funded through TAF spending. Instead, ITS has separate operational funding allocated for wireless infrastructure enhancements. She explained that she has been working directly with the Network Operations team to intentionally focus those funds on high-density and high-impact areas first, while potentially repurposing updated equipment into lower-density areas as part of a broader optimization strategy. As part of these efforts, ITS is coordinating with its wireless vendor to conduct an on-site analysis and survey of the Volpe Library, and potentially other locations, to determine whether those spaces require redesign or re-architecture to improve wireless performance. Jennifer Chavez indicated that the intent is to apply lessons learned from that analysis to other areas across campus.

She noted that ITS hopes to have the vendor on site in April and invited Brandon Walls to share any updates if available, while acknowledging that additional updates could be provided as the work progresses.

Vendor Engagement & Ongoing Wireless Monitoring

Brandon Walls confirmed that the wireless vendor, Extreme, is scheduled to be on campus early the following week and has already been working extensively with ITS remotely. He reported that this collaboration has resulted in the identification of several configuration changes that have already produced measurable improvements in wireless performance, particularly within the Learning Commons. He noted that, in addition to system monitoring, the team has engaged directly with end users to gather feedback about their wireless experience, which has helped inform further improvement strategies. Brandon Walls explained that ITS is also exploring ways to streamline wireless issue reporting so the team can gain better visibility into real-world user experience and more effectively monitor performance over time. He added that while ITS is not currently committed to changing wireless providers, the institution is at a point in its wireless refresh cycle where a potential vendor transition could be evaluated within the next six to twelve months if it would provide long-term benefit. He emphasized that the current vendor has been responsive and instrumental in helping identify and remediate issues to date. He further noted that ITS continues to monitor remaining wireless hotspots and has discussed replacing access points in the Learning Commons and other high-traffic areas to increase network density. To better understand real-world usage conditions, ITS has deployed staff for multi-hour monitoring sessions during peak usage times on a weekly basis. These efforts have resulted in significant improvements, though a few localized issues remain. One such issue involves a laptop cart containing approximately 80 devices, which generates substantial wireless interference. While the cart is located away from most users, ITS is working with Classroom Technology Services to help mitigate its impact. Brandon Walls concluded by emphasizing that multiple teams remain actively engaged in this work and expressed appreciation for the campus community's patience as ITS continues refining a more sustainable long-term wireless management strategy.

Braxton Westbrook thanked the team for the update and noted that students would likely appreciate the continued attention to improving wireless performance. He stated that he would continue collecting student feedback, including from individuals who have previously raised concerns and from others he has not yet contacted.

Wireless Standards & Access Point Upgrade Strategy

Braxton Westbrook then asked whether ITS is considering upgrading access points to newer wireless standards, such as Wi-Fi 6 or Wi-Fi 7, rather than replacing older equipment with similar legacy models. He acknowledged that adopting newer standards

would likely involve higher costs but explained that his question was driven by performance considerations rather than a desire to upgrade technology for its own sake.

Brandon Walls responded that ITS has not identified an immediate need to upgrade access points solely to support newer standards this year, noting that many high-density areas already support more recent protocols. He explained that while some existing access points may be repurposed rather than discarded, the team is targeting specific locations for potential upgrades. He then deferred to David Hales to provide additional technical context.

David Hales explained that access points installed prior to approximately 2020–2021 are generally Wi-Fi 5, while any deployments made within the last two years support Wi-Fi 6E or better. He further noted that ITS plans to begin deploying Wi-Fi 7 access points as the technology matures and becomes more widely available. He indicated that Wi-Fi 7 equipment could be included in upcoming building projects or renovations, including potential upgrades to the Library Commons and the University Center. David Hales clarified that, moving forward, all new wireless deployments will continue to meet or exceed Wi-Fi 6E standards.

Braxton Westbrook thanked the team for the clarification and explained that his question was motivated by the performance benefits of Wi-Fi 6 and Wi-Fi 7, particularly their support for OFDMA, which is especially beneficial in crowded environments such as the library, Swoops, and other high-traffic student spaces. He expressed appreciation for the detailed explanation.

TAF Spending Discussion & FY27 Operational Review

With no further discussion on the previous topic, Jennifer Chavez noted that she had an additional slide related to TAF spending, which served as a verbal update focused on the upcoming fiscal year rather than the current year's expenditures. She clarified that while the slide itself did not contain new data, she wanted to provide context and an update related to next fiscal year planning.

Matt Smith confirmed that, hearing no further discussion on current spending, the committee could proceed to that portion of the agenda.

Dean Consultations on TAF-Funded Software & Labs

Jennifer Chavez explained that since the most recent TAF Spending Subcommittee meeting—and, more broadly, the last ITC meeting—she had committed to meeting directly with the Deans to discuss TAF-funded software, allocations reviewed by the Spending Subcommittee, and laboratory spaces to identify potential opportunities for consolidation,

efficiencies, or improved alignment of resources. She reported that those meetings had occurred as planned.

During the discussions, the Deans reviewed the TAF-funded software portfolio, which represents a significant portion of overall TAF spending. Jennifer Chavez noted that, while the conversations did not result in the clear identification of specific technologies that should be removed from TAF funding outright, the process of sharing the information broadly was valuable. She emphasized that the transparency provided by walking through the data with leadership from all colleges was an important outcome in itself. Feedback and input from the Deans remain ongoing, both with respect to software and laboratory investments, and further evaluation is expected as part of continued planning.

Jennifer Chavez invited Dr. Julie Baker to add any additional context from the meeting with the Provost and the Deans.

Dr. Julie Baker confirmed that the update had been accurately captured, reiterating that the discussion was less about reaching immediate conclusions and more about ensuring that information had been clearly communicated and shared. She noted that the conversations enabled a common understanding of how resources are being used, particularly in relation to academic support.

Laboratory Spend as an Ongoing Follow-Up Item

Jennifer Chavez acknowledged Dr. Julie Baker's earlier comment regarding laboratory spaces and emphasized that lab spending remains an outstanding follow-up item. She stated that ITS still needs to assemble additional information related to lab investments and usage in order to support more detailed conversations about spending patterns, consolidation opportunities, and future planning. She identified this as a clear takeaway for continued ITS work and collaboration with campus partners.

TAF-Funded IT Operational Expenses

Jennifer Chavez then transitioned to a separate but related topic concerning the portion of TAF funding used for IT operational expenses. She explained that, leveraging her relative newness to the institution, she has been asking questions about why a substantial volume of IT operational costs are currently funded through TAF rather than through the central IT budget. As part of this exploration, she has had two preliminary and productive conversations with Dr. Claire Stinson. Jennifer Chavez noted that Dr. Claire Stinson has requested additional analysis to better understand whether there may be opportunities—emphasized as possibilities, not commitments—to shift some IT operational expenses off TAF beginning in Fiscal Year 2027. The intent of those exploratory conversations is to determine whether reallocating certain costs could free TAF funds for other student-focused technology needs. Jennifer Chavez stressed that no decisions have been made, no dollar amounts have been identified, and there is no assurance that such a shift will occur.

She further clarified that the purpose of raising this topic was to ensure that the conversation is happening during budget preparation season. While acknowledging that funding ultimately comes from the same institutional source regardless of budget line, she emphasized that it remains important to evaluate whether current allocations deliver the best possible value for students. She affirmed that IT funds are being spent responsibly and appropriately, based on the analysis she has already shared with senior leadership, but noted that some operational expenditures may not represent the most effective use of TAF resources over the long term.

Jennifer Chavez concluded by stating that, at this stage, the update was informational only. The primary goal is to continue evaluating whether a multi-year approach could gradually shift certain operational costs to the IT budget, rather than relying on TAF, and to keep campus leadership informed as those discussions evolve.

Matt Smith asked whether there was any discussion regarding the FY27 budget update provided by Jennifer Chavez. Hearing none, he thanked her for the update. He then clarified for the committee that, due to the natural flow of discussion around budgeting and spending, agenda items had been addressed slightly out of sequence. Specifically, the committee had effectively covered both the FY26 project updates—referenced earlier through Angie Vick’s project status slide—and the FY27 operational review that Jennifer Chavez had just presented.

Strategic Planning Subcommittee

Matt Smith returned the committee to Agenda Item #4, the Strategic Planning Subcommittee update, and invited Jennifer Chavez to provide the report.

Jennifer Chavez stated that the Strategic Planning Subcommittee had met once since the previous ITC meeting. She explained that the discussion focused primarily on clarifying the role, scope, and purpose of the subcommittee, noting that strategic initiatives do not occur in single-year cycles. As she continues to acclimate to the institution, she emphasized that part of the initial conversation involved understanding what the subcommittee had historically done, as well as identifying where outcomes may not have been as clearly defined in the past.

The group’s first meeting was intentionally focused on aligning expectations for future discussions and reframing the subcommittee’s work around long-term planning rather than short-term or annual initiatives. A subsequent meeting, which was scheduled to take place approximately one and a half weeks prior, was canceled due to a scheduling conflict. That meeting had been intended to focus on EDUCAUSE trends and broader higher-education strategic priorities, with the goal of bringing those insights back to the full committee to help inform alignment between institutional strategy and technology planning.

Jennifer Chavez noted that the subcommittee has not yet had the opportunity to hold that EDUCAUSE-focused discussion, and characterized the work as ongoing and fluid. She

stated that the group agreed a different approach was needed than what may have been used in the past, particularly to ensure that the subcommittee's discussions result in meaningful outcomes and guidance for the broader committee. She invited members of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee to offer clarification or additional context and, hearing none, transitioned to the next portion of the update.

Innovation Subcommittee

Dr. Julie Baker shared the Innovation Subcommittee update on behalf of Dr. Jason Beach, who was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict. She explained that the subcommittee has been using a committee idea tracker to capture topics for discussion and exploration. Recent topics included Discord voice channels, Eduroam, the campus Wi-Fi study and coverage, computer labs, and TAF-funded software, much of which had already been addressed earlier in the meeting.

Dr. Julie Baker noted that the group had also begun discussing an innovation sandbox concept and invited Jennifer Chavez and other committee members to contribute additional context as appropriate.

Discord Voice Channels – Security & Access Considerations

Dr. Julie Baker asked whether there were any additional updates regarding Discord voice channels.

Jennifer Chavez invited David Hales and Dr. Michael Allen to provide clarification.

David Hales explained that the university's firewall is configured according to enterprise security standards and therefore blocks most outbound traffic that cannot be easily identified as legitimate. He noted that standard Discord messaging traffic is allowed due to identifiable and well-defined port usage; however, Discord voice channels use randomized ports, making them more difficult to permit through an enterprise firewall.

He stated that when Discord voice functionality is required for instructional purposes, ITS has historically accommodated such requests by identifying the required servers and establishing the necessary firewall rules on a case-by-case basis. That process remains available through the standard firewall rule request mechanism submitted via the help desk. David Hales added that ITS is exploring whether a more generalized solution may be feasible to reduce the need for individual requests, though no alternative approach has been finalized. At this time, instructional use of Discord voice channels can be supported through a formal request.

Eduroam Implementation & Campus Deployment

Dr. Julie Baker then transitioned the discussion to Eduroam, noting that ITS has been actively working on its implementation.

Jennifer Chavez introduced Brandon Walls to provide an update.

Brandon Walls reported that Eduroam is now fully deployed across campus, though a formal campus announcement is forthcoming. He explained that ITS has finalized testing across all major BYOD platforms, including iOS, Android, Windows, macOS, and ChromeOS, and that end-user documentation is being finalized. Eduroam onboarding utilizes industry-standard tools such as the CAT tool and the GetEduroam application, which automate device configuration and support secure authentication. Less secure configuration methods will not be supported in order to protect user identities. Brandon Walls noted that Eduroam is expected to eventually replace EagleNet and guest wireless for the majority of campus users, with limited exceptions such as unsupported devices within residence halls. He reported that users from more than 50 institutions have already successfully connected to the campus network via Eduroam, and that ITS has confirmed successful connectivity at over a dozen remote sites. The project is nearing completion, with an anticipated early-April go-live pending final documentation review and help desk readiness. He further explained that most support requests related to Eduroam will involve authentication and will typically be handled by central systems teams or by users' home institutions in the case of visitors. Eduroam also supports role-based access, automatically routing students, faculty, and staff to appropriate networks while directing visitors from other institutions to guest access.

Following the update, Dr. Michael Renfro emphasized that users should not manually enter credentials when connecting to Eduroam and should instead use the supported onboarding tools.

Jennifer Chavez reinforced the importance of clear documentation to prevent confusion, sharing her own positive experience connecting seamlessly at another institution while traveling.

Campus Wi-Fi Study & Coverage

Dr. Julie Baker next referenced the campus Wi-Fi study and asked Jennifer Chavez to provide a brief update.

Jennifer Chavez stated that much of the update had been covered earlier in the meeting, particularly with respect to the Volpe Library and the RUC. She noted that improvements have been made through configuration changes, while acknowledging that additional vendor engagement is still needed to address broader issues. She explained that ITS continues to monitor wireless performance through support tickets and on-site observation during periods of peak student usage. She stressed that wireless performance must be evaluated when spaces are fully occupied, as performance can differ significantly between low- and high-density conditions. The team is continuing to target high-usage

instructional spaces and expects to make further progress through the end of April. She emphasized that campus wireless improvements remain a top priority for Network Operations.

Innovation Sandbox Concept

Dr. Julie Baker concluded the subcommittee update by revisiting the innovation sandbox concept discussed at the most recent subcommittee meeting. She explained that the idea is intended to allow safe, responsible experimentation with emerging technologies without positioning ITS or security teams as barriers. Initial discussions focused on defining core principles, guardrails, and potential models for implementation. While the group has not yet engaged in in-depth discussion, preliminary materials prepared by Dr. Jason Beach have been shared.

Jennifer Chavez encouraged committee members interested in the concept to review the documentation available in the Innovation Teams folder and provide feedback. She reported that the proposal had also been reviewed with ITS leadership, which expressed support for partnering on the initiative. She emphasized that the sandbox concept is intentionally broad at this stage and that implementation would depend heavily on the types of technologies involved. Possibilities range from dedicated server environments to more complex configurations requiring additional security and network considerations. Jennifer Chavez concluded by stressing that ITS is open to collaboration and views the sandbox concept as a positive step forward. Future progress will depend on identifying specific projects and faculty partners and clearly defining scope, guardrails, and expectations.

Dr. Julie Baker thanked the presenters and noted that, unless there were additional questions, the subcommittee updates were complete.

Matt Smith asked whether there was any further discussion from the committee and, hearing none, moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

Other Items for Next ITC Meeting

Matt Smith noted that the next ITC meeting is anticipated to take place in early fall 2026, likely in the August or September timeframe, and invited Angie Vick to confirm.

Angie Vick confirmed that ITC meetings are typically held in September.

Meeting Scheduling & Calendar Conflicts

Dr. Julie Baker asked whether ITC procedures specify a standard meeting cadence, such as meeting on a particular Thursday of the month, noting that some other committees operate under fixed scheduling rules.

Angie Vick responded that ITC procedures do not prescribe a specific recurring date and that meeting times are generally scheduled during a Thursday dead hour, as that timeframe typically accommodates the greatest number of participants.

Dr. Julie Baker noted that this Thursday dead hour is also commonly used by other committees and shared that, during the current year, ITC meetings have overlapped with URAC meetings, creating scheduling conflicts.

She asked whether Braxton Westbrook also serves on the URAC committee, to which he confirmed that he does and noted that he had needed to designate a proxy for the meeting.

Dr. Julie Baker added that other ITC members, including Dr. Jason Beach, may also serve on overlapping committees and expressed concern about the difficulty of balancing attendance when multiple committees meet simultaneously. She emphasized that she does not prefer missing meetings and noted that the issue likely affects more than one committee member.

Angie Vick explained that if ITC had access to projected meeting dates for other committees, she could attempt to accommodate those schedules. However, in the absence of that information, she aims to select meeting times that maximize attendance among voting members.

Jennifer Chavez offered to assist by reaching out to the URAC committee to determine whether their meeting pattern follows a consistent schedule (e.g., first, second, or third Thursday of the month). She suggested that, if such information were available, ITC could potentially schedule meetings around those dates.

Dr. Julie Baker noted that she serves on URAC and offered to obtain that information directly.

Angie Vick indicated that this information would be helpful, particularly since the majority of ITC voting members are faculty and dead-hour availability is an important consideration.

ITC Membership Representation & Roster Review

Dr. Julie Baker then raised a related concern prompted by recent discussions during a Deans' meeting. She explained that several Deans had noted a lack of representation from their colleges on the ITC. Upon reviewing ITC procedures, she observed that while the

committee specifies a set number of faculty members, it does not require representation from each college, unlike some other university committees.

Dr. Julie Baker emphasized that she was not suggesting any procedural errors had occurred, but rather encouraging the committee to be more intentional about representation as faculty terms expire. She noted that, at present, several academic units do not have representation, including Nursing, Emerging and Integrative Studies, the Library, Agriculture and Human Ecology, and Fine Arts, while some colleges have multiple representatives. She suggested that as terms expire, ITC could review overall representation to ensure broader academic coverage or, at minimum, ensure that each unit has a voice at the table.

Matt Smith acknowledged the concern and suggested that the issue be formally addressed at the first ITC meeting in the fall. He proposed adding committee representation as an agenda item, allowing members time to review governing documents and consider potential approaches. He also noted that similar considerations could apply to non-academic representation, such as Enrollment Management or Advancement, and that a broader discussion of committee composition may be appropriate.

Angie Vick added that ITS has consistently followed established procedures by requesting replacement recommendations as member terms expire and forwarding those recommendations to the President's Office for approval. She expressed openness to refining the approach going forward, including consideration of a more structured policy that supports balanced representation.

Dr. Julie Baker reiterated that her comments were not intended as criticism, but rather as a prompt for thoughtful planning. She noted that the current structure allows for eight faculty members and two Deans, which provides sufficient opportunity to represent each college. She cautioned that if recommendations continue to be solicited from the same units as terms expire, existing representation patterns may persist unintentionally.

Matt Smith suggested that one possible approach could involve the Provost's Office coordinating faculty recommendations, as that office oversees academic units and may be well positioned to support equitable representation without requiring formal changes to ITC policy.

Dr. Julie Baker agreed that this could be a workable solution and emphasized the value of allowing time for further consideration before making changes.

Subcommittee Membership Visibility

Dr. Mustafa Rajabali then offered a suggestion related to committee transparency, asking whether the ITC roster could include an indicator of which subcommittee(s) each member serves on, noting that this information would be helpful.

Matt Smith indicated that this was feasible and asked Angie Vick whether such information could be provided.

Angie Vick noted that subcommittee membership information is currently available within the ITC Teams channel documentation.

Jennifer Chavez confirmed that the information could be consolidated into a single, comprehensive roster that displays both committee membership and subcommittee assignments.

Dr. Mustafa Rajabali thanked the group for considering the request.

Additional Topics for the Next ITC Meeting

Matt Smith asked whether there were any additional agenda topics to be considered for the next ITC meeting.

Jennifer Chavez noted that, as this will be the kickoff meeting for the new academic year, it would be appropriate to include a formal welcome for new ITC members. She also recommended reviewing the ITC charge and governing policies, particularly if that review is not already a standing agenda item, to help orient new members to the committee's purpose and responsibilities. In addition, she suggested including a high-level overview of the committee's subcommittees and current membership, so members understand how work is organized across groups. Based on her recent conversations related to Fiscal Year 2027 budget planning, Jennifer Chavez further recommended that a budget review or budget-focused discussion be included on the agenda for the first meeting of the year.

Matt Smith expressed agreement with these suggestions.

Jennifer Chavez then asked whether subcommittees typically continue meeting between regular ITC meetings and into the next academic year, noting that this was her first year participating in the committee cycle and seeking clarification on expected practices.

Matt Smith explained that subcommittees generally do continue meeting as needed, even when the full committee is not meeting regularly. He noted that subcommittees are smaller and therefore often able to coordinate more easily, particularly over the summer months.

Jennifer Chavez thanked him for the clarification.

Summary of Agenda Items for the Next ITC Meeting

Matt Smith asked once more whether there were any additional agenda topics to be added. Hearing none, he summarized the proposed topics for the next ITC meeting.

These include:

- Welcoming and orienting new ITC members
- Reviewing the ITC charge and governing policies
- Providing an overview of subcommittees and their memberships
- Conducting a budget review
- Holding a discussion on ITC committee makeup and representation, as previously recommended, with a focus on ensuring broad and equitable representation across campus and exploring potential methods for achieving that goal

Adjournment

With no further items brought before the committee, Matt Smith called for a motion to adjourn.

- Motion: Dr. Julie Baker
- Second: Braxton Westbrook

Meeting adjourned: 11:57 a.m.

Miscellaneous

Rebecca Gooch, Recorder

Documents on file with minutes:

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting's Unapproved Minutes