Attendees: Laurie Broadwater, Patrick Coy, Erica Eckert, Julie Gedeon, Ann Jacobson, David Robins, Steve Schindler, Barbara Schloman, Murali Shanker, Tina Ugrhin, Manfred VanDulman, Kathryn Wilson, Timothy Chandler

Dean Mark Weber welcomed the group.

Attendees introduced themselves.

The agenda and purpose of panel were presented.

The Fall 2008 needs assessment draft report was discussed. The panel is being asked to suggest improvements to the report, and then to endorse the final report and to provide input on how to make the report widely available within the university community.

It was suggested that more emphasis should be made in the report on the following items:

1. Statistical and Qualitative Software and Support is staffed by only one person
   Requests for assistance will be prioritized
   Recommend additional staffing

2. Acknowledge limitations of data collection through focus groups and survey
   May not have complete picture of need and use
   Low response rate to survey
   Citation analysis showed disconnect from survey results (more SAS than SPSS)

3. Need for permanent budget allocation and centralization
   Centralization crucial to make funding more efficient
   RCM is going to do opposite
   Clearly indicate that money is now transferred annually through IS

4. 4% increase yearly may not be enough
   Include past increases as examples

5. Statistical and Qualitative Software and Support needs to be seen as serving broad university needs

6. Models for funding and delivery need to take into account general (educational, larger scale) versus specialized (research, grant projects) use
   Costs and support should be different
   Software needed to support curricular needs can't be supported by grants
   Coordinated purchases of specialized software which allows lower per copy fee should be continued
   Statistical and Qualitative Software and Support should act as conduit
Panel members were asked to reread the report and forward additional comments/corrections/changes within a week.

Handout 3 (budget projections)
- Assumes 4% increase in software licensing fees
- Sales revenue is estimated
- Problem with limited seats
- Cost for selling individual copies of software needs to be reasonable to discourage piracy

Handout 4 (current products, costs, seats)
- Need to develop better tracking and incentives to recapture unused seats
  - Incentive needs to be built into use of software; monetary may be best
- As faculty and graduate students leave the university can this be part of their “exit”?
  - Can KentLINK be used? (currently research carrels handled this way)
  - Alteris on university computers?
- Other software in addition to SPSS and SAS could be available in public computer labs

Handout 6 (pricing)
- Should departments/colleges be required to upgrade or pay an annual fee?
- Does software in labs need to be the latest version?

Handout 7 (funding and delivery models)
Comments and questions related to these proposed models:
- Disks currently given to users—can centralized staff load on PCs instead?
  - Purchasers may believe they own the software when they purchase the disks
- $200 deposit, load on PC, return deposit when software is uninstalled—rental instead of purchase
  - May be acceptable for faculty and graduate students, but probably not for undergrads
- JMP for everyone; replace SPSS?
- Hybrid model—still use SPSS but explore possibilities of other programs
- Can/will students use public labs?

Next steps
Listserv will be set up for Panel communications
April meeting will be scheduled to continue discussion of budget, funding, delivery models; revisions to needs assessment report; share information from individual units