Statistical and Qualitative Software Support Advisory Panel
31 March 2009
Meeting minutes

Attendees: Laurie Broadwater, Patrick Coy, Erica Eckert, Julie Gedeon, Ann Jacobson, David Robins, Steve Schindler, Barbara Schloman, Murali Shanker, Tina Ughrin, 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?
    o 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
    o 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