

## **FY 2004 Computer-Related Capital Equipment Requests for the MIT Libraries: Proposed Approvals for Q1**

As the Libraries look ahead to a year of budgetary constraints, we planned to keep this first round of approvals modest, in the hopes that we will be able to approve more requests later in the year. We received 66 requests totaling \$71,453. Of those, our group recommends filling 28 in whole or in part, either by way of purchasing new equipment or by redeploying equipment already on hand. The cost of the new equipment recommended for purchase is \$36,270.

As we considered these requests, we kept in mind several obligations that must be met this year:

- The Stata Center – This round includes all the equipment for the public stations in the Stata Center, including Audio Visual Services' installation charges.
- Upgrades – Any units that cannot be upgraded to Windows 2000 need to be upgraded this year. We are extremely grateful to IS and Dell for the gift of 100 CPUs; we have already begun to deploy these units. However, we know of at least 20 more units that will have to be replaced (and we expect that as many as 10 more may be discovered during the course of the year.) We decided not to purchase any of these upgrades until we have deployed all of the donated units, but the cost of the rest of the upgrades will impact the next two quarters.
- Networking – We are in violation of IS's policy of one computer per net drop. Several of our locations still have transceivers, and these presented a special challenge during the security problems we handled over the summer. We promised IS to work toward getting the Libraries off the transceivers as quickly as possible.

### **Reporting**

Several changes in the way we report our expenditures are reflected in this quarter's proposal. In the past, requests that were approved out of cycle (emergency replacements or purchases of equipment for new staff) were not included in the report; from this point on, they will be factored into an adjusted total. In addition, we have factored in the value of the donated CPUs.

Unfortunately we are not able to designate these donated units as serving specific support goals (e.g. productivity or teaching) but we have described their deployment to either public or staff.

### **Technical Support Goals**

Over the past years there have been some concerns regarding the way the expenditures for the support goals were calculated. When Eric Celeste managed this process, he assigned the total value of a request to each of the support goals

it met, resulting in the total being greater than 100%. I returned to that practice last year, but I understand that this was a source of confusion to many people. In order to make the total come out to 100%, this year I am asking department heads to assign each request to only one support goal. The down side of this method is that secondary purposes of a request are not reflected in these percentages, but I believe that overall this method will give us a much more accurate picture (in the past there was always a tendency to assign as many support goals to each request as possible, in the hopes that this would make a request look more important.) I'd like to try doing it this way for the rest of the year and at the end of the year, if Steering Committee feels they are not getting an accurate picture of how our funds are being utilized, we'll try something different next time.

...Access... providing enhanced patron access to resources, including patron self-service – 68% of requests approved this quarter

...Productivity... technology that enhances workplace production by our staff – 32% of requests approved this quarter

As was stated above, approved amounts for this quarter are only part of the picture, since we have also approved some requests out of cycle and did not have to purchase the 100 units donated by IS and Dell. The adjusted totals reflect all purchased and donated equipment. For this round, requests that directly serve the public make up 54% of the adjusted total.

I would like to thank the group that worked with me on reviewing these requests (David Johnson, Nathan Matta, Pam Nicholas, Carl Jones, Greg Raposa, and Jim Mullins) as well as the Technology Advisory Group for their help in updating the guidelines.

Nina Davis-Millis  
Submitted to the Libraries' Steering  
Committee 10/2/2003