<u>**LMIS Meeting minutes, October 24, 2011**</u>

In attendance: Gabe H Davis, Pierre Ly, Gerard Morris, William Morse Jr , Mark T Reinitz, Cindy Riche, Jason Sawin, MK Smith.

The minutes from October 10 were approved.

Today's meeting focused on the print management initiative and the associated communication plan. Cindy's powerpoint slides will be available on Sound Net.

Cindy started by emphasizing that this is a sustainability campaign. The goal is to reduce waste. Other campuses have followed a similar path: they introduced a cap on printing beyond which students have to pay for additional pages.

The current name for the system is "PrintGreen."

Technology Services (TS) have developed a very detailed set of steps to follow toward adoption of the new system. TS want to be viewed as an operational arm of campus.

The plan is to have a pilot project in the Spring, with a small number of users who will give feedback. This will allow the full system to go live in the summer 2012. It is better to do this at the beginning of a school year and with more information, to make sure the transition works smoothly. William pointed out that a Spring roll out would be too early, as recent discussions on the LMIS committee have shown careful communication is needed, and the technical aspects of the system need testing through a pilot.

Taking one more semester to do this will help gather important user data, which will help set a realistic printing cap. It was suggested that the first LMIS meeting in the Spring could look at Fall data, and come up with a final number for the print cap then.

Moreover, the pilot will generate good user feedback, so the project can be implemented in the smoothest, most considerate way possible.

Jason asked how much money the system would end up saving. William gave a rough estimate of how much we spend on printing per year, about $100,000. Based on other campuses' experience, we can expect the print management system to reduce printing by about 25%, which could save about $30,000per year overall. Jane added that many costs of printing are difficult to quantify, as staff time has to be spent on maintenance and ordering paper and toners. Such hard-to-measure costs will be greatly reduced over time with the new system.

Cindy's presentation then defined the key roles in the process. LMIS will be key in finalizing the actual number for the cap on free printing, to communicate the initiative and to finalize the process for convenient access to on-demand course packs at copy services.

The course packs raise the issue of copyright clearance. Mark pointed out that it currently takes 2-3 months to get clearance on a case-by-case basis, which is too long and discourages faculty from using course packs. Jane explained the potential benefits of paying for a University-wide copy right clearance site license, which would cost around $27,000 per year. The problem is that not all publishers have agreements with such blanket license providers, so we will need to check whether coverage is good enough first. But down the road, this can make the process of making course packs available much easier. It was suggested that the savings generated by reduced printing could be allocated to paying for such a site license.

Technology Services will be well placed to cover a lot of bases for communication across campus: ASUPS, Sustainability Committee, Senate, etc. Jane mentioned that the forthcoming article in the Trail about print management will be very positive and emphasize the big picture.

Gabe raised concerns that it was unclear how the system would help meet the sustainability objectives. He feels that students here are already very environmentally conscious. However, William responded that the data show our current practices our remarkably similar to other campuses.

Mark pointed out that the key objective is to change the way everybody thinks about printing, so that they adopt more responsible practices. The system will be one more nudge in the right direction.

The current system was developed in response to users' complaints about the previous systems. Students complained about long waits at the print-release stations. The move to no-warning, print-from-any-station to a central printer, was not well received either, because students had trouble knowing where their output had gone.

The current system offers a compromise: printing can be released from each individual computer station. However, the user gets a pop-up with a message asking whether he or she really wants to print the document, along with some information about the environmental impact of his/her particular printed output. Jason found this to be a bit invasive. Gabe asked if the system could be customized so that the user can choose not to see the pop-up.

MK explained that focus groups during the pilot would make clear whether users are OK with the pop-up. In any case, a print management system where users have to pay for output beyond the limit MUST have some kind of interface.

Key points for communication and the road ahead

After much discussion, Cindy's presentation moved on to the key information for communication to students and faculty. There is a clear slide in the presentation about this, with key points reflecting the committee's recent discussions and suggestions. Jane suggested that the

word "free" be dropped, because printing is never actually "free," there is a cost that users do not see, it is borne by staff.

Gabe suggested working with a business marketing class to help with communication. MK said it was a great idea, but it would take a very long time and would delay the system. Mark suggested it could be a summer research project, producing a report within the needed time frame.

Jane and William pointed out that we are not unique on this issue and there is already a lot of research on printing issues elsewhere. Moreover, this has been discussed here for several years, and it may be time to move on and adopt the system. The cost savings can be used in ways that fulfill the educational mission of the university much better than mere printing. Mark pointed out that allocating the money saved to a specific use, such as paying for a site license for copyright clearance, would be very useful. It would make course packs more appealing, thereby reducing wasteful printing even more.

Jason asked whether there was any other initiative we could bundle in. William mentioned the possibility of standardizing our printers in a more economical way. Jane mentioned that it would eventually encourage more sustainable practices in all departments and offices.

In conclusion, some comments were made about whether we really needed to wait until the summer, why not roll out the system in Spring 2012? Mark pointed out that the focus groups and pilot project would consume significant staff time. However, Cindy said that it was better to be very careful: a poor implementation could generate a huge burden on TS staff to fix problems. It is best to minimize the potential for problems in the first place.

Finally, it was concluded that it may still be too early to send a message to the Faculty Senate about the initiative. At the very least we need to be able to tell them what the actual printing cap is.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58am.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly