

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
MAY 3, 2011
Morrill Hall Room 238A

[In these minutes: academic technology survey; student fee study; budget impact on six-year technology plan; IT governance groups update]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Ted Higman (Chair), Pam Solvie, Allison Jacobsen, Myron Lowe, John Butler, Mary Vavrus, Bonnie Westra, James MacDonald, Bernie Gulachek, Ann Hill Duin (for Stephen Cawley), Simin Hickman, Yuk Sham, Benton Schnabel, Sue Van Voorhis

REGRETS: John Miller, Judd Dudgeon, Brent Larson, Paul Rubenis, Billie Wahlstrom, Micah Haber

ABSENT: Neil Olszewski, Craig Hohn, David Arendale,

GUESTS: J. D. Walker, manager, Research and Evaluation Team, OIT; Julie Tonneson, budget director, University Budget and Finance; Melissa Avery, professor and head, School of Nursing; Mike Balak, IT director, CFANS

Professor Ted Higman called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

OIT Academic Technology Surveys Overview

J. D. Walker, manager, Research and Evaluation Team, Office of Information Technology (OIT) asked for the Senate Committee on Information Technologies' (SCIT) assistance with the biannual academic technology survey and provided them with a handout describing the project. He stated the goal of the OIT survey is to help stakeholders understand faculty and student experiences with and perceptions of the educational technology they encounter in their academic lives at the University. The survey is designed to provide information relevant to faculty members using it to enhance their teaching, and to administrators and staff considering what technologies to provide and support. The Research and Evaluation Team is planning to implement the survey in the fall, and will be expanding it to cover all five campuses. The Team is meeting with representatives from all of the campuses in order to revise the survey. There will be a common core of questions applicable to all campuses, questions that apply specifically to each campus, and past survey questions to map longitudinal trends. Dr. Walker asked SCIT for input on the survey questions and its design and methodology. He provided the committee with a link to past survey instruments and reports <http://z.umn.edu/techsurveys> and his e-mail address jdwalker@umn.edu.

Professor Bonnie Westra responded that her students need a real time video connection. They live all over the country and engage in group-projects, and Moodle does not work well for this situation. She stated they need better methods than Skype for connecting with one another. She also asked if there is project management software available for virtual courses. Dr. Walker responded that the survey would consider student perceptions of barriers to delivery of technology.

Professor Higman asked if the Research and Evaluation Team tracks the number of people who begin the survey but do not complete it, and indicated that one problem with web-based surveys is the user does not know when they will be completed. Dr. Walker stated that UM Survey has a progress bar. He also noted that the survey content would be released this summer.

Student Fee Study

Associate Vice President for Budget and Finance, Julie Tonneson, provided the committee with a Power Point presentation on the Student Fee Study with particular focus on technology fees. In 2009 the University Budget and Finance Office began a comprehensive look at all fees charged to students. The purpose was to verify policy definitions, review for efficiency and consistency, uncover policy questions, and identify process improvements. The fees were categorized into two types. Regents policies on student service fees and regents policies on tuition and fees. The tuition and fees group includes:

- Administrative fees such as
 - transcript fees, locker rental fees, and stadium fees
 - these fees are unique and designed to incent a particular behavior or are a penalty
- Course fees –
 - transportation, consumable materials, and special services
 - these fees are designed to recover the costs of a particular course across a term

In 2012 the focus will be on academic fees for special equipment supplies and services. The goal is to simplify and clarify them. Some questions being asked of each type of fee are:

- Are we being consistent in the methodologies we use to assess fees?
- Are all the fees allowable under existing policy?
- Should there be changes in the existing policy definitions?
- Are we effectively communicating fee information to parents and students?

Recommendations for 2012 with regard to academic fees include:

- Eliminating the distinction between technology fees and collegiate fees – implement all as campus/collegiate fees
- Clarify the definition of campus/collegiate fees
- Define a new subcategory, durable goods fees
- Work toward standardization of the campus/collegiate fee structures

- Require comprehensive academic fee review and discussion in the budget process

Associate Vice President Tonneson further discussed the policy recommendations. She stated that currently, academic fees are campus-and-college-wide fees that may be assessed to all students enrolled on a campus or in a college for *special equipment and supplies and services* provided that each campus uses no more than one campus-wide fee and that each college uses no more than one college-wide fee. The proposal is that there be a re-definition of campus /collegiate fees and a new subcategory, durable goods fees. The campus/collegiate fees may be assessed to all students, enrolled on a campus or in a college, for goods and services that directly benefit students but are not part of actual classroom instruction. Computer lab fees are an example of this. These fees center on student activities. Durable goods fees may be assessed by a campus or a college to their enrolled students for educational materials and equipment that will be owned by or assigned to a specific student for their use during the entire term.

In 2013 the analysis will focus on course fees with the goals of simplification, clear definitions, and consistency in methodologies. Jim MacDonald asked if the course fee includes required software for a course. Associate Vice President Tonneson stated that if the software is a consumable material used up during that course it is included. Professor Sham noted the difficulty of charging fees for products purchased in bulk and used over multiple terms. Associate Vice President Tonneson responded that the amortization of course fees would be considered. SCIT also discussed the circumstance of computer bundled software, what happens if a student challenges the fees, and the discrepancies between colleges in the fees they charge. Bernard Gulachek indicated SCIT had previously had presentations from collegiate units on how technology fees are developed, and collegiate IT leaders or financial officers could provide that information if SCIT would like it.

Impact of the University's Budget on the Six-Year Technology Plan

Interim Vice President Ann Hill Duin and Senior Director of Strategy Management, Bernard Gulachek, spoke to SCIT about the impact of the University's budget on the six-year technology plan. Mr. Gulachek stated that OIT developed a six-year technology plan to help the University understand its technology investments. The six-year plan sits above the rolling two-year plan set out in the compact. Some of the initiatives in the six-year plan are reflected in the compact and others require continuous planning and development. The University must understand the major technology investments, their cost, and the trade-offs associated with them. Financing is an important part of developing the six-year plan.

He stated further that today's economic conditions are challenging, but the University and IT leadership are committed to advancing the initiatives in the compact. The IT leadership must identify which projects are the most compelling for the University, and will work closely with University Budget and Finance, and the functional business owners of the projects.

Interim Vice President Hill Duin noted that OIT shared planning materials with the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and these same documents were provided to SCIT prior to the meeting. She noted there would be continued work on alignment, emphasis on optimization of systems, less emphasis on maintenance, and more on academic projects. Professor Higman asked if OIT had deferred any projects as a result of the tight economic situation. Interim Vice President Hill Duin stated that many projects had been slowed including the People Soft upgrade, and the collaborative learning spaces project was scaled back.

Professor Westra asked if there is a central point of contact within OIT to find out if the University has licensed a particular type of technology. Simin Hickman stated that the licensing office in OIT keeps a list of licenses, but it is not a comprehensive list. She stated the following link <http://www.oit.umn.edu/utools/> provides a list of licensed software and access to assistance with negotiating licenses. Further discussion of obtaining, purchasing, and tracking licenses took place. Ms. Hickman recommended individual's seeking licenses for new technology should consult with the IT Directors and make sure the Office of the General Council (OGC) approves the license. She stated the OGC has committed a person to OIT to work on licenses. Mr. Gulachek noted the short term solution to the problem is to work with the IT director, and the long-term answer is to create an institutional catalogue of licenses. Mr. Gulachek stated SCIT might want to return to this issue.

IT Governance Update

Interim Vice President Hill Duin stated the IT Governance groups are composed of the Enterprise Planning Group, Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), Information Technology Leadership Alliance (ITLA), and SCIT. She introduced Melissa Avery, professor and head, School of Nursing and Mike Balak, IT director, CFANS and indicated they would discuss the ATAC and the ITLA respectively.

Enterprise Planning Group - Mr. Gulachek and Sue Van Voorhis, director, Academic Support Resources (ASR), discussed the Enterprise Planning Group on behalf of Jim Nichols, IT director, OVPR who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Gulachek stated the Enterprise Planning Group has been in place since 2008. It is made up of representatives from core enterprise units such as ASR, the Controller's Office, University Relations and the Office of Human Resources. It's role is to support core University business processes and the technology resources needed to support them. For example, People Soft is in place to accomplish specific outcomes in ASR and OHR. The enterprise technology leaders work closely with the core units to understand their needs. One way this is achieved is through discussion of quarterly project work plans that allow coordination of plans and resources. Ms. Van Voorhis gave a specific example the importance of collaborative scheduling when a unit implements systems.

ATAC - Professor Avery stated ATAC was reinstated in 2011 with more faculty focus. Its membership includes associate deans, chancellors, OIT staff across campuses, and faculty. Its goal is to insure academic excellence using good analytics for the adoption of technology. It met four times last year. Some issues it considered were a SWAT analysis

of IT across the University, support of e-learning, ensuring faculty have access to technology, video conferencing systems, and the transition to Moodle. It also discussed how to bring this information back to each unit and making processes common and efficient.

ITLA - Mr. Balak discussed the ITLA. He indicated this group meets monthly and has 22 members. He stated ITLA brings together IT leaders from colleges and administrative units across the University to contribute to the University's strategic technology plan.

These contribution include:

- Information awareness and dissemination
- Evaluation and analysis
- Feedback
- Consultation and advice
- Recommendations
- Decision making

Mr. Balak listed some successes of the collaborative-shared leadership approach such as:

- Google implementation, including shutting off UMCAL and a solution for migrating the AHC to Google
- Negotiating pricing with Dell for a standard set of configurations
- Strategic sourcing
- Server inventory and virtualization

He then discussed ITLA's goals for 2011-12. He stated the goals are aligned to the commitment for excellence goals of exceptional organization, innovation and instruction.

- Exceptional organization – A service inventory of all colleges and departments in order to identify ways to collaborate on licensing and IT cycles.
- Exceptional innovation - Collaboration to create common good services and find ways to draw them down at the end of their lives.
- Exceptional instruction –
 - assisting with the adoption of Moodle
 - supporting innovative tools faculty use for instruction
 - Bridging between ATAC and ITLA
 - increasing IT staffs' focus on helping faculty add value to their teaching.

Professor Higman asked if IT staff would still be available to assist with operational problems. Mr. Balak replied that they would be, but noted many processes have been automated, and standards for strategic sourcing also help create time for IT staff to spend on the research and teaching mission.

Mr. Gulachek commented on the importance of following through on the retirement of old processes in order to move forward on new initiatives. He noted the AHC would be transitioned to Google in June.

New Business

2011-12 Agenda Planning

Professor Higman asked the committee for suggestions for 2011-12 agenda topics. Professor Higman noted he would like to include updates from OIT governance groups such as ATAC at each SCIT meeting. Jim MacDonald suggested a report on the progress of the conversion from technology fees to collegiate fees. Professor Westra suggested receiving information on second life virtual simulation for student learning.

Hearing no further business, Professor Higman adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office