SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (SCIT)
MINUTES OF MEETING
April 7, 2015

[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.]

[In these minutes: IT Governance Input gathering; Topics for next year]

PRESENT: Jim MacDonald (chair), John Butler, Sean Conner, Madeline Doak, Kate McCready,

 Bob Rubinyi, Benton Schnabel, Yuk Sham, Carlos Soria, Eric Watkins

GUESTS: Thomas Auld and Brittany Lloyd, associate chief information officers (ACIO), IT

REGRETS: Michelle Driessen, Zahra Eslami, Karen Monsen, Tom Shield, Tisha Turk,

ABSENT: Zachary Shartiag, Diane Willow

1. IT GOVERNANCE INPUT GATHERING

Mr. MacDonald called the meeting to order and introduced the guests for the first item. Brittany Lloyd and Thomas Auld attended the meeting to discuss the Information Technologies priorities of the past year and gather input for the year ahead. Ms. Lloyd explained that the following will continue to be addressed over the next year:
- FY16 Input Leads: Need More Work
  - Improved video collaboration
  - ESUP
  - Security

She then opened the conversation for member comments and questions. The committee first discussed the effectiveness of the meetings held to gather input for the Office for Information Technologies (OIT) and expressed that they were unsure of the impact of the feedback provided by SCIT. They discussed the following points:
- Members asked: What kind of input would be the most effective from the committee?
  - Mr. MacDonald explained that if something was brought before the committee that was extremely objectionable, the committee is empowered to report that to the Senate Consultative Committee. The input being given by SCIT is being implemented when possible. For example, the feedback that was given to the Moodle team has actually been implemented.
  - Professor Sham added that he has noticed action being taken from the feedback that the committee has given.
  - Mr. Butler advised that the committee should choose one or two areas of focus for each academic year since there are limited numbers of meetings.
  - Ms. Lloyd mentioned that the Formal Communities of Practice (fCoP) could be an opportunity for increased engagement with SCIT.

- What has been the result of the input gathered from SCIT?
  - Ms. Lloyd provided an example: In terms of wifi 200-300 new access points have been established, focusing on common spaces such as Coffman and areas in St. Paul and the East and West bank campuses.

Members then provided the following areas that need improvement:
- AHC issues:
  - There seems to be a need to align these units; currently there is a separation of computer management between the AHC and other units.
- Lab virtualization:
  - Will be deployed for the enterprise in fall of 2015. When multiple units are purchasing the same licenses, when possible they are moved from the budget model to the common good.
- Outdoor wireless would be very helpful, especially on the St.Paul campus.
- Consumer based visualization tools are garnering interest, for example Tableau.
- Defining where faculty should go for central services that are provided.
- Easy access, grant sponsored financial reporting.
- Ms. McCready pointed out that the reporting of the work of researchers is a general need across multiple units.
- IRB standard protocol is challenging and constantly changing, but having a central repository of cleared protocols would be helpful. This could create transparency of the process and efficiency for researchers.
  - The current examination of the IRB process could result in positive changes in this area.
- There are individual units that use technology to track the contacts that are made with students from the beginning of their education until after graduation. Could this be standardized and used by all units?

Ms. Lloyd thanked members for their input and said that she would welcome additional input via email.

Members continued the discussion and pointed out that the "Synthesized view of data focused on input mechanisms" chart included in the OIT handout is misleading because of the way it has been normalized. They also discussed the following points:
- How are "needs" balanced with "wants" in the data?
- Can the committee request to view the data that accompanies the Top Themes for Investment Areas? Can the committee be involved in the process of deciding the priorities?
  - Mr. MacDonald explained that the Communities of Practice are involved in determining the priorities and it is not difficult to get involved.
  - Professor Conner asked what the rationalization is for determining the priorities?
  - Mr. Butler pointed out that the committee should be involved in giving strategic input, while the surveys will likely gather pain points.

Mr. MacDonald said that he will give this feedback to Ms. Lloyd. Specifically, he will convey that they would like to know some of the feedback that was given by the other strategic input groups. The committee agreed that if they had a greater understanding of the budget, they could

provide better input. Members then discussed the possible need for a review of the IT Governance process.

When discussing topics for next year, members expressed an interest in educational technology - what is currently in progress? Members said that this seems to be a very fragmented effort. They added that this area seems to need stability and perhaps the committee could create a recommendation next year.

Mr. MacDonald thanked members for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich
University Senate Office