

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (SCIT)**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
September 10, 2013

[In these minutes: IT Governance Update; Information Security Framework Overview; ESUP Introduction & Faculty Center Preview.]

[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:** Jim MacDonald (chair), John Butler, Bradley Cohen, Sean Conner, Lara Friedman-Shedlov, Bernard Gulachek, Ted Higman, Yiwen Li, Robert Rubinyi, Benton Schnabel, Noel Schumacher, Yuk Sham, Tom Shield, Scott Studham, Eric Watkins

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Brian Dahlin, Bernard Gulachek

**GUESTS:** William Dana, Kate Sophia, John Vollum, Amy Winkel

**REGRETS:** Stephen Levin, Karen Monson, Tisha Turk, Mary Vavrus

**WELCOME & ORIENTATION**

Mr. MacDonald called the meeting to order, welcomed those present, and asked for introductions. He then reviewed the charge with members and stated that he would like the committee to provide formal, written input to Associate CIOs as part of the IT governance process. He informed members that the committee was charged by FCC to review the University's agreement with Google and their privacy policy. They will hear a report in November regarding the agreement.

Ms. Rich informed members of the attendance policy and general expectations for committee members.

**IT GOVERNANCE UPDATE**

Scott Studham, VP and CIO, IT, used a PowerPoint to guide his presentation. Mr. Studham highlighted the following topics:

- Overall Cost of IT by Function
- IT Contribution to University of Minnesota Mission
- IT Governance at UMN
  - Mr. Studham explained the process beginning with input, decision process, funding, and lastly execution/implementation.
  - Mr. Studham meets with individual deans and chancellors regarding the input received, they then vote on the priorities for IT for the following year. The following slide detailed those recommendations as a result of the vote.

- Survey Data: 1560 Respondents
  - The broad satisfaction with IT is high.
  - Academic Technology Tools were rated as a high priority within the 55 listening sessions conducted by OIT members.
  - A member noted that the data showed that the respondents within the listening sessions provided more topics.
  - Mr. Cohen clarified that the feedback is open ended and respondents communicate in their own language. Their responses are analyzed and mapped to IT service language.
  - It was noted that there were no significant differences across the population of students, staff, and faculty in terms of IT demands and priorities.
- Priority Recommendations from Demand Input
  - The following list contains the priorities ranked and voted on by deans, vice presidents, and chancellors.
  - FY 14 Proposed Initiatives
    1. Improve usability and effectiveness of our current software (e.g., Moodle), explore new technologies, and advance mobile applications.
      - The University has the world's largest Moodle environment and currently two people support it. It is not modified, but there is a separate governance group to investigate this issue.
    2. Improve user support. (e.g., allow people to download their own software)
    3. Rapidly expand wireless network coverage inside and outside on campuses.
      - [wireless@umn.edu](mailto:wireless@umn.edu) is an email address that helps users to solve issues with wireless gaps and usage.
    4. Modernize academic technology spaces (classrooms, labs, informal learning spaces) to accommodate Bring Your Own Device and access to specialized software.
  - FY 15 Proposed Themes for Compact
    1. Continued eLearning Investment
    2. Constituent Relationship Management
      - Salesforce.com is of particular interest because this tool is used for recruiting, admissions, and generating revenue.

Mr. Gulachek completed the rest of the presentation to allow Mr. Studham to attend another meeting. He continued to explain that there are external pressures outside of the University that change IT priorities such as audits and the Huron report.

- The Five Biggest Risks and How We Are Mitigating Them
- Huron Report

- Huron analyzed management functions across the University and their alignment to best practices. The analysis was mandated by the Legislature and was conducted last spring.
- The entire report can be found at: [excellence.umn.edu](http://excellence.umn.edu).

## **INFORMATION SECURITY FRAMEWORK**

Mr. Dahlin used a PowerPoint to present an overview of the newly developed Information Security Framework.

- The Information Security Framework Community of Practice helped to establish standard policies and procedures. They have been working to implement an Information Security Risk Management Framework.
- Information Security Risk Management is used to implement the proper level of controls from a cost and business operations perspective. These controls also help to meet regulatory requirements for sensitive data management.
- Three different levels are used to assess risk.
  - Level 1 – Self- assessment risk inventory to determine types of data being collected.
  - Level 2 – More in-depth assessment questionnaire.
  - Level 3 – Interview style assessment.
- Currently, a pilot Level 3 interview assessment is being developed.

## **ENTERPRISE SYSTEM UPGRADE PROJECT (ESUP)**

William Dana, Project Director, Student Systems, led the discussion of the ESUP effort. He began by explaining that the term “Student Systems” encompasses campus solutions involved with various areas including but not limited to admissions, financial aid, and International Student Visa tracking. He distributed a handout to guide the presentation and introduced three other attendees from the ESUP Student Work Stream: Kate Sophia, John Vollum, and Amy Winkel.

Mr. Dana emphasized that the ESUP team is striving to use the delivered functions of PeopleSoft to avoid long-term maintenance issues involved with modifications.

- Ms. Sophia used a handout to display screenshots of Faculty Center with student names redacted. She highlighted the following features:
  - Faculty will be able to access class lists more conveniently with Faculty Center. The class rosters will contain real-time data as opposed to being refreshed overnight.
  - A modification to provide Ucard photos of students will be implemented.
  - Grades can be entered for mid-term and final.
- Members raised the following questions:
  - Is there a feature where we can enter all grades and the system would calculate the final grade? A lack of this functionality creates opportunity for security issues and entry errors.
  - Students want to know their grades as soon as possible. Is this integrated with Moodle so faculty do not have to re-enter grades from Moodle? Is

there a grade book feature? Mr. Dana responded that the conversation is continuing around Moodle integration. Mr. Cohen clarified that Faculty Center does not contain grade book functionality. He continued that grading practices are so varied that a system has not yet been identified that meets the broad needs of the faculty.

- Is the upgrade being done in parallel with the Moodle system? This is a replacement for the current final grading system.
- Members further emphasized the risks that are created by a system that is missing the functionality and requires importing and exporting data to other computing devices/platforms. Integration is very important to mitigate the risks.
- How frequently does the system get upgraded? 2008 was the last upgrade and Oracle is changing the way it does upgrades. New code will be received in a quarterly release system to avoid large overhauls in the future.
- Is there an ability to assess performance of students outside the college as opposed to inside the college? Does the new functionality provide any analysis of student outcomes? APlus will still be used. There are enhanced reporting features that involve different queries.
- Members discussed the different ways in which student learning outcomes are assessed by colleges and how exactly they are defined. Ms. Winkel stated that the Analytics Collaborative is working on coming up with measures and common ways to analyze student outcomes across the system. Mr. Dana added that currently, it would be up to the colleges to determine how they would like to measure and track learning outcomes. He does believe that methods and needs will evolve over time.
  - Professor Shield cautioned against having disjointed systems for analyzing student learning outcomes as related to accreditation.
  - Mr. Cohen asked members to consider if this is an administrative need and, as part of the governance process, does it deserve future investment?
  - Professor Conner stated that the accountability for student learning outcomes is a growing priority across the higher education landscape.
  - Mr. MacDonald stated that SCIT is in the position to identify salient issues and make them visible through the governance process.

In respect of the time, Mr. MacDonald adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich  
University Senate Office