

# University Council Technology Standing Committee

**Minutes**

**October 3, 2013**

**2:30 pm**

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Mary Hardin, Chair
<b>TYPE OF MEETING</b>	Monthly Meeting
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Mary Hardin, Chair
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Margaret Canzonetta
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p>Members Present: Aimee DeChambeau, Mary Hardin, Chris Kuhn, Gene Marchand, Phyllis O'Connor, Alvaro Rodriguez, Jim Sage, Anthony Serpette, Suzanne Testerman</p> <p>Guests: Margaret Canzonetta</p> <p>Absent with notice: Linda Barrett, Stewart Moritz</p> <p>Absent without notice: Kashyap Gaglani</p>

## Agenda topics

### CALL TO ORDER

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mary Hardin called the meeting to order. The September 3, 2013 meeting minutes were approved with a minor change. The minutes have been posted on the UC Sharepoint site.
-------------------	---

### INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Suzanne Testerman was introduced as a returning member of the Committee representing CPAC.
-------------------	--

### DISCUSSION OF CHANGES TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL BYLAWS

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mary discussed the proposed changes to the University council by-laws. For clarification, the executive committee rewrote the by-laws not the provost. At the last University Council meeting, it was decided that people overreacted in rewriting the bylaws and that a committee would be formed to rewrite the by-laws. This committee
-------------------	---

	<p>will be starting with the February version of the by-laws and will be seeking input from the executive committee and the board of trustees on what they want to see. The committee will consist of representative for the constituency groups with no input from administration. They will be going back to the original structure of a steering committee, etc. The focus will stay on responding to issue briefs on a timely basis. Mary felt the subcommittees will still need to play a large role the way they had been doing. If you have any questions, let Mary know.</p>
--	--

**GOALS AND ACTION PLANS FOR 2013**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Mary stated that the committee originally proposed four action items and subcommittees. Aimee indicated that the library uses actionable steps and achievement of goals. This matter will be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the availability and statistics on usage of lab computers. Gene stated that there is actually software for this purpose. It was suggested that a survey be put together to ask how willing students are to walk to a lab, what restrictions are put on colleges/departments lab computers, view on virtual labs. It was suggested that a committee be formed to come up with some specifics on how to put together a survey.</p>
-------------------	---

**BOARD REPORTS AND GOVERNANCE**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The Board reports are posted on the Sharepoint site. Jim invited any questions on the reports. He reported that an rfp for the video conferencing project is ready to go on the street. The committee is headed by Thomas Calderon.</p> <p>On the governance end, there is a lot going on. Originally, a process was put together with an advisory committee. It was concluded that it did not work well. They tried to cover too many broad topics, too big and impossible to understand the needs. They created subcommittees on HR, finance, student, web, academic and IT infrastructure. The subcommittees are made up of representatives of those six areas. They are trying to recapture all the projects within those groups and then prioritize the list. IT also has projects that need to be prioritized. The process of governing is evolving becoming a more formal way of getting things done. Mary asked who sits on the committee that prioritizes the projects. Jim indicated the committee consisted of Mike Sherman, Jim Tressel, Dave Cummins and himself. The committee figures how to fund the projects looking at the strategic objectives of the University.</p> <p>Questions were raised about the University’s network. Jim reported that the network will need a significant financial investment. Over 60% of the network is at end of life and not supported. Phyllis asked about voip. Jim’s assessment is that the phone system is at the end of life but others disagree. They are trying to determine how many years are left on the system. He felt that current technology is hosting in a cloud. An analysis is going to be done on this subject.</p>
-------------------	--

## MISCELLANEOUS

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Anthony gave the committee a brief update on the Time and Attendance project. Suzanne reported that the IT department salaried employees will be going live in two weeks and then PFOC. Everything is moving along fine. Information will be provided in the UA Digest.</p> <p>Mary spoke talk about concerns with the Exchange server due to limited space. Faculty and others have been complaining about the lack of space. Jim indicated there were no plans, but if they call the help desk and ask for it, we do increase the space. Chris suggested going to 365. Jim responded that there is an issue with the faculty and staff side, and public records requests. Microsoft does not allow you to do e-discovery. There is push back from legal on the offshore storage and they cannot perform e-discovery. Anthony suggested getting an account to see the accommodations in size.</p> <p>Phyllis brought up the issue with HR forms such as the performance review forms. Mary suggested that we write a recommendation that forms could have form optimization standards. Anthony indicated that he could do a quick overview of a few of the forms and we can send suggestions to him. Anthony will put together a subgroup, make a few suggestions and offer support. Chris agreed to work with Anthony on this. Maybe put a notice in UA Digest.</p> <p>Gene talked about the IT training department putting together training about email etiquette and guidelines.</p> <p>Aimee asked about state retention of electronic records Jim has presented the question to legal. The University does store it and back it up. Phyllis questioned retention of faculty coursework. The faculty are confused in case of public records requests. This will be addressed when they look at retention/records.</p> <p>Mary heard there are some serious holes in the curriculum review process with faculty not being aware when something was approved. Jim reported that Matt Petras and Shannan Whalen are working on the project and they make enhancements all the time. He thought they we were meeting needs. Matt or Shannon should be invited to attend a committee meeting to give an update.</p> <p>Mary asked if there has been a study done on the wireless capacity issue or equipment life issues? Jim said it is currently being assessed. There are big issues with old fire walls, we do not have dmz and there are issues with the voice mail system. We need to find someone to design a network of the future. Jim stated that there is no process on reporting problems and we are just reacting. We need to have a reporting system. Mary stated that she is using footprints, and doesn't hear back from anyone. Aimee indicated that she also is not receiving responses. Mary has to call to find out the outcome. There are discrepancies on how you ask for things, numbers assigned, differences between work requests vs. request projects. Gene said it was a problem with the ticketing system - no ticket ownership. It is hard to track who is working on something. Jim thought it was more about policies and practices. Jim will follow up</p>
-------------------	---

with the network folks about the ticketing system. He will also talk to Holly and put together a committee to address the issues.

The next meeting will be November 26. The regular December meeting is during UA shutdown. Propose moving to January 7, 2014.