Memorandum

To: Distribution
From: Andrea Miller
Date: April 21, 2017
Subject: University Technology Council (UTC) – April 21, 2017

Attendance:
Present: Adam Paulick, IT Services; Joe Fugere, IT Services; Andrea Miller, IT Services; Kathy Smith, Kenai Peninsula College; Katie Walker, College of Education; Robert Stott, College of Business & Public Policy; Lee Henrikson, Community and Technical College; Dave Dannenberg, Academic Innovations & eLearning; Ian Bushell, Kodiak College; David Fitzgerald, Faculty Senate & ACDLITE; Dennis Drinka, Faculty Senate & ACDLITE; Mike Robinson, Consortium Library; Vince Yelmene, Mat-Su College; Karen Andrews, Disability Support Services; Brandon Wood, IT Services
Absent: Ryan Belnap, Prince William Sound Community College; Angelia Trujillo, College of Health; Randy Moulic, College of Engineering; Larry Foster, College of Arts and Sciences;

1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Call to Order 8:32 am
2. Review and approval of agenda
   a. Approved
3. Review and approval of minutes
   a. Approved with corrections
4. Discussion items
   a. Carry Over
   b. Strategic Pathways IT Direction #1 update (Adam)
      i. The committee completed the report, which was sent to Sam Gingerich and Pat. Shier The report will be sent out soon to the effected organizations heads for comments. Decisions will be made on actions taking into account the report and the comments from the organizations.
   c. Grammar checker (Bob)
      Handout
i. Touched base with vendor, who provided a statement. This statement was sent out to the UTC.

ii. Also reached out to Arkansas State University, who at first thought we were Grammarly with a VPAT. Wasn’t aware of the webpage on their site. Arkansas has a strict policy requiring software purchases have a VPAT.

iii. Grammarly would need to have a VPAT or one in the works for us to be able to purchase.

iv. Hearing more comments about the need for this. Have had a conversation with Jackie Cason of the English Department. There is a need for this software.

v. Right now about 300 universities use this. All universities we talked who use the software love it.

vi. If Grammarly can give us a better timeline for the VPAT, and if it is in the process for the next 3-6 months, then we should purchase it.

vii. Discussion concerning having a policy in place concerning requiring a VPAT for any software for student use that is going to be purchased.

   1. University of Illinois requires either a VPAT or a statement of accessibility for review by the University.

   2. To move this into policy, someone would need to draft a policy and bring it to Faculty Senate. Dennis will bring this to ACDLITe.

viii. Request for formal memo to English department about purchasing Grammarly with request for support or comments.

ix. Question on what UAF or UAS is using. Bob will check.

d. Email, Calendar and Collaboration Strategy (Adam)

i. Had several focus groups, with a few more coming up. We’ve received a lot of great feedback on the strategy. The goal is to compile the results, update the strategy, and put together a proposal.

ii. Will also be issuing survey that asks to rate certain ECC functions on importance. Should be going out Monday.

iii. Regardless of if anyone fills out the survey or participates in the focus groups, it sets a good standard that we are eliciting feedback.

e. ITC Update (Adam)

i. ITC is currently figuring things out

ii. Two focus areas:

   1. IT costs – SP Action Item 1 – looking at costs
a. Discussion on how do we get valid numbers. Discussion about a lot of the challenge areas are restricted funds.

b. CMT did some analysis of the costs before it went to the ITC. Came up with some general cost reduction ideas, such as video conferencing or toll bypass with tail end hop off, etc. There are various potentials for cost savings.

c. Question on what number do we start at. Having trouble identifying this due to cross over expenses, such as if we facilities come over to move furniture, which shows up as an IT expense.

2. Top pain points for the members of the group for members of IT.

a. UAA leadership put together a list of pain points:

   i. Align business practices and then align technology with those business practices by developing and applying appropriate technology strategies.

   ii. Establish annual and midterm priorities/budgets to drive work and ensure accountability.

   iii. Immediately address the disconnects between Statewide OIT, campus IT, and campus end users.

   iv. Immediately address Banner operation dysfunctions including: governance, work backlog, access, cost.

   Managed print initiatives (Joe)

b. Faculty submitted a separate list that mentions classroom technology, blackboard, and other issues.

   iii. Move to top of next meeting.

   iv. Question concerning department rejecting print stations in dorms. Says it is not a good use. Joe will find out more about where this is coming from.

f. Educause survey (Dave)

   i. Move to top of next meeting.

5. New Business

a. Assistive technologies (Karen)

   handout and website: www.atia.org/at-resources/atob

   i. We are seeing more and more students who have a disability. The need for assistive technology (AT) is becoming more and more critical. We have to be accessible; it is a legal obligation, but also a social obligation.
1. AT can be high tech, low tech, no tech. Can be as simple as a color sheet to lay over their printed material to help with those with visual acuity issues, or as complicated as a special-purpose computer.
2. Universal design for learning is good for everybody. It takes a multimodal approach.
3. Demands are increasing on everybody, not just DSS.
4. Because of this, we are looking into AT. There is a growing need for AT.
   ii. As the field is so diverse and more complicated than one person can handle on their own, I am proposing an AT group.
      1. Would do informal AT assessments, provide accessible media, technical assistance, audit courses for accessibility, and more listed on handout.
      2. AT group could be house in DSS, Academic Innovations, or somewhere else.
   iii. Bringing this to UTC as this is a University concern and need, not just a DSS issue. Realizes this is not strictly a UTC issue, bringing it up to gain feedback prior to starting campaigning for this in other areas.
   iv. Suggestion for using some of the surplus student tech funds to fund a student worker for AT, or look at reallocating this year’s budget.
   v. Start by putting together a position description to include with presentation.
   vi. Suggested to give the presentation to ACDLTe.
   vii. Question about grants for something like this. DSS is investigation for applicable grants.

b. Blackboard Course Archiving and Storage (Brandon)
   i. Proposal from OIT with new approach they want to take with course backup and archiving. Overall we think it is a good idea, and do have a few concerns with the approach they are proposing. Want to run it by UTC to get feedback.
   ii. Problem: With system backups, if there’s problem with one individual course where a mistake is made (i.e. user deletes grades, admin deletes course) if there is a granular issue such is this, how to work around without backing up the entire system
   iii. Solution: To have archived backups of each individual courses: a granular weekly archive of all of the courses. OIT is proposing to save these to a google IT drive. The provide access to call center techs and other IT personnel. Concerns about storage, to where the archives are stored.
      1. Pros:
a. Free unlimited storage.
b. Ability to share files with admins and call center

2. Cons:
   a. Cannot get any more granular. You cannot give access to individual instructors with the google team drive. Instructors would have to go through call center to have it refreshed. Access to archived storage is all or nothing.
   b. It is also more difficult to revoke access once someone has left the University. Google account access is not disabled like the University account is.

iv. Alternative: Local storage at UAA. Still weekly archive, but stored locally at UAA rather than in the cloud. Would need to consider how many of these weekly archives would we need to keep? How long to keep an individual archive?
   1. Pros:
      a. Allows tighter control over revoking permissions
      b. Ability to share files with admins, call center, and instructors
   2. Cons:
      a. Potentially large storage needs
      b. ~750 GB per weekly archive

v. Comments:
   1. Faculty would still need support to access, find, and go through the process to refresh the archived Bb class. They are still going to be calling the call center. No need for faculty to have granular access.
   2. Instructors have the ability today to do their own course archives, saving it to their own computer.
   3. What is the cost of storing at UAA? Rate is $0.60/GB/Year for $450 per weekly archive.

vi. Feedback: Preference for local storage. If you go with google, you are going to have a hard time going back to local. If you go to local, you can also see how UAF does and learn from it. The more I hear about google, the more I feel like we are building a house of cards.

   c. Next meeting scheduled for May 12, 2017 – conflicting with quite a few members’ schedules. Will send out a poll/email to reschedule

6. Adjourn 10:43 am
Action Items:

- Agenda Item for May meeting:
  - Review budget and projects to determine carryforward and reallocate.
  - Service center updates
- Bob will check with UAF and UAS on Grammarly usage.
- Joe will find out more information concerning the pushback from Student Housing admin concerning managed print stations in the dorms.
- Andrea will send out scheduling email for May UTC Meeting to look at alternative dates

Next Meeting Dates:

- May 12, 2017 - rescheduling