

UAA University Technology Council

Agenda

February 26, 2021

8:30 am – 10:30 am

Teams Meeting

Attendance:

Present: Benjamin Shier, IT Services; Andrea Miller, IT Services; Katelyn Leary, IT Services; Veronica Howard, Faculty Senate/ACDLITE; Paul Wasko, AI&E; John Lutterman, College of Arts and Sciences; Alpana Desai, College of Business and Public Policy; Kim Riggs, College of Engineering; Brad Myrstol, College of Health; Al Grant, Community & Technical College; Mike Robinson, Consortium Library; Ian Bushell, Kodiak College; Amos Secoy, Mat-Su College; Rob Lewis, Kenai Peninsula College; Anne Lazenby, Student Affairs; Ryan Rivers, USUAA

Guests:

Excused:

Absent: Don Bickley, Prince William Sound College;

- 1) Meeting called to order at 8:35 AM
- 2) Review and approval of agenda
 - a. Approved
- 3) Review and approval of January meeting minutes
 - a. Approved
- 4) Welcome to new member
 - a. Ann Lazenby, Director of Disability Support Services, has joined the UTC as the representative from Student Affairs
- 5) Discussion items
 - a. General Updates
 - i. Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) – *Benjamin Shier*
 1. It was recently identified that there was a potential for fraudulent activity to occur in Banner based on current security measures in place. Decision was made to turn on two-factor authentication for many Banner accounts. Two-factor authentication requires a secondary way in addition to password to authenticate a user on login, such as a pin from an app on your phone or phone call or email.
 2. UA has been piloting Duo for two-factor authentication. It's a small pilot with less than 100 users.

3. This has been a push by UA SW, and the UAA IT Team is now needing to support the roll out without much experience or background knowledge. IT Staff has been getting training on Duo and can refer questions to the correct contact at UA SW if needed.
4. What is the scope of tools that will require two-factor authentication? At the University today we use two different methods for single sign-on. One is a Fairbanks-based solution and the other is an Anchorage-based solution. If the application uses the Fairbanks-based solution it will be integrated into Duo and require two-factor authentication. If it uses the Anchorage-based solution, it is not yet two-factor enabled. IT is working towards enabling two-factor authentication on the Anchorage-based solution.
5. Does Duo support remember a device? The way this two-factor works is that it requires knowledge of and relationship with a device whether it is a USB key or a cell phone. Once it has the knowledge of the device there is a defined time-period where it remembers a successful MFA check.
6. Note that users need to have options and not be locked into a specific authentication method. IE don't want to get locked into a specific app, etc., or a requirement to use their personal device for authentication.

b. Canvas Pilot – ACDLITe letter – *Veronica Howard*

- i. UA SW is piloting Canvas as a learning management system (LMS). The original idea is Canvas would be available to campuses to use if they would like and was not piloted as a replacement to Blackboard. At a recent January meeting there was a discussion of making a recommendation to adopt Canvas.
- ii. There is a concern that if Canvas is going to be considered as a replacement for Blackboard that the pilot and considerations of replacement be more in-depth. There are also concerns about having two different LMS options being available due to needs for training, support, duplicative costs, and more.
- iii. Is it possible the University can move into a new LMS without following procurement processes? There are concerns about a new LMS being purchased without following sole-source requirements.
 1. The pilot looks like it is highly motivated to make Canvas look good. The small number of people involved in the pilot are getting platinum level support, which we may not get if Canvas is implemented.
 2. The spirit of the pilot is not what it should or could be. We have a duty to review the possibility of a new LMS in a certain way, and that is not currently being done.
 3. President Pitney is seen as being a collaborative leader and a letter like the ACDLITe letter will be considered.

4. From a Procurement standpoint, eCampus is convinced that Canvas is the solution and others won't be considered. They have some compelling reasons and it would not be hard to justify a single source. If there is not enough alignment between the campuses, it will be more challenging to move forward.
 - iv. Question on if students or student governance is aware of the Canvas pilot? USUAA is aware that the pilot is going on. There are a few members of student government who have concerns about Canvas. It is unsure how much of the student body prefers one LMS over another. Students are perhaps the most important stakeholder group.
- c. UTC Mission – *Benjamin Shier*
- i. With concerns around budget and declining revenues, there is a need to revisit the UTC mission and purpose.
 - ii. Purpose of UTC is to provide guidance to CIO and ITS, represent their individual units, and provide guidance on STF distribution.
 - iii. Membership is Chancellor appointed with members from each college, administrative divisions, community campuses, faculty senate, and student body.
 - iv. Student Tech Fee provides up-to-date equipment, software, maintenance, training, and support for students with an approx. \$5/credit hour fee. Student Tech Fee is now part of the Consolidated Student Fee.
 1. With the fee consolidation is there a potential for a change in the way the consolidated fee is distributed? There may be a potential for the way the consolidated fee is distributed. We've continued to see an increase in dependence on technology with the fee remaining flat.
 2. STF has had a history of being well funded so the UTC had an opportunity to do some very innovative things with funding. With a decrease in revenues, we need to revisit what the core funding is.
- d. Preparing FY22 STF Budget Proposal – *Benjamin Shier*
- i. Projecting continued decrease in STF revenues linked to decrease in enrollment. Currently basing projections on a 15% decrease in credit hours.
 1. Modeling for next year has not yet been completed. 15% is a conservative approach but 10 or 12% may be more accurate.
 2. Committee determined that a 15% decline was a good conservative model to use for this exercise.
 - ii. Since the committee is not appointed until after the start of the Fall semester, waiting for next year's committee to be able to meet will put decisions around budget way too late.

- iii. The challenge in front of us is to identify what the core items that STF should be funding. What are the things are the most important to this committee for this fee? Are there alternative revenues that are available for items?
- iv. The University has been looking at potential for COVID funding as a stop gap for lost revenues.
- v. Our budget this year was comprised with a significant amount of carryforward. We do not anticipate being able to rely on nearly as much carryforward going forward.
- vi. Some line items are already committed and either have been paid or will need to be paid due to contractual commitments.
- vii. FY22 Budget Prep document will be provided to committee.
 - 1. DSS and the Library are invited to provide notes for their funding line items before the document is sent to the committee.
- viii. Line items overview by IT. Details are included in the budget prep document.
 - 1. Central Labs - will need to see continued support and even an increase in funding (compared to no funding in current year) to operate once campus reopens to continue to operate as it has. Any decrease will lead to not staffing the labs or a closure of labs.
 - 2. TSC – decrease in funding will result in a further reduction in hours and/or longer wait times for support because of staffing reductions.
 - 3. Blackboard – this is a committed cost. STF funding does not cover the entire expense. IT subsidizes a portion of this expense out of their budget.
 - 4. Managed Print – Relatively fixed costs for licensing, supplies, and refresh costs. Service can only be reduced by another \$5k before the service is no longer feasible.
 - 5. Microsoft – this is a committed expense through FY22. The STF funding subsidizes student use of Microsoft services. Decreasing this contribution would directly increase the cost of Microsoft to departments at UAA.
 - 6. Kaltura – Contract ends at end of this FY. There has not been any talk of changing this contract. While there have been discussions within UAA to switching to an alternative, there is not enough time to pivot to another solution before the end of the FY.
 - 7. Library interlibrary loan – pays for interlibrary loan and science journal and e-collection. Library would lose access to around 2200 journal titles.
- ix. Do we have any kinds of numbers for how many faculty are using Kaltura? IT can provide information on a percentage of faculty who are using Kaltura as part of

their teaching. The expense of Kaltura is also related to the cost of hosting the videos.

6) New Business

7) Adjourn – 10:31 AM

Topics for future meetings:

- Continued discussion on FY22 Budget Preparation

Future Meeting Dates:

- March 26 8:30-10:30a
- April 23 8:30-10:30a