

UAA University Technology Council

Minutes

February 25, 2022

8:30 am – 10:30 am

Microsoft Teams meeting

Member		College/Dept	Title
Benjamin	Shier	IT Services	CIO
Veronica	Howard	ACDLITE/Faculty Senate	Chair ACDLITE, Associate Professor of Psychology
Paul	Wasko	Academic Innovations & eLearning	ePortfolio Coordinator
Sarah	Gerken	College of Arts and Sciences	Professor of Biological Sciences
Yoshito	Kanamori	College of Business & Public Policy	Associate Professor of Management Information Systems
Kim	Riggs	College of Engineering	Facilities Manager
Brad	Myrstol	College of Health	Associate Professor and Director of the Justice Center
Al	Grant	Community & Technical College	Associate Professor of Occupational Safety & Health
Mike	Robinson	Consortium Library	Head Library Systems/Professor
Jon	Farmer	Kenai Peninsula College	Educational Technology Team Lead Instructional Designer
Ian	Bushell	Kodiak College	Network Administrator
Amos	Secoy	Matanuska-Susitna College	Director of Mat-Su Campus Technology Services
Don	Bickley	Prince William Sound College	Instructional Design and Technology Specialist
Anne	Lazenby	Student Affairs	Director of Disability Support Services
Ryan	Rivers	USUAA	Graduate Student

Legend: **in attendance**, absent

- 1) Meeting called to order – 8:35 AM
- 2) Review and approval of agenda
 - a. Approved with additions
- 3) Review and approval of past meeting minutes
 - a. Approved
- 4) General Updates – *Benjamin Shier & Andrea Miller*
 - a. [Adobe Creative Cloud End of Life – May 9, 2022](#)
 - b. [Cisco AnyConnect \(VPN\) End of Life – Spring Break](#)
UAA IT Services is migrating from the current Virtual Private Network (VPN) services to Palo Alto Global Protect. Details are available in the Green and Gold notice and several guides are available on the [Seawolf Tech Portal](#).
 - c. Annual Accessibility Recertification for website authors
All website content management system (CMS) editors are required to complete an

annual recertification of website accessibility per the [2017 voluntary resolution agreement between UAA and the Office of Civil Rights](#). Recertification is done through an assessment available to CMS editors on [Blackboard](#). Refresher trainings are also available through June 2022. CMS editors must complete recertification by July 1, 2022. Questions can be directed to Michael Tallino, Associate Director of Student Web Experience.

d. [Blackboard Alert from Feb. 15](#)

i. Related question about UAF LMS transition experience and current UAA Blackboard (Bb) contract

1. We are using Bb Cloud, which runs through June of 2023. This is a year extension of our previous contract. UAF's stated intention has been to move to Canvas and stop participating in Bb at the end of the contract. There have been some changes in leadership at UAF, and it is not clear if UAF intends to change the timeline for their transition.
2. We have learned there is a tail on the Bb contract, where if/when we transition, we would need to keep Bb for the archived courses to maintain the academic records per our records policy.
3. UAA is currently evaluating LMS options. There is an anticipated report, expected in April. That committee would report to the Provost, based on their evaluation and stakeholder feedback, and provide a recommendation. It is currently unclear if UA statewide has given permission to UAA to change LMS options.
4. Timeline is short, especially with faculty currently putting together their workload for the upcoming academic year. Faculty should be including time for transition between LMS on their workload. Next Faculty Senate meeting will include discussion about the transition, but unfortunately this is after the faculty workload deadline.

ii. Irrespective of the final LMS selection, will a vendor be contracted to do most of the migration?

1. Blackboard and Canvas both use the same vendor to do migrations. Initial understanding of the timeline is that we could move courses as needed. We are aware of the options for upgrade services, but do not know what the costs could be. Additional research is needed to understand more about the workload associated with a migration. Whichever way we go with respect to the final LMS selection, we will most likely be doing testing of the options.
2. Experience from UAF pilot – every course, instructor, and migration are different. The platforms are very different. The migration during the UAF pilot was insufficient for the timeline provided.

iii. Comment on preference for Canvas. ASD students are used to using Canvas, and overall sentiment on social media from cohorts at other universities prefer Canvas.

5) Discussion items

- a. [Managed Print Services Data Review](#) - Benjamin Shier
- i. One of the services paid by the Student Tech Fee is the managed print services. Managed print stations are spread around campus. With the remote learning environment of the past two years, we have seen a decrease in print station usage. With decline STF and managed print usage, we have been wanting to analyze usage and determine how the service should be supported going forward. With the Chancellor's recent memo about returning to a more normal operations posture, we may see an increase in usage. What should we do ahead of the fall semester? Does this service need to see increased support, decreased support, or other changes in what it provides to students?
 - ii. First chart shows users. The top user is a Chemistry dept. print card. There is also a Library temp print card. All other users are individuals. Second pie chart shows use by printer. The most heavily used printers are in the Library and ISB (96% of all printing).
 - iii. Feedback requested from UTC:
 1. Students print for various reasons. At the Library there's a lot of printing at the beginning of the semester, including printing of administrative things. As the semester progresses, they may print slide decks for classes as a note taking device. We don't see a lot of students printing homework assignments. We may see a return to more "normal" pre-pandemic behaviors by both students and faculty as we return to a more normal.
 2. There are students who rely on the print stations.
 3. Printing usage has dropped, but that doesn't mean students won't use it. It's hard to decide not knowing how the printer will be used right now.
 - iv. What are the alternatives to managed print stations?
 1. Intention right now is to share data and do not have a specific proposal.
 2. There is a large, fixed cost to this service for licensing. This licensing does not change significantly as the count of printers' change. As we have taken some printers out of the, we see usage of paper and toner shift to other areas.
 3. As we think about the service, we might consider a nuisance fee. IE if it's not as convenient to print it may encourage people to rely less on print. We may look at other options such as GSS or outsourcing to a vendor to provide a service. Potential to get rid of or lower the STF allocation, or shared printing cards.
 4. This is one of those services where we are tight on dollars. We have not replaced printers in several years, especially considering the lower usage over the past few years.
 5. We expect a return to normal, and what do we expect to change with behavior as people return to campus. Do we want IT Services supporting

several machines across campus if the usage is 1% or less? Maybe we focus on the top 10 machines, spreading them around campus.

6. Prior to the pandemic we were looking at shrinking the number of printers provided through the service.
 - v. Original managed print allocation was put in place to ease the transition to a paid service when managed print service was implemented. Prior to managed print, printers were department managed and students were not thoughtful about how they printed. Other campuses, such as MatSu, have gotten rid of the print allocation.
- b. UTC Core Values Discussion – continued
- i. While searching for historical information on the UTC and the STF found some info on the history of the STF.
 1. STF was established in 1997. The ad hoc committee that gave a recommendation provided a request that had the STF supporting computer labs and technology projects.
 2. The committee was formed to advise on distribution of the STF and advise the CIO on various technologies. This was found in the original letters to UTC members asking them to serve. We have not been able to locate an official charter for the UTC or any documentation on core values.
 3. Historic values seem to be student focused and innovated technologies. In the past when we looked at what we could spend the STF on, there was no language that restricted what it could be spent on.
 - a. More recent historic guidance on STF usage is related to doing the most impact on the most students.
 - b. There was a lot of discussion around transparency and impact on students.
 4. What we have now is a fund that was developed with the initial purpose related to student technological support and access. Since then, there has been a lot of changes. We still have that spirit or goals of innovation, access, and success for our students. We see those threads throughout our records for the UTC and STF. How do we maintain that spirit in the current environment?
 - a. Among those values, should security be included among them?
 - i. No matter what area we're in, we must be cognizant of technology security. Security is a critical value in everything that we do in technology. What are the thoughts on the committee on if security should be a critical value for the STF spend, or is it a foundation piece?
 - ii. Is security more of an expectation than an aspiration, mission, or goal? Security should be imbued into each

of the aspirational goals and is a critical value of what we do. It is one of IT Services five pillars.

- b. Suggestion on one core theme of student success, rather than multiple values. Agreement that student success is the highest goal.
- c. See the value of this committee as a university level value, but our engagement is focused on IT Services or the academic side. Some of these innovative efforts could be focused on other initiatives. There is an opportunity to include areas across the university.
 - i. We tend to make decisions in silos. Understanding how we can enable our community; UTC has a role to play in connecting those areas and seeing what the values are and what do our students need.
 - ii. We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to use this moment to realign what the UTC does to determine who we serve, what we value, and the stakeholders we're trying to get back to.
 - iii. We're funding a set of things today that are pretty core to our operations, and we're not sure this is what the tech fee was intended to do. Especially in relation to the declining revenues of the fund.
 - iv. Technology has become ubiquitous. There was a missed opportunity when fees were consolidated to rethink the whole thing. Maybe we're aiming too low.
 - v. This may be an invitation for us to have larger conversations in the meetings left in the year.

c. [Review Drafted Resolution](#)

- i. Who would this be sent to? Chancellor and other members of the executive team.
 - 1. Support resolution, but it doesn't mean much without some other sort of campaign.
- ii. This has been part of a larger conversation that the CIO has been having with the VCAS and other members of the executive team. The declining funds pose a risk to create budgetary problems elsewhere.
 - 1. The proposed resolution breeds visibility.
 - 2. Getting student buy-in and understanding of the issue is also important.
- iii. Does the proposed resolution raise the issue in such a way that helps move the conversation forward?
 - 1. Yes, Ben does think it is helpful to continue the conversation. It may help increase visibility and priority. It would certainly be helpful to have the CIO involved in cabinet discussions.
 - 2. The proposed resolution would be very helpful for advocacy. We've seen that in the past years that the only items that get attention are

those that are crises. The resolution can help be a voice to bring attention to this issue.

iv. Mike Robinson made a motion to adopt the resolution as presented. Seconded by Paul Wasko. Discussion:

1. Concerns that the resolution does not specify what other sources of funding should be targeted. Idea is the resolution brings attention to the issue and leave the decision about funding sources to those who have authority over funding. The UTC does not have control over other funding sources but can bring attention to the fact the current funding source of the STF is no longer adequate.
2. Committee made a motion, which was approved, to table the motion to adopt the resolution for continued discussion at the next meeting

d. Committee made a motion, which was approved, to table the two New Business items for the next meeting.

6) New Business

- a. Support for “hybrid” Fall 2022 courses (combining F2F/place-based instruction PLUS distance delivery) – *tabled for next meeting*
- b. Future of Academic Equipment Loan program (i.e., student laptop and internet hotspot checkout) – *tabled for next meeting*

7) Adjourn – 10:32 AM

Future Meeting Dates:

- March 25, 2022 - 8:30 am-10:30 am
- April 22, 2022 - 8:30 am-10:30 am