

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2011-2012**

I. Statement of Committee Functions and Charge

Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.42. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

A. MEMBERSHIP. The Information Technology Committee shall consist of the following members:

1. Eight faculty members, two from each faculty division, appointed for terms of four years.
2. Three academic staff members. No member of the Division of Information Technology staff may serve as a voting member of the committee.
3. Three students, at least one of whom shall be an undergraduate student and at least one a graduate student, to serve one-year terms.
4. Chief Information Officer, ex officio nonvoting.
5. One nonvoting member representing the director of the university General Library System, two nonvoting members representing the vice chancellor for administration, and two nonvoting members representing the provost. These members shall be appointed by the provost.

B. FUNCTIONS. The Information Technology Committee is the faculty advisory body for policy and planning for information technology throughout the university. In performing its functions, it shall consult with such groups and individuals as it feels may be able to provide valuable advice. It may request such reports on budgets, personnel policies, and other topics as are necessary for it to make informed judgments and recommendations. It shall establish such subcommittees as are necessary to carry out its functions.

1. Reviews and makes recommendations on strategic planning for the university's information technology resources.
2. Reviews the performance of information technology facilities and services in supporting and assisting scholarly activities.
3. Receives reports from and provides general direction to committees formed to address specific information technology issues.
4. Monitors technical developments.
5. Consults with and advises appropriate administrative officers on budget and resource allocation matters including charges and funding sources for information technology services.
6. Receives recommendations from departments, deans, and the Division of Information Technology regarding the establishment, abolition or merger of information technology services and facilities supported by university funds, and makes recommendations regarding these actions to the appropriate administrative officers.

(continued)

II. Past Year's Activities

The Information Technology Committee (ITC) met nine times between September 2011 and May 2012. Meeting agendas were distributed via e-mail to several campus groups and posted online at itc.wisc.edu. Draft minutes were posted online and distributed via e-mail for comment and were finalized at the subsequent meeting.

During the 2011-2012 year, Administrative Excellence (AE) and Educational Innovation (EI) were at the forefront of the campus consciousness. The ITC remained abreast of developments and advocated for campus, and especially faculty, involvement in administrative process redesign. AE and EI were intertwined with presentations and conversations throughout the year.

IIA. IT Strategic Plan

Bruce Maas, the newly appointed CIO and vice provost for information technology, updated the in-progress IT Strategic Plan with support from project manager George Watson (Office of Quality Improvement). Bruce's work with George and hundreds of others across campus resulted in a new strategic plan based upon the following service layers deployed at a local or a central level as appropriate:

- Teaching and Learning
- Research Cyberinfrastructure
- Outreach and Public Service
- Stewards of our Resources
- IT Service Infrastructure

While these are the areas of focus, the IT Strategic Plan recognizes that it runs in tandem with the following campus initiatives:

- Educational Innovation
- Campus Plan Framework
- Administrative Excellence
- Administrative Process Redesign (APR)
- DoIT Strategic Initiatives
- HR Design

IIB. Governance

The ITC chair believed that the effectiveness of the ITC would be improved by more direct communication with the UW-Madison administration and more clearly defined goals for each item considered. With the aforementioned AE and EI efforts, ITC recognized that governance was an area that should and would be re-examined during 2011-2012. The ITC regularly encouraged AE teams to keep in mind that there already existed a framework for IT decision-making on campus and that the ITC could be consulted for feedback and should form part of the longer-term strategy for IT decision making that would come out of the AE teamwork.

Jon McKenzie led a discussion on strategic IT thinking at the March meeting. He highlighted the perceived gap between the teaching, research and service missions of the institution and the administrative infrastructure especially in the ways knowledge is collected and disseminated. The current UW climate is complex for faculty and staff with split responsibilities. Consensus was that administrative and other campus leaders need to balance the core mission of the university and needs of their faculty and staff with administrative improvements. The ITC, as an advisory body to the CIO, also recognized its responsibility to advocate for units and groups that need to be represented to UW leadership.

(continued)

ITC Governance/Subcommittee Structure:

A portion of the October meeting was devoted to examining the ITC's own role, scope, and structure. Since the ITC mission is not driven by specific directives, the committee discussed the importance of its advisory role and how it can bring representation of smaller groups to the CIO and provost. ITC can make strong recommendations with the input of faculty, staff, and students from departments across campus. To facilitate conversation, members were encouraged to relay information back to departments and units as well. The ITC acknowledged that its role may evolve in response to Administrative Excellence.

There was a discussion on whether the subcommittees of ITC should be redefined, for example according to the areas of focus in the IT Strategic Plan. Members agreed no additional standing subcommittees were warranted and felt that subcommittees were most successful and clear in their mission when they were created for limited duration out of expressed need (as the Research Computing Subcommittee was).

Because each ITC meeting had reports from several teaching and learning groups (DoIT Academic Technology, Moodle Council, COMETS, eLearning Roadmap), the big picture tended to be lost at ITC monthly meetings. Eric Alborn and Paul Oliphant led a discussion about creation of a Teaching and Learning Technology Subcommittee. Consensus was instead to ask representatives for each of these smaller groups to meet or confer with each other (and the ITC chair when warranted) to provide each month a consolidated report and possible new action items to the ITC. This informal pre-consideration of issues has brought better clarity to important topics for ITC consideration, larger decision-making items for recommendation, action or advice. Consolidated reports are now incorporated into the meeting minutes.

IIC. Administrative Excellence

ITC monitored the goals of the Administrative Excellence (AE) initiative. According to Brad Barham, the Huron efficiency study had identified 75 areas to be considered in the AE project's first phase. Seven projects were created out of those opportunities.

The ITC was represented by a member on each of the three major IT project teams during phase one (e-mail and calendaring, data center aggregation, and strategic purchasing (computer bundles)) and received periodic updates from these members. Alice Gustafson also provided occasional high-level overviews of the project phases and goals. ITC strongly encouraged her to keep the university's central missions of teaching, learning and outreach as foremost priorities in carrying out administrative initiatives.

As the first wave of AE teams moved toward making their recommendations, the ITC learned that IT decision making was an area of focus for phase two. There would be a current state and a future state team to evaluate the current paths of IT decision making and to develop a transparent process for how IT decisions would be handled into the future. The ITC discussed with Bruno Browning, member of the current state team, their suggestions such as reporting life cycles of one-time as well as routine purchases.

The e-mail and calendaring team submitted their recommendation of a single campus solution by ITC's final meeting for the year. The product was not identified, but ITC learned it is cloud-based and integrated. Implementation would still be a year or more away.

(continued)

IID. Teaching and Learning

Teaching and learning was designated at the September meeting as an area of focus for 2011-2012 for the ITC. Aaron Brower described high-level goals for Educational Innovation at the September meeting. Information technology is rapidly changing, and current funding and structure can't keep up without added innovation. Specifically, Aaron listed areas for development such as learning management systems, e-devices as part of classroom technology, and learning environments such as the WISCEL project. Two WISCEL facilities opened during the year, one at Helen C. White Library and the other at Wendt Commons.

Online education was a specific area of interest. Many questions arose about the student demographics and credit structure surrounding this effort. There was a discussion on this topic at the February meeting as it related to EI. ITC members expressed that finding time to devote to EI developments was difficult.

Other specific teaching and learning developments related to online learning and involvement are as follows:

eText Pilot

Bruce Maas engaged the university via the Committee on Institutional Cooperation and Internet2 in an eText pilot with publisher McGraw-Hill and technology company CourseLoad, along with the universities of Indiana, Minnesota and Virginia and Cornell University. The pilot was limited to ten courses, which were selected based on textbook availability and on a volunteer basis from instructors. It was cost-free for students and began the spring 2012 semester. ITC expressed its support for the pilot program but cautioned that providing new and free resources may influence the student's reactions.

At the April meeting, two instructors involved in the pilot presented their impressions. Felix Elwert, associate professor of sociology, called for a more comprehensive survey to gather analytics. The data he collected showed no clear evidence of eText impact on student outcomes. Michael Titelbaum, assistant professor of philosophy, said he was most concerned with providing cost savings for his students. He noticed that more students now brought their "book" to class.

Moodle

At the April meeting, ITC learned of an Enterprise Moodle business case that was developed and vetted, so a shared UW Moodle infrastructure could be developed. \$250,000 of SITAC fees would be used for the service. Additional cost would have to be covered perhaps as part of a cooperative purchasing effort. Committee members expressed preference for paying internally for a Moodle service rather than using an external provider. The service was envisioned to be open-source to allow developers to innovate further as well as so that there would be connections into other existing tools. The College of Engineering was tasked with generating and maintaining the system, and the DoIT Help Desk was the designated support contact.

Online Course Evaluation

Mike Pitterle asked the ITC whether involvement in the UW System online course evaluation project was of interest. He provided background on the issue, that response rates were at 10-20% and that moving evaluations online could be more accurate and greener than scantron forms, in addition to being faster for students. Data are then available for comparisons across course sections and/or time as well as for accreditation purposes. ITC members agreed that this was a worthy area to explore and that the School of Education should be involved as experts.

(continued)

III.E. Research Computing

ITC's Research Computing Subcommittee was formed at the beginning of the academic year in response to the 2010-2011 research computing outreach and information gathering efforts of the ITC. Martin Cadwallader, dean of the Graduate School, encouraged the team to draft a proposal for creation of a shared research computing infrastructure. The committee did this, with feedback from research computing faculty, technical staff, and administrators. Critically, this committee strongly encouraged the administration to reconsider the fundamental importance of using some research grant overhead funds in support of campus-wide infrastructure in advanced computing. In May, the Graduate School and the provost approved formation of the Advanced Computing Infrastructure, to be supported both by central funds and distributed college funds.

The ITC heard presentations by researchers on campus on their growing needs for data storage and management, and in some cases, on the structures they have in place currently. In September, Brian Yandell and Mark Craven presented on the burgeoning big data they encounter in working with researchers across the biological sciences and how many of these researchers are ill-equipped both financially and with regards to personnel to handle these growing demands.

Umberto Tachinardi, CIO of UW Health, discussed growing data storage needs within the UW Health collective. There is a data warehouse project to respond to this need, the result of the collaboration and investment of the four UW Health partners. When shared, the data can benefit everyone, but security is a critical consideration. Network infrastructure must be adapted to support massive quantities of data.

Bruce Maas presented updates to the committee on grants secured from the National Science Foundation to develop an experimental research network and a Science DMZ. These developments grew out of the expressed campus need for collaboration without inhibition by network structures in place currently. The projects will be ongoing collaborations between DoIT network engineers, the computer sciences department, the CHTC, and WIDMIR. The projects were still in early stages, so further details would not be available until the next year's meetings began.

III.F. Other

Cell Phone Use

The ITC considered whether the current telecommunications contract should be changed to allow use of VoIP applications and for employees to have a cell phone stipend. Consensus was that ignoring the widespread use of smartphones was not realistic. Catie Isenberg of DoIT Voice Services offered a cost analysis of department savings for allowing employees to seek reimbursement for using personal cell phones. The ITC learned of a wireless infrastructure upgrade on campus to solve poor cellular signal issues indoors.

Staff members from Administrative Legal Services attended the following meeting to discuss employer versus employee provided cell phones. The ITC firmly urged the university to consider providing a stipend to those who use their personal phones for business use.

Following this discussion, at the next meeting the ITC unanimously endorsed the following statement:

“In keeping with the current focus on fiscal flexibilities and cost savings for the University of Wisconsin, the ITC encourages removal of prohibition by the Wisconsin Department of Administration of stipend for personally funded wireless services, features, applications, or equipment.”

Bruce passed the endorsed statement to Provost DeLuca and Vice Chancellor Bazzell.

(continued)

New Wireless Network

John Krogman kept the ITC abreast of changes with wireless network access to campus visitors, an effort which started in the unions and libraries. The provost was supportive, and the ITC heard the service may expand to the rest of the campus after the spring semester.

E-mail and Calendaring

The ITC was alerted of the need to migrate WiscCal, as it was no longer vendor-supported. This decision was made purely out of operational concern and would not affect the implementation of a single campus solution. The migration was to take place in early summer, with a move to the Oracle Communications Suite.

Process Improvement

In response to concerns brought to the ITC by faculty members, Chris Hopp and John Varda from the Administrative Process Redesign (APR) eReimbursement project were invited to visit the ITC. The team has been working to improve the system and will continue until December 2013. They had sent a proposed implementation plan to Darrell Bazzell. ITC members expressed gratitude to the team for the effort but underscored that feedback be gathered before large projects like this are started in the future.

Chris Hopp alerted the ITC about an effort to purchase and consolidate shared licenses for software throughout campus. The APR inventory team was attempting to survey use and licensing current practices. The ITC advised asking faculty and staff for software needs rather than just current use. Phil Barak attested to savings in CALS from departmental software license consolidation. He also pointed out that undergoing such a process can help remove some liability from the university. In addition to consolidation, CALS has implemented a software “check-out” system rather than purchasing individual licenses, which has saved a lot of money in the short term. Chris said they often work with Legal Administrative Services during negotiations and that he is the point of contact for anyone interested in help in this area.

III. Concerns and Challenges

One of the greatest challenges facing the university is appropriately responding and adapting to rapid technological changes that affect students and researchers. Academic technology bodies on campus must respond to demand for new ways of learning, which increasingly include an online presence, in a climate where decisions are often re-active rather than pro-active. Researchers generate unprecedented quantities of data and seek capabilities that require better storage and computing capabilities. Enabling access to needed resources for collaboration and innovation would align with EI principles and keep the university at the cutting edge of research.

Administrative Excellence poses challenges as well as providing opportunities. It has placed administrative processes under scrutiny and exposed areas in need of improvement, and campus must respond to these organizational and budgetary shortfalls. Efforts in this area are time-consuming for team members and the units providing information to them, but ITC stayed involved during the first wave of projects. Future AE teams with an IT focus will be asked to provide updates to the ITC as well to ensure feedback is being gathered and incorporated from various groups on campus.

Katrina Forest expressed throughout the year that ITC’s role should be expanded to providing feedback and perspective on issues while they are still in their formative stages rather than receiving reports after the fact.

(continued)

IV. Membership

Faculty

Craig Benson, Civil and Environmental Engineering; physical sciences
Ivy Corfis, Spanish and Portuguese; arts and humanities
Greg Downey, Library and Information Studies; social studies
Randall Dunham, Business; social studies
Katrina Forest (chair), Bacteriology; biological sciences
Mathew Jones, Neuroscience; biological sciences
Jeffrey Linderoth, Industrial and Systems Engineering; physical sciences
Jon McKenzie, English; art and humanities

Academic Staff

Eric Alborn, Business
Paul Oliphant, Wendt Commons
Michael Pflieger, Letters and Science

Students

Ronald Crandall
Elliott Rezny

Non-Voting Members

Ex officio

Bruce Maas, CIO and Vice Provost for Information Technology
John Krogman, Deputy CIO and COO of DoIT

Provost Appointments

Steve Hahn, Graduate School
Clare Huhn, Academic Planning and Analysis
Don Miner, Business Services
Tim Norris, Budget Planning and Analysis
Ed Van Gemert, General Library System

Campus Liaison, Group

Lisa Jansen (Learning Support Services), ComETS
Richard Kunert (Biotechnology Center), NAG
Mike Pitterle (Pharmacy), ComETS
Brenda Spychalla (School of Education), CTIG
Beth Wiebusch (School of Business), MTAG