INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2012-2013

I. Statement of Committee Functions and Charge

Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.42.:

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.

II. Past Year's Activities

The Information Technology Committee (ITC) met monthly from September 2012 through May 2013. Meeting agendas were distributed via e-mail to ITC members and are posted online at http://itc.wisc.edu. Minutes are also available online along with the detailed presentations of guests to the ITC. There are 14 voting member positions on the ITC as well as ex officio and non-voting representatives of the administration. The meetings regularly attract more than 20 additional guests.

In addition to the major items outlined below, the ITC also serves as a "town center" for informational updates and regularly received updates from other IT committees and organizations such as: Network Advisory Group (NAG), Moodle Council, Teaching, Learning and Technology–Madison Advisory Group (TLT–Mag), Campus Technical Issues Group (CTIG), Madison Technical Advisory Group (MTAG) and DoIT Academic Technology.

An important change the ITC sees as the combined result of many of our activities over the past year is the noticeably strengthened relationship between the CIO, the ITC, the University Committee, and the administrative leadership of our campus.

II.A. Research Computing – Advanced Computing Infrastructure
Since the 2010-2011 academic year, the ITC and its research computing subcommittee have been major players in creation of the Advanced Computing Infrastructure (ACI). Throughout 2012-2013, the CIO and the ACI steering committee worked to advance ACI's vision for shared research computing services, including computation, network, storage and support. The CIO worked closely with Steve Ackerman and Martin Cadwallader of the Graduate School, Miron Livny of the Wisconsin Institutes for Discovery and the Center for High Throughput Computing (CHTC), and Paul Wilson of the Department of Engineering Physics. The first step has been to develop a shared high-performance computing capability on campus that leverages prior substantial investments in the Center for High Throughput Computing and WID/MIR. Paul Wilson is the appointed faculty director of ACI. The first facilitator, Lauren Michael, was hired in the spring. The ACI facility is housed in WID. The ACI steering committee along with Bruce Maas, Paul Wilson, and Miron Livny continue to lead jointly the varied aspects of ACI. Future plans include exploring storage and data management needs.

Grants were secured by Bruce Maas and Miron Livny to fund an experimental Science DMZ, which allows researchers to move data over networks without interference from firewalls. The CHTC, WID/MIR, DoIT, and Department of Computer Sciences all worked together on this grant.

Provost DeLuca highlighted ACI and noted the campus has not been systematic in its approach to high performance computing, which affects the ability to do certain kinds of research. The scale of the ACI initiative is large, as is the investment. He is very supportive of the current initiative for ACI.

II.B. Teaching and Learning

II.B.1. eTexts
UW-Madison engaged in eText pilots in 2012 and in spring semester 2013, sponsored by Internet2 and EDUCAUSE. UW-Madison was selected as an Internet2 Net+ service validator for eText, specifically working with Cornell University, the eText Reader vendor, CourseLoad and Publishers. Bruce Maas stressed his goals of lowering costs to students for eText, ensuring accessible eText, and maintaining faculty choice. Faculty members will not be required to choose CourseLoad and are further encouraged to publish their own content.

_____

Self-published eTexts are another path forward. John Hawks, chair of the Letters and Science curriculum committee, presented challenges to leveraging online learning in the classroom and self-publishing an eText. Campus could help by helping to navigate copyright issues. The ITC chair suggested opening a discussion with UW Press as another publishing option for faculty-written electronic texts.

II.B.2. Educational Innovation, aka EI
Throughout the 2012-2013 academic year, Educational Innovation leaders and teams participated in ITC meetings by presenting status reports, seeking input and discussing directions and projects. Now in Phase II, EI seeks to enhance teaching and learning, expand capacity and reach new learners, and develop new revenue-generating educational programs. Some key projects, of the 149 projects in progress, include expanded summer school offerings, post-baccalaureate programs, blending learning, and offering courses in the Coursera Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) environment in the next year. The ITC provided feedback to the EI leaders and teams and recognized the culture change necessary to move these initiatives forward. MOOC subject areas might best be chosen to match our uniqueness–such as the Writing Center and our gaming experts. By our May meeting, four MOOCS had been planned for fall 2013, using the Coursera platform.

II.B.3. Technology Access at UW
Cathy Trueba, assistant dean and director of the McBurney Disability Resource Center, provided context to current accessibility challenges on campus. There are nearly 1,000 registered students with disabilities that affect learning. 160 to 170 of these students use adaptive technology such as screen readers or captioning in the classroom. Dramatic changes in technology and scarce resources make keeping up with federal guidelines difficult. The McBurney Center would like to revise the faculty documents to help with compliance because faculty members are central to the process of ensuring accessibility for those who need it. Universal design benefits all students. UW-Madison should become a leader in this area.

To broadcast the need for accessibility on a wider scale, ITC members proposed figuring accessibility into wider requirements such as lecture capture including captioning as standard practice. McBurney needs should be met up front during development of tools so the labor costs of retrofitting can be avoided. The eText pilot brought many accessibility issues to light, and there is a resulting partnership with the National Federation of the Blind.

ITC suggested a pilot program with one free captioned lecture for faculty so they may see the universal benefit. We challenged the McBurney Center to work with faculty involved in their accessibility services; faculty members should have an opportunity to get and give feedback, and any new methodologies or useful implementations should be made known more broadly so that other instructors can benefit. This engagement would demonstrate to faculty members that their efforts are valued and impact many learners and teachers. We suggested that accessibility be factored into basic training, with Microsoft Word for instance. One concrete suggestion is that specific accessibility issues could be the focus for a future Educational Innovation call for proposals.

Judy Caruso has been working with UW Purchasing Services to change procurement language to reflect accessibility expectations. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation CIO's group is working on accessibility issues and as an organization has some influence in making vendors pay attention as well.

II.C. IT Security
Baseline requirements for IT security at UW-Madison were discussed at the January ITC meeting by Jim Lowe of the Office of Campus Information Security (OCIS). Departments and units often take their own approach to securing their IT resources, but any vulnerability can lead to an incident, which reflects poorly

(continued)

_____

on the entire university. Vice Chancellor Darrell Bazzell has agreed to fund baseline security in his department. It is expected that his department's outcomes can be applied to other units on campus. ITC members questioned whether the baseline takes into account personal machines being used for UW business and the vast array of systems and machines that IT administrators need to support. Lowe acknowledged this gray area and hoped that enforcing a baseline may deliver data and solutions in these areas.

II.D. Network Infrastructure
The ITC was informed about Eduroam, a tool that enables one-time authentication for wireless Internet use at any participating institution. Guest wireless is also made available across campus. The campus began building a 100 gbps network which will increase our ability to transmit large amounts of data. The BOREAS network (providing network service to the upper Midwest) will also be upgraded to 100 gbps to meet better rising demand.

John Krogman and Bruce Maas also kept the ITC updated on the progress of the purchasing of Internet networking services. State legislation requires that UW System sever its membership in WiscNet.

DoIT Prioritization—John Krogman, COO of DoIT, presented a major projects list to the ITC and sought their advice. He explained that the cost recovery model under which DoIT operates leaves little room for flexible spending and decision-making. The ITC suggested there be a clear path for feedback on projects and that our input come early in the decision-making process. This is an area that is likely to be impacted directly by some of the initiatives expected in 2013-2014.

II.E. Administrative Excellence

II.E.1. E-mail and Calendar
The ITC was updated in December on the status of the AE e-mail and calendar implementation. The ITC asked that the decision-making process be clear and that timelines for upcoming decisions be available so interested parties can be heard. In March, it became clear that the campus-wide vetting procedure put in place by the AE team had not reached all of the faculty and staff members who cared about the decision, and there was an intense effort on the part of the CIO, AE team, and ITC to educate and be educated about the technical points of the Office 365 solution. This experience served to reinforce the knowledge that communication on many levels is needed for all campus-wide initiatives and that our campus has evolved to work best with input from all constituencies in advance of major decisions.

II.E.2. Enterprise IT Decision-Making
The AE IT decision-making future state team presented their recommendations to the ITC at the December 2012 and April 2013 meetings. The team studied four IT decision-making models as employed at eleven benchmark institutions. The team recommended a "Wisconsin model" which was based on the desired future state characteristics of the decision-making process and structure. The recommendations were approved, and an IT decision-making function will be added to the CIO office. Implementation of the scheme falls to another committee (which formed in September 2013). Highlights of the proposed Wisconsin model are a nimble ability to make IT spending decisions quickly for simple, lower-cost items and to involve the ITC or its representatives at two different levels in the decision-making scheme for more complex decisions. This model was seen favorably by the ITC because it helps us to satisfy our charge and returns some IT strategic decision-making to shared governance oversight.

(continued)

II.E.3. Data Center Aggregation
Regular updates from the data center aggregation project team were presented to the ITC. At the May 2013 meeting, the team discussed its phase III, which includes facilities, services, and governance teams. One framework for data center services being discussed is based on data security requirements, such as those required by CDC, FISMA and HIPAA. A tiered framework is also being considered for non-restricted data. The team is examining what existing resources on campus can become aggregation resources based upon minimum physical criteria for aggregation points.

II.F. IT at UW-Madison

II.F.1.
At the January 2013 meeting, the ITC heard Provost Paul DeLuca's reflections on campus IT services. Specifically, he outlined areas of focus to be the Advanced Computing Infrastructure (ACI) and changes in teaching and learning. He, along with the ITC, expressed concern over keeping up with the rapidly changing higher education environment and the financial demands of these shifting needs. Provost DeLuca framed the ITC's role as expressing where there are needs and knowing the issues and initiatives of interest to campus.

II.F.2.
Mark Field, CIO of the Graduate School, along with Wendy Crone, Steve Ackerman and Dan Uhlrich of the Graduate School, detailed its specific needs and challenges related to IT services. The Graduate School IT focuses on technology within the Graduate School itself and on technology for research policy compliance, tracking graduate student progress, fall research competition, the COI project, etc. The Graduate School IT team does not directly support faculty, teaching and learning, research computing, or network issues.

III. Concerns and Challenges

In the next year, the ITC would like to continue its progress in research computing support, teaching and learning support, monitoring and assisting with Administrative Excellence action items (including e-mail and calendaring, data center aggregation, and Enterprise IT Decision-Making) and integration of IT leadership and governance across campus. In addition we will address:
1. The challenges of continuity of leadership and membership for shared governance committees in general, our own in particular.
2. Best practices for judicious and impactful dissemination of information and issues that arise within the ITC to the appropriate target audiences on campus.
3. Collaboration with the chancellor, deans, department chairs, Graduate School, and DoIT to maximize the impact of a possible shift in funding models.

IV. 2012-2013 ITC Membership

Faculty
Ivy Corfis, Spanish and Portuguese; Arts and Humanities
Greg Downey, Journalism and Mass Communication; Social Studies
Katrina Forest (chair), Bacteriology; Biological Sciences
Mathew Jones, Neuroscience; Biological Sciences
Jon McKenzie, English; Art and Humanities
Gurindar Sohi, Computer Sciences; Physical Sciences
Constance Steinkuehler Squire, Curriculum and Instruction; Social Studies
Ellen Zweibel, Astronomy; Physical Sciences

_____

Academic Staff
Jennifer Bonifas, Medicine
Michael Pflieger, L&S Student Academic Affairs
Michael Pitterle, Pharmacy

Students
Ronald Crandall
Kristie Stalberger

Ex Officio, Non-Voting
Bruce Maas, CIO and Vice Provost for Information Technology

Provost Appointments, Non-Voting
Alice Gustafson, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
Steven Hahn, Graduate School
Clare Huhn, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Martha Kerner, Business Services
Edward Van Gemert, General Library System

Consultants
Rhonda Davis (School of Veterinary Medicine), MTAG
John Krogman, Deputy CIO and COO of DoIT
Richard Kunert (Biotechnology Center), NAG
Brenda Spychalla (School of Education), CTIG
Catherine Stephens (School of Education), ComETS

_____