**COUNCIL FOR INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

**Wednesday, August 21st, 2013**

**1:00-2:00 PM, ST 501**

**Minutes**

Members present: Virginia Diehl, Justin Ehrlich, Kimberly Hartweg, Bree McEwan, Terry Smith, Sharon Stevens, Cynthia Struthers, Anna Valeva, Bruce Walters.

Guest: Steve Rock, Faculty Senate Chair.

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Chair Anna Valeva.

1. **Starting the academic year**:
2. **Introductions**: All members/guest present introduced themselves.
3. **Comments by Steve Rock, Faculty Senate Chair**: Dr. Rock inquired about the CIT discussion of proposed password policy changes which occurred on May 1st, 2013. Council members expressed strong reservation towards requirements for annual security training. Terry Smith noted that the same effect could be achieved with a simple set of instructions and recommended that the password policy idea be simplified and the time limit for the use of a password extended. Another common concern was the lack of real password reset procedure which does not require a call to the UTech Helpdesk, as well as the common scenario of employees being locked out due to password change synchronization difficulties with multiple mobile devices. Dr. Rock mentioned that there is not an official version of the proposal for changes in the password policy in circulation for the campus community to consider. CIT has a version from April, 2013 (discussed at the May 1st, 2013 CIT meeting).

Dr. Rock also brought to the Council’s attention the IT Governance Proposal and IT Strategic Plan draft. Further discussion was left until agenda item (2).

1. **Approval of minutes**: Virginia Diehl motioned to approve the minutes from the last meeting, seconded by Bruce Walters. The minutes were approved unanimously.
2. **UTAG representative**: Bree McEwan; alternate: Terry Smith (both volunteered).
3. **Secretary** duties will be fulfilled according to a rotation list in alphabetical order. Next on the list for the August 28th meeting is Justin Ehrlich.
4. **Items for immediate attention**:
5. **Information Technology Governance Proposal**: Dr. Steve Rock recommended that CIT members staff the faculty body of the proposed Education Alliance so that this ties back to the Senate. CIT members concurred. Justin Ehrlich noted that the Alliances do not have decision power.

Virginia Diehl posed the following questions: how can we ensure that knowledgeable people will get appointed to the Alliances?  If CIT forms part of the Education Alliance, membership can be overseen by Faculty Senate.  What safeguard can we have in place to ensure that the other two alliances are staffed by people with expertise and interest?

Bree McEwan stressed the importance that a faculty be co-chair of the Education Alliance and then carry on as a member of the Executive Committee. Other members concurred, as well as further recommended that faculty serve on all three alliances. In order to ensure proper communication in the decision making process another possibility would be for a Faculty Senate designee to serve on all three bodies: CIT, IT Executive Committee, and IT Governance Council.

Bree McEwan remarked that the VP areas have multiple points of entry into the conversation but ALL of the colleges are represented by a single alliance.

In addition, unlike faculty, students are present on all three alliances without any clear justification for such preference. Council members also find that there is no structural difference between the Administration and Marketing/External Alliances and suggested that they be combined.

Sharon Stevens and Bree McEwan noted that according to the current structure it is not clear who carries out the role of “Tech Reps” within the various colleges. COEHS currently has a staff member who serves very prominently as a Tech Rep. Virginia Diehl added that CAS has a Tech Rep too.

In terms of proposal flow through the IT governance structure, council members recommended to make the status of proposals and accompanying comments known to the campus community at each stage of discussion/approval.

1. **Information Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2018 - Draft**:

**Comments submitted by Bree McEwan through e-mail**:

ESS concerns need to be addressed as they are rolled into Utech.   
  
Action Item 2.2 is too vague - The CIO should or should not report the President? Which do they want?  
  
Action Item 2.3 - swap the paragraphs. Paragraph two provides the context needed for paragraph one to make sense.   
  
Action Item 2.4 - I recognize the importance of continued training but this rankles a bit when faculty just had all their professional development/travel funding swept. Plus, we can train staff all we want but if the front line users (faculty) aren't provided with training and innovation opportunities then only a few people will use any given technology (or will use that tech well).   
  
Action Items 4.3 & 4.4 - We also need dedicated computer classrooms with instructor stations. Currently I do not have access to a classroom with computers in it that I can use all semester long. I can use the library twice (instructor stations no whiteboard) or Morgan 102 (blackboard no instructor station) or Stipes 331 (no instruction station, tiny whiteboard) for limited times. This also forces the students to move around campus during their semester. In addition, faculty should have some input when the hardware is changed in these rooms. Morgan 102 was switched over to these tiny netbooks and while I am sure they are cheaper it just makes it that more difficult for students to view and interpret their SPSS outputs.   
  
There is a typo on page 16 in Action Item 5.1 "modern than the on in Horrabin" should be "modern than the one in Horrabin". Another typo in Action Item 7.3 on p. 21, line 2: “… currently on ongoing effort …”  
  
Action Item 6.4. While I fundamentally agree with the sentiment here (and this was a topic of debate in CIT two years ago), this seems more like a curriculum issue than an IT/administration issue and thus is under the purview of the faculty senate. CIT did collect data two years ago on faculty's perception on their students technical skills.

Further discussion of the IT proposals will continue during the next CIT meeting scheduled for August 28th.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 28th, at 1:00 p.m., ST 501.

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Anna Valeva.