

## Minutes of the UWM IT Policy Committee

December 2, 2011

CHA 211

**Attending:** Sandra Braman, Chris Burns, Tracy Buss, Woonsup Choi, Prasenjit Guptasarma, Brad Houston, John Jordan, Ed Mabry, Ethan Munson, Kristene Surerus, Chu Law, Raina Bloom, and ex-officio members Laura Pedrick and John McCarragher

**Guests:** Alan Aycock, Paula Brossard, Johannes Britz, David Crass, Keith Emmons, Michael Hostad, Mark Jacobson, Kelly Jeglum, Jim Kavanagh, Scott Kleba, Eric Larsen, Michael Lovell, Jim Lowrey, Mary Lubke, Wendy Luljak, Sharon McCarragher, Scott Purl, Jim Schultz, Beth Schaefer (reporting), Chris Spadanuda, Cindy Wirtz, Melissa Woo

**Excused:** Chris Guse, Michael Zimmer

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by Chair Chris Burns

### **Realignment of Information Technology Services**

Chris Burns welcomed Chancellor Michael Lovell and Provost Johannes Britz to the meeting. The Chancellor thanked every one for coming and explained that all parts of campus were examined in advance of the announced reorganization. The realm in which the campus administration struggled the most was IT architecture.

In retrospect, the campus administration should have asked the ITPC for advice, but now they are asking the committee to be forward looking. The administration will be open to incorporating ideas from the committee regarding how to be as efficient as possible.

Burns drew the attention of the committee members to a handout that diagrammed the new information technology alignments. Alan Aycock stressed for the benefit of the committee that the Learning Technology Center (LTC) does not currently report to University Information Technology Services (UITS).

Burns explained that he and others have concerns regarding potential fragmentation in the plan because it divides UITS into three parts. The first concern is that the CIO does not oversee all aspects of information technology at the University.. The second concern is the separation between the fundamental IT infrastructure and research computing. The third concern is potential disruptions to technology innovation. For example, the UWM mobile application is a recent innovation that might not be fostered as well within University Relations. The

organizational separations of infrastructure, and of areas that we look to for innovation, could both be problematic for the University.

Ethan Munson expressed the concern that UWM may not be following best practices for what a CIO should be. Provost Britz replied that he was not aware of any current best practice.

Munson also expressed concern about locating mobile technology development in University Relations. The Provost answered that the University needs to look forward as an organization because technology is embedded in everything we do. In the future, there may be a Vice Provost for Digital Technologies.

Ed Mabry recommended that the CIO position be situated in a more prominent position on the organizational chart. He also expressed concern with locating web development within University Relations because the University uses the web for more than branding. For example, teaching and collaborations are facilitated via the web. Mabry would prefer to see a separate organization unit formed for web development than to have it located within University Relations. He also recommended that research cyberinfrastructure be more closely articulated and aligned with the research enterprise.

Sandra Braman expressed concern that the realignment will result in the responsibility for research cyberinfrastructure and the University website falling to the CIO even though that person will not have any direct overview or decision making authority. It isn't clear how cyberinfrastructure is defined in the realignment and how it will relate to the Graduate School. Given the budget pressures, Braman is concerned that cyberinfrastructure will not receive adequate support. The realignment also separates classroom support from research.

John McCarragher recommended that the Provost's working group look at what makes the most sense and listen to the frustrations that faculty have with regards to support for research.

Munson proposed splitting web development and mobile applications into an externally focused central team.

The Provost explained that since technology is embedded in everything, it is difficult for one person to own all of it. UWM needs to be a technology smart campus, which will help to focus the definition of the role of the CIO. Britz recommended that a subgroup of the ITPC make positive suggestions to the Chancellor rather than offering fixes.

Mabry questioned the overall feasibility command and control of a unified message in an organization such as UWM that includes diverse views. Concern for image should not drive the University.

The Provost likened the hiring of the next CIO to the recruitment of the Dean of Public Health. The question is whether to hire such a person before or after the organization is built.

Raina Bloom, Braman, and Munson agreed to join Burns in a subcommittee that will have positive suggestions for the Chancellor. Burns will inform the Chancellor of the existence of this group. The Provost reminded the committee there are deadlines looming for budget and only a short timeline.

### **Approval of the November 2011 Minutes. M/S/P**

#### **Continued Discussion of Networking Infrastructure Resolution**

Committee members offered suggestions to strengthen the first paragraph of the proposed resolution, to boldface the specific recommendations and make it clear to the reader that all of the suggestions are of equal importance. For example, although performance issues with WiFi may get peoples' attention quickly, a strong core network is needed for WiFi to work. John McCarragher reported that discussions to date with the vice chancellors have presented the package as a whole.

Given that all of the issues in the resolution are intertwined, Ethan Munson suggested differentiating between short-term equipment upgrades and longer term planning.

The motion was seconded and approved pending clarification of the discussed items and the bolding of the specific suggestions.

#### **Records Management**

Brad Houston distributed two documents as examples of two fundamental issues regarding records management. A draft policy concerning file archiving within the College of Health Sciences was not ratified because of concerns related to the language pertaining to "records relating to research."

Houston's second draft policy document concerned the digital archiving of paper documents. One of the many issues surrounding such efforts is that preservation tools are not always appropriately planned.

Regarding the file archiving policy, Sandra Braman inquired about the University's responsibility if an employee should provide falsified data. Houston replied that the University's legal counsel has maintained that faculty own, and are responsible for, their research data because it is their intellectual property. Ethan Munson suggested the focus of the document remain on retention aspects. Keith Emmons recommended clarity in identifying the owners of records and those who have ongoing responsibility for them. Ed Mabry concurred that establishing ownership of records is the first step. Laura Pedrick noted that with respect to course materials,

the institution needs to assert certain rights. Houston reported that issues with respect to ownership can get complicated and there are ambiguities for certain types of documents.

Braman noted the quid pro quo between record ownership and the use of university resources to store and back up those records. Houston prefers that people work through him when planning for the security and storage of digitized documents.

Ed Mabry noted that many offices are running out of space to store paper records and tend to use whatever technologies they can find because of the lack of a defined, campus resource.

Houston emphasized the differences between storage and preservation. It is challenging to get people to plan for digitization over long term when we are seeing issues with reading documents from only fifteen years ago. Since departments often don't have the resources to deal with these issues they would like to see the discussion elevated to the next level.

The discussion was tabled until a future meeting.

### **Discussion with the Provost in February**

Chris Burns asked the committee for suggestions regarding the annual meeting with the Provost in February. Committee members recommended that both the Provost and Vice Chancellor Christie Brown be invited given the realignment of IT. A possible discussion topic is how support and policy initiatives from central IT should dovetail with those provided by schools/colleges and research centers.

### **Reports from Other Committees**

Chris Burns asked the liaisons to other committees to share any updates via [itpc-list@uwm.edu](mailto:itpc-list@uwm.edu).

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 a.m.