Chair: Mark Peceny
Attendees: Regina Carlow, Kris Casper, Tim Castillo, Kevin Comerford, Julie Coonrad, Debby Knotts, Sean Smock, Trenia Walker, Jonathan Wheeler, Elisha Allen, Trina Altman, Duane Arruti, Dean Bernardone, Tim Johnson, Brian Kimura, Alesia Torres

Topics

1. Review Minutes
   a. Update 2nd bullet re IT funding to state “partial network refresh is built in…”

2. LMS upgrade (Q4 2018 release to be applied May 18, IT Director Allen)
   a. This is the standard upgrade without significant updates. New features that are being tested to confirm they work properly and are supportable include mobile grading app, recordings for student feedback, attendance feature, and accessibility improvements. A cloud storage integration will be disabled since it isn’t working. The annotated pdf download feature has been reintegrated and should be restored.

3. Class Registration opening times moving to 7AM (IT Director Allen)
   a. Advising requested registration opening be moved from 12 am to 7 am. This allows advisors, enrollment management, and IT support to be available to students when registration opens. Students were surveyed about the proposed change and confirmed the change is acceptable.
   b. Dean Peceny asked about closing registration before students leave for the semester. This suggestion comes from one of the enrollment management taskforce committees to support retention. 3rd semester retention rates may be related to the timing of when they are allowed to register. The current timing allows a limited timeframe for them to register before the end of the semester; it also falls at a time they are focused on final projects and tests. The timing also limits the amount of time advisors have to reach out to students to encourage enrollments. The group discussed the timing of registration for different groups and concerns about overstressing the system.

   Action Item: IT Director Torres’ team will evaluate options for adjusting enrollment sequencing.

4. Classroom Renewal Projects FY19, FY20 (IT Director Allen)
   a. IT Associate Director Johnson relayed the following renewal projects will be completed based on guidance from academic affairs group led by the Provost’s office; this group prioritized the following projects based on available funds. In part, IT budget salary savings will be used for these projects.
      i. Refurbishment for 6 central rooms at Ortega Hall.
ii. Evaluate remaining analog rooms and classroom computers that are past useful life to address as funds become available.

iii. Evaluate analog rooms that currently have digital overlay to be upgraded so they allow synchronous two-way communication. When capital funds are available and upgrades are completed, these ITV rooms will return to central scheduling.

5. Major Capital Requests (IT Director Allen)
   a. IT Director Martinez reviewed the two legislative priorities under consideration that have IT components, 1) $11 million technology request and 2) $3.5 million to expand wireless and upgrade AV equipment in classrooms. Included in the same bill are campus safety initiatives. If the bill is reduced, it is likely that they will reduce technology rather than campus safety. IT Director Allen raised the implications of ignoring significant IT maintenance as recently evidenced at Amherst where there was an almost week-long server outage. CIO Arruti agreed there are opportunities to work with government relations to educate legislators of the impact of not funding these requests. CIO Arruti sees good progress in IT working with campus partners to outline IT initiatives and how they serve the needs of the academic mission of UNM.

6. Minor Capital Requests (IT Director Allen)
   a. IT Director Martinez reviewed the 13 requests that total $565,000. Minor capital requests can be no more than $50,000 each. Current requests include:
      i. Network remediation in engineering
      ii. Upgrading auditorium projectors
      iii. Adding lecture capture and web collaboration to lecture halls
      iv. Network switches for Humanities
      v. Storage and servers.
   b. There will be another opportunity to request minor funds in March.
   c. IT Associate Director Bernardone advised that IT is providing support at the SUB Ballroom A for HLC meetings in partnership with the Provost’s office. Zoom capability is more robust when the room is hardwired for this type of use rather than setting it up for individual events. The Domenici Center is an example of a space that was developed for Zoom/web conferencing usage.

7. Zoom adoption and usage guideline discussion (2nd year funding model still needed, IT Director Allen)
   a. IT Director Allen advised that an enterprise license was secured in October 2018. Without significant marketing, Academic Technologies is receiving requests to use Zoom, particularly from faculty members. This supports the case for continued funding.
   b. With additional usage, a number of policy questions have been exposed including
      i. What constitutes an online class?
      ii. How to correctly schedule a web conferenced class
      iii. Homeland security laws regarding F-1 visa students
      iv. Accreditation and state authorization requirements
      v. Privacy issues
      vi. Research subject issues
c. The registrar, GEO, legal counsel, and extended learning are developing a formalized memo for Zoom usage. IT Director Allen asked how this group would suggest policy information be provided to faculty beyond an all-fac message. The committee discussed if Academic Affairs should provide a checklist to department chairs, directors, and scheduling coordinators who would take responsibility for reviewing with all faculty. These policy issues are important to explore when faculty use any of these tools.

d. Evaluating how the Zoom enterprise license is utilized will provide valuable data to demonstrate the opportunity for budget efficiencies in the area of licensing. This is a shift from the current ad hoc model where units purchase individual licenses. The IT funding model supports more efficient funding of licenses.

8. Blackboard Ally reports and project update (2nd year funding model still needed, IT Director Allen)
   a. IT Specialist Altman reviewed a project evaluating Ally, a Blackboard accessibility tool that is available for use through August. Ally is housed within the course and provides direct guidance on how to increase accessibility to course materials. A small pilot of 10 courses is running in Spring 2019. Key features for students include:
      i. Alternative formats of files so documents more accessible such as electronic braille, audio files, etc.
      ii. Assistive technologies that supports all students including those with disabilities
   b. Key features for faculty include assessment of how accessible the document is and provision of guidance on how to update the document to make it more accessible.
   c. Institutional assessment on available documents since 2012 shows around 30% of documents have accessibility issues. This includes common issues such as images that don’t have descriptions. There are some OCR issues that can be resolved without instructor intervention. Institutional reporting includes major and minor problems.
   d. The project team is surveying students and faculty to assess how effective they find the tool and how much students use accessible documents.
   e. If funding is identified to continue the use of Ally, who should have access to institutional reports should be determined. It was suggested that Associate Deans for curriculum management and Department Chairs should receive institutional reports.

   **Action Item:** Include updates on the Ally project in future meetings.

9. Educause ECAR surveys (IT Director Allen)
   a. Last year the Educause survey was sent to students to evaluate student technology satisfaction. This year, it was sent to a 30% random sample of UNM students and faculty. This survey allows us to benchmark responses against other 4-year public institutions.

   **Action Item:** Encourage those who received the survey to complete it.
10. Adobe Executive Strategy discussion (IT Director Allen)
   a. Adobe approached UNM about participating in their Creative Campus program. This program provides Creative Cloud tools to students and supports faculty in incorporating multi-media options into their curriculum. Adobe representatives, including the VP for North American Higher Education, will come to campus March 7th and 8th to discuss the program. IT Director Allen has reached out to faculty in advance of the March meeting to discuss interests for a strategic partnership with Adobe. Adobe representatives will meet with the Provost and are tentatively scheduled to meet with the Dean’s Council.
   b. CIO Arruti shared that for many of the same reasons as Adobe, Microsoft is interested in a partnership program to promote their data center management 2-year program, certificates for programming, and integrations in curriculums for the business school, CS, and/or engineering. Microsoft currently works with the University of Arizona and other schools in Arizona. Microsoft would help fund marketing of their programs if the partnership moves forward.
   c. Microsoft has a developed curriculum. Adobe is interested in developing programs based on needs identified by UNM. These types of partnerships could support new enrollments. The opportunity to complete professional certifications as part of 4-year programs is highly marketable. Branch campuses are interested in 2+2 programs for their online programs.

   **Action Item:** IT will reach out to the branch campuses to include them in both conversations.

11. Role of Academic Technologies Advisory Board with Faculty Senate IT Use Committee
   a. Assistant Professor Wheeler representing the Faculty Senate IT committee asked for input on how to have more robust communication and collaboration between the Advisory Board and the Faculty Senate committee. The most recent Faculty Senate committee meeting generated ideas, needs, and interest in ensuring this input is brought forward to this committee. In general, it would be useful for all Faculty Senate committees to be more coordinated with the Advisory Boards. Faculty Senate is tasked with governance issues where the Advisory Boards are administrative, but it would be useful for both groups to coordinate projects and priorities while maintaining their primary purposes. CIO Arruti described how the Administrative Technologies Board works with a leadership team who scores and vets projects. Could this model be used for the Faculty Senate committee to vet and score ideas that would then be sent to the Academic Advisory board? This would also let the information that is brought to Faculty Senate be disseminated to the broader campus community. The Faculty Senate committee needs to maintain their independence to set their own agendas and priorities. This committee could have a standing agenda item for Faculty Senate to bring items to the Academic Advisory board for review.

   **Action Item:** Develop a process for bringing Faculty Senate ideas to the advisory board.

**Next Meeting:** April 23, 2019, 9:00-10:30 am, CTLB, Room 110