

University Technology Advisory Committee

Western Oregon University

Meeting Minutes, October 23, 2020 / 1:00pm-3:00pm

UCS/Security Update: Automating the computer replacement process

Bill Kernan and Michael Ellis presented the newly created automated computer replacement process. There are two tiers for replacement of computers. Tier one is for a computer without warranty and not working. In this case, a computer will be replaced. In case a computer was bought after 2014 (and is under warranty), then a technician will try to repair any problem. If that's not possible, then that computer will also be replaced. So, any machine that is not repairable or without warranty will be replaced. Tier one will have priority. Replacement will be done by first in, first out basis.

Self-funded departments such as housing and dining can put in a purchase request and will need approval from the respective department head.

This is expected to optimize the computer replacement process at a time when UCS is FTE is limited to six only.

There will not be any user dashboard to track progress of a request. Expected delivery will be within seven days.

New business

Reporting Subcommittee

Amy Clark reported that the Reporting Sub-committee met to discuss the charge of the committee and goals, then Due to COVID disruptions during spring and summer session, the work of the sub-committee was delayed. However, the sub-committee developed a timeline and a survey design to assess what people know, understand and need, and also their knowledge about the supporting tools and various systems on campus. Amy presented a revised timeline and let the committee know that a webpage will be created in October 2020 with the aim for completion of work for analyzing the survey results by Spring 2021.

UTAC was asked to provide feedback on the survey questions. Depending on that feedback, this topic may need to come back as old business. If there isn't significant feedback, we can move forward to open the survey. The timeline to assess the data and do research will depend on the response rate. In January, we can continue the assessment and draw conclusions from the data. If the data leads to a conclusion that the campus needs may be better met by different tools or software than we currently have available, the subcommittee may move into a similar may be invited to come to campus to give demonstrations on their software. We can then survey the attendees, assess results and make recommendations. We expect to be ready to do that by the end of this year.

Survey questions were reviewed.

Amy said that survey questions were given to Chelle only a few days back. She requested feedbacks on the by Wednesday (10/28/2020) by Google Doc.

Next on agenda - Resume work on Technology Plan

Chelle wants to reset the Technology Plan and find out where we are at on on-going work or work that has already been done. She looked at the folder of the sub-committee and saw that the strategic plan was broken into documents. We can draw down the whole body of work and let that inform how we finish the formulation of future plan. Reviewing the work that has already been done which tied technology strategic plan to WOU strategic plan, she saw a mixture of things that could be prioritized according to short-term and long-term goals. So, the question is how do we work to prioritize these goals. In a conversation with Ana, Bill and Michael, thinking about WOU's infrastructure for innovation helped her think about how to approach that.

Technology infrastructure is the foundation of everything we do, like the network system for example. Chelle wants to think beyond wi-fi. It should be about the people and the processes that support innovation.

Chelle presented a document which shows Vision, Gaps and Priorities in blocs. Her question for the committee was if that was a good model or document. We need to explore the areas where we have differences in our thinking. For example, if something was at foundational level or not? That will help us to prioritize. Once we have a sense of our foundation, we can start to prioritize.

Bill thought security system should be added to foundational level. Bill wants to make sure that we have all the different perspectives – whether from faculty or support staff, IT, etc. Prioritization will be more and more important with all the budget cuts.

Feedback on this document was all positive.

Chelle's question to the committee was about the best way to move forward. Kyler thought it's good to clarify the scope of the technology plan but wondered what is the purpose of the technology plan – goals or wish list? Chelle thinks it should be something that helps an organization move forward as that is what strategic plans are for. We cannot move forward if we don't prioritize because we have such limited resources. She thinks there also could be aspirational aspects to the plan. Kyler wants to know if at the end of this, there is a framework of processes and plans in place to guide us on how to move forward or things we identify to attain. What is not clear if we are planning for a wishlist or developing a process by which things are to be brought up.

Chelle thinks it is driven by the mission of the group and we can circle back when we are developing a technology plan. Kyler wondered about the steps – if we do not think it through it will be a cart before the horse type project.

Chelle wants to think about how to operationalize this plan. Are there processes may be in place in UTAC itself which would help either before we move forward or in order to move forward.

Chelle also brought the topic if we need to reconstitute technology plan sub-committee. Camila nominates Michael Reis. Bill supports Camila's nomination. Chelle wants to be conscientious of burn outs.

Chelle, Bill and Michael Reis will collect all the feedbacks from this meeting, make outlines and present at the next one. And address questions like what's the plan for the plan, what we are talking about here and what's the intent.

Faculty and Staff Technology Needs Assessment Survey

Chelle is circling this back on this. This work started last year by ACRC – faculty committee. They came to UTAC with suggestion to survey the faculty about their needs for technology. UTAC thought a need assessment survey for both the faculty and staff will be useful but that should a routine and not one-off thing, so that over time we will have a bench marks to work with which can enhance plans for technology. So, this goes hand in hand with technology plan. Some initial survey questions were brought by the faculty. It's still a work in progress.

There was strong consensus that this will be done by UTAC as a whole and not by a sub-committee.

So, that is where we are now and we all have work to do - review the survey questions. Chelle asked how familiar everyone is with the survey questions. We are not planning to administer the survey in the upcoming quarter. We don't want to administer it at the same reporting sub-committee is sending out their survey. So, we have time to review the questions.

We will familiarize ourselves with the survey and anything else related to it and discuss next steps in the next meeting.

Old business

Nothing to discuss at this meeting.

End of this meeting.