Governance Committee Initiatives: Updates and Endorsements

Classroom Technology Standard

The minimum Classroom Technology Standards were developed by the Research and Educational Technology Committee (R&E) to define what faculty should expect when they walk into a classroom. Working with Joe Tenbarge and the Classroom Technology Committee the group came up with a set of technology standards for general purpose classrooms. The goal in defining standards is to have something to measure against to determine where we stand with our current classroom technology.

The committee noted that as the Board of Regents task forces work through their agenda items it will important for the university to report on where we are with our classroom technology and understand the realities of the costs to move to more online-based learning. The committee expressed the importance of gathering data and understanding our preparedness for distance learning. For example, we do not have the funds for all of our current classrooms to meet the standards as defined; we need to measure and understand the costs. Wireless, lecture capture, and video conferencing are aspirational goals which will be significantly more expensive.

The committee asked about the proliferation of college and school preferences for classroom technology that does not meet the standards during the construction phase when it is easiest to build in the infrastructure. How might the standards address this issue? The answer is R&E recognized the importance of fostering a stronger relationship with the Campus Planning & Facilities Management team and added this language into the standard document.

The committee questioned why we were not taking a stronger stance on the standards particularly for new construction and renovations. The answer is we need to start somewhere and measure against it. When the Strategic IT Advisory Committee (SITAC) report was written the IT landscape on campus was like the Wild West. The standards give us a place to start the dialogue and we can update them over time.

The committee expressed the importance of campus-wide planning from an institutional perspective. We need to move towards planning for centers of excellence where resources can be shared rather than everyone doing their own. Planning allows us to maximize our efficiencies across the institution. We also cannot take advance of volume purchasing opportunities when we aren’t organized.

The Center for Teaching and Learning is working with the Provost’s Office on course transformation. They are positioned to help us understand what will be required to meet the standards and support the course transformation effort.

See Appendix A for full standard.
Decision

- SITAB unanimously approved the Minimum Classroom Technology Standards

Network Operations Standards
SITAC recognized the importance of the network and in the report asked that network standards be developed. The Architecture and Infrastructure Committee (AIC) has been working on the standards and is currently vetting the manual with the various governance committees.

The network operations manual defines the roles, responsibilities, and rules-of-the-road for running the campus network. There is fear that the campus will not be able to afford the standards. The goal, like the classroom standards, is to define a standard and measure to it in order to make informed decisions about resources. The network is a shared resource and under investing in one area can impact the entire enterprise. The committee used the analogy of Greece and the European Union to demonstrate what happens when one member cannot live up to the standard and the subsequent impact on the whole.

The Operational IT Committee (OIT) will explore the reporting aspect of the standards and will have recommendations in the June SITAB meeting.

See Appendix B for full additional information about the manual.

Identity Management
OIT initiated an identity management effort to address the difficulty alumni have accessing services. The group will have a plan developed on how to rethink our approach to identity management this summer.

Change Management System
Our current administrative system development environment lacks adequate controls when migrating software programs into production. We plan to pursue a pilot program that establishes the necessary controls and has the required audit trails. This will address ongoing audit findings in our administrative system environment. ITS funds will be directed for this pilot.

Decision

- SITAB agreed to move forward with the pilot project

Learning Management System
Under the auspicious of R&E, we are looking at alternatives to the current Learning Management System, Blackboard. We are exploring the marketplace included open source and hosted solutions. We will invite vendors to campus in March and April to demonstrate their systems and allow faculty and students to use them and give feedback. The goal is to issue a Request for Proposal before the end of the semester with a decision in the fall.

Email: Strategy and Progress Update
**Student and Alumni and Upgrade to Exchange 2010**
The contracts have been signed with Google and SADA Systems (3rd party implementer). The kickoff meeting with SADA was this week and we are targeting a mid-to-late April launch of Gmail for students. Alumni accounts will follow. There are issues around FERPA and e-discovery that need to be worked out before the service could be offered to faculty and staff. The College of Education will be piloting Google Apps in their college.

**University Data Center: Progress Update**
Over 400 devices have been moved to the new University Data Center. The last big move will be March 13th when a number of administrative systems will be relocated. We will also switch over to the new mainframe during that time. The feedback on the moves has been very positive.

**Topics for Next SITAB Meeting**
- Networking Operations Manual – Endorse

Meeting handouts follow.
Governance Committee Initiatives

Overview
The IT Governance Committees have been hard at work on a number of new initiatives since the last board meeting. These include:

- Defining Classroom Technology Standards
- Completing the Network Operations Manual
- Launching a project to define a strategy for Identity Management
- Exploring a Change Management System for Administrative developers
- Initiating an effort to explore other alternatives to our current Learning Management System

Classroom Standards and Network Operations Manual Highlights

Classroom Technology Standards – Endorsement (see Appendix A)

- Goal was to establish expectations for classroom technology
- Standards define what technologies should be present in general purpose classrooms
- Passed by Research and Educational Technology and Operational IT committees in January 2011

Network Operations Manual – Update (see Appendix B)

- Year-long collaborative effort to define roles, responsibilities, and standards for campus network
- Approved by Architecture and Infrastructure Committee in February, being vetted with other governance groups in March
- Will come to SITAB in June
Governance Committee Initiatives (cont.)

Updates on Remaining Major Initiatives

Identity Management – Update

- Initiated by the Operational IT Committee to address EID password difficulties by alumni
- Task Force is defining future direction of identity with recommendations presented this spring

Change Management System – Update

- Business Services Committee has been looking at change management systems to address audit findings around code migration
- Selected Innowake Technology product for a pilot project, will evaluate the results and have recommendation on how to proceed in the fall

Learning Management System – Update

- Research and Educational Technology Committee asked that the university explore the possibility of using a different Learning Management Systems
- Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued this spring with decision made in the fall
Email: Strategy and Progress Update

Overview
We are taking a two-prong approach with our campus email strategy – Gmail from Google for students and alumni and Exchange 2010 for faculty and staff. The goals are to provide cost-effect email solutions that:

- Provide large inboxes and a user-friendly interface
- Allow students to keep their email addresses after graduation
- Allow calendaring coordination and efficiencies among administrative staff

Student and Alumni Email – Progress and Next Steps
- Signed contracts with Google and SADA Systems (3rd party implementer)
- 7 GB inbox, utexas.edu domain, and access to all Google applications
- Created an implementation plan and timeline
- Naming challenge is currently posted in Ideas of Texas
- College of Education will pilot Google Apps for Education in the fall
- Will work with Legal and Information Security Office on eligibility for faculty and staff
- Once student service is launched, we will focus on alumni
- **We hope to have the initial offering available in April 2011**

Faculty and Staff Email – Update
There are many unresolved issues (FERPA, e-discovery, etc.) that must be addressed before Google’s Gmail solution would be a viable option for Faculty and Staff email. In the interim, we need to upgrade our current Exchange environment to bring it to current industry levels.

- Work will be completed in May
- Storage prices have come down so the default inbox size will increase from 500Mb to 2 GB
- Exchange supports features unavailable in Gmail including the ability to sign and encrypt mail, room scheduling, and domain aliasing (ex. Mccombs.utexas.edu)
- Over-time we will retire the Webmail (mail.utexas.edu) and potentially Exchange. This would be a multi-year effort so we must upgrade in the interim
University Data Center: Progress Update

Overview
The new University Data Center facility is now operational and on track for ~45% occupancy by March 15.

Progress
- 435 devices moved since October 2010; 186 more move between March and June 2011
- Same level of rigor and planning for each move, regardless of size
- December 27 – 29 moved 185 devices, received only a handful of tickets, maintained services campus rated critical
- Customers rate satisfaction at 3.7/4 for planning through execution
- Continuous process improvement based on customer feedback
- Taking on new customers using formal process informed by move planning process – 50 devices

Next steps: Supporting cutover to new mainframe on March 13. Planning for closing of old Data Center, July 1, 2010
Appendix A: Minimum Standards – Classroom Technology

The Research and Educational Technology Committee (R&E) tasked the Classroom Technology Committee to develop a set of classroom technology standards. The following document outlines the standards that have been identified and endorsed by R&E.

The R&E Committee recognizes that as part of this process, not all classrooms are created equal and not all will require the same management. Substantial leeway in standards may need to be given to special purpose classrooms managed by academic units. The types of classrooms defined by the Committee include:

1. General Purpose classrooms that are managed by multiple units
2. General purpose style classrooms managed by individual units
3. Special purpose instruction spaces managed by the individual units

Those have been further defined as having the following characteristics:

- Auditorium style classroom with sloped or stepped floor, fixed seats, accommodate 100 – 500 people
- Standard classroom with flat floor, encompassing a variety of sizes
- Seminar classroom, a table with seating for ~20 people

Using these definitions the R&E Committee endorses that centrally managed and general purpose classrooms OTHER THAN SEMINAR CLASSROOMS will have the following minimum levels of technology available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projection System</td>
<td>Minimum resolution of 1024 x 768 and with a VGA connection for laptop projection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/V Sound System</td>
<td>A sound playback system should be provided for all A/V sources. Additionally, a presenter reinforcement system may be required (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Camera</td>
<td>A document camera should be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>A computer with both PC and Mac operating systems should be available (Mac minis are typically used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Availability</td>
<td>All students should be able to obtain an IP address. This is an aspirational goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplification Sound System</td>
<td>A public address system should be available as appropriate to the room size if needed for presenter intelligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control System</td>
<td>A control system should be provided. Crestron is the prevalent system in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Capture</td>
<td>This is an aspirational goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While issues related to lighting and acoustics are important to the overall teaching and learning experience, they fall out of the scope of minimum technology standards. The committee recommends increased conversation and dialogue with the Campus Planning & Facilities Management team in University Operations in order to support the construction of classrooms that best support a physical environment for teaching and learning.

*These guidelines are officially endorsed by the Research and Educational Technology Committee on January 20, 2011 and by the Operational Information Technology Committee on January 26, 2011.*
Appendix B: Network Operations Manual

Overview

- Networks are the foundation of IT
- There was no agreement on how that foundation would be built or maintained – leading to problems
- SITAC recognized the problem and endorsed the move from a loose to strong federation (over complete centralization)
- SITAC 5.1 and 5.2 called for defining roles/standards and establishing minimum baselines for service
- An AIC subcommittee developed this “manual”: Communication, Education, ECE, ITS, Liberal Arts, Libraries, TRECS

Takeaways

- Goal of the standard is to provide information to make decisions about investments
- The standards are not about funding and are not meant to be unfunded mandates
- A baseline is established for departments to strive to provide (only measured and reported)
- Professional management of network devices
- Formal change procedures, 360 degree communications, commitment to help
- Compliance with laws/policies (identification, security, licensing)
- There are exceptions
- First try for a living document, to be reviewed regularly