

# University Technology Advisory Committee

## Western Oregon University

### Meeting Minutes

April 28, 2023 1pm-2:30pm

Committee Attendees: Bill Kernan, Amy Clark, Michael Ellis, Keats Chaves, Gregory Z, Chelle Bachelor, Camila Gabaldon, Jennifer Hansen, Robyn Lopez Melton, Donna Vasas

Guests: Ana Karaman

Notetaker: Jennifer Hansen

[Notes from February meeting](#)

## Agenda

### UTAC Charge

Conversation with Ana Karaman about [UTAC's revised charge & structure](#)

- Here are the notes from our [discussion about the charge](#) with President Peters
- Does the charge align with Ana's vision for the future of the committee? What role might she have with the committee in the future? Does the current chair structure still work with the new charge / vision for the committee?
- What are our next steps with getting the charge finalized and approved?

Question posted by Anna: language in the charge: charged by and advisory to president and cabinet: when originally created was only to president and not cabinet – is this a change?

Discussion surrounding this, we report to the cabinet and propose to the cabinet but not necessarily advisory, the idea was to go through Chelle or Anna to the cabinet. We can build in relationship to the cabinet.

Anna K: UBAC has reports they provide to the president, final report has recommendation to the president for the next year.

Discussion surrounding this: UTAC happens more frequent – changes in tech – one of the reasons for the cabinet is because of the frequency of changes and the scope of those it affects.

Added president into bullet for reports submitted, removed cabinet in advises.

Anna K – discussion about how policy falls into specific area and have a policy officer, they go through them. Develop and advise on policies – is it part of our charge to develop policy? That should be through senior leadership. Should go through stakeholders.

Discussion surrounding how policies develop on campus- work on a draft, work with stakeholders, UTAC has not developed anything like that. Idea of UTAC being able to develop policy and take it to VP for further movement is in favor. UTAC is much faster than other groups so could develop and submit

Anna K- should have all groups together in the beginning, 100% agree, critical stakehold involved so it's not UTAC to develop but to involve. Should have these advisory groups that can provide input for policies.

Changes created to bullet to include critical stakeholder, and eliminate develop.

Anna K: suggested adding training into the language as well with develop policy. There is a variety of policy, a variety of demands on staff, UTAC can bring those to cabinet and prioritize. Adding to first bullet regarding prioritization, and upkeep for major technology projects. Lots of things that involve technology efforts. This is where it would help to prioritize projects understanding this would not derail current projects, or ongoing upkeep.

Michael E: a lot of ucs projects that only ucs does and knows – the better job we do the less others see it. Variety of things can happen to derail projects and reprioritize demands on us

Anna K: recommendation from accrediting body – maybe we should take this and incorporate it into the revised charge? There may be a need to UTAC to be an advocate to support. It will also elevate UTAC in the priorities. The paragraph that Jesse sent out was what was given.

Talks about turnover, reductions, etc. while university has invested in tech, evaluation team was unable to discern staff had training on tools..... so it's one thing to get these platforms but may not be fully utilized due to lack of training. This recommendation was under HR. The peer evaluation team recommends that the institution deploy current higher education best practices, including the effective use of technology, to ensure attainment of industry standard practices to achieve its organizational responsibilities and the integrity and continuity of its educational programs. (2. F.3)

Maybe we can look at technology less centralized and more dispersed across campus. You need to understand function and technology together. More areas are looking for those people, admissions, financial aid, etc.

AmyC: technology changes fast, like Ivan has learned slate, you figure it out, industry expects you to understand base information and go from there. Campus may have a tech functional person but departments have folks that understand it and are not defined as tech functional.

Chelle B: may need to be something in the charge that indicates UTAC is a convenient space for those functional technologist.

Anna K: once person is gone the expertise is gone – maybe something written to include that? How do folks collaborate to work out the kinks and tech folks provide high touch for a period then move into the functional area with minimal from ucs. Need to maybe cross train folks so when folks leave the information doesn't leave.

Anna K: UBAC has changed significantly – I feel UTAC will continue to evolve and grow. Feel like Chelle and director of UCS should be primary. In UBAC we changed the terms – changed it to 4 yrs on committee. Makes sense if there is a bit more permanency. Chelle, herself, makes most sense to be a co-chair because position is tech heavy. UBAC has benefitted from continuity and longer terms of the co-chairs.

Chelle B – look to make the move to a more permanent position for Chelle ( or dean of library and academic innovation). Co-chair would not need to be voted on each year.

GZ: ucs makes most sense because of what they do. Library makes sense a , a 3 person team with the last from faculty or staff that is not necessarily tech heavy to get through work and new ideas. Could get through agendas and getting through meetings. Having a duo with different perspectives and personalities can be rough, but if you have a third person to temper it can make a good balance. Should have a term limit and move off to allow new perspectives. Chelle does need to stay on to maintain the continuity.

Anna K: tri chairs in UBAC changed the dynamic. First year we had ac/staff/stu we felt every are needed to be represented. Now we have 1 staff/ 2 stu. Can see that eventually director ucs will become ex-officio and guide but not co-chair.

Charge has been updated to include new member language.

Discussion surrounding students as part of co-chair: found to be difficult as term length and commitment time. Would need to be paid, or child care. A variety of barriers for students to stay for full term length..

Result: refining the student at-large members to include ASWOU nominee language. Added "interface with UBAC and tuition and fees committee when those engage related to tech systems or initiatives."

Discussion surrounding timing of nominations, suggested to vote during final meeting of the year. Look at student affairs to see who might be tech heavy and invite them out as well and bring folks in before next year. Admissions, housing, dining, financial aid, disability services all part of it.

## **Cybersecurity Policy**

Should we form a UTAC working group?

Making campus tour of cybersecurity including Pres. Cabinets, Anna's group, senate groups – part of conversation to partner with UTAC for upcoming policies – looking for ideas for working group, or subcommittee, or partner with Michael Ellis to work on policies?

Amy Clark is interested – GZ interested, good idea. Policy is an acceptable use policy: official use policy needing to be updated, and probably other policies relevant plus policies relevant in IT. Have some sample policies and would like to review these, plus others already in place.

Gregory Z – like working on policies, how large are the documents for the policies? ME: most are reasonably brief 2-3 pages. Recommend keeping succinct. GZ is interested, as well as Amy Clark.

Chelle – UTAC seems to be the perfect place for that, gives it some structure, and a review body. Subcommittees are not limited to draw members from this group – can bring in from outside this group.

GZ – don't all policies need official review? AC – yes, part of the cabinet.

Chelle – reminder to have a charge for subcommittee.

ME: will draft and bring it back.

## **Subcommittee reports**

## **Accessibility Subcommittee**

Report from the Strategic Digital Accessibility Training team (Chelle) will speak for group as she is part of a task force. WebAim trainer helps institutions attain better web visibility – 2 sessions so far, learned digital accessibility and digital accessibility policy. Looking to whom might be stakeholders in this avenue. UTAC and cabinet could both be very large stakeholders. Will update after more training. UO is one participant: <https://digitalaccessibility.uoregon.edu/>