

Minutes of 5 December 2016
Circulated 30 January 2017
Recirculate 6 February
Approved 6 February 2017

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)
Wednesday, December 5, 2016 3:15 pm
Regents' Room, Fleming Building

Present: Atzmon, Carlos (by phone), Lehman, Ortega, Schultz (chair), Smith, Szymanski, Weineck, Wright; Potter, Schneider, and Snyder

Absent:

Guests: Pam Gabel, Executive Director, Shared Services, Sean DeMonner, CANVAS Information Systems Executive Director

3:14 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes/Announcements
Chair Schultz called the meeting to order. The Agenda was approved. Chair Schultz said that Central Student Government will also address the Senate Assembly.

3:20 Approval of Draft December Senate Assembly Agenda

3:15 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda

3:20 Consideration of Minutes

3:25 Announcements

3:30 Mental Health Guests:

FASAP Director Tom Waldecker

CAPS Director Todd Sevig

4:30 SACUA Nominating Committee Election

4:55 Matters Arising

5:00 Adjournment

The Senate Assembly Agenda was approved.

3:21: Discussion of the agenda for the December 14 meeting at Flint

8:30 Call to Order/Approval of Agenda and Minutes

8:40 Introductions

8:50 General Discussion of the following for all participants

What is going well on your campus?

What is going well with regard to your faculty governance?

How can our faculties better coordinate and support each other?

9:30 Arrival of Flint Provost Douglas Kerr

10:25 Matters Arising/Adjournment

10:30 Adjourn for Campus Tour

The Agenda was approved.

3:25 Winter 2017 SACUA Possible Replacement(s)

Minutes of 5 December 2016
Circulated 30 January 2017
Recirculate 6 February
Approved 6 February 2017

Chair Schultz discussed replacing Professors Weineck and Szymanski for the Winter Term with the next two vote getters from the last election. These would be Professors Marsh and Dr. Fraser. Professors Weineck and Potter raised the issue of balance. Chair Schultz will offer Senate Assembly with the following four options:

1. The top two vote getters
2. The top vote getter (there is no precedent for filling the slot of a person leaving for a term)
3. The top male and female vote getters
4. Hold a new election

Professor Lehman moved that these options be presented to Senate Assembly, the motion passed.

3:35 Guest: Shared Services Executive Director Pam Gabel

Ms. Gabel said she and her management team designated last year as a time to stabilize the Shared Services Center (SSC); she believes that the center is meeting expectations in processing transactions in a certain period. Last year there was some growth, and, although there were no major events, started to receive requests from administrators to take on additional pieces of work related to its primary functions (Human Resources services for smaller units and schools and some of their financial transactions). SS has expanded connections with the Health System (chiefly around accounts payable), the Flint Campus and Athletics. The fact that the Health System approached SS for financial services is taken as positive.

In addition to stabilization and expansion a third area of emphasis was staff development, ensuring that the staff was getting the best possible training. Ms. Gabel outlined a 90-day training period aimed at developing 80% proficiency and development of a career ladder and competencies. She also said that an active staff advisory council meets with her once a month. This committee developed flexible work hours at the service center. Every person transferred back to campus transferred with a promotion.

SS trains everyone in LEAN, which started as a manufacturing effort to reduce waste and morphed into office tasks. The main points of emphasis are:

1. Built on idea of continuous improvement
2. Drive improvement at a grass root level; change comes from people actually doing things—asking people to run projects better.

Chair Schultz asked if SS software would be adjustable enough to accommodate staff suggestions? Gabel said that this varies, that some fixes are not cost effective.

Professor Szymanski asked about faculty feedback. Gabel said there was no great way to get faculty feedback; they do not often work with faculty members. Professor Szymanski said what they do does have a direct impact on faculty. Gabel said she would love to get more feedback. She has not found how to get better faculty feedback.

Professor Lehman said that SS could e-mail a request for feedback, but he felt that things worked very fast. Professor Szymanski asked about the possibility that the Financial Services Committee could offer advice, and Professor Wright mentioned Ms. Gabel's visit to that group. Professor Wright also said that some reports do not come in forms that faculty could use so units have to set up parallel systems.

Professor Weineck asked what happened to the staff in Accounts Payable at the Health System? Ms. Gabel said that all the people were given jobs in SS, she has never terminated a person moving to SS.

Professor Atzmon asked about units that were effectively “paying ransom” to keep staff their staff. Ms. Gabel responded that it is hard to quantify cost savings. She knows what the SSC

is saving, but does not know what units are saving. She anticipates \$2-3 million on an annual basis and there is soft cost that is hard to quantify.

Professor Weineck mentioned surveys could gather faculty input, saying that even units with no complaints about the services they were receiving were unhappy losing a person. Ms. Gabel responded that the SSC is trying to get more real time responses.

Chair Schultz asked how many layers of bureaucracy have been added pointing to the five-level structure that includes associates, senior associates, supervisors, managers and the Director. He also asked how Ms. Gabel measured employee satisfaction. Ms. Gabel pointed to an employee satisfaction survey done by an outside agency in March. Since the survey was taken at a stressful time, the response was a 68, the benchmark number nationally is 69; while 71 is university number for people not in SSC. Professor Weineck what the number means? Ms. Gabel said the highest value is an 85. She said that after people had been through LEAN training, satisfaction had increased by 9%.

Professor Weineck asked about I-9 processing, pointing out that SS may be dealing with a less friendly State Department. Ms. Gabel said that SS was making sure that the University was compliant. She indicated there was a 12% error rate on I-9 processing before SS, and that the error rate is now just over 1%. The SS is working with the International Center on visas.

Professor Ortega asked about the benefit of training and leadership development. Ms. Gabel said that SS had not been doing it long enough to know if people will stay longer, but applicants for promotion are better prepared.

Professor Ortega asked if there was a plan for the growth of SS? Ms. Gabel said that it is a possibility, but she hopes that the University has learned from experience and that expansion will be handled differently, that should be done organically, and that while there have been pilot programs to see if it works, these have all been small. If something more substantial should be proposed, SS would engage with a number of groups, work very slowly and carefully.

Professor Ortega said it would be helpful if we have these conversations before changes are instituted. Ms. Gabel agreed.

Professor Wright asked how SSC is funded. Ms. Gabel said there were two models, budget lines that existed before the move to SS were charged to SS, new services were charged back to the various units at the School or College level.

Chair Schultz asked if Ms. Gabel would like to add questions to the Academic Evaluation system (AEC)?

Professor Weineck thanked Ms. Gabel for her cooperation. Ms. Gabel concluded by pointing out that the SSC housing 230 people is located on Boardwalk invited visitors.

4:15 Guest: CANVAS Information Systems Executive Director Sean DeMonner
With John Johnston and Jennifer Love (leading effort to move projects from Ctools to Box and Googledocs)

Professor DeMonner said that

1. 5500 courses used Canvas this fall
2. the migration to Canvas was a significant effort for many faculty
3. There was continued support for the transition
4. He is aware that people are experiencing challenges in the new environment; there are 14 courses available to faculty; strategy is to work closely with people in academic units

He offered the following information about the schedule for transition away from Ctools:

1. Phase 1 Spring-Summer Term 2014- Spring-Summer Term 2016 migration to Canvas from Ctools

2. Phase 2: Fall Term 2016-Fall Term 2017: migration of project sites to existing alternatives
3. Phase 3 Fall Term 2016- Spring-Summer Term 2018: move teaching evaluations and placement exams to Canvas
4. Phase 4 Decommission Ctools after Spring-Summer Term 2019, recognizing that people will want access to materials that are several years old.

Professor Smith said that College of Pharmacy is going back to paper and pencil evaluations because people are not filling out the electronic forms (decline was from 85% to 25%). Professor DeMonner said they realized response rates would drop, the registrar's office has finished a Request for Information for course evaluations. The next phase is a Request for Proposal, when there will be requirements that the institution will have to address. Lisa Emory in the Registrar's office is leading the process.

Professor Wright asked about the processes by which information is gathered from faculty users about ways to improve Canvas, whether there was a way to gather systematic data. Professor DeMonner the standard way is through For Help. Professor Wright asked if we have the capacity to change functions through the University staff, or if that is up to the vendor. Professor DeMonner replied that the University is subject to the service the vendor provides, but can make choices about the way features are presented. There are information technology communities attached to individual units to share information about available services. Mr. Johnston said very good support from the vendor, and monthly meetings with peer institutions to explore common solutions

Professor DeMonner said the creation of new project sites on Ctools has declined from 400 sites per month to 30, with a vast increase of the number of accounts in Box.

Professor Potter said that Box is a poor system and that the increase in its use was not a sign of happiness, but of compulsion, and that it is making faculty less efficient. Professor DeMonner said that he is aware of the complaints but says that the same was true of Ctools. Professor Smith said that it is not true that people are making a choice in switching. Professor Ortega said he had not seen a report about what people are hearing, but recalled that we had been told that Ctools would go away much sooner than appears on Professor DeMonner's schedule. He wondered how the information was getting back to the faculty. Professor DeMonner said he had been engaged in outreach for several months, and that the elimination of Ctools has been extended because of feedback from units.

Professor Potter pointed out that he had received by accident a list of all the other reviewers involved a promotion process because of administrative error in Box. Professor Smith asked who determines access to Box. Professor DeMonner said that the content of a Ctools site would be moved to Box and the permissions would be moved with the content. As far as security goes, he noted that these are collaboration platforms. Professors Potter and Weineck reiterated the risk of error in promotion cases. Professor DeMonner said the University has signed a Business Association Agreement with Box (BAA) (see <http://searchhealthit.techtarget.com/definition/HIPAA-business-associate-agreement-BAA>) that allows us to store HIPPA info on that system.

Professor DeMonner discussed training, saying it consisted of the following aspects:

1. Monitoring organic migration patterns
2. Reviewing plans with campus stakeholders
3. Building and testing migration tools

He said the School of Public will do pilot migrations December 2016-February 2017. Assuming that works, his group will begin building a queue to migrate Ctools Project Sites in March-December 2017. They may want to provide people with an opt out.

Professor Potter asked would make Professor DeMonner decide that Box was unworkable. Professor DeMonner said that this would be the case if there was a problem with sensitive data which cannot today be put in Box; he was working with the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) from a compliance perspective it will not work. There is always an option for units to pursue their own solution if the broad-spectrum solution does not work. One is tracking faculty tenure promotion. Mr. Johnson said that there are options other than Box (e.g. downloading everything to a ZIP file), and an option to transfer things to Canvas. They will also set up Ctools like collaboration in Canvas.

Professor DeMonner asked

1. What does a successful migration look like?
2. How best to support faculty?
3. Are you already using other collaboration tools?

He said the University did not provide enough training for the Canvas and Box rollout.

Professor Wright asked what happens if there is a significant software change within the next 5 years and we migrate again, which imposes a great cost on us? Professor DeMonner said the problem is endemic to technology, but as an institution we can be smarter about how these decisions are made. We do not want to fall to far behind. Professor Wright asked if the University is placing too much reliance on non-University companies and is captive to their decisions. Professor DeMonner allowed that this was a concern, but that UNASYN is an institutional strategy to exert more higher education influence on the market place.

Professor Szymanski asked if we are no longer dependent on our own innovation, but get the benefit from the larger group, how do we get informed about new ideas through Canvas? He observed that there is no systematic way to get this information. Professor DeMonner replied that the velocity of change has increased with the vended product, there is a continuing process of new product arrival, and it is easy to plug these products in. Professor DeMonner is trying to take the previous resources used for CTools to repurpose them to provide more outreach.

4:45 Matters Arising

None

4:50 Executive Session

[Grievability Subcommittee]

Professors Lehman, Carlos and Weineck will serve as the committee and report before the holidays.

5:26 Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Potter
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 5.02:

Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges

Sec. 4.01 The University Senate

"...[the Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interests of the university, and to make recommendations to the Board of Regents in regard thereto. Decisions of the University Senate with respect to matters within its jurisdiction shall constitute the binding action of the university faculties. Jurisdiction over academic policies shall reside in the faculties of the various schools and colleges, but insofar as actions by the several faculties affect university policy as a whole, or schools and colleges other than the one in which they originate, they shall be brought before the University Senate."

Minutes of 5 December 2016

Circulated 30 January 2017

Recirculate 6 February

Approved 6 February 2017

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs:

Senate: "In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed."

Assembly: "The Assembly may adopt rules for the transaction of its business. In appropriate cases not covered by rules of the Assembly, the rules of the University Senate shall apply."

SACUA: "The committee may adopt rules for the transaction of its business."