Minutes of 17 February 2014 Senate Assembly Meeting
Circulated 18 February 2014
Re-circulated 17March 2014
Approved 17 March 2014

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
SENATE ASSEMBLY MEETING
17 FEBRUARY 2014

Present: Adunbi, Adler, Baker, Bradley, Cervetti, Custer, Danziger, Dolins, Fagerlin, Fenno, Fiore, Fraser, Garcia, Hayes, Holland, Hollingsworth, Jones, Katapodi, Koopmann, Lehman, Masten, Muehlberger, Mutschler, Nielsen, Odetola, Oey, Olsen, Rothman, Schloss, Smith, Staller (Chair), Swain, Szymanski, Turnley, von Buelow, Winful, Wong, Wright, Young, Ziff

Requested Alternate, None Available: Bayraktar (LSA), Biteen (LSA), Grosh (Engineering), Kirshner (MTD)

Alternates: Fatima Gocek (LSA)

Absent: Alderstein Gonzalez, Atchade, Barolo, Brown, Burrow, Campbell, Christman, Cotera, DiPietro, Friesen, Hershovitz, Jacobsen, Johnson, Kee, Larsen, Lim, Lu, Mitchell, Mondro, Mansfield, Mora, Nevett, Pandey, Poulsen, Primus, Princen, Prygoski, Raphael, Ryan, Sarma, Shah, Silveira, Thompson, Trandafirescu

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED
1. Agenda for Senate Assembly
2. Draft Minutes of the 27 January 2014 Senate Assembly meeting
3. SPG 201.96 Professional Standards for Faculty, issued 8 November 2013
4. SPG 601.34 Policy on Minors Involved in University-Sponsored Programs or Programs Held in University Facilities, issued 13 January 2014

SENATE ASSEMBLY
Chair Staller convened the meeting of the Senate Assembly at 3:17 P.M. The proposed agenda was approved.

MINUTES
The draft minutes of 27 January 2014 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
The next Senate Assembly meeting 17 March 2014 will feature election of new SACUA members and the Senate Secretary.

IT RATIONALIZATION (Guests: Laura Patterson, Associate vice-president and chief information officer; Robert Goffeney, Dearborn director of IT strategy and operations.)

Chair Staller asked Professor Oey to introduce the guests. Professor Oey stated that a consolidation effort similar to the AST consolidation will be affecting IT services, and that the guests had been invited to address the issue.

Ms. Patterson took the floor at 3:20 P.M. She illustrated her talk with a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix), beginning with a review of centralized IT services dating back to the 1980s. She said that a new paradigm-shift is now emerging with respect to scale, personal choice of platforms, social media, and size of data sets.

Ms. Patterson described an inventory of IT support services that suggested at least $300 million per year was being expended, of which about 80% was redundant, and not directly aligned with the academic mission of the institution. In response, she said, she started an initiative called NextGen Michigan with a governance group that is led by faculty. She said that her goal for IT rationalization is to have a shared infrastructure and support structure.

IT rationalization started with email, reducing 44 email services to 3. Next came desktop support services, storage services, and server hosting services. So far, consolidation has saved $10 million per year, and those savings have been passed on to the office of provost for disposition. Currently, pilot projects are underway in the University Library. LSA Dean's Office, School of Education, and LSA Communication Studies; planning is underway for rollouts to the remaining units in future years.

Ms. Patterson summarized a strategic plan for IT (Appendix). She concluded her prepared remarks at 3:52 P.M. and invited questions. Professor Smith pointed out that in the College of Pharmacy specialized, discipline-specific software is needed and asked how IT rationalization would deal with that reality. Ms. Patterson replied that IT professionals would continue to reside in the units, but their reporting lines would change. Professor Smith said that his appointment is in Pharmacy but his office is in Medical Science. He asked if sophisticated software packages could become available campus-wide. Ms. Patterson said that such an outcome would be highly desirable from her point of view. She described mechanisms she was pursuing that would make it possible and cost-effective, particularly in the area of software licensing.

Dr. Fraser asked what they would do differently based on experience to date, and specifically what is planned for UM-Dearborn, including facilitation of services for people with disabilities. Ms. Patterson said that Google is being responsive to access issues for disabled users. Mr. Goffeney fielded the UM-Dearborn question and said that scope and scale issues in Dearborn are different than in Ann Arbor. He said that reporting lines have been consolidated, but the IT personnel are in the same offices, and that they are working collaboratively. He said he did not know if MiWorkplace was coming to Dearborn.

Professor Nielson asked how much information would be archived in remote locations. Ms. Patterson replied that for the most part users will have the opportunity to select material for remote storage and for CrashPlan backup.

Professor Garcia asked whether Patterson's office has interviewed users from units that provided the $10M savings to learn if there have been any positive or negative effects. Ms. Patterson

replied that they have tried to assess satisfaction with some services but not with Google. She said that if she were doing it over, she would not start with Google. Google was selected because a high proportion of UM email was already being forwarded to gmail.

Professor Garcia stated that Google does not have enough security for medical services. He inquired about the degree of security provided by other shared services. Ms. Patterson responded that security and privacy are very high priorities. She said that threats are growing greater and more sophisticated. She said she originally believed that Google would sign a HIPAA-compliant business associate agreement (BAA), but they declined. MiWorkspace, however, as a service is HIPAA-aligned. She added that the Medical School is now consolidating its support services with hospital support. She said her office has made a commitment either to consolidate infrastructures or to interface with them, but that serious challenges remain.

Professor Jones asked the current status of the $300 million previously spent on IT. Ms. Patterson said that she will wait until the rollout of MiWorkspace before conducting a new inventory. She said that our peers tend to spend closer to 4% of their budgets on IT, compared to 10% for the UM. She added that she was not arguing against 10% if the expense is supporting the research mission, and that some redundancy is desirable.

Professor Young echoed concerns about data security for research and personal information. She suggested that one centralized contact be designated for each department. She recounted difficulties she recently experienced in regard to service requests. She said that high performance computing and shared software license agreements are helpful to increase productivity and decrease cost, but that software changes need to be advertised. Ms. Patterson said that a shared ticketing system across campus is a goal, but it has not yet been achieved.

Professor Szymanski expressed concern that choices may be removed in this process of seeking cost efficiencies. He said he was forced to settle for a laptop computer that was not the one he wanted because availability was restricted. He inquired whether the same thing will happen with software. Ms. Patterson replied that it was challenging to know where to consolidate and where not to do so. She cited wireless networks as an example where one common network would be optimal.

Professor Oey asked how Patterson's office will know when it has received adequate input from faculty. She said that the ticketing system is completely broken from her viewpoint. Ms. Patterson reiterated that faculty input is included in the IT rationalization governance structure. She said her office will go unit by unit, faculty member by faculty member. She added that some things may have to be supported at departmental cost if the services are completely unique. She said that in the pilot program in the School of Education every faculty member completes a survey and has an interview. When issues arise her staff negotiates with the dean's office. Professor Oey expressed doubt that IT staff would interview every faculty member on campus. She also pointed out that there are actually extremely few instructional faculty in the IT Rationalization governance structure as posted on-line. Ms. Patterson replied that her staff did meet with every faculty member in LSA Communication Studies.

Professor Odetola remarked that support services in the medical school are uneven and that opportunity for improved efficiency exists. He cited recurring problems with saving data because drives fill up. He asked how services like M+Box will be communicated to the end users. Ms. Patterson replied that the biggest challenge next to security involves the 'tsunami' of data. She said that the needs of every faculty member seem slightly different; she said her goal is to have a service portal where you can see any service available across the university.

Professor Koopmann expressed concern that a quest to contain costs can lead to loss of value, such as quality and reliability of computer hardware like laptops. He asked whether outsourcing computer services have been examined. Ms. Patterson replied that she hesitates to talk about outsourcing because it raises anxieties among staff. She said that IT will be transparent about its costs, and will be clear how service quality and cost compares to the market. She pointed out that the UM is in a time of cost containment, and that outsourcing would have to be considered very carefully. Professor Young followed up Professor Koopmann's remarks, stating that M-Marketplace doesn't work, in that server errors were encountered dependent on website. She said it had only a very limited list of HP computers, and not the one she wanted. She said she made inquiries via email and phone to HP presales support, but received no response to her questions. She noted that in order for a single centralized service to work, it has to be functional, well managed, and supported.

Professor Schloss asked what things were considered commodities. He acknowledged that WiFi is a commodity, but he said that M+Box is not used by his collaborators around the world. Ms. Patterson said that M+Box is a service provided by Box that will protect shared information contractually. She added that part of the ongoing paradigm shift is toward consumer-driven solutions. Professor Schloss replied that it is costly to force all faculty to learn new systems, and that the cost might exceed the $10M advertised savings to date.

Chair Staller thanked the guests at 4:50 P.M. for visiting with the Assembly. She said that faculty governance would like to be part of future conversations about IT. Ms. Patterson expressed interest in returning to the Senate Assembly in the future to continue obtaining input and feedback.

AWARDS, COMMITTEES, SACUA AND MEMBERSHIP
The chair said that Assembly members have been sent requests seeking nominations, including self-nominations, for committees and awards.

RECENT SPGs
Chair Staller called attention to distributed items 3 and 4. She said the March meeting of the Assembly will feature an important discussion about a new Fitness for Duty SPG under consideration by the administration.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS
There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

John T. Lehman
Senate Secretary

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, 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.

University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 4.04:
The Senate Assembly
The Senate Assembly shall serve as the legislative arm of the senate.
The assembly shall have power to consider and advise regarding all matters within the jurisdiction of the University Senate which affect the functioning of the university as an institution of higher learning, which concern its obligations to the state and to the community at large, and which relate to its internal organization insofar as such matters of internal organization involve general questions of educational policy.

Rules of the University Senate, the Senate Assembly and the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs: In all cases not covered by rules adopted by the Senate, the procedure in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed.