



## Information Technology Committee (ITC) Minutes

**Meeting Date: December 10, 11 am - noon** (regular meeting)

Circulated: 01/14/2026

Approved: 01/21/2026

**Present:** Quentin Stout (Chair), Mashon Allen (VP's Chief of Staff), Natasha Allen, Jesse Capecelatro (SACUA liaison), James Cranford, Lydia Fettig, Bob Jones (ITS guest), Sanjeev Kumar, Bruce Maxim, Andrew Palms (ITS guest), David Potter, Angelica Previero (RSG graduate student representative), Larissa Sano, Jeffrey Yackley

**Absent:** Michael Bohanon, Susan Borda, Ivo Dinov, Ravi Pendse (VP for Information Technology and CIO), Daphne Welter (CSG undergraduate student representative)

1. The meeting was called to order and the November minutes were approved by consent.
2. AI in Education Working Group update
  - The AI in Education Working Group, being convened by Provost McCauley and VP Pendse, will have its first meeting in 2026, with its report due out by April 30th, 2026. In November, ITC members nominate committee members. ITC expressed interest in learning about the committee charge.
3. Discussion and updates on U-M digital accessibility efforts, with guest Bob Jones.
  - The federal deadline for meeting new [digital accessibility guidelines](#) is April 24, 2026.
  - Faculty should not need to pay a vendor for support. [U-M ITS](#) can connect faculty with U-M help.
  - The Faculty Senate had [voted by an overwhelming margin](#) in support of [A Resolution Asking the University to Invest the Necessary Resources to Make Our Digital Materials Accessible](#).
  - One is never truly done with accessibility and the project is a marathon.
  - Faculty are concerned about liability and if they might be held responsible. There are concerns about faculty who have heavy teaching loads, don't have GSIs, and are without job security. Past ITS audits suggest, if audited, oversight might focus on U-M ITS' conversations with vendors, such as Google. Journal vendors have not yet made their documents accessible, and ChatGPT can easily make summaries of articles. The perfect should not be the enemy of the good. Regulators would also see the complexities of making a single course accessible. While U-M needs to staff up and act with good intentions, it may be that a single PDF can't realistically be taken any further at this time.
  - The model being pursued by ITS is a train the trainer approach and working with units. It is difficult for ITS to be a central clearinghouse because of disciplinary specializations. A hub and spoke model that curates courses by the type of content is needed, and this requires an investment by U-M.
  - Faculty shared their frustrations from within their units. Testing by College of Engineering IT indicated that making just one course accessible could require as much as 100 hours of work. LaTeX does not make fully accessible PDFs. Within some schools, there has been little conversation to-date about the project. One faculty shared that a single document received a zero accessibility rating, and he has over ten years of documents. Support is lacking within some schools.
  - ITS is working on open-source options for PDF accessibility conversion, such as with use of Mistral AI. The project is currently experimental, but could make document accessibility much easier.
  - **Possible action items:** Several ideas were discussed, including: 1) new GSSA positions focused on accessibility for the project, 2) Government Relations might communicate the difficulty of the April 2026 federal deadline with policy makers, 3) ITS might soon hold an accessibility townhall (with OGC as a possible partner), 4) Fall semester 2026 may be a more realistic target for final implementation, 5) OGC might offer more clear guidance about legal risk.



4. U-M and Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) AI research center collaboration, with guest Andy Palms, Executive Director of Infrastructure

- ITS provided an update on the [UM-LANL project](#). It is physically one [new facility](#), to be owned by U-M, for high-powered computing and is not technically a data center. The smaller unclassified U-M wing will provide 10 megawatts (MW) of power (possible expansion to 20 MW) and the larger classified LANL wing will have 100 MW of power. Current U-M maximum supercomputing capacity is 2 MW. The partnership allows U-M to increase capacity more cost effectively. The design is 95% complete. U-M is site agnostic about the three sites under consideration.
- Data centers can be implemented badly (with diesel engines, coal power plants) or more efficiently. The Ypsi location is desirable because it is zoned as industrial, DTE has 70 MW power available today, and with a substation can provide 200 MW. UM-LANL is working with U-M sustainability. The collaboration increases efficiency for both U-M and LANL. The project would not touch the river or wetlands and uses one third of land available at the site.
- ITC members raised the following issues: Concerns about pollution, climate change, impact on the local community, increased DTE rates, and a lower ROI on AI may than projected; With the new facility, U-M will now have classified research on campus; Poor communication about the UM-LANL project -- U-M needs new supercomputing similar to OSU, U of Illinois and there has been doxing of faculty working on the project; Concerns about the cost of living increases for grad students living in Ypsi.
- The project is an important research collaboration. The project is not necessarily focused on AI but on computing capacity, e.g. public health research on genomics data with analysis on 25 petabytes of data. LANL maintains a nuclear arsenal. An [open house](#) was recently held.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Marshall (FSO, Faculty Governance Coordinator)