

Minutes 12 November 2018  
Circulated 14 November 2018  
Approved 3 December 2018

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA)  
Monday, November 12, 2018 3:15 pm  
4006 Fleming Administration Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340

Present: Atzmon, Beatty, Carlos (Bluejeans), Conway, Lippert, Malek, Marsh (chair), Schultz, Spencer, Potter, Schneider, Snyder

Absent:

Guests: Members of the Press; Stefanie Horvath, Assistant Director of Information Technology Services (ITS) Communications

3:15: Call to order/Approval of Agenda

3:16: Guest: Chief Information Officer (CIO) Ravi Pendse

CIO Pendse said he is thinking about initiatives for the University's Information and Technology Services division to take on, and is spending time with staff and colleagues to discover challenges they encounter. Upon his arrival he discovered that there have been morale problems within the division and has set up regular channels of communication to alleviate those issues. He feels his staff has appreciated his accessibility and his institution of regular Wednesday communications between himself and the staff. He said the division has established the goal of making the University a leader in the most appropriate use of technology among our peers and beyond.

The issues to which the division is devoting particular attention are:

1. Service excellence. Faculty and others are having to wait for long periods of time before their issues are resolved. The division has a new policy of for the rapid resolution of "tickets" opened by faculty. Faculty "tickets" will be given priority with a stress on a "warm handoff" via chat or phone communication. Diane Jones, Executive Director for ITS Administration (<https://its.umich.edu/about/leadership/diane-jones>) and Bob Jones, Executive Director of Support Services for Information and Technology Services (<https://its.umich.edu/about/leadership/robert-jones>) are leading this initiative. It is CIO Pendse's view that with exceptional service, ITS will be seen as a trusted partner across the University.
2. The location of data. Currently data is stored anywhere and everywhere. In order to empower and enable the use of data, Jim Behm, Executive Director, Enterprise Application Services (<https://its.umich.edu/about/leadership/jim-behm>) and Vijay Thiruvengadam, Executive Director for Information Quest (<https://its.umich.edu/about/leadership/vijay-thiruvengadam>) are leading an initiative that is asking the question: where is our data? The outcome of this initiative is expected to be an enhanced data governance process and the ability to provide our researchers with frictionless access to data.

3. The organization of research computing. Faculty have different needs, but those who need high-performance computing should have ready access to it. Brock Palin, Director of Advanced Research Computing (<https://arc-ts.umich.edu/staff-member/brock-palen/>), and Vijay Thiruvengadam are leading an initiative to provide a user-centric access to High Performance Computing needs.

Professor Atzmon asked about the security of email (recognizing that the University will retain its commitment to Gmail). Chair Marsh asked if Google is better at looking after the security of Gmail than the University. CIO Pendse replied that major software companies such as Google and Microsoft have much greater capability and are thus will always be better at security than the University of Michigan can be. Related to the question about privacy, CIO Pendse noted that that the university has a contract with Google and that Google may only process or otherwise use UMICH account data as required for the purposes of providing services. As a comparison, he noted that when people use personal email to make travel arrangements, those accounts suddenly attract advertisements for places in that country while campus email does not. He also noted that at Brown, where he worked before coming to the University of Michigan, certain faculty requested encrypted email due to the sensitive nature of their work. He said this is something that can be done at the University of Michigan as well. Chair Marsh asked why everyone doesn't have encrypted email. CIO Pendse replied that if someone with an encrypted account forgets their password, the University would not be able to help them reset it. In the current system, the University retains a key to individual accounts to help users get access if they forget a password. He noted that encrypted email is always an option if people want more security. It is also necessary, in his view, to consider the return on investment.

Professor Lippert said that, from her perspective, there needs to be a stronger message about the importance to access to information as a way of generating transparency. She noted that faculty have a notoriously difficult time accessing budgetary information. CIO Pendse said it is important to provide the right kind of transparency and to be conscious of where data resides. He noted that with the right kind of data governance and data stewards in place, the right individuals will be responsible for providing access to data. CIO Pendse gave several examples, such as the Registrar's office making decisions about access to student data and the Provost's office channeling requests related to faculty data. For each core data, a data owner needs always to be consulted.

Librarian Spencer said that it has been her impression that the humanities have been left behind in the accrual of data and wondered if there are differences in scholarly approaches and research techniques that need to be maintained. CIO Pendse replied each field had its own technological needs, and that not all technology is appropriate for all researchers. One person may need technology constantly, while another might have periodic needs. It is also the case that technology has to be accessible—for example, an interactive website that is going to be built for use by people residing in countries that lack rapid connectivity has to be simple and lean in order to be accessed in those conditions.

Librarian Spencer said scholars in some disciplines did not feel the need to share their work electronically and asked if CIO Pendse found that this was atypical. CIO Pendse replied that he did run into reluctance, instancing people who don't wish to share publications because publishers will not allow it. ITS provides resources, but an individual scholar decides how to use those resources.

Professor Beatty mentioned that there has been a move at UM-Dearborn towards lab spaces that encouraged students to bring their own devices to work. One point of a "bring your own device" (BYOD) program is that labs do not have to be updated to have the latest consoles. CIO Pendse said the University supports BYOD (or BYOT 'bring your own things'), including natural language processing devices because efforts to control the diversity of devices will fail. Instead, efforts should be made to work on security challenges. Given the decentralization of the

University of Michigan, the development of spaces where people bring their own technology is advisable. He also noted that it is useful to provide students with network storage since his experience at Brown suggested that students didn't like bringing their laptops everywhere they go. He said that he has been in contact with Carrie Shumaker, CIO for UM-Dearborn.

Professor Schultz asked if CIO Pendse could share information about the nature of the morale problems to which he had alluded. CIO Pendse said he believes the situation is improving but that turmoil with respect to leadership leads to feelings of disenfranchisement, and people worrying about their jobs. He feels that he has helped the situation by making himself accessible to staff, even giving out his personal cellphone number. He also feels that weekly, detailed emails which include information about developments in the division, offer kudos for staff members who are doing well, and remind staff of priorities as well as the fact that there is "one ITS" are helpful in building a supportive and transparent culture. In addition, he has breakfast with staff colleagues so he can to meet people from different groups. During the week of Veterans Day, for instance, he invited self-identified veterans to have breakfast with him, and asked others to join in. New staff members in ITS are welcomed with a small gift and a handwritten note from him upon arrival. People appreciate the personal touch.

Chair Marsh asked how many staff members there are in ITS. CIO Pendse responded that there are 675 spread out over a wide range of building (this is in addition to several thousand employed throughout all units, since colleges have their own IT groups as well).

Professor Schultz recalled that faculty were unhappy with the move to Shared Services, and suggested that excessive centralization could elicit negative responses. He expressed curiosity about CIO Pendse's views concerning the advantages and disadvantages of centralization. Chair Marsh asked how centralized IT is at the present time. CIO Pendse said IT is currently quite decentralized: larger colleges have their own fairly decently sized IT staffs that make their own decisions. In some cases there may need to be decentralization (e.g. with respect to Customer Relations Management Systems); in other cases more centralization could be beneficial (e.g. in-building network support or reducing the number of lecture capture systems that are in use). His priority is to evaluate systems in terms of the value they provide to students and faculty. He shared an example where centralization might provide some value related to networks inside of buildings and a genuine need for greater coordination. Currently, ITS's formal responsibilities stop at the entrance of a building and decentralized IT teams make decisions in buildings. As a result, there are more than 130 different switches in use across campus when we might be able to reduce the number to closer to five. This would enable the University to negotiate at scale with vendors because switches are bulk commodities, but this will mean that units will have to agree to centralized purchasing. He sees the construction of partnerships as being preferable to centralization. In moving forward, he favors "data informed" to "data driven" decision making.

Chair Marsh asked about the upsides and challenges he faces. CIO Pendse said he worries about security on a daily basis, and noted that BYOT introduces its own problems, as people want their own fire walls. On the more exciting side, is the possibility for the University to provide leadership in developing the next generation of classrooms, a subject upon which he has published (<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2017/7/next-generation-classroom-some-random-thoughts>). He recalled the use of technologies at Brown to overcome issues caused by bad weather, making it possible for faculty to use technology and teach from anywhere and to students who are anywhere—even while in flight.

In closing, CIO Pendse shared his belief that our future is very bright and welcomed anyone to reach out to him directly (rpense@umich.edu or 316-619-2167) if it would be helpful to have a follow-up conversation.

4:06: The Agenda was approved

4:07: Discussion of Guest Visit

SACUA members expressed pleasure with CIO Pendse's understanding that people have different levels of comfort with technology, with his faculty experience and his interest in teaching. They expressed a variety of views with respect to centralization and institutional impediments to same.

4:15: Approval Minutes/Announcements

The Minutes for November 5 were approved

Chair Marsh said he has meetings with the President 1:00 pm on November 14 and with the Provost at 9:00 am on November 20. Professor Lippert will join the meeting with the President. Professor Beatty discussed preparations for the Davis, Markert, Nickerson lecture and asked SACUA members to help in distributing the posters a week before the the lecture on November 28. Professor Lippert asked if the lecture will be live streamed. Professor Beatty replied that lecture will be taped and uploaded to YouTube after the lecture. There will be 10 people at the dinner before the lecture including two AFLF members (Professors Moore and Kearfott), who will also join lunch from 12:00-1:00 on the 28<sup>th</sup>. There is space for an additional 14 people to attend the lunch.

4:20: Election of Interim Secretary of the Senate  
Professor Potter was unanimously elected.

4:25 Approval of November 19 Senate Assembly draft agenda

3:15: Approval of Agenda and Minutes

3:20: Announcements

The Senate Assembly has been invited to offer input to the Duderstadt Blue Ribbon Recommendation Letters Panel  
Schlissel at Meeting on December 20  
David Markert Nickerson

3:30: Discussion of Rule Change, Electronic Voting and Attendance for the Senate and Senate Assembly

4:00: Breakout sessions: recommendation letters

4:25: Breakout reports

4:35: Interpretation of Governance Policy (Professor Lippert)

4:45: Unfinished Business

4:50: Matters Arising

Next Senate Assembly Meeting Agenda items

5:00 Adjourn

Senate Assembly members will be asked to record written comments in the break out session and pass them to SACUA members for compilation for the Duderstadt panel. Professor Beatty asked about discussion of the breakout reports. These reports will be reviewed by SACUA and talking points developed for the future. Professor Lippert asked if there would be a vote on the issue of electronic voting, and if the issue would be the same for both the senate and the Senate Assembly. Chair Marsh said there might be a straw vote at the end of the discussion. Additional information

will be provided to all Senate Assembly members outlining the issues of remote participation and remote attendance for both the Senate and Senate Assembly

Professor Lippert would like to receive feedback from faculty on the issue of the referral of governance interpretations of a policy going to Human Resources as opposed to a faculty committee.

The Senate Assembly agenda was approved

4:48: Discussion of electronic voting/remote participation for meetings and actions of Senate Assembly and Senate

Chair Marsh believes this will be good for the Senate, but that there might be unintended consequences of a rule change for the Senate Assembly, which makes quorum most times. Professor Lippert expressed concerns about remote participation at Senate Assembly meetings. Professor Carlos suggested that there be a link to log-in that would only be sent to Senate Assembly members along with person-specific passwords to ensure transparency with respect to people participating remotely. Chair Marsh said that a rules change would not be required to permit remote attendance, but that one would be required for remote voting, and a decision would have to be made about whether votes could be extended after the meeting. Professor Schultz is opposed to leaving voting open after a meeting since it is important to know who is voting. Professor Carlos said that if it is possible to set up technology that will make it clear who is voting at a meeting, it should be able to mirror that for remote voting. Professor Schultz asked for feedback from the faculty leadership at the University of Illinois about their experience is with remote voting and attendance. Chair Marsh said that implementation is dependent upon the availability of technology.

5:00: 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

"...[t]he 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."

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."