

MINUTES from Technology Committee meeting of 3/5/2015

(Agenda items are in *italicized blue*, minutes are in black)

Link to fall 2014 meeting minutes:

<http://bit.ly/1FJ1D93>

1) Campus management of compliance documentation for policy regarding usage of personal computing devices when accessing UWG computer services

Statement of policy (brief)

<http://bit.ly/1FA9Ole>

Statement of procedure (more lengthy):

<http://bit.ly/1w5PELE>

Sample compliance form:

<http://bit.ly/1BIXUHW>

Background:

This policy is intended to show that departments have a process in place to demonstrate that faculty and staff are aware of and in compliance with “Bring Your Own Device” (BYOD) guidelines. To be in compliance departments also need to demonstrate an employee intake and outtake process (for example, if people have sensitive files stored on a personal device then they will need to relinquish those files upon departing UWG). A more streamlined compliance method is being pursued but meanwhile many departments are having all employees fill out the paper version of the compliance acknowledgment and filing these forms. Electronic Signatures can also be used on these documents (i.e., employees can return the electronic MS Word document with their name entered in the appropriate spaces on the form).

Questions:

- How can this compliance notification best be communicated to faculty and staff?
 - Faculty: Send an email to Deans and/or Deans’ secretaries
 - Staff: Check with business or finance to see how best to communicate this info to staff side of campus (maybe business or finance or student affairs has an appropriate list?)
- Can this compliance piece be part of overall acceptance procedure when being assigned a westga.edu/gmail account? (e.g., part of the Personnel Action Request -- PAR -- form)
- Is there a way to make this part of existing compliance modules (e.g., part of Risk Compliance Module)?
 - Note: If this goes into the training module it would most likely appear in this fall’s compliance module.

Action:

- Kathy will check into whether past compliance needs to be kept for records retention purposes?
- **(Update 3-17-15)** Kathy has contacted Tara Pearson, campus records retention expert, and records need to be retained for 3 years as per BOR rules: <http://bit.ly/18BzLlu>
- Kathy will talk to Matt Jordan to ask about incorporating this into Risk Management compliance module.
- **(Update 3-17-15)** Kathy has contacted the Center for Business Excellence about adding BYOD policy into annual training for next fall.

2) Departmental management of online student course evaluations

Background:

Computer Science is using their own system on Moodle for running student course evaluations.

- Moodle is open source: code can be altered and extended (or removed). There is no guarantee of consistency of design or features on ongoing basis.
- There has been in-house CS development of a module for recording student evaluations but without everyone knowing the source code there is a potential for vulnerabilities to be exploited.
 - *Note:* It is not seen that there's a problem with using Moodle for CS courses, just the usage of Moodle for student evaluations.
- There is a loophole in the authentication in that there is no way to assure that the users filling-in evaluations are actually the people reflected in the surveys.
 - People could impersonate students to enter or change data.
 - There are possible conflicts of interest because of these vulnerabilities.
- **Faculty Handbook** indicates that all student evaluations must be done in a defined and consistent manner (typically classes with any face-to-face component will use Scantron and all online classes will use an electronic survey system. The Scantron forms are processed by ITS and the electronic surveys are facilitated by UWG Distance Learning).

Relevant Faculty Handbook excerpt:

- ... "In June of 1996 the Faculty Senate passed a policy of centralizing the form and procedure for course evaluation. As of that date, all faculty must use the Scantron form titled University of West Georgia / Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for any class that has an enrollment of five or more students. ... All classes must be evaluated in the final week of each semester... The evaluation instrument is to be delivered during the last week of class, and it should be administered by a student or faculty proxy, not by the faculty member teaching the class. The instructions for the proctor are included in the envelope. Once the forms have been

completed, the proctor shall turn them back in to the departmental office. If the class is being taught at a remote site, the instructor should provide the proctor with a stamped envelope addressed to the departmental office that the student can drop in the mail. The completed evaluation forms are not to be delivered to the instructor of the class...

At the end of the semester, these Scantron forms will be sent to Instructional Technology Services (ITS) for processing and returned to the department to file...."

Action:

Collecting and maintaining student evaluations in a Moodle system that is also administered by a subset of departmental faculty appears to create a conflict of interest and provides potential to undermine the data integrity. The Technology Committee would like to refer this issue to the Rules Committee and will consult with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to determine the proper procedural method to make this referral.

3) Consolidating campus approach to online journal publishing

Background:

It is not believed that anyone on campus has a particularly successful method in place or choice of platform for doing electronic journal publishing. The sense of the Technology Committee is that campus may want to consider this issue in a more holistic manner.

Advantages of this approach could include the following:

- Making it easier for people on campus to publish by creating a set of "core competencies" in electronic journal publishing
- Promoting UWG student, staff, and faculty work to the community at large
- Including consideration of e-publishing capabilities when selecting a new campus CMS

Action:

To be determined. We may want to bring this idea to the attention of the Faculty Senate or simply share it with the President and Provost.

4) Marketplace alternative --

No additional discussion

5) New Chair for Technology Committee

This will be determined in April after departmental Faculty Senate elections

Updates (as needed)--

Selection of new CMS for campus

ITS is working on an RFP that divides the project into two main interlocking pieces, design/usability and code/functionality. Funding for project is still not completely resolved but President Marrero wants campus to be ready with the RFP should end-of-year funding become available. When the process gets to the stage of vendor selection there will be demonstrations that involve or invite various departments for their participation.

Evaluation of campus computer lab needs

Background:

Kathy and Blake mentioned that there are requests for new computer labs on campus but current level of Tech Fee funding is mostly directed to maintaining support, upgrades, equipment rotation, etc. of existing labs. In addition, there are no formal guidelines for determining when a lab would be eligible for Tech Fee funding. What will the University do when Tech Fee money is no longer sufficient to pay for our ongoing programs that are now an integral and expected part of the university's offerings and capabilities? For example, a product that GeoSciences began funding through Tech Fee twelve years ago has now developed to become a critical tool for teaching in their department and is considered to be a standard offering. What if there were no longer sufficient Tech Fee money to finance this resource?

Action:

The Technology Committee will inquire at the next Executive Committee meeting as to the appropriate way to refer the issue of Tech Fee funding and University budgeting to the Budget Committee.

Current ITS projects of a strategic nature that need faculty input (e.g., Portal and campus computer labs)

The need of a portal is being reconsidered as part of UWG's CMS selection. The BOR has informed UWG that we have a license commitment through 2017 to maintain the existing portal. Ideally a new CMS vendor would have a portal option but it's not necessarily going to be a mandatory item on RFP.