

**Academic Assembly**  
**February 7, 2011**  
**1:30-3:30pm, STCN 130**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Karen Feldt, John Strait, Francisco Guerrero, Kristen Shuyler, Katherine Raichle, Allison Henrich, Mark Maddox, Rob Rutherford, Mary Graham, Jeremy Stringer, Chips Chipalkatti, Sonora Jha, Maryann Bozzette, Mary Rose Bumpus, Brenda Broussard, Chuck Lawrence, William Kangas, Jason Wirth, Jacquelyn Miller, John Weaver, Vinay Datar.

**Guests:** Bob Dullea (*Vice President for University Planning and Vice Provost*), Randall Horton (*Assistant Professor, Psychology*)

1. **Welcome**
2. **Minutes from 2-7-11 were reviewed and accepted.**
3. **Technology Update (Bob Dullea)**
  - a. Current contract with Sunguard expires June 30, 2011.
  - b. Put together a working group (including external consultants) to identify and pursue technology options.
    1. The response indicated reasonable satisfaction with services.
    2. Structural technology and training were areas of challenge.
    3. Recognizing cost and difficulty of pursuing options of outsourcing.
  - c. Seattle University wanted a 3-year contract with SunGuard.
    1. Intensively evaluate satisfaction and additional opportunities.
    2. Provides time to look at other options and investigate service improvement.
  - d. **Final Decision:** 4-year contract, which is longer than SU wanted and shorter than Sunguard wanted. The starting point is the same services and the same price.
    1. Re-working of the contract terms and conditions.
    2. Limited right to terminate contract for change in control (bankruptcy, merger, etc.) after 2 years but prior to 4 years. Cannot terminate for convenience.
    3. Another important change: right to reduce the scope of services, up to 40 percent of the contract.
    4. Under the new contract, there are new requirements for user satisfaction surveys. Discussions start this spring about what that will look like.
    5. The new contract has better contract escalation provisions to keep cost of the contract down over 4 years.
  - e. The core negotiation strategy was to delineate the cost of services in any way possible (i.e. cost per unit for email addresses). This allows SU to be more demanding of accountability. Under the new contract, if a request doesn't fall under the contract, they will decline. This was due to the senior staff critique that their work was more directed toward fixing squeaky wheel as opposed to more important large-scope issues with a long-term impact.
  - f. The new contract requires a much more effective ongoing governance process.
    1. Technology governance processes are difficult. We need dedicated resources in-house.
    2. Large committees that distribute work around the table don't work well for technology governance.

- g. **New Position:** Chief Technology Officer position needs to be developed to help guide governance and oversee Sunguard for planning, governance, contract administration, and accountability. Poorly administered contracts leak about 20% of value.
    1. During the FY12 budgeting process new funding was allocated to technology.
    2. Funding for CIO position.
    3. Expanded technology to learning commons (more computers, more servers, more media-supported classrooms).
    4. Funded application support (Mediasite business automation process to forward documents, Enrollment services).
    5. Expanded audiovisual support to include evenings and weekends.
    6. Moving toward 24/7 Helpdesk, which will also include students. Less human connection, but always available.
    7. Funding to support structural technology: classroom improvements, curriculum developments in online programs (especially Nursing).
  - h. **New technology fee** of \$100.00 per quarter for full-time students and \$65.00 for part-time students.
    - i. A concern was raised about needing new equipment for the projectors was brought up. In response, even our best classrooms (such as HUNT 110) are not state-of-the-art and need to be brought up to standard. What is the classroom of the future? We need a process to decide where the money goes to provide greatest added value. This discussion demonstrates the need for an internal CIO position to handle these issues
    - j. Under current contract, intellectual property (something technological that is developed on campus) is owned by Sunguard. Under new contract, it is owned by SU. Please talk more about intellectual property issue.
- 4. Faculty Technology Committee** (Randall Horton)
- a. Faculty Technology Committee will be a subcommittee of AcA. Seeking a coherent and responsive relationship between AcA and tech subcommittee for better flow of information.
  - b. FTC will assess the success of the new technology contract.
  - c. Support for Angel discontinued 2014. Need new provider for online learning. We can support online learning and keep costs down with effective investment in technology.
  - d. Historically, SU has not imposed a lot of fees. The ultimate decision for a technology fee was based upon the need for a completely separate fund. The fund can be cleanly (quickly, less accounting than if rolled into tuition) put toward uses.
    1. Students need to see a change in the use of technology and instruction as a direct result of paying the fee.
    2. There is also a question of variable technology use amongst faculty. Previous discussions on universal laptops failed because they wouldn't be utilized universally. New FTC group will continue this discussion of faculty and technology.
  - e. Previously, there was a tech committee but it was not permanent. The proposed new FTC will be a derivative of the AcA community but also have direct faculty input. New FTC will modify charter of the main faculty body. The process is: draft a proposal, move to the committee, revise the charter, become a permanent fixture that reports to AcA on critical issues.
  - f. The FTC is already a standing committee with volunteer members. The rationale for making a it subcommittee of AcA is to provide clarification to the committee on governance and functions. Currently, they reports to several different areas (Director of Learning Technology, OIT, Strategic Planning) vetting issues such as the technology budget, how to prioritize spending, classrooms to upgrade, technology issues like plagiarism detection software, and legal issues on proprietary content. However, the

current committee is not able to represent broad faculty views and opinions. There is a perception that FTC is too quick to purchase new technology.

- g. The new FTC will report to AcA to discuss big tech issues like distance learning, ANGEL, and how to fit the growth of technology with the SU mission.
- h. The new FTC will be staffed in part by two representatives from AcA, the new CIO, and a proportional representation of faculty from the colleges and library. This structure will increase the faculty voice and allow them to directly and formally contribute to the technology discussion.
- i. Tasks of the committee would be the nuts and bolts work of budget recommendations, vetting new technology, communicating around problems with OIT, and service. AcA can charge the committee with additional responsibilities. Feedback from students and faculty can be dealt with on a smaller scale in the FTC, who then decide what to bring to AcA.
- j. The faculty requirement of the FTC puts a burden on the smaller schools. Perhaps the charter can be modified to read that each school will have at least one faculty on the committee, and can have two if they would like.
- k. The faculty requirement started off with a smaller number, but some of the projects that are taken on require the committee to break up and form subcommittees dedicated to specific projects.
- l. Matteo Ricci should be included as well. GSA and ASSU would also like representation.
- m. There is debate over the length of the term of the chair of the new FTC. The Current chair serves two years. There is still debate over how long the officer will serve. There was a suggestion to have the current chair continue in their position for a year while the new chair serves under them to learn the position.
- n. The timeframe of the meetings needs to be determined as the committee works out kinks.
- o. The existing members will not automatically roll into the new committee; however, quite a bit of standing membership will probably step forward to be on new committee.