*The overarching recommendation for revision of AR 10:2 "University Information Technology Committees" is to **<u>completely discard</u>** the existing AR 10:2 and draft a brand new one.*

_____

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The IT committee structure should be overhauled in a significant fashion to allow for greater input from and interaction with the user community. In this recommendation, the number of AR-specified committees is reduced from three to one. The current three AR-specified committees (Information Technology Coordinating Committee, Academic Computing Committee, Enterprise Systems Committee), and any existing subcommittees thereof, would be replaced by a single larger **IT Advisory Committee** drawn from a campus-wide constituency (ideally all colleges represented) as the only AR-specified committee. The focus of this new single **IT Advisory Committee** would be on issues of user "needs, innovation, and prioritization" of IT infrastructure and services.

This larger **IT Advisory Committee** would establish appropriate standing subcommittees (e.g. Research, Teaching and Learning, Enterprise Systems); and it would empanel ad hoc temporary subcommittees as needed. The structure for these subcommittees (standing and ad hoc), including their membership and charges, would be created and maintained by the **IT Advisory Committee** through internal mechanisms, policies, and procedures and would not be formally specified in the AR. The membership of the subcommittees would be drawn from the **IT Advisory Committee**, with additional, external members added for their expertise specific to each subcommittee and its charge. A *Teaching and Learning Subcommittee* would assume the role of the current AR-specified Academic Computing Committee. An *Enterprise Systems Subcommittee* would address needs, innovation, and priority setting in a way that the current AR-specified Enterprise Systems Committee does not. And a *Research Subcommittee* would fill the oft-noted lack of a Research "needs, innovation, and priorities" group in the current AR. Temporary ad hoc subcommittees would be created, as they have been in the past, to accommodate large projects (such as adoption of a new LMS), or to work on focused initiatives (such as the ITS strategic plan).

Groups involved in "daily operations" would continue to exist as necessary outside of the AR, for example, the Dean's IT Group. As another example of this, the group currently assembled under the old AR as the Enterprise Systems Committee could continue to function outside of the new AR as a "daily operations group" or "working group" for enterprise systems (the role that it has largely filled in its current functioning), while a newly formed *Enterprise Systems Subcommittee* of the new **IT Advisory Committee** would address needs, innovation, and priority setting. These "daily operations groups" (e.g. Dean's IT group, enterprise systems working group) would have normal channels of reporting and communication with ITS as necessary for their role in supporting and maintaining the on-the-ground daily operations of campus IT. Communication of information from these groups to the new **IT Advisory Committee** and back would be performed by ITS members who would sit in an ex officio capacity both on these "daily operations groups" and on the new **IT Advisory Committee**.

The membership of the **IT Advisory Committee** would reflect the desire for more robust faculty input – the large majority of the total committee membership would be faculty, ideally representative of all colleges. Several members of ITS would be appointed to the **IT Advisory Committee** ex officio (importantly to provide links to major divisions of ITS and other groups involved in IT "daily operations" such as the Dean's IT Group, or an enterprise working group). It would also be important to have 1-2 student members on the committee to ensure representation of the students' perspective across the work of the **IT Advisory Committee**.

<u>**SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS**</u>

The following provides specific recommendations (and some questions) pertaining to each category found in the current AR 10:2 (these categories will presumably be the same for the new AR).

TITLE: University Information Technology Advisory Committee.

INTRODUCTION (to AR)
- to provide a channel for active input from faculty to ITS for identifying needs, guiding innovation, and prioritizing development of ITS infrastructure and services.
- and to facilitate the exchange of information between ITS and its users regarding university-wide computing and data communication needs and interests in research, instruction, and administration.
- university creates a standing advisory committee: the University IT Advisory Committee.

MEMBERSHIP (of committee)
- Broadly representative of all colleges (currently 19 colleges [counting the new Honors College]).
  - Is weighted representation necessary to account for college size differentials? (i.e., multiple representatives from larger colleges?, perhaps combining smaller colleges? – see Graduate Council as example of this: http://www.research.uky.edu/gs/Council/members.html).
  - Faculty of all title series and levels of appointment would be eligible.
  - At least two student members (one undergraduate, one graduate).
  - Appointment terms should be staggered and normally for three years, except that the appointments of students should be for one year. One-time reappointments are permitted (for a total of six consecutive years on the committee for faculty, two consecutive years for students [or should student members not be eligible for reappointment?]).
- Ex officio members.
  - CIO and CIO UK Healthcare are ex officio members.
  - Chair of Senate Technology Committee is ex officio on this IT Advisory Committee (and IT Advisory Committee chair becomes ex officio on Senate Technology Committee).
  - CIO appoints a specific set of ITS ex officio members (ITS division heads?).
- Chair of committee.
  - *Old AR 10:2 states:* "The President shall designate the chair from the faculty members."
  - Depending on the process of membership selection (see "questions" section immediately below) a different mechanism for selection of chair should be considered (though should still be selected from among the faculty members of the committee):
    - CIO-designated?
    - Elected by the committee members from amongst the membership?

Questions on membership selection:
- *Does the fact that this is an AR (under the president's purview) necessarily mean that members must be officially appointed by the president, or can the CIO appoint members, or simply directly elected?*
- *Do we retain a nomination process or install an election process?*
- *If a nomination process is retained, who nominates?*
    - *Senate Council? (current process) [has not always been optimal].*
    - *Senate Technology Committee? (channeled through Senate Council).*
    - *ITS? (potentially assisted/vetted by Senate Technology Committee and Senate Council).*
    - *Colleges? (Dean's offices?; College Faculty Councils?) [not recommended].*
    - *Some combination of the above?*
- *If an election process is installed, what is the process? (does an election process assume direct election with no need for subsequent appointment [by president or other – see first bullet in this section]?)*
    - *Campus-wide open elections with college-based candidates each voted on by their own college in a single campus-wide election cycle? (if a college's seat(s) is filled, then no candidate/election for that college in a given year – Graduate Council elections seem to be currently run this way?).*
    - *College-based open elections with each college filling its individual college's seat(s) in college-specific, coordinated election cycles? (each individual college is responsible for tracking terms and electing new members from its ranks – University Senate elections are currently run this way?).*
    - *Would elections (of either sort described above) be run by ITS?*

RESPONSIBILITIES (of committee)
- provides advice and recommendations to the university Chief Information Officer (CIO) relative to broad, university-wide IT policies, procedures, and directions.
- responsibilities include:
    - establishing priorities for issues that cut across the enterprise, including current needs, future development, innovation, and enhancement in the University's enterprise-wide research, instructional, and administrative computing infrastructure and services.
    - recommending and reviewing significant IT policies and procedures that cut across the various university units.
    - serving as liaisons across the university to facilitate communication and to collect input from the faculty and staff regarding information technology policies and procedures, infrastructure, and services.
- *Old AR 10:2 states:* "At the request of the President or the President's designee, the committee also may be asked to consider specific information-technology-related problems or proposals."
    - Should this be expanded out to include the EVPFA, the Provost, the VPR, others?