

2021 – 2022 Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee Annual Report

This report was largely written by Delton Daigle with significant contributions from Kevin Dunayer. The opinions contained within are our own based on observations throughout the past academic year. The remainder of our committee made important contributions to committee work throughout the year but are not responsible for this report. I take personal responsibility for any errors contained herein.

Delton T. Daigle
Associate Professor
Schar School of Policy and Government

Contents

Committee membership:.....	1
Overview:	1
Highlights from the 3 full TPC meetings:	2
Redesigning George Mason’s Technology Policy Committees to be both more Responsive and Representative.....	2
Business Outside of Full TPC Meetings.....	3
4 Questions Asked by the Faculty Senate.....	4
Appendix A – Communication with Provost Ginsberg	7
1/19/2022 (In addition to Provost Ginsberg, this email was also distributed to Kevin Borek, Melissa Broekelman-Post, Joy Taylor Charlie Kreitzer, and E. Shelley Reid).....	7
2/7/2022 To Provost Ginsberg specifically	8
Appendix B: Recommended Faculty Senate Taskforce	9
Appendix C: Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee Charge.....	10
Appendix D – the “Old” ITS Governance Structure Webpage:.....	11
Appendix E – The “New” ITS Governance Structure Webpage:.....	13

Committee membership:

Delton T Daigle ddaigle@gmu.edu (Co-Chair)
Kevin S Dunayer kdunayer@gmu.edu (Co-Chair)
Jessica Matthews jmatthe2@gmu.edu
Laura L Miller llmiller@gmu.edu
Lee Andrew Solomon lsolomo@GMU.EDU
Geraldine G Walther gwalthe@GMU.EDU
Amy Hutchison ahutchi9@GMU.EDU

Overview:

The Technology Policy Committee did not issue an annual report for academic year 2020-2021. During the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic many new technology policies were emerging at a rapid pace and often considered in much greater depth by other groups on campus. For instance, as a member of the GMU Instructional Continuity group, I can observe that we in the IC took on many of the emerging classroom issues including those of a technological nature and ended out being the main sounding board for many ITS initiatives. I was a Provost appointee the TPC in 2020-2021, joining in January. The frequency with which we convened simply did not match the university’s pace of change.

With the election of a new TPC this year I was hopeful that ITS would work with us to fulfill our charge as the primary faculty point of contact, communication, and consultation. It is strongly believed that when faculty coordinates with the administrative units the outcomes will be more thoroughly considered in a way that benefits the university the greatest. Classroom practitioners

who have a vested long-term interest in the success of new initiatives and the experience in the classroom to have a sense as to both what is needed and what is desired should always be at the table when an institution of higher learning contemplates changes to the flow, storage, and dissemination of information. With that in mind, the TPC convened three times as a full group over 2021-2022 (10/14/2021, 11/3/2021, and 01/19/2022) and had several fruitful email exchanges over recommendations outlined below. It should be noted that all requests for information by the TPC from ITS have gone unanswered apart from agreeing to meet with us 3 times. This includes a repeated request to see the Accenture Report which has yet to be shared with the Faculty Senate. It is proposed by this report that the Provost's Office hire (from the current Mason Faculty) a 50% Faculty/ITS Ombudsperson who can serve as a coordinator between faculty and their inclusion on ITS committees, Faculty Senate and TPS, and ITS and the executive offices. This position is discussed below.

Highlights from the 3 full TPC meetings:

- 10/14/2021 - Concerns about Eduroam implementation and desire to sunset Mason-Secure.
- Election of co-chairs (Dunayer and Daigle)
- 11/4/2021 - Eduroam update – sunset of Mason-Secure rolled back until Summer 2022 due to FACULTY FEEDBACK.
-Microsoft InTune deployment update.
-Discussion of the end of the contract for Blackboard (Feb-2023).
*** Note – a pilot of Blackboard Ultra was proposed in the Instructional Continuity group. There was a lack of support for the roll-out of the pilot with faculty being grossly under compensated for participation and the pilot was offered without examining other software alternatives. This was mentioned within the TPC, as was a discussion about the specific role the TPC should play if major decisions were being made without Faculty Senate consultation.
- 01/19/2022 -Eduroam update – sunset of Mason-Secure put on hold indefinitely.
-Residence Hall Wi-Fi being provided by new third party provider Apogee (noteworthy as faculty and staff may not have access to Wi-Fi in Residence Hall areas.
-MS InTune now deployed on all University owned Windows machines. Discussion evolving on network security vs asset ownership.
-Discussion of the “Instructional Technology Roadmap” as envisioned by ITS. It is ITS’s position that they will be the initiators and coordinators of technology innovation conversations with the stakeholder groups they feel are relevant. Moreover, ITS has expressed an interest, through the Accenture Report (again, yet to be shared with faculty) to centralize all university software assets.

In our report to the Faculty Senate based on the 01/19/2022 meeting, we also included the following proposal:

Redesigning George Mason’s Technology Policy Committees to be both more Responsive and Representative

There are many committees at GMU – too many some may feel, with too much crosstalk and overlap. The technology policy committee is aware of that (see Appendix A for a quick survey that does not include several newer technology groups active and being proposed by the administrative offices), but it stands alone among the various university technology committees

as a voice of faculty in the influencing decisions that directly impact the day-to-day activity of university faculty. We are at a point in our university's development where shifts to increased online education and major shifts in software and hardware choices need to be increasingly supported by and advocated by the practitioners directly using the technology assets.

We (the TPC) propose the formation of a limited term taskforce with the charge to inventory and recommend consolidation of the committee structure under a framework that has substantial faculty participation and representation at all stages of planning and decision making. The TPC, with collaboration from Lisa Billingham and members of ITS leadership, will draft a charge for the taskforce and propose membership for presentation at the March full faculty Senate meeting.

Over the long term, we hope that by streamlining our technology committees we can more clearly communicate with all stakeholders about the goals and solutions being considered, solicit feedback, and build consensus on university directions more effectively. Only through active engagement with faculty in major technology directions (such as a new LMS) can ITS work with us to satisfy our goals of effectively teaching and conducting research.

Business Outside of Full TPC Meetings

Outside of our full meetings, several developments took place via email with the TPC or in smaller meetings with Daigle and Dunayer and Joy Taylor, Lisa Billingham, and Melissa Broeckelman-Post.

11/9/2021 - Lisa-Billingham, Joy Taylor, and Delton Daigle met to discuss the Charge of the Senate TPC as well as new proposed Technology committees largely made up of Administration personnel. As these groups were proposed in the IC, there was dissatisfaction with the lack of faculty (teaching, research, and administrative faculty) on the proposed committees. It is unclear if the administrative groups that proposed the committees (such as ATAC) have convened regardless, absent faculty (or at least absent representation from the faculty senate and the TPC). It is believed that these structures, proposed or active, contradict the structure and principles of faculty/shared governance as laid out in the faculty handbook. At most, if such committees existed, they should report out to faculty senate and/or have representation from faculty senate that reports both to TPC and the Faculty Senate as a whole.

Of note, the issue of representative committee composition also came up in the IC in late November 2021 when we were presented a pair ITS planning structures that were largely devoid of faculty engagement outside of those already working in Central Admin, and there were opposition to these proposed committee structures from numerous college and school representatives in the IC. It is noted that in the ITS proposals there was no mention of faculty senate or TPC.

03/08/2021 After agreeing to delay the call for the ITS consultation/governance/collaboration task force above (which was hoped to be presented in February to O&O, and the Faculty Senate for the meetings on Feb. 9th and 23rd), we recirculated among the TPC our recommended task force charge. While there was widespread support for the task force there were suggestions as to how to make such a task force more inclusive, including the inclusion of staff, undergraduate student, and graduate student representation. While I personally am not certain the Faculty Senate is the best body to convene such a broad task force, there is an awareness within the TPC that shifts in ITS assets and policy

impact a broader community than just GMU faculty. Additionally, there were concerns about whether the Faculty Senate, if the task force was approved by O&O, would have the time remaining in the semester to carry out its charge.

04/05/2023 Lisa Billingham (O&O), Melissa Broekelman-Post (Senate Chair), Joy Taylor (ITS), Kevin Dunayer (TPS Co-Chair), and Delton Daigle (TPS Co-Chair) met to discuss proposed task force and TPS goals regarding collaborating with ITS. Joy Taylor (ITS). Joy indicated that ITS had altered its website to reflect new ITS Governance structure. It should be noted that the new structure no longer includes a relationship with the Faculty Senate nor the TPS. We were advised that all of the ITS projects were available on the ITS dashboard (<https://its.gmu.edu/working-with-its/ppmo/projects-dashboard/>) and that they would be onboarding a new PPMO and PM Framework that will solve many communication issues.

We were advised that Kevin Borek would be happy to meet with TPS for a final report, but when we attempted to schedule such a meeting we were advised that Joy Taylor, Charlie Spann, and Kevin Borek had no available time to meet with us until sometime in May (long after the Faculty Senate reports are due).

4 Questions Asked by the Faculty Senate

Given the above summary of our activities, our responses to the Faculty Senate Questions are as follows:

1. During the past calendar year has the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President (or their respective offices) announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

We were never contacted by the President or CIO directly. There have been numerous initiatives promoted or changes to existing IT policies that the Faculty Senate, in our opinion, should have been Privy to. Yes, we believed we should have been contacted. Our committee believes that it would be helpful to have support at the executive level building an improved collaborative relationship between ITS and the Faculty Senate and the TPS. It is felt that our communication with Provost Ginsberg was fruitful, and likely conversations he had with the CIO was responsible for Joy Taylor's outreach to TPS in Feb/March and the meeting held in early April. The CIO never directly responded to requests for information, nor has the Accenture report been released which we feel strongly impacts Colleges and Schools directly.

2. Did your Committee seek information or input from the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President or members of their staffs? If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

On both January 19th the TPS reached out to both ITS and the Provosts office with several proposals to fall within the scope of a proposed task force designed to better facilitate ITS communication and collaboration with GMU faculty and the faculty senate. On February 7th the Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee suggested to Provost Ginsberg it intended to propose initiatives regarding faculty governance and ITS at the Faculty Senate meeting in late February. The initiatives main goals are to establish better faculty participation on new and

existing ITS projects (see Appendices below). The Provost responded to TPS co-chair Daigle in a very timely and supportive manner. It is our understanding that the Provost reached out to the CIO and through a staff member, the CIO sought to better understand what our task force was trying to achieve. They asked that we defer our call for a task force until after we meet. We met finally on April 5th as outlined above, with a promise we would meet again with the CIO, but as mentioned the proposed meeting date is to be scheduled after the final Faculty Senate annual reports are due.

3. Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost, Senior Vice President and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

Our committee is charged with collaborating, coordinating, and consulting with ITS primarily. There is strong evidence that ITS has been reluctant to share information with the TPS, or even recognize that faculty should have any role at all in determining what the scope and plans are for information technology management and oversight. We have heard it argued that many campus IT systems do not impact faculty and thus we need not be consulted.

We would first like to remind ITS that a UNIVERSITY is at its core an institution of higher LEARNING and RESEARCH – the learning is facilitated by faculty and the research is conducted by faculty. We are led by faculty at the highest levels – both President Washington and Provost Ginsberg are faculty deeply experienced in teaching and research. Almost all hardware and software is involved in this enterprise and the ones that are not directly involved support the enterprise indirectly. The intellectual property we protect is OUR intellectual property, the students we admit and hopefully graduate are OUR students, the benefits HR administrators are OUR benefits, the grants administration systems are to administer OUR grants, the alumni network is a network of OUR former students, and even the workflow that ITS seeks to optimize is done to support OUR mission. We could go on here, but the University should be aware that the relationship between faculty and ITS is fractured and ITS seems to be actively working to sever that breach.

ITS need to engage faculty Senate by responding to requests for information. ITS needs to prioritize its meetings with the Faculty Senate and TPC. ITS needs to be proactive in reaching out to the Faculty Senate in requesting input at the very beginning of projects.

It is noted that the bandwidth to communicate to Faculty Senate and the chairs of TPC is far greater than our capacity to provide information in the opposite direction, yet we are relatively stunned by the singularity of that information flow. Perhaps that is part of the problem and there is a solution in that problem. It is not my desire to unfairly paint previous TPS committees as underperforming, they certainly were not. The relative bandwidth of a full-time faculty member serving on a university committee is small given the other demands upon their time and the relatively low weight that committee work is given in P&T processes or additional financial compensation decisions. That said, the relationship with faculty and ITS has always been poor in the 11 years I have been at GMU, but I do not view that relationship as improving on our current trajectory. Faculty have little incentive to do the very heavy lifting necessary to be true collaborators with a department as large and complex as ITS, and ITS will keep growing their department and taking on new projects independent of faculty collaboration believing that this is the way IT departments operate and have always operated at GMU. This is wasteful and shortsighted in my opinion – the process cannot be more important than the product – especially if the product is world class research and education. Those directly involved in the creation of the actual outputs of a university have more than a role here, they have an obligation to engage. But

that engagement is not within any faculty member's job description and as a result ITS has operated with a rather free reign the whole time I have been at Mason. I believe we can do better.

As a result, I propose the creation of Faculty Technology Ombudsperson or some other such position for an individual who is responsible for working to mend this relationship as at least 50% of their workload (the other 50% must be remaining in the classroom – this individual needs to stay grounded in the reality of teaching at a large modern RI). The person would spend much of the time in ITS meetings with the CIO at both the executive and department levels with the remainder of the time assisting the chair(s) of TPS draft and prioritize TPS agenda items and assist in unpacking the complexities of ITS proposals and projects to Faculty Senate. The same individual could coordinate for the recruitment of faculty (from the general full-time faculty pool preferably) to serve on the many ITS planning groups where faculty is either absent altogether or underrepresented. I think through the creation of such a faculty liaison GMU could dramatically improve both vertical and horizontal communication, and likely save thousands, if not millions of dollars in IT expenditure by aiding the procedures that ensure the goals of the university faculty are met in a way that conforms to the safest and most secure information structures possible. I am of the opinion that this individual should be hired through the Provost's Office.

4. Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President, Provost, Senior Vice President, or their staff.

Regardless of what the President and Provost's Office do to work to repair the relationship between the GMU faculty and ITS, the Faculty Senate and the TPS remain committed to engagement with ITS.

It should be noted that Daigle and Dunayer have both been invited to serve on the "Executive Team" of the upcoming Learning Management System RFP project, and Daigle has agreed to serve on a committee to go through an RFP to replace the GMU OIEP assessment software.

Appendix A – Communication with Provost Ginsberg

1/19/2022 (In addition to Provost Ginsberg, this email was also distributed to Kevin Borek, Melissa Broekelman-Post, Joy Taylor Charlie Kreitzer, and E. Shelley Reid)

Hello Everyone,

Part of the discussion at today's Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee identified the need to develop clear collaborative goals for where our technology resources will be allocated in both the near and distant term. While we as a university have many committees (too many as you all probably agree), I am recommending that we create one more with a very clear mandate and duration.

I propose we form a task force that is charged with helping ITS develop a roadmap and framework (with timelines) that relies heavily on extensive faculty consultation for the recommended directions the university hopes to take in terms of instructional software. I am hopeful that such a taskforce could report out and disband by the conclusion of Spring 2022. Consistent with that goal, it is hoped that we could:

- Engage faculty in focus groups on instructional software preferences.
- Poll faculty about utilization, expectations, and preferences.
- Probe schools and colleges about software needs at a level deeper than the forthcoming Accenture report.
- Develop a timeline on the future of Mason's LMS agreement for Blackboard (and potential subsequent replacement as the contract concludes currently in Feb. 2023 – but could be extended).
- Develop a roadmap that links the ITS goals with the broader goals of the Provost's Office in terms of a future Portfolio of Choice GMU experience.

Both Kevins and Joy were participants of today's meeting and can fill in any goals we identified that I may have omitted. It would be my hope that we could assemble the task force relatively quickly, and that where needed we receive institutional support up to and including possibly contracting outside the university to aid in the collection of data and reporting of findings.

I believe the next step would be to identify a small task force to begin developing timelines and goals, reporting back on a constrained schedule to prepare the university for the next step. The task force in my opinion should be balanced between teaching faculty and the various administrative units.

I hope that is enough to get the process rolling.

Delton Daigle and Kevin Dunayer
Co-Chairs – GMU Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee

NOTE: Provost Ginsberg responded very favorably to this email appeal, and for the broader push for faculty/shared governance in general. His response was not included out of respect for the privacy of a person's thoughts that are not my own nor those of the TPC committee membership.

2/7/2022 To Provost Ginsberg specifically

Hi Mark,

I just wanted to reach out because I think that there may be miscommunication about goals and intentions coming from me regarding faculty governance and ITS. Likely that is my fault for having the terrible habit of not proofing my own emails and doing a poor job of it when I do. Regardless, my goal is to get greater faculty representation and participation on all ITS related committees (of which there are too many), and preferably not faculty with direct ties to Central Admin. Moreover, the committee work done that examines potential shifts to policies, hardware acquisition, software licensing, ownership and management of assets, etc. needs to, in my mind, be reported out and discussed in a systematic transparent manner to the faculty as a whole, and I believe the Faculty Senate is that forum. I believe this is necessary for three primary reasons:

1. Having a faculty engage with decision making and providing input at all steps of the process is critical for both getting buy-in (which then facilitates better transition implementation), and it is a way to ensure there is both horizontal and vertical information flow.
2. By ensuring that active classroom faculty, external to central admin, are part of the decision-making processes is one way we as an institution can avoid the pitfalls of groupthink addled decision structures – and thus likely make wiser decisions.
3. With an awareness of the Benjamin Ginsberg argument in “The Fall of Faculty”, direct faculty engagement maintains faculty governance structures and reinforces the critical link faculty have to their institutions. I fear that we may be at a threshold where incoming Assistants know little of the administration of the university, and thus more and more university leadership will transition to a corporatized professional management model. Faculty and their intellectual property will be further commodified, damaging the university structure further. As a result, I recommend at least 1/3 of faculty committee members be Assistants between 3rd year and tenure, or term Assistants in their 4th year of contract and beyond.

While I am a strong believer in what you have been communicating to faculty via the Provost’s newsletter, that communication structure is exclusively top-down. By broadening faculty participation, not only will faculty remain engaged and informed, but you will also be better informed (and frankly, I think this is one of the greatest benefits of a committee like IC).

As a result, I plan to present to faculty senate a recommendation to form a limited term task force to present recommendations on the University committee structure, narrowly, as it relates to ITS and Technology Policy. It is my hope that such a task force will recommend eliminating several unused committees, while promoting a recommendation to university leadership that faculty (again faculty external to Central Admin) have a much greater role in these committees moving forward. UOTF in my mind was an excellent example of precisely this sort of arrangement, and I strongly believe that faculty participation made for a much-improved final product.

I hope this clarifies where I am going with this. At the end of the day, University leadership can receive Senate recommendations and choose its own path, but I believe that is a path best shared with faculty and that is what I am attempting to promote. You were the one who gave me this voice – I suspect you intended that I use it.

Best regards,

Del

NOTE: Provost Ginsberg responded very favorably to this email appeal, and for the broader push for faculty/shared governance in general. His response was not included out of respect for the privacy of a person’s thoughts that are not my own nor those of the TPC committee membership.

Appendix B: Recommended Faculty Senate Taskforce

Short Term Faculty Senate Task Force on Existing and Future Technology Collaborative and Governance Committee Structures

Problem: There are numerous committees and structures in place at the University that are intended to ensure that faculty (administrative and teaching) are having their needs and goals met by existing IT policies and decisions, but frequently these committees fall into disuse, or are conducted in a way that bypasses the essential input of those who use the technology. This contributes to inefficiencies at a university wide level as the communication necessary to support new endeavors is frequently missing, and there is often a disconnect with the broader educational and research goals of the university. It is the belief of the Faculty Senate Technology Committee that by streamlining our committee structures and developing more systematic communication between university services and the goals of research and education, we will improve both the wisdom of the decisions we as an institution make, as well as better facilitate the two-way collaboration that ensures new innovations are understood and embraced across the university community.

Task Force Charge: The charge of the short-term task force on existing and future faculty collaboration will undertake an inventory of all existing committee structures that define the relationship that exists between ITS and the various units and bodies on campus. Once the inventory is complete, the committee will evaluate whether the existing committee is A) active, b) beneficial, and C) redundant relative to the work of another parallel committee. The final deliverable, the recommendation on the University IT Policy governance structures (including a recommendation as to which committees to bolster, which to consolidate, which to sunset, and which to create), of the task force will be to deliver the recommendations, for approval of the Faculty Senate, to deliver to the President and Provost by the final Faculty Senate meeting on XXX.

Membership: I recommend that the membership of the committee include at least 3 members the FSTP Committee, at least 1 faculty Senator, the chair of the Faculty Senate Organization and Operations committee, at least one administrative faculty member, and 2 persons with an ITS affiliation.

Task force duration: 1-2 months

Weekly time expenditure expectation: 2 hours per week.

Appendix C: Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee Charge

Technology Policy Committee Composition: Seven members, at least two of whom must be senators and one an ex-officio faculty member designated by the Provost. The composition should be such that most academic units are represented.

Charge: The Committee will actively advise the Vice-President of Information Technology and other administrators in investments and in implementation of computer-based technologies that impact the educational techniques in the University. The Committee also advises on the development of new computer-based educational techniques and research capacities within the University. The Committee will work cooperatively with the central administration to formulate the technology budget of the University. These actions will ensure that the recommendations issued by the Committee reflect the position of the faculty concerning allocations to programs and/or individuals. The Committee will work with the administration to review and maintain a clear and equitable policy pertaining to intellectual property rights of the faculty.

Appendix D – the “Old” ITS Governance Structure Webpage:

Information Technology Governance Group (ITGG)

The Information Technology Governance Group (the ITGG) is the operational governance organization supporting the university’s Information Technology related-initiatives. The ITGG is responsible for the prioritization of Information Technology Services (ITS) projects and for decisions related to the strategic plan for ITS and the university. The purpose of the ITGG is to ensure that ITS is effectively and efficiently using its limited resources to accomplish projects that meet the university’s needs and strategic goals.

Architectural Standards Committee

The ASC is responsible for reviewing, verifying compliance, and providing recommendations with regards to new/upgrade software or hardware procurement projects.

Banner Governance:

Portfolio Governance Council (PGC)

The PGC was created for the purposes of providing guidance and oversight responsibility for the implementation and adoption of large projects or modifications that impact the Banner suite and related administrative applications.

Project Coordination Subcommittee (PCS)

The PCS was created to provide a regular mechanism for communication and coordination among Banner functional offices, Information Technology Services, and other stakeholders in the university community in the management of the Banner suite of systems and other ITS projects which impact Banner or functional operations.

Classroom Advisory Committee (CAC)

The Classroom Advisory Committee is composed of representatives of all academic areas and campuses of the university and is intended to advise the Space Administration Committee on decisions affecting classrooms in newly constructed or renovated university space.

Data Governance Council (DGC)

The Data Governance Council (DGC) is the executive governance organization supporting George Mason University’s data governance efforts. The DGC is responsible for making binding, university wide decisions about how data will be used and managed, with input from the Data Stewardship Committee (DSC), and acting as the data owner and authority for the university. Mason’s Data Governance Council is responsible for establishing data governance policies, procedures, standards and guidelines for optimizing the value of Mason’s data.

Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee (FSTPC)

The Committee actively advises the VP/CIO of Information Technology and other administrators in university. investments and in implementation of computer-based technologies that impact the educational techniques in the university. The Committee also advises on the development of new computer-based educational techniques and research capacities within the

***Please note the discrepancy between this entry (and its editing), and what preceded as the Faculty Senate charge of the TPC.*

Learning Environments Group (LEG)

The Learning Environments Group examines questions related to classroom design and other learning environments, both formal and informal. A primary goal of this group is to advise the university on the planning and design of learning spaces for future renovation and new building projects, with an eye toward developing flexible, signature spaces that inspire students and faculty to work collaboratively on pressing intellectual and social issues.

Research Computing Council

The Research Computing Council was chartered by the VP of Research to communicate updates from the Office of Research, as well as news from other academic units pertaining to research; also, to bring people together to share ideas, find solutions to areas of concern, collaborate and connect.

Systems Administrators Leadership Team (SALT)

The Systems Administrator Leadership Team (SALT), provides a forum open to all Mason system administrators. A system administrator is defined as the one responsible for the maintenance and configuration of one or more computer servers.

Technology Leadership Council

The purpose of the TLC is to collaborate on IT concerns, projects and initiatives; share IT knowledge and expertise; communicate business needs and IT challenges; and to identify areas of common concern in the area of Information Technology at Mason.

Appendix E – The “New” ITS Governance Structure Webpage:

Under the main page of “working with ITS” <https://its.gmu.edu/working-with-its/> you can find the following entry listed:

Governance Committees

ITS has developed valued partnerships with members of the Mason community to ensure that our services meet the needs of the university community. These committees include the Information Technology Governance Group (ITGG), **Faculty Senate Technology Policy Committee (FSTPC)**, Technology Leadership Council (TLC), and Systems Administrator Leadership Team (SALT).

But when you follow the link “more information: the Governance Committees are listed as follows:

Portfolio Evaluation Committee (PEC)

The PEC was created to align the project management of the Banner suite and related administrative applications with university objectives and supporting the efficient use of information technology resources.

PEC Charter

Contact: Kathy Adcock, chair

Project Coordination Sub-Committee (PCS)

The PCS was created to provide a regular mechanism for communication and coordination among Banner functional offices, Information Technology Services, and other stakeholders in the university community in the management of the Banner suite of systems and other ITS projects which impact Banner or functional operations.

PCS Charter

Contact: Kathy Adcock, chair

Technology Leadership Council (TLC)

The purpose of the TLC is to collaborate on IT concerns, projects and initiatives; share IT knowledge and expertise; communicate business needs and IT challenges; and to identify areas of common concern in the area of Information Technology at Mason.

TLC Charter

Contact: Jonathan Goldman and Joy Taylor, co-chairs

**** Please note the absence of the Faculty Senate Technology Committee and its charge as an ITS Governance collaborator.*