

FSCOT Minutes
November 2, 2021, 3:30

Zoom Connection: <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/7855322637>
Phone Connection: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 646 876 9923
Meeting attendance has been noted on the final page of this report.

- 1.) Turn on recording and announce disclaimer
- 2.) Call meeting to order – **Brett**
 - a. Jason takes Minutes
- 3.) Approve agenda (additions) – **Brett**
 - a. Scott Finkeldei has added item 7C (Campus store feedback meeting) to the agenda.
- 4.) Approve minutes – **Brett**
 - a. **Attachment # 1** (page 4): Minutes provide by Don
 - b. **Minutes were approved with no comments.**
- 5.) Committee Reports:
 - a. Extended IT Leadership Group – **Brett & Michael**
 - i. **No Report**
 - b. IT Policy Review Team – **Don Crawford**, Information Technology Manager, Architecture, Planning & Design, FSCOT Member
 - i. **Nothing to report. This group has not met.**
 - c. Office 365 Governance Group – **Michael**
 - i. **No Report**
 - d. Project Governance Group – **Brett**
 - i. **No Report**
 - e. Record and Retention Committee – **Ryan Otto**, K-State Libraries, FSCOT Member
 - i. **No update. Ryan will send out an email addendum to todays meeting with what policies are being worked on.**
 - f. University Network Infrastructure Refresh Project – **Michael**

- i. Michael shared that there are buildings being updated with issues with conduits. There is no room to add new cables. Some areas may need to be relocated during the update due to re-construction needed. Supply chain affects what is being prioritized.

6.) Old Business (Business from Previous Meetings)

- a. TopHat Resolution update and next action – **Brett and Ryan Otto**, K-State Libraries, FSCOT Member

- i. **Attachment # 2** (page 16): Resolution provided by **Ryan**

- ii. Action:

- 1. Decide next steps -- Should this be formatted as a resolution or a memo

- iii. Brett asked that the group discuss: does this group want this document in the form of a resolution to Faculty Senate or simply to be a summary of investigation that is sent to the new committee on academic tools so that they may have a history of this discussion and this committees findings. Committee members shared their views on the resolution and how this information should be moved forward. Nathan gave his point of view as a member of SGA and asked what was being resolved. He shared that this seems more like some feedback and does not directly address the student request to remove TopHat. Michael shared that it does not appear that this resolution will be passed by Faculty Senate (based on experience with other committees) and any resolution will need to come from FSCOT if any resolution is sent.

- iv. Group weighed in on possible outcomes with comments about the strength of this statement not being “strong” enough for a resolution, about this information being foundational to future actions of the committee on academic tools, and how this being a response to SGA directly from FSCOT regarding the topic being discussed but not a resolution from Faculty Senate.

- v. Motion to go forward with keeping a resolution modality (to be updated by this committee) by Ryan Otto. Second by Lisa Rubin.

- 1. Vote by yes/no. passes 8 votes to 2 with two abstentions.

- vi. The resolution will be posted to teams for comments and if there are no comments it will be voted upon at the next meeting.

- b. Teams Update – **Michael & Don Crawford**, Information Technology Manager, Architecture, Planning & Design, FSCOT Member

- i. Don and Dr. Stephanie Rolley, a faculty member, met with a Teams oversight committee to address moving from teams to SharePoint. Stephanie spoke with them about workflows used in their college and importance of Teams to that process. Stephanie shared her views, and the committee received this well. Robert Howard (on the committee) is proficient with Microsoft 365 and suggested that any workflow with a focus on the “chat” can be sent to the team as an email and the SharePoint repository will hold on to this data. There are concerns with

OGC being concerned with saving chats as a part of the workflow. The committee felt that Stephanie's work is exemplary use of the tool.

- ii. Michael shared that we need to educate campus and create resources around these Teams tools and appropriate use given the concerns OGC may have with saving chats. There is a question of where these resources are and how to deploy this information.
- iii. Gary suggested that this information be placed into the knowledge base so that all individuals may access the information.
- iv. Michael stated that this is how customer service based IT works best, when learning how faculty members use our tools and share ways to improve their use.

7.) New Business

a. Mediasite unused video communication and management plan - **Brandon Utech**, Instructional Media Administrator, Division of Information Technology

- i. Scott shared that IT is addressing practices and policies to align with retention practices in addition to technical storage requirements. Brandon Utech (guest) shared how the record retention policy can be met with MediaSite content (educational and administrative). There are 96,000 videos in MediaSite (90 TB) and they are owned by 1,700 content owners. Growth has been at a rate of 7 TB per semester during the start of the pandemic. Growth continues to be higher than pre-pandemic rates. We do not enforce any content creation/deletion rules and this is not sustainable (cost and retention policy). Retention policy would state that content be deleted 5 years post use. Brandon believes that there is currently 30 TB that was created during pandemic that may not be used again based on how it was used in temporary remote/hybrid courses. Another 19 TB has not been viewed in a considerable (more than 2 years) time. This points to the possibility that much space can be saved if we at least archive some data. Brandon is looking at ways to incentivize means of having content deleted or saved in other locations. IT would not like to penalize anyone actively creating video for courses; however, space is not infinite.
- ii. Brandon continued to share that MediaSite does have a tool to archive video to other storage and it may be deployed with video not used in two years and then it would allow that content to be processed according to the retention policy. There would be a means to recover archived video but it would come at a cost to users. The practice would not measure and criticize videos being rarely viewed, only those not viewed at all. No watched videos would be "touched."
- iii. Gary shared that this group did approve a Zoom retention schedule and that may guide our practices. He shared that the cost is increasing and considerable resources may be saved. Gary suggested a more aggressive approach using a metric of untouched videos that have not been updated. Gary would like to see that any content is checked for accuracy in addition to being watched. (He later retracted his comment after review of the retention policy.)
- iv. Scott shared that the retention policy does allow for cloud content to be destroyed in 180 days but this is not realistic given that faculty may use their content once a year for a "spring class." Colby shared that there is a rationale for the retention policy for administrative content but academic content needs to be viewed in a

different lens given that some courses are not taught each year, elaborating on Scott's point that even two years may be too soon to archive course videos. He shared that some courses are only taught once every two years in some programs. Any retention schedule less than that may negatively affect some important academic content.

- v. Kevin shared that he has moved his content to YouTube and Brandon stated that it may not be automatically processed like MediaSite content and faculty are responsible for following the policy if they are using other means to store content.
 - vi. Scott discussed that the universities obligation is to apply the state retention policies in the best way possible to meet our business needs and there are some needs that may go beyond the policy (such as a longitudinal study for example). Any policy should allow for such circumstances and allowances.
 - vii. Colby Shared that the retention policy isn't congruous with the policy of what should be kept for courses (only the grade data is stored in KSIS for example). It may be confusing and we need to address how any video retention policy relates to other academic policies. Others followed up that not everything has to be kept, this policy is about when to delete information beyond its use.
 - viii. Michael asked how to determine what should be kept and Gary suggested that we invite OGC to answer this question as it pertains to academic content.
 - ix. Gary shared that there is a different cost structure for different kinds of storage and part of the solution with the cost issues may be that there are other storages used that would make content not actively accessible but archived to use upon request.
 - x. Gary followed that we need to keep in mind that the final deletion date is five years after final delivery or use of the content and this resets each time the content is used.
 - xi. Scott summarized our conversation. He and Brandon will return at a later date to share the final plan, how it is being communicated out, and what resources are provided to faculty.
- b. Classroom Update – **Brett and Scott Finkeldei**, Liaison for Chief Information Officer, Division of IT
 - c. Scott shared that the Union and Follett are discussing means of obtaining feedback about their operations and processes for textbook ordering, delivery, and management process. Scott asks if any members would like to sit in on the meetings with Follett to provide feedback face to face with Follett. Any number of people can attend these meetings and need only show up at the meetings. Scott will share out information in Teams following this meeting.

8.) Other Items – **Group**

9.) Future Meetings and Agenda – **Brett**

- a. November 16 – McGraw Hill – Inclusive Access Text Books
- b. Michael shared that the McGraw-Hill group would like to have more conversations with campus about their program. Majority of attendees would not like to visit with them. Various members shared that McGraw-Hill includes terminology in their sales pitch about savings for students, but the group feels that revenue is sought in other ways to cost students more per year. Many faculty shared that they have received information from McGraw-Hill.

10.) Adjourn meeting—**Brett**

11.) Attendance: (X = in attendance)

- ☒ X Brett DePaola, Arts and Sciences (17-22) Co-Chair
- ☒ X Colby Moorberg, Agriculture (20-22)
- ☒ X Don Crawford, Architecture, Planning, and Design (20-22)
- ☒ X Jason Maseberg-Tomlinson, General University (20-23)
 - ☒ X Jim Bach, General University alternate (20-23)
- ☒ X Jennifer Wilson, Extension (21-22)
- ☒ X Justin Thomason, Veterinary Medicine (21-24)
- ☒ X Katherine Jones, Technology & Aviation K-State Polytechnic (21-24)
- ☒ X Kevin Wanklyn, Engineering (21-23)
- ☒ X Lisa Rubin, Education (21-22)
- ☒ X Michael Raine, Business Administration (07-22) Co-Chair
- ☒ X Nathan Vontz, Student Representative (21-22)
- ☒ X Phil Vardiman, Health and Human Sciences (21-24)
- ☒ X Ryan Otto, K-State Libraries (17-23)

Non-voting Attendees:

- ☒ X Gary Pratt, CIO
- ☐ Debbie Webb, Liaison for University Support Staff (Absent)
- ☒ X Scott Finkeldei, Liaison for Chief Information Officer

Guests:

- ☒ X **Brandon Utech**, Instructional Media Administrator, Division of Information Technology