

FACULTY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Georgia Institute of Technology

14 March 2016
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm
260 14th Street (GTRI)

Meeting Minutes

Present: Tanah Barchichat, Kristen Butler, Myrtle Turner, Christopher Edmonds, Justin Eisenberg, Mandi Johnson, Susan Parham, David Gottfried

Absent: Russell Clark, Amy D'Unger

1. Introductions

- New member David Gottfried was appointed by the Faculty Executive Board to fill the remaining term for Denise Johnson-Marshall. His term will end in 2017. He is a principal research scientist at Tech's Interdisciplinary Research Institute, the Institute for Electronics and Nanotechnology.

2. Committee membership and elections

- The terms of Susan Parham, Kristen Butler, and Amy D'Unger all end this year. Susan and Kristen will both participate in the next faculty governance election; however Amy cannot as she has served the maximum number of consecutive terms. Next year's committee will need a new liaison for the campus Web Governance Committee.

3. Approval of minutes from 08 February 2016

- The spelling of Susan Cozzens' name was noted and corrected
- Susan Parham motioned that the corrected minutes be approved. Chris Edmonds seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Reports of FSC liaisons

- Amy D'Unger—Web Governance Committee
 - Reported via email:

I'm the liaison to the Web Governance Committee and have been attending those meetings. I presented our concerns about the web accessibility policy and was able to speak directly to Lori Sundal (Deputy CIO). Our concerns were all registered and many of them are in the process of being addressed. Outside consultants are going to help with this process, and definitions of various kinds of documents and their requirements are being clarified. In the meantime, the policy was passed in mid-February. I have attached the final version to this email.

The other issue that might impact faculty is the proposal for a central web support office. This policy has been denied by administration because of budget

concerns, so the Web Governance Committee is going back to the drawing board to reconsider how to re-propose it. I've attached the proposal (which did not receive support/funding) to this message.

At the next meeting, on March 30th, the tentative agenda includes:

- *Acquia, which is a content management system,*
 - *graphic design standards for web headers,*
 - *large web supplier project mandates and new policies coming out of GTIC, and*
 - *re-thinking the web support proposal.*
 - *I will clarify whether there will be discussion of the web support proposal, as that seems to be the only one that is relevant to faculty.*
- Her email attachments accompany these minutes
 - It was noted that #6 Exemptions, in the memo from Pat McKenna, seems to address most of our concerns
 - Other discussions related to the documents were tabled until the next meeting when Amy is present
- Tanah Barchichat—Open Access Policy Committee
 - GTRI hosted an OA session with Fred Rascoe of the Library
 - 6 people attended
 - Will have another GTRI session in the fall
 - It was noted that there are also funder policies regarding access to research data, which are similar to policies for peer-reviewed scholarly articles.
Future events will have sessions on both scholarly articles and research data.
 - Similar OA presentations will also be offered to schools & departments around campus
 - The OA Policy, in place at GT for 3 years, is up for renewal

5. Old Business

- Discussion regarding information from last month's meeting with Leslie Sharp
 - Need to find ways to connect CETL to research faculty
 - Maybe include links on GTRI/research pages
 - Susan Parham corresponded with Monique Tavares [Associate Vice Provost for Research Administration] who said that to date, their office has not held a separate orientation for research faculty, and that research faculty have typically been part of the various orientations through OHR, Academic Affairs, and/or GTRI, depending on their role with the Institute. Their hiring department manages this process. She is happy to meet with us further to better understand what the committee hopes to accomplish.
 - Susan will contact Monique to come speak to us
 - It is understood there is a diversity of research faculty and job locations as well as a diversity of orientation processes, however there is enough in common—GT history/traditions, transportation/parking, library, etc.—that some standard orientation resources or guides would be helpful
 - It was remarked that GT has a lot of hidden assets that employees are not aware of
 - How to connect all the resources across campus?

6. New Business

- No new business

7. Adjournment

Proposal to Provide Web Support to Campus

Submitted by: Georgia Tech Web Governance Committee

Overview:

The first experience most audiences have with Georgia Tech is through our web sites. The quality and consistency of our sites (and their content) is critical to maintaining our reputation as an academic and research leader. In 2013, Georgia Tech Institute Communication (GTIC) worked with mStoner to redesign its top-level web sites and develop a plan for evolving Georgia Tech's digital presence. Over the last three years, the new web site design was successfully rolled out across campus including top-level web pages, colleges, schools units, and departments. The updated site design provided much needed responsive design functionality, brand consistency, and opportunities for showcasing and sharing content.

Along with the design, architecture, and content direction, mStoner also provided direction regarding the organization of Georgia Tech's Web Team. Based on these recommendations, GTIC was able to add key positions that have allowed it to implement the new design direction and develop useful tools for communicators and developers in the colleges, schools, and units.

While working with campus implementing the new design direction, it became clear that there was a need for additional web support services within the colleges and units. Web developers, particularly Drupal developers, were in high demand and were being lured away by outside firms. According to a recent study, web developers in Atlanta make an average salary of \$96,000 — second highest in the country, making the ability to attract and retain qualified talent difficult. Web developers that did stay on campus ended up being offered positions within other units, creating an internal bidding war for web support. This trend impacted several colleges, including the College of Computing, College of Architecture, College of Sciences, and dramatically hampered the ability of these units to implement the design direction and maintain their respective sites.

As it stands, web staffing varies greatly from one unit to another. Units that have web developers are able to keep their content up to date, make sure their sites are matching the Institutional brand, and add useful features for their respective audiences. Units without web developers are unable to keep up with security issues, visual flexibility, content, brand, or features. This uneven distribution creates a have and have-not dynamic, which ultimately produces an uneven perception of the Institute.

To address the issue, Institute Communications worked with College of Engineering and the Procurement Office to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) for contracted web services. The goal of the RFP was to streamline the process of hiring web vendors by assembling a group of pre-qualified, reliable, and cost-effective web vendors that could assist the campus. Having these vendors on

contract would allow the campus to select a vendor without having to go through an exhaustive and time-consuming procurement process. The vendors would work through GTIC and leverage pre-existing web templates and brand standards, ensuring the campus developed sites that were consistent with the new direction and built in accordance with development standards.

In addition, two tools were developed to make site creation easier: Drupal Express (Drupal) and Professional Web Presence (WordPress). These tools allow the campus to create low-complexity websites with little technical or design expertise. Targeted to the most needy units (administrative offices, research labs, groups, special events, faculty and student websites), these pre-templated websites come with built-in features and tools (such as news and events, an editing interface, and mobile/accessible optimization). Both tools are supported by online resources, and limited in-person training.

But even with these tools in place, it was apparent that many units did not have the time, money, or skill to create professionally- and consistently-branded websites. To investigate further, the Web Governance Committee reached out to several peer institutions including Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Duke, Oregon State, University of Oregon, University of Colorado

Boulder, Penn State, and Princeton, to find out how they handled the issue of campus wide web support. What we found was that our peers are facing a similar problem keeping Web staff on campus, and providing consistent web support to the colleges, schools and units on campus. None of the institutions had a comprehensive solution for campus wide web support, but several had interesting approaches that address some key issues Georgia Tech is facing.

Centralized/decentralized: Out of the nine institutions that we spoke to, four were in decentralized environments, four in centralized environments, and one was split between both models. Most had considered centralizing at some point. Seeing the need for consistent branding, accessibility, and development, Stanford is currently piloting a centralized web team. They are projecting potential savings by not going to outside vendors.

Training: Another trend that we saw was a focus on web training. Most of the nine institutions had dedicated staff that provided some web training. The University of Colorado Boulder had the most developed training program. UCB's web team hired a trainer specifically to provide weekly training sessions to campus. They also provided a five-week comprehensive training sessions to get clients up and running in a more concentrated timeframe. This is part of their overall evolution from a group that builds web sites to a group that empowers the campus by providing tools, resources, and training so that people can build their own websites.

Staffing: On average, most web teams had between 10-14 staff. These included developers, information architects, web designers, user experience designers, and tech support or training staff. Most peers did not feel they had enough staff to meet the needs of their campus. Stanford started their web group with five positions but quickly grew it to twelve.

Cost recovery: The Institutions were split on whether they charged for their time. Some used charge back funds to pay for additional staff.

Proposal

Based on interviews with peer institutions and with Georgia Tech communicators, the Office of Information Technology (OIT), GTIC, and web developers from across campus, the Web Governance Committee is proposing the creation of a centralized web group dedicated to assisting colleges, schools, or units who do not have access to web support. This team would work in concert with the GTIC Web Team as well as with the web developers in the colleges, schools, and units, ensuring that the team maintains a high level of standards and collaboration.

Scope: The Campus Support Web Team (CSWT) will work collaboratively with GTIC and the OIT.

The GTIC Web Team will focus on the management of top-level web sites and support for its key areas (Admissions, Development, News and Media, Research, and Executive Leadership), as well as on developing and providing direction on standards for web and design (including the Theme), brand, and content strategy.

OIT will provide web hosting, security, and consulting time with both teams about future web directions.

The CSWT will be responsible for assisting colleges, schools, and units with web projects. The group will be available to all of campus; however, campus units that do not have web development capabilities will be given priority.

The CSWT will provide support in the following areas:

- *Site creation:* install standard, pre-configured sites (using Drupal Express or PWP). The CSWT will not create content for sites (text, images, video, etc) and will only migrate content if that migration can easily be automated.
- *Common-use features:* Support and create common use features, either embedded within PWP/GTDX or that are reusable exportable components for other units on campus. No

custom development beyond this scope would be supported, until a significant campus need develops (GT Scholar, etc.), or this group transitions to a partial chargeback model.

- *Maintenance and Security*: in consultation with OIT, provide minor maintenance and security for standard sites (GTDX/PWP) and common use features (Mercury, etc.). This does not include supporting any non-common use features.
- *Consultation*: The group will provide web consulting services to clients on web projects that are being done internally and by external vendors. In addition, they would be responsible for providing council on web accessibility, usability, content strategy and standards issues.
- *Training and Support*: Trainers will assist campus clients with web related questions, including Drupal Express and PWP, functioning as first-tier support. Trainers will serve to evaluate and triage these questions. They will provide weekly, monthly, and quarterly training sessions to the campus. Trainers will be responsible for the documentation of web procedures and protocols.

Project requests will be prioritized based on the following criteria:

- *Strategic value*: Sites that are tied to Institute strategic goals will be given priority.
- *Risk*: Sites that have a high risk of failure or have security issues will be given priority.
- *Feasibility*: Sites that are both important and easily addressed will be given priority.

Websites will be created using the following criteria:

- Must have been vetted through the requesting unit's Director of Communications and GTIC Client Manager.
- Must be for colleges, schools, or units of Georgia Tech.
- Must be hosted on Georgia Tech servers.
- Must use approved Georgia Tech templates.
- Must meet Georgia Tech accessibility standards.
- Must designate a content owner and point of contact for each website.

Staffing: All positions will work closely with GTIC and OIT to maintain a high level of quality and consistency.

The CSWT will be made up of the following positions:

- *2 Trainers* – Weekly campus training, documentation, triage support requests, campus outreach.
 - \$50K per
- *5 Web developers* - Theming, common features (Drupal Express, PWP, Mercury, etc.), maintenance, security, some consultation.
 - \$70K per
- *1 User Experience* – Usability/accessibility strategist and point of contact for campus
 - \$50K
- *1 Content Strategist* – Councils clients on best practices for planning, development and long-term management of their content.
 - \$50K
- *1 Manager/Project manager* - Prioritize, schedule and assign projects. Provide technical direction to the team. Act as point person for project requests.
 - \$75K
- *Students* - Student workers could be hired to do some of this work. They will have at least one FTE to whom they report.

Workflow: Projects will be initiated through the CSWT manager. The manager will assign staff, define project scope, develop schedules, and prioritize projects. The manager will be responsible for coordinating with requesting unit communicators and respective client managers in GTIC.

Reporting: The CSWT will report to the VP of GTIC and VP of OIT.

Location: The CSWT will share a common office space, preferably in a central location on campus or near OIT (FYI - Rich Building has available offices).

Costs: Cost for the CSWT will be paid through Institution operating funds.

- 10 FTEs \$650,000 (estimated)
- Equipment: \$50K (Laptops, Accessibility tools and equipment, software, big monitors for coding, office equip/furniture, dedicated VMs, etc.)
- **Estimated Total: \$700,000**
- Projects through Institute Communications – Approx. \$200K year

- More financial data to come.



Legal Affairs and Risk Management
Georgia Institute of Technology
Lyman Hall – Room 305

Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0257
U.S.A.

404.864.6088

February 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: President Peterson

From: Pat McKenna

Re: Information Technology Accessibility Policy

The attached policy relating establishing minimum standards and expectations regarding the design, use, or acquisition of Information Technology was developed by Compliance Programs and the Office of Information Technology to ensure equal access to Institute programs, services and activities. Following stakeholder review and a campus comment period, it was forwarded by the Policy Steering Committee to Cabinet for review at its meeting on January 12, 2016.

Members of Cabinet were asked to provide comments by Friday, January 15, 2016. There were no further comments and the policy will now be posted in the Institute Policy Library (<http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/>), effective January 15, 2016.

Pc: Cabinet
Burns Newsome
Lori Sundal
Tiffany Watson



Information Technology Accessibility Policy

Type of Policy: Administrative
Effective Date: January 15, 2016
Last Revised: January 15, 2016

Policy Owner: Compliance Programs and OIT

Policy Contact: Burns Newsome, Director, Compliance Programs,
burnsnewsome@gatech.edu, Lori Sundal, Deputy Chief Information Officer-Service Delivery,
lori.sundal@oit.gatech.edu

1. Reason for Policy

The Georgia Institute of Technology ("Institute") is committed to providing equality of opportunity to persons with disabilities, including equal access to Institute programs, services and activities provided through Information Technology (IT). This policy establishes minimum standards and expectations regarding the design, acquisition or use of Information Technology

2. Policy Statement

The Institute commits to ensuring equal access to all Institute programs, services and activities provided through Information Technology, whether provided directly by the Institute or by a vendor. As provided in Part VII, below, all Institute offices using vendor-provided Information Technology shall ensure that such IT complies with the Accessibility Standards contained in this policy. Unless an exemption applies, all schools, colleges, departments, offices and entities of the Institute shall adhere to the Institute's Accessibility Standards, as defined below.

3. Scope

Incorporating principles of universal design in the development, acquisition, and implementation of IT and related resources helps the Institute ensure that these resources (documents, web pages, information, and services) are accessible to the broadest possible audience.

Individual web pages published by students, employees or non-Institute organizations that are hosted by the Institute and which do not conduct Institute-related business are encouraged to adopt the accessibility standards contained in this policy, but fall outside the jurisdiction of this policy.

4. Definitions

Information Technology	<p>“Information Technology” means any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. The term information technology includes computers, ancillary equipment, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources, including, but not limited to computers and ancillary equipment, instructional materials, software, videos, multimedia, telecommunications, or web-based content or products developed, procured, maintained, or used in carrying out Institute activities.</p>
Institute Accessibility Standards	<p>“Institute Accessibility Standards” means, at a minimum, the standards of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0, Level AA, as created and published by the Web Accessibility Initiative of the World Wide Web Consortium, as well as the requirements of Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and their implementing regulations. “Institute Accessibility Standards” also means, more generally, those generally accepted principles of universal design which helps individuals with disabilities access the services, programs, and academic, extracurricular and research offerings of the Institute.</p>
Legacy Web Pages Legacy Documents Legacy Multimedia	<p>“Legacy Web Pages,” “Legacy Documents,” and “Legacy Multimedia”, mean web pages, electronic documents, and multimedia created before January 1, 2013.</p>
Revised Web Page	<p>“Revised Web Page” means any web page where a significant alteration or update is made to the visual design of the page or a major revision of the content of the page is made.</p>
Universal Design	<p>“Universal Design” means a concept or philosophy for designing and delivering products and services that are usable by people with the widest possible range of functional capabilities, which include products and services that are directly accessible (without requiring assistive technologies) and products and services that are interoperable with assistive technologies.</p>

5. Applicability

This policy applies to all IT resources that are acquired, developed, distributed, used, purchased or implemented by or for any Institute unit and used to provide Institute programs, services, or activities, including but not limited to:

1. Web Pages

- a. All new web pages and Revised Web Pages, website templates, and website themes must comply with the Institute's Accessibility Standards.
- b. All new and Revised Web Pages must indicate in plain text a method for users having trouble accessing the page to report that inaccessibility.
- c. Legacy Pages determined by the publishing department or unit to be of the highest priority in providing Institute services online (core institutional information) shall comply with the Institute's Accessibility Standards.
- d. Unless an exception applies and is appropriately documented, for any Legacy Web Page or any other web page that for any reason does not comply with the Institute's Accessibility Standards, the Institute will, upon request, convert or render the non-compliant web page so as to meet the Institute's Accessibility Standards or will provide to the requestor access to the web page's information in manner that is equally effective as the original page.

2. Electronic Documents

This policy and the Institute Accessibility Standards apply to all electronic documents.

3. Multimedia

This policy and the Institute Accessibility Standards apply to all multimedia.

6. Exemptions

1. Legacy Web Pages, Legacy Documents, and Legacy Multimedia aren't required to comply with Institute's Accessibility Standards unless
 - a. specifically requested by an individual with a disability (though units are encouraged to identify and improve the accessibility of Legacy Pages even in the absence of specific requests),
 - b. significant and substantial revisions to the web pages, documents, or multimedia are undertaken after the creation of the original, or
 - c. the nature or function of the web page, document, or multimedia is determined by the creating department to be essential to the purpose of the department or program.
2. Undue burden and non-availability may qualify as an exemption from this policy when compliance is not technically possible, or is unreasonably burdensome in that it would require extraordinary measures due to the nature of the IT or would alter the purpose of a web page. The conclusion of undue burden or non-availability is an institutional decision to be made by the Institute's Office of Compliance Programs in consultation with the affected unit(s) and others with relevant perspective or expertise. Notwithstanding the foregoing, an individual in need of an accommodation to access the program, service or activity shall request the same of the Institute's ADA Coordinator or IT Accessibility Coordinator.

3. IT resources specific to a research or development process in which no member of the research or development team requires accessibility accommodations may be exempt. In such cases, the lead investigator must document that, upon inquiry, no member of the research or development team identified as requiring an accommodation.

7. Purchasing

In order to ensure accessibility of IT products, Institute officials responsible for making decisions about which products to procure must consider accessibility as one of the criteria for acquisition. This is especially critical for enterprise-level systems or technologies that affect a large number of students, faculty, and/or staff. Considering accessibility in procurement involves the following steps:

1. Vendors must be asked to provide information about the accessibility of their products as required by the Institute's Computer Technology Request (CTR) process.
2. The information provided by vendors must be valid and measured using a method that is reliable and objective.
3. Those making procurement decisions must be able to objectively evaluate the accessibility of products and to scrutinize the information provided by vendors.

Assistance with ensuring that appropriate contractual language is included in all IT purchasing documents may be obtained through the Institute's Purchasing Office.

8. Compliance

The Institute's ADA Coordinator is responsible for overseeing compliance with regard to state and federal laws and regulations that prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability and require reasonable accommodation. Questions or concerns regarding compliance with this policy, or complaints of discrimination, should be directed to the ADA Coordinator, who contact information is contained below.

Questions regarding the Institute's Accessibility Standards, resources, and other technical matters may be addressed to the Institute's IT Accessibility Coordinator, who contact information is below.

To report an accessibility issue or non-compliance with this policy, please email gaccessibility@gatech.edu.

9. Enforcement

To report suspected instances of noncompliance with this policy, please visit Georgia Tech's *EthicsPoint*, a secure and confidential reporting system, and [read more about the EthicsPoint Portal](#).

10. Contacts

Institute ADA Coordinator:

Burns Newsome
Director of Compliance Programs
burnsnewsome@gatech.edu
(404) 385-5151

IT Accessibility Coordinator:

Lori Sundal
Deputy CIO – IT Service Delivery
lori.sundal@oit.gatech.edu
(404) 894-5348

Assistance with IT Purchasing:

Purchasing Office
purchasing.ask@business.gatech.edu
(404) 894-5000

11. Related Information

Resource	Link
Accessibility Information	http://www.gatech.edu/accessibility
USG Accessibility Policy	http://www.usg.edu/siteinfo/accessibility

12. Policy History

Revision Date	Author	Description
1/15/16	Compliance Programs and OIT	New Policy