

[In these minutes: 1. Discussion with Vice President Bruininks, 2. Discussion of changes to Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources Policy]

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE (SCIT)

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1998

10:30 - 12:00

STUDIO C, RARIG CENTER

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view or, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Gary Jahn (chair), Ron Anderson, James Chelikowsky, Vicki Gaylord, Maria Gini, Andy Lopez, Kevin McDowell, Don Riley, Andy Roterling, William Peterson.

REGRETS: Harold Grotevant.

ABSENT: Stephen Campbell, Steve Cawley, Joe Skupniewitz.

GUESTS: Provost Robert Bruininks, Tim Fitzpatrick, Vice Provost Ann Hill Duin, Myron Lowe, Charlene Mason, Carolyn Parnell, Susanna Smith, and Mark Wahlenberger.

Professor Jahn gave a report for Professor Grotevant, chair of the Teaching/Research Subcommittee. He has been actively recruiting members from SCIT and throughout the University community. There are numerous University committees looking into Distance Education and Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL), but most are without faculty representation. He would like to survey faculty attitudes on barriers, suggestions for remedies, and useful faculty incentives. The subcommittee will meet during Spring Break to develop this survey.

1. DISCUSSION WITH PROVOST BRUININKS

Provost Bruininks said that the administration is trying to reorganize investment strategies around TEL and distance education. At the last set of compact meetings, each college was asked to highlight what they felt were their most important academic technology needs. All of this information was then collated to see what links could be developed between colleges and departments. \$1 million will be invested in the colleges to drive the technology needs that they identified. This will help, but we also need to look at the investment strategy and evaluate it over the next year to see what is the best way to match collegiate and central funds. Another project was funding for small grants. The proposal was sent out and 100 proposals were submitted from faculty and staff with many new and creative ideas.

Major gaps still exist in the quality of service to faculty and staff. One area of concern is the state of technology in classrooms. He wants to work on a strategy for minimal upgrades to East Bank classrooms. The argument has always been that classrooms will be upgraded when the buildings are revamped, but with no set date in sight, we have to act now. OIT would be in charge of this, with input from groups like this. Funds would be provided through an internal loan with a 10 year payoff. There will also be money in the legislative request for classroom improvements in the form of furniture and paint.

Lastly, NTS rates are still being worked on. There will be impacts on the local level, either savings or loss. We are trying to develop a central fund to help those areas that will be losing funds. This will be hard though, since most will be felt farthest from the collegiate level. We will need to work closely with deans and chancellors.

Don Riley then said that a group, Classrooms Inc., is meeting to discuss the issue of classroom upgrades. Shih-Pau Yen is also working on this, but ultimately it will need to be a partnership between the administration and academic

units. One problem with this is that classrooms are not owned by anyone, so colleges do not want to provide funding unless they are guaranteed exclusive use, but all upgrades that include OIT funds must benefit the University as a whole.

Vice Provost Ann Hill Duin said that in terms of small grants, 105 proposals were submitted. A group of faculty members then met and chose the top 30 to be funded. In regards to the Awards for Innovation in technology enhanced learning, the winners will also be chosen by a faculty group and then their projects will be highlighted at a showcase on May 20 at Coffman Union. She then distributed guidelines and procedures for distance learning at the University and a list of web sites for technology enhanced learning.

Professor Jahn said that one issue that continues is in regards to computer labs. According to a CLA survey, which was distributed, one of the main concerns for students as well as faculty is the availability of public lab spaces. This is coupled with the lack of maintenance and limited hours in these labs.

A committee member said that the CLA survey should be used as a model to be conducted every year across the University.

Provost Bruininks said that he liked the idea of a systematic survey. Then, problems that are targeted could be solved in a partnership between central administration and the colleges. The only concern is that we might end up solving the wrong problem. The solution to this is the collection of accurate data.

A committee member said that the difficulty will be in figuring out the partnerships. Last year, the CLA technology fee collected \$500,000 to improve lab access, but none was spent because a partnership could not be reached. A guest at the meeting said that one problem is the distribution of student use between all the labs on campus. One proposal is a Kiosk outside all labs that would direct students to other labs that are not being fully used. It has been very difficult though, to convince ADCS that the technology exists. This proposal would also save colleges and central administration from spending more money on new labs, which could then be used to upgrade facilities in current labs.

Don Riley said that one other issue is that of every student having their own computer and what its impact will be. One problem is the University has never been willing to provide the adequate funding for these measures, and the problem continues to grow. A comprehensive information technology strategic plan needs to be developed.

As for the CLA survey, what it did not ask was the type and age of the computer that each student had. Students buy any computer since the University has no guidelines. MnSCU is going to start publishing a set of guidelines to help incoming students. Without this, OIT is forced to support every different type of computer and software, but we do not have the resources for this.

Carolyn Parnell said that another demand has been for computer jacks for student computers. This requires updating the infrastructure in areas where students want this done.

Q: Is the \$500,000 to compensate for departmental losses going to be recurring or one-time funds?

A: The intent is that it would be recurring since the charges are recurring, but it is on the table with other issues and it needs the President's approval. There is also a \$1.6 million problem with the modem pool. We are recommending that the cost of dial-up be built into the cost of the data jack at a rate of \$1.99 per month per data jack. With this, we could increase the free dial-up hours from 30 to 50 per month. For students, the discussion has been to charge a one-time fee of \$24 per year (\$8 per quarter), but we need more time to fully discuss this issue. The intent of these fees is to maintain the modem pool capacity and provide funding for modem replacement.

Q: In regards to the etherjacks, would this charge be acceptable according to federal guidelines? Would private LAN's be affected? How would this plan affect upgrades to the modem pool?

A: Yes to the first two questions. Under the current funding scheme, where we are short \$1.6 million, the pool will not be upgraded. Under this proposed scheme, upgrades would be funded at \$500,000 for the first year.

Q: Would the 30 hour limit on dial-up ever be removed?

A: The limit would never be removed, although we can take another look at the data and perhaps increase it to 50 hours per month. Currently, 90% use less than 30 hours and the majority of those that pay, only pay \$4.00. The problem is that with increased limits comes increased usage.

2. DISCUSSION OF ACCEPTABLE USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES POLICY

Tim Fitzpatrick said that this policy was formed by a committee roughly one year ago and is a list of rights and responsibilities instead of a list of do's and don'ts. In November, the Office of the General Counsel asked to tighten the policy language in several cases. One deals with the distinction between nominal personal use and official University business, which is the primary use of these resources. Then, once this expectation is made, we need to clarify the rights and privacy with respect to their nominal personal use. Finally, a stronger disclaimer in regards to the liability of the University for inappropriate communications or other activities.

The revised draft before SCIT was also sent to a subset of the original committee that drafted the first version. The feedback says that readers understand what we are striving for, but that the language does not accomplish this in the version. Since the policy still needs revision, we are not asking SCIT to endorse this version, but to provide feedback.

A committee member said that they are not in favor of the proposed changes. There are two issues, privacy and liability, in question. There are ways that we can look at nominal personal data without labeling it as University property because this would increase the University's liability.

Tim Fitzpatrick said that these comments were also expressed by other readers of the policy. We do not want to make the statement that everything that resides on University platforms is University property. The distinction that we want to make is between official University business and nominal personal use.

Q: Where would study materials included on a faculty members web site be included? Is that considered University property or a faculty members intellectual property residing on a University server?

A: This policy should not attempt to rewrite the Intellectual Property Policy. It tries to make sure that our use does not break the law or infringe on the rights of others. It was not intended to touch on property rights, but to address questions of permissibility of certain contents.

Another committee member said that when they read the policy, it does not include protection of intellectual and academic freedom. We need to be careful to not include too many `can't do' statements, but remind the University community that they are also protected by Regents' Policies.

Tim Fitzpatrick said that there was just an article on revising acceptable use policies by including more on community standards and making it a philosophy statement instead of a list of rules and regulations. In conclusion, he asked that any additional comments or revision be sent to him.

Professor Jahn thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 12:00.

Rebecca Hippert
University Senate