

[In these minutes: 1. Discussion of Acceptable Use Policy, 2. Discussion with Steve Cawley and Ann Hill Duin, 3. Teaching/Research Subcommittee Report, 4. Finance Subcommittee Report]

## **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE (SCIT)**

### **MINUTES**

**FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1998**

**2:00 - 3:30**

**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, Steve Cawley, Vicki Gaylord, Maria Gini, Harold Grotevant, Andy Lopez, Kevin McDowell.

**REGRETS:** James Chelikowsky, Andy Rotering, William Peterson.

**ABSENT:** Stephen Campbell, Joe Skupniewitz.

**GUESTS:** Jodie Berg-Combs, Tim Fitzpatrick, Ann Hill Duin, Myron Lowe, Charlene Mason, Cindy Plaisance.

### **1. Discussion of Acceptable Use Policy**

Tim Fitzpatrick presented the latest draft of the Acceptable Use Policy which reflects feedback and comments received in the last week. The policy is being revised because of a suggestion from the Office of the General Counsel to clarify certain aspects of the existing policy dealing with the University's ownership of the physical resources and official University data. It also needed a disclaimer on personal communications and a statement on the consequences of violations of this policy. We are asking SCIT to endorse the policy as it is being presented.

A committee member said that they have been concerned about access to information resources. They are not clear whether data that is leased from external sources would be included or excluded from this policy. If they are included, we need to talk about the user's rights and responsibilities of these resources in terms of academic freedom.

Tim Fitzpatrick said that the philosophy behind this policy was intended to be broad-based, yet the wording is specific. It is not intended though, to cover external information resources. The intent was that information resources should be a right to all members of the University community as they relate to fulfilling their mission at the University. Wording could be developed to address this issue.

Another committee member suggested that this issue should also be addressed in the Policy on Access to Data.

Another committee member felt that the less control the University has over the personal communications and data stored on its systems, the better. The intent of revising this policy was to minimize liability, but the policy, as written, seems to have the opposite effect. The University cannot guarantee absolute privacy to its users, but there are other laws that will protect them.

Tim Fitzpatrick said that the policy's intent was to set an expectation to users that systems may be checked and therefore, absolute privacy cannot be guaranteed.

With no further questions, a motion was made to endorse the policy pending a revision to protect the principal of Academic Freedom. The motion was approved by a majority of members present.

### **2. Discussion with Steve Cawley and Ann Hill Duin**

The committee welcomed Steve Cawley with a round of applause to his new position as Interim Chief Information

Officer at the University.

Steve Cawley informed them that he has been involved with information technology at the University since 1987. He said that OIT has a full agenda for the next year and he hopes to make an impact during this period. A plan will be set for the upcoming year which will include planning for the biennial request as well as initiatives within the colleges.

Vice Provost Ann Hill Duin said that the Provost's Office has been involved in many short-term initiatives. One has been the compacts and Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) for each college. This revealed a need for infrastructure which is linked to many of the academic initiatives within the units. We will need to work with OIT on the next biennial request to accommodate these needs. On a long-term basis, we need to identify the contact people within each of the units and then have them, with information from their colleagues, start a long-range planning process for where the unit hopes to be in 10 years. One problem at the beginning was that we thought that the situation within each unit was unique. As we began to work with them, we realized that many initiatives can be linked across units as well as with OIT. Communication will be a key factor to finding solutions.

Steve Cawley said that they are trying to create a co-provider model in which technology decisions are made in each unit, but are then implemented with the help of OIT and the Provost's Office. One step in this process is determining a set of minimum requirements for each unit, such as a job description for information technology personnel within the units.

Q: Are most discussions focused on classroom and administrative uses for technology? There are also professionals on campus that use the technology primarily for external audiences and their views are not being included in these discussions.

A: By improving the infrastructure for classroom and administrative uses, this also helps professionals dealing with outreach.

Q: What have been the discussions regarding units having different levels of resources and sophistication in technology? How is this being dealt with?

A: First, we need to establish standards for support staff ratios and network connectivity. Then we can see where each unit ranks in these areas, and work with the units that are under to bring them to the baseline. IMG by itself might not help, so a 'Robin Hood' model might need to be used where central funds would be given to some units.

Q: This ties into the level of equipment that will be needed for the new PeopleSoft system. Is it true that Mac and UNIX access will not be available?

A: There was a demonstration on a Mac G3 running Virtual PC. This version performed well. PeopleSoft will require either a Mac G3 with Virtual PC or a newer IBM compatible with a pentium processor. The need amounts to \$4 million for desktop replacement. This amount was originally included in the Enterprise Project cost, but at the request of the deans it was removed. This issue will need to be addressed, along with the need for training and development with emerging technology.

Q: Attention has been paid to emerging technology for learning. What happens to technology in support of research? Where will this be monitored? Will standards be developed in this area also?

A: The question of standards has been raised several times. We do not want to stop innovation, but simply provide guidance.

Q: Is there a plan to appoint an advisory committee of faculty and staff? What would its relationship be to other groups at the University?

A: Provost Bruininks wants to frame the issue for an OIT advisory committee within the next month. It would assist Steve Cawley and be composed of faculty and staff members from various Senate committees. There has been no appointing yet.

Q: When will a search committee be appointed to permanently fill the CIO position?

A: Provost Bruininks would like this to begin in the Fall. He would like suggestions from outside firms.

Q: Has there been any discussion regarding the charge to the search committee? Faculty and staff input should be included as well as represented on the search committee.

A: There has been no discussion yet regarding the charge or membership.

Q: Will the job description be revised?

A: Any revision would be part of the search process.

Q: Do you see any problems maintaining the balance between academic and administrative computing in the near future with the introduction of the PeopleSoft project?

A: An advisory committee would play a role in preserving the balance. We need a team effort, but we are still committed to academic initiatives.

Q: Concern has been expressed by faculty regarding choices made in the design of PeopleSoft. The company seems to choose and the colleges lose their freedom. What is being done about this? Are faculty going to be notified?

A: The software should not be blamed. It can be modified, but at a cost to the University. We want to limit customization to reduce costs and simplify the system. The current software was built according to the vision, not the current practice, but no solid decision has been finalized yet. If customizing is done, it will have to be done in each future version.

### **3. Teaching/Research Subcommittee Report**

Professor Grotevant distributed copies of his committee's report and highlighted sections of it for the committee. He then asked for any questions.

Vice Provost Duin said that the new distance education librarian is holding a series of focus groups as part of the Bush Foundation Grant. There are also 200 faculty members who were involved in TEL focus groups during the past year. You can pool these resources and look at what questions have already been asked. This data can then be used as a base for future efforts.

Q: How broadly will the reach of these focus groups be? Will professionals from the community be included?

A: Faculty from Minnesota Extension Service will be included. We did not include professionals at the beginning, but they can be considered as we progress with our focus groups.

Professor Jahn applauded the effort from the subcommittee and made a motion to accept the report. The motion was approved by a majority of members present.

### **4. Finance Subcommittee Report**

Professor Anderson distributed the report from his subcommittee and highlighted portions for the committee. He added that in regards to the new policy from NTS, some to most recommendations that the subcommittee made were ignored. Therefore, issue still remain and new ones are upcoming. It is difficult to determine how decisions are made, although the final decision rests with the President and Provost. He then asked for any questions from the committee. A committee member said that point 14 of the report, regarding quality of service, is especially important at Morris. They are overwhelmed with requests and the service can not keep up with the needs of the faculty.

Steve Cawley said that he was impressed with the report since it captures the current issues and state of OIT. We can use it as a tool to learn from and build upon. In regards to NTS rates, we made some estimates, so we will need to monitor usage patterns and then make adjustments accordingly.

Q: Does this version of the report take the stand against fees for service?

A: This draft minimizes this stand, but calls for caution and delay before they would be implemented.

Professor Jahn thanked the subcommittee for their hard work and made a motion to accept the report. The motion was approved by a majority of members present.

In conclusion, Professor Jahn distributed a draft final report from the committee. He asked that any comments be sent to him, and then a revised version would be distributed. Instead of holding the June meeting, members would be asked to approve the report by e-mail.

Professor Jahn thanked Hal and Ron for their reports and thanked all members for their service this year. He then adjourned the meeting at 3:44.

Rebecca Hippert  
University Senate