IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDAS AND MEETINGS 2004/2005

July 7, 2005

Membership
Akay, Hasan (E&T: Mechanical Engineering) (Chair)
Byrd, Kenneth E. (Medicine)
Crumrin, Robin (University Library)
Ernst, Michael (Science: Math)
Faiola, Anthony (Informatics: New Media)
Firulli, Anthony (Medicine: Pediatrics)
Freeman, Julie (Liberal Arts: English) (Secretary)
Hoyt, Giles (Liberal Arts: Foreign Languages and Cultures: German)
Keck, Juanita (Nursing)
McGrew, John (Science: Psychology)
Vernon, Bob (Social Work)
Wilson, Jeff (Liberal Arts: Geography)
Xu, Zao C. (Basic Medicine: Anatomy)

Liaisons (or Ex Officio)
Billings, Diane (Nursing) (Ex Officio: Chair of IUPUI IT Council) (Alternate = Linda Griffin)
Elmore, Garland (UITS) (Administrative Liaison)
Ng, Bart (Science: Mathematical Sciences) (Executive Committee Liaison)

AGENDA

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee (FCTC)

Agenda Planning Meeting with Liaisons

Monday, November 1, 2004
2:00 – 3:00 pm, IT 541 Board Room

1. Introductions
2. Chair's Report
3. Discussion on the issues and Faculty Council assignments
4. Planning for the year
5. Adjournment

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee

Minutes of the November 1, 2004 Agenda Planning Meeting with Liaisons

Hasan Akay, (E & T: Mechanical Engineering) Chair, and Julie Freeman, (Liberal Arts: English) Secretary, met with Deans of Information Technology Garland Elmore and Brad Wheeler, Administrative Liaisons for IUPUI and IUB, respectively. (Dean Elmore is also Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning Information Technologies; Dean Wheeler is also Associate Vice President, Research and Academic Computing.)

Agenda

The meeting's purpose was to plan the agenda for upcoming FCTC meetings. The Faculty Council has identified the following tasks for the committee as priority items this year:

1. Monitor UITS policies (privacy, UITS Policy Office, peer-to-peer file sharing, security, etc.)
2. Examine UITS support outside the academic calendar
3. Faculty input in upper-level UITS hiring
4. Faculty input in UITS policy development and coordination with VP McRobbie
5. Monitor Internet protocol and security
6. Work with Cyberspace Research Infrastructure task force

Deans Wheeler and Elmore identified an additional issue which should receive top priority: the rollout of Oncourse C-L (Collaboration and Learning), a new version of Oncourse that will provide workspace for committees and colleagues to collaborate on various research tasks. The URL for Oncourse C-L will be presented to the University community on November 16, 2004. The pilot begins in January 2005, when 10,000 users will test it, stress it, and track feedback to it. It will be ready for general use in fall 2005. (To distinguish between the two versions, the current version will be referred to as Oncourse Classic.)

Dean Elmore pointed out that undoubtedly, issues for the committee will arise regarding Oncourse C-L, especially in terms of use of student data and E-portfolios, for example. Thus, it was agreed that Oncourse C-L should be the focus of the first committee meeting, with an overview provided by Dean Elmore and Dean Wheeler. The committee will also review its charge* for new members and set the agenda for the next meeting.

Hasan will get an update from Mark Bruhn, Chief IT Security and Policy Officer, to determine which policies he wants our committee to review. Hasan will also contact Teresa Walsh (tawalsh@iupui.edu) in Dean Elmore's office for help scheduling the first meeting, which he hopes will take place within two – three weeks.

*Charge of the FCTC:

"This committee shall examine overall planning, use, and funding for technology at IUPUI; and advice and act as liaison with administration, was well as faculty and other technology committees including those which are university-wide (e.g., University Faculty Council, University Information Technology Services.) (Bylaw III.B.13.)"

Submitted by Julie Freeman

AGENDA

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee

Monday, December 13, 2004

9:00 – 10:30 am, IT 541 Board Room

6.	Call to order and introductions	(10 min)
7.	Chair's report	(10 min)
8.	Overview of Oncourse CL	
	(Brad Wheeler and Beth Van Gordon, IT Research Office)	(40 min)
9.	Update on UITS policy related matters	
	(Mark Bruhn and Merri Beth Lavagnino, IT Policy Office)	(20 min)
10.	Future work	(10 min)
11.	Adjournment	

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the December 13, 2004 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee held its first meeting of the year from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

Members present:
Hasan Akay, (E & T: Mechanical Engineering) Chair, and Dean Garland Elmore, Administrative Liaison; Diane Billings (Nursing); Robin Crumrin (University Library); Michael Ernst (Science); Anthony Firulli (Medicine); Julie Freeman, (Liberal Arts) Secretary; Giles Hoyt (Liberal Arts); Bob Vernon (Social Work); Zao Xu, (Basic Medicine). Also present were Beth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations, and Merri Beth Lavagnino from the IT policy office. Joining us via polycom from the Wrubel Computing Center 101E conference room in Bloomington, were Mark Bruhn and Stacie Wiegand.

Agenda

1. After the call to order and introductions, Chair Hasan Akay gave a brief report on the committee's membership and charge. We have 2 liaisons and 13 members, five of whom are new.

2. The following tasks assigned by the Faculty Council Executive Committee were reviewed:
   - Monitor UITS policies (privacy, UITS Policy Office, peer-to-peer file sharing, security, etc.)
   - Examine UITS support outside the academic calendar
   - Faculty input in upper-level UITS hiring
   - Faculty input in UITS policy development and coordination with VP McRobbie
   - Monitor internet protocol and security
   - Work with Cyberspace Research Infrastructure task force

3. Dean Garland Elmore provided background information on the rationale for developing a new version of Oncourse (CL). He reported that with 90,000 users and 13 million accesses per day, innovation in Oncourse was outstripping IT's ability to keep up. With only 6 developers at the time, it was decided that we either had to continue to try to develop Oncourse on our own, move to Blackboard or Web CT (very expensive option), or collaborate with other institutions which had developed their own course management system. Three universities were identified (Michigan, MIT, and Stanford), and a consortium was created, operating on a $2 million grant from Mellon. The result is Oncourse CL.

4. Beth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations, provided an overview of Oncourse CL. Beth is in charge of migration from

Oncourse Classic to Oncourse CL. She reported that the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning and its counterpart at IUB are developing a support model. She distributed a timeline for the rollout.

Key points:

- During the next 18 months, both the "old" version (now called Oncourse Classic) and the new version (Oncourse CL) will be available; however, after that, Oncourse as we know it will no longer be available.
- EPort will be folded into CL this fall, supervised by Jay Fern.
- Pilots will be conducted during the Spring 05 semester, followed by the option to migrate during Fall 05. By January 06, we will all begin teaching in CL.
- Changes and refinements will be introduced during the trial period, announced by banners.
- Faculty and committee input is needed so this system can be tailored to IU's needs.
- Users can look under their Profiles on Oncourse for more information or to request a demo site.
- **A worksite in CL will be created for this committee. We will be notified when it is ready.**

3. Merri Beth Lavagnino from ITPO gave a brief introduction to support and processes for UITS policy-related matters, referring to handouts titled "Summary of the Policy Process for University-Wide Information Technology Policies at Indiana University" and "University IT Policies List." She pointed out that the ITPO is not part of UITS, and that the policies are rules, not guidelines. One policy the committee will review is the Mass Email policy, available at

   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/MassEmail.htm

   Other key points:

   - This committee will be asked to endorse policies, but we are not asked to "approve" policies. For more information, members may visit www.itpo.iu.edu. Dr. McRobbie has final authority on decisions to be submitted to Board of Trustees for approval.

- Mark Bruhn would like this committee to help decide where a policy needs to go; e.g., to help decide if it has an impact on academic mission and should therefore go to IUFC.

- The policies on the list will be prioritized and forwarded to us for consideration. At the chair's prerogative, subcommittees will be appointed to serve as primary readers of policies. These readers will come to meetings prepared to discuss each policy.

- Merri Beth distributed one policy for our immediate consideration, "Mass Email Procedures and Restrictions." This is IUB's policy, and this committee must decide how we would like to handle the corresponding IUPUI policy.

- Garland Elmore proposed that all Oncourse questions will be referred to this committee in the future, as the Oncourse Policy Committee is now defunct.

4. It was decided that the next meeting will include a discussion of the mass email policy and any other policies referred to us by ITPO. It was agreed that the committee will meet more often next semester to address the tasks.

The meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by Julie Freeman
Dec. 13, 2004

AGENDA

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee (FCTC)

Wednesday, February 2, 2005

10:00 – 11:30 am, IT 541 Board Room

12. Call to Order and Introductions	(5 min)
13. Review and Approval of the Minutes of December 13, 2004 Meeting	(5 min)
14. Chair's Report	(10 min)
15. Discussions on Policy Reviewing Process	(10 min)
16. Review of Policies	
a. Policies IT-01, 02, and 03 (Vernon and Freeman)	(25 min)
b. Policies IT-21 and 22 (Hoyt and Ernst)	(25 min)
17. Future Work	(10 min)
18. Adjournment	

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the February 2, 2005 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee held its first meeting of the year from 10:00 – 12:00 in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

Members present: Hasan Akay (E & T) Chair; Dean Garland Elmore; Administrative Liaison; Kenneth Byrd (Medicine); John McGrew (Psychology); Michael Ernst (Science); Anthony Firulli (Medicine); Anthony Fiaola (Informatics); Julie Freeman (Liberal Arts) Secretary; Giles Hoyt (Liberal Arts); Bob Vernon (Social Work); Zao Xu (Basic Medicine). Also present: Merri Beth Lavagnino from the IT Policy Office.

Agenda

5. After the call to order and introductions, the minutes were reviewed and approved.

6. Hasan Akay gave a brief report on a meeting with Jay Fern which he and Julie Freeman (committee secretary) attended. The committee will use an Oncourse CL site to access policies, minutes, agendas, and other committee materials. Members were encouraged to attend the Town Hall campus presentation on Oncourse CL on February 3rd.

7. The committee was reminded of the policy review process: reviewers are appointed and collaborate to complete a Policy Readership Reporting Form. Henceforth, these forms will be posted on Oncourse CL in advance of the meeting in which they will be discussed.

   Merri Beth Lavagnino reviewed the Summary of Policy Process which is based on a process issued by the Association of College and University Policy Administrators (http://process.umn.edu/ACUPA/projects/process/). She reported that on February 25, ITPO will compile all comments and edit the policies 01, 02, and 03. She advised the committee that it is up to us how much coordination we do with IU FCTC and IUPUI FC and other faculty bodies. All policies can be accessed at ITPO.iu.edu. Committee members should feel free to forward questions to ITPO and to Merri Beth Lavagnino.

   Giles Hoyt expressed the need to approve all policies and do away with terms such as “interim” and “draft.” Dr. Elmore pointed out that ITPO considers these policies to be “in force.” They say “Interim” because they have not gone to the Trustees. They have been used for about five years.

8. **Review of Policies: IT-01, 02, and 03**

IT-01: The reviewers (Vernon and Freeman) believe this to be a realistic policy, grounded in the mission of the university. However, they feel the policy may be a bit murky about "Incidental personal use," and wonder how spam fits in. They suggest that the policy be endorsed as follows: The opening of the second paragraph should read: "Incidental personal use is an accepted and appropriate benefit of being associated with Indiana University's rich technology environment. However, this type of personal use must still adhere to all university appropriate use policies, and *must never have an adverse impact on uses of technology and information resources in support of the University's missions.* (Our italics.)

During the discussion concern about use for commercial business was expressed, and the committee agreed that a section on sanctions should be inserted into every policy.

IT-02: The reviewers (Vernon and Freeman) suggested that the policy be endorsed with the following change:

Include an authoritative and procedural clause reading:

> "The establishment of any and all investigative and substantive processes and procedures are solely vested with the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology. The ITPO office or its designees may secure any and all pertinent records and devices owned or distributed by the university in pursuit of any inquiry or investigation regarding the misuse of technology resources."

During discussion it was suggested that "Our right of discovery" (See ii.) should be added (only as outlined in the privacy policy – IT-07).

IT-03: The reviewers (Vernon and Freeman) suggested the following addition to the policy:
"Students who have attained candidacy in doctoral pursuits, but are currently not enrolled may continue to use resources pursuant to dissertation-related studies provided that their department supports this."

During discussion it was suggested that another bullet be added regarding doctoral candidates along with post-docs.

IT-21: The reviewers (Hoyt and Ernst) found this to be an extensive document in its purview yet succinct. The term "administrative" was explained as meaning it needs administrative approval. The reviewers pointed out the need for specific examples of items 2, 3, and 4. It was agreed that the term "mutually acceptable" needs to be revised.

IT-22: IT-22 has been archived. It has been replaced by the Mass Email Policy by the BFC at IUB. During the discussion, the following suggestions were made:

- Find a better word for moderate, which has a technological function (Manage? Monitor?).
- Add a link to unsubscribe at the bottom of every posting.

5. Due to shortage of time, it was agreed that the review of policies IT-21 and Mass Email will be continued at the next meeting. Also agreed that the meetings will be scheduled for two hours instead of 90 minutes to allow more time for policy reviews.

6. The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, from 10-12:00 noon, when we will consider IT-21, the Mass Email Policy, and possibly IT-07, the privacy policy.

Submitted by Julie Freeman
February 11, 2005

AGENDA

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee (FCTC)

Wednesday, March 2, 2005

10:00 – 12:00 noon, IT 541 Board Room

19. Call to Order and Introductions	(5 min)
20. Review and Approval of the Minutes of February 2, 2005 Meeting	(5 min)
21. Chair's Report	(10 min)
22. Progress report on IT-01, 02, 03 (Lavagnino)	(15 min)
23. Review of Policy IT-21 (Hoyt and Ernst)	(20 min)
24. Background information on IUB Mass Email Policy (Bruhn)	(15 min)
25. Review of Mass Email Policy of IUB (Hoyt and Ernst)	(30 min)
26. Future Work – Review of Policies IT-07 and 11 (McGrew and Frulli)	(15 min)
27. Adjournment	

Notes: *IUB Mass Email Policy is accessible from* http://www.itpo.iu.edu/policies/campus.html. *Other policies are available at* http://www.itpo.iu.edu/policies/drafts.html

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 2, 2005 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee held its second meeting of the year from 10:00 – 12:00 noon in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

Members present: Hasan Akay, (E & T) Chair; Dean Garland Elmore, Administrative Liaison; Kenneth Byrd (Medicine); Anthony Firulli (Medicine); Julie Freeman, (Liberal Arts) Secretary; Giles Hoyt (Liberal Arts); Juanita Keck (Nursing); John McGrew (Psychology); Zao Xu (Basic Medicine). Also present: Merri Beth Lavagnino (IT Policy Office); Mark Bruhn and Stacie Wiegand via Polycom (IT Policy Office).

Agenda

9. After the call to order and introductions, the minutes were reviewed and approved.

10. Hasan Akay gave a brief report, pointing out that our Oncourse CL site is set up and asking for any suggestions. He reminded us that the work of reviewing policies is also ongoing at the Bloomington campus, and that he had recently met with the IUB FCTC chair, Jim Patterson, who mentioned that they are also working on the same policies. He explained that after receiving our feedback on these policies, the IT Policy Office will make appropriate revisions and submit them to us for a second review. He explained that we would look at IT-21, 22, and Mass Email policies in today's meeting. We would also look at 7 and 11, if time permits.

11. After introducing Mark Bruhn and Stacie Wiegand, joining us from Bloomington via polycom, Merri Beth Lavagnino gave **a progress report on IT-01, 02, and 03**. She thanked us for our work and the template we created for policy reviews. As Step 3 of the review process continued, forty pages of comments were received by her office on IT-01, 02, and 03. Among those responding were various stakeholders identified by ITPO, such as the UITS senior management, IUB Faculty Council technology Committee, IUPUI Faculty Council technology Committee, Regional CIOs, campus LSPs, the IUPUI Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the IUPUI Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, IU Auditors, IU Legal Counsel, and University Human Resources.

    IT-01 has been edited, but she will wait until after 02 and 03 have been edited to share the draft, since all three of these policies are interrelated. By the end of March, they hope to have drafts of all three to bring to stakeholders for another review. We will then have two weeks to see if the revisions addressed our concerns. She has now begun the process of asking for review of IT-07 and 11, and we have one month for that review. The ITPO plans to get final approvals by this summer.

    Merri Beth also pointed out a direct conflict with our committee's suggestion on IT-02 about adding this wording: "The establishment of any and all investigative and substantive processes and procedures are solely vested with the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology. The ITPO office or its designees may secure any and all pertinent records and devices owned or distributed by the university in pursuit of any inquiry or investigation regarding the misuse of technology resources." (See the full report form on Oncourse CL.)

The IUB FCTC strongly disagreed with our suggested addition. Mark Bruhn explained that the suggested addition is more pertinent for IT-07. Committee members responded that our purpose for this comment was to establish a chain of responsibility because top authority (not subordinates) would be needed to initiate actions described in the policy. At issue is who has the authority to decide to take action and investigate (not what is accessible or inaccessible.) Faculty need the right to appeal. Merri Beth pointed out that if we add a sentence like this, we would have to allude to safeguards defined elsewhere (in IT-07.) In light of this, it was agreed to strike out the second sentence in the above mentioned paragraph suggested for IT-02 in our review report.

Mark Bruhn pointed out that internal audits can initiate an inquiry; we must recognize their authority. The committee agreed that all policies should have a reference section pointing to related policies (with links to them on the Web versions.) Printed versions should clearly state how to access referenced policies. IT 01, 02, and 07 are the most pertinent policies, and will likely be referenced in all other policies.

Since there are multiple levels of policies (unit department, school, campus, etc.,) The ITPO wants users to understand that there maybe more stringent local policies they need to be aware of. The website makes this clear.

12. **Mark Bruhn provided background information about the IUB Mass Email Policy.** Mark Bruhn explained that on the Bloomington campus, they started to see a lot of misuse and abuse, so they developed IT-21, a general usage policy. They were having trouble with students originating messages to huge numbers of recipients and with academic departments sending out recruitment messages to students who were already in other schools. A few "email wars" were conducted, and participants were warned to cease and desist or be reported.

    A statement was originally included in the policy to the effect that students could not send an email to someone with whom they had not already established a mutual relationship. However, it was decided that mass emails originating with students cannot be regulated because it is an infringement on their right to free speech. However, emails originating from a department can be regulated, and are only permitted under certain circumstances, and must be administratively approved.

    It was also pointed out that because we have no issues with capacities of servers and networks, we cannot use controls to satisfy concerns about mass emails; therefore, we need to develop policies. Currently, there is no significant university interest in putting barriers on email. Because IU permits incidental personal use, we cannot limit or establish quotas on the number of email recipients; however, we do need to address this issue, and the IUPUI FCTC could try to establish restrictions by inserting language into the policy.

    We were reminded that the IUB FC Mass Email policy addresses only the IUB campus. It has been effective for what it was written to address, and the level of complaints have dropped since then.

13. **Review of Policy: IT-21 Use of Electronic Mail (Hoyt and Ernst)**. The reviewers reported the following strengths of the policy: Establishes policy for use of e-mail—parameters for collegial, non-commercial; mutually agreed upon transmissions; relatively

succinct; concerns for security are expressed. They found these weaknesses: lack of examples and specificity in a number of cases; the definition of a "mutually-accepted personal, business, or academic relationship" and "sensitive institutional and personal information"

Their recommendation was to endorse the policy with these changes:
1. Include specific examples to address concerns above.
2. Include a statement as to ownership of e-mails.
3. Include statement as to privacy (right of individuals to assume e-mails are not read by administrators/third parties). Option: Right of privacy policy statement.

14. **Review of Policy: IT-22 Use of Email for Mass Communications (Hoyt and Ernst).** IT-21 was set aside to work on the Mass Email Policy and because of IUBFC controversies. Currently the guidelines in IT-21 are part of practice but are not officially in force.

    The reviewers identified the strengths of the policy as follows:
    1. Provides some overview of mass mailings.
    2. Gives some structure to the procedure for mass mailings.

    The following weaknesses were listed:
    1. Much of the rationale is redundant with IT-21
    2. Is there a contradiction or at least lack of clarity in who has the power to make exceptions?
    3. Policy seems already outdated in that the university makes considerable use of email for disseminating various information to faculty, students and staff, e.g., *Jagnews.*
    4. There is the same problem of defining a "mutual academic, business, or personal relationship" as in IT-21, but now they actually call them "unsolicited mailings." That might be too broad.
    5. It is not clear why formal lists need to be moderated. Additionally, the requirement concerning addresses not to appear on the To: or Cc: lines is so vague, it could be interpreted to apply to almost any email. Again, this may be an outdated concern.
    6. The part about sensitive information was already covered in IT-21.
    7. It is never clear to which what types of mass communications this policy applies.

    The reviewers initially recommended that the policy be held for more reviews. There are redundancies and probably unneeded repetitions between IT-21 and IT-22. Some of the policies seem out-of-date and/or reflect concerns that do not exist. Clearly, the University is not holding to some of the policies, nor need it.

    Mark Bruhn explained that these policies have not been adopted because of the issues identified by the reviewers. These issues must be addressed before the policies can be approved. It was pointed out that we could incorporate IT-22 into IT-21; then we would not need to create a separate mass email policy. Another option is to merge IT-22 and the BFC Mass email policy. IT-21 would then be separate. Overall, the discussion clarified that we all want to move these policies forward and finish up the process. Some of the policies go back four years, and they need to be moved beyond the draft and interim phases. It was agreed by the committee to revise IT-21 by incorporating the suggestions provided. It was also agreed to come up with a new Mass Email Policy by combining IT-22 and relevant aspects of the BFC Mass Email policy. IT Policy Office (Bruhn and

Lavagnino) were asked to work on such a policy. Having one Mass Email policy for both campuses (IUB and IUPUI) was emphasized by the committee.

7. **Review of the Policies: IT-07 Privacy and IT-11 Fair Usage (McGrew and Firulli).** Due to shortage of time the reviewers gave a synopsis of their reports on the two policies which will be discussed at the next meeting at full length. Committee members were asked to read the policies and corresponding reviews. It was decided that a Legal Counsel will be invited to attend the meeting due to important legal aspects of the privacy policy (IT-07).

8. The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, April 13, from 10:00-12:00 noon,** when we will consider IT-07, the privacy policy, and IT-11.

Submitted by Julie Freeman
March 2, 2005

AGENDA

IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee (FCTC)

Wednesday, April 13, 2005

10:00 – 12:00 noon, IT 541 Board Room

Guests: *University Counsels Beth Cate and Tom Gannon*

28. Call to Order and Introductions	(10 min)
29. Review and Approval of the Minutes of March 2, 2005 Meeting	(10 min)
30. Chair's Report	(15 min)
31. Progress report on policies IT-01, 02, 03, 21, and Mass Email (Lavagnino)	(20 min)
32. Review of Policy IT-07 (McGrew and Firulli)	(45 min)
33. Review of Policy IT-11 (McGrew and Firulli)	(25 min)
34. Adjournment	

Notes:

- *IUB Mass Email Policy is accessible from* http://www.itpo.iu.edu/policies/campus.html. *Other policies are available at* http://www.itpo.iu.edu/policies/drafts.html.
- Committee agendas, minutes, and review reports are available on the 'Resources' folder of Oncoursecl (http://oncoursecl.iu.edu/).

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 13, 2005 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee met from 10:00 – 12:00 pm in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

Members present: Hasan Akay, E & T, Chair; Dean Garland Elmore, Administrative, UITS, Liaison; Kenneth Byrd, Medicine; Robin Crumrin, University Library; Michael Ernst, Science; Anthony Fiaola, Informatics; Anthony Firulli, Medicine; Julie Freeman, Liberal Arts, Secretary; Juanita Keck, Nursing; John McGrew, Psychology. Also present from ITPO: Merri Beth Lavagnino, Mark Bruhn, and Stacie Wiegand; Tom Gannon and Joe Scodro, IUPUI Legal Counsel.

Agenda

1. After the call to order and introductions, the minutes were reviewed and approved.

2. Hasan Akay gave a brief report, pointing out that the work of reviewing policies is also being conducted on the Bloomington campus and that we are sharing our comments. He reminded us that the focus of the meeting was to review IT-07 and IT-11.

3. Merri Beth Lavagnino gave a progress report on IT-01, -02, -03, -21 and Mass Email. She thanked the committee for its work and the template created for policy reviews. As the review process continued, comments from several entities were received by her office on these policies, and they are in the process of revising them now. She reported that these policies are interconnected yet they lack conformity. A more uniform format is desired, so they are also adding more references to all the policies, making sure they all have the same sections, and they are moving elements from one policy to another to make them more cohesive. They have found that our philosophies and values have not changed significantly in the past five years. The comments tend to be related to procedures or wording, not on the underlying assumptions. The biggest changes have been in IT-02, the "Policy on Sanctions." They are working on the title because it does not seem to be appropriate for the content.

   Mark Bruhn pointed out that the policy statement part of these policies will be static over time; however, the procedures could be addressed in the future during maintenance processes.

   <u>The timeline:</u>
   We'll see these five policies again for a second round of comments by the end of this semester. The final approval process will take place this summer. By fall, the goal is to remove "interim" from the policies. The original reviewers from our committee will look at these policies and forward any final comments. This summer, ITPO will begin to work on merging IT-22 and the IUB Mass Email policy.

4. <u>Review of IT-07: McGrew and Firulli:</u>
   "PC" may be changed to "workstation" in this policy to update the terminology. Problems related to the interpretation of the 3rd bullet on the policy include the wording

"on the property" since someone can be connected to the IU network and the data would be covered but not the hardware. Accessing the infrastructure is not covered clearly by this policy. Any device connected to the IU infrastructure is, however, covered by this policy while the device is connected. The committee raised the question, "should we try to define the hardware or the point of participation? The committee also questioned the extent to which we should be involved in legal matters; however, it was pointed out that the university has an obligation to protect its own resources even if there's no criminal investigation or illegal activity. Another issue is how "reasonable belief" is established, and how "illegal" vs. "policy infringement" is differentiated. Opinions varied on this, but it was acknowledged that there is always a judgment call in such legal matters.

Discussions continued on the definition of publicly owned versus privately owned information. It was pointed out that a clear distinction of these be made in the policy and understood by those who implement these policies.

It was agreed that the due process for all the actions need be defined clearly with this policy. The fact that the due process needs approval from the highest administrator of the campus, as indicated in the policy (chancellor), was found to be appropriate. It was also emphasized that the all IT personnel should be trained adequately in dealing with privacy related matters when working on faculty and staff computers. The committee agreed that a recommendation be made to human resources office to make sure that all departmental IT personnel are adequately trained on privacy related matters by attending a formal certification workshop to be offered by the IT Policy Office. University Counsel Joe Scodro and committee chair Hasan Akay will jointly convey this message to the administrator of the Human Resources Office.

More details on the recommendations are available in the accompanying report submitted by the reviewers. The committee also recommended that the revised version be carefully reviewed by the Office of University Counsel.

In closing, Mark Bruhn pointed out that the original policy was jointly drafted by him and the Counsel Beth Cate.

5. <u>Review of IT-011: McGrew and Firulli:</u>
   The strengths were cited as simple, logical, and straightforward. The weaknesses are: 1) no definition of university versus non-university activities; 2) need for updated list of technology resources; 3) inordinate use as defined in the policy seems to focus on shared resources and doesn't appear to have applicability to some individual use items. More details are available in the report submitted by the reviewers. Mark Bruhn indicated that this policy was mainly developed to address the enormous student usage of shared bandwidth.

The chair, Hasan Akay, thanked all the members for their attendance and contributions throughout the semester and requested that they be prepared to receive e-mails from him regarding the summer activities of ITPO while finalizing the policies, IT-01, -02, -03, -07, -11, -21, and the Mass Email policy. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm. No further meetings are scheduled for this semester.

Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay
April 15, 2005