

**IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES 2005/2006**

**July 20, 2006**

**Membership**

Akay, Hasan (E&T: Mechanical Engineering) (Chair)

Byrd, Kenneth E. (Medicine)

Crumrin, Robin (University Library)

Defazio, Joseph (Informatics)

Ernst, Michael (Science: Math)

Freeman, Julie (Liberal Arts: English) (Secretary)

Koponen, Tim (SPEA)

Kowolik, Joan (Dentistry)

McGrew, John (Science: Psychology)

Namenye, Andrew Joseph (GSO)

Stoten, Sharon (Nursing)

Vernon, Bob (Social Work)

**Liaisons (or Ex Officio)**

Billings, Diane (Nursing) (Ex Officio: Chair of IUPUI IT Council)

Elmore, Garland (UITS) (Administrative Liaison)

Goodwin, Clifford (Engineering & Technology) (Executive Committee Liaison)

**Minutes Recorder**

Theresa Walsh (UITS)

## AGENDA

### IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee

Monday, September 19, 2005

9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room

**Guests:** *Jay Fern, Beth Van Gordon, Merri Beth Lavagnino, and a GSO (Graduate Student Organization) Representative.*

1. Call to Order and Introductions (10 min)
2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the April 13, 2005 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (15 min)
4. Report on Life-Cycle Funding (*Garland Elmore*) (15 min)
5. Update on Oncourse CL (*Beth Van Gordon and Jay Fern*) (25 min)
6. Status of IT Policy Updates (*Merri Beth Lavagnino*) (20 min)
7. Other Business (15 min)
8. Adjournment

## IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### *Minutes of the September 19, 2005 Meeting*

The Faculty Council Technology Committee met from 9:00 – 11:00 in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

Members present: Hasan Akay, (E & T: Mechanical Engineering) Chair; Dean Garland Elmore, Administrative Liaison; Robin Crumrin, University Library; Michael Ernst (Science); Julie Freeman, (Liberal Arts) Secretary; Clifford Goodwin, (Engineering and Technology) Executive Committee Liaison; Bob Vernon (Social Work);

Guests: Beth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations; Merri Beth Lavagnino, Deputy Information Technology Policy Officer.

### **Agenda**

1. After the call to order and introductions, the agenda was reviewed and approved.
2. Hasan Akay gave a brief report, reminding the committee of what was accomplished last year in this committee. He referred the committee to the 2004/2005 annual report, which is available on our Oncourse site. An action item carried over to this year is continuing the review process of remaining policies. A new action may involve taking steps to help establish a training program for all IT personnel.
3. Garland Elmore reported on his office's review of the Life-Cycle Funding procedures. After reviewing their current life-cycle replacement model, they will decide on recommitting the funds to continue. He charged the committee with gathering feedback on the following question: What is the impact of the life-cycle policy on teaching, learning, and research? Although the consensus was that teaching, learning, and research would be adversely affected without the life-cycle replacements, the committee agreed to gather responses to this question at the school and department level through the use of focus groups, at meetings, and via faculty listserv. Garland Elmore promised to submit the charge to the committee in a written form.
4. Beth Van Gordon updated the committee on the status of Oncourse CL enhancements. She explained the Oncourse enhancement process, which includes Suggestions Analysis Team, which categorizes and classifies suggestions submitted to the Oncourse Development Team; the Functional Requirements Committee, comprised of both developers and faculty, which reviews the suggestions and sends them on to the Oncourse Priorities Committee, which prioritizes them and makes recommendations for administrative review and development. She also shared several documents with the committee, including the results of the Oncourse Readiness Survey and comparisons of Oncourse CL and original Oncourse functions. These documents will be posted in our Oncourse site. She also reported that the ePort is now fully integrated into Oncourse CL.
5. Merri Beth Lavagnino thanked the committee on its work on the policy reviews and reported on the status of IT policies 01, 02, 03, and 11. As the review process continues, they are negotiating the language with IU legal counsel. The legal counsel's concerns are related to wording; the underlying philosophies and values have not been altered. IT #7

has not been sent out for a second review because it is still with legal counsel as well. They are not starting a review of the next set of policies at this time.

6. Merri Beth Lavagnino also announced that October is “National Cyber Security Awareness Month” nationwide, and each of the 5 weeks in October, faculty will receive a postcard announcing the week’s theme (password snatchers, worms and viruses, phishing scams, etc.) These have been identified as the most significant security issues at IU.
7. Beth Van Gordon also announced that IU has negotiated a new two-year policy with the radio frequency response system, E-Instruction. Students will buy the response device, and faculty will register their courses and request a receiver from E-Instruction.
8. The meeting was adjourned with the next meeting to be arranged by Theresa Walsh, Administrative Assistant for the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology.

*Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay  
September 20, 2005*

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, October 17, 2005**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Tom Davis and Sue Workman*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the September 19, 2005 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (15 min)
4. Review of IU E-mail storage policy (25 min)
5. Indexing of personal home pages (20 min)
6. Impact study of IU lifecycle funding practice – faculty point of view (20 min)
7. Other Business (10 min)
8. Adjournment

## IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the October 17, 2005 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee met from 9:00 – 11:00 pm in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

**Members present:** Hasan Akay, E & T, Chair; Robin Crumrin, University Library; Michael Ernst, Science; Joe Defazio, Informatics; Julie Freeman, Liberal Arts, Secretary; John McGrew, Psychology. Bloomington guests via Polycom: Sue Workman, Director of User Support; Tom Davis, University IT Security Officer.

#### Agenda

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

##### 1. Review of the IU e-mail storage policy

The committee has been made aware of faculty members' concerns about privacy violations related to the practice of associating users with MAC identifiers (unique hardware identifiers that tie users to the IP addresses and thus to their machines.) Some faculty believe this practice exposes them to violations of academic freedom (please refer to the attached document "Faculty Council Concern on Security/Privacy Matters" for a complete summary of this issue.) Tom Davis, University IT Security Officer, reassured the committee that confidentiality is tantamount; the three key goals of their office are privacy/security; integrity; and availability of resources. The primary reason for the temporary backup policy is to make any recently lost information due to hardware/software malfunction or user error available to users and for official usage for a total of 30 days. This is a common practice in most institutions; some store the information for longer or shorter durations, depending on their resources. He reiterated that their procedures are standard practice among the industry and among higher education institutions. The university's IT office consults legal counsel about any laws that affect practice in higher education.

He also pointed out that IU policy number IT-07, which addresses the question of who other than the user can access stored files, was reviewed and approved by this committee. He acknowledged that the KB document related to this issue has some inconsistencies and will soon be revised for accuracy.

It was suggested that faculty concerned about privacy should not communicate private information via email under any circumstances. Faculty could also consider a possible technical solution such as immediately permanently deleting any sensitive communications before they are stored.

The issue with the MAC identifiers (unique identifiers and IP addresses for computers on the network) was also addressed by Tom Davis, who added that these were used to quickly identify the computers on the network which might be compromised and inform the users. The earlier detection capability provided helps prevent the viruses from spreading quickly to other users. The computers are not taken away unless a computer on the network is compromised and is used in an illegal act (e.g., child pornography) or if the machine contains sensitive institutional data. In such circumstances the machines may be taken to preserve evidence and/or determine the extent of the

compromise. The network security and identification of crackers are the main purposes for these measures. He compared knowing these identifying numbers as being no different than looking a telephone directory.

Also being questioned was the purpose and use of ITNow, which was addressed by Sue Workman.

She explained that ITNow is a support tool that collects information about users' hardware so that their office can assist users, plan and adjust their IT services accordingly. It simply collects machine configuration information, such as processor types, OS versions, etc, and then aggregates these for the usage of resources allowing UITS make future plans. She said it is absolutely not spy ware or other type of monitoring system and that UITS does not monitor file sharing.

## **2. Indexing of personal home pages**

Merri Beth Lavagnino, Deputy Information Technology Policy Officer, asked the committee to consider the problem of users retrieving potentially offensive content as a result of conducting a search at a main IU web page that resulted in returns from a personal home page on an IU server. (Please refer to "Background on Personal Home Pages," attached.)

The committee recommended that the default should be a search of IU pages only, and that a check box should be provided that allows users to also search "Mypages" (personal home pages) with a clearly stated disclaimer appearing adjacent to the check box.

## **3. Faculty view of the impact of IU's lifecycle funding practice**

Garland Elmore submitted a written charge (attached) to the committee regarding his request that we gather information about the impact of the lifecycle policy on teaching, learning, and research. The committee asked for a clarification on the scope of the request; i.e., is anecdotal evidence gathered at faculty meetings across campus sufficient, or are statistically reliable data needed, such as that gathered from a faculty survey? One suggestion was that UITS add a section on this issue to their annual survey. The committee expressed concern that such a section would need to be preceded by a brief explanation of the current practice, of which many faculty are apparently unaware. Faculty would also need to be clear that the policy covers not only faculty members' office computers, but extends to printers, servers, machines in computer classrooms, etc., as the committee predicts that is the area of greatest concern among faculty who teach with technology.

## **4. Other business:**

- *Default home page settings on public computers on campus.* Julie Freeman reported that a common complaint among colleagues (as brought to her attention by the SLA faculty assembly president and members of the English Department's Writing Program Instructional Technology Committee) concerns the UITS homepage as the default home page setting on computers in smart classrooms, some building lobbies, and other public spaces on campus. Many faculty would prefer to have their campus website ([www.iupui.edu](http://www.iupui.edu)) as the default website, since they are most familiar with it and would like to quickly access their email or Oncourse or to visit the other commonly used links,

such as the link to University Library or to academic programs. Users are unlikely to use these computers primarily to access UITS.

- *Training program update.* Tom Davis thanked the committee for our endorsement of their proposal to institute a system-wide comprehensive technical training program working in conjunction with legal counsel and internal audit. The curriculum will include training in best practices in security and privacy issues and will focus on increasing awareness of policies like IT-07. They are also working with Human Resources to develop training certificates to assure that our IT staff is properly trained to operate the systems with which they work, and will keep us updated as they roll out the program.

The meeting was adjourned with the reminder that the committee will meet again on November 21, 2005.

*Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay  
October 17, 2005*



## Faculty Council Concern on Security/Privacy Matters

The question is still one of security and what UITS stores from our computers. We would like to know who determines what is stored? [Why cannot the faculty be in charge of what is stored? Why is it UITS or "the University"?] For how long is the information stored? [Again, who determines the length of time? Faculty input?] What are we being protected from? And how are the faculty protected in this system?

An important consideration, I believe, is the fact that the University of Pennsylvania, David related, solved the issue of having potentially "incriminating" or "suspicious" or dangerous information from faculty computers collected and stored for even 30 days by simply refusing to collect such information. Why cannot IU take the same measures? Why does IU have to collect and store information from faculty computers even for a limited time, thus making us vulnerable to a searching expedition by outside agencies?

The issue is really quite simple: we as a Faculty Council have been concerned about the interim policies regarding who gets access to data available from our tech folks. I am asking that Faculty Council assert faculty rights to determine policy on what information is gathered and stored in the first place. Right now that is determined by tech staff. I have heard from ITPO and ITSO many times. They will tell you that we have to trust them to tell us what is essential and what is the best way of dealing with security issues. I disagree. I think that faculty (probably your committee) should have oversight of their activities. **There are two issues that are of special concern--one is identifying real-time use by associating users with MAC identifiers--** something that is of questionable value in preventing the spread of malicious stuff, but a practice which exposes users to real-time eavesdropping. **The second issue is their planting spyware on computers under the guise of inviting users to install a feature for helping them assess problems.** It's called ITNow, and apropos of the U. of Penn case, one of its explicit purposes (according to an earlier published description that I can no longer find) was to monitor file sharing (see <http://kb.iu.edu/data/apak.html>). Notice the assertion that "All information is handled in accordance with applicable university policies and applicable state and federal laws." The fact is that those laws allow extraordinary access to the information collected, but are moot if the information is not collected. I don't advocate law-breaking, but I do think that we as users have a right to determine the limits of ITPO/ITSO encroachment on our privacy, especially as an agent facilitating policing for private businesses.

In short, I believe that faculty have a right to oversee and determine technology/security policies that may expose them to violations of academic freedom. ITPO/ITSO have an interest in minimizing risk to network operations; there is no reason to believe that they have an interest in protecting us from violations of civil liberties or academic freedom that may arise from their policies and practices. I would like Faculty Council to assert faculty concerns and to see that faculty governance extends to the level of technology policies that truly affect the campus community.

## Retention and Recovery of E-mails

The following summarizes the practice of e-mail storage at IUPUI. Regarding the retention and recovery of deleted emails, the IT-07 policy addresses the "who other than the user can access the files" in question.

<http://kb.iu.edu/data/abdt.html>

### **At IUPUI, can I get backups of files I accidentally deleted from a UITS central system?**

Each night, [UITS](#) backs up files stored on UITS shared [Unix](#) systems (Champion, [Steel](#)). If you accidentally delete a file from your Unix account, you may request that it be restored from a backup copy. You may also request a file recovery for files that you accidentally deleted from [Cyrus mail](#).

Files can be recovered **only if they resided on the system overnight**. Therefore, a file deleted the same day it was created will not be recoverable. Similarly, email messages deleted the same day they arrived will be impossible to recover.

To request a file restore on one of the central computer systems listed above, call the UITS Support Center in Indianapolis at 317-274-4357. Have the following information ready:

- Your name
- Your [Network ID](#) username
- System name where the file was located (e.g., Steel, Cyrus mail)
- Path to where the file was located
- Name of the file(s) to be restored
- Date from which the file is to be restored (most often the date the file was deleted)

On most systems, files cannot be recovered more than **30 days** after their deletion because backup tapes are kept for only one month. On Cyrus mail, files cannot be recovered more than **15 days** after they are deleted.

### **Also see:**

- [In Unix, how do I undelete a file?](#)
- [In Unix, if I accidentally delete my .profile, .login, or .cshrc files, where can I get new ones?](#)

*This is document aghp in domain all.  
Last modified on August 10, 2005.*

**Background on Personal Home Pages (<http://mypage.iu.edu>)**

**By: Merri Beth Lavagnino, Deputy Information Technology Policy Officer**

We have had a number of technology incidents reported over the years where a personal home page (on [mypage.iu.edu](http://mypage.iu.edu)) was indexed in searches initiated at the main IU web pages, and the page contained potentially "offensive" content, or at the least, content that was not in keeping with the teaching, research, and service mission of the university. From the IT Policy Office point of view, it has been difficult to explain to complainants why they retrieved this content. Although there is a disclaimer at the front of [mypage.iu.edu](http://mypage.iu.edu) (see <http://mypage.iu.edu/>), there isn't such a disclaimer on the main IU pages nor on each personal page and so a person doing an IU web page search and coming up with these personal pages is usually rather shocked that it is there as an "official IU page."

In asking around to try to find out how this decision was made so that we could better explain it to complainants, it appears as though no decision was made! It has just evolved this way, apparently because a number of faculty members through the years have asked for these to be indexed due to their placement of course materials or research interest pages on [mypage.iu.edu](http://mypage.iu.edu).

We do indeed provide [mypage.iu.edu](http://mypage.iu.edu) so that users can have a place to put up personal content that is NOT related to the mission of the university. The intention was that pages that support the mission of the university should be hosted on departmental servers, in Oncourse, or on the central Veritas server, and that these pages would be appropriately included in the IU search engines.

Since I cannot locate any official IU community statement on what should be indexed or not indexed, I am asking at this time for a discussion about what we as the IU community want reflected in the IU search engine. Should personal home pages be retrieved in IU web site searches? Should they be indexed separately? Are there other possible solutions for separating mission-related materials from personal materials? Is it even desirable to separate them? If it is not desirable, how might we make clear the disclaimer concerning personal web pages when searching from official IU pages?

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

### Charge to Committee

**By: Garland Elmore, Associate Vice President and Dean, Office of the Vice President for Information Technology and CIO**

Action 1 of the Indiana University Information Technology Strategic Plan (ITSP) stated that “the University should build lifecycle replacement funding into its planning at every level of investment in information technology (including personal, departmental, and central systems, and network hardware and software); and UITS should develop a lifecycle replacement model to use where needed in conjunction with its investments in information technology.” Action 2 went on to say that “the University should budget a standard amount per year, per FTE to support lifecycle replacement of faculty and staff desktop computers, and to cover the cost of providing local support to that desktop.” The third Action specified that the University’s stock of computers be systematically modernized.

In August 2000, after little more than two years of progress on these Actions, IU completed the implementation of lifecycle funding for desktop computers, operating systems, and common applications for all the campuses of the University. During the initial phase of this project, more than 10,000 obsolete computers in 110 Schools and service units were replaced at a cost of **\$11M**. The replacement value of the inventory was calculated at **\$20M**. Faculty and staff desktop computers were upgraded so that **15,000** computers are now less than three years old. A **\$6M** annual lifecycle fund has been established to keep more than **15,000 faculty**, administrative, and student desktop computers up-to-date with the units and UITS sharing management and supervisory responsibility.

UITS and IU Purchasing have negotiated to leverage the mass purchase power of the University to realize the lowest workstation and notebook prices in meeting lifecycle funding objectives. More than **37,000** machines have been purchased by IU schools and departments, realizing savings of more than **\$15M**. In May 2003, IU entered a Preferred Partnership with Dell Marketing — IU’s first such agreement — that offers students, faculty, and staff the opportunity to purchase specially configured workstations, laptops, and multimedia computers at up to **\$600** below standard educational pricing, and discounts of up to **13%** below educational rates on the full catalog of Dell computers, printers, and handheld devices.

The successful implementation of lifecycle funding and basic equipment modernization is an impressive achievement that has brought IU national attention. This accomplishment should have greatly enhanced faculty members’ and students’ opportunities to make full instructional, administrative, and research use of information technology. Indeed, the success of this implementation is generally expressed through high levels of satisfaction in the UITS annual User Survey. However, to help ensure that the program continues to meet its original objectives, and is adjusted to evolving needs and requirements of the faculty, students and staff of Indiana University, the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology (OVPIT) is initiating a review. The campus IT deans and UITS staff will work with campus and school administrators to evaluate many aspects of the program, but only the faculty can provide a meaningful review of the program’s impact on teaching, learning and research.

I write, therefore, to ask the IUPUI Technology Committee to provide a faculty perspective on the value of the modernization and lifecycle funding program. More specifically,

- what difference has the computer modernization and lifecycle funding program made in the effectiveness of faculty teaching and/or research?

- Are there examples that can be cited to illustrate the impact on teaching and research?
- Is the lifecycle program currently meeting the needs of the faculty?
- How could the lifecycle replacement program be improved at the school, campus and/or university levels?

In short, I would appreciate receiving any comments or suggestions regarding the lifecycle program especially as it relates to faculty use of IT in teaching and research.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

## AGENDA

### IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee

Monday, November 21, 2005

9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room

**Guests:** *Merri Beth Lavagnino and Beth Van Gordon*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 17, 2005 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (15 min)
4. Merging of mass e-mail policies (*Lavagnino*) (20 min)
5. DHCP registration of computers and Null Routing (*Lavagnino*) (20 min)
6. Status of Oncourse CL (Van Gordon) (15 min)
7. A draft survey for lifecycle funding program (*Elmore*) (15 min)
8. Other Business (10 min)
9. Adjournment

## IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the November 21, 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; Garland Elmore, Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning Information Technologies and Dean for Information Technology; Michael Ernst, Science; Julie Freeman, Liberal Arts, Secretary; Joan Kowalik, Dentistry; Sharon Stoten, Nursing; John McGrew, Psychology; Bob Vernon, Social Work. Also present: Merri Beth Lavagnino, ITPO, and Beth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations.

#### Agenda

1. After the call to order, the chair welcomed new committee members Sharon Stoten and Joan Kowalik.
2. The October minutes were reviewed and approved.
3. **Chair's Report.** Hasan Akay gave a brief report, pointing out that our committee needs to help establish a common understanding of the need for security policies among faculty. He noted that we would be updated on e-Port at our next meeting.
4. **Status of Oncourse CL.** Beth Van Gordon updated the committee on the status of Oncourse CL. She provided the most recent statistics on the transition to Oncourse CL, as explained in the November 4 report from the Academic Leadership Council, attached. She pointed out the training and support resources available to faculty making the transition to Oncourse CL, also discussed in the previously referenced report.

She reminded the committee of the procedures currently underway to review and prioritize recommendations, which involve the Functional Requirements Committee and the Oncourse Priorities Committee. They will establish the work plan for the development team for Spring 2006.

She pointed out that the most noticeable changes in the new 2.1 version to be released in December will be the Message Centers, with one-to-one, whole class, and group communication. The version has undergone extensive usability testing; however, with wider usage among faculty, weaknesses or deficiencies may be identified. As those are uncovered, they will be addressed by the Oncourse Priorities Committee. The national Sakai group are focusing on the four main weaknesses that have been uncovered in previous versions and our development team will continue this work.

The retirement of original Oncourse application is planned for June 2006, but Garland Elmore noted that this date could be moved if warranted by bugs in the system. Faculty will still be able to use File Manager in Original Oncourse and can migrate files into Resources in CL using a utility designed for that function.

Beth Van Gordon reported that 2200 faculty have taken the Readiness Survey and have opted out, most often citing issues with the syllabus, announcements, grade book, and the ability to redirect courses. Julie Freeman expressed the need for original Oncourse's Group Space functionality to be incorporated into Oncourse CL, as it facilitates collaboration and ensures security of files for students working on team projects. It was agreed that some features may not be used by a large number of faculty but are central to their curriculum.

Finally, Beth Van Gordon announced that our committee will be invited to a "Faculty Conversation" featuring a "sneak preview" of 2.1 in December.

5. **DHCP registration of computers and NULL routing.** Merri Beth Lavagnino reported on DHCP registration of computer and NULL Routing. She provided copies of a printout of portions of the IU Messaging Services website, which indicates that all IU network computers will be required to use DHCP to acquire a dynamic IP address. The goal is to increase security and accountability to the IU network. According to the website, "UITS will globally require MAC address registration on all IUPUI and IUB DHCP subnets effective January 4, 2006."

Users will have to register by authenticating and providing the userid of their LSP. When new machines are turned on for the first time, users will receive a message asking them to register, and current users may be asked periodically to renew their registration. This new approach to registering machines will allow them to count all unseen or unused IP numbers and make better use of existing resources.

She reminded the committee of the three goals of security: confidentiality, integrity, and accessibility (CIA). Their main objective is to protect the IU community from outsiders who may infiltrate the network with malicious intent. They need to have the ability to immediately identify any machines that have been compromised in order to protect other computers on the network, which can be affected in a matter of minutes. She advised the committee to read "IPSAP in a Nutshell," a section of the IU Messaging Services website, which is not available to the public for security reasons. She also explained that NULL Routing is automatic network isolation, a procedure which isolates a compromised device from the network.

Hasan Akay asked how to mitigate faculty concerns about privacy issues and authority, which have been raised in several forums. Some faculty are not convinced of the necessity of the new procedures. Merri Beth Lavagnino and Garland Elmore explained that the IU Board of Trustees directed Vice President Michael McRobbie to secure the network, and he directed the IT Security Office to create the proposal and carry out the plan. This plan has been taken through all the normal channels, including to Bart Ng in the summer of 2004 and to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee in the fall of that year; to a Town Hall meeting in the spring of 2005; to the University Council of Deans, and to the University Faculty Council. IUPUI Associate Chancellor Bill Plater has also reviewed the plan. Garland Elmore pointed out that the new process should actually improve privacy. He also offered to share with the committee written communications he had with the Faculty Council President Bart Ng and the Executive Vice President Bill Plater on this matter.

6. **Merging of mass email policies.** Merri Beth Lavagnino reported on the status of the IT policies that were reviewed by the Technology Committee last spring semester. Out of the five policies (IT-01, 02, 03, 07, and 11) that the committee reviewed and approved, all but one, have received approval by the University Counsel with minor changes. IT-07 (Privacy of IT University Resources) has undergone major wording changes at the University Counsel's Office, as a result



it needs to come back to the committee for a second review. Merri Beth gave a historic background on the three different policies existed on the use of email (IT-21 and 22) as well as the mass email communication (originally drafted and approved by the IUB committee). Our committee reviewed those last spring semester and recommended that a single policy be drafted by ITPO, incorporating the essential elements of the three policies. Merri Beth then distributed to the members a new draft policy for email which has been prepared by merging the three previous policies. She would like the committee to review this policy and provide feedback to her office. She indicated that the draft is still too rough, so any suggestions the committee can make to improve the wording was welcomed. The committee agreed to further discuss the policy at the coming meeting via a review process adopted earlier by the committee. ITPO will then take the revised draft to other stake holders.

7. **Draft survey for lifecycle funding program.** Garland Elmore gave information on an administrative review which has started to evaluate impact of the IU's lifecycle funding program – a program originally started with the goal of changing every desk-top computer in the university every three years. Funds have decreased since the inception of the program, but Garland thinks that we are still ahead of the game due to declining computer hardware costs. This is a self-imposed review to help the administration to assess the effectiveness of the program and find out how it can be improved. In addition to an administrative review, a second review is requested to assess how well this program has affected the faculty teaching and research. Garland would like this to be a faculty managed project. He charged the committee with the task of preparing a survey that will provide quantitative results to find out how to make the program better. He would like this to be done from the faculty point of view and gave a list of sample questions to be considered for the survey. In response to the charge given to the committee, it was agreed that a subcommittee comprised of Bob Vernon (chair), John McGrew, Michael Ernst, and Robin Crumrin will be formed to come up with an appropriate survey and implementation plan. Late March or early April is suggested as the deadline for completion.
8. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 am.

*Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay  
November 21, 2005*

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Wednesday, December 14, 2005**

**10:00 – 12:00 noon, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Merri Beth Lavagnino*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 21, 2005 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (15 min)
4. Faculty perspective on Oncourse CL (*Freeman/Akay*) (20 min)
5. Review report on IT-21 and discussions (*Ernst*) (30 min)
6. Other Business (10 min)
7. Adjournment

## IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the December 14, 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; Garland Elmore, Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning Information Technologies and Dean for Information Technology; Julie Freeman, Liberal Arts, Secretary; Joan Kowolik, Dentistry; Sharon Stoten, Nursing; John McGrew, Psychology; Bob Vernon, Social Work. Also present via polycam from Bloomington: Merri Beth Lavagnino and Stacie Wiegand, ITPO; and Beth Cate, University Counsel.

### Agenda

1. After the call to order, the chair welcomed guests joining us from the Bloomington campus.
2. The November minutes were reviewed and approved.
3. **Chair's Report.** Hasan Akay informed us that the committee will be invited to the Faculty Conversation (preview of Oncourse CL) originally scheduled for December 9.
  - The committee agreed that the proposed dates for spring semester 2006 meetings are suitable. The dates are January 23; February 13; March 6; April 10; and May 1.
  - A graduate student organization member will be coming to future meetings.
  - A joint proposal to NSF for establishing a supercomputing facility on the IUPUI campus is being prepared jointly by IU and Purdue. The system will provide several Teraflops of computing power, facilitating research involving large and complex scientific and engineering problems. It will also handle massive datasets.
4. **Faculty Perspective on Oncourse CL.** Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay updated the committee on the current faculty perspective on the upcoming transition from original Oncourse to Oncourse CL.

Julie noted that faculty with whom she is in contact appear to be excited about the new enhancements like drag and drop, WYSIWYG, and Wiki, but at the same time, they want to be absolutely sure the functions they rely on to teach their classes will be available, easily accessible, and reasonably reliable before they switch to CL.

She pointed out that faculty have invested a tremendous amount of time and effort into fully integrating Oncourse into their teaching. This process has occurred over a period of

several years, as many professors have incorporated a new tool or function every semester, slowly building and improving their course sites as they learned how to fully take advantage of all Oncourse offers. Now, however, faculty wishing to continue using Oncourse to the extent they have in the past will have to adjust to the new application almost all at once. It's true they can gain experience in a practice site, but it takes managing a course in Oncourse CL to truly learn it.

Many faculty have come to rely on Oncourse to the extent that they have incorporated it into assignments, syllabi, and class activities, and are now faced with learning new procedures, terminology, and tools. In some cases this new environment does not yet provide the functionality provided in original Oncourse. In other cases the procedures seem foreign because the interface and the terms are different. Therefore, the transition will mean not only finding the time to learn CL, but it will also mean revising course materials to make adjustments for the new terminology, the new procedures, and the new functions. This will be no small task. For faculty whose main job it is to teach, such as our lecturers who teach 4 classes a semester, it's a daunting prospect.

Because the success of our classes (and our students) rests in part on how we use technology, faculty want to be very confident that things will go well before risking the switch to CL.

As reported by Beth Van Gordon at our previous meeting, the retirement of original Oncourse application is planned for June 2006. Garland Elmore reminded us that although a delay would result in a significant cost to the University, this date could be moved if warranted by bugs in the system or faculty concerns. He also noted that after original Oncourse is retired, faculty will still be able to use File Manager in Original Oncourse and can migrate files into Resources in CL using a utility designed for that function.

5. **Report on IT-21: Merging of mass email policies.** Committee member Michael Ernst prepared a review of IT-21 (attached.) Although he was unable to attend, the committee discussed his report, and Merri Beth Lavagnino responded to the itemized weaknesses listed on p. 2 of the report.

Background information: The University has had two separate policies on mass email. The old policy was limited to the Bloomington campus and addressed only administrative email there. Instead of trying to deal with various separate versions of the policy for different campus and different populations (e.g., faculty, students, and staff), it has been agreed to merge the former policies into one policy called IT-21. Stacie Wiegand created the attached draft of the new IT-21.

The key questions related to this merger include the following:

- Can we create one policy for all email?
- How can procedure and policy be separated?
- How do we differentiate philosophies and values from policies and procedures?

Discussion and recommendations related to the weaknesses listed on the attached review were:

1. Provide definitions and examples of “sensitive institutional and personal information.”
  - a. Explain that “sensitive” means that the data can be used in a harmful way, especially if it reaches an inappropriate audience.
  - b. Ensure that policy statements cover all types of distribution lists and refer readers to KB links regarding listserv management and other relevant information.
  - c. Distinguish between listservs for official business and small distribution listservs.
  - d. Check with the registrar to make sure the policy conforms with their policies.
2. Define “electronic distribution list” and give examples. Explain that this is a generic term for any technology that allows users to email a group.
3. Drop this item.
4. Address this item in the KB but not in the policy.
5. Clarify that “targeted mailings” address large mailings. Refer users to guidelines on the KB.
6. Strike from the procedures.
7. Strike from the procedures.
8. It was suggested that this item is irrelevant unless there’s a system problem. The University is interested in maintaining the integrity of the system. This system could be tied to technical requirements such as the number or recipients and the size of file attachments, if any.

Mary Beth stated that the ITPO will work on the revision, including the rationale section, and will present us the revised draft when it is ready.

Hasan Akay thanked Michael Ernst for his work on the review of IT-21.

6. **Academic Leadership Council’s November 4, 2005 Report.** Garland Elmore distributed a report on the Sakai Project and Oncourse CL. He outlined the positive feedback received so far. He encouraged faculty to get experience with 2.1 so they know if they are ready to make the transition by June ‘06.

The meeting concluded at 12:00 p.m. **The next meeting is scheduled from 10:00 – 12:00 on January 23, 2006.**

*Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay  
December 20, 2005*

## Use of Electronic Mail

**REVIEWER:** Michael Ernst

<b>POLICY</b>	IT-21
<b>STATUS</b>	First Draft of Merged Email Policies, Fall 2005
<b>SOURCE</b>	Office of the Vice President for Information Technology

### SCOPE

This policy applies to all users of Indiana University information technology resources regardless of affiliation, and irrespective of whether those resources are accessed from on-campus or off-campus locations.

### RATIONALE

Electronic mail has become an essential resource for faculty, staff, and students to enhance communication between individuals and to targeted groups of individuals concerning common academic or administrative activities.

The ease at which an email can be sent to one or thousands of recipients can be a disadvantage as well as an advantage. There are millions of email messages traversing through the university network daily. Most users receive dozens of emails per day, and some receive hundreds per day. While much of this email is appropriate to the activities of the recipient, more and more email messages can be classified as Internet junk email, often referred to as “spam,” unsolicited bulk email (UBE), or unsolicited commercial email (UCE). Unfortunately, legitimate internal mailings often get lost among the flood of junk mail, reducing the effectiveness of email as a tool for communication.

Indiana University email users also must comply with laws concerning the use of email. On the federal level, the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-187) took effect on January 1, 2004. The law requires unsolicited commercial email messages to be labeled (though not by a standard method) and to include opt-out instructions and the sender's physical address. It prohibits the use of deceptive subject lines and false headers in such messages. State laws that require labels on unsolicited commercial email or prohibit such messages entirely are pre-empted, although provisions merely addressing falsity and deception remain in place. In addition, the State of Indiana enacted a law in April of 2003 placing some limits on “spam,” and placed offenders under the jurisdiction of Indiana courts.

It is very important that email, like all other communication methods, be used in a collegial and constructive manner. Messages must be formed in ways that reduce the possibility of confusion of the source, destination, or intent, and in ways that show respect for others and tolerance of differences in culture, attitudes and opinions.

Administrative communications in email carry the same business requirements as do communications on paper. As requirements vary for different business processes, individual administrators and offices must understand what these requirements are and how they are related to activities in which they are involved.

Email should not be considered a secure method for transmitting sensitive information. Not only is email easily intercepted by attackers, but at Indiana University emails also are subject to the Indiana Access to Open Records Act.

## **POLICY**

1. Indiana University electronic mail users are required to comply with state and federal law, university policies, and normal standards of professional and personal ethics, courtesy, and conduct. All communications via email will be consistent with all pertinent sections of the Code of Student Ethics, the Academic Handbook, and all other applicable Indiana University policies.
2. Unless inappropriate use of email stems from technical or other problems outside of the individual's control, persons to whom Indiana University email accounts are assigned are responsible for actions and activities within their accounts.
3. Email accounts and account passwords are not to be sold, rented, or shared with any other person, including but not limited to friends, family, roommates, supervisors, technical staff, and vendors.
4. Unless an individual or an organization has explicitly solicited anonymous input or comments, all communications sent using any Indiana University technology service or facility must clearly identify the actual sender by a valid address in the basic header (From:) or in the message text. Forged communications are prohibited.
5. No one may state or imply in an email that they represent or speak on behalf of Indiana University or any organizational element of Indiana University, unless they are tasked to do so by virtue of their assigned duties or they have been formally designated to do so by the Board of Trustees of Indiana University or by university executive administration.
6. Sensitive institutional and personal information is not to be sent via email, unless the content is encrypted end-to-end.
7. University email is not to be used for commercial purposes or for personal private gain.
8. University email is not to be used for indiscriminate mass mailings. Administrative offices or officials of the university may send electronic mail to all members of a campus or the university community when an emergency or urgent need exists. These mailings are subject to the procedures below.
9. Targeted mailings are subject to the procedures below.
10. University email is not to be used to send chain email messages.

## **PROCEDURES**

***Electronic distribution lists:*** All electronic distribution lists supported by university information technology resources are to be owned and maintained by members of the Indiana University community, and each list is to have a stated purpose and policy. Distribution lists are to be

moderated so that inappropriate postings are intercepted and rejected, and so that the lists are protected as far as technically possible from commercial exploitation. Postings to distribution lists will be in accordance with the stated purpose and policy of the list, and list members who consistently experience inappropriate postings may unsubscribe from the list even if membership was initially required. Requests from individuals to be unsubscribed from voluntary lists must be honored. In no case shall electronic distribution lists be approved or used for commercial mailings. Lists of subscribers to electronic distribution lists may not be distributed to third parties. Persons responsible for creating, maintaining and moderating distribution lists should consult the Knowledge Base for information and guidance.

**Targeted mailings:** Targeted mailings are to be concise and to the point, and shall consist of a plain-text message without graphics or bolding, italics, or other formatting. Targeted email may include symbols such as “\*\*\*\*” to highlight key information, and may include hotlinks to URLs in order to direct recipients to further information. Targeted email may not include file attachments. Routine, periodic, targeted electronic mailings from an administrative office or official to any substantial portion of a campus or the university community, such as all students, all faculty, or all staff, must be approved in the first instance by the appropriate campus or university officer; see section “Approval for large electronic mailings” below.

**Approval for large electronic mailings:** The appropriate campus or university officer will be responsible for determining if an emergency or urgent need exists to warrant a requested mass or targeted electronic mailing to a large number of members of the university community, and shall approve all such mailings. The appropriate officer is listed for each university community group, below:

- For mailings to the entire university community, the University President
- For mailings to an entire campus community, the Chancellor for that campus
- For mailings to the entire faculty within the university, the Vice President for Academic Affairs
- For mailings to the entire faculty within a campus, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for that campus
- For mailings to the entire student body within the university, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
- For mailings to the entire student body of a campus, to the Dean of Students for that campus
- For mailings to the entire staff of the university, to the Associate Vice President for University Human Resources
- For mailings to the entire staff, or a substantial subset thereof, within a campus, to the Director of Human Resources for that campus.

**Format of email messages:** All targeted or mass electronic mailings will clearly identify the following:

To: Recipient (e.g., “Bloomington Campus Staff,” or “Kokomo Campus”)  
From: Sender  
Subject: Concise description  
Valid Reply-To Address  
Text  
Signature indicating at minimum the Sender Office



Where possible, the Reply-To Address should be an organizational, rather than a personal, address. If a mailing is to be sent to a list of specific addresses instead of an electronic distribution list, those addresses must NOT be included on visible address lines (To and Cc).

***Assistance with sending large mailings:*** Campus administrators should coordinate with their campus computing centers for mailings to the entire campus community. For the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, University Information Technology Services serves as the campus computing center; requests for assistance in accomplishing mass or targeted mailings should be sent (along with appropriate approvals) to [mail-admin@iu.edu](mailto:mail-admin@iu.edu).

***Email address lists for large mailings:*** Officers and offices designated by this policy as having authority to review and approve large mailings are expected to maintain updated addresses for the recipients of such mailings, and to provide such lists to campus computing centers or UITS when seeking their assistance in sending approved mailings. All recipients of large mailings must have valid university email address.

***Exceptions:*** The University President or his/her designee may make exceptions to this policy for requested mailings to the entire university community. Campus chancellors or their designees may make exceptions to this policy for requested mailings to an entire campus community. Such exceptions may be made if in the respective officer's judgment, the benefits of a mailing with respect to immediacy of communication, universal distribution, and significance of content for the fulfillment of the university's mission, substantially outweigh the costs and burdens associated with permitting a mass or targeted mailing. It is anticipated that exceptions will be made only in exceptional circumstances.

***Privacy of electronic mail:*** All electronic mail (whether personal or business related) sent or received using university information technology resources may be considered a public record under the Indiana Access to Public Records Act (IC 5-14-3) and may be subject to public disclosure. Access to the content of a person's emails by other users of Indiana University information technology resources (including departmental and central information technology staff) is governed by Policy IT-07, Privacy of Information Technology Resources.

***Reporting:*** Reports of apparent misuse or abuse of Indiana University information technology resources are to be made to the following offices:

1. For the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, contact the University Information Technology Policy Office (ITPO) at [it-incident@iu.edu](mailto:it-incident@iu.edu).
2. For all other campuses, contact the regional campus Chief Information Officer (CIO) and the regional campus Chancellor's Office (for allegations involving academic appointees), the regional campus Human Resources Office (for allegations involving staff), or the regional campus Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (for allegations involving students).
3. Where violations of law are alleged, contact the ITPO (for Bloomington/IUPUI) or the regional campus CIO, as well as, campus police and/or University Counsel.

## DEFINITIONS

**Chain email** at Indiana University is considered to be any email that serves a non-academic purpose and requests that the letter be resent.

**Commercial purposes** is defined as economic activity geared toward a mass or specialized market and intended to result in a profit, and that is not part of one's university responsibilities.

**Forged communications** are emails that are made to appear as if they originated from a person or organization other than the person from whom the message was actually sent.

**Indiscriminate mass mailings** are those not approved according to the procedures of this policy, and which are sent to a number of individuals who have no interest in or no relationship to the content of the email.

**Mass email** is approved according to the procedures of this policy, and is sent to a large number of individuals who may or may not have interest in the content of the email, but who have an Indiana University relationship that caused them to be included in the mailing.

**Targeted email** is sent to individuals who have an interest in the content of the email, who have a personal, business, or academic relationship with the sender, or who have made use of a particular service that is the topic of the email. Examples: a person sending an invitation to a party to a friend; a Human Resources employee sending an email to employees enrolled in a specific benefits plan; a professor sending class information to students in the class; a student asking another student in class a question about an assignment.

**Personal private gain** is defined as securing profit or reward for an individual as an on-going activity.

## **SANCTIONS**

Misuse of Indiana University information technology resources may result in sanctions relating to the individual's use of information technology resources (such as suspension or termination of access or removal of online material); to the individual's employment, studies or other activities within the university (such as student suspension or expulsion, or employee reprimand, suspension or termination); or both.

## **RELATED POLICIES, LAWS, AND DOCUMENTS**

IT-02 Misuse or Abuse of Information Technology Resources [link and footnote]

IT-03 Eligibility to Use Information Technology Resources [link and footnote]

IT-07 Privacy of Information Technology Resources [link and footnote]

IT-11 Excessive Use of Information Technology Resources [link and footnote]

Indiana Access to Public Records Act

CAN-SPAM act

Indiana spam email law

Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct with campus addendums and extensions [do not plan to add links since there are 8 of them...]

Indiana University Academic Handbook or campus equivalent [do not plan to add links since there are 8 of them...]

Indiana University Personnel Policies for service maintenance staff, support staff, and non-union staff or campus equivalent [do not plan to add links since there are many of these per each of the 8 campuses...]

Indiana University Policies See: <http://www.indiana.edu/~policies>

## **RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION**

Office of the Vice President for Information Technology

University Information Technology Policy Office

Email: [itpo@iu.edu](mailto:itpo@iu.edu)

For further information, see <http://www.itpo.iu.edu/>

## **POLICY HISTORY**

IT-21 (merger of all three documents below), drafted Fall 2005

Mass Email Procedures and Restrictions, issued by action of the Bloomington Faculty Council, February 18, 2003

IT-22 (Use of Email for Mass Communications) posted as a Draft for Comment, February 24, 2002

IT-21 (Use of Email) posted as a Draft for Comment, January 3, 2002

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, January 23, 2006**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Merri Beth Lavagnino (ITPO), Beth Van Gordon (LTO)*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 14, 2005 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (10 min)
4. Status report on Oncourse CL (*Elmore/Van Gordon*) (45 min)
5. Second Review of IT-21 Email Policy (Lavagnino) (20 min)
6. Draft Survey on Life Cycle Program (*Vernon*) (20 min)
7. Other Business (10 min)
8. Adjournment

# IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the January 23, 2006 Meeting

The Faculty Council Technology Committee met from 9:00 – 11:00 in the IT Board Room on the IUPUI campus.

**Members present:** Hasan Akay, (E & T: Mechanical Engineering) Chair, and Dean Garland Elmore, Administrative Liaison; Michael Ernst (Science); Anthony Firulli (Medicine); Julie Freeman, (Liberal Arts) Secretary; Joan Kowolik, Dentistry; John McGrew, Psychology; and Sharon Stoten, Nursing. Guest: Elizabeth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations.

## Agenda

1. After the call to order and introductions, the minutes were reviewed and approved.
2. **Chair's Report:** Hasan Akay reported that at the Faculty Council's last meeting, Distance Education Committee proposed delaying the retirement of Oncourse Original until Oncourse CL has all the functions from Original in place.
3. **Status Report on Oncourse CL**
  - Garland Elmore announced that Beth Van Gordon is leading the implementation of Oncourse CL university-wide. Beth Van Gordon reported that the faculty conversation related to Oncourse CL 2.1, originally scheduled for December, was postponed because the faculty mentors were not sufficiently prepared to demonstrated the 2.1 version. The Center for Teaching and Learning is planning to reschedule the meeting for February or March. She also noted that the name of the Message Forum has been changed to "Message Center."
  - She shared information from the "Message Forums Tool Functional Requirements and Specifications – Updated 1 – 13-06." This document is available on the committee's Oncourse CL site.
  - Beth Van Gordon said her office's focus the next few months will be to meet with faculty one-on-one and in department meetings to help them learn how to navigate Oncourse CL. She pointed out one problem is that tools have different names than in Original Oncourse, and faculty may not be aware that tools exist to meet their needs.
  - On Jan. 12, the "Post 'em" Tool was added. This tools provides faculty with the ability to upload gradebooks from Excel and to have multiple gradebooks. By spring 2006, users will have the ability to redirect their courses.
  - Approximately 63% of faculty have opted out of Oncourse CL, probably because they have not had sufficient time to practice.
  - Oncourse CL will provide an environment in which faculty can customize their sites and turn on or off tools as needed. Faculty need to be aware of which tools are default and which tools must be turned on. For example, the Message Center is not a default tool. Faculty also need to know that files and links will not transfer from Original Oncourse to Oncourse CL port for port.

- Currently, faculty can create a project site but not a course site. Committee members suggested that examples of Oncourse CL course sites would be helpful.
- Julie Freeman was asked to share current impediments to using Oncourse CL for classes involving team-based learning. She responded that some CL tools are not group aware, and that work-arounds created by CTL staff were too cumbersome.
- John McGrew was pleased to report that the Oncourse staff met with his Department, and they worked out ways to make Oncourse CL fit their needs.
- Michael Ernst raised the question of whether courses should automatically be enabled on Oncourse, since some faculty do not use it and therefore may be unaware that students are sending assignments or messages to the site. However, the decision to enable all courses was made at the beginning of Oncourse use in the 90s, and it is unlikely to be changed.
- The committee endorsed Garland Elmore's announcement that his office is delaying the retirement of Original Oncourse with the following two caveats:
  - 1) File Manager will be retired in May 2006 and links to Original Oncourse to File Manager will not work after it is retired.
  - 2) Currently Oncourse content is kept for two years; however, they will be able to keep the content for only one year with the delay in the retirement of Oncourse Original.

The committee agreed it will be very important for tech staff to make sure faculty understand the need to migrate their File Manager files to Oncourse CL, and to help those who wish to continue using Oncourse Original to determine how they will link files without access to File Manager.

#### **4. Review of Draft Survey on Life Cycle Program**

A subcommittee (Robin Crumrin, Michael Ernst, John McGrew, and Bob Vernon) presented their survey draft on the life cycle program for review. They suggest that the survey be conducted across the university, including LSPs, staff, and faculty. Various suggestions were given, such as changing the focus from the unit to individual office machines.

Bob Vernon volunteered to revise the survey based on the comments. He will circulate the revised draft to the committee for final comments later this week. A prototype will be created and the survey will be piloted. The date of the survey has not yet been determined due to the need to present the idea to the chancellors and other administrators.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2006 from 9:00 – 11:00 in the IT Board Room.

Submitted by Julie Freeman and Hasan Akay

January 27, 2006

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, February 13, 2006**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Beth Van Gordon (LTO) and Jay Fern (AFS)*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the January 23, 2006 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (10 min)
4. The new IT leadership structure (*Elmore*) (15 min)
5. Status report on OncourseCL (*Van Gordon*) (15 min)
6. Electronic Portfolio (*Fern*) (25 min)
7. Tour of IT facilities (*Elmore*) (30 min)
8. Adjournment

**IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**  
**February 13, 2006**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Hasan Akay, Joseph Defazio, Garland Elmore (administrative liaison), Julie Freeman, Joan Kowolik, John McGrew and Robert Vernon.

**Guests:** Elizabeth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations; Jay Fern, Academic and Faculty Services Liaison; Theresa A. Walsh, Administrative Assistant

**Notes from the Agenda**

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Theresa A. Walsh will be the minute taker. Julie Freeman remains as secretary.
2. The minutes were reviewed and approved.
3. **Chair's Report.** The Oncourse CL announcement was made January 23 that there will be one more year to use original Oncourse. File Manager will retire on schedule and may be an issue for some faculty. The most current version of the lifecycle survey is attached to the agenda and minutes. Revisions were made based on recommendations and will be submitted to Garland Elmore's office. The lifecycle survey will be university-wide. It is best to delay the lifecycle survey until early next Fall: a) the Bloomington faculty committee is not currently active, due to a health issue; the lifecycle survey will be coordinated rather than getting ahead of the IUB committee; b) there are two surveys being conducted in the Spring, the UITS User Satisfaction Survey and the ECAR 2006 student survey on the use of technology. Hasan Akay is looking forward to the revised email policy, IT 21. The revised version is still with Merri Beth Lavagnino. Merri Beth will report on the 4 to 5 policies that have been revised and which are at the University Counsel's office. Merri Beth has been very busy reviewing a series of security incidents that focus on credit cards and user identity.
4. **The new IT leadership structure.** Garland Elmore gave information on the new restructure. A chart of the top level organization of UITS was distributed. The Vice President for Research and Chief Information Officer (CIO), Michael McRobbie, is a member of the President's cabinet. Information technology is one of the university's strategic priorities. Garland Elmore and Brad Wheeler serve as deans and work across all four University Information Technology Services (UITS) divisions. They ensure all divisions serve their respective campus needs. UITS has about 1,600 employees in IT at IU; more than half of these are part-time employees, many of whom are students. The new organizational charts will be made available on the Web. It will show that Michael McRobbie retains the Vice President's title of IT and VP for Research, in addition to his other responsibilities, until the interim Provost position is resolved. The CIO position responsibilities have been delegated to the two academic officers. Brad Wheeler focuses on strategies, national and international initiatives as well as UITS leadership. Wheeler is the key IU representative with Sakai and Quali. Garland Elmore focuses on operations and retains his other responsibilities. Wheeler and Elmore have complementary strengths and both are excited about working together. Vice President McRobbie may weigh in on certain issues such as Asia and networking strategies, and the Abilene contract for Internet2. Wheeler is strong in these areas too. The Deputy CIO will meet more with constituent groups, faculty groups and students groups on difference campuses. Garland Elmore intends to continue with the Faculty Council Technology Committee.



John McGrew asked if regional campuses have parallel directors and structures. Elmore explained that in 1998, with strategic plan funding, the positions on the five regional campuses were elevated to the Vice Chancellor level for IT and campus CIO. They are dual reports to their campus Chancellor and to the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology through Garland Elmore. Additionally, the Council of CIOs has just been formed. It meets monthly and this will begin to integrate the regional campus CIOs better into university-wide strategic planning. Fort Wayne is managed by Purdue University which has a similar Council of CIOs. Bob Kostrubanic, a member of both councils, coordinates across the two universities. Hasan Akay welcomes a stronger outreach to the constituencies. The url for the most up-to-date IT organizational charts is <http://uits.iu.edu/scripts/ose.cgi?arkt.ose.help>.

5. **Status Report on Oncourse CL.** Beth Van Gordon said that UITS has received very good input about Oncourse CL. Practice course sites are now available. This permits faculty to link to a form to request a practice course site or project site. The roster is not yet completed. It permits migration of materials from the practice course site to the real course site. Jay Fern is working with faculty mentors. They continue to work on the online feature demos.

University-wide usage statistics of Oncourse CL are:

- o Fall 2005: 34% of all sections opted out; 89% of all sections expected to use Oncourse CL opted out. Thus, approximately 11% used Oncourse CL in fall 2005.
- o Spring 2006: 30% of all sections opted out; 71% of sections expected to use Oncourse CL opted out. Thus, approximately 29% are using Oncourse CL in spring 2006.

More faculty or new faculty are using Oncourse CL than last semester.

**Suggestions Analysis:** All faculty suggestions go to a group that reviews them. Faculty receive an immediate electronic confirmation. The group determines how many suggestions are identical, how many suggestions have already been addressed and how many suggestions require a repair. The Functional Requirements Committee determines requirements that need to be incorporated. The Oncourse Priorities Committee, a faculty group, prioritizes requirements and forwards them to the administrative level for approval. For an illustration of the process, go to <http://oncourse.iu.edu>, click on “News & Info” (on the left sidebar), click on the “Oncourse Enhancement and Development Process” to see the goals, objectives and committee membership. Garland Elmore said that Oncourse can and should be what faculty want it to be. Oncourse has always been a faculty-centered system and it will continue to be. Jay Fern mentors close to 20 faculty. Jay is both a UITS employee and a faculty member. This provides the faculty to faculty approach rather than staff to faculty. Jay Fern coordinates across the centers for teaching and learning and helps with consultation.

6. **Electronic Portfolio.** Beth Van Gordon provided an overview of ePortfolio. The Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) drive the use of ePortfolio here by a limited group of faculty. Call the Center for Teaching and Learning to activate it. It allows a student or faculty member to go through various levels of achievement or growth. Jay Fern joined the group at 10:10 a.m.

Jay Fern demonstrated ePortfolio at Tech Deans last week. He has led IU’s national ePortfolio initiative for the past 18 months to 2 years. A pilot has been running for about 2 years as a result of a grant from IUPUI for continuing excellence (CTE grants). A matrix captures the PULs, deep learning and reflections. It may be used throughout the college experience. There is open source software under ePortfolio. The RSmart group partnered with IU to develop software. It has been added to the Sakai project. It is embedded in Oncourse CL as a tool. To use ePortfolio, see the consultants at the

centers for teaching and learning. The portfolio can be used inside a course and inside a program. It allows you to use forms and collect information. In the process of filling out a form, faculty give the student guidance. There are wizards in ePortfolio for sequential, hierarchical, and a matrix. It is user-centric. The seven steps are 1) collect the model, 2) reflect, 3) design, 4) publish, 5) faculty guidance, 6) faculty review their reflection and 7) faculty analyze their reflection. OSP 2.1 will be enabled in June 2006. It is very flexible. Hasan Akay asked if there will be any online documentation on ePortfolio. Jay Fern said he will send a white paper on 2.1 to Theresa for the minutes. Jay Fern said a sample site can be added to the CL site for the Faculty Council Technology Committee. Nancy Chism has made the annual faculty report available inside ePortfolio. This is part of a pilot she is doing at IUPUI with Nasser Paydar.

7. **Tour of IT facilities.** Garland Elmore conducted a tour of the Informatics and Communications Technology Complex (ICTC).
8. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. followed by the tour of the ICTC.

*Prepared by: Theresa Walsh and Hasan Akay*

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, March 6, 2006**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Merri Beth Lavagnino (ITPO) and Sue Workman (UITS)*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the February 13, 2006 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (10 min)
4. Revised Email-Policy IT-21 (*Lavagnino*) (15 min)
5. Updates on IT-01, 02, 03, and 11 (*Lavagnino*) (15 min)
6. Second Review of IT-07 (*Lavagnino*) (15 min)
7. Renewal of Enterprise-wide Software Licenses (*Workman*) (15 min)
8. Podcasting and iTunesU for Education (*Elmore*) (15 min)
9. Adjournment

## IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

March 6, 2006  
Minutes

**Members Present:** Hasan Akay, Robin Crumrin, Michael Ernst, Garland Elmore (administrative liaison), Julie Freeman, Clifford Goodwin, Joan Kowolik and Robert Vernon, Theresa A. Walsh (meeting recorder).

**Guests:** Merri Beth Lavagnino, Deputy IT Policy Officer, Sue Workman, Director of User Support.

### Agenda

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made.
2. The minutes of the February 13, 2006 meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. Chair's Report. The ongoing task of this committee has been to review several IT policies. Merri Beth Lavagnino will talk about 6 IT policies. Sue Workman will talk about the enterprise-wide software licenses.
4. Update on IT-01, IT-02, IT-03 and IT-11. These policies have been through 3 rounds of review and are much stronger now. These 4 policies are now with University Counsel. Counsel is discussing the word 'campaigning' in IT-01. Does it include students? In IT-03, the eligibility policy, the procedures focus on how one gets accounts. Counsel is considering the possibility of adding 'access to other IT resources.' There was discussion about adjunct, associate and part-time faculty. The Office of Faculty and Academic Records said the wording as is covers all who teach. When these 4 policies are approved by University Counsel, they will be forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology.
5. Revised Email Policy IT-21. Merri Beth Lavagnino is working with Beth Cate on this policy. The policy review process has not yet been started. Merri Beth Lavagnino is working with this committee in the drafting stage of the policy. Discussion followed about the wording in the policy. It was suggested that 'official' and 'unofficial' be used rather than 'involuntary' and 'voluntary.' Lists may not need to be used in this policy. It was suggested to shorten the policy and make it more general. There are too many items, too many restrictions. Merri Beth Lavagnino will work with Michael Ernst on this policy.
6. Privacy Policy IT-07. This policy has not been sent for the second review yet. University Counsel needs to review it more. The first review is done. Merri Beth Lavagnino asked for this committee's comments about the policy and procedures sections. The policy section defines the philosophies and values and is short. The procedures section contains the detail. Rename 'policy' to 'policy statement.' Merri Beth Lavagnino will make suggested changes. Hasan Akay will ask John McGrew to work with her on this policy.
7. Renewal of Enterprise-wide Software Licenses. Garland Elmore said that the first major agreement was with Microsoft in 1997. IU's agreement with Microsoft licensed 114,000 constituents. Sue Workman explained that the first agreement with Microsoft lasted 5 years.

The current interim agreement, started 3 years ago, states that pricing will not go up more than 15% each year. IU pays by headcount rather than by number of computers. As IU grows, these costs increase. The return on investment is really high. Sue Workman's data will be posted on the committee's Oncourse site. IU was the first institution to get a very attractive enterprise agreement with Microsoft. Other universities have Microsoft's standard campus agreement.

8. Podcasting and iTunesU for Education. Garland Elmore introduced the topic of Podcasting. A faculty member may use an audio and/or video recorder to record a lecture in the classroom. The device has a USB port so the lecture can be uploaded as an MP3 file which can then be downloaded to a student's Ipod. Apple has something called iTunes University. They offer free storage for faculty. Apple has asked Indiana University to participate. There are questions of rights, archiving and backup that need to be answered. Garland Elmore asked for input from the Faculty Council Technology Committee. Hasan Akay said this item will be put on the agenda for next month.
9. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, April 10, 2006, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m., IT 541

*Prepared by: Theresa Walsh and Hasan Akay.*

## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, April 10, 2006**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Sue Workman and Stacy Morrone*

1. Call to Order (5 min)
2. Approval of the Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Meeting (10 min)
3. Chair's Report (10 min)
4. More on Podcasting and iTunesU (*Elmore, Workman, Morrone*) (45 min)
5. Discussions on Service Expectations from UITS (*Elmore*) (15 min)
6. Other Business (10 min)
7. Adjournment

**IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**  
**April 10, 2006**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Hasan Akay, Robin Crumrin, Garland Elmore (administrative liaison), Julie Freeman, Joan Kowolik, John McGrew, Sharon Stoten, Theresa A. Walsh (meeting recorder).

**Guests:** Anastasia Morrone, Executive Director, Center for Teaching and Learning and Sue Workman, Director of User Support, UITs.

**Agenda**

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made.
2. The minutes of the March 6, 2006 meeting were reviewed. The URL for the IT Strategic Plan Accomplishments document will be added to item 7. With this change, the minutes were approved.
3. Chair's Report. The agenda was changed to add item #5, "Charge for Printing Policy." Tom Davis, IT Security Officer, sent an email note to Dr. Akay regarding plans to strengthen the password utilization tools. Dr. Akay also reported that IU will acquire the nation's fastest university-owned supercomputer.
4. More on Podcasting and iTunesU. This topic was introduced to this group at the March 6 meeting. Sue Workman is taking the lead on this initiative on behalf of UITs. Schools and administrative units are very much involved in podcasting. Publication and communication services as well are involved. Podcasting will provide additional opportunities for teaching and learning, marketing and publicity, support and education (both internal and external) and entertainment or general use. According to Apple's terms and conditions, it appears that Apple owns the intellectual property and may discontinue the service on notice. Apple will provide 500GB of space for the entire institution. Sue has asked Apple if it is willing to negotiate on the terms and conditions but has not heard back. Perhaps IU will develop its own service and have more control and accountability. There is a lot of interest at IU about the possibilities. Pedagogical uses, intellectual property, and practices and procedures for podcasting need to be discussed. Dr. Akay asked this committee to talk this over with your units and get some feedback.
5. Charge for Printing Policy. Charging for printing is not an issue at IUB or the regional campuses because the student technology fee (STF) is centralized. There is a uniform campus practice based on a quota. The STF fee at IUB is explained in a FAQ located at <http://it.iu.edu/funding/>. Undergraduate students have a quota of 650 pages per semester and graduate students have a quota of 1000 pages per semester. These quotas meet 80% of their needs. If an IUB student goes over the printing quota, they are billed by the Bursar who has a system that bills students individually. The information is tracked by user name. At IUPUI, the STF is decentralized and goes to the schools and to UITs. Since schools manage their own Student Technology Center, some charge for printing and photo copying while other schools offer free printing and photo copying. Onecard tracks the use. Administrative costs for card readers and servers are included in the print charge. This is a campus issue, not just a single school or UITs issue since the STF is decentralized. A proposal went to the campus

officers and the vice chancellors. This recommendation will be taken to the deans in May at the Council of Deans.

6. Discussions on Service Expectations from UITS. UITS has had a cost and quality process in place for ten years. Cost is reported by unit. The cost process is combined with a quality exercise based on a survey of faculty, staff and students. The UITS User Survey is online at <http://www.indiana.edu/~uitsur/>. In the survey, the satisfaction midpoint means 'satisfied' not 'neutral.' The User Survey results are reviewed quarterly and tied to the middle manager level. The User Survey Results are reviewed annually with the vice president, associate vice presidents and officers to explain unexpected results such as a cost going up, quality going down, or the results are not up to UITS standards.
7. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, May 1, 2006, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m., IT 541

*Prepared by: Theresa Walsh and Hasan Akay.*



## **AGENDA**

### **IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee**

**Monday, May 1, 2006**

**9:00 – 11:00 am, IT 541 Board Room**

**Guests:** *Beth Cate, Tom Davis, Beth Van Gordon, and Merri Beth Lavagnino.*

1. Call to Order and Introductions (10 min)
2. Password Strength Enhancements (*Davis*) (20 min)
3. Approval of the Minutes of the April 10, 2006 Meeting (10 min)
4. Secure Use of Sensitive Data (*Lavagnino and Cate*) (30 min)
5. Classroom Technology Strategies (*Van Gordon and Elmore*) (20 min)
6. End-of-Year Report (*Akay*) (15 min)
7. Other Business (5 min)
8. Adjournment

**IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**  
**May 1, 2006**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Hasan Akay, Garland Elmore (administrative liaison), Michael Ernst, John McGrew, Sharon Stoten, Robert Vernon, Theresa A. Walsh (meeting recorder).

**Guests:** Beth Cate, Associate University Counsel, Tom Davis, Chief Security Officer, UITS, Andrew Korty, Chief Security Engineer, UITS, Sean Krulewitch, Chief Security Engineer, UITS, Merri Beth Lavagnino, Chief Policy Officer, UITS, Elizabeth Van Gordon, Director of Learning Technology Operations, UITS.

**Agenda**

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. The order of the agenda passed out at the meeting is different from the agenda that was sent via email. The end-of-year report is to be submitted to the Faculty Council.
2. Password Strength Enhancements. There are a number of avenues where passwords are at risk. The IT Security Office has been concerned about passwords since the early 90s. Over the years smaller projects have bolstered the strength of passwords. The goal of the new password project is to make the password easier to select, remember and enter. Current password requirements are 8 to 14 characters long using letters or numbers. A passphrase is a series of words and phrases and can be just 4 to 5 unrelated words. In July 2006 the maximum length of the passphrase will be increased to 127 characters including spaces and ampersands (8 – 127 characters). In October 2006 the minimum length will be increased to 15 characters (15 – 127 characters). New accounts created after October 2006 will use the passphrase. Tom Davis will provide Hasan Akay with the URL to a test passphrase utility. The test utility is now available at <https://password.iu.edu:2443/>. Users do not have to but are encouraged to change their passwords. For additional information regarding this project, please see [http://itso.iu.edu/Passphrase\\_Resources](http://itso.iu.edu/Passphrase_Resources).

The IT Security Office meets with Internal Audit every two months and has a good working relationship with them. The two offices work toward the same purposes with different roles. Security reviews are conducted by the IT Security Office which is there to support and help.

3. The minutes of the April 10, 2006 meeting were reviewed and approved. A recommendation on charge for printing will go to the Council of Academic Deans on May 3. The recommendation is 4¢ for single-sided, black and white, 8¢ for double-sided, no quota. Akay expressed concern that double sided printing should be cheaper than two single sided paper printing, to encourage paper saving.
4. Secure Use of Sensitive Data. Three laws are coming online July 1, 2006 that deal with data security, privacy and integrity in the electronic and paper world. Communications will be going out to the chancellors, deans and directors about the new laws. A Web site is being constructed.
  - a. Indiana Law IC 4-1-10 limits disclosure of social security numbers. The exceptions are written consent from the individual, the last 4 digits, and a federal or legal mandate. There is individual criminal liability for intentional, reckless, knowing and negligent violations. The individual must be notified of the violation.

- b. Indiana Law HB1101 deals with the secure disposal of sensitive data, i.e., social security numbers, first name, last name, drivers' license numbers, state id, account numbers and credit card data.
  - c. The Security Breach Notice Law (IC 4-1-11) states that one must give notice of a security breach when unencrypted personal information was or is reasonably believed to have been acquired by an unauthorized person. This law applies to all government, business and individuals. Security measures are: 1) administrative policies in place to provide sanctions, 2) physical security measures, e.g., locked cabinets and doors, and 3) technical security measures. Encrypted data according to state law is exempt from being considered breach. When accepting payments via credit card, ensure that the system being used is recognized by the University Treasurer's Office. If disclosing data outside of the institution ensure that the third party will handle it securely. If data is not needed, get rid of it in a secure way. Formatting a hard drive or other media does not remove all data traces effectively. Information on how to securely remove data from a computer is at [http://itso.iu.edu/Securely\\_Removing\\_Data](http://itso.iu.edu/Securely_Removing_Data).
5. Classroom Technology Strategies. IU is on the verge of equipping all 640 classrooms with a network, a permanently installed display device, a computer or computer interface for laptops, and other technology. The traditional analog equipment will be available but not delivered. There will be no additional costs to the schools and units. The Faculty Council Technology Committee's advice concerning this plan is requested. There was a positive response.
  6. End-of-Year Report. The end-of-year report summarizing the Technology Committee's actions will be submitted to the Faculty Council Executive Committee. Let Dr. Akay know if anything needs to be added to the report. It is hoped that at least 90% of the committee will still be here next year.
  7. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.