

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Purdum, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki

Absent: Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Location: Faculty Senate Office

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call to Order

Schubert called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

2.0 Professor Hartke, Chair of Information Technologies and Services Committee (ITSC)

Schubert stated that Hartke was invited to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss some concerns that were raised regarding the ITSC. Woodman noted that membership of the Committee and the lack of faculty input in the decision to purchase KACE were two of the concerns.

Hartke reported that last year the former chair of the ITSC wanted to change the membership of the Committee so it would be more inclusive. As a result the Senate approved increasing the faculty members on the ITSC to nine and increasing the number of Information Technology (IT) people on the Committee to seven. He stated that after the syllabus was approved it was determined that an oversight was made giving everyone on the Committee voting rights. He pointed out that this has not caused any significant problems because the ITSC hasn't really voted on anything recently other than electing a chair, and the information technologies people deferred to not vote on this matter. He stated that a problem that has occurred is the lack of faculty members attending the meeting. He noted that last year the former chair resigned resulting in an open position on the ITSC and several faculty members have not been attending the meetings. He reported that typically four or five faculty members show up on a regular basis which can create the perception that there are more IT people than faculty members. Hartke reported that guests are invited to attend the meeting when information is needed and some of these guests may be invited frequently. He stated that some people from Information Technologies are frequent guests and he believes the ITSC has had good engagement with these people.

Hartke stated that other members of the ITSC include two Deans' Council representatives. He noted that the idea with the Dean's Council representatives is to have computer support people within the colleges who are not members of the central

Information Technologies unit represented on the Committee as well. This enables the Committee to hear issues from a computer support person's perspective.

Hartke noted that some controversy arose when an IT person had difficulty understanding why a faculty member would mind having KACE on his/her computer. He noted that CIO Askren was the one who explained to the IT staff member that the issue of academic freedom for faculty members is critically important, and implementation of software programs that can jeopardize academic freedom is a delicate matter. Woodman asked if the KACE program was discussed prior to when the software was purchased. Hartke stated that he did not recall hearing any discussions at any of the ITSC meetings about KACE.

Hartke asked what would be the best way for him to approach faculty members who are not attending the meetings. He stated that he has sent email messages to these individuals but has not received any response. Schubert stated that he would be reluctant to participate on a committee that did not ever vote on anything. He pointed out that the committee structure and responsibilities need to be reviewed and possibly changed to make the committee more actively engaged in information technology decision making for the campus. He noted that the ITSC should have discussed the purchase of KACE and this should have been voted on by the Committee. He suggested that the Executive Committee could go to the Chancellor to raise concerns with the ITSC not being consulted on important information technology changes that impact faculty members.

Hartke stated that he appreciates Schubert's input and would like to consider the restructuring of the ITSC to make it more effective. He noted that the recent reorganization of the Committee was to have more engagement with Information Technology (IT) and to have more influence on policies relating to information technology and computers. He stated that he thinks the ITSC is forming a good relationship with IT and he believes CIO Askren is seeking to get the opinions of the faculty members on the ITSC. He stated that while the communication has been effective, he believes it could be better.

Woodman stated that one of his concerns as a member of the ITSC is that Information Technology seems to choose an action without first checking with the faculty. He pointed out that KACE is a very powerful tool and the faculty was not completely informed about the true capacity of this program and what it can do. He noted that he wanted to be a member of the ITSC because he was worried about how IT sets up and updates classroom computers and facilities without consulting faculty users. He pointed out that until recently, faculty members were to adapt to what was put on the classroom computers and not consulted about what programs they need in order to teach in these classrooms or were given administrative rights to even update browsers. Woodman also stated that some of these issues are now being resolved.

Schubert stated that it seems that complaints started being made about there being a sense of disconnection between IT and the faculty around the time that CIO Askren arrived, although this may be just a coincidental observation. He stated that he is inclined to think

that there needs to be discussion about demanding a change in the ITSC syllabus, particularly in regards to voting rights. He pointed out that the ITSC is a Faculty Senate committee.

Hartke stated that the increased membership of the ITSC does not seem to be working out the way that it was intended and suggested that the Committee might need to consider reducing the number of members on it. He suggested that some of the administrative representative positions may not be needed, although Associate VC Perez is a member and has been most useful, partly because he oversees changes in the classroom computers.

Nickerson asked if the ITSC has any real power. Hartke stated that he thinks it is currently fairly powerless which he does not think is acceptable. He pointed out that there have been some contentious issues raised, but no vote was taken on any of the issues. Woodman noted that the discussions are always very cordial and non-aggressive, but he thinks the policies are coming from IT and the Committee is just reacting to them. Hartke stated that Associate VC Perez brings up policies too because he leads changes in the classroom computers. Schubert noted that it sounds like conversations are being held but no decisions are actually being made by the Committee.

Hartke reported that the KACE issue has now spanned four meetings of the ITSC. He noted that some input was sought on the program and feedback was provided which appears to have changed some things that IT wants to do with the program, but overall there has been a disconnection between IT and the Committee. He pointed out that the change to the Office 365 email system was not discussed with the ITSC. Rather another committee was formed to look at the email system and there was no representation that he knows of from the Faculty Senate or the ITSC on this ad hoc committee. Reisbig pointed out that it seems reasonable that any ad hoc committee dealing with computer issues would have a representative from ITSC on it. Ruchala noted that creating ad hoc committees allows the administration to control who is appointed to a committee. Schubert stated that the Chancellor can create an ad hoc committee at any time, but if decisions are being made that relate to the faculty there should be a representative from the Faculty Senate or a Faculty Senate committee on it.

Schubert stated that it appears that the ITSC needs some adjustments to make it function better and this requires some broader discussion. Nickerson suggested seeing how other Big Ten schools handle these kinds of issues. Schubert stated that he believes the ITSC should come up with a resolution that can then be taken to the Senate demanding from the Chancellor that KACE be removed from every computer because faculty members feel uncomfortable with KACE. He stated that the ITSC needs to vote on topics on the agenda and the chair has the power to ask the Committee to vote on issues. The chair of the ITSC should then inform the CIO of the Committee's decision.

Nickerson asked how many levels KACE has in regards of what it can do. He pointed out that the faculty does not want to have an intrusive program. Hartke reported that based on the feedback from the ITSC, a policy was recommended to CIO Askren that

faculty members can opt not to have the program installed on their computers. Woodman pointed out that the policy might state that installation of KACE is voluntary, but faculty computers in University Libraries and the College of Business Administration have already had this program installed on their computers without their consent. He questioned whether there was any discussion about the installation of KACE at the college level or whether it was a decision made by a computer tech support person. Hartke stated that it is not clear if there was any discussion and how some of these policies affect the computer support people in the colleges. He noted that there have been varied differences of opinion on whether to have a more centralized IT unit or not. He pointed out that many faculty members are against this notion although having a centralized unit could be helpful. He reported that Director of Information Technology Support Holley-Wilcox, is revising the statement on KACE and is to bring it back to the ITSC.

Hartke stated that KACE is intended to do several different things, including the installation of software on computers and providing easy updating and managing licensed software. However, part of this capability allows KACE to inventory everything that is installed on a computer and can look at a windows registry. He pointed out that the IT people felt this was advantageous because of the ability to inventory software programs being used on campus. He noted that with eShop, purchase of software programs can now be inventoried easily and there are less compelling reasons to use KACE. He reported that having campus-wide software licenses allows the university to negotiate better prices and having an inventory of the software programs being used assists in this ability. He pointed out that the main reason for using KACE is that it can streamline the installation process on computers where KACE is installed without duplicating efforts in different departments.

Hartke reported that CIO Askren relayed a memo written by KACE vendor DELL describing how KACE can be installed with the inability to run scripts (this means that KACE can't directly run scripts written in its own scripting language, but it would still have the capability to install, remove, and update programs). He pointed out that any changes KACE would make on a computer are logged to the University, not to Dell Computers. He stated that his personal view is that KACE is part of a larger issue of balancing IT support and efficiency, and privacy, control, and academic freedom and many faculty members were annoyed that IT went ahead and mandated its use. He pointed out that the pushback on the mandate has encouraged IT to solicit more input on their decisions, and he thinks that changing the structure of the ITSC might help in providing more feedback. He noted that in principle KACE is not a bad thing, but there are times when access to what is on a computer should not be allowed. Woodman pointed out that KACE can shut down a program on a computer if it does not have appropriate licensing. He also pointed out that the sheer amount of logging information collected by KACE would effectively render the information gathered useless. Hartke reported that all IT personnel are required to sign a statement agreeing to Executive Memorandum 16 stating that no staff person who has access for repairing and maintaining computers can take any information off of your computer. He noted that

KACE is an alternate way to provide root access to computers for the approved purposes of maintenance and repair.

Schubert pointed out that KACE is a corporate software control program and the University is a state publicly funded institution that is not run on a corporate model. He stated that KACE allows IT to control what is on a person's computer and while it is being presented as a tool, it brings danger to every faculty member's computer and this requires discussion by all faculty members. He noted that while he agrees that we need to trust our people in IT, they have mandated use of a program that directly impacts the faculty without asking which violates any trust. He stated that this is an issue of shared governance that needs to be solved. He pointed out that he can foresee heated discussions in the Faculty Senate if use of KACE is mandated.

Woodman reminded the Executive Committee that KACE is a powerful tool that can be installed on your machine and can make some installed existing programs useless. He pointed out that he does not think there is a malevolent reason for installing KACE, but the University system was hacked last year and he is concerned with use of a software program that allows all files to be inspected.

Purdum asked if Hartke feels empowered to help with issues on behalf of the faculty with IT. Hartke stated that currently he feels the ITSC only has a small amount of empowerment and he wanted to meet with the Senate Executive Committee to get suggestions as to how the ITSC can be more effective. Purdum suggested that Hartke could meet more often with the Executive Committee which might help facilitate the work of the ITSC. Hartke noted that he was unaware that the Executive Committee has been gathering any comments on the use of KACE and this kind of information would be helpful.

Wysocki suggested that Hartke draft revisions to the ITSC syllabus. Reisbig stated that the ITSC should make suggested revisions to the syllabus. Hartke stated that he would appreciate receiving an official letter requesting that these changes be made. Griffin stated that the Executive Committee can charge the ITSC to revise its syllabus and restructure the committee in order to make it more functional and productive. Schubert reminded Hartke that committee chairs or members can meet with the Executive Committee to discuss concerns if the committees are not functioning well. He suggested that Hartke write a brief synopsis of what has happened with KACE and what its current status is so it can be given to the Senate. Griffin reported that CIO Askren will be addressing the Senate at the April 2 meeting. He pointed out that as a Faculty Senate Committee the ITSC has to serve the faculty, not IT. Woodman asked who made the decision to purchase KACE or to go to a new email system. Griffin stated that she believes the decision to go to a different email system came from Varner Hall. LaCost pointed out that CIO Askren has been charged to help the campus save money by making information services more cost efficient.

Schubert thanked Hartke for attending the meeting and stated that the Executive Committee will contact him about what the ITSC needs to do. He noted that Hartke is welcome to meet with the Executive Committee at any time.

Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee write a letter charging the ITSC to rewrite the syllabus, reduce the size of the committee, remove voting rights for some members, and make sure that the faculty members have the majority of the voting rights. He suggested that an attendance requirement be put into the syllabus as well.

Purdum suggested that the Executive Committee ask Chancellor Perlman how he views the role of CIO Askren and the interaction of the CIO position and goals with the ITSC. She pointed out that we need to understand the relationship of the CIO with faculty and with the Chancellor, also what tasks Chancellor Perlman has assigned to CIO Askren. Reisbig questioned why the administration handpicks people to be on ad hoc committees and does not include representatives from existing committees. Ruchala wondered if this just happens occasionally or if there is an issue with shared governance. Purdum pointed out that there is a redundancy of work when an ad hoc committee is formed to look into a specific issue and there is already an existing committee that already does this work.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Workshop on Safety Procedures

Ruchala reported that the College of Business Administration recently had a workshop on safety education which was very good. She stated that a UNL Police Officer gave the presentation and provided useful ideas to the faculty on what to do should an emergency situation arise. She noted that other units may be interested in offering the workshop. Schubert suggested that the administration should take the lead on this and should require that the presentation be given to each college.

4.0 Approval of 1/9/13 Minutes

Ruchala moved for approval of the minutes as revised. The motion was seconded by Rinkevich. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Survey on Visiting Faculty Housing Needs

Schubert noted that the survey was sent to all academic faculty members this morning and responses are due back by January 29.

5.2 Guidelines for Providing Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members' Rights

Schubert postponed the discussion until the next meeting when more time will be available for discussion. He asked the Executive Committee to review the proposed guidelines.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee discussed the lengthy conversation that was held during the Senate meeting regarding the proposed student bereavement policy. Woodman pointed

out that the policy is to support students, but faculty members are not required to have students produce evidence of the death of a loved one if they choose not to do so. Schubert asked if any proposed language changes have been received yet. Griffin stated that no suggestions have been made yet. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee will discuss the issue in greater detail if suggested changes are made. He noted that discussion will also take place at the next Senate meeting.

Schubert stated that he appreciated VC Jackson coming to the meeting to discuss parking but noted that she did not address the comments that were raised in a previous email message by a couple of Senators. He stated that he was disappointed that the Senators who raised the issue to the Executive Committee initially did not speak up at all at the meeting. Nickerson stated that he thinks it is highly unlikely that we will be able to adjust the cost of parking on campus. Purdum suggested that the next time Senators raise the issue that they are encouraged to take their concerns directly to the Parking Advisory Committee.

Guevara pointed out that it was evident that some Senators did not read the materials for the meeting. Anaya stated that it is embarrassing that people were leaving when Senators were speaking. She pointed out that the meeting was not even two hours long and was not adjourned.

6.2 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman

The Executive Committee identified agenda items for the Chancellor:

- Education of the campus on safety and security procedures in cases of emergency
- Assigned role of CIO Askren and his interaction with the Information Technologies and Services Committee
- Chancellor's view of the contract with the Governor to freeze tuition rates
 - o Will special fees be raised?
 - o How will increase in funding be prioritized and budgeted?
- Greater Faculty Senate participation on ad hoc committees created by the administration

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 23 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.