

# ITCC Annual Report 2010-2011

For this and our monthly minutes, see:

<http://facultysenate.mst.edu/InforTechnology.html>

The following issues have been dealt with by the ITCC in the current academic year:

- 1. Shared Services.** This was a topic of major concern because the implementation of shared services in other portions of the administration (e.g. Purchasing) were widely viewed as unsatisfactory on our campus. A similar treatment of IT would have been unacceptable. However, ongoing discussions at the local and system levels have kept things relatively benign throughout the year. We will continue to stay on top of the situation.
- 2. Data Management Plan.** Federal Agencies now require a Data Management Plan for new proposals, for example, the National Science Foundation began requiring this in January. The ITCC proactively initiated discussions on this topic, which resulted in meetings between Research Services, the Library, and IT. The ITCC was briefed on this and referred the matter to the Research Computing Advisory Group, which continued discussions with the stakeholders and the administration. As a result, some supporting information for providing a data management plan is now being provided. Certain services for data management are provided by default. Principal Investigators can find more information on the Office of Research Services web site. PI's seeking services beyond those listed should allow time for developing an appropriate plan in their proposal development. The Research Computing Advisory Group is available to work with the administration on continuing improvements to our capabilities in this regard.
- 3. Staffing Concerns.** We have had several discussions regarding competition for experienced IT professionals and difficulties in keeping people and filling open positions. Some progress has been made but this is an ongoing issue.
- 4. Open Forum and ITCC Retreat**  
The ITCC decided to continue doing the Open Forum annually in conjunction with the Teaching and Learning Technology Conference that meets on campus in March, and to do the Retreats on an as-needed (no longer annual) basis. The Open Forum this year included detailed explanations of IT's Project Management Process (prioritization of activities requiring dedicated effort), e-Learning, Electronic Marketing and Communications (more about this below), Listserv changes, Research Computing, a case study on computer security's relation to privacy and relationship between institutional responsibility and a PI's responsibilities for data, and more.

## 5. Computer Security

Winners of Video competition

1<sup>st</sup> place \$500 Michael Bubasn

2<sup>nd</sup> place \$250 David Chinnadurai, Roger Rettig, and Kevin Hampe

3<sup>rd</sup> place \$100 Arch Creasy, James Freedman, Ben Brown

Honorable Mention \$50 James Smoot

Honorable Mention \$50 Todd Smith

All on IT Web site:

[http://it.mst.edu/current\\_students/security/contestwinners201011.html](http://it.mst.edu/current_students/security/contestwinners201011.html)

These are very worth watching!

Call for brainstorming for October Computer Security Awareness month.  
Please email Don Wunsch with ideas. There are no bad ideas at this stage.

## 6. What IT Supports

Over the course of several meetings, conversations were held about support priorities: types of systems, mechanisms for supporting faculty and staff machines via the ticketing system vs. the activities of the walk-in centers, and in general how to make the most of limited resources. The ITCC frequently receives inputs on these issues. See the minutes for further discussions and in particular the document “What We Support”, submitted as a draft to the ITCC by Mark Bookout and which is subject to further revision if necessary after future discussions. See our November 2010 minutes and the What We Support Policy (Draft) available in our minutes online.

## 7. Email, Faculty and Student changes

“Email Privacy” is unfortunately, rapidly becoming an oxymoron. We had many discussions about email, including privacy and quality of the email experience. These are separated below into faculty and student issues.

### 7A: Faculty email upgrade to Microsoft Exchange Server 2010 and Archiving

Email changes include an upside – quote increase to 5 GB or more – and areas of concern: new archiving (and anti-archiving) policies.

Concerns expressed included cost, privacy protection, being required to use the service, and saving email locally.

By far, the main concern expressed has been the capability to save our own copy, searchable on Outlook. PST’s allow that now but System is discouraging their use because they don’t just copy, but also remove from the server. The goals of System

could be met if locally retained emails were just copies and the server's records were centrally maintained.

A related concern has been the ability to work offline, for example when traveling away from Internet access, etc.

Things we had previously, such as offline methods of access will still be available. The email quota will go up to at least 5 Gigs.

Some other campuses had pretty small quotas, S&T had 1 Gig for a long time and Missouri – Columbia just went up to 2 Gig. Some schools still have 300 Meg.

Using servers like Google Docs instead of attachments is to be encouraged. This would reduce the memory footprint of emails.

Regarding concerns about quality after issues with student email accounts, it was pointed out that Outlook Live is not the same as Exchange Server 2010. Changes in versions to Exchange have been made in the past without a big impact. It is simply the next version of what we use now.

There's actually a big advantages to going to Exchange Server 2010, i.e., efficient use of storage (attachments are kept only once instead of once per recipient).

Privacy concerns vs. email records requests.

Margaret Cline has Missouri Sunshine Law information. This can be provided on request.

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) issue. (Sunshine act) Paul McGuffy, UM Counsel. Certain information can be redacted, i.e. FERPA, computer security, HR information, Social Security Numbers, etc.

In Missouri, there is no provision for giving the reason for seeking the information.

What happened in Michigan or Wisconsin could happen here.

Records management policy differs across records.

Counsel would work on requests on case-by-case basis.

Info must be checked to be redacted.

Access processes are not changing.

What is a record? This issue has been a subject of ongoing discussion.

Current business policy requires retention and deletion of documents on a schedule.

Technology now exists to follow that policy.

The possibility of a rolling window of email retention was also discussed, but cost is an issue. Selling the idea is another issue. However, the discussions are continuing.

System VP for IT, Gary Allen, pointed out to us that most universities in the Big 12 are going along a similar approach we are contemplating.

The plan is to develop a policy that says:

1. University employees will use university email.
2. Currently relevant university business will be retained on server.

Faculty members can create copies of emails that are needed longer.

There is nothing carved in stone re the July-August time frame. In any event the update would be rolled-in, probably first on System IT staff accounts. (They eat their own cooking.)

There was some urgency from UMSL due to the quota increase.

Dan Uetrecht is S&T Representative on the technical committee, so he can help us keep up to date.

Discussions resulted in the following motion (which carried unanimously):

Motion: The ITCC seeks questions and comments from all stakeholders about email capabilities and policies.

#### **7B: Student email.**

The UM System proposed switching all student email accounts to Outlook Live. After strong concerns were passed to the ITCC by the student government, the ITCC was able to ensure that our campus would give students a choice between Outlook Live or Gmail for student accounts.

In Fall 2010, the Gmail pilot project had approximately 2500 students signed up. About 555 Outlook Live users switched to Gmail. About 4500 students had Outlook Live accounts. All other campuses are 100% Outlook Live. Student feedback here has been positive regarding Gmail.

#### **8. Web presence.**

The ITCC has held ongoing discussions with IT regarding improvements to our web presence for the past several years. This year saw some significant improvements with the capability to automatically generate faculty web pages which can then be further customized by the faculty member. These use existing databases to provide a standard level of information but the capability for an individual to enhance the web page, including replacing the photo, putting in a biosketch, a general-purpose statement, and links, is a significant step forward from previous capabilities.

9. **Electronic Marketing reporting relationship.** Electronic Marketing was moved from reporting to the Vice Chancellor for Development to reporting to the Dean of Enrollment Management. After meetings between the ITCC Chair and the Directors

of Communications and Electronic Marketing, a presentation was scheduled to the ITCC Open Forum. There, the ITCC unanimously passed a motion to remind the administration that decisions like this that impact IT fall within the scope of our charter. Electronic Marketing was moved back to Development after the Dean of Enrollment Management announced his move to St. Louis University.

**10. The Task Forces: Computer Security, CLC's, and Research**

**Computing, have been renamed Advisory Groups** because this more accurately reflects their role. The CLC Advisory Group's charter was expanded to include e-Learning and was renamed the e-Learning Advisory Group. Advisory Group Chairs are Don Wunsch for Computer Security, Frank Liu for e-Learning and Thomas Vojta for Research Computing. All of these groups are open for volunteers to join whether or not they are on the ITCC. Both IT and the upper administration have specifically requested input from the faculty on e-Learning so please feel free to share any opinions or queries with the e-Learning Advisory Group or the ITCC.

**11. The first meeting of next year will be Wednesday, Sept 14, 4-5:30 PM, Room 236 EECH.** We will probably have an update of the email discussions, elections, and plan the schedule of 2011-2012 meetings.

Motions are summarized on the following pages.

**Motions listed by month (excluding those to approve minutes or to adjust dates or agendas of meetings)**

September  
None

October  
None

November  
**Motion N 1:**  
**Crosbie, 2<sup>nd</sup> Liu:**

**For Faculty and Staff, the S: drive quota will be increased to 8 GB without charge with possible increases upon request up to 25 GB without charge. These quotas will be annually reviewed by the ITCC.**

**Passed unanimously.**

(Note: IT subsequently decided to increase all S: drive quotas to 25 GB without charge.)

December  
None

January  
None

February  
None

March  
**Motion Mar 1:**

**Thomas Vojta, motion; Al Crosbie second:**

**Historically, the ITCC was not consulted when policies pertaining to Web presence, Electronic Marketing, Web site creation, URL assignment, and associated reporting relationships were decided upon. The faculty reminds the administration that the ITCC is the right place to initiate and revise policy discussions pertaining to these matters. In view of rapidly changing technologies, policies such as these need to be reexamined.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Motion Mar 2:**

**Motion: David Wright, English & Tech Comm, second Thomas Vojta, Physics**

The ITCC recognizes that problems are never guaranteed to be avoidable. Therefore we recommend that the university adopt a perspective of learning from problems rather than identifying scapegoats. We also recommend that individuals with responsibilities for the protection of sensitive data seek the involvement of professionals to ensure that safety is provided. Furthermore, guidance to accomplish this should be provided to people with such responsibilities.

**Motion carried unanimously**

April

**Motion A 1:**

**Frank Liu, Thomas Vojta 2<sup>nd</sup>**

The mission of the CLC Task force will be expanded to include strategic and tactical feedback to the administration re the e-Learning Initiative and related issues. The name of the task force will replace “CLC” with “e-Learning” to reflect the new mission.

The charter needs to be focused on techniques and strategies, not content.

**Motion carried unanimously**

**Motion A 2:**

**Thomas Vojta, Frank Liu 2<sup>nd</sup>**

The ITCC Task Forces will henceforth be referred to as “Advisory Groups”.

**Motion carried unanimously**

May

**Motion May 1:**

**Al Crosbie motion, Abijhit Gosavi 2<sup>nd</sup>**

The ITCC seeks questions and comments from all stakeholders about email capabilities and policies.

**Motion carried unanimously.**