MINUTES

IT Committee Meeting

September 17, 2013

Krannert 106

Present: Christopher Diller, Sherre Harrington, Steve Head, Chuck Lane, James Ross, Koty Swanson, Penny Evans-Plants, Tom Hocut, Jerry Trammell, Christine Anton (chair).

Meeting was called to order at 11:00 AM. The minutes from the last meeting, April 2013, were approved without corrections.

1. **Old Business:**
* Jerry Trammel told the committee that the “VHS to DVD Policy” that regulates procedures for digitizing VHS material was sent out to the deans for approval by the various schools.
* Tom Hocut reported on wireless upgrades performed over the summer. OIT is ahead of schedule with the Aerohive installations on campus, even though some modification of the system is still required. For example, students use a number of wireless products that can potentially interfere with the wireless infrastructure, degrading performance, and, in some cases, even rendering wireless access inoperable. Yet, in general, feedback from students has been rather positive.

Sherre Harrington related a possible connection problem with VikingWeb when running on a wireless device, as some of her students have stated. It is not clear, however, if the cut-off that students experience when on VikingWeb is indeed caused by the wireless connection or if VikingWeb itself simply times out. A likely solution would be to reconfigure the time-out setting. Koty Swanson told the committee that the Help Desk hands out free ethernet cables to students upon request.

* Students, however, have not been too happy with the upgrade to Office 365. There are many alternatives available to them, though, such as Open Office and Google Docs. In addition, licenses for Microsoft Office 2013 can be purchased at a minimal cost, and the software is also installed in computer labs around campus.
* Jerry Trammel told the committee that his office is currently looking into a substitute for FSSWeb (server solely allocated to instructional purposes). In his opinion, FSSWeb is not a good solution as it requires too much investment of time and energy on the faculty part.
1. **New Business:**
* TechQual Survey: As OIT conducts an assessment and planning survey by gathering feedback from the Berry community (faculty, staff, students) every other spring semester, Penny Evans-Plants has requested three committee members (one faculty, one staff, one student representative) to volunteer and assist her office with the survey’s design for this coming semester, spring 2014. A protocol guide to the survey can be found at: <https://www.techqual.org/docs/protocol-guide.aspx>. Those committee members who would like to participate are asked to contact OIT directly.
* Revised Email Privacy Policy: Over the summer, Penny Evans-Plants constructed an “Acceptable Use Policy” which would replace the Email Policy, Email Use Policy and Computing Use and Ethics Policy currently in place (see: [http://www.berry.edu/oit/ page.aspx?id=2266](http://www.berry.edu/oit/%20page.aspx?id=2266)). This came about in light of the 2012 secret email search controversy at Harvard University, when OIT was approached with the request to review Berry’s own policy.

Prior to the meeting, Chris Diller had forwarded some comments to Penny Evans-Plants, and she subsequently incorporated his suggestions into the new policy. Following are Dr. Diller’s comments and the corresponding sections in the newly reworded AUP:

1. Tone: can we emulate some of the language […] to foster an ethos of “mutual use and responsibility” rather than a mostly punitive tone?

→ Section III, “Acceptable and Ethical Use,” pg. 1: “Berry College encourages an environment in which ideas can be freely exchanged along with a commitment to academic freedom. It is the user’s responsibility to practice cooperative computing.”

1. The current draft does not explicitly endorse privacy as a principle or ideal—as Furman and Centre do and Hendrix implicitly does. In fact, the draft explicitly denies it. Should we not distinguish between privacy and compromises to confidentiality due to need for access/violation?

→ Section III, “Privacy,” pg. 4: “Berry College respects the privacy of all electronic communications however, users should have no expectations of privacy while using Berry College owned or leased equipment and services.” [Suggestion from the committee was to change “no expectations” to “limited expectations”]

[….] “Email and data stored on shared drives are inherently insecure.”

[….] “access will be governed by the expectation of professional conduct.”

1. The current draft does not have any statement of an attempt to give a user advanced notice of access/violation, at least if and when this is possible.

→ Section III, “Privacy,” pg. 4: [….] “When appropriate, an attempt will be made to notify the user of this access [by the Chief Information Officer], in advance.”

The ensuing discussion revolved around the fact that Berry’s Faculty-Staff Handbook also contains a section on “Electronic Privacy” which is worded very differently and in much more detail than the proposed AUP. Fore reference, please consult section D9.00 in

the current Handbook:

https://vikingweb.berry.edu/ICS/Berry\_Community/Group\_Management/Human\_Resources/Public\_Page.jnz?portlet=Handouts

Since the committee will eventually have to bring the document to the Faculty Assembly for approval, it became apparent that the current draft of the AUP will have to be edited and reworked so that it will convey the same principles and ideas as the Handbook does. Thus, it was decided to table the matter and to discuss it again at the next committee meeting. Committee members are therefore urged to please read the corresponding sections in the Handbook prior to the next meeting in October.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:55 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Anton