

**Information Technology Policy Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**IPFW**  
**April 19, 2012**

Attending: Bill McKinney, Deb Conklin, Mark Franke, Rebecca Jensen, Bob Kostrubanic, George McClellan, Cheryl Truesdell, Max Yen, Carl Drummond, Gail Rathbun, Bob Wilkindon

1. Call to Order

Dr. McKinney called the meeting to order at 9:00 am in ET 206.

2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the January meeting were approved.

3. Windows 7 and Novel Zenworks Upgrade Issues

Since it has been determined that Windows XP extended support will continue to April 2014, the concern that 365 faculty and staff workstations would have to be purchased for their Windows 7 upgrade in the 2013 budget has been deferred a year. The Zenworks software upgrade is proceeding by the building using mostly automated means, and will be completed campus-wide by mid-August.

4. The ACITAS Senate subcommittee software adoption policy and 3rd party application policy (attached)

After discussion, the ACITAS proposed policy regarding software adoption and third party applications was approved (see attached) – (McClelland recommended and Truesdale seconded)

5. Review web and social media policy updates (John Kaufeld)

John Kaufeld led a discussion on the proposed updates to the IPFW web and social media policy. It was decided that the proposed updates were not ready for adoption. Several issues were raised that need to be addressed: where does mobile media fit in, intellectual property and/or shared property interests are not addressed (it maybe that the intellectual property policy needs to be modified), copyright and the possibility of a separate mobile app policy. It would appear that the web and media policies need to be reviewed against other institutional policies and all need to be updated where necessary to achieve alignment. Bart Tyner is leading a proposal group of Cheryl Truedell and Bob Kostrubanic to define how to achieve this alignment.

The web and social media policies will be brought back to ITPC when ready.

## 6. Mobile Computing Issues

This discussion started with the notion that the iPad project has been too successful and it is growing too quickly – institutional policies need to be in place to help, not hinder, this growth and innovation.

- A. There is a proposal from Radiology to require new students admitted to the program to have iPADS – about 20 students per year. They also have 7 apps they want to require the students to have on the iPad.

There was no real disagreement about the requirements but the discussion focused on IPFW's role in implementing. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that IPFW should not be the provider or seller of the iPADS. Programs should publish the specifications (and notify potential students of the specifications) so students know what to purchase beforehand.

- B. IPFW is in the process of examining the impact of the iPad project. There are 4 changes being made for the 2012-13 year.

1. Keeping the 2 faculty cohorts moving ahead while adding a third cohort which will be more interdisciplinary.
2. A wireless project will integrate student and instructor use, with collaboration in a localized "cloud," within a given classroom
3. An iPad in the classroom project with 5 classes. Faculty will examine the impact using a common assessment of one class goal.
4. Student government is currently discussing the possibility of an iPad rental program that could start in the fall.

It was also recommended that there should be an iPad student cohort modeled after the faculty cohort model. We could use the honors students. This would complement the interdisciplinary faculty cohort.

## 7. Other

Bob Kostrubanic said they are making progress on the back-up data center in Gingsberg Hall. The storage area network is up and running and the data center should be complete in approximately 9 months.

Digital displays are being proposed for several locations and it is being recommended that they be installed in all buildings as part of the campus notification and information system.

## **ACITAS RESPONSE – PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TO ITPC SOFTWARE POLICY**

4/3/12

### **Policy Statement**

The aim of this policy is to provide appropriate resources to assure that computing software is available to meet the needs of two main university areas:

- The mission of teaching, learning, research, and community engagement, particularly in meeting teaching and scholarship goals, while protecting academic freedom in both individual and unit choice of tools
- Administrative goals in support of the university

The policy aim is also to define the relative limits of such support, and the criteria by which such limits are applied to a particular software, either acquired or proposed for acquisition.

In providing software support, the university will strive to achieve balance among three key areas:

- Supporting the academic and administrative needs stated above
- Controlling the costs of acquiring, using, and maintain such software
- Protecting the security of the university's overall computing environment and data

### **Definitions**

#### **Software support**

Support consists of providing the resources to acquire, install, maintain, and train in the use of, and resolve problems resulting in the use of, the approved software. The university may provide all, or a part of, or none of these resources, depending on the category the software is placed in, as defined below.

#### **Software categories**

##### **Type 1: Enterprise-wide software**

These are core applications used by most of the university, such as Email (Groupwise), Learning Management System (Blackboard), Student Information System (Banner), Content Management System (Web site, dotCMS). These may be hosted by university IT resources, and/or hosted in an outside computing environment by an agreement with others providers.

ITS and CELT provide the necessary support for this category of software.

##### **Type 2: General software tools and applications**

This category of software may be provided as “utility” tools, or as applications providing specific capabilities shared among specific college, division, or department users. Typical of this category are Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), AutoCAD, Adobe Suite, and other productivity tools. ITS provides network-based hosting, installation, and maintenance services. ITS and/or CELT may provide training and issue resolution, and/or these may be provided by areas with more specific expertise depending on the software functionality.

### Type 3: Course-associated or personal productivity software

This category of software is used by a specific college, division, department or professor for a specific course or set of courses. It may serve a distinct purpose for the course, and/or come with the course’s text, such as myITLab from Pearson Publishing, or the various mathematics instruction and study tools. ITS may provide software hosting and network access by individual agreement with the requester. The using organization/individual is responsible for providing all support in installing and maintaining the software, and all user training and issue resolution.

### **Criteria for Software Adoption**

It should be noted that the defining the above three Categories does not imply that funding to procure or maintain the software will necessarily be made available. Each software proposal must stand on its own merit in review.

### Type 1: Enterprise-wide software

Proposals for adoption of such software are made to ITPC for consideration after prior reviews of purpose, value, cost, and a comparison of alternative approaches to achieve the purpose. The reviews and proposal creation will be conducted by the appropriate university committee charged with such responsibilities:

- For academic software - ACITAS (Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate), possibly in joint action with ITCO (Instructional Technology Coordinating Committee of ITPC)
- For administrative software – ADCAC (Administrative Computing Advisory Committee) and/or the Banner Steering Committee

ITPC will use its own criteria, in addition to that stated in the “Policy Statement” of page 1, above, for deciding:

- If the software is appropriate to university needs, at all
- If the recommended alternative is the best alternative to meet university purposes, and its overall mission

- If the university can provide all the necessary resources to procure, install, maintain, and support the proposed alternative, including which Category the software fits

The decision as to which software to support will become the solely supported software of that purpose.

#### Type 2: General software tools and applications

This software will be considered by ITPC after a review and positive referral by ACITAS, possibly in concert with ITCO, where appropriate. The proposal assumes that adequate resources to procure, install, maintain and train for the software use have been secured. Approval will be reviewed periodically by ACITAS to assure its continued adherence as to the original purpose stated, as well as to the continuing availability of needed support resources.

#### Type 2: General software tools and applications (cont'd)

It is strongly recommended that those seeking to procure and install such software consult with ITS before proceeding to avoid problems with its working within the existing university computing environment.

#### Type 3: Course-associated software

This software is not decided upon or procured by the university or ITS as a whole, but instead by specific colleges, schools, departments, or individuals, and therefore requires no ITPC review or approval. It is strongly recommended that those seeking to procure and install such software consult with ITS before proceeding to avoid problems with its working within the existing university computing environment. ITS will give due consideration to all requests with a view to supporting the aims of this policy in supporting academic goals.

#### **Policy Enactment**

- This policy will be reviewed and adjusted as needed to current needs at least biannually
- The current status of software in use is “grandfathered” into the appropriate Categories at the Policy enactment