Meeting was called to order at 1:01 p.m.

In attendance:
- M. Anderson (remote), S. Ho ’19, F. Maloy, F. Orellana (remote), S. Sargent, M. Stahl, D. Snyder, E. Yu

Not in attendance:
- Q. Shi ’21

1. Review and approval of Minutes from 01/14/19
   a. Approved.

2. Status of Proposal for Faculty Retaining Email
   a. Steve sending to FEC.

3. Follow up discussion about allowing Internet of Things (IoT) on our network
   a. Revisiting the Committee’s previous discussion, ITS is receiving more requests to add IoT devices (both personal and College owned) to the Union network. Setting up a separate network where ITS isn’t tracking devices is possible, but not preferred. ITS is unsure what the impact is on the network when these devices are always on, always listening (as well as security, especially when g-mail accounts are linked to the devices where it can read email, etc.). Ellen confirms ITS isn’t concerned with things like Roku, which is a streaming app, in dorm rooms, as dorm rooms are not on the Union network (they are on ResNet). Some Committee members like the idea of experimenting with IoT devices in the classroom, as some kind of virtual TA. Denise Snyder will follow up with Fernando Orellana about possible ways he could pilot the equipment in his lab. The major challenge with these devices is that the phone, which is often where the app to control the device is located, has to be on the same network the device is on.

   b. The Committee recommends allowing IoT devices for teaching or research purposes, on a case-by-case analysis. If people have to contact ITS and ITS sorts it out for faculty, ITS doesn’t need a complicated policy.
4. Discussion about Standard configurations for PC and Macs
   a. IT would like to change the policy to focus on faculty/staff receiving the defined standard configuration instead of a set dollar amount for a computer. If ITS decides on a standard based on a CPU that sufficiently handles the standard software ITS provides, what is the best way to support people that have higher computing needs for their teaching and/or research? Feedback from the Committee indicated that some faculty might not know they can ask for more computing power if they require it for their research/teaching. It is better to have people approach ITS on a case-by-case basis but, in practice, how does that work? ITS could have a lower-based model and if it doesn’t meet a faculty member’s research or teaching needs, faculty can talk to ITS and ITS can work the faculty member to get the needed machine. Internally, Ellen will set the number ITS can cover above and beyond the standard, and what remaining cost departments need to cover. Ellen notes that ITS could potentially still bear the cost, if there aren’t too many requests (she will need to review numbers with Kelly Andolina, Director of User Services).

   b. The challenge for Ellen is where is the line–how does ITS determine how high-end to go with faculty? The Committee recommends the first step is finding out how many faculty are out there that need these higher-end computers (while not making it clear what they could be getting). New hires need to know, so they don’t get a machine that won’t work for them. It is noted that Jenny Fredericks, Dean of Academic Departments and Programs, asks for that information as part of the negotiation. Another suggestion is for higher-end machines, don’t replace them for four or five years (unless it breaks) as jumps aren’t as significant anymore. A suggestion is made that replacements for computers could be longer. It is noted that the current ITS purchasing guidelines are framed around when the computers are still under warranty.

5. New Business
   a. Data Classification: Division IV + II last week, Meeting with III and I this week
      i. So far, the most concern expressed is for more clarity with the Attestation document. If faculty are going to sign this document, they need to know exactly what to do to remain in compliance.

      ii. While generally receptive, Division IV expressed concern with the need to lock up “medium risk” data that is in hardcopy format. Faculty in this Division regularly put student work in envelopes and leave it outside their office for students to pick up. Ellen has checked with the Registrar, Penny Adey, and College Attorney, Chuck Assini, who confirmed this practice needs to change–the best practice is to leave the envelopes with
administrative assistants for students to pick up. Division IV did not like this idea but are open to other suggestions. It is noted Penny is open to having more discussions and invites faculty to send suggestions/options and talk them through with her.

1. A question is asked about the notion of data owners–who decides what is done with data. Decisions about how FERPA data is handled falls under the Registrar.

2. It was noted that this policy also affects adjuncts – who informs adjuncts? It is the job of the department chair to inform them. HR also should distribute the Data Classification documentation in the new employee welcome packet. It also should go into new faculty training and new chair training.

b. Ticketing system: feedback
   i. When someone submits a ticket to ITS, they expect a notification about what is happening if it has taken a long time to get a response. Otherwise, they are just left to wonder and grow frustrated. Right now, the system only auto notifies the requestor when the ticket is created and when the ticket is closed. The technician has to manually notify the requestor with updates when the work order is in process. If a technician is out sick, tickets can linger in their queue until they return. ITS will discuss internally how to improve communication with requestors through the new ticketing system, without burdening them with unwanted spam notifications.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:44 p.m.

Handouts:
- Minutes 01/14/19

Reminder: LCACT website: https://its.union.edu/lcact