

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
East Campus Union, Arbor Suite
April 2, 2013
Presidents Schubert, Guevara, and LaCost, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Schubert called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Recognition of Outgoing Senators

President Schubert stated that on behalf of everyone he wanted to thank the outgoing Senators for their time and service on the Faculty Senate. He stated that he hopes that they will come back to the Senate at some point in their careers to help provide input on faculty matters. He thanked the following outgoing members: Christina Falci, Sociology; Seth Giertz, Economics; Jeff Rudy, Nutrition & Health Sciences; Amit Mitra, Plant Pathology; Michael Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences; Kent Eskridge, Statistics; James Schild, Panhandle.

President Schubert reported that the following people have been re-elected to another term on the Senate are: Ken Nickerson, School of Biological Sciences, J. Clark Archer, School of Natural Resources, Vitaly Zlotnik, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences; William Grange, Theater Arts; William Kranz, Northeast Research & Extension Center; Pat Sollars, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences.

2.2 Donation from the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association

Professor Kranz, Northeast Research & Extension Center, reported that the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association (NCEA) represents approximately 200 extension educators and annually makes a donation to the Ed Schwartzkopf Foundation account which helps to support the Faculty Senate Office. He noted that the NCEA appreciates all that the Senate Office does for faculty members and wanted to present a check for \$1100. President Schubert thanked Professor Kranz and the members of the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association for their generous support.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman wanted to congratulate and thank the outgoing Senators and those who are returning to the Senate for their work. He stated that he recognizes that it can be a burden, although interesting and he appreciates their service to the university. He noted that for those returning he appreciates their willingness to serve again and to provide institutional memory to the Senate.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has previously mentioned a certain level of frustration he and others have had with the UNL Bylaws. He pointed out that if you read the Bylaws there is nothing in them that much goes beyond the Board of Regent's bylaws which we must follow anyway. As a result, he has hired a law student who is going to try to make some sense of them over the summer. He gave assurance that he does not have the authority to change the Bylaws on his own, but he hopes to have a draft of proposed changes. He reported that no great event occurred to stimulate his interest in doing this, but the recent student bereavement policy adopted by the Senate provoked the question of how we can enforce these kinds of policies. He pointed out that life at a university can be troublesome if the institution is not well organized. He stated that he hopes to get things in order so there can be discussions on substantive issues concerning the bylaws.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he recently spent three days on the accreditation team reviewing Arizona State University which reminded him that our reaccreditation is coming up in 2016. He noted that the Higher Learning Commission has just changed some of its criteria for accreditation and ASU is the first major research university to go through the process. This provided him with the opportunity to gain an understanding of some of the things we will be going through with our accreditation process. He stated that Professor Giesecke will be attending a seminar at the Higher Learning Committee regarding the management process of the accreditation. He noted that we will have to do another self-study and the key thing that every major research university has to confront is the very direct emphasis on assessment of student outcomes. He reported that the theory is that every course and program, particularly general education courses, should have clear statements of what the outcomes of the course are and we will need to assess these courses to show how we are meeting these outcomes. He noted that at many institutions this has become a very bureaucratic process. He pointed out that we need to make sure that we are on top of this because 2016 will come here

quickly and there is a lot of work that has to be done.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the master plan for UNL is progressing and the Sasaki team will give its last report to administrators tomorrow. He stated that the plan will not be taken to the Board until September. He pointed out that the process of developing the plan has been transparent and that it can be viewed on the web. He noted that anyone with concerns can express them by September. He stated that if the plan is approved all of the changes will not be implemented at once, but it will make some dramatic changes on campus. He stated that if the construction of a new Business College is successfully financed it will create the need to begin implementing the master plan in that portion of the campus. He reported that the new Veterinary Diagnostic Center will get the plans moving on East Campus, but the full campus master plan will not fully emerge for several years.

Chancellor Perlman wanted to address the persistent and informative discussion regarding KACE and the intention of putting it on desktop computers. He reported that KACE is an agent that allows the university to check on legitimately purchased software programs without bothering the user. He noted that the mechanism allows UNL to save money and protect information on your computer. He acknowledged that the announcement about KACE was rolled out poorly and admitted that he too was surprised by the email message and felt the same as other faculty members did when he read the initial email message. He stated that the administration is not requiring faculty members to have KACE on their computers if they do not want it. He pointed out that the benefits of KACE include protecting information on university computers from the thousands of attacks that are attempted every day. He noted that in order to protect the system it is helpful to have the computers attached to a program that provides security. He stated that KACE is a cost effective way to make security on computers better. He stated that faculty members can put security on their computers themselves or they can have an information technologist put it on the computer. He reported that the information technologist for his office put KACE on his machine. He stated that the university could receive requests from companies that we have site licenses with for audits on whether the software on our computers is licensed and KACE has the capability of determining if a program is licensed. He noted that more than likely most people at the university do not have unlicensed software programs, but graduate students or people in labs using equipment could put on unlicensed program on a computer without your knowledge. He pointed out that anyone with unlicensed software will personally have to pay the fine. He reported that another benefit to using KACE is that it can do updates centrally, freeing up IT people and allowing them to be more responsible to your other computing needs. He pointed out that if we know how many licensed programs are on UNL computers we could possibly negotiate better deals with the software companies. He stated that he knows that there is concern that some IT person could rummage through all of the information of your computer if KACE is installed but the university has a policy against this. He noted that staff members may be required to install KACE and he is considering creating incentives to using KACE. He noted that he is not sure what the incentives will look like, but this will be explored in the next few months. He asked that faculty members should consider the cost savings that can be associated with using KACE.

Professor Hay, Southeast Research & Extension Center, reported that his Center was one of the first to use and review KACE and while many people did not have a problem with doing this they did not feel that there was honesty about what the program can do. As a result some people feel that there is no honesty with Information Services. He pointed out that it would have been much simpler if Information Services had been honest and forthcoming about the capabilities of the program. Chancellor Perlman stated that this issue has been addressed.

Professor Nickerson, School of Biological Sciences, asked if the revision of the UNL Bylaws will address the definition of who is a faculty member or whether this will be deferred to the Board of Regents. Chancellor Perlman noted that this is an issue that has multiple facets. He stated that there are pressures from the Central Administration to have all four campuses use the same definition of faculty so there is more accurate reporting, but he does not think the UNL Bylaws will address it. He stated that the other issue percolating is who has the academic authority to vote in the units. He pointed out that this is unclear at this time. He stated that there ought to be a provision in the bylaws that addresses this, but there are currently no proposals. He stated that the question is whether there is a university-wide common definition of a faculty member or not because faculty means different things to different people. He noted that this is not a high level priority issue, but it could be an issue for some. He stated that if it is decided that there should be a university-wide definition it needs to be in the bylaws. Professor Nickerson asked if it is possible to have a campus-wide definition for UNL that would be different from the university-wide definition. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes it could be, but it would have to be carefully worded and there would need to be Board approval as they have to approve the UNL bylaws.

Secretary Woodman asked what the incentives for using KACE would be for faculty members. He also asked what the Chancellor meant when he said a faculty member would have to pay if they have unlicensed software on their computer. Chancellor Perlman stated that if Microsoft found that a faculty member has an unlicensed version of Word on their computer it would be up to the faculty member to pay the fine, not the university.

Professor Hartke, Mathematics, asked how incentives for KACE would work since IT support is so decentralized. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are some options: one incentive could be to increase the costs for those academic units that will not use KACE. He pointed out that providing service on computers that do not have KACE will be more expensive and the increase in costs should be reflected in the decentralized level because he does not think the administration should have to bear these costs. He noted that if faculty members want university-wide protection on the computers they should use KACE. He stated that a cost will probably be set for providing service to units but those using KACE will have less cost.

President Schubert stated that in a couple of years consideration will need to be given to the fact that most computers will be on a frequency like 4g or 5g which will be completely wireless and many people will take their personal computers wherever they go. He pointed out that the university will not know what programs people will be using when this happens. Chancellor Perlman stated that by the time this issue is resolved things will more than likely have changed. He stated that if a faculty member has unlicensed software, you will have to pay. He noted that he is ending his twelfth year as Chancellor and eleven of those twelve years he has had to deal with budget cuts. As a result the campus is looking at every way that it can to possibly save money so the academic effort can remain intact. He reported that since CIO Askren has been at UNL there has been an effort to free up IT people to get them to be more strategic partners in advancing the academic enterprise. He pointed out that the sophistication of technology that ASU is using to help students succeed is a level above ours and we need to have this kind of technology but it is costly. He noted that we all have different sensitivities to privacy and he applauds this, but people have to consider the costs.

A member of the audience asked when KACE was introduced. CIO Askren stated that it was introduced two years ago, but the notice going out to faculty members stating that they would be required to use it for software distribution occurred last spring. He noted that this issue will be discussed further and it is important for the campus to figure out a policy on its use.

4.0 Approval of March 5, 2013 Minutes

Professor Wysocki, Computer and Electronics Engineering, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Zoubek, Southeast Research & Extension Center. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Information Technologies and Services Committee Report (Professor Hartke)

Professor Hartke reported that the ITSC dealt with two major issues during the year but also worked on some other issues. He stated that the Senate Executive Committee requested that the ITSC review its current syllabus and possibly revise it. He noted that a motion to change the syllabus will be presented later in the meeting. He stated that the proposed changes are to reduce the size of the committee: reduce the number of faculty members from nine to seven and reduce the number of non-faculty members from eight to three. He pointed out that when the ITSC syllabus was changed last year there was an oversight and the non-faculty members on the committee were given voting rights. The proposed changes call for the removal of voting rights for non-faculty members. He reported that the specific responsibilities of the ITSC have changed and the revisions aim to highlight the engagement of the ITSC with the administration and Information Technology personnel. He pointed out that the role of the ITSC is to make sure that communication is flowing between these groups. He stated that a member of the ITSC now attends the UNL IT directors' meeting and UNL IT leadership meetings.

Professor Hartke reported that the ITSC spent a large amount of time on KACE discussing its capabilities and appropriate uses of it. He noted that KACE is a tool that UNL has licensed. The primary use of it is for installing and updating software and auditing software programs to ensure that they are licensed. He pointed out that the ITSC did not become aware of KACE until late last spring when the message from procurement was sent out to the campus. He noted that the policy mentioned in that email message has been suspended. He stated that KACE is controversial because even though it cannot read documents on computers, it does have strong scripting capabilities giving an IT person the potential to scan what is on a computer. He reported that the ITSC approved a statement that KACE can be used on an optional basis by faculty members. He noted that the statement was supported by CIO Askren and he has asked his staff in Information Services (IS) to

make units aware of the statement.

Professor Hartke stated that the ITSC has created a draft policy on KACE pointing out the major points of the program, providing optional use for faculty and units, outlining policies for the acceptable use of KACE, and addresses frequently asked questions about KACE. He stated that the use of KACE must comply with Executive Memorandum 16: Policy for Responsible Use of University Computers and Information Systems.

Professor Hartke reported that the ITSC worked with Associate Vice Chancellor Perez to create a survey to assess the IT needs of academic computing. He asked Senators to please encourage their colleagues to fill out the survey so IT can get a better understanding of what the needs are on campus.

Professor Hartke stated that the ITSC worked on other issues:

- 1) The Blackboard license will expire in a year or so and the ITSC will be looking into whether Blackboard is the right tool for faculty to be using.
- 2) Administrative access to classroom computers. He stated that IS has changed the policy in classrooms so faculty members can install software on a temporary basis.
- 3) Discussed the use of “common good” funding models, such as used for email, UNLcms, and faculty access to the wireless network.

Professor Hartke asked that anyone who has issues they would like the ITSC to consider to please bring them forward to any of the members on the Committee.

Professor Subbiah, Food Science & Technology, stated that some faculty members have sophisticated software on their computers and automatic upgrades of some programs could impact the more sophisticated software. Professor Hartke reported that the ITSC did discuss this. He suggested that there could be groups created within KACE so that updates are not uniform across an entire unit, essentially there would be a do not update group and the local IT person could configure this group based on needs.

Professor Archer, School of Natural Resources, pointed out that the scripting capability of KACE is fairly powerful. He asked if this could be exploited by people outside of UNL and whether this security issue has been considered. Professor Hartke agreed that KACE is a very powerful tool and Professor Archer’s concerns are very valid. He stated that the use of KACE has to be weighed against the cost of individual units having to provide security for its computers. He noted that KACE is used at many organizations, both universities and businesses. He pointed out that there has been a great deal of effort to make sure that the security is at the highest level.

Professor Subbiah noted that a lot of organizations use cloud-based systems because it is convenient and saves both money and space, but he worries about security. He asked if this is an issue at UNL. Professor Hartke stated that there are some initiatives for us using cloud-based systems. He noted that as part of the Internet 2 Consortium universities attempt to bond together to obtain services, but these can have larger security concerns that are worth considering. CIO Askren pointed out that this is a very timely topic that he wants to get faculty engagement on and he looks forward to working with next year’s ITSC on it.

Professor Neal, Art and Art History, pointed out that faculty members have been making comments that Information Services are shoving things like KACE down the throats of faculty members. She asked why faculty input is not being gathered prior to a program like KACE being purchased. Professor Hartke agreed. He noted that ITSC is trying to get more faculty involved so input can be provided before the purchase of software programs that impact the campus is made. He stated that he thinks the idea now is to have more faculty engagement earlier in the decision making stage. He pointed out that he does not think the faculty are completely engaged in all IS decisions, but the ITSC is working towards this goal. Professor Neal asked who makes the decision to get more faculty input. Professor Hartke stated that the ITSC and the Faculty Senate could all push for faculty input. CIO Askren stated that he takes responsibility for the lack of communication with KACE, but he believes the communication with the faculty is much better now and he is working on getting that line of dialogue more open.

The question was asked how much KACE cost. CIO Askren stated that KACE is not a free service and there is a three year agreement with the purchase of the product. He reported that the Microsoft product is the superior product on the market. He noted that we went with KACE because it works better on Mac’s. He reported that we are in the last year of the agreement and this provides us with the opportunity to consider KACE or another product.

Secretary Woodman, who is a member of the ITSC, asked if IS locally has scripting access. CIO Askren reported that three people at the central level have high security clearance will have access including him, but he cannot imagine any IT in the departments or colleges having access. He noted that local IT people are excited about KACE's ability to update programs but acknowledged that there are some trade-offs with the program.

Professor Ford, College of Architecture, noted that the Chancellor mentioned that ASU had a better software program to help students be successful. He asked if the Chancellor may have been referring to Blackboard. Professor Hartke stated that he is not sure but believes the Chancellor was speaking about the MyPlan program.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, asked what the timeline is for assessing Blackboard. Professor Hartke noted that ITSC has not started evaluating Blackboard yet, but believes the process will begin in the fall. CIO Askren reported that the Blackboard contracts ends in 27 months but work to determine whether the contract should be reviewed needs to start this fall.

Emeritus Professor McShane stated that he was interested in knowing whether the ITSC would consider having a relationship with the Emeriti Association since many of the retired professors continue to do research. He stated that they would like to be advised on changes to computers that could have implications with their work. He stated that he could provide Professor Hartke with a contact person in the Association.

President Schubert wanted to thank Professor Hartke for his excellent presentation and his collaboration with the Executive Committee. He pointed out that this was Professor Hartke's first time as chair and commended him on his service and diligence.

5.2 Executive Committee Report (President Schubert)

President Schubert reported that part of the Senate's role is to have engagement with actual committees but the Executive Committee learned this year that it has lost contact with some of the Senate committees which may have contributed to why KACE was not brought to the attention of the faculty sooner. He stated that the Executive Committee needs to strive to work more closely with the Senate committees and should look to see how the committees' work can be made more efficient. He wanted to thank Professor Hartke again for his immediate response to the Executive Committee's concerns. He noted that when the ITSC syllabus was changed in 2012, voting rights were given to more than 50% of the non-faculty members on the Committee. He pointed out that faculty are ultimately the people that need to make the decisions. He stated that Senate committees are only going to work well if they work with the Senate. He noted that the ITSC is now back on course and working closely with Information Services to provide faculty input.

President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee helped the students with the student bereavement policy which is an issue the students have been dealing with for some time. The question is whether this policy will be enforced since the Chancellor is questioning whether Senate policies are enforceable. He stated that the Senate will need to keep a close eye on the revisions to the UNL Bylaws.

President Schubert thanked Coordinator Griffin for her work, particularly with writing up the minutes which is a difficult task. He noted that the Executive Committee report lists just some of the activities of the Committee for this past year.

President Schubert stated that he was glad to hear the Chancellor address the non-tenure track faculty situation and was happy to hear that the Board of Regents and Central Administration are trying to decide how faculty should be defined. He noted that this could provide the Senate with an opportunity to make suggestions on how we want to restructure faculty and faculty rights. He suggested that the Senators bring this discussion into their units to see who they think should be considered faculty and who should have the right to vote. He reported that the College of Engineering has been working on rewriting its bylaws and is considering including that all faculty members have voting rights with some limits, such as only tenured faculty members can vote on promotion and tenure.

President Schubert reported that this past year, as Senate President, he attended the Board of Regents meetings and noted that there are some very active, pioneering people on the Board, but each year a new person from the Faculty Senate attends the meeting. He pointed out the Faculty Senate President does not have a voice on the Board even though there are student regents. He reported that the 120 credit hour changes, Innovation Campus, and other very important matters are voted on and regulated by the Board but they do not hear the faculty perspective on these issues and he does not know how this can be changed. He pointed out that UNL is

traditionally underpaid, but there is no voice at the Board level that addresses this issue. He stated that a current on-going topic with the Board is the price of education and the attempts to deal with the budget, but there is no discussion on the value of education.

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee had numerous discussions on ACE and met with Professor Mitchell, Director of Undergraduate Education, and Professor DeFusco, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee about the issue. He stated that the Executive Committee is trying to figure out how the ACE process, particularly the recertification process, can be improved. He reported that the Executive Committee will continue to work on resolving this issue.

Professor Wysocki stated that he is not involved with teaching ACE courses or is involved with the recertification process, but he has listened to many emotional comments made about ACE from both sides of the issue. He stated that he thinks the whole program was approved by the faculty of each college and the Senate, but it is time to look at how the program is operating and whether it is operating properly and the way it was intended, or if modifications need to be made to address the issues that have been raised. He proposed a motion to set up an ad hoc committee, independent from the University Curriculum Committee, to examine the ACE process and recommend improvements. President-Elect Guevara seconded the motion.

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, noted that he served on both of the committees that helped to create the ACE program. He pointed out that the ACE program was approved by the colleges, not by the Senate. He stated that the ACE efforts were to try to reform the previous general education program and the colleges were very jealous about controlling their curriculum. He noted that this begs the question of what role the Senate has with the program now. He stated that if there are substantial changes the colleges would need to review them and vote on them but the Senate could propose that this be done.

President Schubert stated that it is the Executive Committee's impression that it is not a clear situation. Professor Peterson noted that it is confusing legislatively as to who has the authority to make changes. Professor Shea, School of Natural Resources, pointed out that the Regents Bylaws state that the Faculty Senate is to act on academic matters that affect more than one college so the Senate should be a major player in this issue.

Professor Carlson noted that when a degree is awarded it is by the faculty of the college and the faculty controls the curriculum. He is not arguing that the Senate does not have a role, but we need to determine the relationship between faculty governance and the ACE governance. He stated that the Senate can certainly raise concerns, but he does not have a good handle on how to make any changes.

Coordinator Griffin reported that the Faculty Senate did approve an endorsement of the ACE program and recommended that the colleges accept the program. She pointed out that the ACE Governance and Assessment Document states that the ACE subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee makes formal recommendations to the colleges regarding substantive changes in the ACE program. However, in the University Curriculum Committee syllabus it states that any changes to the ACE subcommittee's duties, powers, or procedures must be approved by the Faculty Senate since the University Curriculum Committee is a Senate Committee. This creates confusion as to who has the authority to make changes. She noted that no one is interested in changing the courses or the outcomes of the ACE program, the proposed changes are about modifying the recertification procedures.

President Schubert stated that the motion to create an ad hoc committee will be voted on at the next Senate meeting.

6.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

7.0 Academic Freedom Award

Professor Fech, chair of the Academic Freedom Award Committee, reported that the Committee received one nomination for the James A. Lake Academic Freedom Award and felt that the person should receive the award. He stated that the Senate is being asked to vote on whether the candidate should receive this award. He asked that the Senate keep the nominee's name confidential until the votes have been tallied.

8.0 New Business

8.1 CIO Askren

CIO Askren thanked the Senate for inviting him to speak. He noted Information Services has been working

with Associate Vice Chancellor Perez on a survey to get faculty feedback on computing issues. He stated that this survey will be coming out shortly and he hopes that faculty will participate.

CIO Askren stated that there are approximately 75 Information Technology (IT) units in departments and colleges and he is working on getting IS to refocus and improve department services to better support edge innovation with the decentralized IT units. He stated that the biggest obstacle is the accelerating demands on needing more IT services while the budget remains flat. He reported that he and his staff are looking at ways for more rational funding mechanisms. He stated that client services needs to be made better and more efficient.

CIO Askren reported that IS continues to work to secure faculty, staff, and student data and services from the thousands of attacks that the university receives every day. He pointed out that some of the computer attacks are just standard, but there are others that could cause problems for us.

CIO Askren noted that as a result of being an early member of Internet 2, UNL has a very strong network. He reported that we will be moving to 100Gb connections to Internet 2 which is essential for high performance research. He stated that faculty connections are being upgraded to 1Gb and 80% of these connections have been completed. He asked faculty members to let him know if they do not have what they need to conduct their work.

CIO Askren reported that Heath Tuttle from Information Services is working with Associate Vice Chancellor Perez on plans to improve instructional resources. This plan, called the T3 Initiative which focuses on technology, teaching and transforming, is an effort to take teaching resources to the next generation. He stated that IT is working to improve the security and reliability of the information technology infrastructure because this is crucial to maintain. He stated that IS has implemented the open source content management system and is leveraging cloud resources and other off campus services where appropriate.

CIO Askren stated that he is impressed with the skill of the technicians in IS and in all of the units. He reported that leadership in client services needs to be improved. He stated that cloud technology and the software infrastructure give us a lot of capability which in turn allows us to work more closely with the other Big Ten schools. He noted that the other Big Ten schools are very interested in seeing how we can collaborate together to establish services between the universities.

CIO Askren reported that improvements that have been made based on faculty feedback have been to replace LotusNotes email system, eliminate the fees for wireless accounts, and provide administrators rights to faculty for classroom computers that are directly supported by the central IS department. He noted that the Executive Committee in particular stressed the need for giving faculty members administrative rights on classroom computers. He noted that the decentralized IT units do not report to him, but IS tries to provide best practices and collaboration with these units to assist them.

CIO Askren stated that areas that need further improvement include engagement, transparency, and communication. He noted that some improvements are starting to happen but acknowledged that the KACE situation was poorly handled although the intent was good. He pointed out that we have the opportunity to have faculty engagement in assessing Blackboard. As stated previously, the contract with Blackboard will be expiring and IS needs faculty guidance in whether the contract should be renewed or whether the campus should use a new program. He reported that there are some new upstart companies offering the same kind of product as Blackboard that we might want to look at and suggested that there be a faculty group to look at this issue.

CIO Askren noted that we still try to resolve problems or create solutions on our own without learning and partnering with our peer institutions. He reported that resource limitations are the nature of the economy, but the question is how we can meet our potential with the limited resources. He noted that there are still some resources issues that need to be worked through.

CIO Askren reported that IS is looking into investing more in mission critical technologies. He pointed out that there was not much investment into computing technology when he first arrived at UNL, but we have caught up in many ways on some things. He noted that surveys provide a lot of needed feedback and IS is working hard to make improvements. He stated that money is being spent on transactional systems but not on statistical information systems. He noted that most of the funding is spent on administrative computing systems which enables the registering of students, payroll, and other campus administrative functions but very little is spent on research.

CIO Askren reported that whatever the university decides on MOOCs, whether we offer these courses here or they are offered as a class that can be taken through another university, we need to be ready. He pointed out that our technology capabilities need to be agile and flexible to accommodate these kinds of courses.

CIO Askren stated that he is very interested in getting feedback from the faculty and asked that people call or email him with any concerns.

Professor Carlson asked how IT personnel view the need for timely, accurate data collection so it is available when needed. CIO Askren stated that having this information is vital and Institutional Research and Planning is our central data collecting office. He noted that several people work on collecting data but conversations are occurring about how we are going to tackle data collection and storage on a larger scale and how this relates to the goals of the campus and in solving problems. He noted that we need to have student financial information and data in order to address questions and provide statistical information.

Professor Lagrimini, Agronomy and Horticulture, asked if improvements in classroom technology are going to be made. He pointed out that there are a lot of programs that instructors would like to try to use in the classrooms but faculty members are frequently told by IT people that it cannot be done. CIO Askren suggested that the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate might want to work with Associate Vice Chancellor Perez and Heath Tuttle to address this issue. He noted that the T3 effort is a systematic approach to upgrade general purpose classroom computers but does not address updating college or department owned classroom computers. This results in a lot of unevenness, sometimes within the same college. Associate to the Chancellor Nunez reported that there is an initiative underfoot that will look at the appropriateness of space and the use of computers. He noted that some money has been set aside by SVCAA Weissinger for this initiative. He stated that a quick review showed that there is a definite disconnection between unit computers and general purpose classroom computers. He suggested that departments and colleges may want to speak to CIO Askren, Associate Vice Chancellor Perez, or himself about possibly making some of the college owned classrooms into a general purpose classroom because more frequent updates to the computers can be made.

Professor Kranz asked what the cost savings are with KACE. He noted that no comments were made about the costs that come with faculty needing to frequently learn how to use different software programs. He pointed out that there is a learning curve with each new program and in some ways this is an unfunded mandate which does not get discussed. He asked CIO Askren how he thinks the transition to Windows 8 is going to work. CIO Askren pointed out that sometimes the most recent version of an operating system is not necessarily the best to use because there are a lot of bugs that need to be worked out. For instance, Firefly is very sensitive to new systems and oftentimes you cannot use the latest version of a browser with it. He stated that IS is trying to figure out a balance, although he thinks Microsoft is pushing people to use Windows 8. He noted that some people are saying they want to support it, but a lot of people are hesitant with using it. He stated that part of the issue is that with new portals coming out we are trying to get better with the user issue.

President Schubert thanked CIO Askren for coming to the meeting and noted that these are ongoing issues that the Executive Committee and Senate will want to address in the future.

8.2 Motion to Review the Information Technologies and Services Committee Syllabus

President Schubert reported that a motion from the ITSC is being made to change the Committee's syllabus. The changes include reducing the number of members on the Committee and changing some of its responsibilities. He noted that the motion does not need a second since it is coming from a Senate committee and will be voted on at the next meeting.

8.3 Motion to Revise the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee Syllabus

President Schubert stated that a formal request was made by the Executive Director of the Alumni Association to add a representative of the Alumni Association to the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee. He noted that the CHCS has approved the addition and the Senate will need to vote on it at the next meeting. Professor Archer pointed out that there is a discrepancy in the number of voting members listed on the syllabus. President Schubert stated that the correction will be made to the syllabus.

8.4 Introduction of the Draft Policy on the Use of KACE

President Schubert stated that the draft policy is being introduced and stated that it will be discussed under Unfinished Business at the next meeting. He asked Senators to read the policy carefully, particularly in view of the comments that were made by CIO Askren and the Chancellor in today's discussion.

Professor Rinkevich moved for adjournment. The motion was seconded by Professor Wysocki. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 23, 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Auditorium. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.