

IRMPPC Meeting Minutes – December 18, 2002

Present: Dalton, Davis, Ellison, Gorman, Grimes, Hanley, Hellenbrand, Kelley, Morton, Holly Sletteland (for Mumford), Shaffer, Stover, and Yelland

Apologies: Grandillert, Hamilton, Mumford, Saenz, and Zingg

Also Present: Lynette Klooster, Johanna Madjedi, Dan Malone, Dave Ross, and Craig Schultz

A. Committee Business

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as written.
2. IRMPPC Website Update – The website will be operational in the near future.

B. Policy

1. Email Notification Policy

A handout was distributed and reviewed. The key policy question is how best to address the need for reliable and effective means to communicate to all students (and faculty/staff) for official teaching, learning and administrative purposes. Background, sample policies, benefits, issues and next steps were outlined. Cal Poly has no policy requiring students to provide a current email address, but provides each student with an account to be used for official university business. More than 90% of students have email accounts before they arrive on campus and access to a computer in their residence. As part of the messaging review, the issue of whether to provide accounts and/or create a policy will be explored. Schultz encouraged members to review sample policies from other institutions.

Questions to consider include: Do we convert entirely to electronic or maintain a balance between paper and electronic communication? If the policy is implemented, more departments will opt to use email instead of paper. Can the email system sustain that level of use without diminished performance? Does this become the only or just one official method for communicating? If required, is the campus obligated to provide students with email accounts? What is Cal Poly's legal obligation if a student cannot retrieve a campus email message from an off-campus service? How do we verify receipt? Guidelines or requirements would have to be spelled out, e.g., regarding security, attachments, etc. What is retained, in what medium (paper or electronic), for how long?

Ross said one issue involves redirection of email. The current system only looks at the OpenMail directory; this will be changing to point to the central directory.

Grimes noted that the sample policies are from R1 universities and asked if there was anything from a University similar to Cal Poly. Hanley is not aware of any, although he noted that many campuses don't provide email to students, e.g., CSU Hayward uses Blackboard to communicate with students. Hanley said there

is a fundamental view that Cal Poly will have an enterprise wide email and calendaring system, but whether this should continue is a fair question to ask. Grimes suggested the portal as a more effective way to inform students of critical information. Dalton suggested a combination using email to notify users to check the portal for more information. Shaffer said the University may still be required to use regular mail for certain notifications due to legal requirements. Schultz said not providing email accounts to every user could significantly change the scope of the messaging project (from 30,000 to 5,000 users). Gorman sees this as an opportunity to retain lifelong contact with students, from freshman to alumni.

The next step will be to review this issue with AACC, IACC and SC3 and request initial input by the end of January. The goal will be to bring recommendations back to IRMPPC in February to make some final recommendations/decisions.

2. Access and Use of Photos

A handout was distributed and reviewed. Current policies and examples of recent requests for student photos were outlined. The campus policy on release of student information defines photo as directory information, which can be disclosed under certain limited exceptions; what's lacking are clear procedures and practices. About 15-20% of students current set the FERPA privacy flag, which is high compared to other campuses. Hanley stressed that University Police and Judicial Affairs have fully cooperated with ITS on this issue.

Linking student photos to class rosters was cited as an application of great interest to faculty. Ross visited the University of Minnesota where making photos available through the data warehouse was one of their most successful efforts. Gorman would love to see this as a default and feels there would be consensus across the board by faculty that this should be done. The need to educate faculty about not releasing photos to others is essential. Morton stressed the need to inform students about what kind of access is occurring so they can make informed decisions and to involve students in the policy discussion.

Specific issues/concerns raised include how long are photos retained after someone leaves the University? How frequently should photos be updated? Hellenbrand suggested a certain amount of misuse is to be expected. Concerns were raised about updating class roster photos. The possibility of defining photo as a field in Blackboard was discussed since feeds are updated daily. Madjedi said policy and data ownership is part of the discussion she, Stover and Shaffer are having in terms of developing a security policy framework. The next step will be to review this issue with the subcommittees for further input.

C. Planning Issues

1. Messaging and Calendaring Strategy

Schultz distributed and reviewed a handout on PolyComm, the messaging / calendaring replacement strategic review project. Full documents are available at <http://polycomm.calpoly.edu/>, the central point for getting information about the project. Schultz reviewed the scope, stressing total cost of ownership, integration of multiple technologies, and guiding principles. He reviewed

expectations, timelines and milestones, noting the very aggressive schedule. A phased implementation is expected, that could take from six to 16 months. He expects to widely engage the campus and reviewed the steering framework and requirements gathering process to be completed by the end of January. The working group and task force members are very committed to getting it done. Even if the RFP is developed, the question of how to pay for it remains. About 10 vendors are likely to be able to meet campus requirements, and the solutions cost from \$1.2M to \$375,000. Hanley emphasized building a business case to support the decision, but he is not apprehensive about budget concerns.

Grimes noted that when the current system was procured, funding was not identified until after the requirements were determined and the vendor selected. This has stood the test for several years. Schultz reviewed the prior RFP process to see if anything could be learned and applied to the current process.

Reasons for pursuing this project now include transaction volumes, lack of features, flexibility and vendor support for the current system. PeopleSoft is driving more processes through email. Yelland said there is a lot of support for moving forward to acquire a new system as soon as possible.

Schultz reviewed a sample meeting summary, noting that agendas and minutes will be posted on the project website. Members were encouraged to share this information with constituents. Schultz will provide regular updates to the campus and the campus communications plan will be posted to the website. Yelland asked if a mass mailing had gone out to the campus yet. Hanley said the mailing was deferred until early January when the survey is available.

Schultz reviewed sample metrics (e.g., non-activated accounts, students redirecting to external addresses, activated but dormant accounts, etc.). This data will help inform the decision about providing student email accounts. Remedy tickets will be analyzed (by college and service) to assess the current environment and determine requirements for the new system. Grimes stressed interoperability, simplicity and integration with tools such as BlackBoard, which is automatically populated with every class.

ITS will be looking to IRMPPC to show leadership, affirm requirements, and review tradeoffs that must be made.

2. Speed Bumps Initiatives – This item was not discussed.
3. Modem Pool Exit Strategy

Madjedi provided a brief update in preparation for a more in-depth discussion at the next meeting. She described the modem services currently provided: the premium service, which students pay for; the same service to faculty/staff at no charge; and a “free” modem pool with limited access. It is reaching the point where the number of subscribers and base funding no longer covers the cost of providing the service. Only 250 (out of 17,000) students subscribe to the service; when this reaches 200, the service will be losing money. The peak number of concurrent users is about 100. Madjedi will have more definitive usage statistics in January. IRMPPC needs to reassess how this service evolves in the future,

e.g., a combination of on- and off-campus services, shifting from campus-based ISP to Help Desk interface for off-campus ISPs? How to attenuate the service model and move to another one? The campus needs to identify robust alternative solutions by Fall 2003 to ensure effective access, efficient support structure, and lifeline service. The need for advance notice of the phase out is critical.

4. Social Impact of Technology

This was a high priority agenda item for IRMPPC members. Hanley asked Hellenbrand to facilitate the discussion, including how to develop a work program to mobilize to clarify and address this issue. Hellenbrand outlined two issues:

- 1) Impact on workforce: Department offices, training, changes in classifications and responsibilities, cost structure. Unintended consequences of technology, e.g., PeopleSoft.
- 2) Cultural issues: faculty, staff and students accessing pornography. Is that an issue the university can disentangle itself from? Do we have existing policy (beyond ITS) that addresses this issue, e.g., sexual harassment? Social and cultural baggage associated with technology.

Hanley asked for advice on how to make progress on these issues? Noting that HR did a complete review of administrative assistants in academic departments, Dalton suggested HR take the lead in addressing the first issue. Davis agreed, adding that a new HR element was added to the library strategic plan acknowledging the impact of technology on library classifications was a critical item to be addressed. Hanley cited the ITS Employee Attitude Survey as a resource for examining this issue. (Survey results can be found at its.calpoly.edu by clicking on ITS Staff Resources then ITS Staff Survey.) Schultz suggested incorporating professional development plans and technology elements into job descriptions and performance reviews. Davis agreed, citing a need for something equivalent to the RPT process to address staff technical skill requirements. Citing the problem of information overload, Madjedi suggested a need to become better at acquiring knowledge vs. information. Dalton suggested the presence of a “digital divide” among staff and a need to determine how to narrow the gap, e.g., incorporating technology into break rooms, reading rooms, etc. Schultz cited the problem of new faculty creating issues for the staff who support them by coming to campus expecting to use high-end tools with which the staff is not familiar.

D. Subcommittee Reports

1. AACC Report – Yelland said the focus for AACC is infrastructure. Messaging and calendaring will be a major part of that, and the email policy will be discussed at the January meeting. Ross is preparing a quarterly progress report against goals.
2. IACC Report – Grimes deferred his time to the ATPC update.
3. SC3 Report – The charter was submitted to the committee on committees for action. ASI passed a resolution endorsing the SC3 “sweep” priorities.

E. Status Reports and Updates

1. Academic Technology Planning Committee (ATPC) Update

This CSU effort asks how technology investments impact on the teaching and learning environment and how can they be improved? Hanley said the next key milestone is a retreat in early January in San Diego. A major deliverable will be to identify best practices on campuses. ATPC is planning a series of one-day visits to 16 campuses, including Cal Poly in early February. They visited seven campuses to collect data, which they will present during the campus visit in two open sessions and separate meetings with the Provost, VP/CIO, and key academic technology planners. Recently, ATPC surveyed campuses about publications involving the use of technology in teaching and learning. Grimes identified and submitted about 25 campus publications, and hopes to publish a subset on the web. Hanley distributed copies of the transmittal memo and a list of Cal Poly initiatives submitted in response to the survey on best practices. Grimes cited Cal Poly's integrated communication and governance planning model as a key factor that ties the initiatives together, and a best practice CSU should adopt; Provost Zingg feels this concept is important to stress during the campus visit.

Submitted by Mary Shaffer