

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

Jan. 26, 2009
3:30 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Dec. 8, 2008. (pp. 2-6).
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. Minutes from the International Education/ International WTE Committee meeting of Dec. 11, 2008. (pg. 7)
 - B. Minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of Sept. 12, 2008. (pg 8)
 - C. Minutes from the Research Grants Committee meeting of Nov. 4, 2008. (pp. 9-10)
- VII. Old Business (revisted).
 - A. President Farley's objection to last year's Action Item 08-05a, Proposed changes to the currently existing Grievance Policy and Procedure (Appendix IX of the Faculty Handbook).
- VIII. New Business.
 - A. Vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS) (Action Item 09-01). (pg. 11) Please see appendix (pp. 14-43).
 - B. Revision of the catalog language on repetition of courses (Action Item 09-02). (pp. 12-13)
- IX. Information Items.
- X. Discussion Items.
- XI. Announcements.
- XII. Adjournment.

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of Dec. 8, 2008
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Arterburn, Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Byrne, Camarda, Chorba, Concannon, Croucher, Ding, Ginzburg, Jacobs, Kaufman, Kerchner, Khan, Lockwood, Manske, McGuire, Mechtly (sub for C. Schmidt) Melick, Naylor, Porta, Pownell, Prasch (President) , Ramirez, Ray, Routsong, Russell, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, Sullivan, Unruh, Walker, Wunder, Wynn

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:32 PM.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Nov. 10, 2008 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. Prasch reported on the WTE Compensation Plan that President Farley presented to faculty members, deans, and VPAA administrators the morning of Dec. 8. Summarizing the plan Farley presented, Prasch said that the compensation in the form of a cash payment will be attached to credit courses (with tuition modeled on a 3-hour course). In many instances, the WTE will be factored into a faculty member's regular load, but in the event the member is doing a WTE independently, then the faculty member could be compensated. There could also be a division in compensation in the case where two faculty members divide the WTE advising. Prasch reported that this university-wide compensation plan referred specifically to the Scholarly and Creative TEs.
 - B. Prasch read a brief statement written by Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, the chair of Modern Languages, who expressed dismay over the fact that Modern Language faculty often advise students who are going on semester- or year-long study abroad programs and that they must grade pre and post-departure papers. These papers often require revisions and thus a significant amount of a faculty member's time. While he knows that this work is significantly less than what is required of members advising Scholarly and Creative TEs, it is nonetheless more work and he hopes that the university will provide at least a little amount of compensation for this extra effort.
 - C. Bowen reported that it was not the intent to leave out the International Study Abroad TE and that should be addressed soon now that the plan for Scholarly and Creative TEs has been formulated.
 - D. Prasch also stated that Farley announced that advising TEs is still voluntary on the part of the faculty, though Unruh announced that it was not optional for SON faculty. Sharafy wondered if there was a back up plan for students who could not find a faculty member willing to work with them a particular semester and Walker wondered whether non-tenure-track faculty in SOB could oversee Scholarly and Creative TEs.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. Prasch reported that the Board of Regents would be meeting the week of Dec. 8 and said he would report on that meeting at the next Senate meeting.

- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
- A. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of Nov. 20, 2008 were approved (Schmidt's affiliation was corrected).
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
- A. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Nov. 7, 2008 were accepted.
- B. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Oct. 13, 2008 were accepted.
- C. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Aug. 22, 2008 were accepted.
- D. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Nov. 14, 2008 were accepted.
- E. Minutes from the Library Committee meeting of Nov. 6, 2008 were accepted.
- F. Minutes from the Faculty Grants Committee of Oct. 17, 2008 were accepted.
- G. Minutes from the Curriculum Grants Committee of Oct. 21, 2008 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business.
- A. A motion for a friendly amendment to attach the following statement (which was approved by the General Faculty on May 9, 2002) to the end of Agenda Item 08-07 was made and passed:

“Each member of this joint appointment will receive an individual contract. Each member will receive half of the full-time compensation for the position. Both of the members sharing the full-time jointly-held appointment shall be entitled to benefits otherwise accruing to full-time faculty members. Among these are:

- Academic and Sweet Summer Sabbaticals (to be shared).
- Retirement (each receiving benefits based on their individual salary).
- Life insurance (each insured based on their individual salary).
- Group Health Insurance (each receiving full benefits; premium payments based upon salary, plan selected, and type of coverage elected).***
- Tuition waiver for children of either participant.

Note: The faculty benefit of short-term and long-term disability insurance will not be available to faculty members sharing jointly-held appointments due to insurance company regulations requiring full-time employment.”

***Indicates the section Deborah Moore reworded.**

B. A motion was then made to add a second friendly amendment to the document was made and approved. The following sentence will be added immediately after the sentence ending “that expected of a full-time faculty member”: “Responsibilities for teaching, research, and service should be balanced on an annual basis except by special agreement between the two members and the department.”

C. The motion for a third friendly amendment to add “in teaching, scholarship, and service” after “the accomplishments of each individual” was made and passed. The sentence now reads: “A joint petition may be prepared, but it should clearly state the accomplishments of each individual in teaching, scholarship, and service; each individual may choose to present his or her own petition.

- D. A fourth motion to correct the spelling of the word “petition” was made and passed.
- E. The Senate voted on the whole document (the entire action item 08-07) and it passed.

VIII. New Business.

There was none.

IX. Information Items.

There were none.

X. Discussion Items.

A. IT issues

a) Senators were asked to review the following documents before the senate meeting:

- 1) Russ Jacob’s memo to Robin Bowen about his concerns over Mike Gunter and IT issues at WU.
- 2) Alan Bearman’s emails outlining IT problems at the Mabee Library
- 3) The proposed *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 4) Minutes from the Faculty IT Advisory Council meeting of Oct. 22, 2008.
- 5) Resolutions regarding theISS electronic information security regulations from NS and SS divisions of CAS

b)President Prasch began with three points regarding IT issues at WU:

- 1) He pointed out the immediate and specific problem of the “alarming” *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 2) He claimed that the above mentioned document was “the straw that broke the camel’s back.”
- 3) He underscored two very specific issues:
 - i)The fact that the ISS director does no report to any academic unit causes difficulties.
 - ii) The specific problem of Mike Gunter and the frustrations faculty feel over the fact that he does not seem to listen to them.

c)Prasch raised the possibility of the Senate issuing a vote of no confidence in Gunter and then opened up the floor to comments from senators.

- i)Jacobs pointed out to Bowen the problem of lack of academic oversight of ISS.Bowen responded that this issue was one of the first she dealt with in July 200 7. Bowen said she brought the two parties together and that progress on the issue seemed incremental, especially in regard to the fact that faculty gained two more spots on the steering committee. She acknowledged that issues remained and that faculty asked for a consultant to be brought to campus, but the one recommended had yet to respond to the request.
- ii) Sharafy said that he felt that the proposed regulations created rules that were being imposed on faculty who had never had the chance to offer feedback. He wondered who decided on the draft. Bowen responded that the document went to the IT Steering Committee and that she was incorrect in assuming that it had first gone to the Faculty Steering Committee.
- iii) Mechtly said that the academic side had been completely cut out .
- iv) Camarda stated that at a supercomputing conference, colleagues from other universities were surprised to learn that IT was not under academic oversight.

- v) Walker stated that the IT Advisory Committee saw pg 7-8 on the encryption of data, but did not see the rest of the document until a week before the Senate meeting.
- vi) Mechtly (sitting in for Senator C. Schmidt), stated that the document did not have to be so complex and claimed that if the document were passed the CIS would be derailed. He explained that CIS professors need administrative access because their students install thousands of pieces of software in order to test it. He added that as part of the CIS program, students are supposed to develop programs and asked: "How do you get permission for a piece of software that doesn't exist? This gives too much power to one person."
- vii) He claimed that 6.3.5 on pg 12 of the document would devastate computer classes.
- viii) Sharafy questioned whether Gunter would have time to give permission to an instructor every time that individual needed to download free software in order to test it to see whether it will work when teaching a class.
- ix) Concannon mentioned this could cause accreditation issues in the Law School and Law Library.
- x) Kaufman said that the FS needs to make a change in the director's reporting requirement.
- xi) Ray declared that IT problems in the library affect all of the CAS and that the library was mentioned as an issue in the accreditation report.
- xii) Jacobs said that the document requires the dept. head to carry an enormous amount of responsibility.
- xiii) Arteburn wondered aloud why the document, which requires so much of dept. heads, was never brought to their attention.
- xiv) Mechtly said that as department head, he would refuse to check his colleagues' cellphones or PDAs to see if they carried students' grades.
- xv) Bryne said that it seems as though Gunter had been making decisions that made his job easier.
- xvi) Jacobs called for a motion, citing the resolutions of Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. He suggested that the Senate adopt a similar resolution and have President Prasch forward it on to President Farley. Ray seconded the motion.
- xvii) Several senators expressed reservations about the "harsh" language of the wording of #4 in the NS and SS resolutions.
- xviii) Jacobs suggested pulling #4 (making the no confidence vote a separate issue), made a motion to do so and it passed.
- xix) McGuire suggested that the Senate include specific items to which it objects in the WUPRDM document and Prasch said that it would take at least a week to do so.

B. In the effort to save time, a motion was made to close the discussion of the resolution on first reading. The motion passed.

C) A motion was then made to suspend the rule requiring a second reading of the document. The motion passed unanimously.

D) A motion was then made to move the resolution to passage and the Senate voted unanimously to pass the resolution. Please find immediately below the resolution Prasch signed and sent to President Farley the evening of Dec. 8th:

Insofar as the proposed Regulations and Procedures for Electronic Information Security would impair the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative research, impede basic research by faculty and students, inhibit free flow of ideas, interfere with the normal operations of university libraries, ignore basic principles of academic freedom in classroom use of technology, eliminate

faculty and student rights to intellectual property, impose unreasonable requirements and oversight to a wide range of faculty and student academic activity, limit the ability of the university to engage with the wider community and its off-campus constituencies, and fundamentally undermine teaching practices,

The Faculty Senate resolves:

- 1) That the present proposals be immediately abandoned;
- 2) That any future such document be prepared with full involvement of academic units affected by such practices;
- 3) That clear academic faculty oversight be established for technology initiatives that directly affect academic programs and activities.

At the end of the meeting, Prasch asked the Senate to consider two issues: the pursuit of a vote of no-confidence in Gunter and the action of immediately composing a document that would outline the specifics the Senate would like to see vis à vis clear academic oversight of ISS. Senators affirmed that they would like to pursue both issues in the next FS meeting, though Unruh urged caution in the wording to be used in the vote of no-confidence, asking the senate not to use language that would be perceived as attacking Gunter's personality. Prasch requested that senators speak to their constituencies about the IT issues and report them to the executive committee which will soon begin work on a no-confidence document.

XI. Announcements.
There were none.

XII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Courtney Sullivan, Secretary to the Faculty Senate.

**International Education /International WTE Committee
December 11, 2008, International House**

In attendance: Norma Juma, Brian Ogawa, Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Cecil Schmidt, Janice Dunwell, Ron Griffin, Rachel Goossen, Judy McConnell-Farmer, and Baili Zhang

1. Zhang reminded the committee that Thomas' application for funding and "The Sport Traditions and Cultural History of Europe" WTE program proposal were accepted by the committee via email after additional information was submitted and reviewed. The Committee subsequently moved to approve the September 26, minutes.

2. Approving WTE proposal:

Routsong's WTE proposal " Intercultural Communication in China" was approved on condition that the author would address or clarify the grading system, reading content on China, the definition of "intercultural communication, and add an on-campus meeting session following the trip.

Sidlinger's proposal "Exploration of Nursing in China" was approved as a WTE program.

Perret's and Prece's "Art and Theatre in London" WTE proposal was tabled for more details on the academic and cultural interaction elements.

3. Approving faculty travel requests:

Lori Khan's request for \$1,200 was approved to present in India. Barb DeSanto's request for \$1,000 was approved to teach at Zeppelin University in Germany. Sharon Sullivan's request was approved pending evidence of presentation content, acceptance, and format.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Friday, September 12, 2008

Shawnee Room

1:30 p.m.

Present: Donna LaLonde (chair), Denise Ottinger, Melodie Christal, Joanne Altman, Cathy Hunt, Jim Hoogenakker, Mary Shoop, Lori Khan, Jay Memmott, Kandy Ockree, Heather Collins, and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Nancy Tate, Jane Carpenter, Whitney Philippi, and Don Vest.

Donna, Jay and Joanne met to plan the Assessment Liaison workshop on Friday, September 19. The Washburn University Assessment Wiki – Tools for Implementing and Maintaining a Successful Assessment Program – has been developed and they would like each member of the committee to add resources to one or more of the pages. Send information to Donna (articles, rubrics, URLs, etc.). The plan for the workshop is to introduce the Wiki, talk about qualitative assessment methods, break into groups to share information about successful tools, and recruit liaisons to act as group discussion leaders for the October workshop.

The minutes from August 5 were approved as submitted.

The university has decided to use MAPP instead of CLA, as it will fit into established class times and should give us a larger sampling.

OASIS – the assessment of common learning outcomes of the WTEs has made reasonably good progress. The next effort is to have each individual area develop an assessment process for each WTE's unique outcomes.

An ad hoc committee has been charged with looking at general education.

Donna asked about putting the writing rubric on the Wiki and asking the liaisons to help move it to the next level. It was recommended that other samples of writing rubrics also be put up and faculty could see which worked best. Donna said that the original idea behind a university-wide writing rubric was so that students would have consistency from class to class.

The meeting adjourned.

WALKER: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,500 for research project, "The Impact of Hedge Funds on Equity Offerings."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$2,500.

ALTUS: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,307 for research project, "Understanding consumers' perception of the Green House model of elder care."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$2,307.

McCONNELL-FARMER: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,986.80 for research project, "Nicodemus Pioneer School Teacher Lula Sadler Craig: In her Words Living the Historic African-American High Plains Exoduster Experience."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$3,000 (The award amount is higher due to the increased mileage reimbursement rate)

SULLIVAN: Requested funds in the amount of \$3,000 for research project, "Women Changing the World: Feminist Activism in Guatemala."
Application awarded partially in the amount of \$2,000.

McKEE: Requested funds in the amount of \$300 for research project, "Assessment of teenage diaries for teaching concepts in adolescent psychology (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$300.

PORTA: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,072.72 for research project, "Windmill Construction (for electrical energy generation)."
Application was conditionally approved for a partial amount of \$1,482 pending acceptable answers to questions regarding the project.

PRUITT/FAULKNER: Requested funds in the amount of \$400 or 642 for research project, "For Dear Life and Selected Short Stories by Belinda Jelliffe: A Woman's Struggle for Equal Rights at Home and Work (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded in the amount of \$400.

McGUIRE: Requested funds in the amount of \$540 for research project, "Relation of Early Testing and Incentive on Quiz Performance in Introductory Psychology: An Archival Analysis (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$540.

Total amount of funds awarded was \$28,253. This leaves a balance of \$2,580.

Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: 18 January 2009

Number: 09-01

Subject: Vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS)

Description:

Because, as head of ISS, Mike Gunter has repeatedly initiated policies and procedures, as detailed in the appended document, that interfere with faculty research and scholarship, academic computing, classroom teaching, library access, faculty privacy, academic freedom, and faculty and student rights to intellectual property;

because the Faculty Senate, members of the faculty, and other constituted committees of the faculty have repeatedly sought redress and changes in his patterns of behavior and have repeatedly been met with stonewalling, dishonesty, and a failure to amend such behaviors and policies;

the Faculty Senate declares that it has no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of ISS.

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate approval and transmission to Vice President for Administration Wanda Hill, Vice President for Academic Affairs Robin Bowen, and President Jerry Farley.

Date: Jan. 18, 2009

Originated by: Thomas Prasch in fulfillment of requested action by the
FS President Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: 18 January 2009

Number: 09-02

Subject: Revision of the catalog language on repetition of courses

Description: The revision will allow the VPAA's office to grant permission to retake courses in which the grade received was a C when special circumstances exist to justify such action. The following revises the catalog language on repetition of courses (p. 59 of the current catalog) accordingly, with the proposed added language underlined.

REPETITION OF COURSES

Undergraduate courses in which the student receives a D or an F may be repeated. When special circumstances exist to justify repeating a course for which a student receives a C, the student may appeal to the VPAA's office to permit that course to be repeated. The transcript will contain a complete record of all courses taken and grades earned. [etc.; no changes in the rest of the language is proposed.]

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NONE.

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate approval and recommendation to the General Faculty

Date: Jan. 18, 2009

Originated by: Thomas Prash on behalf of student Will Ediger
FS President (see attached)

Ediger attachment

From: will.ediger@gmail.com

Date: Thursday, January 8, 2009 10:14 am

Subject: Course Repeating Policy

To: tom.prasch@washburn.edu, gene.wunder@washburn.edu, courtney.sullivan@washburn.edu, russ.jacobs@washburn.edu

Hello, my name is Will Ediger. I am an actuarial science major here at Washburn. I have somewhat of a dilemma on my hands.

To become an actuary, one has to pass rigorous exams as well as complete VEE (Verification by Educational Experience) credits on topics covering Economics, Business Finance, and Statistics. To get VEE credits, you take classes at schools that are accredited by the Society of Actuaries. One of the stipulations for the classes to count as VEE credits is that you have to get a grade of a B or higher in the class. This is where my problem arises. One of the classes that makes up the Statistics portion of the VEE credits is Regression Analysis. I took it two years ago here at Washburn and received a C in the course. At that time, neither me nor my adviser knew that the requirement for the VEE credit was a B or higher in the class.

I have looked into taking the class over again, and I have hit a brick wall. The person who makes the decision on whether or not I can retake the class, Nancy Tate, has said that it is not possible for me to retake the class. She told my adviser that the only way that I could retake the class was if the faculty senate would rewrite the policy to allow the exception.

If I am unable to retake Regression Analysis, I will be unable to become a full fledged actuary until I find another college that is accredited by the Society of Actuaries and offers the class. Needless to say, this will be difficult to do because I will be graduating in Spring 2010, and finding a school close to wherever my job will be that offers Regression analysis will be difficult.

I implore you to feel my predicament.

Thank you for your time.

Will Ediger

Complaints offered to Tom Prasch as president of Faculty Senate about Mike Gunter/ISS

The Hi-Pace system is totally stalled, and the terms of the innovation grant have not been met because of interference with ISS.

Computer systems shut-downs the day before the beginning of the new (spring '09) semester, and on the first Tuesday of classes, hugely disrupted faculty access to email and other systems; in the wake of the shut-down, programs like Dreamweaver no longer functioned (generating “no path” messages). Disruption continued for days.

The decision to change test scanning software and scan tons, a decision carried out without consultation with faculty, caused significant hardship, loss of data, and loss of range of data that could be retrieved in the new system. The lack of faculty input in this case seems to typify ISS process.

ISS often changes specifications on equipment requested in ways that make computing equipment actually delivered useless for the tasks for which they were requested.

In the case of at least one course offered at Washburn, course material that had been put on the n: drive was available to anyone who logged into WUAPPS, including grades and exams.

There must be ways to separate Administrative from Academic computing and provide secure firewalls for the former.

Simple access is an issue.

Too many hoops must be jumped through to use text-connected internet resources.

Limited access is provided to STSS—limited time and restricted license.

Computer Science ought not need ISS permission to shape their academic environments.

Faculty has no access to log-in information, although student workers in Bennett do.

Mike Gunter stonewalled for months on the appointment of a second faculty representative on the Technology Steering Committee, limiting faculty input.

A number of faculty have reported basic lack of trust in Mike Gunter. A number have noted that Gunter seems agreeable in person when confronted with issues, but then does nothing to resolve them. Some have been more direct: “he lied to my face.”

MEMORANDUM

March 11, 2008

TO: Dr. Robin Bowen
VPAA, Washburn University

FROM: Russ Jacobs, President
Washburn Faculty Senate

SUBJ: Summary of Faculty Issues with ITS/Mike Gunter

This is a partial summary of problems that faculty members have communicated to me regarding their dealings with ITS and/or Mike Gunter. It is based on the more detailed comments attached, and details and substantiation can be found in them. I have summarized them here for your convenience only.

- 1) In April of 2007, ITS changed the way multiple choice examinations are scanned, with no consultation with faculty. ITS did not appear to consider the impact this would have on the academic community.
- 2) Many faculty members have complained about alterations made to their computer and technology requests without consulting them. In some cases this resulted in providing them with computers or other equipment they could not use.
- 3) Access to technology planned and purchased by faculty (e.g., the Hipace system) has been commandeered and subsequently controlled by ITS.
- 4) I have been told of various problems with ITS staff, particularly hiring and retention difficulties created by Mike Gunter.
- 5) One faculty member who has had extensive contact with Gunter views him as "...unstable and if not unstable, clearly incompatible with university academics." This is a well-respected faculty member with administrative responsibilities.
- 6) Faculty members have long complained about the forced conversion to WUAD, which removes administrator privileges from faculty, even well-qualified faculty who need such privileges to do their job.
- 7) Gunter has been asked several times for the source of his model for academic computing; he has never responded. Checks with peer institutions uniformly show more input from the academic side of the institution.
- 8) Several faculty members flatly assert that Gunter has lied to them, or seriously misrepresented and mis-remembered conversations with them.
- 9) The system constructed by Gunter and ITS is widely seen as too often inflexible, a "one size fits all" system not appropriate to academic affairs.

- 10) Many faculty and staff members complain that Gunter fails to respond to repeated questions and requests. Often when he does respond, he appears to be dodging the question rather than answering it.
- 11) Despite repeated complaints, patrons of Mabee Library are unable to access library databases if they are using the new Vista operating system. Gunter appears to be misrepresenting when he knew about this problem.
- 12) Several faculty members have requested a Mabee resources shortcut on the WUAD desktop, without result. This is only one of several requests made for WUAD icons; all have been ignored or denied, although granting them seems relatively simple and worthwhile.
- 13) Gunter appears to consistently favor excessive security over the sort of open access necessary to an academic institution. One example is his reluctance to make it possible for Mabee Library to support LibGuides. No open discussion of this priority has been possible; he simply makes the decisions, his way.
- 14) Gunter has refused to permit public access computers in Mabee Library.
- 15) Gunter transferred two staff members from the Mabee Library staff to ITS without consultation.
- 16) He has strenuously objected to free printing in Mabee Library, although this costs ITS nothing.
- 17) He changed door locks on server doors in Mabee Library without consultation with the Dean of Libraries.
- 18) He has resisted upgrading wireless computer access in Mabee Library, requiring the Library budget to pay for any upgrade .
- 19) Gunter has brought pressure to bear on the Interim Dean of Libraries to allow him to join the Technology Librarian Search Committee.
- 20) In general, I believe that it is the opinion of those faculty members who have dealt directly with him that Gunter regards any faculty input as irrelevant to ITS decision making.

Resolution passed by the Social Sciences Division, December 2008

Insofar as the proposed regulations and procedures for electronic information security would impair the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative research, impede basic research by faculty and students, inhibit free flow of ideas, interfere with the normal operations of university libraries, ignore basic principles of academic freedom in classroom use of technology, eliminate faculty and student rights to intellectual property, impose unreasonable requirements and oversight to a wide range of faculty and student academic activity, limit the ability of the university to engage with the wider community and its off-campus constituencies, and fundamentally undermine teaching practices,

The division of social sciences resolves:

- 4) That the present proposals be abandoned;
- 5) That any future such document be prepared with full involvement of academic units affected by such practices;
- 6) That clear academic faculty oversight be established for technology initiatives that directly affect academic programs and activities;
- 7) That the present head of ISS has lost the trust of faculty through repeated actions that show blatant disregard for the academic priorities of the institution, and the faculty in the social sciences declare that they have no confidence in his leadership of ISS.

Resolution passed by the Natural Science Division - December 8, 2008

Insofar as the proposed regulations and procedures for electronic information security would impair the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative research, impede basic research by faculty and students, inhibit free flow of ideas, interfere with the normal operations of university libraries, ignore basic principles of academic freedom in classroom use of technology, eliminate faculty and student rights to intellectual property, impose unreasonable requirements and oversight to a wide range of faculty and student academic activity, limit the ability of the university to engage with the wider community and its off-campus constituencies, and fundamentally undermine teaching practices,

The division of natural sciences resolves:

- I. That the present proposals be abandoned;
- II. That any future such document be prepared with full involvement of academic units affected by such practices;
- III. That clear academic faculty oversight be established for technology initiatives that directly affect academic programs and activities;
- IV. That the present head of ISS has lost the trust of faculty through repeated actions that show blatant disregard for the academic priorities of the institution, and the faculty in the natural sciences declare that they have no confidence in his leadership of ISS.

COMMENTS FOR THE FACULTY OF THE NATURAL SCIENCE DIVISION

I received several comments regarding experiences with ISS. Each issue is presented separately. On the first page I have given a sentence summary for each comment. The full text of the comments I received are presented on the following pages. If further clarification is needed on these I will be happy to contact the faculty member who provided the comments. Thanks.

-Matt

COMMENT #1 - Upon installing the HiPACE computing core, which is intended for faculty research, ISS immediately changed the root passwords so that no faculty could access the system, refusing requests to release it on security grounds. It took several months to resolve this issue so faculty could again access the computing core.

COMMENT #2 - ISS refuses to connect the HiPACE core to the campus network, which greatly complicates faculty use of the system and prevents any software requiring internet access from being used. This prevents the establishment of any HiPACE web-based resources for the WU campus and the general public. Furthermore, the vendor of the system cannot even access the system remotely to help with technical support.

COMMENT #3 - ISS established a policy (without faculty input) that requires the CIS department to seek ISS approval for all equipment purchased from their own internal budget. To avoid changes in their orders, CIS currently petitions the Dean of CAS for all equipment purchases.

COMMENT #4 - Effective functioning of the CIS Department requires that faculty be granted administrative privileges so they can install the software and operating systems that form the core of their curriculum. Currently this is only possible due to repeated intervention by the CAS Dean to circumvent ISS policy.

COMMENT #5 - There are documented incidences of ISS personnel entering faculty offices and changing the software and operating systems on the computers with no prior notification while the faculty member is away. Some faculty members have purchased their own laptops to avoid ISS interference with their work.

COMMENT #6 - Requests for work to initially install the HiPACE hardware went unheeded by ISS. When a faculty member inquired, he was told by an ISS employee that Director Gunter gave orders not to install the hardware and not to communicate with faculty about it unless explicitly asked.

COMMENT #7 - There is concern amongst faculty that ISS does not recognize the specific needs for an academic computing environment. This requires the freedom to experiment with new computing modes and methodologies as well as the ability for faculty to store and access data freely. The feeling is that the model followed by ISS is focused solely on administrative rather than academic needs.

HiPACE Issue #1. In May of 2007 the HiPACE system was delivered and installed in the BT machine room (at this time the machine room in Stoffer was not yet ready). There was a very long delay (at least a month) in connecting the system to the campus network. After many emails inquiring about the delay we were told that ISS had some security concerns and that they needed the root password in order to set up a test environment for Karen Camarda. Unfortunately we took ISS at their word, a mistake we greatly regretted later. Once ISS had the root password, they immediately changed it, effectively taking control of the machine. It took us until October 2007 to regain control of the machine. Many thanks go to Gary Schmidt and his persistence after many of the rest of us had given up.

HiPACE Issue #2. After finally returning administrative control of the system to the HiPACE Committee in October 2007, ISS then refused to connect the machine directly to the campus network. Instead it was connected to the campus network through a Windows 2003 server acting as a "gateway". More than a year later it is still connected in this way. To access the machine from our offices or from off campus requires 2 separate logins. Transferring files requires 2 separate FTPs. We can't do any online software updates (including OS security updates). We can't run software that accesses the internet while it runs (many biology and chemistry packages access online databases on the fly). The vendor is unable to access the machine to help us solve technical support issues. We had planned on developing web resources to benefit the WU campus and beyond. The need to login to a server puts a significant damper on web services. For example, one cannot simply send a link in an e-mail, since a login is required. Work on web resources has stopped since it is unlikely that our user base will go to the trouble of logging in when there are similar web resources at other universities that don't require a login.

CIS Issue #1. The CIS Department has had an equipment budget for many years. We use these funds to buy servers, motherboards, monitors, replacement parts, etc. Over the past several years ISS has somehow (at least without our input) instituted a policy that requires ISS approval for any computer equipment. Every time we order equipment we have to appeal to the CAS Dean to intervene on our behalf so that we can get what we need without ISS changing our orders. The extra step of overriding ISS approval every time is getting old.

CIS Issue #2. CIS faculty are experienced system administrators. A major part of our job is keeping current with new software products and operating systems. We teach system administration and software development in many of our classes. It is imperative that we be able to install software and operating systems on a regular basis. Many of our machines are able to boot into several different operating systems chosen from a boot menu. This way one physical machine can be used to provide several different working environments. It would be impossible to do this if ISS controlled the machines. Fortunately the CAS Dean understands this and regularly intercedes on our behalf, so that we may retain administrative control of our machines. It is tiresome to keep fighting this battle over and over.

Faculty Office Issue #1. Sometime in the Fall of 2007 ISS workers came into my office after I had left campus and "took over" my office computer. They changed the administrative password and set it up to use WUAD. Because I use Linux on this machine and only use the Windows partition occasionally to test software this change had no effect on my work. But the bigger issue here is that I was not asked ahead of time if this change was OK with me. I was not even informed of their plans to make the change before the fact. I only knew of the change because the next day the CIS secretary told me that they had been in my office. I don't believe that this heavy-handed approach is acceptable at Washburn. It has taken a huge toll on morale. It is no wonder that many faculty are choosing to buy their own laptops instead of using university equipment.

Matt, here is an example of what it is like to work with Mike Gunter. When the HiPace equipment was delivered to campus on May 30, 2007, I was asked to purchase 3 fiber optic cables to connect the HiPace equipment to the campus network. I purchased those cables and took them to Mike Tenneyson, ISS's network engineer, so he could make the connections. I waited about a week for the connection to show up on the campus network and when it did not show up I went to Bennett to ask Mike if there was some problem. Mike said Gunter told him to not connect the equipment and to not tell me that unless I asked about it. I took that as very insulting and wasteful of my time. I had acted in good faith to and be met with duplicitous behavior on the part of Gunter.

Failing to learn Gunter could not be trusted, later I gave Gunter the root passwords to the HiPACE equipment as Gary Schmidt advised me to do. Gary thought we should try to work with Gunter. Gunter immediately had the root passwords changed and he told the ISS system administrator at that time, Andrew Fleming, that he was not to tell me what the changed passwords were. I subsequently found the passwords were changed when I tried to perform routine system administration tasks on the HiPace systems. Well, that was it for me with Gunter. From that point on I decided he was not to be trusted and that he had no knowledge of the unique needs of academic computing. Here is a description of those unique needs

which I sent via email to Gary Schmidt in June 2007 as Gary prepared for a meeting with Mike Gunter:

"Gary, if you meet with Mike, I urge you to point out the great distinction between academic computing and administrative or "business-like" computing. By its nature, academic computing is highly experimental, involves students and faculty working together, involves a diversity of languages and computing environments, and encourages people to make mistakes which leads to learning and to push into unknown areas leading to new computing modes and methodologies. I am reminded of the joke that we call it research since we don't really know what we are doing. Experimental computing is much like experimental physics, experimental chemistry, experimental biology, etc. in that its a laboratory learning environment. If Washburn is truly an academic institution then we must sponsor and encourage people to experiment in all areas and push learning. Otherwise we are a bank and no one will let anyone try anything that is not already in a well-worn rut of conventional use. If we can't explain the difference between academic and administrative needs and objectives for computing then academic computing is dead.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE FACULTY OF THE NATURAL SCIENCE DIVISION

These are additional comments I received from NSD faculty regarding the current ISS issue. Again, I have summarized their comments to the best of my ability on the first page and included the original comments on the second page.

-Matt

COMMENT #1 - ISS decisions are made abruptly and without input from faculty/staff that are affected by changes in policy.

COMMENT #2 - Too much control of computer systems has been removed from faculty/staff in the name of security. Use of external media for animations, figures, etc. in classrooms is often not possible due to administrative lockouts. Alternative plans which would return some level of control to faculty have been rejected and has created an impression of mistrust between faculty/staff and ISS.

COMMENT #3 - The ISS staff should be commended for their efforts, both in technical assistance and in responding to the frustrations of faculty with current policies. The current security policies seem to be creating additional burdens on ISS staff. Most faculty take issue with ISS policy, not the majority of the ISS department and employees.

1) Lack of communication - Decisions seem to be made quickly and with little or no faculty or staff input. While there are times that the speed of a decision is most important, the impact of these decisions on daily faculty/staff functions should at least be considered with input from the affected parties.

2) Control of the system is more important than the security - Many of the decisions which have been made (ie no administrative control of a computer by the faculty/staff member, narrowing bandwidth, etc) have been explained as necessary security measures. Certainly we all understand the need for security, but hopefully it could be done without removing so much control from the employees. (ie Faculty now have difficulty loading a CD onto the system to show educational material to their classes, or running a program on the classroom computer.) Alternatives to measures taken have been rejected if they also removed control from the ISS director. This, in turn, creates an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust, and causes more problems with communication. As an additional example, when logging into my.washburn, the login site states that it is secure, but the address contains http, not https (s=secure). Thus, if a student is using the wireless network that has been put up on campus, I believe that it would be possible for someone else to access the login data. Perhaps there are logical explanations of all this, but the resistance that has occurred when trying to have a conversation indicates that control of the system is the key issue - not security.

3) Based on the policies which have been implemented, the ISS staff has been working diligently to take care of the faculty/staff needs across campus. They should be commended, as they are the ones on the front lines, dealing with frustration of other employees when they discover that policies have changed and they can no longer carry out actions that were possible before. The problem is with the policies and the way they are being implemented, not with the majority of the ISS department and employees.

ITS/MIKE GUNTER ISSUES
School of Applied Studies
Summary of Responses From Faculty
Submitted December 12, 2008

ITS ISSUES:

- Faculty does not have administrative rights to computers, such that they can not look at videos of students without ISS individually by-passing the Windows Media Explorer (results in too much work for faculty trying to grade student work, and leads to faculty using their home computers instead)
- Faculty are concerned about accreditation requirements in that computing on-campus may very well cause some departments/programs to lose accreditation
- Faculty was apparently not consulted prior to adopting the current course management system (Moodle), and there is a feeling that Moodle is being crammed down faculty's throats by ITS/non-faculty; Moodle is not favored over Angel, and although Angel might be more expensive than Moodle, but for those faculty who teach on-line courses, Moodle is a better product
- In the spirit of faculty shared governance a systemic problem has existed in the apparent disconnect between the administrative and academic sides of this University; there was a lack of faculty input prior to attempting to implement the current policy on the security of electronic data such that the policy as stated has clear statements of a restrictive nature that should never have been included
- The security policy might be fine in a bank where all transactions should be confidential, but in the academic community where the goal is to disseminate information and knowledge, not restrict it; in academe there has always been a valued collaboration amongst faculty and students; the current policy is ignorant of the mission of the University
- Where there is a need to safeguard private data pertaining to individuals consistent with FERPA, the stated policy goes well beyond that, treating all electronic data as the possession of ISS
- The developmental process of any policy should involve faculty at the start of the process, and failure to do so leads to conflict and a lack of trust
- The new security policy conflicts with efficient and effective use of either the Bonner Foundation money, and the need to have ITS approve the data security before implementation would result in missed opportunities to utilize funds due to the slow turnaround on the application/approval process
- The proposed security policy will make most of our collaborative work with other schools so cumbersome that it won't be worth doing; the relationship with the Bonner Foundation—and the relationship it has with a network of schools—has been cultivated for over seven years, and the interference the oversight contained in this policy would have could jeopardize this partnership

MIKE GUNTER ISSUES:

- Need to maintain professionalism such that issues needing to be addressed are resolved without raising issues with regard to personality conflicts
- While the current policy is not viewed as malicious, there is a clear misunderstanding of the University's mission, and the fact that faculty were not involved in the policy development process indicates a systemic problem
- It is unclear whether the problem lies with Mr. Gunter or with those who supervise him and give him direction; perhaps the problem lies with both
- Some faculty have had limited contact with Mr. Gunter but contact generally with ITS and/or the WebTechs has generally been favorable
- Faculty have experienced difficulty for the past two and a half years getting ITS to complete the integration of the WTE reporting system, and much of this difficulty has been found to lie in Mike Gunter's insistence on reviewing and approving any application before its implemented; the clear impression is given that ITS is being held hostage by Mike Gunter's decisions instead of him working with faculty; many faculty have resorted to calling other ITS staff to fix problems immediately rather than having to submit each little issue to Mike Gunter for his approval before the problem is fixed

Comments from School of Business

Comments from Associate Professor of Accounting Thomas Clevenger:

Distributed processing should allow me to work at home with the same ease I work at my office. If I cannot do that, technology and the web and on-line classes and on and on and on are dead, why have the technology in the first place?

Give me a break - firewalls exist, drives can be protected - or in my case using confidential gaming data I destroy any drives I have in a computer before disposal. I have not in 15 years run into anything like being proposed for us here. It just makes no 21st Century connection.

Our students will drop like flies if they cannot use off-campus computing to bring back to campus.

Comments from Professor 1:

1.) Gunter's reputation for lack of truthfulness probably cannot be reformed at this point. I heard a lot about it, and then experienced it personally. I sat with him for one hour a week ago and asked many specific questions. Among them was what was going to be done with my old office computer. He told me it had to be destroyed/recycled for security reasons. I later found out this was inaccurate -- it's still a good machine, and ISS is going to re-image the machine and allocate it to someone else. The list of these half-truths and misstatements goes on and on. After someone loses the confidence of the entire university community, his reputation cannot be reformed. People need straight answers 100% of the time at work, or they shut down and stop interacting. Multiply that by a few hundred faculty and you have complete disfunctionality, which is pretty much where we've been for an extended period of time.

2.) Gunter does not understand that listening is part of his job. Our entire ISS model on this campus is in error. At all the other universities where I've worked, ISS is a support function. The mission of ISS at other universities is delivered with an air of "Good morning, Professor; how can I help you compute today?" Everyone's computer is customized the way the faculty member wants it, and ISS helps people avoid making stupid mistakes, like erasing data, security breaches, etc. They are a SUPPORT department.

3.) The recent document circulated by ISS is incredibly ill-founded. For example: under these rules, for a faculty member to get administrative privileges (e.g., the right to download software, install and run it), they need special permission from their dean, and the dean has to agree to take responsibility for anything that goes wrong on these machines. ISS wants to abandon support for machines customized away from WUAD. Anyone even proposing something like that clearly does not understand computing in a university environment.

4.) The notion that the ideal academic computing environment would be a plain-vanilla, Office-only WUAD environment stifles creativity -- just the opposite of what we're in business to achieve.

5.) Dealing with Gunter involves frustrating micro-steps of wrangling and negotiation. My new computer request was bogged down for weeks. So was the issue of how it would be set up -- my way or his way. ISS's strategy is to first frustrate, and then exhaust, faculty members and deans in an attempt to discourage customized requests. Only after running this gauntlet of frustration does someone get his own way -- by then, the average person is disgusted and demotivated. These management practices might work in the military, but again, we are the 180-degree opposite of that type of top-down, command-oriented organization.

Additional Comments from Professor 1:

1. MyWashburn is a great idea -- but the technology is 10 years behind the times.
2. The email client is pathetic. Year after year, no improvement.
3. The course shells we're given are too old school. I can't even have my directories and files from a previous semester copied forward. Do you know the wasted efficiency from asking hundreds of faculty to re-create these every semester. Year after year, no improvement.
4. We've been staring at WebCT as our online course portal and vowing to change since I got here 3.5 years ago. Year after year, no improvement.

Comment from Associate Professor of Economics Paul Byrne:

I like to use a USB drive with password protection ability, since I have student grade books and past exams on them. I should also note that ISS has recently proposed that this be a requirement of all faculty members and staff. However, after being switched to WUAD I have been unable to actually use the password protection portion of my USB drive, because I do not have the administrative privileges necessary to run the executable file to open the protected portion of the drive. It has been over a week since I submitted a ticket with ISS regarding this problem and I have yet to receive any response as to whether there is a solution to this problem or if I should develop a work around.

I had a similar problem with proper administrative privileges in WUAD and ISS unresponsiveness earlier in the fall semester after being forced switched to WUAD. Prior to the switch I was assured that I would be able to use my computer just as before with the biggest potential inconvenience being that I would need an ISS tech to install any needed programs. This has not been the case. After switched to WUAD I was unable to sync my palm pilot with my Outlook calendar. This is an important functionality to have since I often schedule meetings with students in the class room using my palm pilot and I schedule future committee meetings while avoiding conflicts. ISS responded to my request by suggesting a work around, which did not work. The issue was then dropped by ISS, they never bothered installing the program for me, informed me of my next course of action or told me that I would be unable to use PalmSync, I simply never heard back from them on the issue. In spite of their false promises prior to forcing me to switch to WUAD, this appears to be the standard approach to handing privileges problems preventing the installation of programs. I am at the point where I have contemplated putting my computer up on a shelf and start doing all my work from my personal laptop.

Comment from Associate Professor of Marketing Gene Wunder:

Recently I purchased a Blackberry Curve. I wanted to interface my WU calendar with the one on my Blackberry. In order to do this I needed to install RIM (Research In Motion, manufacturer of the Blackberry) software. I could not do this as I needed “administrative authority” and it could not be obtained. I worked with ISS on this and was told that I could not obtain permission to install the software. I was told that because the University did not own the Blackberry it was not possible for MY software to be installed. (I gathered from the conversation, that if I GIFTED my Blackberry to Washburn, then it would be possible.) Thus, the Blackberry would belong to the University and the software would be theirs and administrative authority would not be needed. This will not happen! So, in the 21 Century, I am left with a bifurcated calendar and never the two will be merged! I understand the need to restrict any and all outside software from being installed on a University computer. However, I do not see the reason for this decision.

Still on another issue. Textbook publishers provide software for use in and out of the classroom. For example, test banks are available for just about every text. Recently I wanted to look at the test banks for two different texts prior to adopting a new text. When I attempted to install the test banks so I might review them, I could not do so because I lacked “administrative authority.” I eventually found another way to review the test banks. However, it seems absurd that I cannot do what I need to do without jumping through unnecessary hoops. I presume I am not the first person to encounter this problem.

From: Mabee Library and the Law Library

Re: *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*, Draft (dated Nov. 12, 2008)

On Friday, December 5, 2008 select technology staff and librarians from Mabee Library and the Law Library met to discuss the *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*.

These are the initial concerns the group has regarding the *Electronic Information Security Problems and Procedures* document.

- 1) Definition of Data is overly broad. (2.3)
While the document lists some specific types of data, the statements: "Any Electronic Information" and "Data includes, but is not limited to" create confusion and could be applied to any database to which the libraries subscribes, the integrated library system, or many of the other electronic resources the libraries use on a day-to-day basis.
- 2) Definition of Non-University Groups. (3.5)
There is no definition of non-university groups in the document. The libraries interact and share data with non-university groups. One example is the ATLAS consortium in which the State Library of Kansas, the Kansas Historical Society, the Supreme Court Law Library, and the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site all share a common integrated library system with the Mabee Libraries and the Law Library. Would this consortium be in violation of the regulations? Would each of these libraries have to sign off on the Washburn regulations and procedures before being allowed to use the ILS system?
In addition, the law library hosts content from several non-university groups, such as opinions from the Kansas Supreme Court and Court of Appeals and the Kansas Attorney General's office. If these regulations are implemented, the libraries are concerned about being able to provide this valuable service to the citizens of Kansas.
- 3) The draft document limits the free flow of information.
Both the American Library Association and the American Association of Law Libraries have as a **core value** the **OPEN** and **EFFECTIVE** accesses to information. Whereas the Washburn University Libraries and the Washburn University Law Library serve both the university community AND the citizens of Kansas, the implementation of these regulations could hinder the **OPEN** and **EFFECTIVE** access to information provided to the citizens of Kansas and the University community.
- 4) The Limits on or elimination of guest log-ins and community (non-Washburn) free use of electronic resources in the Libraries prevents the libraries ability to provide **OPEN** and **EFFECTIVE** access to library resources. (See 8.5.2.)
- 5) Limitations on installation of software and testing environments hinders the library staff's ability to provide new and effective means of disseminating information and supporting the research needs of the University faculty and students. (6.3.5 and 7.1.4)
- 6) Required approval by the Director of ISS or designee for outsourced software development could hinder interactions with Integrated Library System provider and other database providers. (9.5.5)

The libraries work closely with our Integrated Library System provider and other database providers to improve access to the library catalog and electronic resources. This development and customization of the software interface would be severely hindered if approval of the ISS Director was required.

7) Regulations and Procedures create additional bureaucracy.

The implementation of the regulations and procedures described in this document may result in the creation of several new positions and/or duties within each department that will require reassignment of duties for current employees, or the hiring of new employees within each department to oversee all policies and procedures.

8) Authorship of the Document.

Who is responsible for the authorship of this document? Were all university stakeholders represented and consulted on the creation of this document?

9) Lack of public forum

We are concerned about the means in which this document was distributed. There was no call for comment, nor any apparent consultation with university units that would be affected by the implementation of these rules and regulations.

Comments from Alan Bearman, Interim Dean of Libraries

Tom:

Here is a list of issues that continue to concern us in the library:

1. Libguides: Notice how our help webpages is a .com and .edu environment. Without boring you with all of the specific details, most of which I do not understand, ISS (Mike Gunter and Bob Stoller) claim that it is a security risk to allow us to host our libguides pages on the Washburn servers. So, despite the fact that this is exactly how the vast majority of libguides users (including, for example Emporia State) and host their pages we pay over \$1,000.00 to a vendor to host these pages for us.
2. Earlier this year those with Microsoft Vista machines could not access our electronic resources when off-campus. It took 6 months to resolve this issue because ISS insisted it was nothing to do with them--eventually, of course, the problem was identified as a setting in the WU firewall.
3. Continuing the trend of access, in late October access to the catalog and Millennium software (which operates the catalog) went missing for about 2 days. ISS, as usual, denied it was their doing. Although eventually they decided the problem was caused in the switch from the SBC internet connection to the Cox connection. Once they finally admitted that the loss of service was their doing, they informed us that the potential for long-term problems exist--but, we have no idea if anyone is working on the issue.
4. Late on Friday (Dec. 5) we discovered that we could, for example, work in the Millennium system. Basic services like checking books in and out were not available to us or our partners. As usual, we called ISS and, as usual, they finally realized that they caused the problem when switching to new back-up procedures earlier in the week they failed to include the correct scripts for library operations.
5. On June 4, 2008, we sent a Macintosh laptop to ISS for service and heard nothing about its status until I started asking about it on October 30. I will need to check and see if the unit is still at ISS awaiting service when I get to campus tomorrow, but needless to say 4 months of no news does not amount to what I consider good service.
6. We have the ongoing issue of students needing their WUAD login information to use the computers in the library. On multiple occasions we have asked for the ability to look-up and provide this information to students when they do not know and/or forget said information. This request is continually rejected, so instead we tell students that to get the information they need that they need to leave the library and make the trek to Bennett get their information (usually from a student worker

at the help desk), and then return to Mabee to do their work. As you can imagine this always goes over well.

7. Have you noticed the really modern looking antennae on the really expensive donated televisions in the library. Our goal was to develop multi-media stations that merge the many avenues through which students access information, but we cannot have access to cable television. Why?

I have no real answer. One day we were told it would cost approximately \$500.00 to extend access from Henderson to Mabee. The next day we were told it could not be done. Why? No one we tell me.

8. Upgraded wireless internet access for the library will cost Mabee \$45,000.00, it was placed into the Washburn Union at no charge to them.

9. We have an ongoing disagreement over public non-monitored access to computers in the libraries. ISS claims that strict monitoring is required by law, a position rejected by the American Library Association.

10. The Law Library donated to Mabee 5 computers that were originally paid for and then replaced by new units paid for with private funds. ISS attempted to destroy the hard drives of these units when we ask for them to be imaged with the campus software package. Their position was that the units were dated and out of warranty, ours was the HLC report slammed the university for a lack of computers in the library and in a tight fiscal situation we should use the units until they died. Strangely, once the VPAA got involved, ISS has units for us but will only give them to us in a trade for those from the Law Library. This, obviously, leads to the question--why not give us the Law Library computers plus the recently discovered units?

11. When the bulb in the projector in the electronic classroom went out, we were told it would cost \$400.00 to replace, so I asked who pays for bulbs across campus and was told ISS. When I asked, therefore, why the library had to pay for the bulb in this room I was told because it is a general use classroom--which is, of course, not true and I am still waiting for ISS to tell me how they determine they determine what amounts to a general use classroom. Apparently, a classroom used for courses from across campus, such as the electronic classroom, does not meet the definition.

At this point I will stop, rest assured more issues exist, but you get the basic idea. ISS is little interested in the academic mission of the libraries. The lack of communication is problematic because of their iron clad grip on campus technology. Unlike most libraries, they house our servers. Thus, we are dependent upon them, and yet they seemingly have no desire to communicate with us in advance of their doing something and then quickly deny their responsibility when problems emerge.

Exhausting!

And, I have not even said anything about the draft security document.

Best Wishes
Alan

Forwarded by Alan Bearman

fyi,
alan

----- Original Message -----

From heather.collins@washburn.edu
Date Sun, 07 Dec 2008 22:16:35 -0600
To alan.bearman@washburn.edu, judy.druse@washburn.edu,
tammy.baker@washburn.edu, farhan.makda@washburn.edu
Subject Wireless connection

Hello,
Just FYI, we had 124 students in the library at 9:00 tonight (finals week after hours) and received complaints that the wireless network was 'limited'. I took a quick head count and 2/3rds of the students here tonight brought their own laptops.

Heather

Heather Smith-Collins
Curriculum Resources Librarian
Curriculum Resources Center, Washburn University
Topeka, KS 66621
heather.collins@washburn.edu
(785)670-1956

Forwarded by Alan Bearman

So, being in Hays allows me to do e-mail. Here is one that I missed earlier in January, but again points to the problems that we face in the Library due to the handcuffs that ISS place upon our operations.
Alan

----- Original Message -----

From Judy Druse <judy.druse@washburn.edu>

Date Wed, 07 Jan 2009 09:50:33 -0600

To Alan Bearman <alan.bearman@washburn.edu>

Subject Summary of encounter with patron

Monday, January 5, Andrea called and asked me to come to the circulation desk. A KU student (accompanied by his father) needed a computer on which he could listen to audio files in his online course. He was unable to do this on the public terminals. I explained the university policy about access to computing resources. The father showed me his newly acquired guest borrower's card and asked if it allowed more access. It does not. He then commented about being a Shawnee County tax payer and this being a public university and being able to use the public library computers to do just this type of activity. I agreed with all his points but explained that I was bound by university policy. As a concession, I did agree to have the reference librarian on duty log the student into one of the "real" computers using a guest account (which ISS assigned to us but NOT for this purpose).

These types of conversations occur weekly with community patrons, alumni, and campus guests who want to use library terminals/computers to read email, type documents, listen to audio and/or video files, chat, play games, etc. which are not allowed by university policy.

--

Judy Druse
Interim Assistant Dean of Libraries
Mabee Library
Washburn University
1700 SW College Avenue
Topeka, KS 66621
(785)670-2507
judy.druse@washburn.edu
www.washburn.edu/mabee

----- Original Message -----

From Barbara Ginzburg <barbara.ginzburg@washburn.edu>
Date Wed, 10 Dec 2008 09:32:06 -0600
To martin.wisneski@washburn.edu
Subject Re: [Fwd: Re: Libraries' initial response to the Electronic Information Security Regulations and procedures document]

In addition to meeting with Bob, I think we should also forward our initial concerns to the academic representatives on the Steering Committee and ask them to take action (either throw out completely or radically amend), if indeed, Bob's comment below is correct.

"One of the first steps in that process was to create a security proposal for the Technology Steering Committee to review, suggest changes, and ultimately approve before sending it on to the Washburn Board of Regents for approval."

As a side note, the faculty senate on Monday did decide to adopt the Social Sciences Resolution asking for the abandonment of the entire document, minus item # 4. It was my understanding, Cal please correct me if I am wrong, that Tom Prasch will draft the document as a resolution from the faculty senate (keeping the same language), sign it, and present it to President Farley by the end of the week.

Barb

martin.wisneski@washburn.edu wrote:

> I say if we care about this issue be proactive, meet
> with Bob and treat it as an opportunity to provide
> him with more information about how this would affect
> the libraries. It is also possible he could provide
> us with a clearer understanding of those pesky
> definitions...

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Alan Bearman <alan.bearman@washburn.edu>
> Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2008 7:17 pm
> Subject: [Fwd: Re: Libraries' initial response to the Electronic
> Information Security Regulations and procedures document]
> To: john christensen <john.christensen@washburn.edu>, Barbara Ginzburg
> <barbara.ginzburg@washburn.edu>, Cal Melick <cal.melick@washburn.edu>,
> Martin Wisneski <martin.wisneski@washburn.edu>, Farhan
> <farhan.makda@washburn.edu>, Curtis Von Lintel
> <curtis.vonlintel@washburn.edu>, Jewel Makda <jewel.brueggeman-
> makda@washburn.edu>

>

>

>> Two of the many inherent problems with this response:

>>

>> 1. The Libraries are not just another group represented at the

>> Tech
>> Steering Committee, we are so technology dependent that the notion
>> of
>> drafting any document that deals with these issues without
>> speaking to
>> us in advance is unbelievable! It simply adds fuel to the fire--
>> that
>> the goal is a clampdown of the academic enterprise at Washburn.
>> And,
>> further demonstrates the need for someone-anyone to take academic
>> computing seriously.
>>
>> 2. Is it possible, with a straight face, to suggest that any
>> regulations will take place of 95% of current and future
>> technology
>> security issues? My high school history teacher once said there
>> are two
>> types of governing/constitutional documents in the world--the
>> short ones
>> that work because they cause dialog, and the long ones that do not
>> because they presume to know every scenario in advance and destroy
>> dialog. Little doubt as to which category this document falls into!
>>
>> So, now the question is--do we want to visit with Bob or wait and
>> see
>> what the response is to the Faculty Senate's demand that the
>> document be
>> withdrawn?
>>
>> Thoughts?
>> Alan
>>
>>
>>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From Bob Stoller <bob.stoller@washburn.edu>
> Date Mon, 08 Dec 2008 15:15:05 -0600 (Central Standard Time)
> To Barbara Ginzburg <barbara.ginzburg@washburn.edu>
> Cc tom.prasch@washburn.edu, john christensen
> <john.christensen@washburn.edu>, Alan Bearman
> <alan.bearman@washburn.edu>, 'Cal' <cal.melick@washburn.edu>,
> bob.stoller@washburn.edu, michael.gunter@washburn.edu
> Subject Re: Libraries' initial response to the Electronic Information
> Security Regulations and procedures document
>
> Thank you, Barbara, for providing this response. I would be glad
> to meet in person with this group to discuss your comments
> in detail.
>
> Very briefly, I was given the assignment to implement an

> Information Security program for Washburn University. One of
> the first steps in that process was to create a security proposal for
> the Technology Steering Committee to review, suggest changes,
> and ultimately approve before sending it on to the Washburn
> Board of Regents for approval.
>
> The Libraries are represented on that committee by the VPAA as
> well as 4 faculty representatives. I presume those reps will
> solicit input and advice from you as part of their review
> process and before the document is adopted. All areas of the
> campus have representation on that committee. The steering
> committee got their first look at this document a few weeks
> ago, so it does not surprise me if they have not yet had
> time to make contact with all the areas each of them represents.
>
> I have attempted to recommend best security practices, but it
> is up to the leadership of the University to determine exactly
> how much risk they want to accept in any given area of the
> proposal. This is not a technology question, it is a
> "business" question (using the term business very broadly to
> include all teaching and research components of the campus).
> My job is to make the steering committee aware of potential
> risks to the campus. They will then tell me which ones they
> deem of sufficient concern to require the proposed regulation.
>
> Again, I'd be glad to meet with all of you if that would be
> helpful. I can explain what issue we are attempting to
> address with every portion of the document. And, of course, as
> with any regulation we want the language to handle 95+ percent of
> software and hardware scenarios on campus with the
> understanding that a Vice-President can always
> grant an exception where circumstances are unique.
>
> Bob
>
>
>
>
> On Mon, 8 Dec 2008, Barbara Ginzburg wrote:
>
>
>> Hello Bob,
>>
>> On Friday a group of library technology staff from Mabee and the Law
>>
> Library
>
>> met to discuss the Electronic Information Security Regulations and
>> Procedures. Attached is a list of our initial concerns. While we
>>

> appreciate
>
>> the need for security we are concerned that the document would
>>
> impede our
>
>> ability to serve the University faculty, staff and students as well
>>
> as the
>
>> citizens of Kansas.
>>
>> It is our sincere hope the libraries' directors and technology
>>
> staffs will be
>
>> consulted as partners in the development of these policies.
>>
>> Sincerely,
>>
>> --
>> Barbara Ginzburg
>> Electronic Services Librarian / Faculty Senator Washburn University
>>
> Law
>
>> Library
>> 1700 SW College Ave
>> Topeka, KS 66621
>> Phone: (785) 670-1087
>> Fax: (785) 670-3194
>> barbara.ginzburg@washburn.edu
>> www.washburnlaw.edu/library/
>> www.washlaw.edu
>>
>> Abundance of knowledge does not teach men to be wise.
>>
>> ~ Heraclitus of Ephesus
>>

--
Barbara Ginzburg
Electronic Services Librarian
Washburn University Law Library
1700 SW College Ave
Topeka, KS 66621
Phone: (785) 670-1087
Fax: (785) 670-3194
barbara.ginzburg@washburn.edu

www.washburnlaw.edu/library/
www.washlaw.edu

Abundance of knowledge does not teach men to be wise.

~ Heraclitus of Ephesus

Exchange with Rob Weigand, Professor of Finance and Brenneman Professor of Business Strategy

----- Original Message -----

From Michael Gunter <michael.gunter@washburn.edu>

Date Fri, 23 Jan 2009 13:41:28 -0600

To 'Rob Weigand' <profweigand@yahoo.com>

Subject RE: WUAPPS -- dead in the water

Hi, Rob.

I do remember our discussion in December and applaud your creativity and accomplishments. I also believe there needs to be customized environments.

What we try to do is establish minimum standards on our computing hardware and software, so everyone has at least a minimum capability to exploit the standardized services we offer. Not all faculty need the same systems, or access, so the Deans are empowered to make decisions to modify those minimum standards. For example, administrative access is not automatically provided on new machines, but we have dozens of instances where Deans have asked this be included. We have always followed their wishes.

Even with Technology Requests, where there are the eight different choices for computing hardware and when these do not fit a faculty member's needs, truly custom systems are acquired. However, the standards have allowed us to get huge cost reductions. Last year we purchased over 50 systems just on the savings we were able to achieve.

I recall in December we spent a lot of time discussing your need to keep your current computer, which was being replaced by a new system, and to relocate that system to your home. While I agreed with your logic, and based on your comments the old system had some utility, I understand that ultimately, Dr. Bowen did not approve the request. I hope you understand I could not reverse her decision.

Mike.

From: Rob Weigand [mailto:profweigand@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, January 23, 2009 5:33 AM

To: Michael Gunter

Cc: Paul Byrne; Rosemary Walker; David Sollars; Alan Bearman

Subject: WUAPPS -- dead in the water

Mike:

Thanks for your note. As I'm sure you recall, we've already met -- we visited for an hour in December, at which time I did my best to explain what faculty need from ISS at a modern university. While I think it's admirable that you carry a Blackberry 24/7, I still maintain that our campus computing policies must explicitly recognize the need to support customized computing environments that suit individual faculty member's academic missions and personal preferences. In my positions at various universities, I've never seen a vibrant and creative faculty whose work could be stuffed into a one-size-fits-all computing template.

Rob Weigand

Professor of Finance and
Brenneman Professor of Business Strategy
Washburn University School of Business
1700 SW College Ave., Topeka, KS 66621
phone: 785.670.1591
email: rob.weigand@washburn.edu
website: <http://www.washburn.edu/faculty/rweigand>
blog: <http://marketblog.wordpress.com>

From: Michael Gunter <michael.gunter@washburn.edu>
To: Rob Weigand <profweigand@yahoo.com>; support@washburn.edu
Cc: Paul Byrne <paul.byrne@washburn.edu>; Rosemary Walker <rosemary.walker@washburn.edu>; David Sollars <david.sollars@washburn.edu>; Alan Bearman <alan.bearman@washburn.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 9:36:45 AM
Subject: RE: WUAPPS -- dead in the water

Hi, Rob.

Please accept our apologies for the service failure. While WUAPPS was functioning, the SFTP connectivity you use for your file transfers was not. My understanding that it is now functioning correctly and we apologize for the inconvenience.

I would like to take the opportunity to describe our operating hours and how Monday's holiday was handled.

This weekend, ISS maintained the same schedule on Saturday and Sunday as we do any other weekend. We had staff available in the TSC this Saturday 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. and Sunday 1:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m. These are our normal operating hours. The only difference this weekend is our staff was off on Monday. These operating hours and days off are set in concurrence with the Technology Steering

Committee which governs our service levels.

While the majority of our staff is not in the office on a weekend, we do have on-call personnel available to the TSC for critical systems and circumstances. In addition, the critical systems are monitored electronically, 24x7, and pages are automatically sent to the on-call system administrator if one of those systems goes down.

We were available this weekend – several people were remotely working, and in particular on Sunday, we had someone in Bennett 104 taking support calls on 670-3000 and monitoring email at “support.” I know John Haverty helped several people over the weekend with issues.

At present, we are not open 24x7, so I welcome you to email me anytime with anything you need addressed. I have email on my cell phone and carry it nearly everywhere so I can commit resources to address critical problems after hours.

We do our very best to provide service within the parameters set for us. If you have any suggestions on how we could better deliver support I would be glad to meet with you. It is important we need the needs of the University and would welcome the feedback and the chance to improve.

Mike.

From: Rob Weigand [mailto:profweigand@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2009 6:15 AM
To: support@washburn.edu; Michael Gunter
Cc: Paul Byrne; Rosemary Walker; David Sollars; Alan Bearman
Subject: WUAPPS -- dead in the water

Mike:

I have been unable to log in to WUAPPS since yesterday afternoon. It's the first week of classes. You can't tell people to get hooked on remote computing and store all their files on ISS servers and then walk away for a 3-day weekend immediately prior to a predictable spike in computing activity.

Thankfully, I stuck with my plan and kept all my files on my desktop machines, where they belong.

Rob Weigand

Professor of Finance and

Brenneman Professor of Business Strategy

Washburn University School of Business

1700 SW College Ave., Topeka, KS 66621

phone: 785.670.1591

email: rob.weigand@washburn.edu

website: <http://www.washburn.edu/faculty/rweigand>

blog: <http://marketblog.wordpress.com>

Comments from Miguel González-Abellás, Chair, Modern Languages

Tom,

Sorry for the delay, but here you have a follow up to our conversation at the last Chairs' meeting, regarding technical problems.

1) I have a personal palm computer that I use mostly (maybe 75% of the time or more) for work: appointments with students, meetings, classes, things to do, conferences... Sure, there's my dental appointment there as well, and other minor things, but I don't think that will amount to 20%. It seems that ISS does not allow to sync personal devices with our work PCs. That's what I have been told when I requested help. So I cannot communicate my work PC with my palm, which is, basically, a work device as well.

2) I use films/videos a lot in my classes. It seems that I cannot preview the films on my computer, because I need to purchase a decoder for Windows Media Player... I have that program in my personal computer at home, didn't have to buy anything, and have no problem watching the videos... Some of them play with another program on my PC at work, but not all. I am talking about legally purchased DVDs here in the U.S., not even foreign copies (that's a completely different story, and I think some of my colleagues have already complained about it). Honestly, I didn't even bother to request assistance for this one.

It is frustrating, honestly... I understand there are some security and copyright issues, true, but there should be a middle way to solve this. I hope this helps.
Let me know,

Miguel

--

Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Spanish
Chair, Department of Modern Languages
Washburn University
1700 SW College Avenue
Topeka, KS 66621
(785) 670-2015
<http://www.washburn.edu/cas/is/index.html>