Present: Brandt (w/o vote), Bridges, Cannon (boise), Caplan, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Jeffrey, Johnson, Keim, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Kirchmeier, Laggis, Lawrence (for Wiencek, w/o vote), Lee, Lee-Painter, Luckhart, McKellar (Idaho Falls), Morgan, Raja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella. Absent: Benedum, Chopin, Lambeth, Schwarzlaender, Watson, Wiencek. Guests: 6

Call to Order and Minutes. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. A motion to approve the minutes (Lee-Painter/Seamon) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report:
- Veterans and Military Week Events are taking place this week. These include “Working with Veterans: Professional Discussion for Faculty and Staff” at 9:00 - 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 8, Commons Clearwater Room, Idaho Commons and “NPR War Correspondents and Ensemble Galilei Present ‘Between War and Here’” at 7:30 p.m. Wednesday, November 7, in the Administration Building Auditorium.
- The Teaching and Advising Committee has completed a report that will be circulated to senators and discussed at the senate meeting next week.
- The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is hosting a Teaching & Learning with Technology mini-conference on November 14 at 8:30-12:30 in the Commons: Conference Schedule and Sessions descriptions and Register to Attend.
- UI dining contract goes out to bid in mid-2019 and UI is hoping to gather information on current operations. Faculty, staff and students are encouraged to attend a series of dining forums on Wednesday, November 7, at 4:45pm to 6:00pm in Living & Learning Center Garnet Room (Taco bar and beverages provided), Thursday, November 8 at 11:45am to 1:00pm in Wallace Morin Room (Taco bar and beverages provided) and Thursday, November 8 at 1:45pm to 3:00pm in Wallace Morin Room (“I” cookies and beverages provided).
- The next University Faculty Meeting will be at 3 p.m. Pacific time Wednesday, Dec. 5. Locations and more information will be available soon.

Provost Report: Vice Provost for Faculty Torrey Lawrence attended the meeting in Provost Wiencek’s absence. He did not have a report.

Ombuds. The chair introduced Laura Smythe, the university’s new ombuds. Smythe explained that she operates the ombuds office according to the four core tenets promulgated by the International Ombuds Association. She offers confidentiality unless there is an imminent risk of danger. She is impartial and does not advocate for either the university or individuals who consult her. She is particularly trying to let students know that she is available for their consultation. She offers informal services and is not an office of record for purposes of reporting. Finally, within the bounds of being a UI employee, she is independent. She is not part of a unit or department and does not report through a chain of command. She reports to the president on staff issues and makes him aware of patterns of issues that raise concern. In addition to meeting campus constituencies and reaching out to students, Smythe is also visiting various UI locations throughout the state. She was in Coeur d’Alene last week and has upcoming visits planned to Boise and Idaho Falls. She concluded by wishing senate a conflict-free evening!

Improving IT Support. Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer Dan Ewart presented plans for improving Information Technology Support (ITS). He has presented proposed general principles to the president who has authorized him to move forward.
Support for technology is currently provided through a combination of both centralized and decentralized services. Approximately half of the information technology (IT) support is provided through units and the other half is provided centrally through ITS. Decision-making and funding are also divided in both centralized and decentralized ways. This system has both good and bad aspects. Ewart is hoping to improve the system without harming its positive features. Throughout the university users experience problems with the level of support available, the consistency of support and the speed of support. The university also faces extensive security and compliance pressures. ITS must work to protect important and expensive data that is the livelihood for many researchers and for the institution. ITS also struggles to meet the level of user expectations for immediate and always available IT support. External changes also require the UI to improve. In 2015-16 the governor issued a cyber-security executive order that imposed unfunded mandates on state entities to implement higher levels of computer security. Both the state government generally and the State Board of Education (SBOE) are working on centralizing IT support and IT purchasing. These changes will put pressure on UI to also centralize its IT operations. The SBOE is specifically interested in the concept of “system-ness” among the various state universities and is considering the coordination of business operations across all the 4-year institutions. UI also has some budget challenges right now that can be addressed through efficiencies. Ewart believes that these problems are the result of trying to do too many things. He advocates that a small narrowing in the breadth of support would result in efficiencies, cost savings and higher levels of support for all users.

Currently ITS spends the vast majority of its time ensuring that UI technology operations remain functional. The university has over 400 software applications in its portfolio. It has approximately 140 staff to manage these apps and maintain functionality for end users of technology. One goal of the improvement process is to reallocate resources so that more planning and “upstream” support is possible, and less time is spent patching and fixing the various systems.

To accomplish the planned improvements, Ewart has identified six priorities.

1. **Improving IT governance and Prioritization.** Currently end users who need software often invest without consulting ITS but later need support from ITS. This has resulted in duplication of efforts and software and has resulted in slowing support to all users. This approach has also raised security risks. The institution must inventory the software it already has and should evaluate its capacity before purchasing new applications. Ewart gave the example that ITS supports multiple card-swipe software systems and multiple Customer Relations Management (CRM) applications. Not only does the institution need to make better use of existing applications, but the purchasing and implementation of new applications should be prioritized. E wart recognized that reforming IT governance will require the university community to collaborate.

A senator asked for examples of software currently in the purchasing and implementation queue. Ewart responded giving examples of an artificial intelligence-based system that will enable admissions to more effectively use text messages that are in the queue to implement, software to support faculty curriculum vitae and the promotion and tenure process, software to support market-based compensation, student requests to improve wireless services and software to provide a student portal to BBLearn, VandalStar and Banner. He pointed out that the university does not currently have a process to determine whether existing applications can meet any of these demands or to prioritize the competing demands for support and implementation represented by these requests.

A senator asked whether the new process is completed or whether there would be an opportunity for faculty and staff input. Ewart responded that the president has approved the concept, but that each of the six priorities must be developed. He anticipates that there will be significant faculty and staff input on how the priorities are implemented. Ewart pointed out that procedures must be developed and that a process for exceptions and consideration of special circumstances must be included. The senator followed up expressing concern that neither his college dean nor IT staff were familiar with the initiative. Ewart responded indicating that he is in the process of presenting his approach to many different groups on campus. He was not able to present to the Provost Council until earlier in the day of the senate meeting. He also indicated that he has worked with others
on a number of different aspects of his approach, although they have never been bundled together in a single proposal previously.

A senator asked where the funds to support the proposal were coming from. Ewart responded that he developed the proposal, in part, to decrease the demand on resources and thus no additional resources are needed for the proposal.

A senator asked how granular the proposed changes would be. Ewart responded that the scope of each priority is different. He recognized that the proposed changes should not stop innovation on campus but pointed out, again, that duplicative applications, unexpected demands on support and applications that raise security concerns must be more effectively managed. He plans to roll initial changes in the context of the institutions’ “big data” applications and needs. But he anticipates that the institution will move to a standard list of software and hardware that must be purchased through IT. He also acknowledged that at some levels the system must be self-executing – there must be a way for purchasers to move forward without waiting for IT approvals for relatively small matters. With respect to larger projects, the system will likely require executive-level support to move forward and will be part of a list of desired projects that are evaluated for duplication and are prioritized.

A senator asked about the review and evaluation process. Ewart responded that recommendations would be made by a high-level review committee, but that Ewart (or the person in his position) would be ultimately responsible for the final decision. The senator commented that the only faculty member represented on the proposed review committee is the head of the university IT committee. The senator suggested that more faculty representation is needed and that faculty on the review committee should serve for a longer term than a single year so as to develop expertise. The senator cautioned that the review committee should not become a vehicle by which responsibility for the ultimate decision is deflected. Ewart indicated that he appreciated the comments and would take them under advisement. He pointed out that decisions about hardware and software support are being made now with no process. His goal is that the institution develops a transparent process up front. A senator asked if Ewart had a sense of the time the process will required. Ewart responded that his goal would be to make decisions within a month of a proposal being submitted.

Finally, the senator suggested that the process should include some sort of an appeal mechanism in case a request for support is denied. Ewart responded that he does not anticipate an appeal process and that he anticipates that employees would work through existing supervisory channels to seek review.

2. Annual IT Security Training for All Employees. This is a priority that is already being implemented through the Employee Development and Learning Process. This training must be completed at least annually because changes in technology happen rapidly.

3. Common Work Flow Management System for All Employees. Ewart envisions a common system for submitting requests for support that will automatically route requests to the most appropriate central or decentralized support location. Under the current system, not all requests for support are routed through the central support ticket system. This means that central IT support personnel end up handling matters that should be more properly handled by local IT support and vice versa. Ewart wants to give everybody access to a ticket system so decentralized support personnel can get access to ITS and has already implemented this approach on a volunteer basis. Universal use of the support ticket system will also help ITS analyze workload issues and address common problems. A senator asked whether the system uses an algorithm or Artificial Intelligence to analyze trends. Ewart indicated that the system does this. Another senator expressed frustration that the institution has changed how employee access IT support several times. Ewart responded that we have uneven levels of support across the university that impose challenges for implementing a system for accessing support.
4. Central and End-User Technology Procurement and License Management. To gain efficiencies and reduce the amount of money used for end-user technology, the university must be able to procure technology in bulk. Also, more consistency in end-user computers is needed. Each laptop has different support systems and drivers. This means ITS must spend more time supporting the diversity of computers on campus. Ewart stressed that he recognizes that different users have different needs. However, he stressed that the institution must identify two or three laptops across campus to streamline support needs. He envisions a system in which the supported systems would be purchased centrally and would be configured, tagged with university asset tags before being provided to the end user. This approach would also permit the institution to recycle more used machines.

A senator commented that there is a need for individualized computers in many parts of the university for example some faculty need Linux machines and other high-power workstations. Ewart acknowledged these needs and stated that there would be a process for exceptions. Ewart stressed that most users should be able to order a computer from a list of supported systems.

A senator commented that the proposals seem to envision a lot of process that might be overly burdensome. Ewart commented that at some level these processes would result in cost savings and efficiencies for all. But he also stated that his goal is to make the system as efficient as possible.

5. Central Device Management. Ewart explained that IT needs to know all the devices and applications with access to the university’s network. This includes instituting an automated process for updating computers. This process will eliminate some of the hands-on time for ITS. He acknowledged that some faculty and staff worry that this will allow ITS to “spy” on them through their computer. Ewart stressed that ITS does not have the time to do this, rather the proposal is needed for basic security so that software and devices accessing the system are up-to-date and loopholes in security are minimized.

6. IT Personnel and Risk Study. Ewart proposes to more clearly define the responsibilities of centralized and decentralized support personnel and to provide better coordination between the two groups. Currently some of the decentralized personnel are “islands” institutionally crucial information that could be jeopardized if they leave employment. This can not only lead to disruption but also subject the entire network to risks. He stressed that he is not proposing to centralize ITS support personnel. However, ITS must be familiar with the responsibilities and work of the decentralized personnel.

In conclusion, Ewart stressed that there is much that must be fleshed out regarding the concepts and priorities he has outlined. He is committed to listening to feedback and collecting suggestions for implementation and, as mentioned earlier, is in the process of introducing the proposal to many different groups. ITS will be sponsoring open fora in December to further disseminate the proposal and to gather input.

A senator asked if Ewart could discuss the SBOE initiative to centralize IT across all Idaho 4-year institutions. Ewart responded that he could not address the specifics. However, he believes his proposal places UI in a better position to respond to SBOE inquiries about centralization. He believes the board will respond positively to the institutions in house efforts to eliminate duplication and gain efficiencies. He believes that the consultants hired by the SBOE will see that four institutions in Idaho have very different needs. However, he believes there are possible efficiencies, particularly regarding such operations as purchasing.

The chair thanked Ewart for his presentation.

FS-19-004 - FSH 4930 Honorary Degrees. Professor Beth Hendrix, chair of the Commencement Committee presented a seconded motion from the committee to clarify the eligibility language for honorary degrees. She explained that when the policy was last revised in 2002 some language was omitted. The current proposal attempt to resolve this long-standing problem. The motion passed unanimously.
FS-19-013 and FS-19-014 - APM 30.10 and APM 30.17 Identity and Access Management and Identity Theft Protection. Dan Ewart returned to the meeting along with Chief Information Security Officer Mitch Parks to discuss recent procedure updates. Parks explained that APM 30.10 replaces an out-of-date policy. It attempts to implement current best practices to manage user accounts in compliance with federal and state law (e.g. the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Health Insurance Portability and Privacy Act (HIPPA) and the governor’s cyber security executive order). The proposal aligns UI with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Cybersecurity Framework. The new policy establishes that the university user account is the preferred email address for all important communications. It also establishes more clear policy for the lifecycle of accounts. Under the new policy no account will be created until properly authorized and the access permissions for each account will be evaluated when a user’s position changes. Mapping our account access and management policies to NIST will also help the UI as it interfaces with other networks in support of research and other operations. In HR employees have access to protected info but when they move, we need to have that access changed.

A senator commented that social science graduate students who interact with the public do not want to use the term “vandals” in their email addresses. Parks responded that the new policy establishes a clear way for such students to obtain a sponsored account that does not include “vandals” in the address. He also pointed out that Teaching Assistants and Research Assistants will also generally be considered university employees.

A senator expressed concern that the lifecycle of student accounts may result in closing accounts for students who take a break from school. Parks stressed that the policy is focused on truly inactive accounts and would require a two-year period of inactivity.

APM 30.17 applies to accounts maintained by the UI. Parks explained that for some purposes, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) considers the UI to be an account provider analogous in some ways to a financial institution because UI handles monies in accounts such as student financial aid accounts and short-term loan accounts. For this reason, the UI is required to comply with the FTC’s “Red Flag Rule” that requires security that prevents a third party using a stolen identity from accessing the accounts.

FS-19-009 (FSH 3220), FS-19-010 (APM 95.15), FS-19-011 (APM 95.20), FS-19-012 (APM 95.33) - Sexual Harassment Policies. Associate General Counsel Jim Craig and Director of Civil Rights and Investigations Erin Agidius presented editorial changes to the Faculty-Staff Handbook and three APM provisions. The changes were required to bring UI policy into compliance with SBOE policy. The changes require employees to report Title IX violations within 24 hours of obtaining knowledge of the violation. Agidius pointed out that the institution has already been providing training on the SBOE provision. A senator asked whether the language in FSH 3220.C.1 should be “learn of behavior or of an allegation of sexual harassment.” He suggested that the reporting responsibility of employees should extend to behavior that is observed directly not just allegations reported to the employee. Agidius and Craig responded that the proposed language tracks the SBOE policy. The faculty secretary suggested that she, Craig and Agidius review the policies and the SBOE language and suggest appropriate changes. The senator also pointed out that the language problem is present in the related APM also.

A senator asked what is the consequence of failing to report under the policies? Agidius responded that such a failure would be addressed by the supervisor. She stated that possible consequences could include a letter of warning, or educational reminder of obligations. The senator suggested that, as a matter of due process, the consequences of not reporting should be included in the policy. Craig responded that any violation of university policy can have employment consequences up to and including termination. The senator reiterated his request.

The agenda having been completed, a motion (Morgan/Foster) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate