

MINUTES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
DECEMBER 12, 2003
BALLANTINE HALL 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Summary of Actions Taken:

Agenda:

1. Approval of Minutes

September 10, 2002, <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY03/minutes/09-10-2002.htm>

September 17, 2002, <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY03/minutes/09-17-2002.html>

October 1, 2002, <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY03/minutes/10-01-2002.htm>

Oct. 7, 2003, <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/10-07-03.minutes.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions

(Moya Andrews, Dean of Faculties)

Professor Emeritus Wu-Chi Liu

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B15-2004.htm>

Professor Emeritus Walter Poesse

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B16-2004.htm>

Dean and Professor Emeritus Schuyler F. Otteson

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B17-2004.htm>

Professor Emeritus Maurice Glen Baxter

<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B21-2004.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business

(Professor David Daleke)

4. Question / Comment Period

(Professor David Daleke)

5. OnCourse: Update from the Distributed Education Committee

(Professor Kathy Gilbert, Co-Chair Distributed Education Committee)

(Brad Wheeler, Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Technologies for UITS)

6. SPAM Update (approximately 30 minutes)

(Professor Jim Patterson, Chair Technologies Policy Committee)

(Brad Wheeler, Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Technologies for UITS)

7. Strategic Plan and Mission Statement Follow-Up
(Professor Fred Cate, Chair Strategic Planning Committee)
(<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B26-2004.htm>)

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Jeff Alberts, Moya Andrews, Sharon Brehm, John Slattery, Neil Theobald, Joyce Alexander, Bennet Brabson, Simon Brassell, Ann Bristow, Malcolm Brown, Bonnie Brownlee, Erik Bucy, David Daleke, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Patricia Foster, Ann Gellis, Kathleen Gilbert, Laura Ginger, Michael Hamburger, Kevin Hunt, Margaret Intons-Peterson, Elin Jacob, Elizabeth Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Deidre Lynch, Murray McGibbon, Theodore Miller, Kelly Mix, Richard Nash, Harold Ogren, James H. Patterson, Mary Popp, Eric Rasmusen, Amy Reynolds, Elyce Rotella, Barry Rubin, James Sherman, Sarita Soni, Rex Sprouse, Holly Stocking, Herbert Terry, Larry Thibos, Thomas Walsh, Mary Wennerstrom, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Celestina Wroth, JoEllen Baldwin, Casey Cox, Grant McFann, Matthew Hottell, Kimberley James, Claudia Geist

Members Absent: Dale McFadden, William DeKemper, Andrzej Ziemiński

Visitors: Steve Hinnefeld (Herald-Times); Julie Knost (Affirmative Action); Al Ruesink (Biology); Charlie Nelms (Vice President for Student Development and Diversity); Sara McNabb (President's Office); Bruce Jaffee (Business Economics); James Wimbush

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 10, 2002; September 17, 2002; October 1, 2002; Oct. 7, 2003

DALEKE: Good afternoon everyone. I think we'll get started. This will be our last meeting of the semester, which would have been Chancellor Sharon Brehm's last meeting with us but she is away at a CIC meeting and couldn't be with us. In the cases where the presiding officer is absent, the BFC President presides at the meeting, and that is why I am sitting here with a gavel.

We have before you the agenda for today's meeting. The first order of business is the approval of minutes. We have three sets of minutes from last year, as well as the minutes of the October 10th meeting of this year. All of these have been posted on the web and we have given notice of their availability. Does anyone have any corrections to the minutes?

INTONS-PETERSON: I move that they be adopted.

DAVILA: I second that motion.

DALEKE: The minutes have moved to be approved and the motion was seconded. Any discussion?

TERRY: I move that you separate the minutes from last year and the minutes from this year. I can't vote on last year's minutes because I don't know if they are accurate or not. I can vote however on the ones from 2003.

DALEKE: Would we like to divide these into separate motions? I think we'll take that as a friendly amendment to the motion. All those in favor of approving the minutes of September 10th, September 17th, and October 1st of 2002, please raise your hand.

Hand vote, motion passes.

Let's take up the October 7th, 2003 minutes then. Do I hear a motion to approve?

TERRY: Yes.

BUCY: And a second.

DALEKE: We have a motion to approve the October 7, 2003 minutes and it was seconded. Any discussion? All those in favor, raise your hand.

Hand vote, motion passes.

The minutes are approved. Thank you. We have a few more sets of minutes from last year to approve as you might notice, and a few more from this fall. We will again try to bring them to you in groups about this size in future meetings.

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

(Moya Andrews, Dean of the Faculties)

DALEKE: Next on the agenda are the memorial resolutions. Moya Andrews is here in her role as the Dean of Faculties to present these resolutions. We have four of them today.

ANDREWS: We remember those faculty who have gone before us in the history of the Bloomington campus. Professor Emeritus of East Asian Languages and Cultures Wu-Chi Liu came to IU in 1961 and served as that department's first chair for five years, until 1967. He retired in 1976. He was the founder of his department, the mentor of many well-known scholars of Chinese literature, and a distinguished and productive scholar himself. He wrote and translated more than 25 books, including the influential anthology "*Sunflower Splendor: Three Thousand Years of Chinese Poetry*". During his long life, Professor Liu served as a link between traditional China and the modern era, and was a bridge between Chinese culture and the west.

We also remember Professor Emeritus of Spanish and Portuguese Walter Poesse, who joined the Bloomington faculty in 1941. Aside from periods of military service as a colonel in military intelligence in WWII and again in the Korean War, he remained on the faculty until his retirement in 1975. Thus, he witnessed the expansion of the university under Herman Wells. His research area with the Spanish Golden Age Theater, and he was greatly admired by his students and colleagues, both nationally and internationally. He was a founding member of the Bloomington Humane Society, and largely responsible for the establishment of the local animal shelter.

We also remember Emeritus Dean and Professor of Business Administration Schuyler F. Otteson, who joined IU in 1946 as an Assistant Professor of Marketing. Prior to being named the fourth dean of the Business School in 1971, he was director of both the M.B.A. and D.B.A. programs, and he always had strong international interests. Ott, as he was affectionately known, led what is now the Kelley School through a period of tremendous growth, where the enrollment doubled. He was referred to as the "building dean" because he planned the construction of the new business building in Indianapolis and a major upgrading of the building in Bloomington. He was responsible for the idea of "One school, one mission, one faculty, two locations." He tried to capitalize on the strengths and environments of the two campuses. He himself played leadership roles in many organizations nationally and internationally, and on campus he served as secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council, President of the AAUP, and member of the Athletics Committee. He was always willing to serve the university in any capacity. He was humble, yet effective, and never took himself too seriously, which resulted in the natural ability to gain the cooperation of others. Someone once described him as "the fellow in a poker game who makes little noise but always goes home with the money." His outstanding leadership and many accomplishments were achieved in a very quiet and unassuming way.

We also remember Emeritus Professor of History Maurice Glen Baxter. He arrived on campus in 1948, shortly before his 30th birthday. He had joined a small department, only a dozen colleagues that were described as "conservative and provincial and reluctant

about change.” His interests in Constitutional history lead him to center his research on the New England lawyer Daniel Webster. In 1984, Harvard University Press brought out his much-praised biography, *One and Inseparable: Daniel Webster and the Union*, which was the culmination of many articles that he wrote; showing that in its formative years the Supreme Court relied heavily on lawyers such as Webster in its decisions concerning interstate commerce and contract law. Mo was a dedicated teacher, and also was director of a Lilly Grant for a statewide program to improve the quality of teaching of U.S. history in the state’s secondary schools. He was always willing to shoulder tasks of service and served as Chair of History at one particularly difficult period, when he managed to put the department back on an even keel. However, he gratefully then was allowed to return to what he most preferred: his teaching and the quietude of his scholarship. He continued to write and publish long after his retirement.

We will have a moment of silence to remember these accomplished colleagues. Thank you.

DALEKE: Thank you, Moya.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS
(Professor David Daleke)**

DALEKE: Our next order of business is the Agenda Committee business, which I will present. I would like to first remind everyone that on November 21st the President announced his selection for Interim Chancellor of the Bloomington campus and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs is Ken Gros-Louis. Ken is a person that is familiar to this body, having been the previous chancellor here and having spent many, many hours in our meetings. Ken’s appointment is pending approval at this Friday’s Board of Trustees meeting, and I anticipate that all will go well there. This means that at our next meeting in January, Ken will be the presiding officer.

There was also an announcement for a change in Vice President Charlie Nelms’ title and duties. His title has been changed to Vice President for Institutional Development and Student Affairs. The press release accompanying this announcement didn’t give many details of his duties or a description of the position; we have requested that from the President and I anticipate that he will also be further describing this position to us when he presents this change in Charlie Nelms’ title at the Trustee meeting at the end of this week also. We will hear more about that later on this week.

On today’s agenda, we will have an update on OnCourse and our SPAM protection, both by Brad Wheeler. We also have a relatively minor though important correction to the mission statement, which just will not go away. (Laughter) I think this is a very important correction that has to be made. As you know, the mission statement was passed on to the Chancellor, who then passed it on to the President. We are taking this chance to correct the document before it goes any further. Finally, we will have an update from Ann Gellis about some research compliance issues.

I have a couple of other announcements. The nominations process for next year's BFC elections has begun. Sometime near the end of this week or the beginning of next week you will receive your nomination forms in the mail. Please contact us as soon as possible if you don't receive one and either Kelly or I will get one to you. Also, please return these as soon as possible. This is a good opportunity to recruit other members of your units to participate in faculty governance and so please encourage your colleagues to nominate others or themselves for election. We would like to have these nomination forms back as soon as possible so that we can complete the election in January. According to our schedule we are to have the elections complete by February so that we can also undergo another round of elections, including committee chair selections, UFC member elections, and so forth, which should occur before March.

A week from today we will have our second Standing Committee Chairs Meeting of the year. This is a meeting that will follow the one that we had at the beginning of the year when all of the committee chairs came together and discussed respective agendas for the standing committees as well as talked about some general agendas for the BFC for the year. The Agenda Committee thought it would be a good time to bring the committee chairs back together again near the end of this semester to reassess the state of each of our individual agendas and the direction the BFC has been taking this year. That meeting will be held a week from today in this room. For those chairs that are unable to attend, please find a proxy from your committee and encourage them to come and participate.

As I mentioned earlier, the January 20th meeting will be the first meeting with the new Interim Chancellor, but it will also be attended by the President, so we will have an opportunity to have a much longer discussion with the President about some of his plans for the university. I think that in particular we have been interested in his plans for reorganization of the senior administrative positions and I would encourage you to prepare yourself for that meeting and that topic. This is a good opportunity to have a very long and in-depth discussion with the President about issues that might be of interest to us. The Agenda Committee will probably send out a primer of topics that we would like to cover but again, if you have any specific issues that you would like to see addresses, please send them to me or the Agenda Committee or Kelly so that we can put them on the agenda.

Lastly, I would like to thank a couple of members of the BFC who are ending their terms this semester, Dale McFadden from Theatre and Drama, and Gary Wiggins, from Informatics. Thank you for your service to the BFC and we appreciate the efforts you have made for this body this semester.

**AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD
(Professor David Daleke)**

DALEKE: Next on our agenda is the question and comment period and I will open up the floor for any remarks.

DAVILA: I'm sorry if I missed it, but did the President propose this correction to the mission and values statement?

DALEKE: No. This is something that the members of the Strategic Planning Committee had noticed. One of the points of the mission statement actually offered something that we cannot offer and this is just a clarification. It is on the agenda for today and you should have a copy of the correction in your packet. Any other questions or comments?

AGENDA ITEM #5: OnCourse: Update from the Distributed Education Committee
(Professor Kathy Gilbert, Co-Chair Distributed Education Committee)
(Brad Wheeler, Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Technologies for UITS)

DALEKE: Let's continue on. Next we have a presentation on OnCourse, presented to us by the Distributed Education Committee. Kathy, do you wish to make any comments?

GILBERT: Because more and more of us are using OnCourse and that it is in a constant state of change we thought it was appropriate to give the BFC an update on where we are and where we are going. It's pretty interesting.

DALEKE: I think everyone knows that OnCourse is our online course management program that is used extensively here in Bloomington and to present some more information about the changes that program will be seeing is Brad Wheeler, who is Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Technologies for UITS. Brad, thank you very much. For your information, this is the first PowerPoint presentation we have had this year.

BRAD WHEELER: I really needed the graphics. I was afraid that if I tried to do them with hand signals they might be hard to interpret. (Laughter) What I would like to update you on today is the direction we are going with OnCourse. I have had opportunities to talk with both the Technology Policy Committee and the Distributed Education Committee here and with the University Faculty Council and my colleague Garland Elmore at IUPUI has met with their campus councils as well. As we get started with OnCourse, the agenda today holds two things. First is where we are today, and second is where we are going. David mentioned that a lot of people use OnCourse and here are the numbers. Of all the students the registrar has enrolled for a given semester, this graph indicates the percentage of them that logged into OnCourse at least twice. We can use different numbers like five or ten or 37 because those students who do use OnCourse use it a lot. Those numbers don't fall off very fast. What is interesting is that students continue to log into OnCourse for the very first time after a semester is over. You would think that our numbers would flat line after finals week, but we will add about 2,000 after a semester has closed. Draw whatever conclusion you will from that.

The purple line on the chart here is the percentage of faculty using the program, and the bottom line is the percentage of course sections, which might look low but that is deceptive as there are many ghost sections that are listed out there. These include doctoral seminars, independent studies, and other assorted courses that are not open to the

general public but that drive that number down. Forty percent of sections are probably the true upper bound of what is going on there. Numbers as of this morning, which includes all eight IU campuses systemwide, indicate 75% of faculty and 83% of students using the system. This is about eight percentage points higher than this time last year. For Bloomington the numbers are exactly the same for the percentage of students and faculty who have been on OnCourse at least two times this semester. Sixty-two percent of the faculty has been in 10 times or more. Those are our heavier users. Our colleagues up the road at IUPUI are at 86% and their students are at 91%. There are 88,000 students using the system, or about 88% of the total student population system-wide.

What's going on is interesting. We have very detailed data about which parts of OnCourse are used, how long someone is logged in, and so forth. While the numbers of users continues to go up, what has been more of a challenge in the last year is a change in behavior. The first change in behavior is that faculty and students are putting more stuff in it. The raw number of bytes, of data that go in and out, grew 40% between September 2002 and September 2003. It had been going along between 15 and 20 percent, and last semester it just shot up. The other thing that happens is that people stay logged in to OnCourse longer. There was a 62% growth of total number of minutes logged in, and that is even with much faster hardware serving it than what there was a year ago. The story with what the faculty is doing with online teaching and learning at Indiana University is really remarkable. In some ways it is unrivaled as compared to our peer institutions. If you were logged in yesterday, you know it is not all rosy.

Forgive me for putting in charts that are quite small. Yesterday we had a slowdown between 11 A.M. and 2 P.M. where the system really got slow. This is after the entire month of November where there were almost no service calls for performance issues. We cooked right along in November. I guess you scared the heck out of the students when they came back from Thanksgiving because they all logged in yesterday to figure out what it was that they needed to be doing for the rest of the semester. Between 11 and 2, what you see here is the total number of pages that were being served out. You see a big spike in activity and this is the volume of files that were being pumped in and out of the system and this represents the worst of what you experienced yesterday in terms of response time from the system. About a month ago we called in a special consulting team that knows the details and nuances of tuning the hardware that we run OnCourse on, because it is a very large and complex system and it needs to be gone over with a fine-tooth comb. I want you to know that we are monitoring performance in every way possible. We are aware of when it slows down and we are taking every measure we can. Last fall we had a big disk capacity and hardware upgrade on the system, and we are currently looking at those issues and others to see if there is any way we can get the system running at its peak potential. The slowdown periods are an economic tradeoff. Do we want to go and spend \$200,000 on additional hardware for a few critical moments of slowdown or is that money better spent on other priorities? We know that if people are willing to shift their behavior a little bit that we can move on without that. We are monitoring it very closely.

When we go look at other big universities like Wisconsin, Michigan, and others, we find that our faculty are using a course management system far more aggressively across the range of disciplines than any of our peers. There are a lot of reasons for that, but mainly it is just the character of the faculty who have embraced it and are using it. It has gone through voluntary adoption as a system that we wrote ourselves, and we have control of our destiny. We have changed many, many things about it along the way. We are not subject to a vendor. We track every change, every request. If you have a suggestion, go to the front page of OnCourse and drop that suggestion in the box. I guarantee you that every one of those is tracked in detail and used to give us guidance as to what to do better. Frankly, if you go to the front page of OnCourse, before you log in, there are a number of links on the side. One says "Development Process". If you look under there you will find a list of suggestions that have been made for OnCourse. If 12 people say they want us to move the login button to another page, it is listed there once with the 12 incident numbers listed beside it. The second thing you might find of interest are the stats that I put up about student and faculty usage, which are public access and are again available from the main OnCourse page. If you click on "Usage" you can look at prior semesters and find almost all the data available since the inception of the system.

The next thing I will do is turn our attention to looking ahead, but maybe this would be a good time to pause and answer any questions you have about where we are today with OnCourse.

MCFANN: You said 75% of faculty members are using the system but only 40% of sections are posted on OnCourse?

BRAD WHEELER: Not necessarily. If you look at the number of sections that are active as a percentage of the total number of sections listed by the registrar right now, it's 32% or so. There is probably only justification for using OnCourse in about 40% of those sections anyway. Consider then that of the 40% of the courses we consider as users of the program, 80% are using OnCourse.

RASMUSEN: Would it be possible to put on the opening page a notice of a system slowdown? A lot of people could and would shift their usage if they anticipated a slowdown or trouble.

BRAD WHEELER: We will do that sometimes if it is a sustained period, and it often depends upon where the slowdown is. Sometimes IUPUI may be experiencing a slowdown and South Bend is not. That is a single page for all eight campuses that does not necessarily reflect the actual current usage at any of the campuses. If it is a network problem that persists, we do post a notice directly to the right of the login button.

COX: Do you have any feedback regarding the satisfaction that students have with the program or why some faculty choose to use the program or not?

BRAD WHEELER: I can answer the first but not the second. UITS does a yearly survey that is a perceptual instrument that goes to a sample of faculty, staff, and students which

is managed by the Center for Survey Research. That data is all rolled up and posted publicly on the UITS website, and student satisfaction is 95.4%. That survey is ready to go out again. If you get one, please respond.

NASH: I noticed in your stats a number that didn't make sense to me. Though you indicated that there 7,531 faculty there were only 5,657. That seems that there are faculty not logging in. How is that possible? What does that mean?

BRAD WHEELER: The registrar reports to us nightly, indicating that 7,531 unique faculty are teaching this semester. Of the aggregate number of faculty on all campuses 5,657 have logged in.

DALEKE: Is there an indication of whether they have just logged in or if they are actually using the product for their courses? That is, of the 5,657, how many are just logging in and how many are actually using the program?

BRAD WHEELER: We can know depth of usage but I don't have those numbers in front of me. We don't monitor usage of specific functions within the software, such as the quizzing function or the schedule function. What we do track is how much people log in. There are faculty who simply use OnCourse to post their Word syllabus and that is all. That is the last time they log in all semester. Students tell me that is better than never having them log in, and I understand in some occasions it is actually a support staff person logging in for that faculty member. We also have faculty who are in and out of the program ten or twelve times a day. It is really a personal choice by the faculty member.

ROTELLA: I've been making a suggestion for a couple of years, and presumably not through the right mechanism. On your grade book program, you display for students the mean score. I don't want my students to have that information and you have no way of letting me turn that off. Can you fix that for me?

BRAD WHEELER: Mean is a mean problem. (Laughter) We can't even seem to find real consensus and agreement about what "mean" means among various departments and programs. Your timing is actually pristine because I anticipate the grade book is going to get some considerable attention this spring.

ROTELLA: All I want you to do is give me an option to turn it off.

BRAD WHEELER: Give you an option to turn it off. Okay. I will make a note of that. We'll call it the Professor Rotella feature (laughter).

HUNT: I have a question that may be an answer to one of these others. I used to use OnCourse and at one point about a year or two ago it became impossible to upload an Excel spreadsheet into OnCourse to post your grades and like to build in those manipulations, such as means, for use on my computer but I don't want to keep a separate grade book on OnCourse that an Assistant Instructor will need to update, which results in

keeping the information in two places. I quit using OnCourse simply because of that. Has that changed? Is it now possible to upload Excel spreadsheets to OnCourse or if it is not, can that be remedied?

BRAD WHEELER: There is an import/export feature for grade book, but I expect it may not be as rich as you would like. The real life cycle of the whole thing is that most faculty would like to be able to manage grades for their own use during the semester with the ability to periodically expose those to students in some way and then ultimately to zap them into the Registrar when you bless them and say "it is so". PeopleSoft is currently going through their process of getting modules installed with the Registrar's office and such, and the steering committee for that project has looked at grade book connectivity matters with OnCourse as well and have sketched out what that will look like, but it's not the first thing that is being turned on there. Let me summarize the grade book feature a bit. I may be getting ahead of myself, but the grade book feature is one of the things our team will be working on in the spring. Grade books are an important part of teaching for all of us, and if you have ideas and suggestions if you will just go to the front page of OnCourse, drop it in. Even put in the beginning "From the Bloomington Faculty Council meeting with Brad" and we will go from there. I'll tell them to be sure to watch for all of those.

TERRY: I have kind of an archival question. I have begun to worry about how the use of these sorts of things will interact with building tenure and promotion dossiers down the line. Some of the faculty I have come across are able to print out what is in OnCourse; others haven't. It doesn't really relay the richness of what they have done. How long do you archive a course? Assuming the committees were willing to do it, how far could they go back, for instance to say that six years ago this faculty member was doing this with OnCourse and now they are doing something else?

BRAD WHEELER: We keep courses up for I think three years, inclusive of the current year. That's two archival years you can roll back. Faculty members themselves can export the materials to keep on their local hard drive for longer term purposes, but you are right. For the typical tenure clock, from start to finish, OnCourse doesn't reach back that far.

HAMBURGER: Some of these core services are also provided by BEST's Quizsite and Post'Em. Are those things supported independently? Are they expected to develop along their own paths?

BRAD WHEELER: Can I ask a hold on that until we move to looking forward because I can speak directly to that? That is a wonderful question.

INTONS-PETERSON: I'm not sure how you categorize the people who are logging in. You have faculty and students, but as a retired faculty member I am able to sit in on night classes. The faculty members in charge of these register me in various ways, all of which will fit into the mean, no matter how you calculate it. I will be there, but there won't be

any grades for me. My presence and that of other people in my situation will really be skewing those.

BRAD WHEELER: Are you suggesting that you don't do well on the exams? (Laughter) It's a fair point. In calculating those, we need to have the ability to have audit type students who aren't counted.

INTONS-PETERSON: Supposedly we do, but not all of the faculty members seem to know how to handle that.

BRAD WHEELER: That's a good point.

OGREN: Can you say something about the reliability of the system? What fraction of the time has it been up? Let's say how many times in the last two years have you lost a grade book?

BRAD WHEELER: To my knowledge, we have not lost a grade book. To my knowledge, it is up 23 hours a day. We have an update cycle very early in the morning where it goes offline. It is usually online more than it says that it is. The only real outages that I am aware of are that we had a problem a year ago November when we were doing the hardware cutover and that was the longest OnCourse had even been offline in its history, and that was a matter of about four hours or three hours, and we had one period on a Friday, this semester, that was 37 minutes or something like that. Our team has the knowledge on that.

OGREN: And where is the server located?

BRAD WHEELER: The OnCourse hardware is located in Indianapolis. I really need to make this very clear. Hopefully you're familiar with I-light. We own our own fiber, connecting our fast network around the perimeter of the campus and the Bloomington machine room to the Indianapolis one. It is really irrelevant on which end of that it is located. All the messaging infrastructure is in Bloomington for the entire university. It is the fiber that keeps all of that moving. Let me take one more and then I'll move on to looking ahead.

MCFANN: The team that you are going to have next semester look into the grading parts you said would be heavy, is there any student representation on that?

BRAD WHEELER: You would like to contribute to grade book design? (Laughter)

MCFANN: No, just ... yes

BRAD WHEELER: We're not talking content, just design. (Laughter) We do run usability studies, former usability testing, for the features and other things that I am going to show you in a moment. One of the things I'm going to show you in a moment is in usability studies right now. If you guys would like to participate in that or delegate

someone that can be arranged. Let me move on to looking ahead then and make sure that we stay in some reasonable time frame.

There are really two challenges in moving ahead for technology in higher education. These are the same problems that everybody's got right now. The first problem is building services that have sustainable economics. If you've ever been part of a department that went off and got miracle money to build a computer lab or a gee-whiz something then in a year or two, it got old and it needed support and there was no money for it and you started getting in trouble. Sustainable economics are really the key. One of the easiest ways to have sustainable economics is to not change anything. Just screw it down, don't change anything, no innovation around it, and you can maintain the economics of it. You can't do that in an educational institution because we have all learned to expect certain services in dealing with our banks, Amazon, and the things that make our lives easier. So, we also need to support the frontiers of innovation, for example, Math department has got a whole *clubber* of technologies that they have built for teaching and tutoring around math and they just get better every year. And the last commonly taught languages group, they have technologies that they use as part of their *patting* agent. So, being a university we have to figure out how to fund and keep the innovation going as well. Here's our strategy in going forward with this.

Number one, we looked at this real hard, should we go buy something different, should we keep investing in Oncourse as we've got it or what should happen. We're very clear and the market is clear that maintaining control of our own destiny is the right idea. We're looking real hard at where we can find some better economics, consolidate some services instead of paying for them two or three times, we're going to work with partner schools who are trying to do the same thing. There is no sense in five or six schools each paying a half million dollars to invent the wheel when a lot of it is the same thing they are trying to accomplish and we're going to use open *source* products. If you're familiar with open *source*, the most public version is if you want to use the Microsoft operating system, you have to pay Microsoft to use it. If you want to use the Linux operating system, which is often used for many servers and sometimes in desktops, it is a public download, you can go and get it and there is no licensing fee. And for many things in software, they are increasingly moving towards open source options so *they are ending* the licensing fee for that.

So here's the strategy, going forward with Oncourse Next Generation, as we're referring to it, Oncourse NG. We are formally partnered with University of Michigan, Stanford and MIT to develop a standard based course management system. When I say standard based, that means, things like textbooks that you may use, sometimes they have chapter quizzes in the back of them or tests and instructor manuals. Increasingly there's some standards, if the textbook publishers will publish these in this way, they can be imported right into a course management system and this is stuff that really just emerged in recent years. So, standard based, it's designed for integration of the Onestart *plural*. What that means is, we pretty much think that most people don't necessarily want three or four different calendars on Oncourse. A different calendar and a personal calendar in Exchange and another calendar somewhere else. Why don't we have, why can't a person have a

calendar where the university events will come together? So, integration with the *plural* and a foundation for discipline specific innovation.

One of the things that is going to be big win, we believe for higher education, is Michigan, Indiana, MIT and Stanford on the same course management system co-platform. Now, we can put a different face on the front of it, each of the institutions can and it will be open source. There are many other institutions who have already expressed an interest in using this.

So, think of what happens, right it looks like the Math department for example; they developed a *clubber* set of tools for tutoring and teaching math. Let's say Ball State University or Oklahoma State University, and I would like to use their tools. Well, if I bring it to Oklahoma State and they use blackboard, it's a real difficult integration thing right now. If I want to take it to Ball State and they use Web CET or some other commercial product, it will be difficult to integrate.

The harder through were a common big platform out there so that discipline specific tools could travel easily. So, a law professor at Connell writes a great case study, quiz, *beat them up* Professor Kingsfield tools in someway, and then it can be imported to Bloomington relatively easy. So, we think that getting our common platform, is really going to open up discipline specific innovations in ways that we would never be able to do otherwise.

Timeline, where's does this look like going forward? In the spring of 04, certain things will be turned on; the most important one is the first new tool for Oncourse Next Generation and what I want to say first and foremost before anyone faints, the current one will not change at all for spring. Everything you use, it will still be there, it is only if you want to go and use the new and quizzing and testing tools that you will be able to do so. They will not be turned on until about mid semester. We are going through a lot of testing and such now, we don't want to turn them on prematurely but the key points are that we are going to use these standards so that you may even have a colleague in another institution who teaches out of the same textbook and you want share quizzes or you want to share exams, you will be able to do that.

Now to the question you ask about services out of BEST, BEST has been involved in the design of this. Another thing the system will be able to do is support quizzing and testing that is not on a computer. So, here's what I mean, let's say that you have a large section you teach that has 100 students in it, 250 students in it, you go to *banker* questions of 75 or 100 questions and you can have the system go and randomly create a forty question test for each student and then it will print a unique test. It will print a unique paper test for each student with their student ID number on the front and may be even their photo that's pulled from Campus Card Services. So, is there *a walking in job*? No. not you, that should, in passing those out. And you're working with BEST because BEST then needs to have a unique answer key for each one of those exams and it is a way of minimizing. We hope it's just one more low insurance.

HAMBURGER... is this service going to continue or they...

BRAD WHEELER: You know *RACE*, Math and I have had a long discussion about that and in the long term we save this way and *Ray* would like to really be in the academic services business and less in the technology business of running servers and back office stuff and we really would like to do the technology business and just support the academic direction and mission. So I think over a sensible time line, that's what will happen.

Two more things, library tools were turned on actually about three or four weeks ago. If you go on the tools section of Oncourse, the library has done a good job. We worked with them, it's much easier to navigate and find the online databases and digital subscription services that the library has that may be relevant to your discipline rather than having to scroll through this enormous list that they used to have. It's just a big alphabetical list.

And then finally thanks to a competition we ran last year with graduate students from five schools here on the Bloomington campus, we took the work that they did and wanted to continue to work through the summer, you will be able to access Oncourse through handheld devices such as your phones or PDA's that use wireless connections. Mobile Oncourse will be turned on in January and if you have noticed this is the typical mode of *walking* across campus now. So, this is a set of tools, I have to say, we put the challenge out, what should mobile Oncourse do? And we gave them 10 alternatives to design it. If Oncourse has a 100 features, I honestly expected the teams to pick the 10 most frequently used features and build on these *closeable* devices and that's what they would do. I was absolutely, my jaws on the floor, I'm a *propeller* head myself, and I understand the need to review *prospects*. You know, they came back and demonstrated 60 to 65% features accessible from a little handheld device. So, it's amazing what's going on now. I still would suggest that you spend about a day working on it, that it is possible.

Okay, there is a final timeline that's I'll show you. Here we are spring 04, the new quizzing and testing tools will be made available, mobile Oncourse gets turned on at the beginning or middle of summer with no change to the existing Oncourse, it will continue to pearl on. We will do a limited release of Oncourse Next Generation and that's for the, you know, the brave at heart that will bring over and let them begin kicking the tires on the 1.0 release for us to begin tuning the equipment behind and ensuring that its ready for the lads with all the features that will be written during this year, then in summer of 05 that's when we will turn on the full Oncourse Next Generation, that's preliminary, this is the plan. Fold Oncourse Next Generation into 2006 and that's when we will retire the old. Ok, I think that's more time than I should have used for that.

DALEKE: Does anyone have any more questions.

COX: It seems like one of the most basic concerns that many students have is that there is still not the widespread of nuchal use by many of the faculty members in the various sections of Oncourse. I was wondering, the review theme that comes from how we facilitate or just how we as students facilitate that discussion.

BRAD WHEELER: To me, I don't really have a great answer for it. First thing I would like to say and I hope people can grasp, we really are doing extraordinarily well, relative to the *douche* we see at many of our peer institutions. I think the key level that I have observed is student influence. Asking faculty could you please post that online. I know somebody else may have another answer for this because there is no top down mandate, there is no "you have to" teach this way and for some this is better suited than to other disciplines.

DALEKE: I think I would just like to add to that. I think we've had this discussion that really a lot of the application and the use of these tools is pretty much student driven and I imagine that for most of my colleagues here, if the students come up to you in your class, and if a proportion of them say they want this. They want you to use this, its there, I'm sure you would be willing to adopt it. In fact, I would be curious, how many people here use Oncourse in their courses? I know some people just use it to post grades. But that's interesting; it entails a fairly large proportion. That may be that the extent of use varies from class to class or from section to section and that's something but I guess we don't have that information.

BRABSON: David, it would be interesting to know a list of say the five most popular uses of Oncourse for those of us who only use it for grading for example. I suppose that exists, is there a list saying which?

BRAD WHEELER: It certainly does exist, I couldn't point them out off hand but I can certainly make them available to you. The other thing I would like to make sure everyone does know is the center for teaching and learning that is a joint partnership with academic affairs, Moya's office, and UITS, one of them is located on the third floor here of Ballantine, the other one is located in the library up on the third floor if you haven't been there, it's a new facility over there. There are people there who are wonderful, they are there for you to just walk in and say, "Here's what I would like to accomplish with my students or my students have asked me to use the discussion forums but I don't understand why they would be valuable, can you help me understand why". They are there for consultation just on a sought of walk-in basis.

DALEKE: Herb.

TERRY: Speaking of Ray Smith, at this last meeting of this council, we approved proceeding with the test on Turn it In and Plagiarism Protection Software. Is that going to be coordinated with your Oncourse developments so that students might submit in some way through Oncourse or something like that in order to carry out ways?

BRAD WHEELER: Yes, since the Center for Teaching and Learning, our partnership between both organizations was certainly aware of the Turn it In and may be they are doing the *pile up* with those guys. Many of the papers come in through Oncourse. Faculty use the drop boxes as means of gathering them, so, yes. I don't have an exclusive plan for you yet but yes we know that's a desired featured.

DALEKE: Mary.

POPP: I just have one question about the Next Generation. Is there going to be something in there that will tie the Oncourse email to the student's regular email? I know that faculty get a notice a midnight if we signed up for the new mail, what about the students?

BRAD WHEELER: The mail function in Oncourse was created because at the time Oncourse was generated we did not have a university wide mail system. Each campus was doing their own thing and there were lots of problems and what we find is that 50% of the faculty even and students seem to be *in violent* charge that Oncourse should not have its own email; people just use the normal email. And we have 50% who in violently like having their email for courses *peeled* out, including the different courses and segregated there. I will tell you though, going forward, in *admission* retiring redundant services, we do not plan to have a separate email function in Oncourse. We are working with the messaging team to find out if there's a way to still have class email flowing to folders or something that will assimilate that feature. But it's just one of those things that right now we're paying for twice that we probably shouldn't be *for the long run*.

ROTELLA: But that doesn't mean we have to go back to using the *normal email*, do we?

BRAD WHEELER: No not at all.

ROTELLA: I mean the nice feature is that you could send something to the whole class. I don't care if it goes or where it goes but the management feature *should still run*.

BRAD WHEELER: The functionality at large will still be there.

DALEKE: Are there any more questions? Thank you Brad, we're not quite done with you yet though. The next item on the agenda is an update on our spam protection software. This is coming from the Technology Policies Committee. Jim, did you want to anything?

AGENDA ITEM: #7: SPAM Update (approximately 30 minutes)
(Professor Jim Patterson, Chair Technologies Policy Committee)
(Brad Wheeler, Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Technologies for UITS)

PATTERSON: The Technology Policy Committee has actually been working on two sources of spam this semester, one internal and one external and *David* asked you the last time as some of you were here last time you know the talk about the external spam email feature. So, we did invite Brad in, so he's going to also be next on the agenda to talk about that. *Syllabus* on the Technology Policy Committee including and have been using a pilot version of that, as may be even as Brad has done talking you can put your comments in as to your experience with it. I've done the same.

I know that from evaluating that, there are some very critical issues to be dealt with and it takes some time for that implementation. I know Brad is going to talk about that. One thing I would like for you to know is that you must realize that Spam represents someone of an anomaly or *incongruance*. I think like a lot of you I get a lot of unwanted messages these days. It seems like I get a whole lot of advertisements from both regular and generic Viagra in 50mg, 100mg and yes sometimes even 200mg sizes [laughter] and it seems that these are always offered at bargain basement prices kind of a member of a special group. And I receive most of the advertisement “due for *insert* of male growth enhancers”.

SHERMAN: You really read these don't you?

PATTERSON: I sure do. Like you, I think, and they always come from a *plethora* sources. Well, before I was aware of the concept of electronic or Spam email, I somewhat wondered out loud, “how do all these people know?”. Anyway [laughter], you can imagine my relief when I learnt that the concept of Spam *REX* or Real External Email and realized that some of you were getting the same type of messages. Now that I'm aware of the concept of Spam and realize we get them all, I think that what Brad is going to talk about is how we go about eliminating it now. So, Brad, with those thoughts in mind I will turn it over to you.

BRAD WHEELER: Well the title of this is [laughter] “Fighting Spam at IU” and truly the word fight is the correct one because this is not a problem that there is a technical or behavioral solution to in the near term. So what we are here to tell you about is the battle. Engaging the battle, and what's happening and where things go.

First of all, the problem; we're dealing with about three million email messages a day at Indiana University. We think or we have dated to know more than 60% of this is of the sort that Jim just so eloquently described to us. Many people are getting 20 or 30 Spams a day. Sometimes your life is going along just fine and then all of a sudden the next day *Pandora's Box* has been opened. You just start getting 20 or 30 or 40 more “your name has been found out” and then it starts replicating through various Spam lists and people are really sick and fed up with it. It's really an annoyance.

The second point is to know is that unlike this nice can here, there's not one kind of Spam. There are many many many different kinds of Spam and I don't mean just whether it's about prescription enhancements or various adult oriented sites. It is worded, it is constructed, and it comes from many many different places. You know in an ideal world there would be 30 or 40 bad guys out there and we would blacklist them and tune them out or the FBI would go black them on their head for some reason but it's just not that way. It's a combinatorial problem in trying to deal with Spam, it's out there. Very very diverse.

The other problem that we have is some of the things that I may view as Spam regarding a solicitation *to go to a* travel destination or hotel chain that may be I'm a frequent stay

club member at, other people really want to get that particular message. So, it's really very very difficult because it's all different.

The other thing that we see is that Spam often is a means of propagating really bad things. Virus being the worst little worm or a virus. Some of those things that run around in our network and just to, perhaps you've heard already but *it's* reinforced, the virus and worm outbreak of the late summer that you saw in the paper and all, we probably have around \$200,000 of direct cost to the university in dealing with those. Around \$200,000 of staff time, duplicating CD's. You know the second one arrived on the eve of all the students moving back in with all of their computers from God know where and connecting back to the network. The staff did a heroic job in association with the Halls of Residence of insuring that those machines were clean before they get on the network because that can infect a hundred machines like that. Email and Spam were one of the ways of propagating those bad things. So, it's really a bad problem and some people view it as interesting, amusing, other people we've had messages come to us from somebody we just absolutely offended by what they saw and wanted to know if there was some legal recourse to it. There really is not firm *solute* that we can do anything about.

So, dealing with it, what are your possible solutions. One solution is, not my problem, your problem. So you go and have to install special software on your desktop computer which means you will eventually call the support center which means when your computer is upgraded, then you have to go through and install all that again and et cetera et cetera. Client based solutions, things that you do on your desktop are a cost and support nightmare and that's again back with tens and tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of our community trying to keep up with this combinatorial problem out there.

The other *dichotomy* in ending this is, well UITS we're just sick of it. You guys just shut it down. Well that raises some particularly thorny legal questions and again what I view as Spam you may view as an important email message. So that's not a viable answer either. So what we are engaged in is some kind of arms race in the middle that hopefully we can filter, block, kill, quarantine in a way that works for everyone.

So here's what's going on, already we put in a system from Spam house and what they do is they keep up and they monitor all of these bad guys out there. They coordinate AOL and Microsoft Network and everyone and the series of bad guys identified they grab that domain and they filter on. So, that what pretty good. That knocked out about 30% of the bad stuff right off the beginning. What we are doing now, what the Technology Policy Committee has been in the alpha pilot testing of is something called Pure Message and Pure Message is something that we add in the mail system itself and it does a probability on whether something is Spam or not but it lets you retrieve it if you want. So here's how that system works going forward. I actually have already mentioned that, Spam House actually blacklists certain senders where Pure Message it actually it lets the mail into the IU environment and then we make a judgment call or whether its likely to be Spam or its likely to not be Spam. So, this is the slide that with those *embodiments you will be breaking up for.*

I'll try to walk you through this, first of all, internal mail, we've made a decision that mail that comes from an Indiana University domain, we're going to go ahead and let that through. So that mail that comes from inside is checked for a virus, if it's got a virus we're going to kill it but if doesn't have a virus we'll deliver the message and you get it. Mail that comes in from outside, what we'll do first is we're going to roll it together into a consolidated email address. For most people in this campus your email address is bwiller@indiana.edu. But since I have university wide responsibility I also have @iu.edu. Some people may have an address based on some other server. So to make this work we have to pull all of your addresses together to one place. So if you're someone who you need to have three different email addresses and it's an important part of making your day work well, this isn't going to be a solution for you so let me just say that upfront. It's just one of the limitations of being able to do this.

The second thing then what we do is that the Pure Message software, it does a probability on "is that message likely to be Spam". One of the colleagues at a company that I work with, who is legitimate business and we do messages all the time, his signature line has six phone numbers in it. His AIM, his Yahoo chat, his Microsoft messenger address in it and all this other stuff and then he gets classified as Spam because that's one of ways that it identifies; lots of URL's, lots of numbers in a message contributes to the probability score. Now what it will do then is it tags a message. If the message is less than 20% likelihood of Spam, it will go ahead and deliver the message and by far that is the bulk of your communication. In my experience things are getting through largely just fine. If it's over 20%, what it's going to do then and say, did this user sign up for mail filtering and the quarantine system? And if they did not then it's going to pass it right on through to you. If you did sign up for the quarantine system, what it will do then if the probability is greater than or equal 20, it will not deliver that message to you but it will put it in the quarantine bucket and it will just sit there. And then what happens is on a batch process that runs during the middle of the night, I think mine's showing up at about 6am in the morning right now, the *court* idea is a single quarantine message a digest, a list of all the things that were sent to me that it put in the Spam quarantine bucket with the probability that it was Spam. The ones that it was not so sure about at the top and the ones that it's darn sure those are Spam down at the bottom. The subject line and the sender and then I get a single message in the morning that says here's the list of things, are there any of these that you want? and if you want one of them you click on it and then it will send an email message to the quarantine system that says, "oh, go fetch that message", and then it just delivers it as regular email and you don't have to manage the quarantine bucket it will stay there. Right now we're doing 5 days and you can imagine 5 days for 130 thousand mail accounts, it can pile up fast. So we by doing 5 days you should be able to go back and get a message. This is the technical diagram of all the servers and such, most of you will be happy if I don't explain that.

Pure Message specifics; there's a few details here on what some of the algorithms are that this company uses and this is a real nice thing. For example, we had a message come through the other day that was clearly Spam when you read it but it had a low probability score so we studied it and what we found is it was an American English major who

wrote, I don't know, it was a finely worded Spam message. I mean they had really worked hard to avoid all the probability triggering things

NASH: And they say there are no careers for our majors!

[Laughter]

BRAD WHEELER: We've talked about it a *whole 5 days*. Essentially though, this software we subscribe to it, I mean, we install it here but we get updates so as the spammers start to adapt what they're doing to defeat the filters, we get better filters. That's why I say it's an arm's race that we're engaged in. more details, I think we've talked about retrieving and probability, this is what the digest message looks like, I realize that it's really really small so I'm sorry if you guys there in the back, I mean Jeff's got *good* eyes, he can read it from there. There's a little heart link here, this is an email message, this is Outlook that we're running here and you could be using Webmail. If you clicked on this, then this message would be sent to you. This is actually one of Brian's quarantined messages from a couple of days ago. Now, we've done here is this shows the probability score. That one had a 52%, then a 58% and a 79%, then they go up until it's really really sure that those are Spam. Now the green here are two messages, Brian likes the Sopranos and he gets an update on the Sopranos and what's going on, so he wanted to read that and something here from Paul Fredrick Men's Style and you know Brian is *tied* so he wanted to get that so he would *play* to be able to receive it.

So what's the status? We're bearing alpha testing of this right now. We usually guinea pig people in UITS to try stuff that we don't know if it's reliable yet or not. That's been going very well; we brought in more victims with the Technology Policy Committee. They've tried it out; so far things are going pretty well with it. What happens now is we move it up to a larger population, probably about 5000 people [laughter] and I'll accept cash, [laughter], checks. We move it up to a larger population if everything runs well there for about 30days. We don't want to get in a situation where this becomes a bottle neck for messages flowing in and out and we have to get the help desk trained so they can answer calls from people who know if something comes up. Then after that probably for that *weary* time frame it would be made more widely to the university community. Now, it is an opt in process. You have to go and say "yes, I want to be in on this" and if you're saying, "well I'm going to be away for 14days and I wont be able to check my 5day Spam Market before it times out", well, you can go opt out for those 14days. Now you have 7000 messages when you get back [laughter], you can't go and opt out. I think it's also very important to understand that this is not free. We're looking at about three hundred and sixty thousand dollars of equipment, software and then life cycle funding to replace that as it gets old, to put this system in place and I suspect that immediately you say "what, half million dollars, we don't care, just do it, solve the problem". But it is really one those things that a dollar here is a dollar you can't spend there at zero something gain. So with that let me take your questions.

SHERMAN: I have a couple of different questions. First, IU ... *state mail*, are there some Spam that in order to delete it have to be on it and every once in a while I get *stuck*

on and the system freezes but I have to go to Lear to get rid of it. Are there some Spams that just freeze your system at IUB?

BRAD WHEELER: Some of the Spam may be carrying really bad thing like Spyware built into it or you put old scripts into it and depending on which version of the operating system, which processor, which version of the browser, you know those combinations can have unintended consequences.

SHERMAN: Ok now, aside from those that create that problem I'm probably different but you know I get about 20 to 30 a day and I would say it takes me one each to *clear them*. It seems to me that the savings in time and effort if you go to the quarantine and look at them, it will take you the same 30seconds, is it worth the three hundred, five hundred thousand dollars? You know I don't particularly mind the one second *flip* of each one and may be some people get annoyed at the same one but you know I can go down the *Viagra bloop bloop bloop bloop* and it's no big deal.

BRAD WHEELER: I don't know perhaps somebody who's been part of the product wants to come, *Ed* do you want to come?

PATTERSON: Yeah. I'm a member of the Technology Policy Committee which ... first I would like to say how much I appreciated working with *Brian Gross* who's been very responsive to everything that the committee has brought forward. Two, the specific point you make Jim may be the only thing I didn't hear you say Brad was that if you choose, you don't even have to get your daily digest of the quarantine. So you have now saved another whole seconds. [Laughter]. I'm certainly among those people although I'm always horrified at the cost of every software package that we invest in and this is no exception. I think it's really horrific. My experience with this Pure Message product that we are privileged not victimized to test in the last month or so has been very positive. I chose to look at quarantine just to see if I was missing something I wanted and I most definitely was not missing anything I wanted. After enough experience with that. I think my choice would be not to see the thing at all. I did have over the weekend. Interestingly the first two in about a month I think that came through to me where clearly Spam. One was addressed to a blond mature bluff, defensive on many grounds. [Laughter] and I had an interesting dialogue with Brian about the writing skills and after describing he told me it was probably well written Spam. I described the subject line and said it wasn't my idea well written that you can't explain what you've explained to us. There's a certain, we are going to get a few things as people exercise their skills but in general ... I think that my experience has been very good with it and I'm really and delighted to see such a first *roll*

BRISTOW: ... We're really not doing that.

BRAD WHEELER: I might just speak to the timing of it. Some people might ask, well why didn't we do this a year ago? Really a lot of the technologies were not that robust and mature be able to handle messaging in an environment as large as ours and as widely as this is. My personal experience with it is I'm killing one message, may be two messages a day out of quarantine that may be from United Airlines which is one that

actually want to see and I'm seeing about four or five Spam messages a week get through, that's been my experience with it.

BRISTOW: Eric

LYNCH:

BRISTOW:

TERRY: One quick question and then a comment. The dollar amount sir I assume the system might cost, so campus cost will be less than 40% of that depending on how I think it's allocated. Second comment I think would be that for those who didn't see it in the IDS this morning, there was an article about this which I think when it ends it's a very good discussions as to why you selected an object and system and why you didn't go down the big brother route and I would commend you for that choice or approach to this and we're running out of time for this but it's fairly good encounter of that in the IDS this morning.

BRAD WHEELER: Correct.

TERRY:

RASMUSEN: Because you know I might want to use you are not in ... Everybody wanted opt in but I do listen to *calculations* gives on your question and if its 30 seconds a day, 300 days a year, its 115 minutes, 2 hours, 10 ...

SHERMAN: It's a BFC meeting!

[Laughter]

RASMUSEN: that's \$... an hour, that's \$30 year, fifty thousand users means that over a million dollars a year savings. There you go.

REYNOLDS: Is there any sense that this is *going to be more* effective with virus protection too? That is, is the cost also going to be may be down the road on the virus end of it?

BRAD WHEELER: Absolutely, I mean it's a second round of defense and what we really like is, we try to kill all the viruses at the border so they don't even get in. but you get some things going on around inside and this will definitely help with that as well.

LEVINSON: *Epical* remark about receiving *seven* thousand messages over *email of more than five pages*, I'm wondering whether it is cost effective or logistically possible to expand the five day quarantine period either program or on select cases so that if you're going out of town or over vacation periods may be that could become a default?

So that's one question and then I have a following question to that.

BRAD WHEELER: Right now, we're still learning what it means to hold five days of Spam for 140 thousand email accounts. So six months from now we'll know what that means and whether that's hitting 40% of available disk space *or retaining* and that policy might be shifted somehow after we learn.

LEVINSON: So it's really about space rather than the quality of the program or some other consideration?

BRAD WHEELER: Absolutely. In space we save all the dollars but we're making a judgment call there.

LEVINSON: The next question is if a piece is sent to quarantine and then its never accessed, is there a return to sender message that it was not delivered or can that be built into it because one of my concerns about, thinking about how perhaps unlikely scenarios that after checking my quarantine list then I sought of quickly discover that its highly unlikely that there's going to be something there that I would really really miss especially if I go away or something like that? So, I'm willing to live with occasional messages meaningful to me slipping through if the sender is getting a not deliverable message. You know if it's a message where the sender assumes that you got it and you just don't reply that's *part of the problem*.

BRAD WHEELER: Right now, no, it does not kick messages back out. That would be more load on the mail relay system. In doing that enduring the best approach is to not respond or not to deal with these guys getting any signal back at all. The messages themselves, all this, the quarantine messages, we do have a special exchange server that tortures them before delete them. [Laughter]

BRISTOW: *What is* the percentage of things you're finding in *court* do they or might be interested in and you used the example of United Airlines, have you found any that was actually from an individual that you in fact wish to reply to?

MCFANN:

BRAD WHEELER: No, I have not, from an individual. I have not.

BROWN: There's a case about and I'm not sure if know, is the United States Congress talking about *banning* Spam something, is that related to at all to this?

BRAD WHEELER: Yes, they've been talking about it for six years.

ANONYMOUS: I have a question, when sometime about I would probably two months in the way I started getting a lot of Spam from an IU address and I actually sent a message to a Professor *Braufe* because he was the person assuming to be the source of it. It turned out; I mean he didn't have anything to do with it. But I'm pretty naïve about how these

things work and I keep now, I get messages constantly, frequently that had *Braufe* in the subject line. Is that something that other people are experiencing?

BRAD WHEELER: It's a tactic that spammers use. They spoof the address so it's not really coming from an Indiana address. It's being made to appear as such. But Pure Message filter will recognize that and will not it as internal mail.

SHERMAN: And speaking of that on the subject line I had something *curious happen* about a year ago, I don't know whether it's still inexistence, on the subject line I would always put hi and I would send messages out to colleagues and some of it is important, most of it I would guess and these messages were never delivered and nobody was ever told that they weren't delivered and I checked on it and they said, "oh, its because 'hi' is often a subject line for viruses so we just delete them and never send them out and nobody was told about that". So now I use "ciao" and assume as they go to other languages they'll delete those, is that something that was inexistence?

BRAD WHEELER: no, we don't do that. I don't know, what where you using for your mail or going out?

SHERMAN: Netscape.

BRAD WHEELER: But to which system? Not to exchange but to? It doesn't sound like it was on a UITS managed mail system; it may have been a departmental.

SHERMAN: I'm sure it was, at the time I remember talking to someone and they said that there are some subject lines that because they are so associated with viruses that we

BRAD WHEELER: I can ask *Barb Broom*, our IT Policy Officer but to my knowledge we have never filtered on this.

SHERMAN: Anyone else with such experience?

DALEKE: I think we have time for about one or two more questions.

INTONS: Just a follow up on Jim's question. Sometimes I get messages with nothing in the subject line, what happens in cases like that? Does it pass them through?

BRAD WHEELER: We don't do anything. We don't interpret that one way or another. As far as scanning it for a virus or something like that. That's really a payload of the message more than the line.

INTONS: I have a tendency to do the exact opposite because you know unless I recognize the source on the sender's line, because I think its polite to indicate what the subject is.

DALEKE: I just have one comment or actually a question first and then a suggestion. One is that I've worked with another, I use a Macintosh, and I work another mail program that learns when you claim something is Spam and then it will always then consider it to be Spam. Does this program have any kind of a learning routine going through?

BRAD WHEELER: No it does not because it is a big none size fits all perimeter of mail system. Now this does not preclude you from *sorting* it out in your desktop solutions. If you want put a *quinine* in, you can still do that. As a matter of fact, I was *personally* using a desktop client for about a year before we did this just as my own defense. Thank for your *learning*.

DALEKE: I have another suggestion, I think that there are a number of prudential data users sitting here, I was wondering if you could put the BFC membership on a list of *computer* testers?

BRAD WHEELER: I will speak to Brian *Gross* and I suspect we could.

DALEKE: If anyone has any other comments or suggestions to Brad I'm sure that he'll be willing to receive them by mail as long as they come from an adequate IU address.

GINGER: Look out for the subject line.

DALEKE: Thank you very much and thank you gentlemen.

**AGENDA ITEM #7: Strategic Plan and Mission Statement Follow-Up
(Professor Fred Cate, Chair Strategic Planning Committee)
(<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B26-2004.htm>)**

DALEKE: The next item on our agenda is we have a correction to the mission statement and it is to presented by Fred Cate who is chair of the Strategic Planning Committee and Michael Hamburger are going to be?

HAMBURGER: May be I'll say a quick word while Fred is on his way up here. I presume all of you recall we discussed this not too long ago and we promised that this would be a dynamic document that we change as changing *names* up here. We didn't quite expect it to come this quickly but this is a minor modification to the Mission Value Statement. It comes as a anonymous recommendation from the Long-Range Planning Committee and just by way of background you probably recall that we made this as a formal recommendation to Chancellor Brehm who in turn recommended it to President Herbert and it is in his hands now and presumably will be eventually forwarded to the Trustees for their approval. In the interim Strategic Planning Committee had some discussions about it and expressed a particular concern about this one item in the Mission and Value Statement which we concurred with and we're now presenting to you as a modification of the whole.

CATE: Thank you very much... wanted to be represented by *council*. [Laughter]

GINGER: It's true.

CATE: I by the way got to be a bigger tester for the Spam. If you send Bryan *Gross* enough *ugly* emails he will make you a *beta* tester for just about anything. First let me just take one step back. I understand that the BFC meeting at which the Mission Statement was discussed, there was also a discussion about the fact that the Strategic Planning Committee and its first report last January as on the Strategic Academic Priorities had dealt with the issue of one of those five priorities. You might remember it was Inter-Disciplinary Initiatives involving the Liberal Arts and there was some concern expressed during the discussion that the first report had used an overly narrow definition of Liberal Arts and although that was not, I understand, formally part of the recommendation that came forward from the BFC. It was reported back to the Strategic Planning Committee and in fact we are capable of learning and went back and reviewed the document and in fact thought it was a very good recommendation that was actually not brought forward formally to go ahead and delete the language that was interpreting Liberal Arts in that report in a particularly restrictive way as both inconsistent with our intention but also inconsistent with the university's understanding of what the Liberal Arts are. So I can at least report that we are capable of learning along the way and I appreciate the fact that that was brought to our attention.

At that same discussion we discussed the Mission Statement, the BFC made a number of changes to it all of which we felt were positive with one except and that was the Provision on Guaranteeing Academic Freedom for all Members of the University Community. Our issue was not that Strategic Planning Committee has decided to take a position against Academic Freedom but rather two separate concerns. One was that the combination of words "Guarantee Academic Freedom" and "For All Members" represented a significant and a dramatic change in the policy of the university which we understood was not the intention of the BFC and all prior documents including all of the policy statements for the University Faculty Council, Academic Freedom is only referred to in connection with faculty and librarians and if in fact the BFC wishes to begin the process of opening that discussion as to whether all students and staff should also have Academic Freedom, it seems like that would require a broader discussion and a more deliberate effort to do that. Along with that concern were concerns voiced by the Council's office that in fact Mission and Value Statements and other types of Strategic Planning documents often find themselves being used in ways that may not have been intended. For example in the context of court cases or arbitrations in which case an effort that involved disciplining a student or a staff member that this could very well be used as an effort to explain the conduct that had led to the disciplining which is if we now guarantee Academic Freedom to all members of the university community it would in fact be quite difficult to justify certain types of actions which are currently taken today with regard to oversight of students and staff.

That was the substrate of set of concerns; the second concern we had was largely a procedural one and may be even more accurately to put it, a political one which was that

the Mission Statement would now go to the President and from the President to the Trustees. They would be advised by Council that there was this concern and it would put the Trustees in the position of either having to enact a document that reflected a substantial change of the university's policy over the past 40 years in this regard or in having to send the document back to the BFC on a matter of academic Freedom which seemed an unfortunate situation to put the new President in and unfortunate situation to put the Trustees in since I don't believe and you will certainly correct me if I'm wrong, that was what was intended.

So, the Strategic Planning Committee raised this with the Long-Range Planning Committee with Michael who with great patience and generosity and great energy on the evening of Tuesday just before Thanksgiving dedicated themselves to coming up with alternative wording that would continue to convey the enormous respect and regard that we have for Academic Freedom as a legal operable concept but also tied with the notion which is what I think was actually intended of this broader notion of open discourse that we believe *of certain* in Strategic Planning Committee applies throughout the campus. And so this modified language which is to promote open discourse and respect for academic freedom was thought of as a no way weakening the commitment academic freedom. In fact in some ways I think it actually strengthens it yet not reflecting a substantial change in university policy without the type of debate and sought of process which would of course include the UFC necessary to do that. I don't know if you wish to add to that.

HAMBURGER: No, I think that's a good summary. I would just mention that we considered a number of possible alternative ways of handling this concern. We tried to avoid messing with any of the other IMs on the Commission Statement that may cause unintended confusion or complications in the examining and I think this is a very simple and supportive statement in the place.

DALEKE: As it's brought to the floor, it is already moved so to discuss it we will need a second.

PATTERSON: Second.

DALEKE: We are second, is there any discussion.

MCFANN: Yes, could you please *revive* me just one example of the kind of academic violation that the word "guarantee" would cause legal trouble for?

CATE: Certainly. Certainly, for example, this is the example in fact which I wrote in the email to the Committee which is Academic Freedom is generally thought to protect the *life* of a faculty member to determine what to include for example in an article or what to, the language to teach a subject. We don't *record* that same type of really absolute protection for example for staff. So that a staff member can be told its part of your job for example to develop material for example to promote an upcoming show with the Art Museum and the type of Academic Freedom we would recognize in a faculty member we

would not recognize there. In fact that staff member said that you know, I can't do that. I won't do that. I believe that it has to be green or red and I'm willing to lose my over it", that would be an act of insubordination. It could easily lead to a disciplinary procedure and in fact Academic freedom could then be raised as a defense here, as a matter of Academic Freedom. I chose that it should be in color different than that which I was instructed. Similarly from students, if we say the page limit for this paper is 20 pages and a student says you know I couldn't do it, my academic freedom said I needed forty pages to fully express myself and I say well I would accept your paper because it is over the page limit. If we guarantee academic freedom to all members, you can we are going to see this document in that grievance procedure.

MCFANN: Thank you.

DALEKE: Herb.

TERRY: I agree in empathically with he is trying to accomplish but oddly enough you have ended up with a phrase that troubles me for what it leads out. In academic discourses and rhetorics and AAUP documents and so fourth, academic freedom used in this particular way is usually accompanied by the phrase untenured. And I would be happier with this because tenured is an essential component of academic freedom for a faculty. I would be happier if this proposal if ... discourse and respect for academic freedom and tenure because I think the latter is under some jeopardy in American universities.

CATE: I'm hesitant to speak to the substance of that. I think that we can have the committee, let me disagree with you on the factual side of that. The phrase Respect for Academic Freedom comes out of an existing university document, the Student Code of Conduct for Students and that is the way in which students we currently talk about academic freedom which is not we guarantee your academic freedom but that we want to be involved in ... so that you learn to respect academic freedom and I think that was the concept that was intended to be conveyed here and tenure is not used there so it certainly didn't come up with the committee.

DALEKE: Ann.

BRISTOW: I do believe though that Herb makes the right point for me. I think this wording is an *infest improvement* and in fact it's rather embarrassing that it had to go back to the committee and pass through us without noticing this at our meeting. I think, you mention the fact that academic freedom is guaranteed only for faculty and librarians. That speaks to the point Herb's making I think, that the only thing that could remotely be called a guarantee is a tenured appointment and those are the only two classes of affiliates that enjoy that privilege. I think, for myself, that it is not necessary to add the word tenure here however I think respect for academic freedom really says what we intend.

CATE: One issue that came up with the Strategic Planning Committee discussion and in the Long-Range Planning Committee's discussion is the fact the mission statements are

rather very definition intended to apply to the entire institution and I think we all worked medially to avoid any phrase that would say it only applies to you, some subset, but not to everybody else and that why the phrasing as it is, “respect for academic freedom”, particularly seemed to respond to that concern. I appreciate your comment.

DAVILA: I think Ann Bristow makes a good point in so far that I think in the academic imagination, tenured is also associated with people that are, I mean, forgive me, academic freedom is also associated with untenured people if they’re brave enough. [Laughter] I think they might be more conscious but the spirit of academic freedom permeates, if you like, discussions that faculty have especially within their own field and though its exercised more readily when it’s tenured, it applies to untenured faculty too. Ann.

BRISTOW: I think what the statement is trying to say is that generalized principles of academic freedom apply throughout the university and respect for academic freedom is something we want to promote. I was simply speaking to the issue of guaranteeing and what I believed is the purpose of tenure which is to come as close as one can, how open one is in exercising their rights to academic freedom, quite another issue.

DAVILA: But tenure and academic freedom are certainly joined and it’s as a result of guaranteeing tenured people to exercise freely academic freedom without fear so to speak. But I think it’s best in my opinion to leave out the term tenure in this mission statement as you’re proposing.

DALEKE: Yes, Harold.

OGREN: My impression however reading these is that we’ve somehow weakened considerably. The *tenure* statement was made academic freedom here. I mean before it was a guarantee of academic freedom and may be the qualification weren’t right. Now it’s just promote respect for academic freedom, it seems to be quite a drop in what this mission statement is saying and along the lines of promote and defend or something, I worried also what historically and what might be happening within the university in the future and may be open for a statement that actually is a little bit stronger and indicates something about a steadfastness for maintaining that rather than

CATE: Steadfastness *primitive* [Laughter]

DAVILA: We are throwing out the baby with the wash because I think the *fairest* word is the first one guaranteed, guaranteeing it for the university community as whole and what we’re saying is that conceivably, plausibly academic freedom should be guaranteed and asserted for faculty as *traditionally* a tradition of prerogative so the word faculty is banished as you’re saying at all.

CATE: May I just say no, this discussion has been had at a great length and in fact the issues you’re raising are exactly the issues that have been discussed at great length and I think it’s safe to say that everyone who has looked at it would have liked the statement that said “guarantee academic freedom” but then we have this problem because we have

to say that this is a mission statement. Every other statement here applies to the campus as a whole and suddenly we have a statement that doesn't apply to the campus as a whole. So the end about thinking, might as well just say guaranteed academic freedom for faculty. Well, that's going to be applauded because now we'll have mission statement that we've now said, "this doesn't apply to the rest of you when we get to this". So we ended up with "guaranteed academic freedom and promote concepts of open discourse for others" and you end up with something that's impossibly wordy or unnecessarily confrontational. So the idea was to try to find something that will capture the notion of open discourse which is separate from academic freedom but a very important and I think treasured concept. at the same time as keeping academic freedom in a notion of not, understand that this isn't the university's policy statement on academic freedom, that came from the Trustees many years ago and is not a question. This is consistent with it but it doesn't amend it. But rather that notion that not *merely* will the institution respect the academic freedom but we will would all respect it. So that we would respect it when a colleague does something we don't like, we would hope students will respect it when a professor does something, that it's a broader concept that we're trying to give real forced to. So although I see the argument for saying taking out the word guarantee weakens it. It was the strongest way of articulating it that we could think of still kept it appropriate within the mission statement.

DALEKE: We're running short on our time available for discussions. I have Bradley, Richard and then Deidre.

LEVINSON: I just wanted to point that we have to remember of course that this is just a mission and value statement and there are other documents which this move would provide for guarantees for academic freedom especially for tenured members of the faculty and so we think about this as something which is in fact a kind of layer on top of those existing documents which didn't exist previously then. Really, even though this statement seems a bit *narrowed* down it is in fact nonetheless *bow strength* for other statements that all seems to exist to guarantee it.

DALEKE: Richard.

NASH: I think take your point Fred and I very much want to respect the deliberation your committee has done. I do want to ask, if the committee did turn this question around and ask itself and consider the possibility, how central is it to the mission of the university as a whole to explicitly guarantee academic freedom to faculty and librarians? Was that specific topic, how central is that guarantee to the mission of the university as a whole, was that under discussion and what was the wisdom of the committee?

CATE: I think it certainly was because one of the recommendations the Strategic Planning Committee made which the Long-Range Planning Committee wisely rejected was just a *leak* to stay *inbound*. We hadn't added it, why did you add it? And Michael and the Committee wisely said its far too important of a concept to just delete.

HAMBURGER: I think this was a *bullet* though it was added it was added after the initial draft from the Strategic Planning Committee. I think it was in amongst a number of discussions about items to add and which things overly encumbered the statement with too many bells and whistles. I think the group felt that this was important enough to essentially separate it into an item of it's own to highlight as an important priority.

NASH: The reason I'm asking that question is because it does seem to me as I try to imagine the mission of any university out there in the abstract that the guarantee of academic freedom to faculty and librarians does seem to me a special case that may indeed be worth knowing even given that context that you don't want to get it *passing out*, this is restrictive. It's hard for me to imagine a university adopting a mission that it does not guarantee academic freedom to faculty and librarians. That seems to me an exceptional component the more I think about this however much it may not extend to all parties involved in the working of the university as a whole. It seems to me that it is still essential to what a university is. That's what I'm particularly interested in, that little version.

HAMBURGER: I think it comes back to the same conundrum about adding wording to this statement that would restrict one item to a particular fraction of the university community might end up having a negative repercussions, negative impact on the university. I think the idea of this is that bolts to us the guarantees that already exist in the university policy and in legal doctrine that protect academic freedom for faculty and it simply highlights it as an important value of the university.

DALEKE: Deidre.

LYNCH: I have a very small suggestion that may sought of, I agree with not wanting to kind of single out faculty and librarians in a *statement* of that *respond*, permission of the university as a whole but I wondered whether the committee had considered a wording that would go something like this, "promote open discourse and defend academic freedom", which I think would kind of, the verb defend would perhaps engage what sense, that is constantly under threat and is a value with standing up for. Respect seems weaker than defend for and that's why I wanted to propose an alternative wording.

CATE: I can speak to this but obviously not on behalf of the committee that I think in the discussion it was thought that "defend" was a weaker word, that in fact the view of academic freedom on this campus is one actively promoted, it was one of teaching it so that students learn to respect it, so that the administration respects it, so that faculty respect it and not only for us as individuals but for others and therefore defending it means wait for an attack and then defend it and the notion here is one of promoting respect.

LYNCH: Yeah, I think the problem is that promote is so distant from...

CATE: Surely, it's only three words

LYNCH: No, no, in other words, I take your point about promoting but it's respect, it's the word that's closest to academic freedom obviously in its non-*substantive* form but what about reversing it then?

CATE: I feel I should defer here to the committee chair because obviously I don't speak on behalf of it.

DAVILA: It's important to refer,

DALEKE: I'm sorry someone was ahead of

DAVILA: I think it's a *fable up on ... jest* into one word. It's important to affirm academic freedom because we *know* secretly every time we get a new President or a new Chancellor or whoever wants to have fun, there's no question of tenure, it comes up because if Brehm had to defend it before the AAUP and far as back as Chancellor Byrum Carter there have been and there still are plans to consider doing away with this nuisance that is sometimes problematic for administration. In faculty affairs we have a conundrum of people, everybody wanting to be a professor even though they are just clinically associated with the university. But I think possibly affirming academic freedom *which* is just a truism as opposed to respecting it or due respects might not be and so I go along with this game of if you like, conscientious consciousness it *held* and others that are offered to us and we ought to be careful not being too forgiving about not affirming academic freedom.

DALEKE: Michael did you want to respond to that?

HAMBURGER: I don't have a good response to these except to try to preserve and defend the structure of the document. Most of these items have a single verb that applies to the seven prescriptive that followed. If there we can't afford open discourse I don't think, so I guess I don't see an obvious structure to replace.

DALEKE: Can I make a suggestion, we are running short of time, very short on time and in our previous discussions of the mission statement we had often had this type of discussion on wording and I think we came to the same conclusion on several points and that is that this statement will probably never be perfect for each of us and what we're trying to achieve here is a statement that we can all agree upon at least at some level. As Bradley mentioned, there are other places we make affirmations of our other values and as Michael and Fred have pointed this mission statement is just to highlight some of those but we can fully explain those somewhere else. Besides, I don't think we should try to let this document be everything for us but mostly to just affirm the things that we have elsewhere. Now I've skipped Kevin and Ben for a *second*, is that okay? Kevin did you want to say something because Ann wants to say something?

BRABSON: That's fine.

DALEKE: Ann.

BRISTOW: I just want to say that I agree with what you've said. I think this wording is good. In fact I think I would just like to take it to issue with the thought that this is a *whickering down*. In fact I think it's quite the reverse that when we were pretending, when we were saying, we were guaranteeing academic freedom quite a part of the legal issues. We were taking away the real meaning of that term and I view the new statement as an attempt to restore meaning.

DALEKE: Now again I would not, I don't want to cut off discussion but we have within four minutes of our mandatory agenda time. Is everyone comfortable with voting at this moment? Do you feel we can do that, unfortunately we'll probably have to squeeze Ann out of this meeting. I feel bad about that.

CATE: I'm for charging Michael and six men in *increments* for being here so I would like to discuss this.

DALEKE: If I hear no objections to that, then I'm going to bring this to a vote. So, all those in favor of the amendment to the Mission and Value Statement as presented to you in circular B26 that's 2004 signify by raising your hand. All of those opposed. The motion passes. I'm sorry abstentions. 33, 4, 2 against and 3 abstentions. Thank you very much, Michael, thank you Fred. We have Ann who we want to move into the next semester, would you be okay with that?

GELLIS: Yeah, that's fine.

DALEKE: Sorry about that delay. So Ann will bring an update on *issues to the client issues* to us next semester. We may even get that at our first meeting on January 20. I want to thank everyone for being patient and for the discussion again on the mission and value statement, I think that was very important for us to take the time to do that. Again, this is our last meeting of the semester so I hope everyone has a wonderful break and we'll see you next semester. The meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned 5:30 pm.

William Wheeler, Secretary.