

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

4-4-2013

Consultative minutes 04/04/2013

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 04/04/2013" (2013). *Consultative Committee*. 39.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/39>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consultative Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Consultative Committee
Moccasin Flower Room
April 4, 2013
9-10 am

Committee members present: Co-chairs Brook Miller and LeAnn Dean; Jim Hall, Nancy Helsper, Joey Daniewicz, Molly Donovan, Bonnie Tipcke, Jim Barbour, Chad Braegelmann, Zac Van Cleve, Heather Waye.

Updates:

RAR, which both Brook and Jim Hall were involved with is finished. Jacquie will be distributing a summary shortly. They asked if there were any questions. Nancy asked if they ended up putting the groups into the original three categories. They responded by saying the language didn't exactly fit. Instead they moved the lowest scoring programs into a category called "further investigation" and also added a "review again" category.

Minutes:

First up were the minutes from Feb. 21st. Jim Hall moved to approve. Heather seconded and it passed unanimously. Next up were the minutes from Feb 28th. Joey motioned to approve. Nancy seconded and it passed unanimously.

Active Directory:

Jim Hall provided us with a short dialogue about active directory. He was seeking an endorsement of the program with consultative. His first point was to simply describe the function of AD. People tend to look at AD as big brother, but in reality it's nothing like that. Instead it is a program that provides a single login for all U of M programs, and increases cyber security for the U of M system. It also provides access to a "h" or home drive and a "s" or shared drive which can be accessed on all computers running our version of access directory. The h drive is for personal data and is only available to the individual. The S drive is shared along logical lines such as within departments.

Next he discussed the future of active directory. The goal is to provide all individuals with the ability to remotely update software. This is because out of date programs tend to cause security risks, and because remote updates allow for more remote help. For example you can give the help desk person the ability to access your screen remotely (only with your explicit permission), which allows them to solve problems that would otherwise be very difficult for them to help with. Eventually the board of regents wants the whole U of M system on AD but for now they are prioritizing staff and faculty.

Next we went through a series of questions and answers.

Q1: What if I want to download a new piece of software?

A1: Not a problem. AD doesn't affect individual downloads or installations.

Q2: Is there any basis to the big brother concerns?

A2: People are protective to their systems. When people talk to their friends who work in industry rather than a university setting they hear stories of active directory in another way. Higher education will never use AD in this way though.

Q3: Are there any problems with third party programs such as Google drive?

A3: No problems with google drive or net flies. Other programs are not sanctioned but are definitely not banned and will not be affected.

Q4: Will AD serve as a backup?

A4: Definitely. H and S storage is done at the TC on a massively redundant storage system which is saved in two separate places. Very easily recoverable. Also provides the "oops" recovery where people incidentally lose data. AD can generally restore data to a point where it automatically saved the current work. This process happens several times a day. It's very well backed up.

Q5: Are you ever able to totally delete something?

A5: It's very hard to accidentally delete something but if you want it gone it's fairly simple.

Q6: Any progress with running compass and not being able to update Java?

A6: U of M is coming out with a replacement program so no. They have created a group that would not get java updates until that time because otherwise it interferes with Compass. The vulnerability of old java remains however so they are looking to rectify this asap.

Q7: Have you done a fact sheet?

A7: No but it definitely could be done.

Q8: Would you have the authority to use the big brother functions of AD?

A8: We wouldn't want to. The people running AD only have the ability to perform certain functions. Computing services is not interested in monitoring other people's work.

Q9: If regents are requiring it what's the point of CC endorsing this process?

A9: It would help with the transition process. Even though it's required there is still some push-back. This will show it's reviewed by the governance process.

Joey moved to endorse with the following language: "Consultative has discussed and reviewed active directory and endorses moving forward with rolling the program out." Seconded by Jim Hall and passed unanimously.

Workplace Bullying/Negative Environment

Consultative committee reiterated its desire to meet with Jacquie and Sarah to discover what's next. Brook and LeAnn created a memo to articulate that desire. Below are the revisions suggested by the committee.

1. Add in 3rd paragraph "are there fears of retaliation if one reports?"
2. Paragraph 6 line 2. "Sarah provided information about interpreting conflicts between employees." Nancy thought it was broader than that. Change to just conflicts-- strike "between employees."
3. Should points 4&8 be at the top to establish 1-3 are necessary? Yes.
4. Change to bullets to avoid prioritizing.
5. Change 10 to "any instances."
6. Consultative not wanting to be responsible about collecting data? Nancy sees a role for Consultative in initiating a campus conversation about this issue. Jim Hall thinks a smaller task force would be better. Questions about who would select the task force arose.
7. LeAnn pointed out that Consultative is supposed to be a forum for people to come to. . Nancy though HR might be a more appropriate office. LeAnn thinks Consultative has a role in addressing these issues. Bonnie thinks it should be an independent organization not HR. Molly suggested representatives from Faculty/PNA affairs. Nancy thinks we could just recommend this be done and we don't have to decide who does it.
8. "Seek to explore" or just "explore?" (strike "ask Consultative to do a report exploring") and replace with just "explore"
9. We are trying to take a snapshot of the atmosphere today.
10. Not removing the possibility of Consultative taking on this task, just not guaranteeing it will be us.
11. Brook wants to make sure all parties are included. Should we add a sentence to make that clear?
 - a. In our discussion we have mentioned that some groups are treated unequally.
12. LeAnn thinks we should expand the word employees to faculty, staff, and students. Heather suggests we should clarify what employee means. Molly suggests changing the language to "UMM community" and then clarifying that to mean staff, faculty, and students, as well as guests.
13. The way staff and faculty interact provides a lesson for students in work place civility.
14. Change title to "Civility concerns and ideas at UMM" – striking employee and bullying. Nancy suggests using "Civility/Incivility."

Respectfully submitted,

Zac Van Cleve