

## IIAC Meeting Minutes: 19 May 2004

Convened 4:00 PM

Present: Faculty—Dennis Henry, Deborah Downs-Miers, Jonathan Smith, Tim Peterson.

Absent—Scott Moore

Ex officio—Dan Mollner, Sarah Daniels, Pat Francek, Bruce Aarsvold, Mark Braun.

Absent—JoEllen Schultz (excused); Jennifer Ringler

Guest—Chuck Niederriter, Michelle Koomen (will be Education Division Representative for 2004-05)

Chair Dennis Henry called the meeting to order at 4PM and reviewed the agenda.

The Minutes of 31 March and 21 April were approved, with the promise to change the inadvertent misspelling of JoEllen Schultz's first name in the listing of those present.

The Chair explained the chronology of elections to AOC and thence from that body to IIAC at the upcoming 20 May general faculty meeting. IIAC members were requested to wait at that meeting to elect our Chair after the AOC liaison has been chosen.

Report on Tech Summit: The Summit was not widely attended. Henry and Aarsvold discussed how to disseminate the information from the meeting. This was to have been done in Tech Directors meeting of 17 May, but that meeting did not occur. It was noted that many faculty teach at 1030, making that time not very good for a campus-wide meeting. The discussion continued regarding methods of informing the community of what has been transpiring in regard to technology developments and delivery of services. Faculty reps to IIAC could communicate via web links. Tech Directors will report via Faculty-L. There was some discussion about logistics for the next Tech Summit, as Directors plan an annual such occasion.

Strategic Plan: Sarah Daniels suggested it would be helpful to know where the priorities stand. Administrative Council has not replied to Tech Directors submission of Plan document. Pat Francek did receive \$10,000.00 for creating/upgrading smart classroom. Dan Mollner reported that the Library had received nothing. There were questions for Bruce Aarsvold as to precisely how much money was distributed and for what purposes. Aarsvold explained that we have \$40,000.00, that some of this goes to IIAC and part is for the Internet. Dennis Henry said the Administration needs to be credited for additions to Tech budget, but IIAC needs a specific breakdown of these monies. The 40K to IT seems to be given "with no strings attached." Yet IIAC is charged with responsibility for at least a portion of these funds, and this particular amount seems unrelated to the Strategic Plan. It seems to be from budget left over at the end of the AY. The question was raised if this money is part of the 50K set aside. Those who received any funding from this line need to let IIAC know the details; the \$ amount, the application and restrictions of use, etc. The committee expects to receive this information from Francek and Aarsvold. The question was also raised of whether there are any new positions which will be funded out of the IIAC budget. We learned that the publications design person will also be working on our Web materials. The Tech Directors are to meet during the summer regarding this. Aarsvold reported that there might be some cost for external security review.

Discussion of administration and overseeing of “IIAC budget.” Henry reviewed the history of this situation: Dean Mosbo says IIAC budget is an IT line. Historically, there was a dramatic change in AY 93-94: the monies IIAC oversees was given to IIAC (taken from then IT Director Dick Johnson’s budget). Steve Mellema, as Acting Director, signed off on all budget items and IIAC was very much involved in these processes.

At this point Chuck Niederriter was recognized by the Chair. He told the committee that he had come to us because he is very concerned about the state of faculty governance in regard to IIAC budget, which is completely under the control of the IT Director rather than IIAC having “ownership”. He asserted that the faculty have a perception that faculty, through this committee, supervise these expenditures. It was suggested that we look at least the past 12 years of the Faculty Handbook language in regard to IIAC in its various manifestations.

There ensued a discussion/explanation of how IIAC functions in regard to budget. There is clearly a difference of perception between the committee and IT. Aarsvold stated he does not understand why there is a question about his fall reports about spending (from late Spring through Summer in particular). Niederriter asked if it is possible to see EXACTLY what was spent. He repeated more history: Elizabeth Baer, when Dean, gave oversight to a faculty committee, the body currently known as IIAC. Niederriter asked when, how, and why did this “revert” to the Dean’s Office/IT Director? At present we do not see or know precise costs of items—we must take this on trust. Previous Chairs of IIAC believe they could have had access to the budget. Aarsvold stated this has not been the case for a decade.

As the hour had elapsed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:02 PM.

As agreed at the 21 April meeting, the voting members remained for an Executive Session.

Chair Dennis Henry rehearsed the situation: IIAC differs with the IT Director and the Dean in regard to access to the budget the committee is charged with overseeing. This is a critical governance and oversight issue, one which we have spent an entire year and many hours in addition to committee meetings trying to sort out. The Chair raised the following questions:

To what degree do we wish to inform the faculty of the current situation?

What action do we take?

Shall we insist on another review of IT, insisting that IIAC be in charge of that process? It was noted that the previous reviews had fundamental defects in design, execution, and completeness.

After discussion, the voting members determined to:

1. Request that Dean Mosbo direct the Finance Office to release to IIAC all budget matters pertaining to the committee.
2. Conduct a campus-run review of IT during AY 2004-05.

Session adjourned at 5:36PM

Deborah Downs-Miers  
Secretary