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UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 11, 2002 – 2:00-3:00 p.m. in St. Mary’s 113B

PRESIDING: Brian Conniff

SENATORS PRESENT: Conniff, Dandaneau, Gauder, Hallinan, Morel, Mormon, Pedrotti, Sharma


2. Roll Call: Eight of twelve members were present.

3. Approval of ECAS Minutes for October 4, 2002: The October 4, 2002 minutes were approved.

4. Announcements: B. Conniff met with T. Skill to discuss the “Policy on Fair, Responsible and Acceptable Use of Electronic Resources”. They will work together to incorporate the Senate’s recommendations from the fall of 200 into the May, 2000 draft of the document. T. Skill, H. Gerla, and B. Conniff will try to reduce the scope of the document, partly by reference to existing policies.

4. Dial-in Networking: T. Danford was invited to the ECAS meeting to discuss the “dial-in networking” situation on campus. The issues on the table are the costs of maintaining or not maintaining the modem pool and informing the faculty of the relevant issues.

T. Danford brought costing information for the committee to review. The main issues/crisis are:

- Age of the system and its maintainability (should it be “junked” and/or replaced?)
- The greater percentage of the modems are analog (the modems work in a progressive series; if one modem goes down, it can not progress to the next modem, stopping the process.)
- The maximum speed of these modems is 33.6k.
- At the end of life for these systems, the manufacturer will no longer support them.

It will take $40,000 to correct the problems and then there will be on-going costs. There is no money now budgeted to put into the existing modem pool.

As it stands now, the plan is to pull the analog modems at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The existing digital modem has a maintenance contract and the company will maintain it until 2006. That maintenance agreement will cost $4,700/year. With the current system, the yearly cost is $112,760. It is proposed that keeping 96 circuits open
in the digital system will reduce costs to $45,945. Currently, the cost of the dial-in service is taken out of the UDit funding. There is no charge to anyone on campus.

Use of the dial-in networking system is decreasing. People are moving towards high-speed access. UDit has talked with Broadwing, Cincinnati Bell, and Ameritech to see if they would be interested in having UD as a customer. They are not interested because there wouldn’t be enough business generated. The long-term solution is to find fast access. It is always a question if UD will be able to subsidize the faculty for their dial-in expenses.

T. Danford also distributed a chart compiled by Notre Dame that shows how much other schools spend in their budgets on institutional IT for their students. It was asked how this chart was devised. Where did the information come from? For instance, why is Georgetown’s budget per student quite a bit more than UD’s. A speculative answer might be that Georgetown’s costs for IT spending is centralized where UD’s is fragmented across campus. The College and Schools also spend IT money out of their own discretionary funds.

It was mentioned that T. Rizvi is preparing an announcement that will explain to the faculty what the process will be in shutting down the analog system, clarify the timetable, and address the misconceptions that have arisen. A notice should also be sent to the chairs of departments to advise them of the situation, too. T. Danford will share T. Rizvi’s notice with ECAS when it is available.

5. Guidelines for Presidential Searches/Presidential Transition: B. Conniff distributed the portion of the Academic Senate’s Constitution (Section 3, point g.) that explains the “consultation” function of the senate in the “selection, review and retention of the President and Vice Presidents”. B. Conniff e-mailed D. Curran asking for his advice on two issues:
   1. Should/could/ and how would we draft guidelines for the next presidential search;
   2. What kind of faculty representation with the Board of Trustees is necessary?

Before the ECAS starts to draft guidelines, they would like to wait for D. Curran’s responses.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by J. Rogatto