

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

**November 29, 2012
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Austin Hall**

Members present:

Nancy Baker (H&SS); Tracy Bilsing (H&SS); Kevin Clifton (FA&MC); Tom Cox (H&SS); James Crosby (H&SS); Mark Frank (COBA); Randall Garner (CJ); Richard Henriksen (COE); Joan Hudson (COS); C. Renée James (COS); Bill Jasper (COS); Gerald Kohers (COBA); Hayoung Lim (FA&MC); Dennis Longmire (CJ); Sheryl Murphy-Manley (FA&MC); Joyce McCauley (COE); Lisa Shen (NGL); Tracy Steele (H&SS); Stacy Ulbig (H&SS); Walton Watkins (FA&MC); Ricky White (COS); Pam Zelbst (COBA)

Members not present:

Helen Berg (COE); Don Bumpass (COBA); Donna Cox (COE); Diane Dowdey (H&SS); Debbi Hatton (H&SS); Paul Loeffler (COS); Dwayne Pavelock (COS); Debra Price (COE); Doug Ullrich (COS);

Visitor: John Pascarella, Dean COS

Called to order: 3:30 p.m. in Austin Hall by Chair Tracy Steele

Approval of Minutes: Approval of November 1 minutes was deferred until next meeting, pending edits.

Special Guest: David Hammonds, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Risk Management

David Hammonds visited Faculty Senate to discuss Affirmative Action and the issue of a hostile work environment.

In short, Affirmative Action is a group of federal regulations requiring an employer to provide every possible opportunity to protected classes (e.g., minorities, women, certain age groups, etc) in order to, for example, gain employment. Numbers are tracked on SHSU employees (both faculty + staff) and progress reports are presented annually.

In addition to AA, there is a federal requirement for pay equity between male/female workers. A study will be conducted to determine whether any pay disparity exists at SHSU, a study which has apparently never been conducted in the history of SHSU. If a disparity exists, the next steps will be to determine where the inequities lie and what would be the best way to address them.

Senators asked Mr. Hammonds whether there is a plan to address underrepresented groups, particularly in faculty positions. Mr. Hammonds indicated that if we can improve the diversity of our applicants, in time the employee base will diversify. It is particularly difficult to get diversity in many faculty positions, given the current academic climate. He also emphasized that AA rules do not consider international applicants a protected class (this is a group that is covered under Equal Employment Opportunity). Senators indicated that diversifying our applicant pool can be done by wider advertising, but this strategy requires money – sometimes considerable – that departments simply don't have when it comes to advertising positions. Unfortunately, even in staff positions – where the requirement is typically only a BA – SHSU still has difficulty achieving any level of diversity.

Senate was also interested in gathering data on relative promotion rates for minorities and relative rates of tenure and promotion for men and women.

With respect to the issue of a hostile work environment, Mr. Hammonds assured Senate that complaints of a hostile work environment are investigated seriously. He did indicate that a majority of the time the problem is not so much a hostile work environment but a personality conflict. There seems to be no consistent level of hostile work environment complaints. Additionally, staff generate approximately 85% of the complaints, versus 15% from faculty.

When a complaint is received, the first step is to allow the employee to express his/her concerns. If there is any discomfort talking to a particular HR member, another one can be requested. After the initial session, Mr. Hammonds proceeds on a case-by-case basis, with a concerted effort to work the situation out with the supervisor.

Should an SHSU employee feel discriminated against, there is a time limit to file a formal grievance (14 days from the date of the incident of discrimination). However, there is no time limit to reporting an act of discrimination. Typically Mr. Hammonds is the first point of contact should someone feel he/she is a victim of discrimination.

Mr. Hammonds then handed out Finance and Operations Human Resources Policy ER-4 (Affirmative Action Plan) and Finance and Operations Human Resources Policy ER-7 (Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, and Equal Employment Opportunity [EEO]), which can be found here:
http://www.shsu.edu/intranet/policies/finop/human_resources/documents/ER-4.pdf
http://www.shsu.edu/intranet/policies/finop/human_resources/documents/ER-7.pdf

Chair's Report:

A. HEAF Funds:

Both Senators Anthony Watkins and Debbi Hatton had indicated that there was great concern in their departments about the reduction in HEAF money. We were unable to get to this key issue when we met in Senate on November 1, but during the November 2 meeting, the Provost said that many departments had been using HEAF money for basic operating expenses, which was not the appropriate use of these funds. Finance VP Hooten had determined last year which departments were using HEAF money correctly (such for the purchase of computers or equipment) and how much they needed. HEAF money was distributed this year based what was determined to be the department's need (they realize that they may not have gotten this right and are willing to address those departments who received too little). To cover the loss of operating expenses for departments, VP Hooten is making one-time payments to departments. In future budgets, these costs will be paid by slowly increasing O&M allotments. So, each department should receive supplementary money to replace lost HEAF money, but it has not all been "pushed out" or allotted yet. A sizeable amount of the HEAF money went to IT to cover the cost of computers. Colleges may submit their request for computer-related equipment through Mark Adams and IT to access that HEAF money. In fact, the Provost said, that even more money should be available than under the old system of distributing HEAF money. The Provost indicated that he wants all money spent, but he wants it spent wisely.

According to the Provost, departments that need more money need only to ask for it. For example, if you have broken equipment that needs to be replaced quickly, it needs to be reported to the department chair.

The chair needs to request funds from the Dean who should in turn request funds from the Provost. Money is available, but there is a need for improving communication. \$800,000 was left in College budgets in August for faculty positions. Previously, college Deans used those lines to cover their budgets

since several colleges were underfunded and summer school was not funded at all. Now, everything has been funded adequately and the idea is that Colleges can and should return that money to the Provost who intends to use it for large one-ticket, one-time purchases (one-time since it cannot be guaranteed that next year \$800,000 will be left from this budget line). The Provost has expressed his desire to spend it all (rather than return it to the President), but he wants it spent wisely (not just to be used rather than lost such as buying a new sofa). If a Department Chair feels that the issue needs the attention of the Provost directly, he or she should go to the Provost and talk. The intent is not to “starve” departments of funds but to stop spending HEAF in an un-prioritized, inappropriate manner.

B. Permanent Representative to the Texas Council of Faculty Senates (TCFS) and Budget Increase:

I provided a copy of my Chair’s Report (Nov. 1) and went over highlights that underlined our need to have a permanent TCFS representative. Senator Paul Loeffler was the one who suggested that we may need such a position in order to increase our presence in TCFS. It was noted that we hoped this would increase the likelihood of having an SHSU representative elected to State office (there are four positions that will be open next spring and Senate should probably actively address this). The Provost was very much in favor of having a continuous presence at TCFS. He immediately increased our budget to facilitate this move, with assurance more could be arranged so that the elected could attend public Coordinating Board meetings. The Provost would like SHSU and the Senate to have as much representation at key events in Austin as possible. The spring meeting of the TCFS will not be held at the same time as the Coordinating Board’s meeting, so we might want our “permanent” representative to be present at those meetings. We now have the budget for our new “permanent” representative to attend the next meeting on March 1-2, 2013, as well as to represent SHSU at the next Coordinating Board meeting in Austin that will be held in January of 2013.

C. SHSU General Financial Situation:

The Provost reported that funding from the State had been cut by 4% in recent years. In addition, Hazlewood and other legacy programs are costing the university 4% of its budget. Despite this, SHSU is holding its own. An extra \$2 million (from budget rationalization and increased tuition) had been added to the Academic Affairs Budget. This money has been used for increased O&M, new positions, new initiatives, shifted HEAF allotments, and raises. If SHSU is reimbursed for its Hazlewood outlay and Hazlewood is funded in future, SHSU stands to gain \$15 to \$20 million.

On the subject of internal grants the Provost said that, in fact, none of the internal grants or Faculty Development Leaves has ever had its own line in the budget. Money to cover the costs of these grants has always just been “found.” These items will be funded in future and the Provost hopes that this will help to not only stabilize a set amount to fund these grants but also to make it easier to raise permanently the money set aside for them in future.

Summer School is now funded in the budget. Vice President Hooten has added 4.9% to the summer budget, reflecting the increase in enrollment for Fall 2012.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Mark Frank unanimously elected to be the ‘standing’ representative to the TCFS meetings. The Committee on Committees was charged with drawing up specific guidelines, duties, and limitations of the position.

Huntsville Economic Study meeting – In one of several focus groups, faculty living both in Huntsville and outside of Huntsville discussed what the city of Huntsville could do to attract more faculty. It was unanimously agreed that Huntsville schools need improvement, but senators felt that there was little discussion about viable solutions to this problem. Instead more discussion focused on issues of cosmetics and beautification. One senator suggested that a major underlying issue is the lack of addressing of racial

inequality in Huntsville, something that will continue to be an issue. Senators were reminded that this was only one of several meetings that the City of Huntsville is hosting in order to gather information and find out which projects are most supported/supportable, etc.

It was mentioned that there is funding to send a senator or two to the upcoming IDEA ‘training of trainers’ session in San Antonio in early February. This is something that will be revisited.

The perennial issue of the late drop date was discussed. The reality seems to be that the late drop date serves to save administrators’ time, but in return it takes up the time of the professors. One rationale to have the drop date be the last class day is to help students succeed when they retake a class, the logic of which was discussed vigorously. An additional concern is that if the drop deadline is too early in the semester, students might use up their drops too early in their academic careers and adversely affect later years. Again, though, if one of our missions is to teach personal responsibility, it would seem that effective academic planning would be preferable. The University Affairs committee was given the task of exploring the drop date issue.

CORE Report: Debbi Hatton – no updates.

Committee Reports:

1. Academic Affairs Committee [see attached report on recommendations for IDEA representative visit]. When the AA Committee met with Dean Mitchell Muesham, there was concern that Senate was requesting two identical sessions for faculty members and no sessions addressing such issues like using IDEA for accreditation (e.g., SACS). The committee asked whether it is possible for IDEA to come for a 2-day visit so that they may address both faculty issues and administrator issues.

Online courses: [see attached for the full report on online offerings]. For online courses, there is a \$300 fee paid by the students to cover course development, scholarships, graduate assistantships, and other things that assist in the creation and implementation of an online course. Senators questioned why students would continue paying such a high fee, but the overall feeling was that if they wanted to pay this known fee, that was the prerogative of the students.

2. Faculty Affairs Committee

This committee is looking into adjunct pay and status. One issue revolves around the possibility of “resurrecting” the title of lecturer for full-time adjuncts. Senate did not know what the specific rights of adjunct faculty were, nor whether there was a formal body of adjuncts with whom issues could be discussed. These questions will be explored.

Faculty Affairs has been conducting a survey on teaching compensation practices, the results of which will be brought up in a future Senate meeting.

Finally, the Faculty Affairs Committee reported on privacy issues with the email server [see attached]. The upshot of their findings is that SHSU (or individuals with access to a given email account) can wipe emails from mobile device by following directions within the , which would be nice if phone/iPad were stolen.

3. Committee on Committees

The committee preference email has been sent out to all faculty members. All faculty members interested in running for Faculty Senate should check the appropriate box.

Old Business:

Report on “visioning” meeting (Loeffler, Frank, or Murphy-Manley). The day-long session seemed more to focus on small sound bites and advertising points rather than plans to increase academic excellence. The impression from the meeting was that academic affairs is not the focus of the “visioning” process.

Upcoming Scheduled Visitors:

Norma O’Bannon, Travel; Marsha Harman (PACE) on Dec. 6

Mark Adams, Vice President for Information Technology, on Jan. 24

Next Senate Meeting: December 6, 2012 in Austin Hall

Adjournment: 5:02 pm

Academic Affairs Committee Report

Sam Houston State University

Submitted by Sheryl Murphy-Manley, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee
November 29, 2012

Members: Sheryl Murphy-Manley (CFAMC), Kevin Clifton (CFAMC), William Jasper (COS), Paul Loeffler (COS), Rick White (COS), James Crosby (CHSS), Doug Ullrich (COS)

I. The IDEA Visit, Spring 2013

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the following agenda be adopted for the IDEA visit to take place in the spring 2013 semester. To maximize faculty participation, we envision a morning session and an afternoon session that are identical. The Faculty Senate plans to distribute this schedule to the SHSU faculty ahead of time so that they will be afforded the opportunity to make plans to attend some or all of the sessions. The faculty would like identical sessions of the following:

1 Hour

We would like to begin each session (morning and afternoon) with Dr. Shelley Chapman's No. 2 option. She outlined the contents in her email as such:

Using IDEA scores within a Faculty Evaluation System (1hour) Audience: Anyone interested in how IDEA data can be used within a system of Faculty Evaluation (for promotion, reappointment, merit pay, tenure, adjunct selection, etc.)

- Conditions for the good use of IDEA within a broader system of evaluation of faculty
- What the reports provide in terms of summative data
- Criterion-referenced and Norm-referenced scores
- Examples of how data can be used
- Examples of other sources of evidence that could be used with IDEA

1.25 hours

1. Discuss recommended ways to use IDEA on a campus like SHSU. Specifically, how should each individual rating, instructor's score, discipline score, and institutional score, be interpreted? Which score is more important: discipline or institution? How does an administrator decide to use a raw or adjusted score? Which score, raw or adjusted, is more applicable to SHSU?

2. Tell us about our comparative groups of schools, program by program, including, but not limited to:

- a. How many schools are using IDEA currently?
- b. How many schools have discontinued using IDEA?
- c. In developing an adjusted score for a particular course, how can a faculty member gain access to the following information: which specific course, by course number, at our comparative schools were used in adjusting his or her score?
- d. Given the statistics on our evaluations for one course of ours, which courses are you using for comparison? For example, are courses for majors and non-

- majors being equated? Are freshmen courses being compared to sophomore courses? How are comparative courses selected and which corporate officer in your company is responsible for the selection?
- e. In the comparative courses, are on-ground classes segregated from online classes?
 - f. We would like to see the standard error of measure addressed.
3. Discuss recommended ways to use IDEA in courses like ours which include a wide variety of subject matter, sizes ranging from 1 to 100s of students, and include both on-ground and on-line teaching. If possible, please provide us with names of other universities where IDEA is being used as you intended. We would appreciate any contact information that may be available as well.
- a. We would like to hear discussion concerning discipline-specific items on the IDEA form. (Note: There seems to be a consensus among those teaching in the arts that the form doesn't really address in a very nimble way the content we teach and the ways we teach that content. We are interested in having some guidance on how to formulate questions that would give us more useful information about the effectiveness of our teachers in delivering the kinds of skills and sensibilities that we want to cultivate in an arts curriculum.)
4. As discussed in your previous visit, can you provide an update concerning your progress on an assessment tool for online instruction? If your online assessment tool is available, can you provide recommended ways to use it for online teaching? We also would like specific recommendations from IDEA on the validity of assessing teaching effectiveness in online courses.
5. What do you consider inappropriate uses of IDEA?

1.25 Hours

1. Describe the services and support that you provide for chairs, as outlined on your webpage below, and/or in additional venues.
<http://www.theideacenter.org/services/department-chairs>
2. Discuss recommended ways to use the IDEA system for faculty development in teaching, and for other formative purposes beyond evaluation.
3. What other types of measures will work well with your system in an aggregate assessment of teaching effectiveness in addition to IDEA? (Assessing an activity (learning or teaching) with only one assessment tool can be frowned upon in many fields of study.) Can you indicate how your IDEA system's measurement of teaching can work within an overall model of assessment? What other assessment tools are being used by our partner schools concurrently with your system?
4. Some faculty have voiced concerns that your system of scoring, and SHSU's use of those scores, incentivizes faculty to strive for higher scores, resulting in attempting to

make courses less rigorous in order to raise their scores. What suggestions have you given to other schools using your system concerning this issue?

5. How has IDEA evolved over time, and how has your research changed your methodology for calculating adjusted scores? Have you considered various published research, which questions the validity of student evaluations, in both on-ground and online courses?¹ What reliability and validity studies have been completed using IDEA for online evaluations?

6. What are the weaknesses of your system, and what steps are you taking to improve those issues?

30 minutes

Session for Faculty to ask IDEA questions

II. Online Courses

The committee met with Bill Angrove on October 30, 2012, and discussed the following issues. His replies are included in the following report.

1. The amount of courses that are being developed or placed online is driven by the Deans, the Provost, and the President. Distance Learning is primarily a support and service organization, and does not seek to create online courses on its own. Likewise, they do not market online programs or instigate online course development unless asked to by the Deans, Chairs, or a faculty member.
 - ♦ For instance, Criminal Justice is in the process of marketing their online program, while the MBA program fills up regularly, having to turn away students, and is not in the process of marketing their program.
2. About 14% of all student credit hours (graduate and undergraduate combined) are generated from online courses.
3. At the last report for the fall 2012 semester, Dr. Angrove saw about 2500 students who appeared to be fully online. However, these students aren't necessarily enrolled in a program at SHSU and could merely be taking a course or two for a program at a different University. It is difficult to measure this number, and the enrollment is fluid.
4. Presently, of the 91 courses in the core, 34 are online (these are courses, not classes/sections). SHSU is almost in a position to enable a student to take the core 100% online; we are at about 95%. 37% of the entire core is

¹Many articles address this issue of validity. Here are three selections.

<http://www.vccaedu.org/inquiry/inquiry-fall97/i12-adam.html> ;

<http://psych.fullerton.edu/mbirnbaum/faculty3.htm> ; Anthony G. Greenwald, "Validity Concerns and Usefulness of Student Ratings of Instructors," *American Psychologist*, November 1997;

online (courses, not classes). [Note: A different core will be in place beginning fall 2014.]

5. This year saw a reduction in percentage of growth of online courses, down to 30% growth from 50% growth last year. This figure is expected to rise next year, with the current development of 29 online courses in CHSS.
6. Percentages of Courses online:
 - ♦ About 12% of lower division courses are online courses.
 - ♦ About 11% of upper division courses are online courses.
 - ♦ About 30% of graduate courses are online courses.
7. All issues concerning credit toward faculty workload and compensation decisions are the responsibilities of the departments and colleges. Distance Learning doesn't deal with these issues.
8. The Distance Learning fees originally were split (2009-2011) 50% to the colleges and 50% to Distance Learning. This year (2012) it was changed to 55% to the colleges, 10% to the Provost's office, and 35% to Distance Learning.
9. Concerning Hybrid Courses: The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board identifies a hybrid course as follows, "A hybrid/blended course is defined as a course in which a majority (more than 50 percent but less than 85 percent), of the planned instruction occurs when the students and instructor(s) are not in the same place." [A course totaling 85% or more divided time is designated as an online course.]
 - ♦ SHSU does not have a system yet to identify hybrid courses.
 - ♦ Distance Learning is currently working on a system to use within Banner that will allow this hybrid designation. They plan to implement this designation beginning in the fall of 2013.
 - ♦ Distance Learning has been authorized to charge a fee for the hybrid courses that will total one third of the online fee (so, about \$100). Dr. Angrove said that he does not have to collect the fee, but he has been given the authority to if so desired. This might be something that the Faculty Senate would like to discuss.
10. Dr. Angrove pointed out that while the quality and rigor of online courses is strictly the responsibility of the faculty, departments, and colleges, his office offers workshops and training sessions that facilitate sharing of best practices and suggestions for online teaching. He is in the process of developing a pedagogical workshop for the spring.
 - ♦ The Distance Learning office has the ability through *Tegrity* to help monitor assessment for online courses. They even have the ability to involve a third party proctor if needed.
 - ♦ Interactive TV is also available when needing to show a lecture in two or more places at once. For instance, if student numbers are needed

to make a class meet, the faculty member can broadcast the lecture/class via I-TV to another location where the other students are located.

11. “Barnes and Noble” and “Course Smart” have building blocks within Blackboard that enable 60% discounted purchases of E-books and other materials that enhance learning in the online environment.
12. Pearson Labs (“My Labs”) are also available for a variety of subjects.
13. Distance Learning and Enrollment Management have formed a taskforce to optimize the University’s website making the process for potential online students more efficient when they want to move through the application process online.
14. The following is an estimate of the number of courses online in each department:
 - ♦ **College of Business Administration:**
 - Accounting: Undergraduate (4); Graduate (3)
 - Economics & International Business: Undergraduate (7); Graduate (3)
 - General Business & Finance: Undergraduate (7); Graduate (9)
 - Management & Marketing: Undergraduate (5); Graduate (13)
 - ♦ **College of Criminal Justice:**
 - Undergraduate (30); Graduate (18)
 - ♦ **College of Education**
 - Curriculum and Instruction: Graduate (15)
 - Educational Leadership and Counseling: Undergraduate (1); Graduate (57)
 - Health and Kinesiology: Undergraduate (8); Graduate (7)
 - Language/Literacy/Special Populations: Undergraduate (18); Graduate (31)
 - Library Science: Graduate (17)
 - ♦ **College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication**
 - Art: Undergraduate (6)
 - Mass Communication: Undergraduate (13)
 - Music: Undergraduate (4); Graduate (11)
 - Theatre and Dance: Undergraduate (4)
 - ♦ **College of Humanities and Social Sciences**
 - Communication Studies: Undergraduate (9); Graduate (2)
 - English: Undergraduate (4); Graduate (1)
 - Family & Consumer Sciences: Undergraduate (4); Graduate (4)

- Foreign Languages: Undergraduate (18); Graduate (6)
- History: Undergraduate (13); Graduate (40)
- Political Science: Undergraduate (6); Graduate (10)
- Psychology & Philosophy: Undergraduate (9)
- Sociology: Undergraduate (14); Graduate (17)

- ♦ **College of Sciences**

- Agricultural & Industrial Sciences: Undergraduate (14); Graduate (3)
- Biological Science: Undergraduate (7)
- Computer Science: Undergraduate (1); Graduate (20)
- Geography-Geology: Undergraduate (12); Graduate (5)
- Physics: Undergraduate (3)

15. The following degrees can be earned completely online through SHSU:

- ♦ Criminal Justice, BS
- ♦ Business Administration, MBA
- ♦ Business Administration, Executive MBA
- ♦ Criminal Justice, M.S.
- ♦ Criminal Justice Leadership and Management, M.S.
- ♦ Curriculum and Instruction, M.A.
- ♦ Curriculum and Instruction, M.Ed.
- ♦ Curriculum and Instruction, M.Ed. w/ Certification
- ♦ Digital Forensics, M.S.
- ♦ School Counseling, M.Ed. (requires face-to-face visits)
- ♦ Education Administration, M.Ed.
- ♦ Higher Education Administration, M.A.
- ♦ Family and Consumer Science, M.S.
- ♦ History, M.A.
- ♦ Information Assurance and Security, M.S.
- ♦ Instructional Leadership, M.A. or M.Ed.
- ♦ Instructional Technology, M.Ed.
- ♦ International Literacy, M.Ed.
- ♦ Library Science, M.L.S.
- ♦ Public Administration, M.P.A.
- ♦ Reading, M.Ed.
- ♦ Sociology, M.A.
- ♦ Teacher Certification - Alternative Route
- ♦ Developmental Education Administration, Ed. D.
- ♦ Criminal Justice Leadership and Management for Military Police, M.S.
(for members of the U.S. Military only)
- ♦ 13 Graduate Certificates and 8 Professional Certificates (see SHSU
Online Website for list: http://www.shsu.edu/~dl_www/)

III. Graduate Student Support and Low-Producing Programs

We have received no replies from the Coordinating Board concerning our questions posed to it in October 2012. We are planning to ask Kandi Tayebi to a committee meeting in the spring to further investigate the current situation of both issues.

Faculty Affairs Committee Report

Report on Privacy Issues with the Email Server.

November 29, 2012

Overview of the Issue:

The Faculty Affairs committee was assigned the following question to investigate: “Can IT@SAM delete all content from faculty mobile devices that are synced to the new exchange server?” The committee has found this statement to be true. Any mobile device that is setup to sync with the email server at SHSU can be cleared of all its data remotely with or without that user’s permission or knowledge. This is true for all mobile devices, including iPhone, Android, and Windows devices.¹

SHSU Remote Wipe Policy:

- From a web browser, connect to www.shsu.edu and select E-mail from the main page. Enter your log-in credentials. This brings you to your main inbox menu. Select the “options” drop-down menu in the upper right-hand corner of the page, and from this menu select the “see all options...” choice. This brings you to an account management page. From the menu column on the left-hand-side of the page, select the “phone” option. From here, select “mobile phones” from the three title choice options (voice mail, mobile phones, and text messaging).

From here, you will notice a list of all your smart devices (phones and tablets) that are setup to access email (sync) from the SHSU exchange server. Notice the “wipe device” option on this page – if selected, this option will delete all information from a selected device. Without a backup of this information, there would be no recovery; all emails, photos, text messages, contacts, calendar appointments, downloaded apps, etc. would be deleted.

This is a powerful function that one might want to use if their device had been stolen. However, the exchange server grants this ability to “wipe” a device to the server administrators as part of its Microsoft Exchange ActiveSync protocol.²

- In correspondence with Katherine Davis of IT@SAM, the committee has been reassured that “IT@SAM will not without the devices owner’s permission/knowledge wipe a personal device.”

Recommendation:

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends greater disclosure by IT@SAM of the remote wipe function. Beyond that, the committee recommends that faculty be cautious with the devices they allow to sync to the SHSU email server.³

¹ While Android-based devices notify users of this functionality, iPhone/Windows devices do not.

² One alternative would be for a user to setup email with the IMAP Secure protocol instead of the Microsoft Exchange ActiveSync. Reportedly, the exchange server will support this protocol, though it is less convenient and less powerful.

³ For example, it might make sense to allow one’s university-issued iPad sync to the SHSU exchange server, but not one’s personal phone.