



## UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY

*Friday, February 3, 2012*

*2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.*

*316 Kent Student Center*

Attendees: Paul Albert (Educational Technology), Mark Ashmore (College of Technology), Cathy Bakes (Faculty Senate), Denise Bedford (Information Architecture & Knowledge Management), Paul Farrell (Faculty Senate), Tom Klingler (University Libraries), Jan Kover (Regional Campuses), Mike Lum (Advancement), Arden Ruttan (Chair), Rose Tran (Vice Chair), Brendan Walsh (Security & Access Management)

I. Welcome and Call to Order – Chair Ruttan called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

II. Minutes –Draft minutes from November 4, 2011, were approved with two minor corrections.

Plan Meeting Themes for Remaining Meetings - Distance learning will be the theme for March's meeting, and Federated Services (ways to use effectively for maximizing potential) will be the theme for April's meeting. A recommendation was made to invite Richard Rubin, Associate Provost; Deb Huntsman; Jeff Pellegrino; instructional designers such as Richard, Thomas, and Jason in EHSS; and Preeti Palvankar to the distance learning meeting in March.

III. Update on CommonSpot Support Model by Lin Danes – Lin Danes was not present to provide an update. Rose Tran reported that this initiative involves developing a process for departments to receive more individual training when needed for work in CommonSpot and that approval for hiring an additional staff member to assist with providing more CommonSpot training was received.

IV. Status of the UCT Web Pages by Rose Tran – The UCT Web Pages were actively displayed and reviewed. The landing page has the mission statement with menu navigation on the left to UCT historic information; membership information; council schedules, agendas, and minutes; major technology related studies; and the UCT Action Groups as well as links to the IS page, the UCT By-laws, and the Faculty and Senate Description. Membership information is current. Agendas and minutes for the current year will move to the historical page after this year.

For each action group, there will be a page which includes a description of the group's purpose, goals, committee membership, and a link to the UCT feedback form for questions, concerns or comments. The data collection page will have a drop down menu to route the message to the appropriate receiver. The basic purpose of the action groups is to move relevant issues for UCT onto the table to work on the issues. The goals and groups may expand as the committees start working on their topics.

Committee members were asked to forward any suggested additions or changes for the pages to Chair Ruttan as well as any interest in being part of an action group.

V. How Computer Security Policies are Formulated by Brendan Walsh, Manager, Security & Access Management – Opening remarks noted that this general topic is basically about policies. There is an IS policy from 2002 (last changed in 2007) for responsible use of information technology. The focus of this discussion is to consider the policy makers to determine those who make the security decisions. An investigation into this matter did not lead to much in the way of anybody outside of the IS group. The distinction for this discussion will be how policy is used in the University, not how the policy constrains, but how decisions are made within the policy. For example, consider IMAP (Internet message access protocol). Management makes certain choices to turn things on or off. Was the decision made within IS to manage the system and to disallow IMAP?

From security's perspective, whether IMAP is turned off or on does not affect security. Some issues are really policy and misrepresented as security. Often, someone wants security to say you cannot do this when it is not a security issue. However, security is not going to ban something because of security if it is not a security issue.

Availability is one of the goals for enhancement within security. For example, Banner wants to maintain confidentiality; so, availability suffers. For visiting scholars, every time there was a different set of instructions. Security is working with the Office of Global Education to put together a set of procedures to make this process work more smoothly.

Another project under way will enhance and rebuild how the data center operation works. A proxy card will be scanned to get into the building for computer access (works on proximity and then locks in). The data center is serving as the pilot group for trying out this newer technology as we ensure we are not building vulnerability. The guys who handle desktop infrastructure are working on this project; so, it could represent something that could be addressed procedure wise and spread to other areas.

One security concern noted for distance learning is the remote proctor that utilizes a 360 degree camera and powerful microphone with someone in the center watching each student. They have to know what each student looks like.

Security considerations come up a number of ways. Sometimes it is a matter of a new purchase and it's missing a firewall; so, the purchaser then involves the security office. Sometimes security is not made aware of these things. Security strives to perform proactive research but currently has several large projects in process—OCPM, 365 option (free Microsoft Exchange enhanced version in the cloud under consideration), etc.--and there is not much time available to be as proactive as security would prefer to be. Security will be replacing a position vacated in December and received approval to hire one additional staff; so, there is hope this additional staff will free up some time to be a little more proactive and for research.

Some access decisions are made by the data steward of the corresponding data. All departments have a security administrator, and they should be able to advise on access. The steward just provides you access. A lot of security administrators are chosen at the college level and not the department level. The idea is to choose someone who knows who should have access as the security administrators. For Arts & Sciences, the security administrator was chosen at the college level, James Brown, the Associate Dean, and probably not the one who should be on the list. A department level should be used for Arts & Sciences. Third party access is vital when employees are coming and going

For the UCT technology security action group, the primary goal would be to share these kinds of security concerns throughout the University. For example, a new technology is coming your way, but you do not have time to check it out. People from within the University could answer your questions, and you could trust those answers to be relatively accurate. Would this be useful to security if we have a recommendation group (not oversight group) monitoring incoming security issues and forwarding them to security? There is currently a security and architecture advisory group consisting of Brendan Walsh; the architect; the lead persons from server, network, and client infrastructure; and Jay Frye. The group's focus is to raise concerns that are more than a one-user concern. Group members share their different areas of expertise and perspective. A vendor from India performed an information security risk assessment on the IS operations, and they recommended keeping this group active and using it to its full benefit. We could expand this out and extend it to the AFS group. Chair Ruttan noted that his hope for UCT was to expand the group so that any department which wanted to get involved could join. The intent is not to criticize what is out there, but to extend it to areas lacking a security representation. Grouping together to discuss these security matters will work with security.

Regarding the action group web pages, suggestions were made to consider substituting another term for "concerns" in the action group name because of the negative connotation associated with concern, maybe use communications instead, and to consider substituting the secondary goal of "minimizing the inconvenience," with "maximizing the convenience."

Initial members for the Technology Security Concerns action group will be Chair Ruttan, Brendan Walsh, and Cathy Bakes. In addition, there are a lot of very talented system administrators, and it was recommended that one of them be included in the group.

VI. New Business – Prioritizing and Acting on the Current UCT Priorities – The floor was opened up for input on anything UCT is not currently working on that should be brought up (only three remaining UCT meetings). Suggestions were made that the last UCT meetings should include reviews of the three topics the action groups are working on and that in April or May, the UCT should discuss a projection of what will be done over the summer.

VII. Member Concerns –

- A. Google Security Policy - Jan Kover inquired if the Google security policy change affects students or adjuncts in any way. Security responded that the change should not affect students or adjuncts. Google acquired a number of security policies, and they are implementing an overarching policy and applying it across the board as a matter of standardization.
- B. Social Media Use Policy – Denise Bedford inquired if there is a policy addressing social media use. Their program is practitioner-based, and they will be creating an open participation group on a social media in May. The administration policy on web publishing governs the use of logos, etc. Paul Albert suggested discussing the site with Lin Danes if it will be a public site (outside the University) and added that Ben has some experience with regard to a conference that he sends out across the nation.

Chair Ruttan also noted that he wants to reach out to schools, etc. and was thinking about offering the chance to use the server (virtual machines). Does this present issues regarding university policy? Security responded that the closest related policy has the basic premise of disallowing university equipment use for private or personal gain. However, some licenses are based on FTEs; so, if the initiative takes off, it could cause licensed users concerns.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.  
Minutes submitted by Debbie Dobrilovic