University Council on Technology

Meeting Minutes
Friday, October 12, 2012
2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
304 Kent Student Center

Call to order

Chair Arden Ruttan called to order the regular meeting of the University Council on Technology at 2:
04p.m. on September 14, 2012, in 307 Kent Student Center (room changed).

Roll call

The following persons were present: Arden Ruttan (Chair), Paul Albert (IS), Jason Piatt (EHHS), Sean
Melnik (Ashtabula), Mark Ashmore (CAEST), J.P. Cooney (Graduate Studies), Koon Hwee Kan (School
of Art), Rick Schroath (College of Business Adm.), Denise Seachrist (Provost's Designee), Gina Campana
(DDEI), Denise Bedford (Remote Visitor), Jason Wearley – Guest (Executive Director of Infrastructure
and Division Architect)

Approval of minutes from last meeting

Due to the length of the minutes they will be shortened by Arden Ruttan, Chair and presented for approval at the
next meeting.

Open issues

1. Discussion of Security Sweep
    Guest speaker: Jason Wearley, Executive Director of Infrastructure and Division Architect Sitting in for
    Brendan Walsh, Mgr, Security & Access Mgmt

   I. What it is:
   The security sweep is basically something IS put forward to identify sensitive data on computing devices
   throughout the university. It is a multiphase thing that we plan to do over time. Initial phase was to cover
   areas of Academic Affairs at all campuses identifying servers that may contain sensitive information that
   may have been left on machines over time; data such as any accounting information, social security
   numbers, credit card information that sort of stuff. We just want to make sure we know what's out there
   and protect it properly. About 6-9 months ago they received the okay from the Dean and the cabinet to
   move forward.

   II. Project at Large:
   Partnering with a company called Secure State, a third party security company.
   Brendan Walsh has the data on how they were chosen and how they are bonded. They are also in the
   running for the PCI Compliancy Project, so other people in the university are also evaluating this company.

   III. Process:
     A. Focus from department to department, start by gathering a list of information on servers in an area.
        There would be a basic interview process where they come through and talk about each one of the
        servers to gain an understanding of what there purpose is. We know there may be exceptions, due
        to grant work and other pieces of data that we don't want to run scanning software on but we want
        to review all that and note why we made that decision.

B. Next step would be letting the company gain access to the machines temporarily to run their automated software utility to scan the data looking for patterns. This companies software has ways to eliminate data, if it's a nine digit sequence they have ways of knowing if it's a social security number or not. If there's a question it comes back as a list for us to review and work with the department to understand why it's there and if it's properly secured.   It may be easy to remove it because it's just pulled data left there over time, some data may be part of the business process and we will just look to see that the system is secure and protects that data.

- <u>Discussion on Security</u>

  Questions for Jason Wearly:

  - I teach a class in grading a student's work, if I have their work on my computer would this look for a name as sensitive information?
  - Are personal desk tops included in this scan?
  - Every machine has to have the root password on it and they would need to know it for them to access its data. We would have to go through and change every machine after they have gone. Is it possible for us to watch them and sign them in and out?
  - Brendan is implementing security but he takes directive from a variety of different people, how do we get a handle on those directives to come to a committee that will hear them and raise any questions that might be relative to that?
  - I understand that they will come up with a list, but I don't know what happens at the point they present the list. Could we try to leverage the expertise that exists here on campus that might come with a different approach? Would it be a burden on IS to have a more open discussion?
  - I am trying to get a grasp from a regional campus stand point, are you looking at any server that touches the network?

  Answers:

  - Don't believe simple name will jump out; it is really when the name is combined with other data. I will have conversation with Brendan regarding Academic or regressive retention.
  - Only servers will be scanned.
  - Perhaps that is what I would recommend to them that they come do it on site rather than web access. I will need to evaluate what that does to the contract. I don't have the expectation that I would give them the root password for long term access. I would hope that we would have accounts that can be set up for them to run scan and then the access would be eliminated not giving them long term access.
  - The concept of what we are trying to do is pretty straight forward mitigation of any data loss, losing information and getting law suits against us for the dissemination of data. The question seems to be how. We are getting a lot more questions than we expected up front. I will put the questions back on recommendation to outside departments
  - We found an expert in the industry that has done this with multiple clients. We want to get in and out without disturbing a whole lot. The challenge I have already had being over the security area for only 5 months. When it comes to security in different areas, what one department feels versus another; the nature of it is that when it comes to security sweep or audit no one likes an audit. There is a reason we went with Secure State, there is a lot of sensitivity when you are conferring with too many people you will get a lot of different opinions, where as an outside company is just looking for the specific sequence of numbers that might relate to secure data.

- Probably as far as the regional Academic Affairs and those departments that has a lot of central storage. Probably look at any cloud shares you run, any server types you use.

2. <u>Sponsored Links for Search Engine :</u> Denise Bedford.

The challenge we are trying to solve:

We want to make sure that when somebody searches something that might have a institutational data associated with it, that that data has a primary owner, whether it comes up as a key match or as a sponsored link are the two options to work within.

a) Key match links you to a site that matches specific work in the search string. There are some limitations on that but it is the first option to work with.

b) The second option which is the one you all are suggesting is that for a particular search; you have the primary units and the primary site that you want to seek. To do this it means that you have to know what those units are and who the sponsor is. Lyn's team has pointed us to a list site or URL's already associated with business in the university so we have a very good base to work from, the Graduate Assistance working with Lyn and Sameer on this has started to go through these to think about how we might align these units essentially designate these units as the sponsored link for a particular query. Another effort that I heard about from Sameer, that seems to align with this, is the services catalog that is being developed that would be another very good source to use for sponsored links. If there is a way to combine these two efforts it would be great to have a services catalog that you could look these things up but it would probably behave the same way that a sponsored link would when you search. That is where we are now. Denise asked Paul if he had anything to add.

Paul Albert - The services catalog is just for IT services so if that is as general a thing as sponsored link or key word matching.

Denise Bedford - In that case if we were to go through the whole list of links and identify ownership and things that the unit might be sponsored would that help to develop the catalog, could we use it two ways.

Paul Albert – Perhaps, but that would not be my project I would have to go back and talk to people about that. What we are working is for IT services catalog not for the whole university.

Denise Bedford – In which case the way we would look at this is that we don't have a conflict if Jenalyn continues to work on the sponsored links cap for Sameer and Lyn.

Paul Albert - If anybody wants to see an example of the key word match just type in library in the search. There's a certain group that shows up at the top that's what Sameer and Lyn have been working on, that's the direction they have been taking.

Denise Bedford - The advantage of working with sponsored links is that the key match is limited to one. The sponsored links I think you can have more than one sponsored link. In the event you have somebody that is searching for more than one policy an overlapping of two units you would have an opportunity to showcase both of them.

Paul Albert - I'm not sure how they do it it's not my technical area; if you type in library you get three items at the top. We might want to have Lyn and Sameer come in and talk about where they are and how it works.

Arden Ruttan - there are going to be some stakeholders that are going to want to participate in this.

3. Development of Action Groups – Conversation is continued from item (2) above.

Arden Ruttan - This council has 2 potental links and 1 that we share with Director Huntsman, i.e. Distance Learning. So we would have 2, one is a search committee which Denise has discussed. We may come up with more if we can make this model work.

Debra Huntsman - What we are thinking of for the distance learning group; which Valerie Kelly will probably come and talk about it for the next meeting is a virtual community for the faculty. I think she is proposing that we start we a survey, she wants to get some guidance on how to best communicate with the faculty about changes and enhancements around the campus. We are looking for this to be a partnership or collaboration versus us doing it on our own.

Arden Ruttan – what we would like to do with all Action Groups is have a few people monitor the web pages and bring it to the attention of someone if there is some sort of an issue. The problem with the people in IS is this going to be a burden on their time. If it is going to become a job assignment we will need permission of the administrators to do it. If it is going to take time away from their current jobs it will take some type of administrative approval, but I think most of it can be handled by email with little overall time commitment. I don't think it will be a big process; we want to have people with expertise monitoring this and encouraging a dialogue. I hope that it would work for Distance Learning as well.

Jason Wearley – I don't mind there being an Action Group, especially with something like the security sweep some of the questions I'm getting today could probably be handled in that group. I think that's a fair way of handling it, just knowing who they are, I will defer to Brendan. I hope to go back to Secure State to address some of the questions presented today.

Arden Ruttan - If you don't mind discussing this with Brendan.

Jason Wearley – I will go the other way and have Brendan get a group together. I will have Brendan reach out to you he will probably have some suggestions as well on this topic.

4. Member Concerns
    Follow-up of Action Groups

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned 3:45
Minutes submitted by: Deborah Davis