Minutes from I.T. Council meeting 3/20/17
Travis Conference Room, Bizzell Memorial Library

Attendees
Eddie Huebsch                      Stephen Crynes
Elizabeth Pober                    J. Quyen Wickham
Sunny Lee                          Boris Apanasov
Chris Cook                         Burr Millsap
Loretta Early                      Mark Morvant
Patrick Livingood                  Carl Grant

Meeting called to order by Patrick Livingood at 10:32

- Minutes accepted
- Uncertainty about whether changes to Charge document were approved last meeting
  - Motion to accept the change, voted, and accepted.
- Discussion of Acceptable use policy – Opening Discussion
  - Patrick: It’s an active policy now. ITC used to be a body generating these sorts of policy, but not anymore. I’m not interested in generating policy, but we need to review the policy and give feedback. Committee-to-committee
  - Definite problem with provision to make it the business of chairs to disseminate policy
    - General agreement
  - Patrick: The document reads like a legal document, but does not discuss desired outcomes
  - Carl: agree with your observation. People would have a hard time digesting it; more overhead on the frontend, legal implications; when they came to talk about security, theirs seemed very reasonable, but this might not be like that
  - Boris: Majority of users are students; they would not review this carefully; only very few of them would look and fully understand the meaning of this policy for them; they cannot expect privacy; which is a very strong condition.
  - John: I Got a OUHSC account, they had me sign their acceptable use policy, which was only one page, I liked it, since it was all right there, and didn’t have to flip pages. Why don’t we have a full policy and a bridged one?
  - Boris: That maybe much better, an abridged one should be in place.
  - John: We could have a faculty and student version.
  - Patrick: The length helps cover a lot of contingencies. OU criticized either way. If I share this with my colleagues, though, they will have serious questions. What’s changing? It seems there’s no intent to make significant changes for actual practice, but language matters. Reserving as many rights as possible for the university, I’d recommend some sort of discussion about desired outcome, what sort of change is happening…
  - Loretta: It could be helpful to have supporting documents for standard best practices; communication between training and other activities. Why this is needed, desired outcome; what’s different? Challenges: we didn’t have policies
before; we were already practicing what’s in the policy; the state is mandating having a policy; HSC, they have hundreds of policies, We do try to coordinate what’s happening in each campus

- Patrick: was there an interest in capturing our current practice? Or momentum to change?
- Loretta: My impression was to capture what’s already been recommended. The goal of providing clarification. Employees know legally, what’s university might be subject to. Such as open records request, or search.
- Patrick: If this is not meant to change course, as a faculty member, I’m certainly nervous that this would be used as a template to change course; maximum rights to the university, without discussion with faculty
- Loretta: It could benefit from a FAQ, discussion with colleagues
- Boris: Highlight most important changes, every user should have the full text That would be better for students as well;
- Loretta: confusion in the public space; what subjects, email, text message, it’s important to provide transparency and clarity

- Acceptable Use Discussion on Text
  - Patrick: We should have two tracks for discussion. Any comment on this document as it is; are there technical issues for that? Any advice for supplementary information? Eddie emailed one small technical issue. Last sentence on page 6.
  - Eddie: Student information contained on education… I understand their intent, but the wording seems problematic.
  - Patrick: Dissemination of such information would violate university policy.
  - Eddie: There is also issue with Preamble, university is not in business in regulating, monitoring, we maybe need to soften it someway.
  - Mark: The qualifier is “academic freedom”. But the passage is largely focused on restrictions
  - Patrick: I understand why the legal office would want this. something has to be put on papers somewhere, but distributing this to the colleagues would cause concerns. Other technical issues?
  - Chris: p. 3. Care security…, smartphone making movies, I could come up with many counter examples,
  - Chris: Issues with the “malicious software” clause. “Knowingly” can be a matter of opinion, no definition of “malicious” programs. There are a lot of opinions there. Hard to define, but you know when you see it. Installing MS word: if the machine doesn’t work well by that, does that make it a malicious software?
  - Another: No expectation of privacy. How can you do research if you can’t guarantee protection of privacy of your subjects. The focus should be protecting, not unprotecting. Protecting research mission of the university,
  - John: Research will go through IRB; they also have data requirement;
  - Chris: Data breach? Respondents’ data
  - Boris: Can’t be individual’s responsibility; installing software; trying to get into administrative position to install some software and something went wrong; does that make it illegal?
  - John: NSF, NIH mostly require data management plan
  - Loretta: University takes every measure; broad category of information; limit the scope of exposure;
Patrick: I propose that I’ll work up a memo of this discussion, circulate, and next meeting, we’ll discuss again, and try to recommend by the end of the semester.

Eddie: p. 2. IRB data would be excluded by the law.

Patrick: Also, the desired outcomes are not captured here;

Eddie: to your HR point, once the policy is approved, this might be distributed to new employees...

Elizabeth: What’s the plan for dissemination to students?

Loretta: What training should be mandated? Conversation about it; positive reinforcement steps; if you demonstrate risky behaviors, do you take training.

Mark: plan for dissemination already in policy; related to department chairs’ responsibilities.

Patrick: I asked my chair, she was not aware of this responsibility or this policy.

- D2L, Ozone shutdown
  - Mark: need to make sure the shutdown dates do not conflict with grade submission dates.
  - June 15 shut down, We will remove access
  - Right now, departments/colleges using D2L for various purposes; remove access first, and bring it down. There are 300-400 faculty, permanent courses, we don’t know exactly, but try to communicate directly with staff, some emails were bounced
  - Some colleges might use it for file storage system. We have a few days to bring back...
  - Patrick: Would there be an archive accessible?
  - Mark: All users will be notified, they need to download any information they need to store. We archive raw data; course content, it’s not student content; so no grades, they need to download course by course; mail servers, other ways, communication get to the right person. Main master course, allow them to be used; passed June 2, need to use Canvas.

- Password Change Update
  - Loretta: Feb. 22, 75% response to password changes, 12-15000 still not changed that day; initial analysis, we didn’t get many phone calls, going through clean ups, delinquent accounts; most complex ones are retirees’, how to improve the process; put the University much a better position; expect a surge in phishing attempt, between now and tax day;

- ProofPoint
  - Patrick: Small group working with IT Security to see if ProofPoint is generating false positives. Trying to recruit admissions, recruiting, international students
  - So far no major numbers of false positives
  - Boris: Most quarantined messages I received were from fake journals
  - Pat: I received an email from major journal, invitation, looked good, but links were malicious
  - Boris: We should provide general access to this quarantine email, and decide whether to keep or delete...

Meeting adjourned 11:15am.

Action Items:

- Acceptable Use Policy – Will circulate draft memo for discussion before next meeting