Administrative Advisory Committee on Computing
Meeting Minutes
October 25, 2004

Attendance:
Members Present: Colvard, Drury, Holleran, Mason, Neill, Overgaag, Ross, Sparling, Stewart, Stover, Yelland

Members Absent: Barr, Brar, Elfrink, Maraviglia, Melvin, Pietsch, Ramirez, Sletteland

Guests Present: Joan Lund (for Melvin), Wendy Sprague (for Sletteland), Velma Tiberti (for Ramirez), Irma Arellano, Dwayne Brummet, Sandra Harris, Jerry Hanley, Johanna Madjedi, Craig Schultz, Mary Shaffer, Tom Zuur

1. Approval of the Minutes:
The minutes of the September 27 meeting were approved as written.

2. Announcements:
- Jennifer Overgaag was introduced as the SC3 representative to AACC.
- Upcoming agenda items include a presentation by the Library in November and the annual status of the infrastructure review in January.
- Identity reconciliation went into full production last week. Feeds from all the different systems now go into one central, enterprise directory. Reconciliation can differentiate between individuals with multiple roles when necessary.
- PDA synchronization with OpenTime has been identified as impacting overall performance of the calendar system at times. OCS will resolve this known problem, but until then users need to be aware of the issues. Delays in updating system status and the failure to reflect the status change in Application Manager were noted. Ross will review both issues.
- OAR, Scheduling, and ITS implemented the recommended changes to the registration system. Zuur briefly described the major changes, including wait-listing and e-permits, and how they are being communicated to the campus. The goal is to make best use of the current system at minimal cost pending implementation of the new student system. The changes go into effect this week through mid-January. Madjedi said SC3 students praised OAR’s communication campaign. CAPTURE was discontinued due to lack of use.

3. Cal Poly ADA Compliance Overview:
Several handouts were posted on the web for committee review, but more detailed discussion is needed. The law mandates that the campus make websites and other electronic resources accessible to those with disabilities. This includes students and employees who are more likely to represent a liability for universities. ITS, the Library and the Disability Resource Center are soliciting input from advisory committees on how to raise awareness and actively engage the campus to achieve compliance. This includes building on existing practices such as electronic copies of textbooks, use of scanners, software and hardware acquisition, promoting use of Blackboard vs. faculty websites for classroom applications, pressuring vendors to comply, etc, e.g., the law requires TVs (but not projectors) to support closed captioning, an issue Hanley raised with Epson last week. Zuur wondered if organizations that sponsor web conferences use closed captioning. Everything needs to be revisited in light of ADA compliance.
Mason reiterated a need for the plan/recommendation to be accompanied by standards, guidelines, and procedures to ensure compliance.

4. **Information Security Overview:**

   Stover distributed two articles that came out within the last week. The first one described an incident in which a UC computer was hacked, potentially disclosing 1.5 million names and social security numbers which under SB1386 requires notifying the affected individuals. Cal Poly has experienced a few incidents as well and Stover reiterated the need to continually work to secure systems and information as much as possible given the open nature of a university. The second one described the top 20 workstation security threats. Hanley has copies of a cyber security awareness CD from Educause with a useful set of resources.

5. **Desktop Management:**

   Yelland distributed a one page summary developed by the technical review subcommittee, which he hoped everyone could endorse today to move forward to IRMPPC on Friday. He reviewed and discussed each section; the following points were raised by the committee:

   - Limiting the scope of this document to desktop security only and addressing and defining the management/productivity issues later.
   - Formalizing LAN Coordinators membership and charge (see below).
   - Referencing evolving CSU security guidelines.
   - Specifying that this will be developed within the new framework of policies, standards, guidelines and procedures.
   - Including personally owned devices attached to the network.
   - Addressing password management and how it integrates with workstation, laptop and server access and machine configuration
   - Addressing incident tracking reporting and response – audit requirements; require annual report on information security incidents
   - Education and awareness on how to use and destroy confidential data.
   - Providing checklists and control points for verifying compliance to optimize and implement the practices.

   Madjedi and Stover agreed these were needed but questioned whether they should be included in the scope of this document beyond how to control the desktop containing confidential information. Stover said education/training is part of the total information security program, which is her responsibility. This is one aspect of the total program. The committee conceptually agreed to the changes. Yelland will revise it for presentation to IRMPPC. Schultz will share this version with IACC and SC3. Madjedi noted student concerns with security measures in lab environments, e.g., timeouts, and the potential impact on student productivity.

   Schultz distributed draft standards modeled after the University of Minnesota, e.g., a security patch application standard. It doesn’t specify how to do it, just what must be done and allows for exceptions. Madjedi suggested including roles and responsibilities similar to the network attached device documentation. Other suggestions included separating policy, standard, guidelines and procedures into multiple documents with cross-references where appropriate, e.g., rationale.
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(background statement); a bulleted checklist format for detailed procedures, etc. Schultz will work on revising the documents with these suggestions in mind.

The LAN Coordinators loosely defined affinity group has grown to more than 40 ITS and departmental staff. The technical review committee suggested revisiting that group’s role and function and how they should be organized to provide input when needed. (One possible model is the CSU network technology alliance.) It will mean shifting from an informal to a formal responsibility with authority to speak for the college/program area. The deans and vice presidents need to know they are making that level of commitment. Schultz and Yelland will bring this suggestion to the IRMPPC for further discussion.

6. Oracle/PeopleSoft Takeover Issues
The merger appears likely to occur based on the latest news. Concerns have been raised as to how this might affect CSU. Hanley and Yelland both feel CSU is in a strong negotiation position, having just concluded major multi-year deals with both vendors. Oracle needs PeopleSoft’s customer base and they should not be affected for 3-4 years. Impacts would typically be on sales and marketing not research and development or product support. If there are disruptions, there is no way to prevent it and it could have happened for any number of reasons.

Minutes prepared by Mary Shaffer