Administrative Advisory Committee on Computing  
Meeting Minutes  
November 29, 2004

Attendance:  
Members Present: Elfrink, Maraviglia, Mason, Neill, Overgaag, Ross, Sletteland, Sparling, Stover, Yelland  
Members Absent: Barr, Brar, Colvard, Drury, Holleran, Melvin, Pietsch, Ramirez, Stewart  
Guests Present: Laurie Borello (for Rick Ramirez), Sandra Harris (for Debbie Arseneau), Jerry Hanley, Craig Schultz, Mary Shaffer, Tom Zuur

1. Approval of the Minutes:  
No minutes were available for approval at this meeting.

2. Announcements:  
• The Blackboard 6.1 migration testing went well and ITS will be notifying faculty on the planned outage for the upgrade and final migration  
• The new wait-listing process has been very successful so far

3. PolyComm Status:  
Ross distributed and reviewed a brief update and revised rollout calendar. Current calendar users will be migrated in mid-January, followed by the migration of early adopters, ITS staff and pilot groups to the new email system. The rest of the campus will migrate from mid-February through March. Calendar will roll out to students during Spring Quarter once FERPA compliance is worked out. Initial testing of other components will occur at that time also. Ross reviewed factors that have made this implementation more complex than initially anticipated and said two significant milestones remain: system fail-over and system load performance testing. PDA synchronization is still intermittently affecting the calendar system; the new system should eliminate this problem. Mason cited a need for improved regular communication with users and LAN coordinators about changes to the schedule. Yelland suggested pushing notices to AACC as milestones are completed. Sparling cited a need for consistent messages regarding the calendar synchronization problem, e.g., application manager showing the system is working, system status not being updated each time the problem occurs, system status messages not being written in plain English that a user can understand and follow to implement the workaround.

4. IRMPPC Feedback (last meeting):  
Yelland reported that the desktop security initiative was approved at the last meeting. IRMPPC endorsed the recommendation to formalize the advisory role of the LAN coordinators and will spearhead that effort with the campus. A hybrid model to address threats works best for Cal Poly, and sanctioning the role of the LAN coordinator in this effort is essential. Issues include training/currency, formal recognition of related responsibilities/accountabilities in job descriptions and performance evaluations, securing supervisor/administrator buy-in across campus, establishing good communication channels, and determining the representation and scope of the working group. Schultz will seek guidance on how to appoint/staff the working group at the IRMPPC meeting this week.
Based on feedback from the last IRMPPC meeting, Hanley reported that ITS is working with the Library and Disability Resource Center to develop a plan for complying with CSU and legal requirements for accessibility to electronic information resources. The President will notify the campus community once the plan is approved. An assessment of heavily accessed websites is underway to determine the extent of remediation. A draft resolution will be presented to the Academic Senate in January to garner faculty support; the statewide student organization passed a resolution. Hanley emphasized a need to make reasonable progress while avoiding potential liability and consequences of non-compliance as experienced by other campuses.

5. **Desktop Security – Next Steps:**
Schultz and Yelland distributed copies of the latest version, which was approved by IRMPPC at the last meeting. The content did not change but may need to be clarified; the next step is to determine what needs to be done to address the first four short term objectives, e.g., how many policies, standards, guidelines, and procedures are required? how to mobilize the campus to make progress towards developing and implementing these standards and practices?

**Objective #1:** Mason cited a need for an overall framework (ITS “CAP”) to tie everything together, e.g., policies, procedures, standards, guidelines, checklists, etc., which LAN coordinators can easily follow. He suggested having a manual and certification for LAN coordinators and accountability for implementing that. ITS will lead the staff effort to do this with assistance from LAN coordinators.

**Objective #2:** These exist on paper but the need for built in control/access points to ensure compliance was noted, e.g., network logon and authentication. Schultz suggested using a working group of LAN Coordinators to identify solutions for tuning the existing model, e.g., do these three things before connecting.

**Objectives #3 and #4:** These are specific implementations associated with the first two objectives; they should be the first issues addressed by the LAN advisory group. Sletteland noted the need for testing patches before applying them and a process for ensuring compliance.

**Objective #7:** Hanley said ITS and University Police are meeting with Stover to discuss using Remedy for confidential security incident tracking and collaborative use of forensic analysis and investigative tools.

Schultz and Yelland will prepare a summary report for the IRMPPC meeting.

6. **Network Attached Devices:**
Mason summarized the feedback from the working group for ITS and IRMPPC. While each document works as is, the most common theme was a need to understand the overall framework they fit into and how it will be implemented. Specific suggestions included clearer definitions, LAN Coordinator manual and annual certification, defined roles and responsibilities, monitoring services, new tools that can be decentralized, consequences and accountability measures, and a process for evaluating and updating standards. The LAN Coordinators as a
whole had no specific feedback. The major concern for IACC was a process for approving exceptions based on instructional program requirements.

7. **Library Systems Presentation:**
   This item was deferred since Brar was off campus due to family emergency.

8. **Status of Infrastructure Report Content**
   Yelland reviewed and modified during the meeting the following outline for a future presentation by Madjedi, which he will resend to the committee alias.

   - Servers
     - Topology
     - Status
   - Operating Systems
     - Level/Support End Date
     - Newest Releases
     - Known Issues
   - SAN
     - Topology
     - Capacity Utilization
     - Statistics, meantime to failure, uptime, etc.
   - TII/Network
     - Implementation Status
     - Improvements as expected
     - Status
   - Upcoming Significant Infrastructure Changes
   - Business Continuity
   - SpeedBumps, i.e., issues that impede normal operation and attainment of stated goals in each area
   - Throughput (Performance/Capability, e.g., MPG), Uptime, How Robust?

Minutes prepared by Mary Shaffer