Information Security Advisory Council Meeting Minutes  
Loyola University Chicago  
January 14, 2010

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Ron Iwanski</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Cheryl Heckel</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Admin</td>
<td>John Connolly</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>David Wieczorek</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Cory O’Brien</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Erik Decker</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Tad Verdun</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>Reg &amp; Rec</td>
<td>Diane Hullinger</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Carol McCormack</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Sue Bodin</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS / Facilitator</td>
<td>Leilani Lauger</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Stephen Ham</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS / Minutes</td>
<td>Yolanda Neal</td>
<td>In Attendance</td>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>Jeremy Inabinet</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business

Approval of Minutes
Leilani opened the meeting with an introduction of Sue Bodin. Sue Bodin will be replacing Stephen Ham. Stephen has resigned from his position with Loyola. Everyone introduced themselves as well.

The minutes from the 9/17/09 and 10/19/09 meetings were approved.

Draft Charter
Leilani shared that she is tentatively scheduled to present the charter/mission statement to the ITESC on January 21, 2010.

Risk Assessment Update
Leilani mentioned that the risk assessment is 38% complete. The scope still needs to be presented to the ITESC at their next meeting. Task: Leilani will present scope of risk assessments to ITESC.

The ISAC needs to give its view on the risk assessments. There are 133 controls. Leilani asked the group how should the group review – as a group or individually? The group agreed that individually would be too time consuming. Leilani suggested that the group start with those ranked as a high priority. Erik and Leilani will review all 133 controls. A few controls may be a part of phase II.

After the assessment is complete, Leilani projects that 10%-15% will be in the high ranking. Right now there are 28% in the medium priority.

Diana asked if there was an opportunity to work in small groups with the groups being based on each person’s knowledge of a certain area of risk. Split the review to areas each individual has related job knowledge. It was agreed that may be a good idea and there will be some overlap. Dave suggested narrowing down the description and letting each ISAC member identify which area is touched by his/her department. The timeline for this project has been pushed back about a month. Task: Leilani will attempt to categorize the controls to share with the group.

Policies
At the last meeting there were proposed changes to 3 policies. It was also asked who created the list of what is considered Loyola Protected Data. Erik shared that Registration & Records helped develop the original definition along with the PIRG. Registration & Records’ definition of Protected Data appears to be standardized. Other universities use the same language as defined on the Registration and Records’ website:

("...Protected Data are any data that contains personally identifiable information concerning any individual and are regulated by local, state, or Federal privacy regulations, or by any voluntary industry standards or best practices concerning protection of personally identifiable information...")

The group reviewed the policies. Susan had a few suggestions to the wording. Dave asked if faculty is considered employees. Carole suggested that the policies all state “faculty and staff” versus employees.
It was suggested that “employee handbook” be removed from policies because an actual handbook no longer exists.

There was some discussion about the statement that passwords should not be passed through email. It was agreed that the statement should instruct users to never email the password that allows access to the encrypted data. Cory asked if the policies apply to LUMC. Leilani explained that it is undetermined because there are university staff at LUMC but LUMC provides the computers. *Task: Leilani will take this question to the CIO and ITESC for clarification.*

It was also mentioned that the nursing school’s policy is not to encrypt but there are a lot of data being stored. In addition, departments that get grants to purchase laptops and software, and data are being stored on those devices.

Other areas of discussion and revisions to the policies include:

- It should be stated that Protected Data should not be stored on local computers. If there is an exception, a request for exception must be submitted to the CIO for approval.
- It was pointed out that Undergraduate Admissions office manages their own data. The Law School manages their own data. However, with the Law School, ITS has a MOU that they will abide by the ITS policies.
- It was noted that data stored on thumb drives is a risk.

Cheryl indicated that it is not clear as to whether the policies are talking about Loyola owned or personal computers. For clarification it should read “Loyola owned/supported” computers. It was noted that there needs to be more clarification on the use of personal computers and storing data.

Ron brought up the issue of storage for servers/disk space. He mentioned that support is not provided so his department purchases their own. *Task: Leilani will speak with Jeff Apa regarding this issue.*

Leilani suggested there may be a need to develop some online training that remind faculty and staff about the policies and increase awareness. She said that Texas A&M has a great online training program about security concerns. Erik suggested doing randomized audits, in addition.

Appropriate revisions will be made to the policies. After policies are finalized, the policies will be moved through the approval process. The review process starts with the ISAC, then moves to the ITS Directors and CIO, then ITESC will review and approve and forward to the appropriate groups for approval. *Task: Leilani will make revisions and email final draft to the group.*

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at LSC and the date is TBD. By the next meeting, a date will have been selected for the Data Steward’s training and the Identify Finder should have been approved.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm