Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 11:36 a.m. The meeting agenda is an update of the eTranscripts project, an overview of the grade changing incident and a security update. The minutes from the June 11th meeting were approved as written.

eTranscript

Xiomara Franco explained eTranscript is an official PDF electronic transcript and will reach the requestor in a few minutes rather than in a few days. The purpose of the eTranscript project was to alleviate the cost and time it takes for a manually pulled mailed transcript to reach the requestor. Use of eTranscripts is increasing for not only students and alumni but potential employers, Educational institutions, Law School Admissions Council and the American Medical College Application Service. Approximately 28,500 transcripts are ordered annually, the cost to the University is $9.00 per transcript, which is a combination of paper, toner, envelopes, postage, staff time and tech support. The new model under the vendor, National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), would reduce the cost to the University to $4.00 to send to a specific email address and $2.25 to send to a shared client of the NSC.

The vendor, National Student Clearinghouse has a network registry of over 750 participants, includes a broader selection of security features and has a positive reputation throughout their client community. The transcript will be requested the same way it always has been, through LOCUS or Alumni Request Form, will remain free of charge, and comes with a notification of delivery. However requestors can still opt for a mailed transcript if they’d like.

Xiomara advised once the vendor agreement is approved by the GC, her team will start planning major milestones, timelines and dependencies and continue a working group with Registration and Records.

Grade Change Incident

Jim Sibenaller provided an overview of the two grade change incidents; each used different methods to engineer a password change of a userid that had privileges to alter student grades. A discussion among the committee followed. Bruce Montes then summarized the steps taken after the incidents to change the process of handling password change requests by the HelpDesk.

ACTION: Andrea suggested this list of high risk users be vetted by her and Becky Gomez.

As of today, an outside vendor will be on campus to audit the current password management system. In addition, Jim Pardonek advised there is a Technology Assessment Committee (TAC) in place reviewing Password Management System vendors. One of the solutions discussed was to have a set of security questions upon log in, which would allow for a 24/7 accessible password assistance. The TAC will review different models and have a recommendation to the ARB in September/October 2014.

Security Awareness

Jim Pardonek advised the committee the Payment Card Industry Compliance (PCI) standards will implement new requirements effective in 2014. The requirements will be reduced from 215 to 200, however, the University needs stronger evidence to reduce the risk to faculty and staff. The standards are really being specific on what’s required; additions include:

1. Verify all staff and faculty have read and acknowledged information security policy.
2. Verify all staff and faculty participate in information security awareness training.

The UISO team is in search of a process that will successfully touch each faculty and staff member. There was a discussion around the solutions, perhaps around an activity that is initiated at the beginning of the Academic Year. The verification and training can be completed all at one time and only needs to be done once in a calendar year. Jim assured the committee they had time to think about the best solution, he was presenting today to make them aware a decision will have to be made by the end of the year.
The second security topic was Personal Identifiable Information (PII). The PII program began running twice a year in 2009 and has been fairly successful, the amount of PII that has been left on University computer has dropped from 21% to 0%. The main concern is with Data Stewards that are within each division and school. There is a high turnover rate and new training has to be done each year based on new requirements. There has been enhancements to the Identify Finder tool reducing the Data Steward’s work but Data Stewards are taking on this task in addition to their current job duties resulting in slow or no response back to the PII Administrator, among other issues from their respective departments, faculty and staff.

Jim advised the University does not have an asset management program that houses an inventory of each computer deployed. As a result, a computer that started with one faculty or staff, can end up with another. Jim feels a risk based structure would even further reduce the Data Steward need. The risk based structure would include modifying the scanning for less risky departments to once a year while keeping the scanning at two times a year for higher risk departments. The committee approved this new structure and also advised to have the Data Steward report to their respective Dean or Supervisor any issues they encounter with faculty or staff fulfilling the remediation their scan.

Wrap Up

Due to time, the Tech Briefing will be presented at the October 9, 2014 meeting. There will also be a BCDR update. Kana did wish to discuss allocation for a needs assessment. She advised Facilities is in the process of cleaning up their documentation.

Respectively submitted by;
Sondra Heine