Regents Information Technology Council (RITC) October, 2009, Meeting Notes

<u>Date:</u> October 20, 2009
<u>Attendees:</u>
    Ravi Pendse (WSU), Gary Ott (WSU), Jason Holmes (WSU), Sherry Callahan
    (KU Med.), Kathy Sanley (PSU), Lynn Carlin (KSU), Joe Hennes (KITO), Denise
    Williams (KU), Chuck Crawford (KU, David Schmidt (FHSU), Cheryl Helget
    (FHSU), Mark Griffin (FHSU), Mike Erikson (ESU), Cheryl O'Dell (ESU), Mike
    Gunter (WU), Brad Williams (KBOR), Cort Buffington (KanREN)
<u>Note taker:</u>
    David Schmidt (FHSU)
<u>Discussion Items:</u>

I.   Preliminaries
         There were some general introductions.

II.   CITO Report *Joe Hennes*

   a. Joe reported that the leased data center in Wichita is just about
      finished. He has been coordinating work at the center with three
      agencies which plan to have their equipment running in the building in
      November. The rate structure includes the electrical work, but it does
      not include the racks. Agencies need to supply their own racks.

   b. Upgrades in DISC.

      1. The mainframe continues to be an important component of the
          State of Kansas IT infrastructure. The mainframe itself was
          upgraded within the past year. Additionally, decades old tape
          equipment from STK has just been upgraded with a new tape
          library.

      2. Three new laser printers have been installed in the data center.
          They are driven by the mainframe. They replace 3 older laser
          printers that were acquired on lease when the lease expired.

   c. Observations from the JCIT Meeting

      1. Joe noticed that the members have been emphasizing
          collaboration. Videoconferencing collaboration has been of
          interest to them.

      2. Licensing issues are also of interest. Joe mentioned the Oracle
          license that they manage for the state of Kansas, and he noted
          that Oracle often gives special educational pricing.

      3. At DISC KIRMS has been implemented for work orders.

III.   Network updates
   a. KanREN – *Buffington*
      i. Cort is working on the EPSCoR grant with Rick McMullen from KU. The grant is to help support the 10 gig purely optical network. The cost is an additional 20% for the circuits and more for the equipment upgrades to connect at that bandwidth.
      ii. Planning to get a redundant connection to ESU has been problematic. AT&T has not been very responsive and any estimated costs appear very high.
      iii. Johnson County Community College is now live on the network as a Class 2A member.
      iv. He met with Army personnel at Fort Leavenworth to discuss the possibility of connecting them as another Class 2A member. They preferred being a "stub" on the network because they did not want any liability incurred in being part of the ring topology.
      v. Cort attended the I2 fall membership meeting.
   b. Kan-ED – *Williams*
      i. The Governor approved going forward with the ARRA grant application that would supply 90 high definition video room connections and equipment for libraries across the state of Kansas.
      ii. Brad is also coordinating the Health Information Technology and Health Information Exchange efforts. This involves looking at the statewide infrastructure. If Kan-Ed provides that infrastructure, it would be done on a fee for services model. Kansas will get nine million dollars from the federal government for this project. These funds are designated funds; it is just a matter of getting all of the planning done and meeting the grant specifications. The goal is to establish a single health information exchange, and this would probably be done by a private company.
      iii. On November 9-10 there will be a Kan-Ed Membership Conference in Wichita. There will be multiple tracks at the Conference. Everyone is welcome.

IV.   Agenda Items

   a. Discussion of Concerns Regarding the Proposed New Security Requirements Document(s) – summary of comments -- Cheryl O'Dell
      i. The document appears to assume that all institutions are at the same level of technical expertise and do things in similar ways.
      ii. In general the document goes into far too much detail – instead of remaining at general policy levels.
      iii. There are many issues revolving around scope. Does the state want to assume responsibility for all of the data on our campuses, for example. The document wording makes it appear that it does.

There is a reference to state-controlled data. What is the scope of that statement? Does this include student records?

iv. The public record laws apply to information housed on campus. There doesn't seem to be a provision for that.

v. Many noted that the universities serve students. Many of the provisions as written appear to apply to students as well as employees. In many cases, those provisions are unworkable if applied literally to the student population.

vi. It was noted that the most senior IT administrators on the campuses are not referenced in the document. Responsibilities for security appear to reside at the President/Chancellor level or the chief security officer level on campus. There is also reporting ambiguity. Do the universities report to KBOR, to the state security council, or elsewhere for security matters?

vii. In the document the data classification responsibilities do not appear to match up with the data owners.

viii. The document makes it appear that the role of HR has scope over the whole campus. The problem is that HR has little to do with students.

ix. There is a practical issue of training students on security matters. If signed documents are needed, this is a large logistical problem.

x. There appears to be an anomaly because risk assessment is not mandatory but security self-assessment is mandatory. Risk assessment would seem to most of us to be of highest importance.

xi. No procedures are articulated for exceptions. Who has the authority to grant exceptions – the President or Chancellor, KBOR?

xii. The approach and philosophy of this document lacks a reference to institutional management. IT on the various campuses does not operate in a vacuum.

xiii. In general the document lacks context. The consultants interviewed many state agencies, but they did not interview any universities. Did the consultants intend for it to apply to universities or only to non-university state agencies?

xiv. The problem is that there is a need to put all of this in the appropriate context. There should not just be a one size fits all model. Because of this issue the document is fundamentally flawed. If exceptions were to be allowed for state universities, would the auditors agree to apply different standards to universities or would they use the one size fits all model?

b. Where do we go from here?

i. We recommend that the consultants create a parallel document for Universities – one that recognizes some salient differences that differentiate universities from other state agencies.

ii. **Action Item**. Brad Williams agreed to call the consultants to see their reaction to doing this and to see if they intended the policies and procedures in the documents to apply to universities.

     iii. It appears that these consultants do not work with universities. There may still be some value for these consultants to interview universities and create a parallel document or significantly amend the original document.

     iv. Many noted that the Universities want to participate in this process and get a document that is a living document that will work for the Universities too.

     v. **Action Item**. We need to share these concerns and comments with Joe Hennes and Larry Kettlewell. The overriding concerns should be featured with the details relating back to the overriding concerns. The ISO group will meet on November 3. If they can summarize these concerns and communicate them to Brad Williams, he can notify Rege Robinson, Joe Hennes, and Larry Kettlewell before the November ITEK meeting.

c. **Activities of the Kansas Partnership for Accessible ITechnology (KPAT) and its Potential impact on our Institutions**

     i. The W3C guidelines specify compliance in 18 months (October, 2010).

     ii. One troubling requirement: no video content without captions.

     iii. There is an undue burden exception that can be granted by the state office.

     iv. There is some indication that this exception will not be routinely granted for video, particularly for recurring instances of video such as streaming ballgames, streaming lectures, etc.

     v. There is some possible relief from this requirement if the lecturer provides a transcript of the lecture.

     vi. It is not clear how the requirement applies to audio-only events.

d. **Collaboration Document**

     i. As noted above Joe Hennes commented on the fact that the JCIT is quite interested in collaboration efforts.

     ii. **Action Item.** Brad Williams will e-mail the version of the collaboration document that we prepared several years ago. It needs updating. Send comments back to Brad.

e. **Special Event for Jerry Smith**

     i. **Action Item.** We agreed to have a meal with Jerry if we could coordinate it with his schedule. David Schmidt will contact Jerry to see if he can attend the November or December meeting.

f. **Campus Reports**

     i. Washburn University did a forklift upgrade of the Sungard hardware including the hardware for the Luminous portal and the e-mail server. This did not work well. There were some load problems with LDAP server, and a core router failed and corrupted the mail store. So, there was no e-mail service for a prolonged period of time. WU went back to using an older e-mail server until the new system is restored.

    ii. WSU had a similar fork lift upgrade some time ago, but they maintained a stand-alone e-mail system.

    iii. KU's Initiative One collaboration project is bearing fruit. All of the reports are in and are being reviewed.

    iv. KSU. The CIO position will be filled during the year. Zimbra is used for faculty and students. There is a collaborative element (a briefcase) included in this e-mail/calendaring product.

    v. PSU continues to require student e-mail accounts and uses Gmail for students.

    vi. FHSU. A comprehensive security policy document has had first reading at the ISM level (the President's council).

V. The next meeting will be **November 17, 2009,** from 10 a.m. to noon. **This meeting can be attended in person or via video conference. Brad Williams will reserve a room in Topeka for the folks that want to meet in Topeka.**