

Committee of Data Stewards

2/2/09

Discussion Items

D1) Executive Committee – all items discussed at the meeting were placed on today's agenda.

D2) Policy – Merri Beth gave a quick overview of the handouts regarding the standards which she and her staff are developing based on National and International Standards. She provided an outline of the structure, and the standards as they stand right now, and asked for feedback from the committee as she works through these with the Policy Committee over the next 3 months.

Mark asked where we stand with regard to other institutions; Merri Beth noted that we will have a more cohesive set of policies and standards than our colleagues once this project is completed. Barry indicated that we were the only school who approached it from an institution-wide classification standpoint. Some states have requirements as to how this is to be done, e.g. Texas or Ohio. We don't have such a requirement.

D3) Education/Awareness – Don reported that as a committee we want to start by taking the lead from Merri Beth and others in IPO and ISO. This was partly based on the fact that the committee had a tendency to get into too much detail rather than guiding a more general set of awareness tools, such as the "flippy book".

Merri Beth put together a draft quarterly plan which the committee reviewed and found very helpful. The notion behind the "flippy book" is that it provides general guidance on how to handle critical data; the goal is to get this distributed in the next few weeks. Merri Beth provided a handout on "what is critical information?" This material will be placed in OnCourse when it is finalized. Scott will design a booklet which we are referring to as a "flippy book". We will keep the idea of "red hot" in the design, but otherwise we will use the term "critical". Many different groups have reviewed the booklet at this point. The Committee was asked to e-mail comments to Merri Beth or Scott by end of day Wednesday. The booklet will go to the ~9,000 staff who have access to enterprise data.

D4) Access Provisioning – Dan reported that we have gotten almost all major system flowcharts for access provisioning. Phyllis will continue to work with Research to get their systems flowcharted by mid-February. Phyllis will ask for differences in access to IUIE if they exist.

The group of stakeholders that provided the draft document on "role-based" provisioning has met again to develop more detailed requirements for how this might work.

Barry asked if the CDS has formally stated that we propose moving toward a "role-based" access methodology. The ITSP2 denotes the need for this; Mark proposed that we need to develop a memo from the CDS to the AVPs whose areas would be involved to indicate that the CDS endorses this concept. Barry pointed out that this is a multi-year project and much that we are doing now is a strategic move in this direction.

Vic talked about the idea of individuals having a provisioning profile. Dan indicated that the document we presented last semester outlines how this would work. Dan reminded everyone that the document might provide the background for Mark's memo to UITS. Mark would like the memo to be more general but include this as examples. Barry wants us to formally endorse Dan's document. We will resend Dan's document and put on the next agenda a formal approval of it.

D5) Kathleen would like the committee to endorse updating the User Agreement (UA) on a yearly basis. Marilyn asked what the penalty would be if you don't. Right now if you don't change your passphrase you get a pop-up window if you haven't updated your Passphrase in the past two years. We could work out a similar warning if users do not update their UA. The Committee approved the requirement to update the UA on a yearly basis. UITS will figure out the logistics.

D6) Retention/Preservation – Paul reviewed the committee's e-mail retention proposal. See document in OnCourse under Resources. Several questions arose regarding the need to actually preserve documents, not just e-mail. For instance do we need a file-sharing environment?

Dan asked about security. Paul indicated that the shared repository would be kept and shared with a department or wider. Shared could be an individual; it depends upon how a department defines the shared repositories they need. We are focusing mainly on Exchange so we would like to find tools that work within this environment for ease of use. Access would be similar to access on departmental file servers. Committee members should take a look at the 9 items in Paul's proposal and provide feedback for revision; this document would then go to UITS.

Dennis noted that we might make it more general than Exchange, to something like University e-mail system. The P/R committee felt that academic e-mail differs somewhat since their e-mail might go with them rather than belong to the Institution. However, Beth pointed out that faculty should still be advised about how to handle e-mail relating to their research, even if they have the intellectual property rights to the results of such research. Kip pointed out that the primary impetus for this proposal is that there is a lot of important University information that is being lost because so much of it takes place in e-mail.

The consensus of the CDS is that this is an appropriate direction.

D7) Paul talked about the HRMS retention schedule for all of their documents. This subcommittee would like to document these schedules for all of the administrative areas. Susan McCammon commented that her office had worked with Phil Bantin to document academic retention schedules. Phyllis will put a link to this website from within OnCourse.

D8) Mark discussed the disposition of the DS/DM lists. He advised the group that we will be advising accounts management and all other access points within UITS that this is the official list and people not on it will not be allowed to grant access to enterprise systems. He also noted that we are working on 4 sessions for raising awareness for the DM and their responsibilities.

D9) Mark noted that we were a bit behind on taking action on the schedule for updating of user access to enterprise systems. Mark gave an update on where things stand. We have sent two reminders and have had about a 60%. We are going to send along one more reminder and then ask system owners to disable access for those people who have not responded.

D10) Merri Beth reported on security incidents.

D11) Kevin audit reports

Kevin talked about an audit in the Athletics Department relating to Interns who are required to access athletes' grades. They were alerted that they need to follow requirements for access to this FERPA protected data. There was also an issue with excessive restrictions to necessary data. Tom and Mark worked with Athletics to define the positions that need such access and what the criteria should be.

They are also in the process of an audit at South Bend.

D12) **Overview of Information Security and Privacy Program (Tom and Merri Beth)**

Tom outlined the structure and reasons for developing such a program which is based on 12 domains. He went through a large number of slides to outline the philosophy and rationale behind such a program, and how it is structured. Tom noted that once we have the overview developed, the CDS will have an opportunity to comment. Mark noted that they will be meeting with VP John Applegate to go over this program and also with CIO Wheeler to determine how to move forward.

Action Items

A1) Mark will develop a memo to UITS regarding the development of infrastructure for "role-based" provisioning.

A2) Mark will also develop a memo to UITS regarding User Agreement updates on a regular basis.

A3) Phyllis will edit Paul's proposal/add date

A4) Phyllis will put Paul's document and Merri Beth's "flippy book" information in OnCourse.

A5) Phyllis will put a link to Phil's site for academic retention into OnCourse.

A6) Determine who is going to approach Alan Walsh about making the process automatic on a regular basis for determining who needs access.

A7) Ask Tom for copy of slides for his presentation on security program

A8) Re-send Dan's proposal on role-based provisioning