

## IRMPPC Meeting Minutes – January 13, 2004

Present: Dalton, Detweiler, Ellison, Gill, Grandillert, Grimes, Hanley, Morton, Saenz, Shaffer, Stover, Yelland

Apologies: Davis, Gorman, Hellenbrand, Kelley, Khosmood, Mumford

Also Present: Klooster, Madjedi, Linda Sandy (for Ross), Schultz

### A. Committee Business

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the 12/9 meeting were accepted as written.
2. Announcements
  - a) ITS Video – Hanley introduced Jane Worthy from Media Distribution Services. She videotaped the start of the meeting to obtain footage for a brief video describing services provided by the ITS Office of the CIO.
  - b) PolyComm Email Client Support Matrix – Schultz distributed an updated copy of the matrix and asked IRMPPC to endorse/affirm that ITS is heading in the right direction. It has been endorsed by AACC and the LAN Coordinators and is currently being reviewed by IACC, which is concerned about support for MacMail. IRMPPC endorsed the matrix but had the following comments. Dalton asked how many faculty use older technologies (e.g., Eudora, Pine, etc.). Schulz thinks it is less than half and primarily those working at home. The web client should provide an attractive and viable option for them. Timing for migrating faculty should be carefully considered to avoid frustration in Fall. Technical and then administrative staff will be migrated with faculty phased in based on department needs. Yelland asked if there is any limit to how much support is provided for at home use. Schultz said ITS gets several hundred calls per year which are generally time intensive for older operating systems, but as a rule, ITS does not service personal computers in the home.
  - c) Other – Morton distributed copies of a flyer promoting an event featuring Roger Wilkins to be held at Vista Grande on 1/15.

### B. Policy

#### 1. Information Security Program Draft

Stover reviewed the draft with affected areas, including ITS, University Police and the Security Committee. She asked what other campus groups should be asked for input. IRMPPC suggested the following constituent groups: AACC, IACC, SISU, OAG, LAN Coordinators, Deans Council, Student Affairs Council, ASI, and Foundation. She will bring the final draft back to IRMPPC before it is taken to Management Staff for final review and approval. Hanley considers security an essential part of maintaining University data. There is a need to raise campus awareness and get clarification around implementation issues, such as

identifying data stewards, what kind of training and support is needed, developing guidelines and practices, etc. Grimes asked if there would be a review body. Stover does not anticipate a separate group but using existing sources, such as the Security Committee. Grimes suggested including faculty.

Hanley, Stover and Kelley met to clarify the relationship of the Information Security Officer (Stover) and CIO (Hanley). CSU has raised expectations about the ISO role in protecting data in response to increased regulatory requirements. Cal Poly follows the traditional model of having the person responsible for oversight and compliance (ISO) not being part of the operational unit (CIO). The ISO plays a change management role in addition to their audit function. Both are pleased with the current model which they feel is working well.

## 2. Wireless Strategy and Policy Development

Madjedi distributed copies of the documents emailed to members yesterday and briefly reviewed the talking points presented at the 2/9 meeting. The need for cost and accountability at an enterprise level requires having policy to ensure that the campus is making the right decision on how to deploy wireless. Inaction will create operational and support problems in the future. Costs could run from \$1-\$16K per building, depending on the number of access points. The alternative is to risk growth in the number of rogue networks. Access is controlled by registering individual laptops (MAC addresses) and configuring the base stations to accept only those addresses. Since online authentication is untested and cost-prohibitive at this time (based on ITS pilot with CSc/CPE), ITS will continue this practice and implement a no-cost solution (network logon) in the next year or so. Madjedi briefly reviewed the policy, why it is critical to adopt and what elements should be it, and what kind of planning is necessary to help this service grow in a way that makes sense. Hanley suggested IRMPPC endorse the policy/strategy and then address how to plan the deployment. The following points/questions were raised by IRMPPC:

- Any First Amendment issues (Detweiler)? The responsible use policy still applies regardless of technology.
- Practices at other campuses? Restricting access, vendor partnerships or ignoring it. It is commonly prohibited in business, which is not realistic here.
- Potential classroom use (Saenz)? Wireless is not a viable replacement for wired connectivity, due to lack of available bandwidth, but could be used to address specific needs, e.g., temporary relocation, etc.
- Hardware solution to security problem (Grandillert)? Not cost-effective yet.
- If students are the primary beneficiary, Morton suggested reviewing it with ASI. The policy applies to departments not users, but conferring with SC3 and ASI on wireless requirements might be useful.
- Application to Residence Halls? Rooms are hard wired but wireless use in common areas is being considered. Rogue networks are still prohibited.
- Need to inform students, faculty and staff about the guidelines (Detweiler).
- Security awareness of individuals using off-campus wireless services, e.g., Internet cafes, airports, hotels, home use, etc. (Grimes).
- The need to encrypt data being accessed over wireless networks (Stover). Madjedi will work with Stover and Shaffer to add language addressing this, to

be supplemented with FAQs, a list of certified applications, notifications to users (e.g., handout at time of registration, upon opening applications, etc.).

- Wireless is not included in the TII minimum baseline. CSU is talking about adopting standards for wireless without providing funding.

In principal, IRMPPC endorsed the concept of ITS stewardship of the campus wireless network build-out. The discussion then turned to planning/deployment. Madjedi suggested a hybrid model in which departments fund the initial rollout based on ITS engineering standards, while ITS assumes responsibility for management and support. All registered users would be able to access any wireless point on campus. If necessary, departments can purchase additional hardware to restrict access and control bandwidth in their area. If this is an acceptable paradigm, Madjedi will reach out to computing advisory committee, LAN Coordinators, college fee committees, deans, department chairs, etc. for further discussion and input. She will update costs to reflect the new strategy.

## C. Planning Issues

### 1. ITS Speed Bumps

Hanley distributed and reviewed copies of the two-page summary, which he reviewed with Kelley during Fall Quarter.

### 2. Mid-Year Priorities

Given the serious budget constraints facing the campus, Hanley asked for advice on what services ITS should preserve, e.g., AACC recommended focusing on critical infrastructure needs, such as the network and e-mail. ITS is in the unique position of helping the campus as a whole lower its cost to do business through use of technology, e.g., moving services to the portal (Yelland concurred, citing student pay as an example.) or extending existing ITS service level agreements, e.g., consolidating/managing desktops, servers, software, labs, etc. Hanley will be bringing suggestions to the Strategic Management Group later this month.

Morton suggested charging each of the major units to study, through consultation with ITS staff, pragmatic and concrete ways to save money and achieve operational efficiencies. Detweiler said encouraging staff to identify ways to reduce costs could also benefit other service areas besides technology. One suggestion is to use video conferencing service to reduce travel costs. Dalton suggested focusing on specific areas with high transactions for more in-depth discussion, e.g., HR, Purchasing, Inventory, etc. Detweiler emphasized the need to preserve essential IT services (e.g., phone, e-mail, etc.) during the budget crisis as the campus has become dependent on these to deliver basic services, such as admissions. These should be given priority over new services. Grimes is concerned about the need for faculty to make more effective use of technology to save costs and improve teaching and learning, which is a priority for IACC. Hanley is committed to seeking less costly ways to deliver service in the future. Grandillert agrees with idea of slowing innovation provided the campus continues to focus on solutions to improve student success (e.g., DegreeWorks). Detweiler agrees that the campus needs to intelligently invest State money--even in bad times--to improve services to students, graduation rates, etc.

D. Subcommittee Reports

1. AACC Report – Time expired before this item could be discussed.
2. IACC Report – Time expired before this item could be discussed.
3. SC3 Report – Time expired before this item could be discussed.

E. Status Reports and Updates

1. ADA Compliance Status Report
2. SPAM Filtering / Email Performance Update

Time expired before the above items could be discussed.

F. Future Agenda Items

1. PolyComm Policy Issues
2. Software Acquisition Framework
3. Outsourcing Applications – Open Discussion
4. CMS Update

Submitted by Mary Shaffer