SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (SCIT)
February 2, 2016
Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Vendor Management Standard; Public Jobs, Private Data Training; ESUP Update; New Business]

PRESENT: Eric Watkins (chair), Rajkumar Vyas, Sean Conner, Madeline Doak, Nancy Carpenter, Michelle Driessen, Brandon Vanderbush, Robert Rubinyi, Kate Martin, Santiago Fernandez-Gimenez, Karen Monsen, Carlos Soria, Bernard Gulachek

REGRETS: Benton Schnabel, Geoffrey Ghose, Yoichi Watanabe, Tim Nichols, Kate McCready, John Butler

ABSENT: Diane Willow

GUESTS: Brian Dahlin, chief information officer, Office of Information Technology (OIT); Sue Van Voorhis, associate vice provost, Academic Support Resources; Amy Kucera, senior director of operations, Office of Human Resources; and Sharon Ramallo, senior director of application development, OIT; Mike Volna, associate vice president, Controller’s Office

Professor Eric Watkins, chair, welcomed the committee and members introduced themselves.

1. Vendor Management Standard: Brian Dahlin, chief information officer, Office of Information Technology (OIT), spoke about the University’s updated Vendor Management Standard, which is an information security policy related to building the security controls appropriate for various data classification levels. Dahlin said it provides controls based on the type of data involved and how secure that data needs to be. The intent is to help provide standards on what controls should be in place when working with a vendor. Dahlin said that the University needs to know that if a vendor is working with University data that we are getting it back, and it is getting cleaned out of their systems.

He said they are mostly concerned with vendors putting data into another’s system: for instance, putting data into cloud solutions. OIT, he said, wants to make sure vendors have appropriate servers and data standards, as well as making sure they are meeting the regulations that govern that data. HIPAA regulations would be one example. Dahlin said they want to make sure a
vendor is creating a solution that is thinking about security, and not attaching a system to the University’s network that would then leave data vulnerable in some way.

Professor Sean Conner stated that a lot of security relies on encryption. What is the University’s standard on purchasing software that legally requires a backdoor entry? Mike Volna, associate vice president, Controller’s Office stated that if an individual believes that this is a critical element, then it should go into the RFP as something for vendors to respond to. Additionally, he said, typically a vendor will send a version of the contract they want to use, and that typically contains a piece on what state they reside and what requirements for security exist. Dahlin added that when talking about sensitive types of information it should be certain that there is some way to transfer the data in an encrypted way. Some regulation requires the data to be encrypted while at rest, not just in transit. HIPAA appears to be going in that direction, he said, but not there yet.

When asked about specific devices and security issues, Dahlin replied that they are trying to establish a policy that would cover everything, not specific devices. He added that they expect if a vendor is attaching their products to the University’s network, that the language in this policy would require them to meet the University’s level of standards. Dahlin also clarified that they are primarily concerned in this policy with large system records, and not so much with individual responsibility regarding data privacy.

Santiago Fernandez-Gimenez commented that he found it challenging to go through the GAP analysis, and that “monitor” is a key term to consider. What is monitoring? How do you define that term, to spell it out in more detail so individuals have some guidance? Dahlin said that he would try to make that clearer, but that the intent is to assure that a 3rd party can validate the controls are tested and adequate. That generally gives us enough information and assurance that the right controls are in place. When that is not in place, he said, then the GAP analysis comes in. Somebody may have contractual obligations with an organization storing their data, and if they have a breach, they have to report that to the University and then the University has to tell the individuals. If we don’t ask up front, said Dahlin, then we have a situation where we may be potentially in violation.

2. Public Jobs Private Data Training: Dahlin stated that the original training on Private Data was created in about 2002 or 2003. He said that it was quite dated and that since then, they have done a lot of work on security policy and standards, and over past year have been working to update the content of the training. He stated that staff, faculty, and any employees of the University are required to take the training at the beginning of their careers. He said they have contracted with the SANDS Institute to provides security training, as they have experience in this type of training for higher education institutions. He said it is a twenty-five-minute video with questions at the end, and helps assure that individuals have the knowledge they need, and helps the University meet regulatory requirements. Dahlin asked if the community would take the
training and provide feedback to his staff. The committee agreed to do so, and a link will be sent out to all members.

Conner asked if all employees could take the training rather than just new employees. Dahlin said that he appreciates and agrees with the intent but that is a larger conversation that has to happen. Bernard Gulachek, interim vice president and chief information office, OIT, added that he would be interested in committee’s feedback as to frequency. He said he took the new training, as well as the old training years ago, and the new is dramatically improved. Perhaps, Gulachek suggested, after the committee has taken the training they can provide feedback on frequency.

3. ESUP Update: Sue Van Voorhis, associate vice provost, Academic Support Resources, began by reviewing the history of the Upgrade: Van Voorhis said that in 1998, the University wrote many of the pieces of the system that affected students, including class search, registration, and financial aid packages. Every time they customized the software each of those pieces had to be tested and retested. The University had customized to the point where PeopleSoft, the software vendor, refused to visit campus to help with any bugs. The system, she said, was too personalized.

At the point of the Upgrade, she said, it made sense to be less customized because:

- Customization requires development and testing.
- Customization increases ongoing costs.
- Customization is a poor long-term strategy – it often causes unforeseen problems down the road.

She said the Upgrade goals were to:

- Reduce risk,
- Achieve operational excellence,
- Assure change is driven by operational need, not technology, and
- Place Enterprise focus on change management and communications.

She added that there was a lot of feedback provided through faculty focus groups, and she appreciated the participation in the process. The system went live April 20, 2015, said VanVoorhis. At that point, things went well and the staff felt good. However, she said, when fall term started, problems arose. Students could not look at schedules; faculty could not look at class lists. Initially, they couldn’t figure out what was happening. Since that time there have been 51 million page views, and they feel they have done well considering all the tertiary systems. For instance, she said, in the student area alone there are fifty-seven systems besides PeopleSoft.
Van Voorhis said there is some good news with this upgrade:

- Adoption of new MyU was successful.
- Student self service was successful.
- Moodle integration was successful (grade entry).
- Payroll was successfully delivered.
- Paperless timesheet and time off requests are working.
- Financials transition was smooth; functionality satisfactorily implemented.
- Tertiary systems were successfully connected.

However, the following areas, she added, have proven to be “user pain points”:

- Dislike new look/feel;
- Frustration over use of pop-up windows;
- Delivered class search does not provide needed information;
- Dissatisfaction with Recruiting Solutions and establishing a position in the system; and
- MyAdvisees tab showing notifications and holds. (VanVoorhis added that this has just been fixed.)

VanVoorhis said that moving forward they have the following priorities for each of the various areas:

- System stability and production support;
- Compliance technical maintenance (People Tools 8.54 Upgrade is happening soon);
- User feedback and planning for future enhancements;

**MyU Priorities:**

- Partnerships with Campus Solutions area, Financials, Human Resources, OIT, UServices and others to improve user functions;
- Technical Updates from vendor;
- Data-driven, user-focused services;

**Student/Academic Priorities:**

- Class/course projects (issues related to compliance, improving access to course and class information, improving class search experience);
- Rollout of GPAS implementation (degree audit at degree program level);
- Student work stream data and analytics;

**Mike Volna talked about Finance Priorities:**

- Build capacity to support payroll accounting - all the financial transaction activity that feeds payroll information into the reporting;
- Refine PC card functionality;

**Amy Kucera, senior director of operations, Office of Human Resources, discussed HR Priorities:**

- Continue to work with super user advisory group to identify and prioritize issues.
• Continue to enhance and proactively align our partnership with other workstreams.
• Continue to enhance the Recruiting Solutions module through Oracle updates and usability results.

Sharon Ramallo, senior director of application development, OIT, discussed the EDMR (Enterprise Data Management and Reporting) Reporting Priorities:

• Build Community (FCOP);
• Focus on data definitions;
• Move to self service reporting;
• Be a model for development of enterprise reporting;
• Shared enterprise project prioritization;
• Support business decisions; and a
• New EDMR website (EDMR.UMN.EDU).

VanVoorhis said they have received feedback from all constituents, and that has helped them prioritize needs and plan for the next two years of upgrades of various applications, so that there are no surprises. She then opened the floor for question.

• Rubinyi asked VanVoorhis to talk about schedule and catalog issues. VanVoorhis said they want to build what faculty need with a different solution from what students have. For students they want a better class search function that will roll automatically to registration. Then they can work on getting faculty what they need. She said that class search is a primary complaint from users, and faculty should feel free to send feedback to her.
• Watkins added that he gets frustrated with signing in because sometimes the system doesn’t know who he is and asks him to log in and start over. VanVoorhis replied that they do not want to modify in PeopleSoft and so they need to look at an alternative solution outside of PeopleSoft.
• Professor Michelle Driessen said that a staff person in her unit has to hand enter every class from scratch. There are hundreds of sections and so errors naturally occur. VanVoorhis replied that the rooms never roll forward, but she thought the other data was supposed to roll forward. She will check on that.
• Rubinyi asked, since the purpose of the project was to “go vanilla” and save money, has there been an estimate on what has been saved? VanVoorhis said that she knows in Student Services that OIT has saved the work of two developers dedicated to their projects. She didn’t know if it was possible to calculate the total amount.

Gulachek added that the work of VanVoorhis, Volna, Kucera, and Ramallo has been monumental. He said it was important to acknowledge that they have done a monumental job. The goal, he added, will always be as lightly modified as possible.
5: **New Business:** Gulachek noted that the University has submitted its supplemental request to the State, and that it will be discussed in the not too distant future. One of the requests is centered on the Cybersecurity portion of the network upgrade that is being planned. He said it felt like a good time to bring it to the state due to the current budget surplus. He said he would like to bring a team to a future meeting to talk about the upgrade.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.
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