SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES (SCIT)
MINUTES OF MEETING
October 2, 2012

[In these minutes: Committee orientation; Scott Studham, vice president and CIO, Information Technology, IT initiatives review; Brian Dahlin, director, Security and Assurance, OIT.]

PRESENT: David Arendale, chair, John Butler, Lara Friedman-Shedlov, Helen Lin, James MacDonald, Noel Phillips, Benton Schnabel, Yuk Sham, Tom Shield, Scott Studham, Tisha Turk, Mary Vavrus

REGRETS: Ted Higman, Sean Conner, Stephen Levin, Shashi Shekhar

ABSENT: Yiwen Li, Nolan Shen

OTHERS ATTENDING: Brian Dahlin, Bernard Gulachek

GUESTS: Brad Cohen, associate CIO Academic Technology, IT; Ben Neeser, chief of staff, OIT

Professor Arendale called the meeting to order, welcomed those present, and asked members to introduce themselves.

COMMITTEE ORIENTATION

Professor Arendale reviewed the charge with the committee. He commented that there are other Senate committees that deal with issues related to technology. He reminded the members to review the pending issues list, identify the items they would like to address this year, and send their selections via email to Ms. Rich.

SCOTT STUDHAM, VICE PRESIDENT AND CIO, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Studham began by emphasizing he would be speaking about information technology as a whole, not just the Office of Information Technology. He distributed a folder containing the IT Governance chart and a list of initiatives.

He explained the governance chart and added that the process has been streamlined recently.

- The input, or red section of the chart, is to be reviewed in the spring of an academic year, in an attempt to plan for the following year.

- The decision process, or blue section, is to be completed in the fall when decisions are made regarding investments. Currently, the input and decision process are compressed and being completed together.
- The right side of the chart diagrams how the information and guidance is communicated to the collegiate and non-collegiate IT staff across the system. There are 1,200 IT professionals, of which 384 are in OIT. As the governance process is undertaken, strategic initiatives are identified for the following year. Mr. Gulachek proposed to base the communications around communities of practice. For example, if the University requests development on a strategic initiative, IT professionals that are interested in the initiative are offered the opportunity to work on it. Professor Sham commented that the revised governance process would allow for more feedback and interaction throughout the IT community. Mr. Studham emphasized that he wants to assist the governance process, not just establish initiatives without input. It was pointed out that it might be difficult to identify stakeholders for specific initiatives in such a large group of people.

  Mr. Cohen explained that in the short term, a survey would be released by the end of the month to the largest possible audience including: faculty, staff, and students across the system. The system is cloud-based and will enable OIT to receive immediate input regarding how people perceive the University's IT services. They can benchmark the responses against those of similar institutions. The survey will measure things like: what level of network access do users want and what level do they perceive they get? The most important issues will surface, and IT can prioritize based on the results. The input process will enable them to broadly receive as much input as possible. They will look at trends, speak with campus constituents including SCIT, sample broadly, benchmark against other institutions, and based on this information they will identify the candidates for IT priorities. The investment strategies and priorities of IT will be centered on the information generated through the governance process.

IT Initiatives Review

Mr. Studham stated that the compact process would begin at the end of October. He drew the committee's attention to a document that was created by synthesizing input that had been gathered from various sources such as President Kaler, an online forum at excellence.umn.edu, and the six-year IT strategic plan. President Kaler asked each college and vice president to identify procedures where risk needed to be recalibrated. At the website, excellence.umn.edu, users can post comments and make recommendations about IT improvements. The list Mr. Studham created contains items that were consistent across all the documents. He prioritized the list himself into high, medium, or low priority. He has begun meeting with representatives from the University to hear feedback on the list such as: Are items missing? Should anything be rephrased? Is the prioritization correct? He has met with President Kaler, several deans, Provost Hanson, and presently SCIT.

Initiatives include:

Alignment of IT staff across the University

How can alignment be brought to IT across the University system without centralization?

The goal is to establish standardization, not centralization. President Kaler has asked for a plan to be submitted by December 1st 2012.

Clarify IT Prioritization Process

The governance process will only be effective if there is a broad understanding of the process across the IT community.

PeopleSoft Upgrade

Replacing and re-implementing the Human Resources system, student system and upgrading the finance system will be done simultaneously. The scope of this project is much larger than the EFS upgrade. A member commented that exposure to the system before it is implemented will make the transition easier. Mr. Studham responded that a change management team would be assigned to help users with the new system. He explained that there is a real-time educational component that was purchased with the PeopleSoft system in addition to the personal support that will be offered by the change management team. The new system will not be implemented for two years. A member emphasized that the personal component will help mitigate the anticipation surrounding the upgrade.

E-Learning Technology

The provost is working with the faculty to develop an e-learning strategy. The goal is to find the units using e-learning tools, ensure that they are implemented at the lowest cost, and establish similar formats across the system to make them more accessible to the students.

X% Cost Reduction in IT Administrative Functions

President Kaler created this initiative to redefine administrative cost. He is committed to reducing administrative costs. In the past, OIT has been considered an administrative cost. How can the total IT expenditure cost be reduced? Often, as you reduce central expenditure, you increase administrative cost. The typical IT cost is measured as a percent of gross revenue. Most universities spend 5.5% of their gross revenue on IT expenditures. The University spends 6.5% on IT expenditures, which equates to nearly $200 million across the system. The University may spend more because of research grants. The goal is to rationalize the amount that is being spent.

Server Consolidation

The initiative began two years ago and the goal was to consolidate 75% of the servers into a data center and virtualize them. About 25% of the servers are independent researchers or department level instrument control systems that are not candidates for efficiency gauging.

Help Desk Consolidation

There are 73 different points of contact for University help desks. The non-collegiate help desks need to be consolidated. Once it is proven that some desks can be centralized, departments will be approached with the option to invest the IT professionals in academic technology. They will be repurposed as consultative

resources for the faculty regarding using technology in the classroom. The collegiate units have a choice, the administrative units will not have the choice. Mr. Sham pointed out that information regarding turn around time and HIPAA would impact the choice made by department chairs. Mr. Studham responded that service level agreements for each of the services provided centrally have been collected over the last six months.

He suggested that SCIT discuss the common good IT services offered at the University, the best effort, and what is the guarantee?

Complete a Gmail Policy for the AHC

Mr. Studham emphasized that he is not equipped to answer questions regarding HIPAA despite the numerous questions he receives. He is not sure how HIPAA regulations will affect the AHC's use of Gmail.

Develop an IT Risk framework for Security and Privacy

Currently, 1.1% of IT expenditure is spent on information security, which is the lowest of any of our peers. There are a few policies, like the Acceptable Use Policy, which is guidance for best practices. Information security framework includes adopting a national standard. There are 250 prescriptive controls within a national standard. As a University, we need to meet the standards, and identify the necessary exceptions to meeting the national standard. A security framework outlines who accepts risks and who approves that commensurate controls are met. For example: the deans will accept collegiate level risks, the local IT professionals will accept day-to-day risks, Brian Dahlin, director, Security and Assurance, Information Technology, will accept commensurate controls, and Mr. Studham would accept enterprise level risks. The framework for these discussions has not been established. President Kaler has stated that this is a high priority for IT.

CRM

CRM is customer or constituent relationship management. How do we maintain correspondence with prospective students, current students, and potential donors? Selectedsalesforce.com is the University's CRM and it is up to local units to implement the service. Data will be gathered from Admissions to determine the primary value. Next, the colleges will use it to manage correspondence with the student while they are enrolled. The goal is to make sure that the experience is personalized for each constituent. Advisers can view their experience with the University to recruit them for Admissions and later Alumni Relations will use the information to maintain a relationship.

Create Capacity for Technology Innovation

Within the OIT budget: where are we de-vesting and where are we investing? This year we are de-vesting in physical infrastructure as technology moves toward cloud-based and wireless systems. The largest investment is in academic technology, the second largest is in information security, the third largest is shirring up the help desk consolidation, and the fourth is in academic training to faculty.

Low priority items include:

Deliver well-defined services and service level agreements for all of IT. What are the services that are common good, guaranteed and what are the departmental services and those that should be shared? Departments are taxed, but what do those taxes pay for?

Part of the governance process is to establish an IT Buyer's Deans group. Directors cannot be the only voice of IT because they do not have the fiduciary responsibilities, therefore CFO's or chief academic officers should have input on the day-to-day, tactical investments in IT.

Create enterprise-wide reporting strategy or data exchange framework and create a governance structure to make data based decisions.

Conduct a geospatial survey to determine where the wireless coverage is around the University.

Mr. Studham asked the committee if they had feedback regarding the list of priorities.

- Professor Arendale responded that it is difficult to choose because some are enormous infrastructure issues, while others are direct service issues. He appreciates the opportunity to see the list early and offer feedback.
- Professor Sham stated that he speaks from the HIPAA perspective and is most concerned with the handling of data. He believes that the handling of data will determine the policies. He would like to see HIPAA sensitive data separated from non-HIPAA sensitive data. Mr. Studham replied that the use of Gmail by the AHC has to do with the University's stance on HIPAA. Most of our peer institutions operate HIPAA sensitive machines completely separate from all other actions. These machines are completely guarded and the HIPAA sensitive material cannot be accessed from another machine. The University's assumption is that everyone in AHC has HIPAA sensitive data, but Mr. Sham states this is not true. Mr. Studham agreed that the HIPAA assessment needs to highlight this issue. The liability of the University is increased by making the assumption that every machine contains HIPAA sensitive material.

BRIAN DAHLIN, DIRECTOR OF SECURITY AND ASSURANCE, OIT

The major components of establishing the security framework are: instituting an overriding information security policy, a risk management program, adopting specific national standards**,** a process to manage exceptions to the standards, and gap analysis to the standard that is established.

Having a data classification system is important for the entire framework. Data classification in the past relied on the privacy classifications of the University of public, private, and confidential. The privacy standards are limiting because confidential is a very small subset of data. They are looking towards security classifications of unrestricted, restricted, and highly restricted data. HIPAA data would most likely be

classified as highly restricted, but there may be instances when it is not. The classification policy will go to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) in October.

They are working to establish the Information Security Policy for the University that establishes risk management and exception management. In the past, the University has relied on the Acceptable Use Policy to determine the roles of people within security. He expects that this will not reach the PAC until November.

Professor Sham added that an individual researcher or research group may deem data to be restricted, but it is not considered restricted by the University. This could cause issues in terms of intellectual property.

Mr. Dahlin explained that HIPAA and PCI do not have the same set of rules, despite them both being restricted there are different rules for handling the data. Breach notification is an example of where they differ.

Professor Arendale suggested that this issue is revisited in the future. He summarized by saying he sees a need for more classifications of restricted data. He thanked the presenters and moved on to the list of potential topics.

TOPICS FOR 2012-2013

Professor Arendale explained that he thought it best to have the members vote on the topics by placing a check mark next to the topics they want to be addressed this year. He asked the members if they thought any items were missing from the list.

He would like to add data security within the AHC as a potential topic.

A member commented that it would be important to consider the restructuring of the governance process.

Professor Arendale suggested ad hoc committees be formed to research documents that formed the basis for the list of priorities presented by Mr. Studham.

Mr. Butler emphasized that SCIT is being called upon to provide feedback to the FCC and the IT governance process. Professor Arendale commented that this year is an important year for the committee to provide input on the changes occurring throughout IT.

ADJOURN

Hearing no further business, Professor Arendale adjourned the meeting.

Jeannine Rich
University Senate Office