

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
FEBRUARY 6, 2007

[In these minutes: Two Factor Authentication, Electronic Letterhead, SCIT Background Resources]

[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.]

PRESENT:

Nancy Herther, chair, Mark Sanders, Dale Swanson, Sue Van Voorhis, Deanette Schmidt, Eric Celeste, Linda Jorn, Danielle Tisinger, Joan Hughes, Bonnie Westra, Briana Clark, Parker Schultz

REGRETS: Alan Ek, Douglas Ernie, Andy Lopez, Jim Waddell, Mahmoud Sadrai

ABSENT: Stephen Cawley, Greg Laden, Stuart Speedie

GUESTS: Steve Baker, University Relations and Mark Powell, Data Security

OTHERS: Bernard Gulachek, John H. Miller

I). Nancy Herther called the meeting to order and made the following announcements:

- Eric Celeste will be leaving the University of Minnesota. His last day will be Friday, February 9<sup>th</sup>. Until a replacement has been hired for his position, Mr. Celeste noted that the Library representatives to SCIT would be John Butler and Christina Meyer.
- Two new students have been appointed to serve on SCIT, Briana Clark and Parker Schultz. Ms. Herther welcomed them both and requested they introduce themselves.
- Danielle Tisinger has been named as the ex-officio representative from the Senate Library Committee to serve on SCIT. Ms. Herther welcomed Ms. Tisinger.

II).

Ms. Herther welcomed Mark Powell from Data Security who was invited to speak about two-factor authentication.

He began by noting that the goal of the two-factor authentication project is to improve upon the security of the University's systems and access to its data.

A two-factor authentication reduces the risk of unauthorized access to systems and data.

Mr. Powell cited two examples of two-factor authentication:

1. An instant cash card, which requires its owner to use both the card and a corresponding PIN in order to conduct a transaction.
2. The mainframe financial system at the University requires the use of both a SecurID card and a PIN in order to authenticate and have access to this system.

Over the years, Mr. Powell stated that he has been involved in several projects to improve the security of the University's password Internet and Enterprise systems. While a lot of improvements have been made, the reality is that a password alone is just not strong enough. Unfortunately, nothing will make passwords strong enough.

There are too many threats, both hardware and software, that can allow others to capture passwords and authenticate as someone else.

In terms of who will use two-factor authentication, this project will impact:

- OIT server administrators.
- All Central Authentication Hub (CAH) enabled Enterprise Application users where the user is required to authenticate with their Enterprise password. The two-factor system will integrate with CAH.
- Anyone logging directly on to the University of Minnesota OIT administered UNIX or Oracle systems.
- Be positioned for the Financials system. Note:  
using two-factor authentication is not an implementation requirement for the Financials Project.

Progress made on the two-factor authentication project to date:

- The project team drafted requirements, issued a RFP, evaluated proposals, selected finalists and recently completed a Proof of Concept phase, which basically has the finalists demonstrate that they are able to do what they say they can do.
- The project team made a recommendation to Steve Cawley, chief information officer, on February 2, 2007. This recommendation will be taken to the Board of Regents at their March meeting for approval. Regental approval is required before an order can be placed.

Once Regental approval has been secured, training, hardware set-up, installation and testing will occur between March and June 2007.

Next steps:

- In order for the two-factor system to work with the CAH system, tokens will need to be distributed to users of the system. A self-enrollment process for setting up tokens and PINs will be created.
- A pilot will likely start in June.
- Rollout to existing Enterprise application users, server administrators, etc. over the course of the fall of 2007.

Mr. Powell distributed sample tokens for members to examine.

Members' comments/questions following this presentation included:

- Will Enterprise passwords be used with this new system? According to Mr. Powell, it is unlikely that Enterprise passwords will be necessary once the new system is rolled out.
- Will this new system impact both faculty and staff? Definitely staff noted Mr. Powell and only faculty if they access Enterprise applications.  
This new system is not intended for self-service applications at the University such as pay statements, etc.
- What is the process for getting another token if the original one is lost? Through the Help Desk, a person could get a by-pass for the day with the assumption that the token was left at home, etc. If, however, the token is permanently lost, the Help Desk would need to go into the system and disable that token and a new token would be issued.
- How many people will be impacted by the implementation of this new system? The estimate is 13,000 – 14,000 employees.
- Will this system be accessible for blind employees? Yes, the new system works well with screen readers. Phil Kragnes from Disability Services helped with this testing. A special token will be issued to those that are blind, which would not require sight.
- What about non-University employees that will need to access the system? This will need to be looked at on a case-by-case basis noted Mr. Powell.  
It would be possible to issue tokens to people outside the University or to have these people assigned passwords.
- This project falls under the category of 'Strengthen Data Security' in the OIT Compact.
- What will happen to the SecurID cards?  
These cards will still be needed for work on the mainframe for the Legacy financial system until the

new financial system is implemented.

Once the new financial system has been launched there will no longer be a need for the SecurID cards.

- What mechanisms are in place to protect the Enterprise databases? Is the data on these databases encrypted? There are a lot of layers of protection built in for protection. Mr. Powell was unsure whether the data is actually encrypted, but would find out.
- Resetting passwords and getting replacement tokens should require more than a call to the Help Desk. Realizing that making oneself physically present to the Help Desk staff on a campus this size is not realistic, maybe instead individuals should be required to make themselves physically present to someone with an authenticated token who can vouch for them. The current system seems too lax.

Nancy Herther thanked Mr. Powell for his informative presentation on two-factor authentication.

III). Nancy Herther welcomed the committee's next guest, Steve Baker from University Relations. Mr. Baker was invited to provide information to the committee about electronic letterhead.

In response to a need across the University community, University Relations is exploring creating electronic letterhead templates.

Increasingly organizations that do business with the University are requiring only electronic communication as opposed to paper correspondence.

In light of the new graphic standards that have been created and the new Driven to Discover Campaign, University Relations is seeing a lot more interest in proper use of the University's wordmark and the whole notion of properly branding the institution.

University Relations' goal is to try to make the University's communication materials as standard as possible in terms of quality.

The goal will be to have electronic letterhead ordered the same way as paper stationery. It is likely that the electronic letterhead would be created off the paper letterhead template.

A member stated that currently across the University the use of electronic letterhead is being handled differently from department to department.

University Relations should consider creating procedural guidelines for using electronic letterhead. Once created, there should also be a way to 'tamper-proof' the letterhead so it cannot be manipulated.

Another member took the position that locking up the letterhead format would make it less functional and there would be an increased demand on Printing Services to make trivial changes. Regardless if the format is locked, anyone from around the world could look at the format and simply recreate it. Anyone can recreate the University's identity and fake a document. Tamper-proofing letterhead is a pointless endeavor.

It was noted that the institution's position is that any electronic correspondence with a .umn.edu extension is considered official University correspondence.

The real question is how to standardize the letterhead to make it look more official and appropriate given the audience that is being targeted.

Any decision to make electronic letterhead templates available to departments will need to be easy to use stated Mr. Baker.

A member concurred and stated that in addition to being easy to use, the electronic letterhead distribution process will need to be widely communicated.

Can departments create their own electronic letterhead asked a member? Currently, University Relations position is that the University does not have electronic letterhead. Instead, if a document is sent out with a

.umn.edu extension, this is considered official University correspondence. By the same token, University Relations encourages departments to use the wordmark and other graphic standards properly because it is wellknown that departments are creating many different types of documents, electronic and otherwise. Because departments are creating these formats anyway, University Relations has decided it would like to be more service oriented and offer an appropriate and easy way for departments to obtain electronic letterhead.

With the emergence of HTML email, increasingly email is looking more and more professional and official stated a member.

As a result, departments are going to be exploring how they can make their correspondence as elaborate and intricate as other organizations.

It was suggested that Printing Services and University Relations pay attention to developments in this arena because it will be much more difficult for departments to do this than create their own electronic letterhead. It was suggested that the University consider creating an HTML email template, which departments could populate with their own information.

A member stated that while electronic letterhead and HTML email technology may look nice and leave a professional image, it should never be confused with authenticity. Striving for a professional image, however, is always a good thing to do.

A member commented that while the University recognizes the .umn.edu extension as official correspondence, many organizations receiving this communication do not recognize it as such.

How does University Relations plan to rollout its electronic letterhead campaign asked a member? Mr. Baker stated that further discussions with Printing Services would need to take place before a final decision is made about how to rollout this campaign.

Based on previous conversations with Printing Services, however, Mr. Baker estimates that this service could be rolled out within a couple months.

Ms. Herther thanked Mr. Baker for this time.

IV).

Ms. Herther developed a list of resources, which she believes committee members may find useful and informative as they serve on the committee: [http://www.lib.umn.edu/libdata/page.phtml?page\\_id=2323](http://www.lib.umn.edu/libdata/page.phtml?page_id=2323) At the next meeting of the Senate chairs, Ms. Herther explained that she plans to share her idea for enhancing communication, both within and between committees as well as with the larger University community, by suggesting other committees do the same.

In addition to having a link to the minutes, charge and meeting schedule, each committee's website could contain a link to key committee resources suggested Ms. Herther.

A member commented that what was just described sounds like a blog. Members were reminded that the University has UThink as its blog service.

It would be interesting if each committee had a blog that all members were authors suggested a member. Alternatively, it was suggested that a wiki would be another option. Ms. Herther acknowledged these suggestions and stated that it would be nice to have the Senate committee websites contain more useful and dynamic information.

V). Two issues were raised earlier this year, which SCIT may want to explore noted Ms. Herther. The first issue had to do with the multitude of expert databases on campus, many of which are woefully out of date. Considerations include:

- What are the best ways for maintaining information stored in these databases?
- With respect to security, where should this information housed?

- Should a single database be created?

A member stated that there is a University-wide working group looking at database issues on campus, IFARS.

So as not to duplicate efforts, the suggestion was made to talk with John Butler from the Library, who serves as a member of the IFARS working group, before taking any action on this issue.

Professor Steve Ruggles, chair of the Senate Research Committee, suggested the establishment of a joint subcommittee with representatives from both SRC and SCIT to look at the database issues from the perspective of staff and, in particular, from the perspective of faculty noted Ms. Herther. In Ms. Herther's opinion, a joint SCIT and SRC database subcommittee, would be another voice for this discussion, separate from what IFARS is doing.

The purpose of the subcommittee would be to facilitate conversation that enables faculty to weigh in on this issue in parallel to the conversations that are occurring administratively.

Mr. Herther asked members whether establishing this subcommittee was worth pursuing. A member voiced concern over establishing this subcommittee without consulting first with the IFARS working group to find out their intentions.

Based on comments received, Ms. Herther noted that there was enough interest on the part of SCIT to establish a subcommittee, however, before doing so, she would check on what the IFARS working group has been doing and continue discussing the matter further with Professor Ruggles. She will follow-up with an email to the committee.

The second issue that was raised last fall had to do with whether there should be guidelines for basic technology support for faculty members.

Based on input from people that Ms. Herther had spoken with, the level of technology support for faculty varies widely from college to college and department to department.

Mr. Gulachek stated that standards have been developed around certain practices related to server management and professional management of private data, but there are no standards set up to address faculty technology support across the institution.

A member asked what is meant by the term support? Ms. Herther cited examples such as hardware, software, etc.

By creating a standard, it would be an opportunity for the institution to explore what level of technology each faculty member should be able to expect.

Ms. Herther reported that she spoke with the chairs of SRC and SCFA, Professor Ruggles and Professor Sirc, respectively, to determine whether this is an issue for either of their committees. Both indicated that the issue has been raised in their committees and that it is definitely an issue. The suggestion for another joint subcommittee was mentioned.

An AHC member stated that within the AHC guidelines have been adopted that identify computer requirements and support levels. It may be helpful to look at this document.

Has actual data been collected around this issue or is it more or less hearsay, asked a member, affecting only a few faculty?

It would not be worth the committee's time to investigate an issue that only impacts a handful of faculty. Ms. Herther replied that that was not how it was brought up to her; SCFA and SRC both think it is an issue that needs to be addressed.

After all, if the University expects to be one of the top three public research institutions in the world, this is

an issue that needs to be addressed.

The observation was made that as collegiate units fund technology support for faculty and staff in their colleges, there are definitely colleges that earmark more resources than others. Some collegiate units such as those in the AHC have set uniformity expectations, but it is unclear what the appetite is in terms of guidelines for the rest of the institution to follow. This is definitely an issue.

Various Senate committees can band together to support faculty by providing them with the leverage they need in the form of a resolution outlining technology support guidelines/recommendations. It will then require faculty to take this ammunition to their units to get the technology support they need.

After much discussion, there was general agreement among committee members that this was an issue they wanted to move forward on.

Ms. Herther will attend the SCFA meeting on February 13, 2007 to listen to that committee's discussion on this issue. She will report back at our next meeting or earlier, via email, if necessary.

VI).

Briefly, Mark Sanders brought to the committee's attention an issue that has arisen concerning technology fees, which the committee explored a couple years ago. He reported that following SCIT's technology fees discussions, the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) decided to reduce its students' technology fees and to charge technology fees to non-CBS students taking CBS classes/labs, similar to what CLA and IT does.

Because CBS was never notified until several months later that their new fee structure had been rejected by central administration, they were faced with a \$375,000 budget shortfall. While CBS is working through this shortfall, Mr. Sanders would like there to be uniformity in terms of how technology fees are assessed across campus.

This is an issue he would like the committee to address and for the committee to bring the issue to the Senate.

In light of time, Ms. Herther thanked Mr. Sanders for sharing his concerns and noted that this issue would be discussed further at the committee's next meeting on March 6<sup>th</sup>.

VII). Hearing no further business, Nancy Herther adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University

Senate