INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY (ISAT)
COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, October 28, 2004
1:30 – 3:00 PM
718 General Classroom Building

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. L. Albert</th>
<th>Carolyn Codamo</th>
<th>Chip Hill</th>
<th>Yi Pan</th>
<th>Jim Senn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Benardot</td>
<td>Nancy Floyd</td>
<td>Susan Laury</td>
<td>Bill Paraska</td>
<td>Mary Shof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Casto</td>
<td>Marty Fraser</td>
<td>Tom Netzel</td>
<td>Cherise Peters</td>
<td>Ellen Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cheshier</td>
<td>Doug Goans</td>
<td>Karen Oates</td>
<td>George Pullman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval of Minutes: The September 23, 2004 minutes were distributed prior to the meeting; motion was made to minutes as amended, seconded, and carried.

Budget Principles and Priorities: Marty distributed the first five pages from the December 16, 2003 report Subcommittee on Budget Principles and Priorities, with the request that ISAT Committee members review the page any suggestions for modifications to accommodate redirection-type money, as well as handling cuts. He will comments emailed to him by Monday, November 8, 2004. Marty will circulate this via email as well. Marty suggests for modifications to the IS&T section in the Appendix, but does not want the focus to be keyed specifically but the overall higher level.

David asked if this is relevant to the $3.5 million university-wide process; Marty said it is looking at longer term although could be related to short-term cuts. David asked if the ISAT committee could be helpful to IS&T units the FY05 budget reductions. J. L. said that there is 3/4 of 1% giveback on the immediate horizon and still absorbing la cut. Bill asked if it was being suggested that IS&T come to the ISAT committee with their own proposed method for holdbacks. David said not necessarily. He was referring to administrative units who are often asked to take heavy reductions. The question may not be relevant.

J. L. said that he has is having discussions with Ron Henry and Jerry Rackliffe about some of IS&T’s networks and phone service) being considered as utilities. When you place a utility connotation on something generally funded differently and have a different priority in the budget. These discussions are ongoing, and while conclusion, it is on the table.

Tom suggested that ISAT could be a vehicle for IS&T by confirming the stress that the committee can see and the collision they see coming, to faculty, staff, students, and others throughout the campus. He asked J. L. to pull together some numbers as staff reduction over the last three years, email demand, etc., that will show the impact on IS&T. J. L. has already “talking points” that President Patton presented to the Board of Regents, showing the loss of 26 positions and almost in salaries. J. L. will continue gathering information and prepare a list of services that could be moved to a utility account to bring to the next ISAT meeting. Marty said that the committee can disseminate the information.

Notification of Appropriate Use Statement: J. L. submitted wording of the statement to John Marshall for legal review. Today’s document indicates the changes John Marshall made, and J. L. is open to suggestions for additional changes, and asked for suggestions for implementation. J. L. said the purpose of this statement is primarily legal and closes the potential liability issue for Georgia State. It is to put people on notice in such a way that they cannot escape the fact that they were notified. There remains some terminology to be decided and defined, such as “guests.” The two most prevalent options for implementing such a policy are: (1) a one-time annual or initial basis where you
button to indicate that you agree to the policy, then that acknowledgement will be recorded electronically, or (2) every time you enter the universities network and/or facilities. Cherise said that it has to be every time.

Mary Jane said an alternative could be by areas, some notified each time, others not. Susan said that if you have a you should not have to accept the notification each time.

The legal department wants a method in place to ensure notification to all users, faculty, staff, students and visi question today is not whether or not to implement, but how to get the notification to users. Visitors to the campus most difficult to cover, and the library PCs are most vulnerable. George said this is partially a conduct problem; tl not adhere to the policy could be handled as a trespassing or security issue. Tom said that no method can be 100% cover every person in every circumstance; we should opt for a reasonable program of notification to a diverse at variety of ways. This proves a good faith effort on the part of the university. J. L. said that part of the problem is we need to change the culture so that individuals will protect their machines by locking, or turning them off suggested to J. L. that he contact Rebecca Stout for a list of publications that are provided to students from t Students’ office, and she will also send J. L. a list of her publications. J. L. will talk to John Marshall again to enst are covered.

Questions / Answers

Q1) What obligations do faculty have to ensure that individuals are notified?
A1) The policy provides blanket coverage to protect the institution, of which faculty are a part. It is not facult responsibility, rather individual compliance.

Q2) Is there any implication in terms of classroom use of technology and faculty content if they have undera students in the classroom?
A2) This a different issue to be addressed by the Legal Department.

Q3) What liability would there be if inappropriate sites pop up accidentally in the classroom?
A3) This would be handled as a hostile environment in the classroom, and would be dealt with immediately.

Q4) What is the best method for getting this policy to the campus?
A4) Suggestions include:
1. Faculty/Employee/Student Handbooks
2. Background screen on all computers
3. All public computers should have signage.
4. Splash screen behind network
5. Screen notification at logon
6. Multiple solutions: signage, screen notification, etc.
7. All users of GSU computers sign a pledge
8. Faculty include as part of syllabus
9. Include in Student Packets, with all other statements they have to sign
10. Student bulletins
11. J. L. send reminder to Deans or Chairs at beginning of semester for awareness, to be passed to faculty
12. For those with GroupWise ID, once a semester, click and agree. If no GW ID, go to internet and click time you log on.
13. Post statement on GSU home page

Q5) A user in the library does not logoff of a workstation and leaves; another person comes along and ha access…how can this be resolved?
A5) Computers can have timed-out function.
Q6) Do we look for one electronic solution plus signage for all, or different electronic solutions plus signage for different locations or audiences?
A6) J. L. recommends one solution for all in order to have a standard in place for the entire campus.

Q7) On the first day of every semester, when faculty and students logon, can you have a screen popup with notification statement and they click to agree to the statement?
A7) The problem with that method is that another person may use your computer without authentication to the network, and the agreement would be theirs, but recorded as your own.

Q8) With authentication, can you store on a resident computer with a code that it has been authenticated?
A8) This can be done.

Minimum Information Security Environment Policy:

Mary Jane distributed copies of the revised policy which replaces the policy approved in March, 1999. A financial audit came out in June, 2004, and from that it was determined that surplus accepts computers with no certification that hard drives has been erased. The auditors asked IS&T to develop a policy to put that certification in place. $ add a statement to their forms to indicate machines they accept have been cleaned. Mary Jane determined that the Minimum Information Security Environment Policy would be the best way to do this. The revised policy paragraph “Secure Disposal or Re-Use of Information Systems Equipment” which defines a standard for equipment prior to disposal or re-use. The standard is effective January 1, 2005. At some point, new software deployed that will clean the machines, but until then, they will be cleaned by reformatting to erase data prior to disposal. This policy is adapted from the Department of Defense’s policy.

Customer Service Review:

J. L. discussed IS&T’s internal program to look at customer service functions. Problems noted are: (1) fragmented internally as to how we approach customer service, and (2) there is a growing demand to service personal PCs, PDAs, laptops, etc., and that has not been on IS&T’s radar scope as part of our charge and charter. J. L. discussed IS&T’s internal program to look at customer service functions. Problems noted are: (1) fragmented internally as to how we approach customer service, and (2) there is a growing demand to service personal PCs, PDAs, laptops, etc., and that has not been on IS&T’s radar scope as part of our charge and charter. IS&T was set up to help the administration, provide data, financial and personnel records, courses, and a help line for faculty…was it the intention originally envisioned to not service student. Traditionally it has not been done, and not recognized. With budgets being cut, servicing students is something will cost more money. J. L. answered that IS&T has been servicing students, but it has not been publicized. will continue to formulate a plan for customer service, with a target date of January, 2005.

Modem Reduction:

No investment has been made to the modem pool in the last several years. As the remaining 24 modems fail not be replaced. Tom suggested that the remaining modems be eliminated. Susan agreed but asked that fair given to users. Motion made to remove modems by the end of the year, seconded, and passed with the stipulation that a fair warning notice will be sent out that modems will be gone by the end of the year.

Disk Space Quota – Novell:

J. L. wanted to make the committee aware of SAN storage issues. Users have not been good stewards for purging email/emptying trash as they should. Recently, we were very close to running out of disk space.
current budget, IS&T may not be able to increase disk space and applying quotas is a possibility.

J. L. said that 10% of the users are consuming 70-80% of space; a few have 500 gigabytes. Tom asked if IS&T could go to those people and ask why they are using that much space. The users would justify by saying that it was for proof of journals they are editing, videos, etc. Tom asked if the university should be supporting that kind of activity, or should the researcher or department find ways to support those activities? J. L. said that IS&T is conducting some fact-finding, and is considering applying a quota system at different levels: individual, department, and college. Individuals could be given 500 MB. An algorithm will be developed for departments and colleges, and it will be their responsibility to assign and monitor. J. L. said he believes that it is very much IS&T’s responsibility to provide disk space to the campus, because it’s controlled and backed-up and data is preserved. He is concerned that a large amount of institutional data that is not backed-up could be lost. Tom said that problem could be solved by archiving. J. L. said that is another step in what IS&T wants to do. One of his long-term intentions is to set up a SAN at the Alpharetta Center, which is more than 20 miles away, connected to GSU by fiber-optic, and meets the auditor’s requirement. But for right now, he needs some way of managing on the front-end. When we start running short of space now, a notice is sent out to encourage people to clean up their files.

End-Note:

Doug distributed a flyer announcing EndNote bibliographic management software, purchased by Tech Fee funds and available free to all GSU faculty, staff and students. It can be downloaded at www.library.gsu.edu/endnote

Tech Fee Proposals:

Marty reminded everyone that the Tech Fee Call for Proposals would be on the web tomorrow (Oct 21-25, 2005). The second meeting will be during the week of March 21-25, 2005. The Tech Fee Subcommittee initial meeting will take place during the week of March 28 - April 1, 2005. Tom said since the requirement has been established for the re-use of equipment purchased by tech fees, a database is needed to track that equipment. Mary Jane said that the Stage 1 Proposal form asks for a list of tech fee purchased equipment if the current proposal is displacing that equipment. The new requirement for re-use of tech fee purchased equipment goes forward from this year and also covers any equipment that is still in use.

Other:

Tom asked if J. L. and Mary Jane would be interested in planning a seminar or meeting to outline where we are going, how do we survive in light of budget cuts, etc. J. L. said he knows the co-owner of a company called Nucleus Research at www.nucleusresearch.com/index.html who may be interested in making this presentation. The company has a straight-forward approach to IT research from the ROI point of view and could provide us with an ROI analysis of IT strategies. The presentation would be open to the campus, possibly at a Town Hall Meeting.

With no further business, meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
November 4, 2004
Carolyn Summerlin