The minutes of the December 16, 2004, meeting were approved as distributed.

Request for Tech Fee Grant Extension
Proposal #2.3.1 – Hospitality Learning Center at the Georgia World Congress Center

In the November 18, 2004 meeting, there was discussion about the number of requests for extensions that J. L. was receiving. The committee approved a motion that tech fee monies must be encumbered by December 31, with the only exception of construction delays, and in that event, a written request will be made to the chair of the Senate ISAT Committee before December considered by the entire committee at the first January ISAT committee meeting.

Marty distributed the first of such requests that he received from Debby Cannon, Director of the School of Hospitality, with the Georgia World Congress Center to construct a Hospitality Learning Center from a meeting room. The amount funded for the proposal is $157,425 (adjusted from $167,425 - $10,000 for LCD signage removed).

They have encountered unusual difficulties working with another agency, and delays in getting construction information, such as drawings and cost estimates. Because of these delays, they request an extension until April 30, 2005. Some of the problems stem from administrative leadership changes and commitments at the World Congress Center (John Smith, General Manager of the Georgia World Congress Center and Adjunct Professor at the School of Hospitality, retired in October, 2004).

Discussion ensued…Tom said the request seemed reasonable, but what would happen after April 30 if they could not just extend it until the end of the fiscal year or end of the calendar year? Marty would prefer the end of the fiscal year; however, they did only ask for the end of April. Dabney motioned that Marty ask the requestor what date she wants, up to December 31, then grant the extension. The motion was seconded, and carried.

Marty will call Debby Cannon, decide on an extension date, and approve the request without further review from the committee.

Action Completed January 22: Per the instructions of the committee (in the Jan. 20, 2005 meeting), Marty phoned Debby Cannon, Director, School of Hospitality, on Friday, January 22, 2005. She requested that the grant be extend to December 31, 2005. She thanked the committee for its cooperation in the face of construction problems.

Notification Policy and Implementation
Report from the Ad Hoc Notification Subcommittee

At the December 16, 2004, meeting, the committee agreed to invite John Marshall to attend a meeting to address the questions and concerns of the committee regarding the Notification Policy and its implementation. Marty also formed an ad hoc subcommittee consisting of J. L. Albert, Mary Jane Casto, Dabney Dixon and Tom Netzel (Chair), to continue refining the statement. Tom reviewed and cleared the language with John Marshall. The last line in the statement is a placeholder but should be an easy-to-remember click to go to Georgia State’s policies concerning responsible use of the campus network and all computing resources. Tom would like the Committee to recommend to Human Resources that
this information is in employee handbooks and to the Registrar’s Office that it is available to students. At this time Novell, wireless and labs, but authentication to other access points in the network is anticipated in the future. T university-wide and consistent in all areas.

David asked what legal liability issue the statement solved for the University. John Marshall answered that if the Improper Use policy is enforced, having the Notification Policy implemented would nullify a person’s claim that he/she was not aware of it directs you to all Georgia State’s specific policies concerning responsible use of its campus network and other computing resources.

David recalled two issues of concern: (1) unauthorized external access; and, (2) internal access by minors. He asked how the policy would help with internal problems. John Marshall said that when the policy is implemented, it will be a good-faith effort has been made on the part of Georgia State to ensure notification to everyone who accesses our campus network computing resources.

Discussed which venues should receive notification and in what form, such as:

- Publicly accessible computer stations – Signage on each unit
- Public labs/rooms – Post on walls where it will be easily noticed when you enter room
- Desktops – Post as wallpaper (does not have to be “clickable”)

David suggested adding a third statement to the policy to include posting in publicly accessible computer stations. The policy posted on walls as a constant reminder; people tend to ignore desktop wallpaper. It should be posted in areas most likely to occur. Tom said that paper documents would become a burden to someone having to keep watch certain they stayed posted.

Marty stated the recommendation: The Notification Policy will be posted in all publicly designated labs managed by ITC, IS&T, and the University Library. Motion made and seconded; the recommendation is adequate with no further amendments…question called, all voted in favor of the motion with one opposed.

Dabney asked for clarification on a conversation between James and J. L., that once something goes onto your laptop, it’s always there. James said that related to his wondering about the technology to implement the notification…as soon as you authenticate would a message come up? There is a way to put it in the registry so that it pops up as soon as you authenticate and you click it to close it. A change to the registry could remove that. Dabney asked if she goes away from the University, does she get the Georgia State screen every time she logs in. Mary Jane said it would be an addendum to the log-in script, not adding anything to the registry and it will not be engineered so that you have to acknowledge it when you are away from campus. Tom said that if you are not authenticating to Georgia State, you will not see it. Question asked why authenticated users can’t simply sign a document acknowledging the policy. Marty said the statement has been approved and unless the majority wanted to open it up again, it would stand with the three recommendations. Cherise said she will go forward with Recommendation #2.

The recommendations are:

1. Recommend to Human Resources that the Employee Handbook contain a Responsible Use Notification for Computing Resources.

2. Recommend to the Registrar’s office that the Student Handbook, orientation and registration materials contain Notification for GSU Network and Computing Resources.

3. Recommend that the Responsible Use Network Notification be posted in publicly designated labs operated by ITC University Library.

4. Marty will send an email to Provost Henry outlining the Committee’s recommendations, and the recommendations to the Administrative Council.

Completed 01/21/2005

Potential Implementation issues for ON iCommand Software –Implementation Advisement

http://sea.symantec.com/content/product.cfm?productid=13
Marty said he had some concerns expressed to him about iCommand, having to do with how the software will interact with existing software (such as research or instructional software) when upgrading operating systems; the security of exams and grades; and the compatibility with the end-users’ work environment.

James reviewed the process leading to the purchase of central desktop management software: The ISAT committee to investigate desktop management systems. ITSSS looked at several products and met with several vendors. Symantec proved to be equally strong candidates, and the committee members decided that both products could fill the basically, interchangeable. On May 20, 2004, the ISAT committee voted to select the product most advantageous to the institution.

Symantec On iCommand was approved for purchase in June, 2004. The Symantec ON iCommand product suite with both enterprise and college-level management of computing devices, including Windows, Macintosh, Linux, PC operating systems. The suite will enable us to automate initial provisioning, OS deployment, application deployment (security patches and OS service packs), de-provisioning and re-provisioning. Currently these activities are managed across the institution, primarily through a combination of non-integrated tools, and much manual effort.

With iCommand, a technician can pull up your screen and fix the problem remotely. There will be lines of demarcation balances; this will not be a solution for everything, but is a solution for a lot of things. You can decide what you want to do. Initially, it will be rolled out on centrally basic systems, such as OS and IE, in a base package and images for a central location and made available to colleges and departments. They then can build their systems on the application to their own unit, with departmental oversight.

J. L. said it's not mandated, but recommended and in your best interest to install on your machine. The general intent at a protected level (mass protection). If you don’t do all the updates and secure all the systems, you become vulnerable to not participate, and become a weak link, risking the rest of the network, your machine would be isolated and repaired.

Tom asked how IS&T can tell when an individual machine is infected and requires isolation...does the University have the technology to scan individual machines? He does not think faculty would want the University to have that responsibility and kind answered, no, that it is done by looking at traffic patterns. Mary Jane emphasized that this is not virus protective delivery mechanism where your technology support people can use a base pre-built image of Windows, and any other institution decides should be on machines, and can stream pre-built applications, including patches, to your machine without a person having to come physically to your office.

Suggestion was made that in the future, when considering the purchase of new products, consider MAC together with Windows always behind when it comes to new technology. James said they did try to address that issue during the evaluation process currently is on Windows, but James expects MAC will be supported in the future as well as other operating systems of time. Currently, most colleges are using a patchwork of different programs to do what iCommand can do, as well as differences.

Marty expressed concerns that exams and grades could be accessed on faculty machines through iCommand. Mary Jane has remote control capability, but it is never automatic. Any faculty member would have to approve a technician to be on their machine. Dabney has great concerns about the security of exams, grades, promotion and tenure documents. She is responsible for the security of exams. Dabney said she now stands over any technician who is working on a computer where exams are stored. Shes areas definitely need this, such as in the labs, but high security computers should be allowed to opt out, such as for graduate students.

Tom said there are two issues at stake: a maintenance question and a security question. If a machine goes down, immediate help. If you have a machine that you want help on, then install it. If your machine holds sensitive, confidential data, you do not want the product, then opt out. Tom said as long as it is voluntary, it would be a great help, but if mandated, confirmed that there is no formal policy concerning iCommand at this time. James said that if you do opt out, you can manually control it.

James said, as a tech, there is a disadvantage in trying to provide all the answers at this time. While he has a concept of iCommand, he hasn’t gotten down to all the technical aspects and cannot be sure of all the implications. As we get to know the product, all these questions can be answered more specifically. Some answers will not be known until people a
and gain experience and more data. At that time, if it’s determined there are sufficient guards; faculty may be more inclined to want iCommand on their machines.

Cherise asked about the implementation plan, since the product has already been purchased. J. L. said it is not whether implemented but how and when. Symantec will recommend an implementation plan the week of January 24. iCommand on all computers managed by IS&T, in open labs and classrooms. Ten thousand licenses have been purchased at a cost of $387,000.

**Other Discussion:**

**Vista WebCT** Richard Welke inquired about Vista. He said that Vista seems to go down at the beginning of every semester, which is very bad timing. He asked if there is anything to preclude this repetitive occurrence from happening, thus, infusing Vista from faculty and students. Richard emphasized that testing should not be done at the beginning of a semester.

J. L. addressed the hardware/software problems that faculty have experienced and poor communication with the Bo team. He explained that the latest outage resulted from a test of the UPS power supplies in the Network Operations Center, conducted in response to an item contained in the IT BOR Audit. During the test, it was discovered that one of the systems was not plugged into the UPS, so when the system went down, it took the WebCT systems along with it. Richard mentioned Vista. He will forward to J. L. an email incident report regarding Vista systems overload.

Mary is concerned that no explanation or notification of Vista going down was posted and it was down for 48 hours. Without better communication, faculty will leave this system; there is no sense of community. J. L. said IS&T is working with the issue, possibly by putting up a service announcement page that will appear instead of the institutional login page, but the database and software is run in Athens. Cherise said they are well-prepared on the Banner side in case of outages, but problems arise with communication to other components. Mary Jane said that we do not have control over the front page of USG WebCT Vista; however, IS&T now has procedures in place to take that into account. J. L. said that IS&T is actively addressing all these issues.

Richard identified two other issues that he would like the Committee to consider addressing: Single Sign-On and Video Conferencing. He said there is an increasing need for single sign-on to all central applications, such as email, Banner, WebCT, etc. Video Conferencing provides a useful interactive communication in the classroom and he would like to be able to use this technology. Now may be the right time for the Committee to see what can be done to move these efforts forward.

With no further business, meeting adjourned, 2:50 PM

Respectfully submitted February 3, 2005
Carolyn Summerlin