Senate Information Systems and Technology Committee Meeting  
Thursday, May 19, 2005

In Attendance:

J. L. Albert  Tammy Clark  Steve Harmon  Karen Oates  
Shelia Bradley  Missy Cody  Yu-Sheng Hsu  Yi Pan, Committee Chair  
Dan Bragg  Susan Easterbrooks  William Monahan  Larry Pankey  
David Cheshier  Doug Goans  Tom Netzel  Cherise Peters  

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Pan called the meeting to order at 1:30, and then invited the members to introduce themselves. Dr. Pan asked for a motion concerning the minutes of the previous meeting. He pointed out that the September 22 meeting date has been changed to September 15. He also advised that the name of the subcommittee appointed to study the proposal from the University ADA/504 Advisory Committee for Web Accessibility was listed incorrectly, and should be changed to Web Accessibility Policy Sub-Committee (WAPS). Motion was made, seconded and approved to accept the minutes as corrected. It was also noted that the Agenda and any related documents should be sent to the Committee in advance (more than one day) of the meeting.

I. Old Business

IS&T Printing Service Update: Dr. Pan presented a general picture of this issue to the group: The FY 2006 Student Technology Fee Subcommittee voted to end funding for student printing subsidy because, after careful consideration, they concluded that continuing to use STF funds to subsidize a portion of student printing was a less appropriate use of tech fee monies than other proposals that contribute directly to student learning. The question now is: how can the student printing problem be solved?

Since the last ISAT meeting, J. L. asked Joe Amador, Lab and Classroom Support Manager, to determine the cost for the campus printing system. Joe met with technical managers from the library, ITC, PantherCard Office, UETS, and colleges.

For the current year, 718,432 jobs have been completed for a total of 3,090,613 printed pages; an average of 4.3 pages each costing 4.6 cents per page. In determining costs, they considered:

1) Printer Maintenance and Replacement  
2) Toner Cartridges  
3) Other Cartridges/Fusers/Drums, etc.  
4) Paper  
5) Staff Labor and Maintenance  

The participants also looked at the uniprint costs that UETS incurs maintaining this system for the campus. The colleges agree to charge students whatever fee that IS&T determines, and that IS&T needs to cover their costs when supporting the Print systems. They suggested increasing the cost per page from 5c to 7c; however, all costs have not been yet been fully identified. It is important to know the “loaded” price in order to set an appropriate per page cost.
Tom asked if there is a significant difference for the cost of printing among the colleges. If that is the case, and the difference is more than 10%, the cost should be based on a variable rate. J. L. said that is possible, although managing variable rates would be difficult. Tom asked if an SLA between IS&T and Auxiliary Services would be apt. J. L. replied that he will look into that as soon as the bottom-line cost is determined.

The committee discussed whether or not there is a policy issue with subsidized services for students. Why subsidize some and not others, for example, Course Packs were provided as a subsidized service. J. L. said in that instance, Course Packs do not go across campus, whereas printing does. He stated that Georgia State has to begin looking at standardization to ensure cost controls. This extends to volume purchasing as well. A case in point is the current Dell Volume Purchasing Agreement. Dell has offered a 19% discount to Georgia State for volume purchasing. J. L. said that, to date, a commitment to purchase more than 1,000 machines is firm, including the tech fee purchases. With the discount, one out of every six machines will be no cost. Aggregative buying programs require standardization.

David and Tom agreed that they would like to see the paragraph from the Report of the FY 2006 Student Technology Fee Subcommittee (STFS) concerning eliminating subsidizing student printing, be posted or announced somewhere, so that students and others will understand that the subcommittee is not against supporting the printing service, but their decision was based on the fact that the monies could be used for more appropriate student learning. Tom suggested adding a sentence to the announcement that a cost analysis has been done and students are only charged what the actual printing cost.

David asked if there was an estimate of how many students went into labs only to print. Many, if not most, students now use laptops, and use the labs only when they need specialty software. J. L. said that he has observed little in/out traffic and is not aware of that happening. Steve agreed, and furthermore, said that we need pro-active management of student expectations. When students have to pay, they will expect excellent service.

Discussed options:
1) Outsourcing: In the past, this has resulted in poor service.
2) Printing Stations: Though they remove load from labs, unattended stations are at risk for theft, vandalism, inept users

**Action Item:** J. L. will bring an update to the August meeting with final recommendations for printing services.

**II. New Business**

**Georgia State University Security Plan – Overview:** J. L. introduced Tammy Clark, Assistant Director and University Security Officer, and William Monahan, Information Security Administrative Lead, both from IS&T’s University Computing and Communications Services. When Tammy began at Georgia State in 2000, she authored both long and short-term Information Security Strategic Plans that provide the direction and development of the University’s information security program, based in part on a security audit that was completed at the University in 2000. She has developed and implemented a number of security initiatives, including an information security awareness program.
an intrusion detection monitoring system and incident response mechanisms to track attacks and intrusions on university systems and databases. Tammy provided handouts with diagrams showing the Compromised System Process and the Computer Security Incident Response Team Procedure (CSIRT). A Draft of the Incident Response Policy was also distributed. Tammy explained what the different shapes on the flow diagrams indicate:

○ = Event / Incident Occurs  ○ = Actions Implemented  □ = Person Notified

NOTE: Included with the minutes is an updated, improved Computer Security Incident Response Team Procedure, provided by William Monahan May 23, 2005.

Cherise expressed concern about an incident that she was not notified about until several days afterwards. Tammy explained that each college has their own security network and Tammy relies on that fabric of communication to contact their constituents in the event of a security breach, incident or offense. An auto-generated summary of events is available for those who would like to receive it. Tammy offered to add email addresses to her notification list for those who would like to receive alerts when incidents occur that would affect their area, so they would not have to solely rely on communication from their college network people.

Tom noticed that there is no academic input involved in the process. He suggested that Tammy include appropriate faculty representation as they are stakeholders.

The University Information Security Plan was made available to the Committee. This document replaces its entirety the Information Security Master Plan (created June 2000) and the Information Security Annual Plan (created April 2004). The plan is structured using the format of International Standard Organization (ISO) 17799. The format was selected in order for Georgia State to attain certification from the ISO and for its adherence to the Board of Regents recommendations. The ISO 17799 format includes the 12 domains listed below:

1) Scope  
2) Terms and Definitions  
3) Security Policies  
4) Organizational Security  
5) Asset Classification and Control  
6) Personnel Security  
7) Physical and Environmental Security  
8) Communications and Operations Management  
9) Access Control  
10) Systems Development and Maintenance  
11) Business Continuity Management  
12) Compliance

David asked if the document presented major policy differences from the Master Plan created in 2000. Tammy said that the Board of Regents dictates the format and there are considerable changes in policy. David said major revisions should be discussed if the ISAT Committee is to provide feedback, if not explicitly approving. In order to prepare, he would like to see the new version side-by-side with the older document with all modifications or major clarifications noted.
Tammy said she has an over-arching plan, and if accepted by the Board of Regents, she will then create project plan which she will bring to the Committee. David would prefer that the Committee review the roadmap to ensure ISL standards are followed. He expressed concern that Georgia State is to abide by BOR mandate without a thorough study of the policy. Tammy said that she has been given some leeway and she is looking at the environment from Georgia State’s perspective.

**Action Item:** Tammy will provide excerpts from the University Security Plan to the Committee so they can review each chapter prior to the August ISAT meeting. Expect the first in mid June.

Steve asked for an explanation of the difference between an incident and an offense. After discussion, Tammy said she will change the word offense to incident, since “offense” connotes a legal violation for which there would be adjudicated consequences.

**III. Future Business**

The June and July meetings will not be held. The next meeting is August 18, 2005.

**Meeting adjourned** at 2:30 PM, followed by Karen Benitez, NetworkD Presentation: Opportunities and Best Practices in IT Customer Service in University Environments.

Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of May, 2005

\[Signature\]
Steps for responding to an Information Security Incident.

CSIRT Flow Diagram

Help: If you have questions, or need assistance, please contact the Help Center (404-651-4507 or help@gsu.edu).