Senate Information Systems and Technology (ISAT) Meeting
608 Classroom South
Thursday, August 18, 2005
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. L. Albert</th>
<th>Nancy Floyd</th>
<th>Yu-Sheng Hsu</th>
<th>Larry Pankey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Casto</td>
<td>Teryl Frey</td>
<td>James Jones</td>
<td>Bill Paraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cheshier</td>
<td>Doug Goans</td>
<td>Susan Laury</td>
<td>Cherise Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy Cody</td>
<td>Carol Grantham</td>
<td>Tom Netzel</td>
<td>Raj Sunderraman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Easterbrooks</td>
<td>Chip Hill</td>
<td>Karen Oates</td>
<td>Ellen Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yi Pan</td>
<td>Draga Vidakovic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval of Minutes: Minutes were approved as amended.

Report from WAPS Subcommittee
David reported that the first Web Accessibility Policy Sub-Committee (WAPS) met in June with a positive beginning. He restated the group’s charge: To review the draft recommendation from the University ADA/504 Adv Committee for Web Accessibility, with the purpose of ensuring Georgia State University’s Internet-based materials compliance with all current Federal and State laws, W3C, and University Internet policies.

The general census of the larger committee is that while the recommendations are necessary and important, both ethically and legally, they also run the risk, if not carefully considered, of imposing considerable cost and administrative upheaval on the university as a whole.

At the June organizational meeting, the committee made a list of questions to collect information on, including:

1) Would bringing the University into ADA compliance affect the posting of instructional materials - can they be “grandfathered” in – what are the options?

2) Phase-in and cost issues.

3) Determine what constitutes a “good faith effort” to meet guidelines.

4) Investigate peer institutions’ policies, both within the USG and regionally, specifically for regulatory (not cost) information.

5) Produce an informal survey to determine Georgia State’s current status.

The next WAPS meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 7, 1:30-2:30 PM, in 718 GCB. David will make a to the ISAT committee at the October meeting, where he may have specific wording recommendations from WA to modify the proposal for the committee to deliberate.

WAPS Sub-Committee members are: David Cheshier, Chair, JL Albert, Missy Cody, Susan Easterbrooks, James Jones, Cherise Peters, and Wendy Hensel. David invited anyone interested to participate with the Sub-Committee, or to suggestions even if not joining the group, to feel free to email him. He will also email any updates or information if you would like to receive them. Tom asked that the information be placed on a website to download, than via email attachments.
Printing

Dr. Pan asked about Steve Harmon’s inquiry concerning Panther Print reimbursements from April to the end of the Year. Steve did not get his reimbursement for spring term until after the university books closed so he could not spend it. Mary Jane said that before making a judgment, it should be determined how it happened. Panther Print reimbursements come from Auxiliary Services.

As an outcome of the Student Technology Fee Subcommittee’s decision to no longer allocate tech fee funds to subsidize printing (resulting in a 30% reduction in printing by students), the ISAT committee requested that J. L. bring an update on this issue today. He distributed a Draft Proposal for a New Printing Services Model for Students that will allow for cost recovery of student printing charges. This model recovers the costs for the software license, server replacement, software upgrade from the departments using the Pharos software and Uniprint system based on the number of printers that each department has on the system.

J. L. said that tech fee funds for Panther Print ran out of money in early December, 2004, thus IS&T has absorbed approximately $10,000 since that time. Currently, while providing the service, there is no mechanism to recover costs. J. L. provided options to remedy the situation:

1) Raise rates from 5¢ to 6¢ per page, per printer.

2) Charge each academic unit a share of the operating costs, based on the number of printers that use Uniprint, approximately $132 per printer.

3) Leave rates the same and go back to the Student Tech Fee Subcommittee next year with a new proposal. This is the option J. L. supports, as it provides a funding mechanism without having to go through the accounting process which may cost even more than what’s collected if you bill on a per page, per printer basis, plus students will be happier.

David stated that he would support a Tech Fee Proposal of approximately $12,000 if it is presented as infrastructure, recommended avoiding the jump to 6¢ and making a proposal to the Student Tech Fee Subcommittee next year.

Tom asked if raising the rate one cent would cover the costs, and J. L. said that it would. Tom does not think students would protest a one cent increase; however, Susan’s opinion is that, since departments are pressured more and more to put everything online, students are now responsible for much more printing on their own; to raise rates while asking them to print more could cause a backlash.

James said that although printing costs are convenience fees, pragmatically, they have to be paid, and there has to be a mechanism in place to do that. For the record, he stated that he prefers raising the per page cost, as that is guaranteed revenue.

Motion was made, seconded and approved:

1) Total cost recovery is the model.
2) Acknowledge and accept donation provided by IS&T this year.
3) Submit proposal for funding student printing to the next Student Tech Fee Subcommittee.
4) If the STFS denies the proposal, raise the cost per page, per printer to 6¢.

Network Upgrade

A handout was distributed for the Network Upgrade Project, dubbed “Extreme Makeover.” The handout includes application cut-over dates and a list of building names and deployment dates. This project is in preparation for Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP Telephony) which will give Georgia State the ability to maintain its own phone system.

Every user will have a 100MB connection to their desktop, rather than the 10MB most areas currently have.
individual request basis, users in some of the buildings that have a high capacity data requirement - at an additional will have the ability to have a 1GB connection on the desktop.

Another advantage is increasing the security level of the campus network by authenticating at the port level.

The project is underway, in the final stages, bringing in equipment and loading configurations. Every piece of elect on the campus network will have to be changed out over the next 3-4 months. There are over 500 servers, 2 network connections to be unplugged and plugged back in, and 1,100 switches.

Interim funding for the project came from the VP of Finance and Administration. Some additional funding came year-end sweep. A loan will be acquired and paid back on an installment plan that will match the revenue stream for telephones.

David mentioned that the One-Stop Shop in Sparks was inundated recently with 85,000 calls on circuitry that can handle 5,000 calls. He asked if the new IPT system would solve that problem. J. L. said that the new system would solve the problem.

Currently, there are no more copper phone circuits in Sparks. The telephony rides on the campus network. Uninterrupted power supply will go into every wiring closet on campus. Also, the Registrar needs a call director. With a director, will know how many calls are stacked up and be able to reroute the calls. The new system provides a directory | display on the phone. Every desk will get a new handset and new number. PCs will plug into the phone and will not be a problem with older machines; if they work now, they will work with the new system. Regarding print costs of new business cards and stationery, the VPFA may provide funding for those costs, as they did when the MS changed to PO Box numbers; however there is no declared intention that they will do that yet.

Bill said the building deployment schedule has changed significantly since the hand-out was printed, and to look IS&T website for the current status of the Campus Network Upgrade.

If you have a request that a specific building needs to stay online during its scheduled cut-over, please contact Bill Paraska as soon as possible.

J. L. has proposed an Amnesty Program to ensure that no more hubs are installed. He’s making a one-time offer to purchase wired jacks for anyone using hubs at IS&T’s expense. Because of security risks, the plan is for hubs to go away. He gave a recent example of machines behind a hub that became infected and had to be turned off. Tom asked for more clarification about why hubs cannot continue, as he feels that to predicate that he can't use hubs seen restraining; his preference is to continue using hubs. J. L. said that hubs have a life cycle and replacement cost, whereas a jack is a one-time expense, and provides more security.

Vista Migration
J. L. said that the University System of Georgia is migrating WebCT Vista to a consolidated server group in Athens. conversion is complete. Georgia State is the largest Vista user, with 58,000 entries. Vista is available but the G State University URL to reach Vista has changed to https://gsu.view.usg.edu.

UETS will continue to support instructional design and course development. The completion date for moving all W CE courses to Vista is December, 2005. Karen said that several WebCT Vista Workshops for faculty support staff will be held starting in September through December 20, 2005, and First Friday Drop-In Clinics available for help with WebCT courses. UETS also provides one-on-one WebCT Vista training and support in faculty offices or in a UETS office.

Karen provided brochures describing WebCT Vista Assistance from the Presidium Online Support Center. The Board of Regents/Advanced Learning Technologies entered into a contract with Presidium Learning to create maintain online Vista Support. Presidium offers 24x7x365, real-time support channels (toll-free telephone and live
and a “self-service” knowledge base.

**Risk Assessment Policy**

James provided a draft version of the Risk Assessment Policy. (See revised version attached – no change to content, format only). He said the Policy provides a formalized process to perform risk assessments by the Information Security Department. After brief discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to accept the document as the official Security Risk Assessment Policy and to forward to Administrative Council for their review and approval.

**Next Meeting:**

Thursday, September 15, 2005  
718 General Classroom Building  
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Possible Discussion Topics:

- Emergency Power Interruption Procedures
- Student Technology Fee Subcommittee – [Overview of Process](#) (control/click)
- Campus Security Plan Update*
  
* Tammy Clark and William Monahan will attend a session at Macon State on September 15, which will provide an opportunity for each campus to share any comments or recommendations about their security plans and to ensure that they are complying with the Board of Regent’s request for a consistent format. They will also discuss OIIT’s responses to their security plans and any other documentation they would like to review.

Respectfully submitted, August 22, 2005  
Carolyn Summerlin
Security Risk Assessment Policy - DR.

POLICY:

Formal information security risk assessments will be performed by the Information Security Department on all new technologies/processes being evaluated or implemented for either connection to the Georgia State University network or for handling sensitive information.

Rationale:

Managing the security risks associated with Georgia State University's growing reliance on information technology is a continuing challenge. Information Security personnel should perform vulnerability assessments to determine threats, the likelihood of such events taking place, the estimated impact if they were to occur, and recommend controls.

Standards & Procedures:

Standards:

Information security risk assessment timing. A risk assessment will at a minimum be requested and completed before any procurement action can be taken for IT related systems or contracted services.

Threats. Things that can go wrong or that can 'attack' the system. Examples might include fire, system failure, hacking. Threats are present in every system.

Vulnerabilities. These make a system more prone to attack by a threat or make an attack more likely to have success or impact. For example, a hacking vulnerability would be the lack of patches on a computer operating system.

Controls. These are the countermeasures for vulnerabilities. There are four types:

- Deterrent controls reduce the likelihood of a deliberate attack
- Preventative controls protect vulnerabilities and make an attack unsuccessful or reduce its impact
- Corrective controls reduce effect of an attack
- Detective controls discover attacks and trigger preventative or corrective controls

Procedures:

- Securing a Sensitive Server (Server 2003) that is used to Processes Sensitive Information
- Securing a Windows 2000 Workstation that is used to Processes Sensitive Information
- Securing a Windows XP Workstation that is used to Processes Sensitive Information
- Sensitive Information Audit Checklist
- Sensitive Information Security Questionnaire
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