Members present: Brian Bopp, Norman Dennis, Garrett Jeter, Beth Juhl, Frank Liu, Carla Martin (Provost Designee), Chris McCoy, Derrick Mears, Polly Parnell, Cheri Poellot, Mandel Samuels, Joe Scribner, Randy Thompson, Jason Tullis, Teresa Waddell, Shelly Walters (Global Campus Designee), Sandy Kizer (Walton College Designee)

Members Absent: Scott Biehle, Casandra Cox, Jeff Pummill

1. **Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m. by Chairman Frank Liu.**
   a. **New introductions**
      i. Shelly Walters proxy this semester for Miran Kang
      ii. Brian Bopp new to council for Student Affairs
      iii. Jason Tullis returns from OCDA
2. **Approval of the meeting minutes for November 2017**
   a. Motion, second, and approval of November 15, 2017 minutes.
3. **Announcements**
   a. Membership changes: Brian Bopp has been appointed through Provost approval to represent the Division of Student Affairs
   b. Next meeting (2pm on Wednesday 3/28?)
      i. Chris McCoy will send David Bruce in his place due to conflict.
      ii. Verify location is available.
4. **Old Business**

<u>IT Infrastructure and Security</u> -- Recommendation reports (Randy Thompson)
   a. **Cybersecurity Policy:** Committee was referred a draft of an already prepared high level cybersecurity for the campus. This committee submitted their recommendation before the November 2017 CAC meeting to send thru to the council. The cover letter explains the committee's recommendation.
      i. <u>Motion, second, and approval</u> to accept the committees written recommendation for Cybersecurity policy to move it through the next steps of the governance process.
   b. **Outlook for Students:** Expected improvement of communication between Faculty and Students.
      i. Focus groups outcomes from student input indicated this move was desirable because this was a platform of choice for most businesses.
      ii. <u>Discussion/questions:</u>
         1. Student sessions were conducted in the spring and facilitated through housing. 10-12 students in each group.
         2. Student addresses will be converted to @uark.edu away from @email.uark.edu.
         3. Assistance can be provided for mailbox migrations.
         4. Recommend training videos as supplement and helpdesk assistance.
         5. It was discussed that having a pilot group go first would create confusion.
         6. Mail stamping can help with students who use @email.uark.edu for setting up third party accounts. This is a consideration several areas for example, libraries, publisher content, and clickers. May require additional work with vendor. Configuration for overcoming this should be simplified.
         7. This change should eliminate technical issues for students who currently possess separate staff (Outlook) and student (Google) accounts.
         8. One e-mail and one source for a given university account.
         9. Recommend we understand the impact to user experience and impact related to dropping Google services.
         10. Technical teams within UITS have advised the best time would likely be mid-summer time frame.

   iii. <u>Motion, second, and approval with no objections, no abstentions</u> to move forward with Outlook for students and cutover plan would likely need to happen quickly, over the summer, but timing is challenged given the limited time frame between orientations and fall semester.

   iv. A must is training paired with adequate and overwhelming notice and communication to the students ahead of and throughout this change.

<u>Research IT</u> – Application to track software (Teresa Waddell on behalf of Jeff Pummill)

Committees recommendation summarized into short report. "The committee recognizes there is a need to consolidate software purchases and there are ways to do this via administrative and technical methods. The Research Committee encourages the CAC to pursue all options that may result in University savings and proceed through the established governance process."

Discussion/questions:

   i. Concern of the costs (Staff/man-hours) it takes to analyze the reports from monitoring software likely outweigh the benefits.

   ii. This may be something we put off for a later time.

   iii. Faculty concerns of being watched or applications being policed.

   iv. Can we require that people commit to self-reporting by offering a common tool to report through? Can what others are reporting also be seen?

   v. What are possible incentives to encourage self-reporting?

   vi. Can the application be configured to look for specific applications only, rather than monitor and report on all applications?

   vii. Can we establish parameters/practices that address the privacy and other concerns surrounding the data being collected? Where stored? Who has access?

   viii. Suggestion that we Incorporate software needs questions into a faculty survey or into our annual survey.

   ix. Recap: This request originated with the IT Directors and the original intent was to continue down the path of finding benefits with commonly used applications which could be consolidated for cost savings and provide broader access to campus.

b. <u>Motion, seconded, and approval</u> to return task back to Research IT Committee for more analyzing while addressing the following concerns. The committee is encouraged to reach outside of itself for additional input or expertise that would help us to advise on next steps. By doing so it's understood this could take additional time for the committee to return with a revised recommendation.

   i. Concerns for staff time for analyzing the data collected and security around the data collected.

   ii. What is this replacing and how does it make what we do now better?

   iii. Concern this would remove personal choice for faculty who have unique software needs.

c. Although this topic is rolling back to the committee for deeper review the governance process appears to be working.

<u>Classroom technology</u> – Classroom technology recommendation and survey wrap up (Mandel Samuels)
Discussion/question:

1. Kevin Hall was contacted for Faculty senate to review the recommendation and their charge is to provide comments.

2. Paige and Jean Mitchell have worked on 25live classroom categories.

3. Student workers within IT were tasked with capturing classroom technology inventory for this process.

4. Additional info being evaluated

   a. Evaluating all attributes.

   b. Classroom Layout

   c. Space type

5. Presenting at next Faculty Senate meeting

Administrative IT – Password Policy (Polly Parnell) the policy that CISO Alan Greenberg prepared to the committee needs to be vetted before they bring it forward before and will be shared over e-mail ahead of the next meeting.

Discussion/questions:
1. When to implement two factor authentications? Suggestion would be to not apply it to all things, all the time.
2. IAM is coming and almost a certainty that Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) will be part of the new ERP system. At this time, it's not known which applications would require MFA, but rules about what uses MFA would be better to know.
3. Regarding Question #5, what can we use? Answer is not known. Posing question back to CISO for insight.
4. Are these rules or guidelines? Original policy gave some flexibility around password protection tools were removed from this document. Some lines may in fact be policy.
5. NIST standards upgraded their federal guidelines so as a campus we're trying to align with that. No longer a mandate to change every six months.
6. Committee will reach CISO with comments Conduct feedback over email.

1. Secretary update -- SharePoint, website, & annual survey progress (Teresa Waddell)
   a. New SharePoint site is live and link will be shared over listserv.

New Business – Chairman Frank Liu
   a. Presentation of CAC classroom technology recommendation to faculty senate executive committee on 3/7
      a. Faculty senate have their own classroom technology committee that have never met. Frank and Mandel planning to attend.

Meeting adjourned 3:08pm

Minutes respectfully submitted: Teresa Waddell