INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT FORUM (ITMF)
THURSDAY, JUNE 07, 2007
GA. CENTER ROOM J
1:30-3:00 p.m.

Present: Chris Adcock, Matt Blankenship, Sharon Burch, William Clayton, Sherry Clouser, Wayne Crotts, David Crouch, Shefali Dhar, Mark Ellenberg, Stan Gatewood, James Gilstrap, Sandi Glass, Brad Hunt, Steve Kane, Will Laney, Christine Miller, Jerry NeSmith, Theresa Payne, Jeremy Sanderlin, Rayid Tartir, Jeff Teasley, Sharon Thelen, Greg Topp, Carol Watson, Chris Wilkins, and Georgia Moore

Absent: Sue Achtemeier, John Anderson, Greg Ashley, Mark Cherry, Bill Clayton, Lee Cornell, Mike Dennis, Bert Desimone, Corey Doster, Debbie Ellerson, Paul Keck, David Knox, Juan Machado, David Matthews-Morgan, Tammy McGarity, Anthony McLeod, Wayne Peacock, Tim Peacock, Jeff Pentz, Nathan Pettigrew, Barry Robinson, Cletus Stripling, and Chris Workman

Approval of Minutes: Last month’s minutes were accepted. Further clarification by Matt was made to the response given to the question regarding Data Sanitization. Machines being transferred to another University Department need only have the appropriate Material Transfer form completed and the contents of the drive zeroes out in order to make the transfer.

Welcome of Visitor(s):
Rory Weaver, Special IT Projects Coordinator, EITS

New Members:
Sherry Clouser, Coordinator of Instructional Technology, Center for Teaching and Learning. Main responsibility is WebCT support. Sherry is located in Instructional Plaza North.

Maria Cleghorne, Human Resources, will replace Judy James.

Featured Speakers/Discussion:
Steve Kane: Document Management Workflow Implementation

Many units across campus requested funding for a Document Management Workflow Tool during the FY08 Budget Request. Dr White asked Steve to look at the different tools that are available. One very important aspect is to determine if the tool would be implemented across the University. From and integration point, a main-frame database
versus a non-mainframe would work best for the campus. One tool generated a consensus from most of the units. Next step is to present a business case, and then send to procurement for bid once approved by leadership.

Question: Would the document management solution be hosted outside of the individual units?

Answer: In order to provide the opportunity for business process workflows to easily integrate across business units, a centralized hosting of the workflow database would be preferred. However, the task force has in mind negotiating terms that would allow for "standalone" workflow installations, should they be required.

**Matt Blankenship: Securing Sensitive Data Initiative**

Matt met with Dr. White and Stan Gatewood to reviews some of the materials they are working on for the Securing Sensitive Data Initiative. Dr. White’s PowerPoint presentation a while back showed a series of steps on how to improve security on campus by role, starting at the Senior Level, Administrative Level, System Administrator Level, on down to the individual’s role in securing sensitive data. Dr. White and Stan have prepared a grid that will be presented to the Security Committee first for them to give feedback and then the Security Committee will present to group (ITMF) for their comments. There are two faucets to the plan: 1) Based on your role in the organization what are you responsible in securing sensitive data; 2) How do we insure that people in those roles have the right training to fulfill their charge?

Another grid showed currently available on campus training materials, associations, and instructional opportunities for the responsible individual to get caught up or to stay current as things change. This area also showed how much time one would need to invest to cover the necessary training requirements.

Another aspect is the flowchart that shows how sensitive data policies are shepherded through the process, put out for comments to groups like ITAC, UGANET, and ITMF. And how the polices are finally accepted or rejected by the Executive Management Team. When there things that the groups comment on that are not accepted as part of the final policy the groups will get feedback about why this was left out.

Outside training is also part of the plan with possible funding but we do not know for sure. The Provost is on board so far with helping out (Stan Gatewood).

**Concerns and Comments: Securing Sensitive Data Initiative**

1. Dr. White and Stan will communicate to the Provost all the caveats that are involved in implementing the initiative (Time, Budget, Resources, Training)
2. The possibility of being terminated for a security breach is very scary. The last security incident reported in the paper stated that this person was terminated. The group was reminded that there were other mitigating circumstances related to the employment of the individual in question and that the newspaper is not always the most accurate barometer of the facts.

3. Directors’ need to let their people know that they are protected if they are acting in a responsible manner with the tools they have been given and the effort you are investing in them.

4. I argue that this is not an added responsibility; we are already accountable for this.

5. My view on this is simpler: People have no ideas where their data is what is sensitive and what is not. Simple accounting or a simple inventory on this level will help to determine what the problem is or how big it is then people can articulate what is will take to protect them.

6. Every single layer from the President on down to the frontline individual must be held accountable for securing sensitive data.

7. A unit is at a greater risk of exposure if they have internal custom systems as compared to other options for using more centrally available systems that have data like the Mainframe. This risk exposure might need to be part of the evaluation.

Question: Will it be tied into Annual Evaluation?

Answer: Matt: I think getting it tied into the annual evaluation will be our individual responsibility. Don’t feel that the evaluation form will account for this level of specialization for people who work in our professional arena. Once we learn of the plan and approach that is something we need to take on and made sure it is included in our key staff evaluation profile.

Question: What is happening with ID Management?

- Some forms no longer require Social Security Numbers.
- No official date has been set for the elimination of usage of the Social Security Number.
- Before the ID Management Committee can move forward with any recommendations, they are waiting to see what the Data Integration Exploratory Committee comes up with. The committee is in a holding pattern right now.
- Provost has initiated a project to remove Social Security numbers from the classroom. This includes: class roll, grade roll, and test sheets. When a professor asks a student, “What is your student ID”? The answer will be the 9 digit CAN
number on my ID card. Also, looking at the Kronos Initiative for Time and Attendance activities for employees. Likewise how do we tie our hourly employees into the system for payroll when we trying to move away from the Social Security Number in that and tie it to the 8’CAN number.

- As soon as the CAN number is in place for the Kronos system, then other systems like the Personnel system can then covert over to CAN.
- Beginning fall semester, the CAN number will be used in the classroom. A PR campaign is under development by the Registrar’s Office. The campaign theme is “What is your 810.” This is derived from the fact that each of our CAN numbers begin with ‘810’ followed by six unique numbers for each individual (so our ID numbers will still be comprised of 9 digits). Please see http://www.uga.edu/ugacard/ for an explanation on the numbering scheme used.
- Need a process in place to assign CAN numbers to UGA affiliates.
- Main issue is an employee has to have the CAN/ID number up front. Until they have that number at the very being then you can’t convert systems like Personnel and Payroll system to use the CAN. You have to have that number assign right-up front. And this is what is being worked out right now. When you have that in place then you can start using that as an identifier in the other systems.

**IT Security Committee Report:**

Committee has met twice. Some key resources for the group are missing. Need a representative for CITP, Terry, and the College of Ed. Steve Harris has been recommended to represent the Office of Security and Emergency Preparedness. When the appropriate membership has been attained, a chair person will be elected.

Review of Privacy Policy: Template that they are trying to create for policy creation which will be reviewed by ITMF, the OCIO, IT Advisory Council on up to the EMT group.

The committee decided to focus on framework policies: Things that Dr. White and Stan have spent some time on already have a shape and form about them. Need to get these key items taken care of since they are being asked for by my Senior Administration.

**Special Note(s):**

The July 5th meeting has been moved to July 12th. If you are not able to attend some of the meetings, you can send someone in your place.

Meeting Adjourned.