

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 5, 2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne, Christine Isaakson, Elizabeth McNie, Cynthia Trevisan, Wil Tsai, Sianna Brito (Academic Support Coordinator), Michael Mahoney (Interim Provost)

Guest: Julianne Tolson (Chief Information Officer)

I. Orientation Update

- Senk reports she attended the Orientation Committee meeting on Monday, February 3 and noted that historically there has been very little faculty presence and inadequate communication between faculty and Student Affairs. Expresses concern that students are being subjected to hours and hours of lecture or “discussion” groups that appear not to promote discussion but a one-way imparting of information. Reports Tener and Taliaferro appear to be aware of the inherent problems with such a model and recommends we maintain open lines of communication between relevant campus constituencies to promote faculty engagement in Orientation.
- Committee questions whether the Orientation Committee is responding to the CIS report.
- Browne asks if the committee is following “best practices” or considering what other universities do for Orientation.
- Senk reports that it was unclear from the meeting, but will follow up with Tener.

II. Meeting with Chief Information Officer (Julianne Tolson)

- a. AV Support for Faculty teaching early and late classes
- CIO requests information about what types of unexpected needs of faculty
 - McNie reports issues with projectors and smart-boards
 - Browne asks clarifying question: AV was moved to Academic Affairs, so why was it moved back to IT?
 - CIO reports that the AV team was two people, both of whom worked from 7 to 4. Many times when people have an issue it’s not actually an AV issue, but an IT issue. So AV would go and say “that’s not the projector, it’s the computer.” So by integrating AV and IT into a single support unit we could provide complete rather than fragmented classroom support. After one member of the team retired, the second unexpectedly resigned, so the office has been scrambling to figure out how to do the job without AV staff. CIO is currently in reference stage of hiring replacements, and will consider an on-call component.
 - Moorhead asks if the people being hired are IT or AV folks.
 - CIO reports that they’re mostly foundation, so we will be looking to get them training in the specific areas, which is a challenge given the diversity of AV needs. Given the resources available we cannot hire AV experts.
 - Tsai: we’ve done a survey in the past, and the most common thread has to do with simplifying the interface. Perhaps for starters we can remove some functionality to

establish a baseline. (eg. One problem is that Smartboards require some rooms to have multiple computers, some are behind locked doors and you need access if they're turned off.)

- CIO: opportunities may be to “bring your own device,” to look at using a virtual desktop that the instructor could sign into. CIO suggests surveying faculty to ask “are you using these software titles that we’re paying for” so that we can reallocate resources according to demand.

b. Data Breach

- Chair asks what preventative measures have been taken?
- CIO reports that a report including the social security numbers of every faculty member were included in a report disseminated to Department Chairs, some of whom in turn forwarded the email to their department members.
- Looked at mail relay logs to see if anyone had forwarded that email outside of the community.
- The queries, which are stored in Peoplesoft, which you use to produce these data extracts, can have names that identify their risk. CIO is working with office of “level 1” queries.
- Who has the ability to run these reports? It was not well defined; it was far too many people (include the Senate Chair). CIO emphasizes that this was a problem: the roles should consistently be assigned. There had been a practice in the past where people would say “I’m new here and I need an account like the person who was here before me.” And when people transition from one department to another they would carry with them the rolls. Now CIO’s office is reevaluating how to identify these standard roles. Office revoked the ability of individuals without appropriate training to run these queries, first confirmed there wasn’t a business reason why those individuals needed the data, and there wasn’t.
- Senk asks what the number was (of people who had access revoked).
- CIO reports that she doesn’t have exact number but recalls it is somewhere in the “20-range.”
- Isaakson asks if there is a CSU policy that identifies levels of security.
- CIO reports that Level 1 includes confidential data, Level 2 includes FERPA, etc.
- Isaakson asks if we have information about the authorization and whether or not people with access to confidential data have a signed legal document.
- CIO reports that online training is assigned to all employees. “We do not give PeopleSoft accounts to people who haven’t completed the training.” HR has been responsible for the assignment of the compliance training. CIO has worked with them to get information and discovered that in transition to new system they had not moved people over from the prior system. CIO is working together with HR to compile a complete report that will include *all* of the assigned compliance training. managers will get a list of everyone’s assigned training and status, and it is hope that manager will see it as part of his/her managerial duties to follow up with employees who have not completed training.
- Browne asks if there is a way to identify whether someone downloaded the file onto personal devices.

- CIO replies that most of the messages deleted had not even been opened, but can't confirm that someone didn't download to a personal device. Unmanaged devices are an area of concern. But risk appears to be very low.
- Isaakson: given that it is impossible to say that there is *no* risk, it would be nice if the university would offer some sort of data protection service for the faculty, which would take away some anxiety
- CIO replies that we can try, but that the decision is at the Chancellor's office, and they'll probably also assess that the risk of data exposure is low, particularly given recent big breaches including Marriott and Experian.
- Senk expresses concern that the message we've received consistently is that we have nothing to worry about, and asks that the message be revised to clearly communicate that the risk is low, but *not* nonexistent, and that rather than telling us there is no risk, we should be advised to follow best practices: freeze credit, etc.
- CIO reports that she must follow CSU-procedure, which means that one campus cannot set a "stellar example of overcompensating for the problem that occurred" that causes another campus, a larger campus with a moderate breach, to follow that standard, because of liability issues. CIO commits to communicating Senk's request to HR and the Chancellor's office, and will ask whether it would be appropriate and within CSU norms to send such a message to faculty. But the Chancellor's office must authorize how information is communicated. (CIO mentions as an example that the original letter sent out had to follow a specific CSU template.)
- CIO can send a general message about best practices
- Browne requests detailed account of what has been done to be disseminated to all faculty.
- CIO reports that Michael Martin and Steve Runyon are already working on such a document as part of the CFA grievance.

c. Qualtrics Update

- Chair reports that currently we are struggling without a platform for surveys, requests explanation about the delay
- CIO reports that early in negotiations it became apparent that every CSU campus has separate contract with Qualtrics, something that is currently being rectified. our negotiations ended up being a negotiation on the part of the whole CSU. The benefit is that the new contract will apply system-wide, so we can use it in collaborations with other campuses. It's out of the CIO's control, but hope is for software to become available by the end of the semester.

d. Watch-Standing

- Moorhead reports that "historically" (as recent as 5 years ago) there was a bright student who moved the watch-standing process from paper to Google. But since he left campus the maintenance of the Google Doc has been causing problems. Is there an issue with returning to paper and posting that information in public places?
- CIO reports it's an area of concern because the information reveals where someone will be at a particular time. Can you distribute a document like that electronically to

the people who need it? eg. we don't hide the fact that a student is in a class, but we don't publish it for members of the public to see.

III. Senate Census 2020

C&C: 1 rep

ET: 2 reps

GSMA: 1 rep

IBL: 1 rep

Library: 1 rep

MT: 3 reps

ME: 1 rep

S&M: 2 reps

Faculty-at-Large: 4 reps

Lecturer-at-Large: 2 reps

Statewide Senators: 2 reps

[clarify that ASCSU rep overrides constituent group / in the event that the elected ASCSU rep is a department rep, then the department will elect a new departmental representative]

Meeting Adjourned at 12:10