Minutes
CIO Advisory Committee Meeting
The University of Tennessee Health Science Center
910 Madison, Room 502
January 26, 2015

Members Present (12): Larry Tague (Chair), Daniel McGarry (Vice Chair), Charles Cossar, Yan Cui, Robert Mitchell for Paul Gahn, Anna Montgomery, C. Judith Nyabando, Tricia Page, Phyllis Richey (Teleconference), Jada Williams; Adobe Connect: Stephen Adams (Chattanooga), Travis Turner (Knoxville)

IT Services (ITS): Jan van der Aa, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and CIO, Lisa Aitken, Customer Technology Support; Todd Barber, Web Services; Steve Butler, Instructional Technical Support; Peter Fox, Jr., Computing Systems; William ‘Billy’ Hatcher, Jr., Infrastructure; Vikki Massey, Project Management; Ebony Smith, Educational Technology

Judy Jefferson Johnson, Secretary

Other: Bryan Lemieux; Safety Affairs

Absent (4): Ramona Jackson, Sajeesh Kumar, La’Keith Miller, Rakesh Patel

Mediasite Recording: For members’ review, the recording of the 1-26-15 meeting is provided.

Meeting Materials: Agenda; Minutes of the November 24, 2014 meeting.

Call to Order
I. Chair Tague welcomed members and called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
II. Meeting agenda and minutes of the joint November–December 11/24/14 meeting were approved.
III. ITS Reports: The agenda includes clickable links to reports provided. Questions/comments CIOAC may have re: posted reports should be added to the Discussion Board, per Chair Tague.

OLD BUSINESS
I. Subcommittee Report (Tague)
   i. Google Apps for Education Survey: A report is being put together. Total preliminary responses received—84 (good representation of faculty, staff and students). This will also show how HIPAA is impacted.
   II. New Discussion Forum Contributions--CIOAC suggested ITS projects and priorities (Tague): Responses received total 4–5. The 2-fold purpose for the forum was reiterated: for input on (1) things members feel ITS should be involved with on campus; and (2) the impact of these on their representative areas.
   III. Policy on Policies (van der Aa): ITS is writing standards that need to be reviewed and approved. Noted: ITS writes standards, not policies; UT System writes policies. The challenge—how to move ahead on draft policies (about 50). Posed questions: Do members see the CIOAC being a part of the process? How can this process be done effectively, with timely feedback and suggestions? Response proposed by van der Aa was more from the CIOAC. Comments by Tague—take one CIOAC meeting for this purpose; focus groups will take a lot of time to organize, and surveys will yield an inadequate amount of responses. Additional feedback:
      i. Existing Policies: These date back to 2004 and in the HIPAA security audit, were cited for non-review. These need to be updated to include new technologies and approaches to
information security, impact of encryption, and aspect of workstations. A subset of policies exist that addresses these areas. Lemieux proposed that this group address policies with a global impact, rather than technical-focused policies. The aim—to publish policies that have direct end user impact (e.g., encryption, physical security of datasets, etc.), so users can be notified ahead of time.  van der Aa stressed the need for feedback from this group.

ii. Suggestions for communicating ITS policies to campus:
   a. Streamlining the Vetting Process (McGarry): Avenues were discussed on how best to get the needed feedback—develop an online voting checkoff/approval process for members, or publish to the campus for feedback and determine the best way to solicit their feedback. He also proposed posting policies (format similar to the Projects List) for review/discussion/approval that impact users.
   b. The CIOAC represents constituency in their areas, who are tasked with voting on their behalf (Massey).
   c. Publish to the campus community at large, give a timeline for feedback, make a decision and then move forward. (Tague) Noted: Unless there’s a direct impact, most users would not respond.
   d. Tague also emphasized that members should disseminate information to their constituents and bring feedback to the committee before votes are done.

   Noted: Pushback, if any, should be sent to the Chair or CIO for input, or create a Discussion Board thread, if warranted.

Conversations ensued on how information is disseminated to the campus from the CIOAC. With a low campus presence, the way information from CIOAC reaches campus users needs to improve. Roundtable feedback on approaches used:

- via staff meetings (McGarry_Nursing/Tague_Graduate Health Sciences);
- only with impacted constituents (Page_ Research/Lemieux_ Safety Affairs);
- another approach to inform users—to engage constituents in discussions about infrastructure or other related ITS areas (Williams_Development). She also asked whether members are asking constituents if they have questions for the Committee.

Tague noted it seems members are doing as they should.

NEW BUSINESS
I. Update: NAC/Sophos/MAC OX problems:
   i. Problems persist because Apple has made no changes. Computers with operating systems Mac OS X 10.5, 10.6, and 10.7 are experiencing the problem.
   ii. ITS is working with individuals to upgrade the operating system on affected devices. Impacted users have been told to upgrade OS via campus digest email. A specific email from CIO van der Aa was sent to 30 affected users (those people have upgraded as are doing fine now). Hatcher will make sure the networking web pages are telling people to upgrade to fix the problem.
   iii. Tague, Hatcher, McGarry, and others agreed that computers with operating system 10.7 or older should be removed from our network (the same as was done with Windows XP)
   iv. The need for computer refresh was discussed. van der Aa, Hatcher, and Butler emphasized that a refresh should include servers, network infrastructure, and classroom technology, not just workstations. An inventory will be done to get a picture of campus equipment, technologies and infrastructure that need to be refreshed, van der Aa noted.
TABLED NEW BUSINESS
   I. New Firewall Report
   II. Educause Roundtable
   III. Establishing a Meeting Registry for those on campus attending outside meetings

OTHER ITEMS
   I. HIPAA Security on Campus (Tague): Proposed discussion topic for the next meeting
   II. HIPAA Security Audit (Davison): The audit was done by the UT Statewide Administration in December 2014. Awaiting results. Also, the annual renewal of HIPAA training has been re-implemented as of Jan. 5, 2015 (when the 2015 training became available). A total of 2,000 people have completed their IT security training.
   III. Additional HIPAA Security Training Session (Page): IRB is setting up an additional session for researchers. On Feb. 19, an email will be sent to researchers notifying them of the session.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT
   I. Next Meeting: **February 23, 2015**
   II. With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn. With a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.