

## UW System CIO Council Meeting Notes

October 20, 2016

Attending In-person: Werner Gade, John Krogman, Jason Fishbain, Mike Schlicht, and guest Dave Pulda

Attending Remotely: Dan Dunbar, Chip Eckardt, Jason Winget, Tom Janicki, Anne Milkovich, Bob Beck, Beth Schaefer, Jim Barrett, Joe Kmiech, Mike Sherer, Dave Kieper, Elena Pokot, Mohamed Elhindi, Bruce Maas, David Stack and guests Ruth Ginzberg and Renee Pfeifer-Luckett

### Approval of Minutes

Changes to the October meeting minutes were suggested for the second page. Werner Gade will send the changes to David Stack.

Gade reported that the topic of the Educational Media Technology Council came up during a strategy discussion at the Learn@UW Executive Committee. Gade inquired as to what the CIOs know about the EMTC. Discussion followed regarding the ITMC CIO track, as well as who will be going to EDUCAUSE the week of October 24-28.

### UW-Madison Planned Use of Duo

John Krogman reported UW-Madison is using multifactor authentication (MFA) and there are 3,200 users across the UW System. Krogman explained that the Big 10 institutions are looking at newer technology with more functionality, such as Duo. Duo is a two-step verification service that provides additional security for access to institutional and personal data. Krogman announced that an RFP would be released in the next month to see what products are available. Even though it's a UW-Madison RFP, it will extend to the other institutions. The goal is to roll out the service next summer.

Krogman also reported that next spring UW-Madison will be looking at a Trusted Browser NetID project for their students, faculty and staff until the new MFA tool is in place. UW-Platteville is currently rolling out Duo and it is going well. Mike Sherer stated that UW-Platteville procured Duo through a simplified bid process and they have 52 users with tokens for SFS or HRS.

### Implementing IT Security Policies – Phase 1

Mohamed Elhindi reported that he and David Stack had a meeting with Internal Audit Executive Lori Stortz regarding Internal Audit's role regarding the Information Security policies. Bob Beck noted his institution has been subjected to audits from three different areas and the faster the UW System pushes the implementation of the policies the greater the risk in finding ourselves responsible for compliance.

The discussion turned to security awareness training and what tools are available. The LawRoom training may not fit the needs of each institution. Ruth Ginzberg said all institutions except UW-Madison are included on the contract. UW-Stout and UW-La Crosse will roll into the UW System contract in 2017-18. Beck indicated that one of the values LawRoom provides is that the training is tracked. Werner Gade suggested inventorying what training products are in use at the UW System institutions. UW-Madison puts a hold on the records of students not taking their security training.

### IT Security Policies – Phase 2

Mohamed Elhindi stated he did not want the Information Assurance Council to become a policy factory and recommended that the scope for phase two of the project include:

- 1) Review implementation of Phase 1
- 2) Complete the security program document
- 3) Determine Costs
- 4) Determine campus resources

The first step of the review of Phase 1 was to determine which institutions already had existing policies and what would be done with them. The drafting of the security program document has become a liability. David Stack noted that VP David Miller said the program document is not policy and should be written to reflect that fact. Elhindi said that Phase 1 is complete with the five policies and three procedures. Phase 2 will focus on implementation, the program, cost and resources.

Werner Gade noted that communications need to be defined and it's important for us to all speak the same language. We need to develop the communications to the provosts, chancellors and CBOs. Elhindi recommended that student affairs officers need to be in the loop and recommended that VP Jim Henderson be the conduit.

Bob Beck believes we need to also have the same definition of a shared strategy. Beck would like to see explicit talk about the strategy. Elhindi suggested a facilitated work session to develop the strategic direction.

Gade suggested that we need a group of people to get together to develop the strategy, another group to identify what we want to accomplish, and we then need to bring the CISOs in when there is work to be accomplished.

Elena Pokot pointed out that we need to be honest and practical about what can be done centrally, and what aspects need to be done by the institutions.

In conclusion, it was noted that David Kieper's position on the council needs to be filled by the beginning of the year.

### **Data Classification and Training**

On behalf of Mohamed Elhindi, Jason Fishbain noted two issues. One is the coordination of communication and training. The second is to see if there is any training on data governance available to the institutions.

Bob Beck shared that there is contention at his institution regarding data governance roles. Beck mentioned that the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) has an extensive collection of data governance materials regarding best practices. The same themes of data governance are pervasive through each of the thematic areas of the EAB memberships such as the Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and IT.

Beck offered to bring the EAB resources to the group and will send a list of the topics on data governance to the CIO list. David Kieper noted that some of these themes were also noted in the information Gartner previously presented in the workshop they conducted for the UW System. Beck and/or David Stack will confirm with EAB that it's acceptable to share the webinars with the CIOs who don't have subscriptions. EAB focuses on data governance for student success, thus their lens is not on security.

Elhindi said that he is looking to the CIO Council to assist in moving this issue forward. He noted that the policies will be reviewed in March 2017. Anne Milkovich said UW-Oshkosh is digging through their data, producing a data dictionary, and looking through multiple "lenses." UW-Oshkosh started with their standard reports and developed a method to assign a steward for each element of data. UW-Madison is taking the same

approach. Beck suggested that we solely can't look at this through the information security lens. Elhindi said there are three steps going forward:

1. Deciding upon data classification
2. Developing data handling
3. Moving on Business Intelligence

Gade suggested having consistent methodology on how we use the data classification for a data governance program.

### **Expanding Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA)**

The IAM Technical Advisory Group (TAG) met at UW-La Crosse last week and UW-Madison gave a presentation on Duo. John Krogman reported that UW-Madison will be releasing an RFP for Multifactor Authentication and they are very interested in Duo. The institutions will be able to piggy back on the on resulting contract if they want. Elhindi recommended slowing down. Werner Gade suggested the CIOs wait for UW-Madison's RFP results and that the CIOs move forward as one.

### **Benefits That Come With Cyber Liability Insurance**

This year, the UW System did not see a reduction in premiums, but probably won't see an increase either. The vendor is willing to offer breach coaching and Dave Pulda recommended that the CIOs identify an hour of time for it. The premium allocations for cyberliability will likely be folded into the property liability premium. Chip Eckardt suggested that the premiums not be folded into the CSRG budget.

### **Learning Environment RFP Update**

Renee Pfeifer-Luckett reported that 2,900 students responded to the learning environment requirements gathering survey. She is pleased with the response rate and that believes the survey had good reach into the institutions. The Chair of Engineering at UW-Stevens Point and Pfeifer-Luckett reviewed the data and met yesterday to ensure they are consistent with their coding of the results.

Common themes that came out of Learning Environment Needs Analysis (LENA) were:

- 1) Customization – students were interested in displaying information as it makes sense to them, today it is course centric
- 2) Faculty wanted more training and better tools for students to collaborate on assignments
- 3) Faculty wanted to integrate external tools more easily
- 4) Students were unhappy with discussion boards and want them to be more intuitive, clean and easier to use
- 5) Students want faculty to use the LMS calendar so they can see due dates at a glance and tie the dates in with their calendars

The next step is to analyze the data by November 1 to move into the RFP phase. Pfeifer-Luckett stated that there was nothing surprising except for the sheer number of things faculty were asking to do that they already could do with the tool they have. The questions are, "Do we want to have an LMS that's open and do the institutions need control since not all functionalities are active?"

UW-Superior reported that they have a half-time FTE administering their LMS and it's a matter of managing the work versus implementing everything everyone wants.

The next steps in the process are:

- Provide the results of the survey to the Procurement office

- Develop the RFP
- Identify the members of the RFP committee
- Release the RFP mid-January and target April 30<sup>th</sup> as the date that the decision will be made

As the leader of the technical requirements team, Werner Gade reported there are 110 technical requirements in 12 categories.

John Krogman asked about the web conferencing results that Pfeifer-Luckett distributed and how many responses there were from each campus. Pfeifer-Luckett reported that the response pattern matched how broadly the survey was distributed at each institution.

**Review Action Items & Next Meeting**

Action items:

- Bob Beck and David Stack will work on a data governance webinar
- Mohamed Elhindi will work on a security facilitated strategy lesson
- David Kieper’s vacancy on the Information Assurance Council needs to be filled

2016 Meeting Dates	Meeting Time	Meeting Location
November 7-8	TBA	ITMC Fall Conference, Paper Valley Hotel, Appleton
★ December 15 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup>	Noon-to-Noon	THU.: Van Hise Hall, Room 1820 FRI.: 780 Regent Street, 126A-B