

LMIS meeting 10/6/2017

Present: Sam Berling, Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Jeremy Cucco, Sue Hannaford (Chair), Wade Hands (scribe for the day), David Latimer, Janet Marcavage, and Lisa Wood

Meeting called to order at 1:02.

Approval of minutes from last meeting.

Overview: The focus of the first few minutes of the meeting was the Makerspace and how LMIS might be involved in making it successful. The remainder of the meeting focused on security of information: mostly digital, but other forms as well.

Hannaford raised questions about what LMIS might do to promote the Makerspace and make it successful. It was nice to have the last meeting in the space, but there was not time to settle on a strategy.

Carlin raised several questions and concerns. There was discussion of the proposal for \$10,000 budget and staff request. Twenty-five hours of student employee time are available to the Makerspace now. This is a pilot year and the committee is only advisory at this point. It will be evaluated after this year.

Several members noted that success criteria are very difficult to specify for this type of a project since how it will be used is conditional on who ends up using it, and in what ways. Perhaps some faculty examples would be useful and more information will be available after the Makerspace opening. Marcavage noted that using hands etc. is fundamental to what she does, but this is not the case for many areas of the University. More questions were raised about use, hours, and funding. Carlin noted that they are still working with use/rules and suggested that LMIS insight would be useful.

Berling: Can students go now, or only after open house?

Carlin: It is open some hours now, but not weekends. More hours will be added later.

Latimer: How about a faculty workshop on how to use it?

Wood: The Makerspace is certainly exciting, but there is certainly lots to do.

At this point the committee moved to the LMIS charges and in particular, the additional charge related to appropriate use of institutional data on campus.

The standard charges are:

- To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director and the Chief Technology Officer.

- To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.
- To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.
- To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.

And, the additional charge (from last year's LMIS and Senate)

- *In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the LMIS Committee to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to identify which of the existing data use policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus are most relevant to faculty, and develop and distribute informational resources to help faculty understand and comply with these policies.*

The discussion of appropriate use of institutional data expanded to the more general question of information security.

Hannaford: The committee needs a plan on how to approach the variety of security issues we face. What exactly do we want to accomplish?

Wood noted security problems regarding letters of recommendation (students and colleagues), grade records, and a number of other areas. Why do we need to keep things that are accessible and yet will not be used again by faculty? Faculty should be accountable for purging records at the end of each year.

Cucco: Different members of the campus community behave in different ways; some get rid of everything and some keep everything.

Carlin: There are no "record retention" rules on the academic side.

Cucco: Consider the example of a stolen University laptop. What is the responsibility of the faculty member and/or others? It depends on the laptop and the encryption. There are legal responsibilities.

Hands: There may be intellectual responsibilities to the historical record (example of the historical value of letters of recommendation).

Cucco: 4 gigs of storage space available to faculty. So some solutions already exist; there just needs to be education about what is available.

Carlin: What is the existing data use policy? Where is it? How might we revise?

Cucco: The issue is a policy of "Acceptable Use." But this is currently not clear and it needs more teeth.

Cohn: Is Jeremy saying "policies" are not what we need at this point, because all of these are being reorganized?

Cucco: All of this is currently in flux. Some policies need board level intervention and the board would need to accept/vote on them. The general need is a data privacy policy. There has been an issue for a while, but the analytics make this a bigger deal. The best way to approach this is a very simply policy statement: "No personally identifiable information should be made available to the public or others who should not have access."

Wood: For a letter of recommendation one could eliminate information without it being cleaned from the server. The download or email could be destroyed. This could be best practice but not a "policy." What seems to be needed are exemplars of best practice and maybe not policy. We retain things we do not need to retain. The best practice should be to not retain unless it is needed. We need a lower level of risk.

Cucco: If you provide specific examples then people think that is all there is to it. It is better to provide general information rather than specific examples.

Both Cucco and Wood: Education is key. We need education on information security.

Hannaford: This is top priority. We need information about current policies and legal responsibilities.

Cucco: Yes, but all this keeps changing all the time.

Wood: Much of this is about professional ethics; protecting the confidentiality of your students in a variety of ways. There doesn't seem to be much discussion about the ethics of confidentiality.

Hannaford: Time is running out on this meeting. Hold on to the charges from the Senate and we will continue to discuss these security issues.

Carlin and others: There is also the question of why the online campus directory went away? Other universities still have it. There are also issues with the calendar.

Cucco: The directory in Peoplesoft is the corporate directory. It was a Cabinet level decision not to use it. There is a potential risk from hacking. There is a directory in Outlook.

The discussion will continue next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00.