**IT Gov Minutes**

November 1, 2023

Via Zoom

**Attendees:** Noah Daniels, Brenton DeBoef, Melissa Frost, Brandon Fuller (absent), Marta Gomez-Chiarri, Michael Greenfield, Amanda Izenstark, Shaun Kavanagh, Karlis Kaugars, Michael Khalfayan, Kara Larsen (absent), Ian Lester (absent), Dean Libutti, Matt McDonald (absent), Sanjay Kumar Mupparapu (absent), John Stringer

**Guest:** None

1. Approval of Minutes
	1. October 2023
	2. Karlis moved to approve minutes as presented.
	3. All present voted to approve.
2. GLBA IT Policies (Mike K)
	1. IT Audit showed deficiencies: use of obsolete operating systems, change management processes lacking, allowing developers in PS direct access to production. Deferred re-examination until January the policies & procedures portion once we pointed out GLBA policies, endpoint protection, acceptable use policies.
	2. Remaining gaps can be set at IT policies, not rise to university policies.
	3. Overall information security program is required of every regulation that is out there in state and federal guidelines.
	4. Vulnerability, patch management, access control management are in our policies among others.
	5. Control of classified information in research.
	6. Need to have clear policies and guidelines available.
	7. Questions?
		1. Noah: we are the only research institution that is part of the state and we have unique needs as a result. We are not typical to what the state is thinking of so is there a disconnect between perception and reality? The research DMZ takes care of most of this, but what about other research tools?
			1. Karlis: we need to educate the auditors to have a better understanding of what the needs and tools are for a research university.
			2. Karlis: anything short of writing, approving, and pushing through what they’re asking for will result in another negative report to the URI BOT.
			3. Mike K: we need to educate them through paper proof and then in-person proof showing them the systems, safeguards, etc.
		2. Marta: what is the plan for the research DMZ?
			1. Karlis: we need Gaurav to provide a full report; he has taken measures on a number of items.
			2. Karlis: our compliance rates with IT policies is suspect. We have to depend on distributed staff to be following the policies.
				1. Mike K: we have tools that we can deploy but we cannot always get every computer because not everything is run on the network or is hidden.
		3. Brenton: there are hundreds of machines that are running air-gapped / off-network. Is that really a problem because they’re not participating in the network. Do we fight for an exception from the auditors.
		4. Michael G: is having an out-of-date machine running off the network a violation of this audit? Yes.
		5. Karlis: we will finalize the text of the policies, put them in our Teams folder for this group to review and edit, and in December we will approve and adopt them. Our timeline is tight and very important to meet.
3. CIO Updates
	1. None.
4. Project Status Updates
	1. In response to your request, changes since last month have been highlighted and hopefully helped you as you reviewed it.
	2. Michael G: no questions but thank you for highlighting.
5. IT Purchasing Process (Karlis)
	1. Changes have been made to the approvals process and it’s important to know the background and reasons.
		1. We have no global view of IT at URI, only partial. Software and hardware is purchased independently of any central repository and deployed without any central support, simply run in a closet somewhere.
		2. We need to wrap our arms around this globally, given US release of prohibited vendor materials which results in no federal funding. Issues with software practices and uses related to administrative systems with sensitive data, and eventually research data. Priority 4 of Focus URI about administrative efficiency and service delivery.
			1. Other items have been reviewed regarding credit card purchases specific to Adobe Cloud for full time staff and other items.
				1. Adobe license is only available for full time faculty and staff; there is a system to review on an as-needed basis. Bringing it to students is cost prohibitive (over $500k annually).
			2. Our purchase process is also incredibly slow (110 days between submission request and permission to purchase).
			3. Start of IT review came only after the purchasing process review occurred and then the process stopped.
			4. As a result, we are moving IT review to earlier in the process through ServiceNow request. We will pull credit card transactions at the end of the month to review that they fit the rules and regulations for IT security. This is better than blocking the process.
			5. Still trying to figure out LVPOs ($1,000-5,000) and suspect it will be a post-purchase review.
		3. It’s an interesting educational process for IT staff, learning about how faculty conduct their work. We’re starting to engage in a far more complete process to learn what things do.
		4. We recognize that this is making things a bit more difficult as we start this new process, but the end result will be worth it.
		5. Questions?
			1. Brenton: I commend you for doing this.
			2. Michael G: with purchasing process, is there to get an understanding of what’s purchased or is this a way to reduce the various types purchased (do we want to limit what software are implemented on campus?)?
				1. Karlis: There is a necessary type of software needed in different disciplines. What we need is a full list of reference software that are used so we can review and determine the need to pursue a university license for everyone.
			3. Noah: there are free and open-source software in use. Do we want that accounted for too?
				1. Karlis: Yes, and it becomes about effective information gathering, as well as the rapid shifts of use.
6. IT Strategic Plan: Prioritization Rubric
	1. Deferred to next meeting.
7. Open Forum
	1. Upcoming Meetings
		1. Next meeting is WED 12/06/2023 at 9 AM via Zoom.