

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Anaya, Bender, Guevara, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Sollars, Wysocki, Woodman, Zoubek

**Absent:** Joeckel

**Date:** Wednesday, June 12, 2013

**Location:** Faculty Senate Office

**Note:** These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

---

### 1.0 Call to Order

Guevara called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### 2.0 Security Standard Changes to Blackboard – Paul Erickson, Enterprise Architect and Brett Bieber, Senior Web Applications Programmer

Erickson reported that he wanted to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss campus efforts to integrate UNL computer campus credentials with other computing systems both within the University of Nebraska system and with other agencies such as NSF, NIH, and the CIC. He noted that in order to do this UNL will need to raise the bar with passwords and expiration dates, but Information Services (IS) wants to do this as painlessly as possible. He stated that we have several options to accomplish this goal.

Bieber stated that the goal is to have fewer user names and passwords for individuals, but in order to be able to access systems outside of UNL we need to make passwords as secure as possible. He noted that as a member of the CIC we belong to a common consortium and in order to enable collaboration with the other Big Ten schools and have access to the servers of these institutions we must be under a more secure system. He pointed out that NIH and NSF are expecting higher education institutions to build up best practices of computer security access. He stated that the federal agencies and other Big Ten schools need to be able to trust that people outside of their institution have high security standards so their data and servers are protected.

Erickson reported that some faculty members have been able to interact with NIH systems for about a year now and it is convenient to access NIH servers with our local campus credentials, but as we move into more services provided by NSF or NIH with more sensitive data we have to make sure that there is a certain level of security which verifies people's identities and credentials.

Guevara asked when this effort was going to start. Erickson stated that the start of the effort will depend on discussions between IS and the Information Technologies and Services Committee.

Bieber stated that UNL is already a member of some of the agencies, but if top researchers are going to have access to more sensitive data from these organizations they will need stronger credentials. The question is how to build up the level of credentials that will be required without placing too much of a burden on the user.

Erickson pointed out that currently campus credentials are used when accessing MyRed or Blackboard. He stated that in the past Central Administration has been unwilling to allow local credentials to log into some of the university systems such as Firefly which is why people have two different user IDs and passwords: one for campus systems like Blackboard and email and a different one for Central systems like MyRed and Firefly. He noted that while our security systems meet industry standards, some of our password systems are outdated. He pointed out that there is much more to security than just a password. He stated that he does not want to have a system that requires a new password every 30 days but we do have to make improvements.

Schubert stated that password changes are already required and all IS has to do is to change the settings to make passwords more secure. Erickson pointed out that the campus needs to decide what it considers to be a good practice for password security for UNL and how we are going to manage our risks.

Bieber reported that the most frequently asked help desk question is about passwords. Schubert pointed out that this is because of the rules that were created by IS regarding passwords. He stated that IS should just change the setup. Bieber noted that the UNL passwords have no expiration dates but, the passwords required to get into Central Administration systems, such as TrueYou, require that you change your password periodically. Erickson noted that if UNL can enhance its password security to a point where Central Administration is comfortable there will not be the need to have two sets of password credentials. Bieber stated that Central Administration controls the password policy for any software system that is shared across the four campuses.

Guevara asked how secure the password is for Blackboard. Erickson reported that when Blackboard was first developed users needed a shared secret that could be used as a default password. Schubert pointed out that no one in Electrical Engineering is using Blackboard and he does not think it will be around in a few years. He noted that MyRed is not connected to Blackboard and IS should fix this connection. Erickson stated that IS is trying to get a system that will provide good security but will not be a burden to people.

Woodman pointed out that the more complex the password requirements are, the more help services people need. He asked if IS plans to increase the number of people working the help desk. He pointed out that it is frustrating to call the help desk only to be told that a ticket will be generated and you have to wait for an email reply. Erickson noted that there are a lot of reasons why we need to invest more in the help desk.

Woodman asked how the security standard changes will impact Blackboard. He asked if Blackboard users will need to change their password every so often. Bieber stated that he

envisions that there will be three different types of users: students, faculty, and staff. Each one of these groups will have a different expiration period for their password. He stated that it is important that we prevent someone from guessing what the user ID or password is for another person. He noted that one solution is to allow only a certain number of password entry attempts, similar to what many banks do. If you fail to enter the correct password you would need to answer a security password question to get your account reactivated. He stated that this might be more acceptable to some users. Schubert stated that a simple solution would be to have an automatic email sent to you should attempts be made to enter into a system with your user ID or password.

Anaya asked if the security standard changes would be moving the campus towards a single sign-on process. She noted that the Libraries just created a pin system for people to access information. She asked if the changes would include single sign-on for access to an active directory, Blackboard, and all of the other campus services that require passwords. Erickson noted that the Libraries have a larger audience than just the campus and UNL cannot provide addresses for all users. He pointed out a single sign-on process might not be a fit for every system that is on campus.

Woodman stated that he has his TAs enter grades into Blackboard once he has logged into it. He asked if the TAs could access any of his personal information from Trueyou if we go to a single sign-on process. Erickson noted that a TA role can be created in Blackboard. Woodman pointed out that the TA role only permits limited capabilities and he wants his TA's to be able to do more on it. Erickson stated that he does not envision anyone being able to get into the different computer systems to obtain personal information. He stated that the single-sign on process has not been designed yet and that a convenience like single sign-on may not be a good fit to allow someone to pass from tools like Blackboard to something like SAP.

Nickerson stated that some systems can distinguish where you are logging on from and this could be used as a form of security. Erickson reported that there are intrusion systems that can block or suspend a user from a certain range, although this is not being considered yet for individual users. Bieber stated that it is a question of balance: we need security but we don't want to make accessing computer systems so difficult that it becomes a burden for users. Nickerson pointed out that credit card companies manage it by allowing customers to notify them if the customer will be going elsewhere.

Zoubek asked how the new reimbursement system works. Erickson stated that this is still managed by Central Administration. He noted that we could use the same campus credentials but we have to decide what level of security we can manage. He pointed out that the security needs to be flexible and resourceful but we definitely need some parameters.

Anaya asked if Erickson and Bieber had any specific questions for the Senate. Erickson stated that they wanted to meet with the Executive Committee so the changes do not come as a surprise to the faculty. He reported that they hope to work with the

Information Technologies and Services Committee to decide what the best model will be that is acceptable to everyone.

Bieber reported that NIH and NSF want institutions to meet a certain level of security classification. He stated that there are gold, silver, and bronze levels of classifications. He noted that Virginia Tech is certified and the University of Chicago and all of the other CIC institutions are trying to meet these classifications. He pointed out that we might have different levels of users at UNL: some gold, some silver, and some bronze. He stated that IS is trying to figure out the least intrusive way to meet these classifications without making it too difficult on the users.

Schubert stated that he works with NSF every day and does not need a special log in from UNL. He asked why these changes need to be made. He noted that Sponsored Programs might need special classification because of the exchange of funds, but he does not understand what this has to do with faculty members requiring special log in capabilities. Bieber reported that NSF and NIH will be offering other services in the future such as data from projects and sharing collaborative research data. In order to access these resources institutions will be required to have more highly secured credentials.

Anaya pointed out that some faculty members might not need access to this data but others might. She noted that the available information might be discipline oriented, but she can see many different types of collaborations that could be used. Erickson reported that the CIC is trying to build a system of shared access so faculty members can share the resources from research data. Anaya asked if this could also extend to census information from the Office of Research on Census Information.

Woodman asked what kind of password would satisfy NIH. He pointed out that we wouldn't want to develop a password system that makes passwords so complicated that people cannot remember them. Bieber reported that there are different levels of security. He stated that if we added an expiration date to our passwords we would meet the bronze standard of security. He noted that currently our passwords must be eight characters long and must meet certain other rules. He stated that to meet the bronze level of security we could require passwords of eight characters in length, have an expiration date of 365 days, and a user will be locked out for three hours after five failed attempts to sign on.

Bieber stated that they talked with Director Hawkey, Registration and Records, about upgrading the security standards for students but Director Hawkey pointed out that expiration dates for student passwords will not work.

Reisbig asked how IS would discourage people from writing their password on a sticky note and keeping it in their office. Bieber pointed out that there is no way IS can totally prevent this from happening, but better education needs to be provided about security and why it is important to keep passwords confidential.

Reisbig asked what has already occurred in regards to security standard changes. Erickson stated that we are involved in a federation with NIH and NSF that allows low

security standards and provides access to some of their servers with our local campus credentials. We can also go to some of the other CIC institutions to access their wireless network. He noted that IS recognizes that we have to make some changes to our security in order to work with Central Administration and some of the more secure systems. He pointed out that when we agreed to join CIC we agreed to join the cable network and to achieve InCommon Silver. The agreement is on a contractual level and requires us to increase our security levels so we can fully participate with the other CIC institutions. He stated that we are now into the implementation phase to get the work done to get our security to the next level.

Woodman asked if there are different ways the standards can be met. Bieber pointed out that we are at the point that we need to decide how technically to make these changes so we can determine a pathway for an individual to obtain the level of credential that s/he will need. He noted that there will be different needs across the campus and only some people will need to have the silver or gold classification of security.

Guevara thanked Erickson and Bieber for attending the meeting and providing the information to the Executive Committee.

### **3.0 Announcements**

#### **3.1 Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Retreat**

Guevara reported that he attended the recent Student Affairs retreat where the Student Code of Conduct was discussed. He noted that a large group of people representing different parts of the campus were in attendance and that the meeting was very informative and cordial.

#### **3.2 Report on Board of Regents Meeting**

Guevara stated that the Regents meeting is very informative in many ways and is open to the public. He pointed out that the students have a representative to the Board but the faculty does not, although they are free to speak at the meeting.

Guevara reported that the Regents had several serious discussions on the proposal to turn the UNL Health Center over to a private firm. He stated that the students were against the proposal as were the UHC employees and in the end the Board rejected the proposal.

Guevara reported that among many things there was also discussion about the Omaha engineering program. He noted that there was a recommendation that the Board should not be micromanaging the campuses. Also, he reported that there is a very strong divide among the Regents about the merger and the future of the program.

Woodman asked if the change in the Board members makes it a more proactive and aggressive Board. He cited the decision to change the required credit hours to 120 and the decision on the Health Center. Schubert noted that the Chancellor had indicated during the spring semester that there might be a change with the new Board. He stated that he believes there is a constant theme to make education at the university cheaper. He stated that some of the Omaha Regents want to make the Omaha engineering program the

primary program for the university, but this would be considerably more expensive. He noted that right now the Board appears to be split on some major topics. He stated that it is time for the four leaders of the campuses to come together to work on faculty issues. He pointed out that a combined faculty voice can exert real power, but most faculty members are unaware of this.

Nickerson asked if there is a plan B for the Health Center. Woodman stated that one possibility is for student fees to be raised to provide funding to finance a new Health Center facility. Nickerson questioned whether increased student fees would be sufficient to build a new Health Center. He suggested that there may be health care professionals Nebraska who would be willing to donate support for a new facility.

### **3.3 Pin Number Required for the Libraries**

Anaya reported that a pin number is now required for those accessing the libraries electronically. She stated that the pin number authenticates that the user has access, particularly if they are off campus. She noted that more information on the pin number can be found on the libraries website <http://library.unl.edu/screens/pinhelp.html>.

## **4.0 Approval of 5/15/13 Minutes**

Rinkevich moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Nickerson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

## **5.0 Unfinished Business**

### **5.1 Student Code of Conduct Proposed Changes**

Guevara stated that in reviewing ASUN's proposed changes to the Student Code of Conduct it appears that some of it is outdated and that legal definitions may need to be updated in the document. He noted that the Senate particularly needs to review the sections on cheating, academic dishonesty, and plagiarism. He stated that he thinks the Code is soft on the punishment for plagiarism.

Reisbig stated that she still has concerns with section 4.2, item 7, about admissible collaborations. She noted that collaboration is addressed in item 1 on cheating and questioned why it would need to be a separate item (item 7) and the students should make an argument why it should be a separate item. Woodman suggested that it could be combined in item 1 on cheating and used as an example. Schubert stated that item 7 should be deleted. Reisbig suggested that item 1 can be enhanced to address collaboration not allowed by an instructor.

Guevara stated that section b under 4.2 dealing with academic dishonesty is a section that the faculty needs to carefully review and consider. Nickerson pointed out that this section should make students aware that there can be consequences if they engage in academic dishonesty. Guevara noted that it is definitely within the faculty's purview to suggest changes to this section of the Code.

Woodman questioned whether the section on campus disorders was correct because there is proposed language that is listed under 4.11 Sexual Assault that appears to apply to section 4.9 Disturbing the Peace.

Sollars stated that she is concerned whether the current conversation can be conveyed in a meaningful way to the students and suggested that the Executive Committee meet with one of the students who worked on the proposed changes. Woodman suggested that VC Franco should be contacted stating that the organization of the proposed Code needs to be revisited. Guevara noted that at the Student Affairs' retreat he did report that the student's first attempt was rejected and the second document that was sent to the Executive Committee made a better attempt. He also asked if the students had been given any guidance when the changes were suggested.

Schubert reported that he looked at the University of Michigan's Student Code of Conduct which is a much more professional document than our existing Code. He suggested that the students formulate a new Code modeled after the other Big Ten schools. Reisbig pointed out that the current Code with the proposed changes is salvageable and she will be glad to meet with the student representatives to discuss how the document can be fixed. Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee contact VC Franco to say that the Code of Conduct is not appropriate for a Big Ten school.

Guevara stated that she will send a message to VC Franco expressing the Executive Committee's concerns.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 Nomination for MOOC Platform Task Force**

Guevara stated that the Executive Committee has been asked by SVCAA Weissinger to determine a member of the Committee to serve on the MOOC Platform Task Force that is being created. Guevara and Woodman volunteered to serve on the Task Force. Guevara stated that he will inform SVCAA Weissinger of his and Woodman's agreement to serve on the Task Force.

### **6.2 Search Committee for Dean of Libraries**

Guevara asked the Executive Committee if there were any other suggestions for members of the search committee for the Dean of Libraries. Schubert stated that he objects to an internal search and does not believe it is for the betterment of the university and that there is a danger in hiring too many internal people as deans. Guevara noted that the Executive Committee has discussed the issue of failed searches for administrators with the Chancellor and SVCAA in the past.

Anaya noted that SVCAA Weissinger was approached by several faculty members within the Libraries asking that Interim Dean Busch be appointed as Dean. She reported that SVCAA Weissinger then spoke with other faculty members within the Libraries to determine if this was the consensus of opinion among the Libraries faculty.

Ruchala stated that one of her concerns is that it is not known what portion of the faculty members in the Libraries approves of an internal search. She pointed out that it would be chilling for someone interested in applying for the Dean's position to hear that faculty members within the Libraries want the Interim Dean appointed.

Guevara pointed out that if the Executive Committee opposes the internal search that it needs to state reasons for the opposition. Schubert stated that the first principle should be that we want to maintain an open search. He asked why this principle should be pre-empted by an internal search. Reisbig noted that the Libraries have already identified a person. Ruchala questioned how many of the Libraries faculty members have agreed with the internal search process. Anaya reported that at a regularly scheduled Libraries faculty meeting the issue was discussed and the vote was unanimous. Schubert asked if an anonymous ballot was used. Anaya stated that the vote was anonymous.

Woodman pointed out that the campus does not know what the outside offers in terms of candidates. He stated that the Dean of the Libraries can influence the other colleges. Woodman stated that the search seems to be pre-determined and that the new Dean has already been identified and vetted by the faculty of the Libraries and that SVCAA Weissinger can just appoint the person. Ruchala stated that she agrees with this line of reasoning, but noted that just because all of the faculty members agree to an internal search does not mean that the internal candidate is going in a forward direction that will take us to the level of a Big Ten school. She pointed out that there could be many different reasons why people want an internal search. For instance some people do not like change and would rather have the Dean be someone they already know. She pointed out that the Libraries unlike other colleges because it is a unit that is broadly represented of the campus. She stated that the Dean of Libraries affects all faculty members on campus.

Schubert read from the UNL Bylaws, section 2.5.3 "A search advisory committee shall solicit and receive suggestions and recommendations for filing the position from all sources – Regents, Administrators, Faculty, Students, and the Public." He stated that the search committee must be open.

Ruchala moved that the Executive Committee states its strong objection to doing a closed search for three reasons:

- 1) The Library Dean position affects other faculty members like no other Dean on campus.
- 2) The need to have an open search according to the Bylaws.
- 3) A unified faculty does not tell why this person should be chosen or that this is the best candidate for the university.

Wysocki seconded the motion. Sollars objected to the use of the words strong objection. Guevara suggested the statement that the Executive Committee objects in principle to the internal search. Nickerson offered a friendly amendment: the Executive Committee objects the internal search in principle. Ruchala accepted the friendly amendment. The friendly amendment was approved with one against and one abstention.

The motion to notify the SVCAA Weissinger of the Executive Committee's objection to the principle of an internal search was approved.

**6.3 SVCAA Weissinger's Message on Coursea Agreement to Faculty Senate?**

Griffin asked if the Executive Committee wants SVCAA Weissinger's message sent to all Senators. The Executive Committee agreed to have the message forwarded to the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 26m 2013 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.