### IT Governance Program – Information Risk, Policy, & Security Committee

**Meeting Minutes**

July 28, 2020
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
*Zoom*

**Attendance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRPSC Members</th>
<th>Ex- Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Paul Wellman (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>X  Adam Mikeal (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Aaron Brender</td>
<td>X  Deena McConnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dale Cook</td>
<td>X  Jacob Mclean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Paula Dewitte</td>
<td>X  Katherine Rojo Del Busto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X John Kovacevich</td>
<td>X  Dr. Michael Sardaryzadeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Antonietta Quigg</td>
<td>X  X Melia Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X  Cynthia Kauder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITG Program Support</th>
<th>IRPSC Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Mainka</td>
<td>X Mark Barteau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Missy Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ethel Vaught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minutes: Scheduled Business**

**Item 1:** Welcome & Announcements

*Description:* General welcome and opportunity for announcements and items of interest relevant to the committee.

**Item 2:** Update on Data Governance Classification

- Adam Mikeal gave a presentation on this agenda item.
- As a refresher, an IRPSC subcommittee reviews and updates security controls. This subcommittee meets regularly with another committee of ITAC, as well as the director of the A&M System SOC, to discuss data classification. They wanted to move the current data classification standards into the controls catalog. There is still some tweaking to be done before being taken back to the advisory
A presentation was shown for data classification that included:
  - Background – TAC 202 requires data classification be defined at the university level. Information resource custodians need to implement controls based on these classifications. The A&M System required data classification be aligned with the TAMUS standard, which is currently under review. TAMU Security control RA-2 defines categories for data classification.
  - Peer Comparisons – looked at Indiana University, University of Michigan, University of California, Berkeley, and Carnegie Mellon University.
  - Existing Standard – This is not new work, but a revision and refinement of the current standard. It aligns with the TAMUS standard, but it needs better alignment with the TAMU controls catalog. Need to get rid of duplications and conflicts, reduce compliance overhead, clarify ambiguous language, and simplify roles. Also, the standard is currently in a pdf format, which isn’t very accessible.
  - What’s changing – some important things are not changing, such as the number of classification levels, the definitions of data ownership, etc. Some categories are being renamed to better align with the TAMUS names, and to make the names less ambiguous.
  - Roles – names were changed to make the roles less ambiguous. Will be providing information of webpages to help with understanding these roles.
  - Role Examples – individuals typically have multiple roles. Some examples of roles were provided.
  - What is University Data – continues with current definition of university data.
  - Who owns University Data – this definition is not changing.
  - What does this mean to me – we will be responsible for implementing security controls based the data classifications. Tools are available to help calculate the correct classification at u.tamu.edu/data-calculator.

After the presentation, Adam opened for questions and discussion.
  - Mark Barteau is concerned that items are not over-classified. Researchers will be emailing items to collaborators, and these needs to be unrestricted. Adam agreed and found other areas where the current language wasn’t practical and such changes will be made in the control catalog.
  - Michael S. said he was very happy with the process and committee that has been put together to review these items before presentation. Lots of valuable experience reviewing these items before it goes to Michael.
  - The review process may be improved if increasing representation from researchers. Mark Barteau suggested review by the Council of Principal Investigators or the Research Council.

Adam will be sharing this presentation as well as the actual controls for viewing of this committee.

Where are we in the review process today? Adam shared the IRPSC IT SAP-Rule-Security control review process-work flow diagram. We are in the policy development workflow step, which is in the middle of the process.

**Item 3:** **New Committee Meeting Schedule**

**Description:** Discuss changing meeting date and time to avoid conflicting with EAC meetings.
• Discussed changing this committee’s meeting date and time to avoid conflicting with EAC meetings.
• It was suggested that we keep the meeting monthly and cancel when the meeting may not be necessary.
• The committee agreed that meetings will be scheduled for the third Wednesday of the month at 1:30 p.m. via Zoom.

Meeting adjourned 2:29 p.m.