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

Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2020
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Computing Services Center Conference Room 004

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRPSC Members</th>
<th>Ex- Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Paul Wellman</td>
<td>x Adam Mikeal (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Dr. ‘Jon Jasperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x Deena McConnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Brender</td>
<td>x Joe Mancha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Cook</td>
<td>x Jacob Mclean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Dewitte</td>
<td>x Katherine Rojo Del Busto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x John Kovacevich</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Sardaryzadeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret “Peggy” Zapalac</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 Cynthia Kauder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.

- We will review committee membership. We are down a few members. If you have suggestions for additional committee members, please send to Paul Wellmann.

Item 2: Security Program External Review
Description: Information and invitation to participate

- We are undergoing an external review of the university’s security program. This is a biennial review mandated by TAC 202, which reviews the extent to which we are applying and conforming to the controls catalog for our security program.
- The external reviewers are the CISO of University of Texas at Austin, CISO of Rice University, and CISO of Prime Healthcare in Dallas.
• They will be here for a two-day external assessment on March 4-5.
• This is based on an assessment framework built by NIST, called PRISMA, which is used by federal agencies.
• We want IRPSC to participate, and have set aside time for the reviewers to speak with any IRPSC member who are available. They want to interview us on IT Governance, and how external feedback is gathered and input into the security policy framework on campus.
• One hour in the afternoon of March 4 is set aside. We will send out an invitation to IRPSC members.
• Can these meetings be conducted via Zoom if a member is out of town. Yes, preferred to be in person, but will send out a Zoom link.
• Are there any other entities that the group may want to meet with such as faculty? IRPSC is serving as the faculty proxy. They are also meeting with the policy subcommittee. Hopefully, the IRPSC faculty members can attend.
• Who will get to see the review? It is for the President and CIO. Don't know who they will release the report to.
• Do you have anticipated questions? Yes, we will send the questions to the IRPSC committee. We haven't prepared answers, which will be up to the committee members. The questions are process-driven questions.
• Assessors will be meeting with the CIO, CISO, Division of IT section heads, IT Risk members, and others.
• Will we be evaluating them in return? No

**Item 3: Update on Department of Justice Inquiry**

• A letter was sent from the DOJ to the university on December 23, 2019. They asked for extensive information on accessibility of anything a student may touch. Also, the information requested was very granular.
• Mechanisms for collecting the information from across the university were developed.
• Jocelyn Widmer (Academic Innovation) and Cynthia Kauder (IT Accessibility) requested a meeting with the DOJ several times. They finally met with the DOJ representative, and found out the scope of the inquiry was very different than what was conveyed in the original letter. Jocelyn spoke to the DOJ about the imminent LMS migration from Blackboard to Canvas. All of the current content will be changing with this migration. DOJ now understands this situation and put somewhat of a hold on the inquiry. Academic Innovation will be meeting with Canvas on Feb. 22 to begin discussing settings and templates for the LMS. DOJ volunteered to be instrumental in approving these templates so that the LMS is as accessible as possible from the get-go. After that, the university will be responsible for making sure the content (Word documents, pdfs, videos, etc.) that are put into the LMS is accessible. We will need faculty training during the LMS transition on accessible content.
• The second part of the inquiry involved analyzing the public facing university websites. They randomly selected about 15 sites. Main university site, www.tamu.edu, passed with flying colors, but other sites didn’t. Dining Services and Athletics utilize third-parties to create and maintain their sites, so there is a need to work with vendors to fix these sites. Accessibility watches trends on 150 key entry point sites. Next week we will be sending out reports on these trends and what people can do to make their sites as accessible as possible. The strategy is to work with the most poorly accessible sites, which are about 6-7 sites, then tackle the next group in a rolling fashion. University tools for checking the accessibility of a site are SiteImprove and Tenon.
• We are still collecting information about resources in the teaching and research area, but not as granular. Instead we will be using the resources collected by the annual risk assessment, and look at whether they are compliant or if exceptions have been filed.
• What happens if a website or application can't be fixed, for whatever reason? Please contact IT Accessibility to work with you and do the best that we can to optimize the site. If it is bad enough so it isn't worth the risk vs. the reward for keeping the site up, then you may need to do something different, such as re-create the site. For non-accessible applications, you can continue using them if they fulfill a particular business need and they have been vetted against other potential products. You should file an exception that documents that the solution is the best that can be found.
• Can we get a copy of the DOJ letter? Will need to talk with Office of General Counsel.
• The university is looking into purchasing Blackboard Ally, which is compatible with Canvas. It provides a dashboard view to course creators about accessibility of their course content.

Item 4: Upcoming Launch of Accessibility Compliance Review Utility (ACRU)

• The acronym has been changed to ACE Accessibility Conformance Evaluation tool.
• Why is this important? If you purchase an information resource, you need to work with Procurement and Contracts, which is a time consuming and lengthy process. We want to reduce this time as much as we can. This tool allows stakeholders to see if a VPAT is already on file for a product that you are purchasing, or an exception has already been filed and accepted.
• Demonstrated the tool (CAS authentication required): https://it.tamu.edu/policy/it-accessibility/tools/vpats.php
• The accessibility office has a back-end where they enter the VPAT and exception files for the particular product. You can search for data in the tool. IT Accessibility has entered notes into the VPAT pdf to provide extra guidance.
• Where does the information come from to load into the database? The office gathers this information for accessibility processing for procurement, and we retain these for our records.
• Read more at https://itataccessibility.tamu.edu/procurement/eir_accessibility_conformance_tool.php
• For recent enhancements, see https://itataccessibility.tamu.edu/procurement/procurement_process_enhancements.php

Meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.