

**COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
2006/2007**

Charge: It shall advise the appropriate administrators on matters pertaining to computing and electronic communication on the campus. Further, this committee shall advise the directors of the Educational Communications Centers on the operation of those centers.

Chair: Andrew White, elected 4/06

Humanities and Fine Arts:

Stephanie Dinkins	Art, 2-7250	SDinkins@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
vacant			

Social and Behavioral Sciences:

Gregory Zelinsky	Psychology, 2-7827	GZelinsky@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
vacant			

Natural Sciences:

Scott Sutherland	Math, 2-7306	Scott@math.sunysb.edu	9/08
Michael Zingale	Physics, 2-8225	mzingale@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/09

Library:

F. Jason Torre	Library, 2-7119	FJTorre@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
----------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	------

College of Engineering:

Yuefan Deng	Applied Math, 2-8614	Deng@ams.sunysb.edu	9/07
Wei Lin	Biomedical Engineering, 2-4382	WLin@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08

Health Sciences Center:

Andrew White	HSC Library, 4-3102	Andrew.White@sunysb.edu	9/07
Harris L. Cohen	Radiology, 4-9565	HCohen@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
Jolyon Jesty	Hematology, 4-1262	JolyonJesty@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/09

Professionals:

Anita Lago	Communications, 2-1594	ALago@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
Erich Bremer (ex-officio)	Pharmacology, 4-3560	erich@pharm.sunysb.edu	

Students:

Undergraduate (1): Jonathan Hirst (JHirst@notes.cc.sunysb.edu)

Graduate (1):

Administrative Contact:

Richard Reeder, Chief Information Officer, Division of Information Technology

May 12, 2006

Computing and Communications Committee

The Senate Computing & Communications Committee held its final Spring 06 meeting on Friday May 12 at 2:15 PM in the Psych B Senate Conference Room.

Present: Gregory Zelinsky, F. Jason Torre, Wei Lin, Anita Lago, Andrew White, Jolyon Jesty

Rich Reeder was invited to attend to address several items.

- Updates on C.A.L.E.A-Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act

Rich outlined the intention of this 1994 act. The act was intended to allow the surveillance of telecommunications transmissions. For academic campuses, compliance would require an overhaul of the teleco infrastructure, thereby costing the campus millions of dollars. There are questions as to whether or not the act includes surveillance of all network transmissions, and newer encryption technologies would allow one to bypass many of the CALEA specifications. It is still unclear how to interpret and implement CALEA on the campus. At the moment, most in the education sector are opposed to CALEA. SBU is currently waiting for additional information and clarification before concerning itself with CALEA compliance.

- Status of Wireless on campus and CEWIT

There has been an expansion of wireless network coverage across the campus. There are currently wireless access points in all of the Instructional Computing SINC sites and access from the Fine Arts Plaza. We are expecting to receive a list of WLAN campus locations from Rich. Rich is also looking for input for future locations and implementations. At the moment, areas designated as primarily public receive priority for wireless coverage.

There are plans to create campus connectivity to the Center of Excellence in Wireless and Information Technology, but most of the campus networking operations will remain separate from CEWIT and will continue to be managed and supported from the Computing Center.

- Filtering of outgoing email

DoIT has a mail relay that is setup with antispam and antivirus filters for Lotus Notes. Departments that run their own mail system separate from Lotus Notes have the option to use the DoIT mail relay and associated filters. DoIT still needs to come up with a mechanism to notify users of automated filtering actions taken on those non-Notes email systems that utilize the mail relay.

- East Campus / ARCAN issues regarding support for Lotus Notes should be addressed to Charles Bowman
- East Campus / ARCAN issues regarding support for Norton Antivirus should be addressed to Sanjay Kapur
- Timetable for NetID implementation across the various university systems

DoIT will continue to use the SOLAR ID as the master account to manage personal information for students, staff, and faculty. Lotus Notes authentication will remain as is, with the combination of Lotus Notes ID file and associated password. Plans are place to use the NetID with EzProxy and Aleph (libraries), Softweb (campus software), and NetApps (network storage). The SINC sites and Blackboard are currently utilizing the NetID.

- Recruitment and Reorganization of Educational Technologies

With Nancy Duffrin's retirement, the position for as Head of Instructional Computing has been revised with increased duties and oversight of Educational Technologies on the campus. The recruitment process for this newly-defined position has yielded 2 finalists with a hope to have a summer announcement of the new hire. For those who are interested in more information about the candidate presentations, you can contact Bill Collins.

- Turnitin Software with campus site license

Brian Colle, Chair of the Undergraduate Council has been addressing the plagiarism issue, and see a need for a campus-wide system that can assist instructors tackle the problem. Our Committee has recommended to Rich for a commitment to the market leader in plagiarism software, Turnitin. Rich stated that he would post a survey of faculty and staff to ascertain the level of campus interest.

University Senate Committee on Computing and Communications
Meeting minutes of Nov. 11th, 2005

The meeting came to order at 2:15 in the European Languages, Literatures, and Cultures Conference Room. Present: Lin, Rohlf, Cohen, Lagos, Ledgerwood and special invited guest: Rich Reeder, Stony Brook's Chief Information Officer. Two other members phoned/wrote in questions for the meeting.

The Committee welcomed Rich and then proceeded to work its way through the minutes of the first meeting, getting comments from Rich on each item the committee addressed at that meeting.

1) The first item was the PR 109. Rich had sent the entire committee two documents before this meeting that outlined what is happening with questions of policy on computing. These items are attached at the end of the minutes. The committee's questions related to the need to have links to the laws mentioned in one of the attached items (Rich will look into have the links present on web site where the policy is listed) and whether the HIPAA privacy regulations would have to be enforced all over campus (no). In fact the new network being created for research faculty on East Campus who don't deal with patients should underline this fact. At the same time, it is also important to note that any machine with any patient information MUST be behind the hospital firewall/protection. An additional matter discussed was the fact that Notes, with its built-in security has to be used on clinical/patient computers. Notes also has built-in encryption for its forwarded mail as required by HIPAA.

As an aside, we had a report on the new HSC ARCAN network. It is in the last stages of being created. The first department to be on the network will be pharmacology with other departments to be added as soon as all works well with the first department. After entire departments are added, then it will be possible to discuss adding parts of departments, too.

3) In our continuing discussion of the need for more technology in teaching classrooms Rich told us that soon there should be someone new responsible for addressing this question. He announced that a search has been approved for a new administrator who will take over Instructional Computing (since Nancy Duffrin is retiring), the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CELT, which has been without a director for several years) and also supervise Educational Technologies (Gary Van Sise's and Javits Lecture Center's unit). The holder of this position will be a senior administrator and will report to both the CIO and the Provost. A search committee has now been formed and two of this committee's members (Rohlf and Ledgerwood) have been named to it. The first meeting of this committee will be on Dec. 7th. At that meeting a job description will be discussed as well as other aspects of the search.

4) Lin brought up the topic of the East Campus/West Campus divide over computer support, especially Notes support. Rich told us that he simply doesn't have the staff to do support for Notes for 3500 East Campus Notes users as well as West Campus. Given extra funds he could do more in the way of support for East Campus however, although he did note, again, that Notes differs from East to West Campus, including the need to have PH1 certification in East Campus Notes. The committee decided to send these minutes to Dennis Proul, East Campus CIO, to ask for his ideas on why there are so many complaints about computer support on East Campus, especially for Notes users, and so many complaints about the Help Desk as well.

5) We talked with Rich about what is happening with wireless on campus, including the status of the new Humanities Building. The new Humanities building should have wireless capability by January. Rich talked about other areas that might have wireless soon, such as the Wang Center and the SAC as well as more spots in the Library. The committee felt that expanding wireless was, generally, a good idea, especially since we will have a Center for Excellence in Wireless Computing soon. See the next item, too.

6) The committee continues to be very interested in seeing that a single, simple authentication procedure will be implemented for all campus computer users for Solar System, the libraries, virtual private networking (VPN) and wireless. Rich told us that a lot of progress has been made on this during the past year. In January services will be turned on for authentication using Microsoft's Active Directory (ADAM). Eventually there will be a master key for all

authentication. This will be the SOLAR system ID and password. From that account users will be able to change passwords in the two other logins they will still have to use. They will still have to have a separate Notes login and password and a separate "Net ID" which they will use for VPN, library, wireless, and dial-in. Still, this is quite an improvement over the current situation. Rich did mention that one of the problems with this implementation is the number of users who use UNIX for mail or other authentication since the Microsoft application is not secure for them.

7) We did not discuss paying for a web site that would allow us to prove student plagiarism. This is a subject to be discussed again.

8) Wei Lin again brought up the fact that faculty like him and some of the rest of the committee (as well as others not on the committee) would really benefit from the creation of something like a "Power Users Group". [Upon their agreement I can quote from e-mails that he and Charlie Bowman exchanged. Here is the text I would add if they both agree, starting with Wei's questions. I would welcome any editing to this text as well:

{The first question is the sharing of client support knowledge base to the IT staff in campus departments. It will certainly help them to fix problems that already have solutions and relieve some load from client support. I have visited the client support website and found some technical information. But I feel they are more like FAQs. Do you have an internal knowledge base that can be shared?

The second question is the communication between the client support or DoIT and the departmental IT staff. Currently there is a USB tech support mailing list, which I am on, distributing updates from DoIT. However, it seems there is no efficient way for the departmental IT staff to communicate back directly to the client support. I am suggesting to make phone numbers, email addresses and support area of the client support staff available to the people on the USB tech support list. If this does not work out, another alternative may be to provide the people on the mailing list priority access to support staff when they call 2-9800.

The third issue is if it is possible for DoIT to host technical brief meetings and invite the departmental IT staff on a regular base, e.g. quarterly or every semester. I think it will be a good opportunity for them to learn what campus computing resources are available and give feedback. The LDAP, which will be rolled out soon, will be a good topic of such meetings. This can also be a social event that the DoIT staff and departmental staff get to know each other.

Here is the answer from Charlie Bowman:

First, I want to say that I agree with all three issues that you have mentioned in your email. In my opinion they are issues that one would have a hard time arguing against. However, as with many issues at SBU, it comes down to a question of allocation of resources versus workload. I would welcome the opportunity to present to your committee my view of the management problems that, I believe, are unique to Client Support in this regard.

Knowledge sharing can and should be accomplished. At one time we did have a document database that was shared, however we also have a considerable amount of information that should not be shared. It became very time consuming to understand which was which and when to search what. So, we reverted to a secure database. I am searching for some software that might make web based knowledge sharing easy and simple to do. While some of the present offerings on the web are FAQs, others are full tutorials on certain subjects. It's a trade off based on whether we think the web user is just looking for one piece of information or an entire explanation.

Communication between DoIT and departmental IT staff can be improved. There are several means of communication that already exist. USB Tech Support consists of three public groups in notes (East Campus, West Campus and Interested Parties). They are available for anyone to use, in and outside of Notes. SupportTeam@notes.cc.sunysb.edu as advertised on our web site under "Contact Us" is our mail in database for sending questions, solutions or requests to Client Support. Also on our web site is an automated "Submit a Help Request" link. All of these may be used to contact Client Support.

Our 2-9800 telephone number is the best way of contacting anyone in Client Support. Since all of our techs are called on to do site visits, or attend meetings, one is never certain as to the availability of any given tech at any particular time. There is one tech designated to be on phone support during the morning and afternoons. So, after the phone is answered by our students, the call can be directed to a tech designated for phone support at that given time. Our techs do specialize in certain areas so sometimes there is merit in contacting a particular tech. However, messages are taken by our students for anyone in Client Support and emailed to that tech. I am sure we could provide some procedure for departmental techs to identify themselves to our phone support for some kind of

special handling of the call.

I have recognized the need for all of DoIT to communicate more often and more effectively with the University Community. I have written a position description for an individual that would coordinate DoIT's communications. In addition to things such as newsletters and announcements, this person would also review University publications to make sure that they contain the correct instructions for using our IT resources. This effort is proceeding and has been endorsed by the CIO.

Technical Briefings. This is a good idea and I will work on this for the Spring '06 semester. I know we are going to have a presentation from Microsoft about Windows Vista in March. That should be opened up to the entire campus. I recognize that there are other local issues that should be addressed also. Your last sentence brings me to a topic that is dear to me, "DoIT staff and Department staff get to know each other". With the requirement for administrative passwords and increased security and patch maintenance on individual desktop workstations, it is very important to clearly define the responsibility for support. Both from the stand point of the provider as well as the requester. Client Support often receives calls from users that have no idea where or who placed that machine on their desktop. And, it is often the case that Client Support doesn't know either. And of course, there is the other approach to support that many Stony Brook users take. They call several support provides to see who gets there first. Many university web sites have pages that clearly indicate where support is supposed to come from. I would like to work to that end and would certainly host such a page.

I hope this answers some of your questions. As stated above, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss any of these answers with the Committee.

9) Stephanie Dinkins again brought up questions about the faculty addendum which the Provost requires faculty to do to be considered for merit raises. She and others questioned why it had to be entered via Lotus Notes user name and password. Rich responded that this was still a question of authentication. When informed that faculty and chairs did not know if an addendum had even been filed since there was no note of confirmation, he explained that the addendum did not work like a typical web site for ordering items. Instead, the user was populating a data file with all of the information supplied. All of the data, once saved, was saved permanently. So, a user who entered data and saved it had an updated addendum file, even without knowing it. Still, the committee explained that a user, especially someone not familiar with data files and Notes, would not know that he or she had actually created a file to satisfy the Provost's demand that a file exist for a merit pay raise. The committee, humorously, discussed what kinds of buttons and responses needed to be created by DoIT to help faculty realize they actually had a file for raises.

10) Ledgerwood mentioned that he had been contacted by UMass Amherst concerning their difficulties with PeopleSoft and agreed to answer questions by their Senate Committee (equivalent to this committee). Rich agreed to help with this if needed. Jim Rohlf talked about his knowledge of the people at Amherst.

11) Finally Ledgerwood read an article in the NY Times after the meeting where colleges are now going to be forced to do more to help the government be able to spy on Internet users and how colleges are resisting the cost of this new initiative as well as questioning its utility. Rich gave a very detailed response explaining why this is a very important issue. He told us that if the most draconian bill, the Communications A? Law Enforcement Act, is passed in Congress it would require SBU to replace all of its networking, all the way down to routers and switches and would have to spend millions of dollars. He told us that a lot of groups, including EDUCAUSE, are working very hard to defeat this measure.

After all of these items of old business, the committee will have to consider two items of new business at its next meeting.

The first item involves the library, privacy issues, and records purging. The second is the reinvigoration of the Provost's Task Force on Technology and whom we should nominate for that committee. One of its first topics will be classroom technology at all three campuses, here, Manhattan, and Southampton.

Respectfully submitted to the committee,

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair.

Attached item 1:

SUSB HIPAA Information and Communication Infrastructure Security and Privacy Policy

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish direction, procedures, and requirements to ensure the appropriate protection of the Stony Brook University (herein after referred to as the University) information, and infrastructure systems as relates to Protected Health Information [PHI] and the HIPAA Regulations for Security (CFR 45 Parts 160,162 and 164, February 20, 2003) and Privacy Standards (45 CFR Parts 160 through 164, August 14, 2002).

This policy is intended to emphasize for University workforce members the necessity of PHI security and privacy in the various communication and information system environments and their role in maintaining security and privacy of same. The policy will also assign specific responsibilities for the provision of PHI data and PHI security and for the security of the various infrastructure environments. This policy is also intended to conform to federal, state and local regulations and statutes affecting the security and privacy of PHI.

SCOPE

This policy applies to all University workforce members, including employees, students, medical staff, trainees, volunteer staff, contractors, consultants and other representatives, including those affiliated with third parties who access University Computing Systems and University Computer Network Systems which contain PHI (herein after referred to as University workforce members). It applies equally to all computer systems, networking systems, physical medical records (including wireless), firewalls, servers, peripheral equipment, workstations, personal computers (desktop and portables), personal data assistants (PDA's), including wireless PDA's, within the University. Network and computer resources include PHI data, PHI printouts, PHI software (applications and databases), PHI hardware, facilities and telecommunications that permit access to PHI.

POLICY

It is the policy of the University to prohibit unauthorized access, disclosure, use, duplication, modification, diversion, destruction, storage, loss, misuse, or theft of medical (hard copy or electronic) records, information, software or hardware as relates to PHI. Any such unauthorized activities or misuse will be cause for disciplinary action to be taken to the fullest extent of the law, in accordance with university policies and collective bargaining agreements when applicable.

POLICY CROSS-REFERENCE: University Policy 109R and related SUSB, SBUH, HSC and LISVH HIPAA policies.

DEFINITIONS

Access:

The ability of clinical and technical users with authorization and a need to know to access systems and medical records (in either physical and electronic format) which contain PHI or the ability of University workforce members that work in various areas to have contact with PHI.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT

The University will have in place a formal structure that will govern risk management and assessment of the University PHI data management structure. This structure will have oversight of the privacy and security (hard copy and electronic) of the University PHI and communication infrastructure environment that stores or transmits such information.

EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY

Users:

Users are expected to follow all policies and procedures related to PHI security and privacy of medical record data in both physical and electronic format. University workforce members will comply with policies and procedures at the University (global) and departmental (local) levels for security of printing, copying and faxing PHI. This includes transmission, viewing and distributing PHI. University workforce members are expected to not only be aware of all existing security and privacy policies, but also to comply with all future policy changes as they arise. Only authenticated University workforce members will be given access to the communication infrastructure as relates to PHI in a capacity limited to meet the ability to perform their duties appropriately and with a need to know level of access only. All University workforce members who have been determined to no longer need access to the communication infrastructure or specific areas of the network and applications will be removed from access lists, including terminated employees, employees on extended leave, retired or transferred employees with new duties and responsibilities. All University workforce members with PHI access capabilities must attend HIPAA specific training sessions which will provide information on current policies, procedures and regulations relating to PHI security and privacy compliance.

Confidentiality:

The University, in accordance with Federal and State laws, is required to protect and preserve the confidentiality of PHI. All University workforce members must sign a Workforce & Electronic Information Confidentiality Acknowledgement Statement to be granted access honoring all the legal and ethical requirements for protecting and preserving the confidentiality and privacy of patients at the SUSB Infirmery, University Hospital and LISVH. This includes pre-employment and any subsequent additional requirements or changes in access to PHI either for hard copy or electronic format.

Administrators/Department Heads:

Administrators and Department Heads are responsible for ensuring that PHI data privacy and information security measures are being followed for their areas. They must maintain a current working knowledge of the University policies pertaining to PHI security and privacy and identify necessary process improvement changes when new policies are approved.

The Department Head is responsible for ensuring the PHI security and privacy of all department/agency data stored as either physical paper records or electronic records on departmental computer servers. Department Heads will work with the appropriate network and information security administration to ensure PHI security. The Department Head may assign responsibility to someone within the department/agency who will oversee the day-to-day implementation of the PHI security and privacy policies and procedures for their departments. Department Heads must ensure that all employees in their area of responsibility are trained in the most current University policies and procedures as relates to PHI security and privacy. Department Heads will ensure that all employees under their supervision will have appropriate access to PHI and will review such on a regular basis.

The Information Security Officer:

The designated Information Security Officer of each University division is responsible for oversight and monitoring maintenance and compliance of the University PHI systems as outlined in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, Security Standards, Feb. 20, 2003, 45 CFR Part 164.308. (This position may be assigned at the University or at divisional levels.)

Privacy Officer:

The Privacy Officer of each University division is responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of policies, procedures and systems for protecting the privacy of protected (PHI) health information maintained by that University division or its business associates that has the potential to reveal the identity of patients as per HIPAA Privacy Standards (45 CFR Parts 160 through 164, August 14, 2002). (This position may be assigned at the University or at divisional levels.)

Security Committee:

A committee will be established to monitor the electronic security structure of the University, and interpret and implement changes in applicable regulations. To further the protection of the University PHI infrastructure, the committee will consist of not only the Information Security Officers but representatives from all local University divisions that have access or input capabilities to PHI, and any other relevant department(s). This committee will authorize appropriate audits and maintain records for compliance with this policy and SUSB, SBUH, HSC and LISVH policies that relate to PHI and the security of systems.

Privacy Committee:

A committee will be established to monitor HIPAA Privacy compliance and will interpret and implement changes in applicable regulations. The committee will also review new or revised health care laws, regulations and standards pertaining to the privacy of PHI, to determine whether the establishment of new policies and procedures or modification of existing policies and procedures are needed. To further the protection of PHI the committee will consist of representatives, as necessary, from all University divisions that have access or input capabilities to PHI, as well as other relevant department. The committee will review suspected violations and/or incidents on a case-by-case basis.

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS**Authentication:**

The ability to authenticate the users of every University computer network and application that accesses PHI is required. No application or hardware that prevents authentication and identification of users on the University network infrastructure will be permitted. All users on the University computer network will be authenticated by a Human Resources personnel database, i.e., PeopleSoft and/or the Medical Staff Directory. Authentication will allow access to systems with PHI by role and on a need to know basis and will be verified by a department director/manager. Access

levels to systems with PHI will be managed by the appropriate System Administrator and an alternate.

Access:

Access is the ability of an authenticated user to access systems with PHI. Methods of access will be by a unique user name (alternate methods such as biometrics or tokens can be used) for identifying and tracking. All passwords used by a user will consist of a minimum of eight alpha/numeric characters and will be changed on a regular basis, but not to exceed 120 days. System administrator passwords will be changed on a regular basis, but not to exceed 60 days.

Acceptable Use:

The PHI communication infrastructure and physical records are the property of the University and the governance of its use are restricted to further the legitimate interests of the University. Actions and activities that directly or indirectly threaten the integrity of the University PHI communication infrastructure, including circumvention of established security mechanisms, constitute a violation of this policy. Any violation of this acknowledgement or University policies and procedures is strictly prohibited and will be subject to disciplinary action and/or dismissal.

Physical/Technical Security:

Servers, networking equipment and other computers storing or transmitting University PHI data and physical records must be located in secured areas. Access is restricted to authorized personnel. PHI data will be backed up appropriately and tested to ensure the back up is an exact copy as per University policies. Any PHI that is on electronic or magnetic media will be controlled to prevent unauthorized access and will be destroyed in an appropriate manner as per University policies. Additional measures for the safeguarding of PHI, such as the development of individual system disaster recovery plans, firewalls, intrusion detection systems, virus and other intrusion scanning, use of UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supplies) and offsite storage of backups, will be implemented as required in the HIPAA Security regulations.

Authorization for Services on the Internet/Network:

The Communication Infrastructure Security Committee must approve all services that will be made available on the Internet. All servers connected to the University network system must be documented appropriately. Any unauthorized servers on the University network system will be disconnected and appropriate disciplinary action will be taken. The latest encryption technology will be utilized for all University network system communications by external vendor services, business associates/partners and individuals with access to PHI.

Training/Orientation:

All departments will provide appropriate staff training. The University will provide HIPAA training sessions, as needed, for all workforce members.

Updated Software:

Software used on the PHI communication infrastructure will be kept current through the use of the latest version(s) that have the most current updates, service packs or "patches". New versions of software, especially operating systems, will not be supported by the University until a determination of the acceptability of the PHI security of that software is determined. SUSB and SBUH Information Security Administration, together with the appropriate network/client support, will review all new applications that effect PHI. System administrators will maintain a record of the most current updates, service packs or "patches".

Waste Disposal:

All departments must prevent the disposal and destruction of PHI that may directly or indirectly breach PHI confidentiality. Examples include unsecured disposal of hard copies of medical records, computer media, or documents containing network IP addresses, or usernames and passwords. Disposal of sensitive documentation and storage media will follow applicable University policy.

Verbal Security Breaches/Social Engineering:

All University workforce members who have access to the PHI network shall communicate sensitive information about the network only to appropriate personnel. Release of such information in any form to individuals not properly identified is a violation of this policy.

Minimum Necessary Standards:

All University workforce members are expected to limit their use and disclosures of PHI. Requests for PHI should be kept to the minimum amount of information necessary to perform their duties. Each department will implement policies and procedures, identifying the persons, or groups of persons within the department who will be permitted to access

and use PHI to carry out their respective duties. Departmental policies should specify what categories of PHI each person or group may access and use and under what conditions. The determination should be consistent with individual job responsibilities. For example, individuals involved in treatment may be permitted to access the entire record as needed. As a guide for assigning access levels, the following factors should be considered:

1. Who may access the PHI?
2. Which types of PHI may be accessed?
3. In the record of which patients?
4. During what time period or for what activities?

There must be a specific justification for using or requesting the entire physical medical record or accessing the entire electronic medical record.

Public Viewing/Hearing

Many customary health care communications and practices play an important role in ensuring that patients receive prompt and effective health care. Due to the nature of these communications and practices, as well as the various environments in which patients receive health care services, the potential exists for PHI to be disclosed incidentally. For example, an Infirmery, Hospital or LISVH visitor may overhear a health care provider's confidential conversation with another provider or patient. The Privacy Rule permits certain incidental uses and disclosures of PHI when the University has in place reasonable safeguards and minimum necessary policies and procedures to protect an individual's privacy.

Reasonable safeguards for University workforce members include:

- Speaking quietly or talking apart from others when discussing a patient's condition with family members in semi-private patient rooms and waiting rooms;
- Isolating or locking file cabinets or records rooms;
- Isolating or screening from public view and access computer terminals, printers and fax machines containing PHI;
- Providing additional security, such as ID and passwords on computers maintaining PHI;
- Safeguarding PHI from inappropriate public viewing and hearing and refraining from discussing PHI in public areas, such as elevators or reception areas, unless doing so is necessary to providing treatment to patients; and
- Ensuring that confidential databases are exited upon leaving workstations so that PHI is not left on a computer screen where it may be viewed/accessed by individuals who are not authorized to see the information.

Incident Reporting:

All reports of incidents of HIPAA PHI violations will be reported to the appropriate SBU business unit Privacy Officer. Privacy violations will be appropriately reported up the chain of command. Electronic PHI Security violations will be reported to the appropriate SBU Information Security Administration unit for the University and University Police in accordance with policy. Warnings and reports of external PHI security threats will be monitored and distributed by each University division. All hardware will be handled in accordance with incident reporting and investigation policies. All PHI violations will be properly investigated and reported.

PENALTIES

The University will not tolerate the intentional or unintentional breach of PHI security. All violations will be penalized according to policy with respect to the type of violation. Any violation of this policy or other applicable University division policy or procedure is strictly prohibited and will be subject to disciplinary action and/or dismissal and could include additional penalties in accordance with federal, state and local laws.

Forms: Workforce & Electronic Information Confidentiality Acknowledgement Statement

Attached item 2:

USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY P 109

Issued by: Office of the President

Replaces: Policy 109, April 2001.

Approved:

Application. This policy applies to all users of any University network, communication system or computer resource. Guidelines adopted by a division or department to meet specific academic or administrative needs must comply with this policy and with policies on the use of University information technology resources established by the University Division of Information Technology and Hospital Information Technology Department.

Purpose. Information technology resources are provided by the University to support its education, research, public service and health care missions. Use of campus computing and network information resources is a privilege. Accordingly, all users of University networks and computer resources are responsible for the proper use and protection of those resources.

Access / Usage.

Computer accounts and passwords are assigned to individual users for University-related purposes. Account access may not be shared.

Improper usage may include, but is not limited to: the misuse of or unauthorized access to network or electronic data in any form; the use of another's password or account; circumventing network security measures; the use of University data, networks or computer resources for private, commercial or political purposes; harassment or defamation; the unauthorized alteration of electronic files; disruption or interference (hacking / spam / viral programs); software license or copyright violations; violations of state or federal law.

To ensure the continued integrity of its information technology facilities and controls, the University may audit, inspect and/or monitor network usage, at any time, without notice.

The University may also restrict unlimited electronic access. If an imposed limitation interferes with a user's bona fide educational, research or health care activity, the user may direct a written request for a waiver to his or her Department Chair, who shall, on approval, forward the request to the appropriate administrative officer for review. The University reserves the right to limit the use of information technology resources based on institutional priorities, technical capacity and fiscal considerations.

Misuse of the University's information technology resources is subject to disciplinary and/or legal action.

Inquiries/Requests

Division of Information Technology
Office of the Chief Information Officer
Room 231, Educational Communications Center
(631) 632-9085

Information Technology Department (Hospital & Medical Center)
Office of the Chief Information Officer
L4-215 Health Sciences Center
(631) 444-2249

Related Policies

Division of Information Technology ([link](#))
Information Technology Department ([link](#))
NYS Office of Technology Policy 97-1
SUNY Administrative Procedures 007, 008
SBUH Policies 0038, 5007
SBU Policies 105, 507, 510, 512
SBU Student Conduct Code Article II A 6

Related Laws

17 USC § 101: Copyright Act
17 USC § 512: Digital Millennium Copyright Act (protects electronic text, graphic files, commercial software and audio and video files).
18 USC § 1030: Computer Fraud & Abuse Act (protects computer and data integrity)
18 USC § 1302: Crimes (email fraud)
18 USC § 2252: Crimes (exploitation of minors)
18 USC § 2501: Electronic Communications Privacy Act

20 USC § 1232g: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
42 USC § 1320a: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
42 USC § 2000e: Civil Rights Act

NY Penal Code §§ 156, 170 (computer crimes; forgery)
NY Executive Law § 296 (Human Rights Law)
NY Public Officers Law §§ 84, 91 (FOIL, Personal Privacy)

Computing and Communications, First meeting, October 14, 2005.

Present, Dinkins, Rohlf, Lago, Lin, Ledgerwood. Excused: essentially the rest of the committee membership.

The Committee met in the new Humanities Building in the European Languages Literatures, and Cultures Conference Room. The tour of the new technology classrooms was postponed due to lack of equipment in them, according to the staff from the Humanities Institute. However, I have heard this week that some projectors were stolen from the third floor. So, there is equipment in places at least now.

The Chair began by discussing agenda items from last year, introducing the new committee members to the type of items that the committee has often discussed. During this discussion and presentation the committee also was able to present some of its successes that occurred during the past year. Finally the committee discussed possible new agenda items for this year. Rohlf suggested, and all agreed, that there were so many agenda items that the committee should decide which items to focus on this year. Thus part of the next meeting will be to discuss prioritizing such a list.

The first item discussed was meeting times. It seems that Friday afternoons will have to continue to be the day and time for future meetings.

We then mentioned the PR 109 policy on computing and privacy. We'll ask Rich Reeder for an update on where that stands.

3) We discussed the continuing need for more technology in teaching classrooms and how the way the Registrar's office assigns classrooms should take into account what rooms have tech. and which do not, but also realized that the campus needs many, many, more classrooms than it has which adds to the unwillingness of the Registrar's office to take tech. into account in assigning rooms. We talked about what Gary Van Sise from Educational Technologies had told us about this and the new Humanities Building rooms as well as the fact that the Provost's taskforce on technology has gone inactive.

4) Lin brought up the topic of the East Campus/West Campus divide over computer support, especially Notes support. We all agreed that it would make sense for West Campus to take over Notes support for the entire campus. We will ask Rich Reeder if this is possible. We also discussed whether it would make sense to invite both Rich and Dennis Proul (CIO of East Campus) to a meeting together to get their take on the division of support. We went over the progress of the new network for East Campus researchers that would not be subject to patient privacy firewall restrictions and will ask White/Bremer for a report on this at the next meeting.

5) We agreed to talk to Rich about what is happening with wireless on campus, including the status of the new Humanities Building.

6) We wanted a report on the LDAP authentication implementation as well. We are still very interested in seeing that a single, simple authentication procedure will be implemented for all campus computer users.

7) Now for new agenda items, Rohlf mentioned that he had been sent to a conference on plagiarism. He learned a lot from the conference and its speakers and hopes some of the speakers will be brought to campus to talk to faculty and students about the issue and how technology facilitates it. Ledgerwood mentioned he would like the campus to subscribe to one of the sites that make finding plagiarized papers easier.

8) Lin brought up the fact that faculty like him and some of the rest of the committee (as well as others not on the committee) would really benefit from the creation of something like a "Power Users Group". This would be a discussion board/web site that would exist to give those of us who do support for other faculty/staff a "leg up" and make our support much easier by providing us essential information to do it properly. Rohlf suggested that there might be enough people in such a group as to have a type of "tech support union". Others wondered if that group could even

have an official status on campus.

9) Dinkins brought up questions about the faculty addendum. She and others questioned why it had to be entered via Lotus Notes user name and password. Ledgerwood responded that it was partially because of the authentication problem. She questioned the interface and set up of the site to do the addendum. One huge problem with the interface is that the faculty member doesn't know if the completed addendum has actually been received by the Provost's office, nor does his/her dept. chair. Since the Provost has decided that merit pay raises will only be awarded to faculty who do addendums, this is a serious matter. Although the entire interface needs to be reexamined, a way to let a faculty member know that an addendum was submitted successfully is needed before next year's addendum is due, no matter.

10) Ledgerwood mentioned that he had been contacted by UMass Amherst concerning their difficulties with PeopleSoft and agreed to answer questions by their Senate Committee (equivalent to this committee).

11) Finally Ledgerwood read an article in the NY Times after the meeting where colleges are now going to be forced to do more to help the government be able to spy on Internet users and how colleges are resisting the cost of this new initiative as well as questioning its utility. The committee will ask Rich for his opinion on this.

Respectfully submitted to the committee,

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair.

Committee on Computing and Communications held its last regular meeting of the academic year April 15th.

In attendance: Jesty, Bishop, Sutherland, Lin, Zelinsky, Dinkins, Sekar, Rohlf, Ledgerwood, and an invited guest who has applied to be on our committee from the library, Paula Di Pasquale. The University CIO, Rich Reeder, was unable to attend this meeting due to illness.

As has been the case all year long, we did have lively and humorous discussion at the meeting. We discussed a variety of continuing concerns and questions and brought up two new areas of discussion that we will take up more fully in the fall. The Chair wishes to thank the Committee for its good humor and good spirits throughout this year!

Old and Continuing Business:

1) P109R has been divided into different sections and different groups of DoIT are discussing it and revising it. This document will be presented to the committee for comments, when it is finally finished.

2) The work on LDAP and having a really straightforward way of authenticating users is continuing. The committee urges this process to continue. In addition the Committee urges computer support staff on both East and West Campuses to meet and decide who will support a certain area, such as Lotus Notes, as well as listen to concerns about authentication, especially from library staff.

3) The Chair expressed his pleasure with the meeting of the Committee with Gary Van Sise, head of AV Services and Educational Technologies. He also mentioned that it was quite possible the Committee might want to meet with Gary again over the summer (once or twice) to discuss what was happening in the new initiative to equip classrooms with technology. A note about possible meetings during the summer will be forthcoming.

4) The Chair summarized what has been happening with the funds from the tech fee increase (see previous Committee minutes).

5) The Chair has finally found the e-mail note relating concerns about lack of SINC site facilities on East Campus. Andrew White has responded quite well to these concerns. The Committee will not bring up this topic again.

6) None of the Committee members responsible for the creation of the new Health Sciences computer network were present at this meeting to provide details about its progress. However the committee wishes this project "full steam ahead"!

7) The Committee continues to express its concern about technology available to adjuncts and lecturers. The Committee will now go on record advising all Deans and Department Chairs that all lecturers and all adjuncts must have easy access to a computer connected to the Internet. With the growth in importance of e-mail and Blackboard for all teachers and students, good computer access is now an absolute must for all instructors. The Committee wishes to bring this up to the full Senate as a motion for action.

New Business:

1) The Chair brought up the topic of computer videostreaming and videoconferencing. He and the Director of the Libraries had discussed this in a previous meeting. The Committee found this to be an interesting topic. Several Committee members explained how they would like to have videoconferencing using videostreaming available to them. Dissertation committees would love to have this available for outside Committee members who cannot be present at the defense. A number of faculty are working on collaborative projects with people at a distance. Having video contact with these collaborators would facilitate their own research greatly. Sharing performances and being able to critique performances was mentioned. Sharing creative works of art was mentioned. The need to have very good videostreaming and videoconferencing with our Manhattan Campus and our potential Southampton Campus were also highlighted. The Director of the Library is interested in having some materials available via videostreaming. He mentioned that the University of Maryland College Park is using Blackboard for the delivery of videostreaming. This interested the committee quite a bit. The Chair mentioned he is interested in having foreign language news available via videostreaming. The Committee mentioned that Internet II would be ideal for this, when applicable. The Chair mentioned that a linguistics professor wants to videostream a very specialized linguistics class he is already planning to teach to a University in Serbia which would double his enrollment. The committee then mentioned that this should involve a question of tuition at some point, especially after an initial experiment. Various problems with campus pipelines were then discussed that might prevent videostreaming from becoming more common than it is now. However, the Committee wants to continue to discuss this issue. The Chair also pointed out that Gary Van Sise's unit has two rooms that have ISDN-based videostreaming available. The Committee decided it would love to meet in the smaller room which has this set up and see how it works. The Chair did mention that the cost to use this set up is not insignificant. The Committee then wondered if these rooms could have Internet-based videoconferencing added that would not be so costly, even if it provided a much lower quality picture. Nevertheless the Committee will ask Gary if we can meet in the smaller videoconferencing room in Javits at a future meeting.

2) A final topic for new and continuing discussion was the ROLM telephone system. While the deficiencies and inequity of this system are nothing new to the campus, the huge growth in cellular telephones has added a new layer of discussion. It is well known that adjunct faculty, some lecturers, and even some faculty do not have telephone service on campus in an office due to the high cost of having service and equipment. The Chair of the Committee noted that having a fax line, two telephones, voice mail and international service on one phone, and an alarm system on a separate phone line costs his Center over \$1000 a year for equipment charges. It is easy to see why some instructors do not have phones and why many faculty do not have voice mail. A new fact, however, is that many instructors are now using personal cell phones to overcome these problems. Instructors believe students should be able to have contact with them via telephone. For instructors--and especially adjunct instructors--to have to pay for this "privilege" of connecting with their students is an outrage. The Committee urges a change in the ROLM system and its financing. It urges Deans and Department Chairs who have instructors using personal cell phones to connect with students to find a creative way of paying these instructors who provide this service to their students. The Committee agreed to invite John Stier, who is now head of telecommunications to attend a future Committee meeting to discuss these issues.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee,

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair

CC Meeting-March 22, 2004

The next meeting is scheduled for April 15th (!) at 2:15 in Univ. Senate room in Psych B.

I did not take formal minutes this past meeting. With it being held during spring break I subconsciously refused to bring paper and pencil.

We discussed some old business and new business both. P-109R is being discussed in DoIT now and has been broken down into a variety of areas and being discussed by all parts of DoIT. We'll ask Rich for details at the next meeting. Andrew White was unable to attend this meeting so we will ask him for more details about SINC sites on East Campus and how student tech. fee money is spent on East Campus in April. I will try to bring the e-mail Brent Lindquist (Univ. Senate Pres.) sent me concerning these questions to the next meeting.

I have asked him to forward this e-mail to me so I can send it to Andrew in advance of the meeting so that he can prepare responses. We discussed the continuing problems concerning client support. The main problems lie in the area of who supports whom. As an example East Campus people are finding it difficult to get Notes support since Notes is a West Campus item. We'll discuss this issue in greater detail with Rich in April. We heard progress continues on authentication issues. We heard about what items are now available for students that are either free or very low cost due to the tech. fee increase. We discussed what else the increase is funding (better student networks, student SINC sites, support personnel, etc.).

At this point Gary Van Sise, head of Educational Technologies, was introduced. The rest of the meeting was spent talking about classroom technology. I informed the group that he, Maria Doelger, and I had lunch to discuss how to improve classroom technology with the new funds. I also informed the group that Rich Reeder is working with a group (perhaps the Provost's taskforce on technology that I belong to) to discuss this issue. The committee enjoyed talking with Gary. We learned a number of interesting things, including the specifications of new Humanities building and its classroom technology. The committee discussed a number of options about what kinds of technology some of the existing 110 Registrar-scheduled classrooms need, especially video projectors. We talked about more loanable portable computers and the fact that Gary can now hire some support staff to help keep the classrooms running well with their new technology. The first money in this area for existing classrooms will be spent in the fall after the new Humanities building is finished and opens. The Committee discussed this issue again at the next meeting with Rich.

Please send me all additions and corrections to the minutes by the end of the week. I will send Laurie a corrected version for posting after revision.

Respectfully submitted for the committee,

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair

Computing and Communications
March 11, 2005

The meeting convened at 2:15 PM.

Present: Zelinsky, Rohlf, White, Bremer, Dinkins, Jesty, and Ledgerwood.

Excused: Sutherland, Bishop, Sekar. Silverberg

The Chair began by talking about the agenda for the semester, what items remained from last year's agenda and what new items would be discussed this semester. The following topics were discussed.

- 1) The new HSC research network. Progress continues on this new network. It is still hoped that the first "run-out" of this network can take place before April 20th.
- 2) P109 will await Rich Reeder's update at the next meeting he attends.
- 3) The Provost's taskforce on technology has not met since November.
- 4) The chair announced that the student tech fee increase started this semester. Students now have new (almost free) software available to them from the bookstore. This includes Microsoft Office.
- 5) Gary Van Sise now has been given the task of improving technology for classrooms on campus and money to do that

from the tech fee increase. The committee will invite him to its next meeting to talk about his plans and how the committee can help him.

6) The committee still wants to work with the Registrar's office on how to assign classrooms with technology appropriate for the classes. We will ask Gary for his help with this topic, including the right people to contact about this issue. Some committee members wondered whether there was a person in the Provost's office we should contact or a "deputy" of the Registrar to be contacted.

7) LDAP and authentication continue to be issues of importance for computer access. The committee discussed various aspects of this at length. This is especially a nightmare for the libraries since users can switch from one category of user to another often. We will ask Rich about progress on this issue and offer our thoughts on it.

8) A new topic is how client support needs to be rethought in its current division between East Campus and West Campus. Many faculty are on both campuses and have offices on both. In addition some support areas, such as Notes, are supported only on one "campus" and not another. The committee would be happy to explain the difficulties many users have in this current client support division. It would be happy to facilitate a meeting between the CIOs of both campuses so that they can come up with a very clear delineation between support for the campuses.

9) A final topic engendered a lot of discussion. The committee felt that communication between IT staff and normal campus users could be improved. The committee volunteered to receive IT e-mails discussing problems/outages/ etc. and disseminate those affecting people in their own areas. It would like to help communication in any way it can.

The meeting closed with the following announcements:

Oracle is buying Peoplesoft. How will that affect us?

The committee would like to invite Gary Van Sise to its next meeting. The tentative date for that meeting is March 18th at 2:15 in the Univ. Senate Conf. Room in Psych B.

The committee would like to invite Rich Reeder to its April meeting. This is tentatively planned for April 15th at 2:15 in the Univ. Senate Conf. Room in Psych B.

Minutes respectfully submitted by,

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair

Computing and Communications
Minutes of December 10, 2004

1) Update on the P109R. What is happening to its implementation? Any new thoughts from campus lawyer?

Discussions are still on-going. The revised P109R will be submitted to this committee for discussion before it goes to the Cabinet. Perhaps the part of the document that may prove to be controversial will involve e-mail. The University will reserve the right to monitor campus e-mail using University mail servers. Faculty, staff, and students should not see University mail servers as a permanent archival resource either. Faculty needing permanent e-mail archives should transfer e-mail to their own computer hard drives and then archive and back-up e-mail locally. Faculty, staff, and students who are using campus mail accounts to conduct illegal business activities or in breaking U.S. and State laws will lose their accounts if discovered and appropriate authorities will be notified.

In response to questions, it was agreed that faculty/staff/students could use web-based e-mail services on campus that could not be monitored by the University. It was also stated that all monitoring of campus e-mail would be done following clear procedures that would address very serious concerns only. There would be no routine and random monitoring. All targeted monitoring would be done on a per case basis and only done if very serious and potentially provable concerns were raised.

Secondly the CIO (Rich Reeder) will provide the Committee with a list of programs that are routinely deleted when attached to an incoming e-mail. It is important for faculty to know this in case their correspondents have a legitimate

need to send such programs as attachments. In that case they will have to send the programs in a different manner. Examples of routinely deleted programs when attached to e-mails might include .exe files (executable files for PCs/Windows), and .pif files (program information files for Windows).

2) What can we learn from Rich about the Registrar's office scheduling algorithms? Our concern is that instructors needing a technology-strong teaching space should have a better way of obtaining one. Can we help with suggestions to include technology into the scheduling of classrooms?

Rich stated that he was fairly sure that the Registrar's office had a pretty good scheduling program that would include data fields for items such as what technology a particular classroom contained as well as number of chairs. He said he would check on this to be sure. If it does, the reason the Registrar's office might not be using these fields regularly could be a fear of "bad data" in the fields, although Gary VanSise's group has collected data on classrooms, including their technology, routinely and recently. It also might be that the Registrar's office simply is overwhelmed by the needs of scheduling and puts that data field down too low in the program for it to matter in the process. Yet since the problem of having the very few technology-capable classrooms assigned appropriately is getting worse every term, the committee feels there has to be a change. It will ask the Registrar to see if she can attend a committee meeting early next semester, perhaps at the same time as the CIO. Then this matter can be raised with those in charge of helping improve the situation. The committee also wants to know if there is a Senate committee that oversees classrooms? We had many comments for such a committee.

Finally the committee also wondered who (if anyone) in the Provost's Office is in charge of the CASA reports? These reports give details about all rooms on campus, including teaching classrooms and would include comments about classroom technology.

3) What is the status of campus-wide software licensing? Could we add Endnote to the list of programs licensed? What about Adobe Acrobat?

The Univ. continues to have a license for Microsoft Office (both Mac and PC). Finding out how to obtain these programs might be made a bit clearer on Univ. web pages, however. The fact that this program can be used at home was mentioned and limitations on the MS Work at Home program discussed (for example children may not use the program on home computers). For Adobe Acrobat, it was stated that our faculty may purchase this program at a very reasonable price from the Univ. at Buffalo (SUNY) (UB) Micro site that is linked to from client support at SBU. The CIO is exploring having the professional version of Adaware available for free for on-campus users in the way that Norton AntiVirus currently is as well as adding a new Symantec Anti-Virus program that would protect against spyware, too. In terms of having Endnote available the CIO will look into making a certain number of copies available in the same way as MS Office.

4) Any news on campus-wide VPN access with a Solar System interface and authentication?

This continues to be a big issue. The LDAP group is now meeting again and discussing this now that the PeopleSoft 8 upgrade has been successfully installed. A first step in providing campus-wide authentication is the purchase of a "box" that can allow authentication through web browsers for access to Univ. records/PeopleSoft. The first group to have access in this way to these files will be administrators. If this experiment proves successful, then other groups might be added to such a box (or boxes).

In response to a question there was a discussion about which group of users on campus needs access to which group of records/files/services and what type of level of authentication would be necessary for different levels of access. It was agreed that this is a complicated issue that needs discussion by a variety of groups on campus. It was suggested that the Provost's Office look into this question thoroughly and make recommendations not only to DoIT but also to departments on how to classify users and user access. As examples of problems it was noted that on East Campus there are different types, levels, and ages of volunteers for the Hospital who have different functions and needs and need different levels of access to campus systems. If volunteers, even, cause classification and access problems for computing, one can see how complicated resolving this problem can be. However libraries, especially, need help with this.

5) Request for an update from East Campus committee members about the status of East Campus Internet servers and access to computers.

This process is still going on. More departments have contacted the group looking into the new network about becoming part of it. The process is still following the schedule indicated in the previous report.

One of the committee members also gave the committee a letter from a very disgruntled professor on East Campus. He was having problems installing a USB device on his computer and called the help desk for assistance. Someone came from the help desk and installed the device. After the person left, the professor realized that not only was the device not installed but the professor had lost control of his computer. This was a computer purchased with his own funds and was a private machine. Now, however, he was locked out of the machine and not the administrator of it any more. To say he was livid would be an understatement. (The full text of the letter is available for those interested.) Quite obviously discussions need to occur on East Campus about the rights of individuals owning private computers vs. the need for security in certain networks/areas. Yet for a private user and owner of a computer to lose control of their own machine without warning or discussion is something that certainly need not occur.

A final question was posed about having to use Lotus Notes for submitting the faculty addendum in the summer. It was stated that users did not have to use Notes. However, they have to have a Notes ID and password to submit addendums. A discussion relating to replacing this access with a different kind ensued. It was stated that Notes had very good authentication and was much more suitable to this kind of task than PeopleSoft or Blackboard. Undoubtedly this discussion will occur again.

6) Report from the Chair about his meetings with a) the Provost's Technology Taskforce, b) the Univ. Senate Coordinating Council, and c) the search committee for the Director of the Center on Learning and Teaching.

The Chair reported a) that the Provost's Technology Taskforce had met since the previous CCC meeting. He expressed his disappointment that the subject of classroom technology was not on the agenda that day, but rather an SBU relationship with a small local tech. firm which produces courseware. While this relationship is interesting it is not nearly as important for the campus as a whole. It is hoped that the next meeting of this taskforce will be about classroom technology. b) The Chair reported that he had learned a great deal about many aspects of the University he had been unaware of at the two Senate Coordinating Council meetings he had attended this fall and gave examples to the CCC. He was asked to pose the questions listed in point 2 above: is there a Senate committee that oversees classrooms, and who in the Provost's Office oversees CASA reports? Finally, c) he reported that there were two finalists for the CELT Director position, that the search committee for this position had met with the Provost concerning the search and that the Provost might select the Director soon, perhaps by the beginning of the Spring semester.

Old Business not otherwise listed.

Old business revolved around questions presented earlier and the need for specific improvements in campus networking. Marine Sciences and the Staller Center were mentioned. Marine Sciences has already been improved. The Staller Center cannot be improved until two rooms are identified that can be used as communications closets. The CIO gave the specs for these rooms and their proximity to each other. The Arts representative on the CCC will take back this info. to the Staller chairs for comments.

New Business.

The CIO had a number of "good news" announcements. The most important announcement was that the (long-awaited) increase in the Student Tech. Fee would take effect in the Spring Semester of 2005! This fee will be spent in the following ways: 1) to provide to every student a Microsoft package of software which will include the full Office package for both Mac and PC and some other programs for PCs--details still being worked out, 2) increasing network availability and speed in the Resnet, 3) improving classroom technology, and 4) a small number of grants to support experiments in using technology for teaching. The committee discussed each of these areas, especially discussing what kind of group would be necessary to figure out how to spend the money allotted for improving classroom technology efficiently and effectively.

Finally the CIO also talked about planned improvements that would support high-speed two-way videoconferencing between SBU and SB-Manhattan. His office will work with SB-M as well as Gary VanSise and Educational Technology to purchase equipment and outfit spaces to allow for a new connection between both campuses.

Finally he talked about improvements to SBU's access to the outside that would allow new collaborations with high-speed broad bandwidth, especially in-state. This bandwidth should prove exciting to a variety of researchers.

Scheduled Adjournment for 3:45.

The Committee adjourned at 3:55, having begun at 2:25, instead of 2:15.

Respectfully submitted to the Committee by

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair.

Computing and Communications Committee
October 22, 2004

The latest meeting of the Univ. Senate Computing and Communications Committee took place on Oct. 22nd and went from 2:15 to 3:30.

Attending: Jesty, Sekar, Dinkins, Bremer, White, Rohlf, and Ledgerwood.

Rich Reeder was unable to attend this meeting, so the agenda shifted completely. We agreed to table items pertaining to his office and his knowledge until he could attend. Thus the questions of 1) P109R, 2) changing the Registrar's office scheduling algorithms, 3) and campus-wide software licensing will be taken up again in December.

The Committee Chair did announce that he was having a meeting with the Provost's new technology taskforce on Nov. 2nd. He anticipated that this group would have something to do with bringing more technology into classrooms. He will present a report from the taskforce to the Committee at its next meeting.

He also announced that he is part of the search committee to select a new CELT (Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching) Director. There are four finalists for this position who are being interviewed during the first two weeks of November.

He then passed around a letter he wrote for the committee supporting the tenure and promotion of one of the Committee members which was then sent to the candidate's department.

The rest of the meeting was devoted to the issue of East Campus computers. Andrew White and Erich Bremer gave a very detailed explanation of their struggle to create a new East Campus network that would be separate from the current network. They explained that they are trying to create this network in a short time. Thus the network has to be created in stages. The first stage is to set up the network for the departments who have asked to be part of it. A possible second phase would be to add other academic units and then, perhaps, individuals and individual computers to the network. The Committee discussed many aspects of this network as well as various aspects and problems dealing with cabling changes, static and dynamic IP addresses, and authentication. Questions were raised dealing with how VPNs could work to deal with administrative control and access and how the University's initiative in LDAP was going. For more details about all of this, please come to the next CCC meeting.

Which Fri. in Dec. at 2:15 PM is better: 3rd or 10th?

Best to all, Mike

The first meeting of the year of the University Senate Committee on Computing and Communications was convened at 2:10 PM on Fri. Sept. 24th, 2004

1. Introductions and Presentations.

A good number of the committee were present. Those present included: Bremer, Sutherland, Dinkins, Sekar, Silverberg, Rohlf, Zelinsky, Ledgerwood, and Rich Reeder.

2. Reaffirmation of Ledgerwood as Chair.

The committee decided to reaffirm Ledgerwood as Chair for the rest of this academic year. He has been told he has a two year term. He is now also looking for a "vice chair" to take over after his term is up.

3. Discussion of the Committee's role and duties.

Committee members were told to go to the Univ. Senate web site to look at our charges. However, most of us worked on the charges last year, so were quite familiar with them.

4. Discussion of the year's agenda, meeting times and meeting frequency.

Not too surprisingly, those at last Friday's meeting can make a 2 PM Friday meeting. Unless the Chair hears howls of outrage from those not attending, we will stick with this time. We also decided to try to meet once a month. Rich Reeder agreed to try to make any meeting we specifically requested him to attend.

5. Update or lack of it on policy for computer use on campus.

Rich told us that the huge 109 document we worked on last year is now in limbo. The user policy piece is facing a challenge from one of the Univ. lawyers, who has a different policy document. The committee asked to be included as consultants on that document, if it is approved. However, it has not yet been and might not be. Matter tabled for now.

Rich then talked about some other items which will be listed below under "new business".

6. The Provost's taskforce on classroom technology.

The CCC Chair, Ledgerwood, has been asked to be a member of this taskforce, in light of his role in helping to create such a taskforce and his role as Chair of CCC. He will keep the Committee informed about its activities and explore the utility of having a joint meeting of both groups at some point. Ledgerwood detailed some of the history leading up to the creation of the taskforce and thanked the previous CCC Chair, Joanne Daly, for helping to make this possible, too. One of the points he made was the new head of CELT will be a key figure in this area.

7. Request from Head of the Libraries about footnoting programs for campus site license. See attached file as well....<ref.xls>

The committee as a whole was surprised by the choice of the two programs the Head of the Libraries sent for us to look at. Comments ranged from "I have never heard of these two programs" to "No one uses anything besides free programs or Endnote". In a follow up conversation with the Head of Libraries today, he explained that the request he was given asked for a web interface and web storage for this type of program, something Endnote doesn't seem to have. The Chair will take that new information to the Committee at the next meeting.

If original viewpoints remain unchanged, however, the Committee will likely ask Rich Reeder if Endnote would be a program he would be interested in obtaining a site license for, for general faculty and staff use. Endnote's ubiquity and its inclusion of "thousands" of different Journal bibliographic templates makes it hard to beat.

In other discussion of Endnote, it was noted that the Stony Brook library's proxy server is set up in a way that is more inflexible and reluctant to allow connections from researchers that other campuses allow. This involves Endnote as well. Jim Rohlf can provide more details about the problems.

As an aside having a site license for Adobe Acrobat was also discussed as useful to a wide variety of faculty, especially those who write grants.

8. Discussion of need to move Health Science from Hospital Internet servers to West Campus servers.

Several research faculty on the East Campus have expressed major dissatisfaction with changes in East Campus Internet servers that have taken place over the past two years. As a result of new federal regulations on patient records, all East Campus servers have new firewalls with new restrictions on Internet access. For research faculty these restrictions have been very burdensome. The Chair has e-mail correspondence that gives details of the problems.

Erich Bremer then explained how a group of technical staff on the East Campus (including Andrew White from the committee) is trying to solve this problem by moving groups of faculty/staff and their associated servers out from behind the firewall that do not need to be behind it. He explained in detail how this will occur with the move planned to take place in the spring of 2005. Thus all groups that want/need to get out from behind the firewall will need to contact this working group as soon as possible, if they have not already.

A potential problem could occur in the clinical sciences. Some groups there might have both computers that need to be behind the firewall with patient data along with other computers only used for research. It is hoped that this is not the case, however.

Under 9. New Business, the Committee agreed to work on a support letter for the tenure and promotion case of Stephanie Dinkins, one of its members. Ledgerwood will draft a letter that Comm. members may choose to sign. Members are encouraged to go to the Staller Center Art

Gallery to see some of Prof. Dinkins' work on display. Since her art often is technologically-inspired, the Committee should find it quite interesting.

In Rich Reeder's report to the committee, he highlighted a number of items of interest. He talked about his disappointment that the student tech. fee increase was pared down a significant (but quite affordable) increase (65\$ increase) to a mere \$3.50 a semester increase. He had planned the increase to be used for a variety of areas, including giving students a Microsoft software package for "free" (paid by the increase), further improvements to the Res.Net including more staff for it so that its servers are manned nearly 24/7, and improving classroom technology. He is hopeful that the full increase will be approved for either the spring or fall semester of 2005. The need for ResNet improvement is verging on critical with the growth of spam and viruses as well as student downloading of large files.

He discussed the changeover to PeopleSoft 8 in some detail.

He explained that there is a strong push to bring LDAP authentication to the Univ. with a Solar ID interface. This would solve a great number of problems that now require VPN connections to campus servers, including exam authentication and library access. There would be different types of accounts set up in Solar/PeopleSoft for computer administrators as well.

Finally the committee also talked about the need to improve classroom scheduling. It appears that the program the Registrar's office uses is woefully inadequate in nearly all aspects. Most striking, however, is its total lack of information about technology in classrooms. The committee has decided to explore this problem in depth.

After other discussion, the committee hammered out three agenda items for the October meeting.

- 1) Follow up with Rich about the 109 policy discussion and expressing again its desire to be involved in this discussion in a meaningful way.
- 2) Talking with Rich about possible site licenses for Endnote and Acrobat. What is involved? Would these programs be worth it for the entire campus?
- 3) Talking with Rich and any others about the room scheduling program. How can the committee help improve the program? What types of information should be added to the the program. How should information be updated about room qualities for the program?

Respectfully submitted by

Mike Ledgerwood, Chair

Senate Computing and Communications Committee
Year End Report
Academic Year 2002-2003

Prepared by Joanne English Daly

During the academic year 2002-2003 two elected chairs of the Computing and Communications Committee served the university. Due to the retirement of Roger Kelly on 12/18/2002 a new chair was elected to serve for the spring semester. The committee members unanimously elected Joanne English Daly as the new chair. This report primarily reflects the activities of the committee during the spring 2003 semester.

Many important "computing and communications" developments occurred on campus this year. Examples include:

- The campus fully moved into implementation of People Soft;
- SkillPort became available for all faculty and staff to access 800 distance-learning non-credit courses;
- A contract was signed allowing access to Microsoft XP Office for all faculty and staff both on and off campus;
- Library services implemented access to online databases, which were previously only available on campus. Due to a VPN students, faculty, and staff can now access library databases from off campus sites.
- AV upgraded systems mid spring to XP operating systems and Office XP.
- Upgrades to BlackBoard 6.0 and XP operating systems will occur after the close of the Spring semester.

All decisions were made lacking input from the committee. Currently the committee members are informed of decisions rather than serving in a capacity of advisement. Faculty and students must be part of a team of decision makers. The first step the committee made was to develop a model that would facilitate communication. A movement from collection of data, reflecting events impacting computing and communication, to that of an advisory capacity occurred.

The committee met three times during the semester. The charge of the committee was discussed at the first meeting. Members believe that a strong need to improve communications between the Division of Information Technology and the committee exists. In an effort to move into a position of advisement to information technology administrators the committee has chosen to attend weekly staff meetings organized by Rich Reeder, Chief Information Officer. On a rotating schedule, with the approval of Rich Reeder, members of the committee will attend weekly IT staff meetings and participate in an advisory capacity. The attending committee member will be responsible to take notes at meetings and forward these notes to the committee chair. Evaluation of the minutes for May, June, July, and August meetings will occur during the September meeting. Further evaluation of this procedure will occur at the meetings.

The current explosion of technology within higher education demands that the scope of the Computing and Communication Committee expand their current charge of

"It shall advise the appropriate administrators on matters pertaining to computing and electronic communication on the campus. Further, this committee shall advise the directors of the Educational Communications Centers on the operation of those centers."

Committee members believe that the charge of the committee should include "serving in an advisory capacity to audio visual as the area which impacts on teaching and learning via communications and computing. In addition, distance learning is currently growing within higher education and role of the committee should include investigation of growth opportunities available by leveraging our current infrastructure.

Rich Reeder has suggested that the committee name be changed to Information Technology. In an e-mail message (3/31/2003) he states "The Division of Computing and Communication ceased to exist after the division moved from reporting to the Provost to the President. As you know the name of the division has been Division of Information Technology since 1995." The committee members discussed this topic at their meeting held 5/2/2003 agree with Rich.

Given the reorganization of CELT the committee is concerned that the steps forward in supporting the use of technology by faculty since its inception will be lost. Next year the committee would like to evaluate the technological strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats confronting SBU. The committee believes that avenues put in place to encourage the faculty to fully leverage the available technology resources must include:

- Support groups for faculty both generating pedagogical computer based solutions and training in the use of technology.

- Distance learning as an opportunity for growth.
- Audio Visual support in the classrooms both hardware-based and tech support.
- Digital library services
- Available updated hardware and software for faculty/students/staff.

The Committee is aware that the university senate extended the charge on 10/6/2002 to include

1. Issue of getting new technology to all faculty including non-tenure track faculty and adjuncts.
2. Issues of priorities for student technology fee. Should some of it be used to help provide AV facilities for classrooms?

In response to issue #1 – The committee would like to defer this issue until the 2003-2004 academic year. However, they emphasize that hardware without software is of little value. Often faculty identify funds for upgrade of hardware, however, the software needed is not available.

In response to issue #2 – The committee believes that the student technology fee should be used to promote student success. This includes available AV services in classrooms, available support outside of the classroom, ongoing investigation of new technological advances, and support for faculty in the development of new teaching methodologies. This would impact on the Division of Information Technology (which includes Instructional Computing), Audio Visual Services, and the Center for Teaching and Learning with Technology (CELТ). In addition, we should evaluate the appropriateness of the technology fee. The Stony Brook technology fee may be too low to be effective. Further investigation of the must be completed.

University Senate Computing and Communications Committee
Minutes of October 31, 2003

In attendance: Joanne English Daly [Chair], Gulnara Shafikova, Erich Bremer, James Rohlf , Chris Swann, Andrew White, Greg Zelinsky, Scott Sutherland

Absent: Mike Ledgerwood, Stephanie Dinkens, Yuefan Deng, Michael Silverberg, Jolyon Jesty, Melissa Bishop, R.C. Sekar.

The meeting was brought to order at 10:00 AM

2. We welcomed our new member Gulnara Shafikova. We look forward to working with her.

2. It was decided that a set schedule of meetings, for the semester, should be established. Of the members polled Tuesday/Thursday was best for 2 members and the balances preferred Friday meetings. The following schedule has been set:

next meeting 11/7, 10:30-12:00 noon

meeting planned 11/14, 10:30-12:00 noon

following meeting 11/28, 10:30-12:00 noon

final meeting for the fall 2003 semester 12/12, 10:30-12:00 noon

At the current time the Harriman Hall conference room, 339 has been reserved. Last year our meetings were held in Psy B, 112. Harriman Hall is a short distance from this location. If there is a strong objection to this location we can investigate other locations.

3. The members of the committee suggested that our charge be revised. The charges of all other senate committees were distributed and discussed. The following language was suggested:

Charge: It examines all aspects of computing and communication which impact upon students, faculty, and staff.

Responsibilities include, but are not limited to electronic communication, academic computing, audio visual services, instructional technologies, information technology policy, and networking. The committee shall be consulted before significant changes are implemented in technological services and/or policies.

4. P109R, Responsible Use of Information Technology has been attached in digital format. This document was discussed during the meeting. The committee felt it is a very important document and it is important that we review this carefully. Several points 'jumped' out and revisions will be necessary. The discussion was tabled until the 11/7 meeting. Each member was asked to carefully review the document and record suggested language before we meet on 11/7.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM

University Senate Computing and Communications Committee
3/28/2003
Spring 2003
Minutes

In attendance: Joanne English Daly [Chair], Stephanie Dinkens, Chris Swann, Andrew White, Greg Zelinsky.

Absent: James Rohlf, Scott Sutherland, Yuefan Deng, Michael Silverberg, Jolyon Jesty, Marie Marino, Melissa Bishop, Erich Bremer, R.C. Sekar.

1. The meeting was brought to order at 1:10 PM.
2. The meeting began with a brief recap of the past meeting and a discussion of the agenda for the present meeting.
3. It was decided that the date of the Committee's next meeting would be April 25, 2003.
4. There was a discussion of how to improve the Committee's input into decision-making. Points raised included:

- The possibility of conducting a survey to assess what computing and communications needs are not being met.
- The possibility of having a Committee representative at relevant DoIT planning meetings

5. There was a brief discussion of questions for Rich Reeder who was to arrive at 1:30 PM. Some topics were:

- The effect of budget cuts on DoIT.
- Ways the committee could increase its input into

6. Rich Reeder arrived at 1:30 PM and made a 20 minute presentation regarding the impact of budget cuts on DoIT. Some of the points made by Rich included:

- DoIT received a 7.5% reduction in its budget this year and expects a 5% reduction next year. The impact of these cuts has been partially offset by the retirement of the mainframe computer and some organizational changes.
- Additional savings have been gained through lowered telecomm costs, and there may be further cost reductions from a new contract for commodity internet services.
- There will be no loss of personnel this year.
- Rich expressed concern about the retaining qualified personnel if the budget situation does not improve. He also raised the possibility of terminating some software maintenance agreements.

In addition to the discussion related directly to the budget, Rich also addressed the following issues:

- The technology fee is used for items that provide direct support to students – it is not used to close budget gaps.
- DoIT is working on providing campus-wide directory services facilities (LDAP).
- New Computer Based Training courses are either on-line or will be coming on-line soon. These are accessible from both on and off campus.
- There is a new Microsoft site license.

7. The committee then asked some questions of Rich. These included:

- Is there a way for this committee to have some input into decision-making?

Rich expressed a willingness to have a member of the committee present at DoIT meetings but expressed his view that most of these were involved less with planning and more with day-to-day operations. He also expressed a willingness to attend this Committee's meetings as required.

- Would it be possible to obtain an organizational chart? Answer: "yes".
- What is the status of computer corner?

Computer corner is closing over the summer (in June?). While this is not a DoIT enterprise, DoIT is working to try to ensure that the services provided by the Computer Corner are still available.

- Is there a way to improve the functionality of the campus announcement system because many people find the current announcements to long to be usable?

DoIT is open to suggestions on this point.

8. The meeting was adjourned shortly after 2:00 PM.

University Senate Computing and Communications Committee
2/28/2003
Spring 2003
Minutes

In Attendance: Joanne English Daly [Chair], Mike Ledgerwood, Stephanie Dinkins, Chris Swann, Gregory Zelinsky, R. C. Sekar,

Absent: James Rohlf, Scott Sutherland, Yuefan Deng, Andrew White, Michael Silverberg, Jolyon Jesty, Marie Marino, Melissa Bishop, Erich Bremer.

1. The meeting was brought to order at 1 PM.
2. Each attendee introduced themselves, listed their associations, and discussed their vision of the committee's tasks at hand. General discussion lead to an agreement that the committee would like to make a change in the level of productivity of communications on campus. It was pointed out by one member of the committee that his past experiences on another campus commands an understanding of the need to improve methods of communication on the Stony Brook campus.
3. Future meeting times were discussed, as non-present members were not available at this time. Each attending member listed available times. The time for the next meeting was set for the first Friday after return from Spring Break, 1PM, 3/28. LauieTheobalt will inform all members of the planned meeting time.
4. The "Charge of the Committee was Discussed" as posted on the committee website.

Charge: It shall advise the appropriate administrators on matters pertaining to computing and electronic communication on the campus. Further, this committee shall advise the directors of the Educational Communications Centers on the operation of those centers.

- In the past the committee has not been given a chance to advise administrators as major decisions have been made without consulting the committee.
- The Committee has several times requested an organizational chart [tree] of staff reporting to DoIT. Committee members felt it was important that this chart be made available to the committee.
- It was suggested that we further investigate appointment of an individual within each department who would receive updates on the topic of communications and computing on campus. That individual would be responsible to distribute the materials to department members. This idea was tabled for future discussion.
- The committee would like to read a definition of "technology" as defined for use of the technology fee. The Chair will research this question. Buffalo University has hired [technology fluent] contact specialists to work with faculty and COWS are available in buildings. Questions such as "Can COWS be purchased with technology fees?" were brought out.
- Mike Ledgerwood announced that Tony Scarlotos of Computer Science would like to form an interdisciplinary committee of those interested in multimedia on campus. A possible minor in multimedia is being discussed outside of this committee. Also more client support is needed to support the use of multimedia in teaching environments. Further discussion will occur on this matter.
- Recording of the minutes and posting the minutes on the web were discussed. The Chair volunteered to record the minutes of this meeting. Minutes of future meetings will be recorded and transcribed by a volunteer committee member in the future. A process was described whereby the recorder will transcribe the minutes; e-mail the minutes Laurie Theobalt, Laurie will distribute the minutes to the group. Error should be reported to the chair within 7 days. If no errors are reported the minutes will be posted on the website.
- A vacancy was reported. Laurie Theobalt will arrange for a new member.
- A need to understand the budget, possible cutbacks, and the effect on computing and communications was discussed. Future discussed will continue. The Committee will invite Rich Reeder to attend the next meeting for this discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 PM.



Created by [Melissa Bishop/DoIT](#)
November 19, 1998
Modified by Laurie Theobalt, October 2006