CTO Meeting Notes-Final

- Key Point
- ✓ Item Resolved
- → Action Item
- 🗁 See attached document

Name:	**Campus Technology Officers**						
Date, Time:	Friday, July 7, 2006 9:00am-2:00pm		**Location:**	GBC-Berg Hall			
Purpose:	Regular Meeting						
Facilitator:	Roberta Roth		**Note taker:**	Annie McDonald			
Attendees:	Steve Zink	x	Lori Temple	x	Terry Norris		
	Lyle Pritchett		Brian Chongtai	x	Steve Zideck	x	
	Jeff Cox	x	Don Moxley	x	Paul Mudgett - Video	x	

Topic:	LDAP Services	**Presenter:**	Roth

Information:

- Roberta presented information about the progress of SCS's activities in migrating UNIX services to a new platform. As part of that migration, an LDAP server will be enabled. The existing student email login file will be migrated to the LDAP directory. Unix e-mail users will authenticate using the LDAP tool. After this implementation is complete, we can begin working with campus applications wishing to use the LDAP directory.
    - CTOs had discussion of what this might mean for them. They are requesting more information.
    - CTOs specifically asked for an education/information session to be scheduled with Mike Smith and appropriate members of his team to discuss the timeline and the short and long-term plans for LDAP at SCS. The following individuals were identified by the CTOs to participate in this session.
        - Brian Chongtai - NSC
        - Aron Smetana – UNR
        - Don Diener – UNLV
        - Steve Zideck – TMCC
        - Jeff Cox – GBC
        - Don Moxley – WNCC

Topic:	Firewall Guidelines Review	**Presenter:**	Mudgett via video

Discussion/Decision:

- Paul Mudgett presented and briefly discussed the Firewall Guidelines proposed by the Security Interest Group (SIG).
- DECISION: The CTOs unanimously approved these Firewall Guidelines. Their thanks and congratulations to the group were sincerely expressed.
- Paul indicated that the SIG will next begin work on guidelines for IT Incident Handling.
- The CTOs asked that next month's meeting agenda include an update on the progress of this item, if appropriate.
- Paul Mudgett is new to most of the CTOs. A suggestion was made and agreed upon to invite Paul to

participate in the next meeting to introduce himself and his role as Security Officer. The CTOs requested a short bio on Paul be sent out as well.

Topic:	Student Email	**Presenter:**	Roth

Discussion/Decision:

- Roberta presented to the CTOs a request from the Unix group to discontinue the practice of using the Social Security Number when activating their email account. The id that is used to activate is stored in the database and is displayed to campus help desk personnel when resetting a user's password. This is a risk to the student, the employee and the campus. Discussion followed.
- DECISION: The CTOs unanimously agreed to discontinue the use of Social Security number in advance of a probable upcoming Federal mandate.
- While the CTOs agreed that discontinuing the use of the Social Security number as part of the authentication criteria for establishing email is important, they also agreed that the campuses would need to discuss the use of alternative criteria well in advance of any change (e.g., the use of Student/Employee ID would require changes in the way those IDs are communicated to campus constituents).
- There was also a brief discussion of SCS's plans to add self-service functionality for resetting passwords into SWAMI. That change is expected to be implemented this fall.
- During the group's discussion, time was spent discussing the importance of making account activation as easy as possible for the students/employees. Student ID/employee IDs are often easily forgotten by users.
- CTOs request an SCS moderated discussion of current process and potential approaches and impacts in this redevelopment effort. Representatives are:
  - UNLV – Don Diener and Cathy Stevens
  - TMCC – John Molt
  - UNR – Aron Smetana
  - NSC – Brian Chongtai
  - GBC – Jeff Cox
  - WNCC – Don to email name of respresentative
- An update/status of these activities should be included on the August agenda

Topic:	Roundtable	Presenter	All

Information:

- Jeff Cox – Pahrump Tech Center's transition from CCSN to GBC is completed. Elko campus computer room construction is underway to consolidate SCS and GBC racks into one space. Wireless access points are being installed thanks to the gift of year-end money. GBC's webmaster recently resigned. Technology planning for Elko campus dorms is underway. Jeff has helped the campus form a technology committee and GBC will host the Regents' meeting in August.

- Brian Chongtai – NSC has purchased a NAS solution, is in the process of upgrading their network structure, and is implementing a managed wireless solution from Cisco. Additionally, the campus is

currently revamping their Audio-Visual technology in their classrooms. And their largest current project is moving their faculty and staff email from SCS's Notes to their own Groupwise server.

- Lori Temple – OIT is excited about the new IP Telephony project for the new Student Union. Also, their Student Help Desk will have a new permanent home in that new Student Union. This is a result of the decision to contribute to the construction fund, allowing them to enlarge the original building design in order to house the Student Help Desk. All summer classes are operating on Vista now. By the end of the fall semester, they will have migrated all classes and plan to retire their WebCT CE server. Identity management, portal development, refreshing campus labs are all large projects in process and a top priority project is preparing for the "new president".

- Steve Zink – Top priority is "new president" project (President Glick is technology focused). Blackberry via Exchange deployment is underway in order to support the President's technology needs. A new phone system is currently under contract negotiations. The winning vendor will be installing the new phone system, targeting cutover during Christmas break. Campus telecom has been moved into the user services and infrastructure group. WebCT 6.0 upgrade is expected to include implementation of Horizon/Wimba and e-portfolio. The Campus is installing a GPS for asset tracking, providing directions and for campus mapping. The Knowledge Center is scheduled to open Fall 2008. IT has received requests from researchers for adding terabyte storage. A chargeback policy is being developed. Desktop replacements are underway. The campus is in the process of discussing and developing an employee departure policy. The Davidson Profoundly Gifted Institute will start up Fall 2006 with approximately 25 students.

- Steve Zideck – Implementing the "V Brick" streaming video system throughout campus. The Angel platform will be in place and be supporting some Fall 2006 classes. Help Desk has moved to "Trak IT" for incident/problem tracking and has also moved to "Schedule 25" for scheduling. TMCC is also test driving a "Pixie" control system for their smart classrooms to see if the faculty likes it.
TMCC is implementing a policy for password security, requiring a user to change their password every 90 days. Steve will report at the October CTO meeting about progress and feedback surrounding this effort.

- Don Moxley – Blackberries have arrived at WNCC and asked others about chargeback efforts at their campuses. Lori Temple described the UNLV fee structure for Blackberries and will send each CTO a link to their website with additional forms and fees. Additionally, the campus is in the process of email requirements discussions, upgrading firewall technology on campus and extending Zenworks capability.

NOTE: The link to the BlackBerry site at UNLV is:

http://ccs.nevada.edu/ccs/BlackBerry/default.asp

The website contains links to:

CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY OFFICERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CTO Meeting Notes-Final

- Key Point
- ✓ Item Resolved
- →Action Item
- 🗁 See attached document

1. General information about BlackBerry
2. Getting started
3. BlackBerry Support
4. Firmware Upgrade Information and Instructions

*****Please contact Lori Temple if you have questions or access difficulty.

Topic:	SIS Clean-up effort/status	**Presenter:**	All

Information:

After iNtegrate RFP #7499 was halted, work on SIS clean-up at the campuses was slowed somewhat. While work continues, other important initiatives are being worked on as well. Code clean-up will continue and may be impacted by the component (Financial, HR or SIS) selected to implement first.

Topic:	Data Administration	**Presenter:**	All

Information/Discussion:

CTOs discussed their thoughts on the importance of Data Administration. All agreed that in order for the new ERP applications to be successful, there must be identified those elements that must be common throughout the system and that the Data Administration role will be key. Three areas were identified as important elements in forming the data administration role. Those areas are: 1) to develop, maintain and enforce policies and procedures on access, usage and integrity of data, 2) a common set of terms and definitions should be adopted by the system. Those definitions should define the data elements and the roles for stewardship and administration of that data, and 3) that maintenance and reporting occur at a meta-repository level within the system. The group agreed it was about information, not applications, with the goal to be an integrated warehouse of data required at a system level.

→The CTOs asked that SCS prepare written support for System Data Administration. Roberta will take this request to Kenneth McCollum.

🗁 Lori Temple handouts: Data Administration philosophy and Definition of Metadata Registry

Topic:	New Topics	**Presenter**	All

Discussion/Decision:

Lori Temple asked that a discussion of progress of CALEA rulings be included at the next meeting.

Topic:	Next Steps	**Presenter**	McDonald

Information:

- Additional items for August agenda:
  - Progress on Real Time Credit Card Authorization and Processing Project

CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY OFFICERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CTO Meeting Notes-Final

- Key Point
- ✓ Item Resolved
- → Action Item
- 🗁 See attached document

  - CALEA update (Paul Mudgett)
  - Update on Student e-mail Requirements Committee (Roberta)
- Next meeting August 16, 2006 (via video)
- Next in-person meeting Friday, October 20, 2006 from 9 am – 2 pm hosted by UNR CTO Steve Zink

Definition of Metadata Registry

Metadata registry From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A metadata registry is a central location in an organization where metadata definitions are stored and maintained in a controlled method.

Use of Metadata Registries
Metadata registries are used whenever data must be used consistently within an organization or group of organizations. Examples of these situations include:
1. Organizations that transmit data using structures such as XML, Web Services or EDI
2. Organizations that need consistent definitions of data across time, between organizations or between processes. For example when an organization builds a data warehouse
3. Organization that are attempting to break down "silos" of information captured within applications or proprietary file formats

Central to the charter of any metadata management project is the process of creating trusting relationship with stakeholder that definitions and structures have been reviewed and approved by appropriate parties.

Common characteristics of a metadata registry
A metadata registry typically has the following characteristics:
1. It is a protected area where only approved individuals may make changes
2. It stores data elements that include both semantics and representations
3. The semantic areas of a metadata registry contain the meaning of a data element with precise definitions
4. The representational areas of a metadata registry define how the data is represented in a specific format such as within a database or a structure file format such as XML

Clear separation of semantics and system-specific constraints
Because metadata registries are used to store both semantics (the meaning of a data element) and systems-specific constraints (for example the maximum length of a string) it is important to identify what systems impose these constraints and to document them. For example the maximum length of a string should not change the meaning of a data element.

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has published standards for a metadata registry called ISO/IEC 11179.

Metadata registry roles
A metadata registry is frequently set up and administered by an organization's data architect or data modeling team.

Data elements are frequently assigned to data stewards or data stewardship teams that are responsible for the maintenance of individual data elements.

Metadata element workflow
Metadata registries frequently have a formal data element submission, approval and publishing approval process. Each data element should be accepted by a data stewardship team and reviewed before data elements are published. After publication change control processes should be used.

Metadata navigation, search and publishing
Metadata registries are frequently large and complex structures and require navigation, visualization and searching tools. Use of hierarchical viewing tools are frequently an essential

part of a metadata registry system. Metadata publishing consists of making data element definitions and structures available to both people and other computer systems.

Examples of public metadata registries

- Dublin Core Metadata [1]
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare [2]
- US Department of Defense Metadata Registry (requires sponsored registration) [3]
- Cancer Data Standards Repository [4]
- National Information Exchange Model [5]

Metadata registry vendors In alphabetical order:

- Data Foundations Metadata Registry
- Oracle Enterprise Metadata Manager (EMM)
- SAS Metadata Repository

Data Administration Discussion
July 6, 2007

Data Administration Philosophy - data is a valuable resource belonging to the University. - assume freedom of access to University data by all members of the community, coupled with the responsibility to adhere to all policies and all legal constraints that govern such use

Data Administration Agenda

Establish **roles and responsibilities** – create communication forum for each
- Data Trustees
- Data Stewards
- Data Administrators
- University data administrator

Recommend data **policy** - approved by data trustees, forward to Cabinet via CIOC
- Access
- Usage
- Integrity

Create metadata repository/**data dictionary** – specifications working together with University experts from IT and Library

Identify **specific issues** that the above will address
- Preparation for iNtegrate - work together with SCS
  - SCS Business Analysis – start with student area
  - Data cleanup – SIS started, then on hold
- Consistent security from SCS -> data warehouse -> down the pipe use
- Inconsistent data in current systems
  - Common ID across student/employee etc..
  - Building/Room codes
  - Sharing data where needed – Registrar to Foundation example
  - Moving data from one step to another when crossing systems
    - Admissions -> SIS example
- Data definition problems or missing data elements within our systems

Examples:

HR - Salary schedules – one field called rank/range is used for 2 different things. For faculty, it is a rank, for professional staff, a salary range.

Distance education - need to track over time, no identifier at the student level in SIS that persists

In a nutshell -- Roles and responsibilities

Responsibility for the activities of data administration is shared among the data trustees, data stewards, data administrators, data users, and the University Data Quality

Administrator.

Data Trustees- senior University officials who have planning and policy-level responsibility and accountability for data.

Data Stewards - appointed by Data Trustees to carry out the data policies that have been established, as well as the University's overall administrative data security policies. Data Stewards are responsible for making known the rules and procedures to safeguard the data from unauthorized access and abuse. They authorize the use of data within their functional area, and monitor to verify appropriate data access. They assist University data users by providing appropriate documentation and training to support institutional data needs.

Data Administrators – usually report to a Data Steward, they have an intricate understanding of the data in their functional area. They establish procedures for the administration of data, including data entry, and reporting. Because they have a hands on role with data, they evaluate for quality and integrity of the data

University Data Quality Administrator -- responsible for coordinating data policies and procedures in the three primary enterprise data systems: Finance, Student, and Human Resources, ensuring representation of data stewards, managers, and key users, and developing a culture of data management beyond the major administrative systems, to those smaller but critical databases. Establishing an effective campus-wide communication structure will be key to success in this position.

In a nutshell - Policies to be considered by the Data Trustees

Access - Open access to administrative information will be provided to employees for the support of University functions. Every data item will be classified by the relevant data steward to have one of thee access levels. These levels are: 1) information that is considered to be in the public domain; 2) data that is University-confidential; and 3) data or information that is restricted either by law or other University restrictions. Refer to OIT Policy IS02 for a more detailed explanation of each level. Any employee or non employee denied access may appeal the denial to Data Trustees.

Usage - Use of data depends on the security levels - Access to data for University business is authorized by the data steward on an as needed basis, but is made openly available when need has been established. Special care must be taken in the creation of "downloaded" files so that both the values and their meanings as defined in the Data Dictionary are not altered. UNLV employees and students who fail to comply with the policies will be considered in violation of the University's relevant codes of conduct and may be subject to disciplinary action or to legal action where laws have been violated. In less serious cases, failure to comply with this policy could result in denial of access to data.

Integrity - University data has to be consistently represented across all systems that use it, and have the same coded values in all UNLV/NSHE systems. All University data will be represented within a single logical data model that will be the source for all physical data models. Data Administration is responsible for developing this model. Documentation (metadata) on each data element will be maintained within a University registry according to specifications provided by the University Data Quality Administrator and presented as the University Data Dictionary. Data Trustees will consider data issues that arise, and will decide outcomes. It is the responsibility of each data steward to ensure the correctness of the data values for the elements within their charge and to take timely corrective action when necessary.

In a nutshell -- Data Dictionary, Metadata registry

The dictionary will focus on metadata - a detailed description of the data that is stored in all of the data bases that support the NSHE systems. Created from a combination of technical information, interpretive information, and administrative information, the resulting tool will assist University members to discovery if the data they need is available, or when they are looking at a specific report, clarification of the actual meaning of the data they are using. A group composed of data administration, Information Technology, and the University Library will analyze the need and write a specification.

Definition of Metadata Registry

Metadata registry From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A metadata registry is a central location in an organization where metadata definitions are stored and maintained in a controlled method.

Use of Metadata Registries
Metadata registries are used whenever data must be used consistently within an organization or group of organizations. Examples of these situations include:
1. Organizations that transmit data using structures such as XML, Web Services or EDI
2. Organizations that need consistent definitions of data across time, between organizations or between processes. For example when an organization builds a data warehouse
3. Organization that are attempting to break down "silos" of information captured within applications or proprietary file formats

Central to the charter of any metadata management project is the process of creating trusting relationship with stakeholder that definitions and structures have been reviewed and approved by appropriate parties.

Common characteristics of a metadata registry
A metadata registry typically has the following characteristics:
1. It is a protected area where only approved individuals may make changes
2. It stores data elements that include both semantics and representations
3. The semantic areas of a metadata registry contain the meaning of a data element with precise definitions
4. The representational areas of a metadata registry define how the data is represented in a specific format such as within a database or a structure file format such as XML

Clear separation of semantics and system-specific constraints
Because metadata registries are used to store both semantics (the meaning of a data element) and systems-specific constraints (for example the maximum length of a string) it is important to identify what systems impose these constraints and to document them. For example the maximum length of a string should not change the meaning of a data element.

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has published standards for a metadata registry called ISO/IEC 11179.

Metadata registry roles
A metadata registry is frequently set up and administered by an organization's data architect or data modeling team.

Data elements are frequently assigned to data stewards or data stewardship teams that are responsible for the maintenance of individual data elements.

Metadata element workflow
Metadata registries frequently have a formal data element submission, approval and publishing approval process. Each data element should be accepted by a data stewardship team and reviewed before data elements are published. After publication change control processes should be used.

Metadata navigation, search and publishing
Metadata registries are frequently large and complex structures and require navigation, visualization and searching tools. Use of hierarchical viewing tools are frequently an essential

part of a metadata registry system. Metadata publishing consists of making data element definitions and structures available to both people and other computer systems.

Examples of public metadata registries

- Dublin Core Metadata [1]
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare [2]
- US Department of Defense Metadata Registry (requires sponsored registration) [3]
- Cancer Data Standards Repository [4]
- National Information Exchange Model [5]

Metadata registry vendors In alphabetical order:

- Data Foundations Metadata Registry
- Oracle Enterprise Metadata Manager (EMM)
- SAS Metadata Repository