



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

March 12, 2007

To: Don Harris, CIO

From: IT Policy Task Force:

James Bailey, Disability Services
Andrew Bonamici, UO Libraries (co-chair)
Randy Geller, Legal Services
Melinda Grier, General Counsel
Noreen Hogan, Information Services
Jon Miyake, Information Services (co-chair)
Cleven Mmari, Student Affairs
Erin O'Meara, UO Libraries
Joe St Sauver, Information Services
Josh Ward, Information Services

Subject: Task Force Update #2

The IT Policy Task Force was appointed in Fall, 2006 with the charge to 1) Review standard categories of IT-related policy and procedure as identified by EDUCAUSE and other organizations. 2) Review the UO's policy framework to determine where IT-related issues are currently addressed and identify existing potential gaps. 3) Recommend high priorities for new &/or revised policies, and identify likely stakeholders to lead the policy development process.

The task force met on a weekly basis through Fall term, and semi-regularly during Winter term. We assembled as many IT-related UO policy resources as we could find, including an October 2005 Computer Use Policy drafted by Legal Affairs, policy resources from the EDUCAUSE/Cornell Institute, and policy websites from other institutions.

Following this orientation and information-gathering phase, we began an in-depth review of major policy categories. Note that some of these categories are not necessarily IT-specific, but have significant IT components or implications and therefore need to be cross-referenced to and from an IT policy framework.

1. General (introduction, oversight, authority, policy development process, community feedback, consequences/penalties for violations, appeal processes, etc.)
2. Academic Freedom
3. Intellectual Property
4. Privacy

MAIN LIBRARY
Knight Library
(541) 346-3056
F (541) 346-3485

BRANCH LIBRARIES
Architecture and
Allied Arts Library,
Lawrence Hall
(541) 346-3637
F (541) 346-2205

John E. Jaqua Law Library,
Knight Law Center
(541) 346-3088
F (541) 346-1669

Mathematics Library,
Fenton Hall
F (541) 346-3023

Science Library,
Onyx Bridge
(541) 346-3075
F (541) 346-3012

Loyd and Dorothy
Rippey Library,
Oregon Institute of
Marine Biology,
Charleston
(541) 888-2581
F (541) 888-3250

Architecture Library,
Portland
(503) 725-8742
F (503) 725-8406

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARIES

1299 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1229 T (541) 346-3056 F (541) 346-3485 libweb.uoregon.edu

5. User Accounts
6. Acceptable Use
7. Email
8. Data Security
9. Access for People with Disabilities
10. Web Policy and Guidelines
11. Records Management & Retention
12. Standards
13. Domain name/address administration
14. Physical IT infrastructure
15. E-Commerce

Individual Task Force members are taking the lead with one or more of these categories, using the following template for review and discussion:

1. Does UO have an existing policy in this area?
2. Is this area addressed in the October 2005 draft from Legal Affairs? (y/n)?
If yes, insert text
3. Are we aware of other campus or OUS groups working on this policy? If yes, indicate name of group and brief description of project.
4. Are we aware of “best practice” examples from other campuses? If yes, provide links.

Our category-by-category analysis is still underway, but we can offer some general observations and preliminary recommendations in the meantime:

- This project is overdue. From a campuswide perspective, there are significant gaps in our IT policy framework. These gaps and potential strategies for addressing them will be articulated in detail when our group completes its work.
- Our search for existing IT-related policies across campus was very challenging. There are multiple presentations of policies by the central administration, schools, colleges, and administrative units.

- We recommend developing a central website for all approved campus IT Policies, designed to be current, consistent, usable, and sustainable. The site needs to work for students, faculty, staff, and non-UO users looking for answers to specific questions. These users will typically start from a keyword search from the campus homepage. The site also needs to work in structured ways for training, administration, and reference. With this in mind, we suggest the following features:
 - An outline view that serves as functional table of contents and for an overview of the policy framework.
 - Consistent presentation of specific policies with associated procedures and contact information to make the policies real and useful to the community. This is essential for users looking for practical answers to specific questions, typically starting with a keyword search from the campus homepage.

For potential models, we suggest looking at best practices from the University of Minnesota

<<http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/ppd/documents/main/policyhome.cfm>> and UC-Berkeley <<http://campuspol.chance.berkeley.edu/>>. Closer to home, the UO's Business Affairs Office has an excellent template for drafting and organizing individual policies; see <<http://baowww.uoregon.edu/policy.htm>>.

- Policy development requires both institutional review and community participation. We recommend adopting a process that provides all stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on proposed IT policies before adoption:
 1. Suggestions for new IT policies or revisions to existing policies should be forwarded to the CIO or designee.
 2. The CIO or designee will evaluate the request. If the CIO determines that Information Services is not the best "owner" of the proposed policy, the request will be forwarded to other campus officials as appropriate.
 3. The principal policy author will draft the policy using an established template (see above).
 4. Once the policy is drafted and ready to move forward, there will be public notice of an open comment period, followed by a public hearing. Open houses and focus groups may be scheduled as needed. Key stakeholders will be directly notified and invited to provide comment. Stakeholder groups would typically include but are not

limited to Student Affairs (including student judicial affairs), Academic Affairs (Deans, Department Heads, Graduate School, Vice Provosts, etc.), Human Resources, Legal Affairs, relevant advisory committees and governance bodies (Ed Tech Committee, University Senate, Faculty Advisory Committee, etc.)

5. Following the public comment period, the primary policy author will incorporate appropriate suggestions from the community and forward the final draft to the appropriate university officer for final review and approval. Depending on the policy, this could be the CIO, the Executive Vice-President and Provost, or the President. Once ratified, the policy will be posted on the IT Policy website.

- This new IT Policy site should be prominently linked from the UO's general policy site at <http://policies.uoregon.edu/>
- There is a need for a focused, dedicated staff to provide ongoing review of emerging IT policy and procedural issues, and authoritative guidance for campus units in adoption and compliance.
- There is a need for orientation and training at all levels. This may require dedication of additional resources.
- As gaps are addressed and a policy framework established, school, college, or department-specific IT policies should be reviewed to ensure alignment. In some cases, local policies may be superseded and should be replaced by links to overarching campus policies.
- We recommend exploring potential for collaborative development of policy templates with other Oregon University System (OUS) institutions, particularly the other research universities. This may be especially applicable for those policies that are mandated by statute and have well-established definitions (e.g., "sensitive personal data"). Procedural guidelines, training resources, etc. would still need to be developed at the campus level.
- Our policy frameworks need to accommodate rapidly emerging issues and developments in both the legal/statutory environment and in technology itself. Examples include:
 1. Federal e-discovery requirements that took effect December 1st, 2006 have potentially profound implications for how UO handles enterprise data storage and access requirements.

2. Control of Personal Identifiable Information (PII) offers both practical challenges and examples of rapid translation from policy to procedures to implemented actions.

3. UO faculty, groups, and departments are rapidly adopting hosted/free services for institutional activities. Examples include offsite blogs, wikis, social networking/tagging tools (facebook, myspace, del.icio.us, etc.), game/simulation environments (Second Life), streaming/downloadable media services (iTunes, Google Video, YouTube), and hosted communication and productivity applications (Gmail; Google documents & spreadsheets). These tools are exciting and have potential for fostering innovation. At the same time, they raise a number of policy issues -- privacy, security, use of accounts, intellectual property, records management, use of university trademarks, just to name a few.

For more information, we have a public website linked from the Information Services Task Force page at it.uoregon.edu. We welcome your questions and feedback.