

NSHE Campus Technology Officer Advisory Committee

**CTO Meeting Notes**  
**October 24, 2005, 8:00 am – 9:00am**  
**Via Video**

**Present:** Lee Alley (SCS), John Molt for Steve Zideck (TMCC), Don Moxley (WNCC), Jeff Cox (GBC), Jim McKinney (UNR), Al Valbuena (CCSN), Lori Temple (UNLV), Brian Chongtai (NSC), Sally Phares (SCS). **Absent:** Lyle Pritchett (DRI)

1. IIS Update (Lee)

Lee Alley shared information regarding the timetable: Dec. 2, 2005 the RFP will go to the BOR for approval. The proposed selected vendor and contract will be on the June 9, 2006 BOR agenda.

To have the RFP prepared, the draft will need to go to the CTOs 2-3 times for their input. These drafts will likely have a short turn around period of 2-3 days. The first time will be October 24, 2005 with a request for the CTOs to begin to put in their part of the technology environment regarding applications that exist today that may need to directly interface with new applications. At a minimum, title of the application, vendor and brand name and age of the application should be supplied. The CTOs also need to supply general information about their campus networks. The goal is to make it easy for the vendors to understand.

2. Acceptable Use Policies (Lee)

Lee asked if anyone had any concerns about the current system Acceptable Use Policy (ie. Computer Use Policy) in place. Specifically he noted areas related to technical staff and what they are required to do or precluded from doing. He also asked about systems/practices in place using automated security scanning software to detect viruses.

UNR noted they would like a companion piece that relates to best practices for security/authentication. Jim McKinney noted the Security Interest Group is working on a set of guidelines that could possibly be used. Jim noted they are doing some blocking at the residence halls and he outlined the process as well as how they handle any necessary discipline.

UNLV likes the umbrella approach in place that gives them the ability to put further policy in place that is more specific to their campus environment. Lori noted they are working on two such policies, one relating to the user and one relating to the technical staff. Lori concurred that UNLV is doing something similar to UNR regarding the residence halls and violations.

Lee mentioned some of the new legislation (CALEA) that will require higher education networks to be able to accommodate wire taps, etc. Lori pointed out that there is a conflict in the Nevada Revised Statutes and this newer law and how it pertains to Libraries and their resources and what constitutes a computer log, etc.

### 3. Domain Name Request [nln.nevada.edu] (Vista Consortium-Lori)

Lori explained that the Vista consortium is requesting the use for two domain names.

The first **nln.nevada.edu** will be used for consortium information and the second requested name **webcampus.nevada.edu** would be used by faculty and students to actually log into Vista.

No concerns were mentioned. Lee said it was a go.

### 4. Start discussion about new email system for students (UNLV-Lori)

Lori Temple asked other campuses how they felt about the possibility of exploring another email package for student use. This is important to UNLV as they are now requiring students to receive official email. It was noted that the current WebMail is not very robust in terms of the interface.

CCSN noted they are moving their students to WebMail for Spring 2006 and so have no feedback at this time. NSC students began using it this fall but it has not been long enough to receive feedback.

Others noted if this were to go forward it should fit within the guidelines to work well with whatever the student portal would become as part of the IIS project.

Lee asked the institutions to continue to work on this if they feel it needs to be pursued and to bring two or three options to the table that would fit their needs.

### 5. Discussion about how to affectively use SCS project management office & Customer Relations (UNLV-Lori)

Lori expressed concern about how the project process is working at SCS. She explained that when the PMO first rolled out everyone understood the process, began using it and was getting things done or at least getting notification if things could not be done. She said at some point it seemed to have changed/broken and the campuses have been given no information as to how to proceed.

Other institutions expressed similar experiences or that they have not tried using the process. Further discussion ensued concerning the differences between “projects” and priority work tasks from the user groups. Lee asked for a list of user groups, participants and meeting dates and times. Sally will supply that to him.

Lee further explained that work is going on that will refine the input queue, however he recognizes there is still a missing piece that must be addressed.

#### 6. Streaming video services (WNCC,GBC-Ed Anderson)

This item was discussed briefly. However, it was put on the agenda as having come in as a request from others than the campus CTOs. Lee explained that he has no problem looking at providing streaming video services. However, the institutions will need to decide on how it works, intellectual property issues and access issues.

Some of the CTOs were not aware their campus was interested in this service. Lee explained these requests would be sent back to the requester(s) with a request to review them with their respective CTO and if they need further addressing that the CTO would bring them back to the group. Lee further explained that he preferred that any new service requests such as this would follow that procedure.

Other: Lori Temple asked to have Digital Signatures put on the next agenda

The next meeting is currently scheduled for November 16, 2005

.