FY2023 ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (ACEC) FINAL REPORT

Members:
- Andi Back, Libraries, Faculty, 2024 (Chair)
- Robert Szarka, Business, Faculty, 2023
- David Rahn, Geography, Faculty, 2025
- Zsolt Talata, Mathematics, Faculty, 2023
- Jila Niknejad, Mathematics, Faculty, 2024
- Scott Cossel, Libraries, Staff, 2023
- Joseph Chapes, IT, Staff, 2025
- Andrew Beckwith, Voting Student
- TBD, Voting Graduate Student
- Mary Walsh, IT Services, Ex-officio
- David Day, IT, Visitor

FY2023 Standing Charges:
1. Monitor current and proposed policy concerning security of information, intellectual property rights and responsibilities, and other matters relating to information technology. Identify issues for which policy should be developed or revised. Report issues and any recommendations for action to SenEx. (ongoing)
   Actions:
   - ACEC welcomed the new CISO, Ed Hudson in December 2022. Hudson introduced himself and how his position can provide insight into the committee's Standing Charge #1 for FY23. Hudson discussed that in 2023 he would like to receive input regarding KU Policies from ACEC regarding which policies need to be reviewed sooner rather than later.
   - In April, Hudson provided the ACEC committee with a high-level overview of some assessment work his office completed and proposed strategic priorities for the coming year. IT had just completed work with an outside company to assess KU IT security and began review of KU IT policies, which has not been done in sometime. While reviewing policies, Hudson's office is considering how they align with Jayhawks rising and strategies that are being developed. These strategies or pillars, include access control, inventory of digital assets, operational security, system acquisitions and maintenance, information security incident management, updating IT policies, and annual reporting to KU Executives. Hudson and Walsh have met with University Deans and will bring the strategies to KU Executives for approval and a timeline next. The pillars will serve as ways to continually measure and improve IT at KU, particularly security. ACEC asked Hudson about future work with the committee. Hudson would like to continue to be invited to meetings, at least bi-monthly. This will allow Hudson to share and receive input.

FY2023 Specific Charges:
1. Continue to review IT Governance. Noting the committee should be included in the IT Governance structure.
   Actions:
   - Tom Roderick began the discussion with referring to the [presentation he gave for the ACEC committee in FY 22](#), which included IT Governance models from other large academic universities. In reviewing the FY 22 final report, Roderick stated many of the

actions were in the works and the structure would evolve over the next year. Due to the ongoing work surrounding a new foundation for KU IT Governance, the ACEC committee agreed to invite Roderick to future meetings to receive updates and provide feedback. In the future committee members should consider the following points raised during the discussion. Walsh asked about how the ACEC committee would fit into the larger KU IT Governance structure if included, especially when considering the ACEC committee is focused more on campus experience versus applications. Rinnert suggested that the ACEC committee could perhaps fit into the scope of security. Szarka also raised concerns regarding the past outsourcing of KU IT Governance and the vulnerability of faculty/staff/student data. Roderick responded that there is complexity in who owns the data, who's data it is, who is using the data, etc. Szarka followed by giving an example of Google Analytics, employed by Canvas. Google collects data via cookies, which is active unless turned off in this instance. It was noted that faculty is not able to access the data collected via Google Analytics about their students. A discussion ensued highlighting the complexity of making campus faculty/staff/students aware of data collection and transparency.

2. Work with IT to exploring other options, such as using MyKU to distribute confidential documents such as contracts. (See FY2022 final report)
   Actions:
   - Regarding employee confidential documents, Walsh reminded the ACEC committee that a conversation with HR was proposed FY 22. Andi will reach out to HR regarding this charge. Regarding student confidentiality, Zsolt Talata referred to a conversation in FY 22 regarding student email correspondence and encryption. Szarka began a discussion about the complexity of encryption (both in sending and receiving email). Discussion ensued about the complexities of encryption, that KU applications (Canvas) do not allow the use of a non-KU email, and that faculty/staff cannot control what applications students are using. Rinnert highlighted that specific charge #2 and #3 are related to KU being more transparent to how faculty/staff/student data is used.

   - Walsh provided an update regarding Specific Charge #2 for FY23. Walsh had talked to Pam Burkhead, Director of HR/Pay Systems regarding encryption and confidential information, such as contracts sent to faculty. Burkhead stated that the COVID-19 Pandemic moved many internal documents with confidential information behind a single sign on (BrassRing). However, some documents still require a wet signature. Walsh will continue work with Burkhead. Burkhead will be invited to a future ACEC meeting to discuss processes and documentation.

3. Work with IT, on identification of options and university resources that instructors and others may have regarding the reproduction or publication of course materials or related intellectual resources by students and others via the internet. (See FY2022 final report)
   Actions:
   - Talata highlighted that the [KU Intellectual Property Policy](#) was created over 15 years ago and needs to be reviewed/possibly updated to include more specifics regarding course materials/intellectual resources. The ACEC committee agreed to review the policy, at which time a discussion and possible recommendations could be made. (See actions for Standing Charge #1)

- Dave Rahn began the discussion related to student work and Canvas pulling this content for assessment. Due to FERPA this is allowed, but Rahn is concerned that students are not fully aware this is taking place. What is ACEC's role here? Should we be communicating potential issues with security and a third party? Zsolt Talata shared concerns regarding faculty work along the same lines.

- Mary Walsh suggested that Jean Redeker, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs attend a future meeting to discuss Canvas/third parties and FERPA compliance. Walsh also mentioned that Canvas was not pulling faculty materials, but student work for KU Core Assessment. Gina Wyant, Director of University Assessment, was later invited to a future meeting on the topic.

- John Rinnert suggested inviting Gina Wyant, Director of University Assessment, to a future meeting to discuss the committees' concerns regarding privacy and Canvas. Rinnert had recently spoken with Wyant and shared a draft handbook related to assessment at KU, highlighting page 15 regarding student rights. Wyant stressed that faculty should communicate with students when assignments would be pulled from Canvas for assessment and that identification is removed. Further work needs to be done to anonymize research studies, for example speech videos. There is currently no model in place to search the learning management system for content, at present this is all done with faculty/departments voluntarily.

- Gina Wyant, Director of University Assessment attended an ACEC committee meeting centered around Canvas, student data, and privacy as it relates to assessment. Wyant began the discussion with highlighting that faculty select the data that is used for assessment to represent the KU Common Core. It is up to the faculty to anonymize this data. Wyant does redact student information if faculty has not done this before the artifacts are sent to the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). There is no behind the scenes access to Canvas for CTE, who accesses the artifacts once they are uploaded to Portfolium. In preparation for the meeting members reviewed the University of Kansas Assessment Handbook draft. During the discussion with Wyant, Rahn highlighted the policy regarding KU Core Course Review & Recertification beginning on page 14 of the handbook. Discussion ensued regarding the stated time to retain records and the effect this had on faculty. Wyant noted that her office is not expecting faculty to digitize all artifacts of a course on their own. In the future only one assignment artifact for Common Core Courses will be required. This process is being developed now. Discussion ensued regarding the faculty's role in notifying students of the assessment process for KU Common Core Courses. The faculty may not know in advance which assignment will be collected and students work is anonymized. Rahn highlighted that page 15 in the University of Kansas Assessment Handbook draft, is not clear on whether to inform students that their work may be collected, though anonymized. Rahn along with other ACEC members suggested that there be clearer guidance on whether to inform students or not. Lack of clarity in this policy creates inconsistency in student artifacts. Rahn suggested the handbook list who the official members are that can view the raw material. Wyant agreed and noted that her office is reviewing the assessment communication policy.

- Wyant informed the committee that the University of Kansas Assessment Handbook is in draft mode until next FY24. This year her office is gathering feedback before making it official. The handbook is accessible through the KU Assessment website faculty resources behind a single sign-on. Once the handbook is official, Wyant will circle in the ACCEC committee and welcomes any feedback the committee may have in the meantime.

Prepared by Andi Back, ACEC Chair, May 2023