

## **Non-Academic Sub-Council Meeting Minutes**

**October 10, 2013 (Thursday)**

**3:00pm – 4:00pm. Barge 410**

**Present:** Connie Williams, Jillana Hernandez, Tina Short, Chris Huss, Sue Noce, John Swiney, Lindsey Ulrich, Andreas Bohman, Lindsey Brown, Bill Yarwood, Tim McGuire, Chris Schedler. **Absent:** Lucinda Lunstrum

### **Agenda Items:**

**Approve September 26<sup>th</sup> minutes.** Lindsey Brown motioned to approve minutes, Chris Huss seconded.

### **Business Cases:**

#### **Canvas Learning Management System (Chris Schedler):**

Currently CWU uses Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS) which offers multimodal learning in the classroom and online. In 2012 the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges completed an RFP process to select a new LMS. Instructure Canvas was selected as the new LMS vendor and already WWU, EWU, and UW have chosen to transition to Canvas.

A pilot case study for Canvas started in spring of 2013 at CWU and by summer 2013, 60% of students and 90% of faculty were ready to switch from Blackboard to Canvas. Since most schools in Washington State will be implementing or have implemented the Canvas system, this would ease the transition for new incoming transfer students if CWU uses the same LMS system as other institutions.

Canvas is a cloud-based service and unlike Blackboard does not need hardware maintenance. CWU would not need to purchase and maintain an onsite server to run the Canvas learning management system, the service provider is responsible for updates/refreshing of software. Canvas provides updates and fixes bugs every two-three weeks unlike Blackboard that updates every three-four months.

LMS systems do not need to be replaced very often. We had Blackboard for about ten years, and we expect the same with Canvas.

John Swiney asked since the state contract is already done do we need to approve?

Chris Schedler responded that no, it's being sent to EISC to review the proposal as for a new Enterprise LMS system solution. Funding has been identified for this request. Presenting the case to the Non-Academic Sub-Council was more for our knowledge.

#### **Network Security (Andrea Bohman):**

As technology changes, so does our security. CWU currently has a firewall, but does not have an Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) or Intrusion Detection System (IDS). A firewall allows in most traffic, but not all traffic. IDS would help layer the defense.

Since we allow quite a bit of traffic in our portal and with the implementation of the new portal; additional defenses are necessary to keep track of the traffic. The purpose of these devices is to detect intrusion as they happen and then prevent them from intruding on our network.

Connie Williams asked if the additional layers that data would need to pass through would delay the receipt or transmission of information. Andreas responded that the additional layers would add maybe nano-seconds to processing times, but not enough for the users to notice.

Implementing these new systems would take about two weeks, and Andreas recommends we implement in early January in line with the new CWU portal. There is currently no funding set aside for the project and the cost would run from \$75,000-\$100,000.

### **Security Audit (Andrea Bohman):**

In order for CWU to implement an effective campus-wide information security program, our current state needs to be measured. By having an outside independent vendor provide an audit, it will allow CWU to develop a baseline and provide information that we can use as metrics for future improvements and effectiveness over time. No funding has been identified. The estimated cost is \$90,000-\$140,000.

The security audit will be used to measure the overall security posture of CWU and the effectiveness of the security controls that are currently in place.

Connie asked if it would be possible to roll the security audit into the current internal audit RFP. The committee agreed that would be a good idea. Connie requested that Andreas check with Stuart Thompson to see if they could use the same vendor for the two audits. If they cannot, then she would be happy to support sending the business case to EISC for review. Andreas requested to be on the committee reviewing the RFP responses.