

Audit Committee Meeting

March 2, 2016

Attendees: Deirdre Burns, Laura Schulkind, Paul Slayton, Rick Walker, Tom Burnell

Invited Guest: Steve Jensen

Technology Audit

Steve Jensen joined our meeting to review his findings based on his preliminary Audit of the District.

Policies - Tom received sample policies and regulations from our legal counsel covering Computer Resources and Data Management, Information Security Breach and Notification and Wire Transfers for Online Banking. He and Steve Jensen will review these prior to sending on to the Policy committee for review and action. Generally speaking, the District tries to keep our Policies succinct while allowing the supporting regulations to provide the detail.

Password Management - Our weakest link seems to be with Password security. Now that we are using Office 365, a cloud based system, sharing passwords could lead to misuse of, or access to colleagues' email and network files. Faculty will begin generating their own passwords within the year. The supporting policy will outline how frequently passwords should be changed and how complex they should be for security purposes. OSC recommends 30-60 days but as a practical matter, the District will determine the time line and level of complexity. Currently, students generate their own passwords and create new passwords from a prescribed default. Steve will re-think this process as the default is not secure.

Inventories - Steve has completed the hardware inventories and is working on reconciling that information with the District's inventory documentation. Specifically, he is confirming locations of equipment and deletion of surplus items. The CLS Library still uses paper inventories and will need to be converted to a digital format. Steve would like them to use the RHS Library model and will discuss that further. The software inventories have not been maintained as well as the hardware, but we seem to be moving more toward subscription-based software which is easier to account for.

Data - Data Security is being reviewed at all levels from most rudimentary to most confidential. Data will have different levels of permissions and access. Marvin Kreps holds the key to all instructional data, but this information will need to be documented in some way. Review of data management by all our vendors (i.e. SchoolTool) will be required as well. In general, data security will need to be addressed by regulation to determine levels of access for particular subgroups.

Contracts - Technology contracts are currently under review. Our agreement with BOCES is clear but not documented. We will need to develop language that provides for any contractor to comply with all RCSD data and privacy policies. The question was raised: "Should we have agreements with vendors who are not compliant with the privacy act?" A boilerplate letter of assurance for vendors and consultants will be drafted. We will also need to follow up re: privacy compliance when piloting new software.

Disaster Recovery - BOCES will be testing their plan during Spring break this year. Steve wants to delve more deeply into our plans. Where are our vulnerabilities? How quickly can we be operational if there is a disaster? Tom reported that his professional organization, American Society of Business Officials (ASBO), has a template from which to start, but we may need a recovery/asset management plan from an outside provider. This may be an area where the monies saved from not performing a Vanacore audit could be utilized.

April Agenda

Meeting is to be determined based on progress of further technology investigation

Respectfully submitted by Laura Schulkind