



**December 3, 2024 - 11:00 a.m.**  
**Virtual Microsoft Teams Meeting**  
**Minutes**

The meeting was called to order on December 3, 2024, at 11:00 a.m. by Mr. Matt Smith.

<b>Voting Members Present</b>	<b>Non-Voting Members Present</b>
Dr. Mohan Rao	Mr. Brian Seiler, CIO
Dr. Mike Reagle	Mr. Will Hoffert
Dr. Kumar Yelamarthi	Mr. Tyler Farsoun
Dr. Lisa Zagumny	Mr. David Hales
Dr. Jason Beaman Dr. Matt Smith (Chair)	

	MS. Angie Vick
Mr. Eric Brown	Mr. John Woodard
Mr. Dan Warren	Mr. Hunter Kaller
MS. Elizabeth Williams	Mr. Allan Jones
Mr. Braxton Westbrook	Mr. David Garrett
Mr. Harrison Simpson	Mr. Cody Bryant
<b>Voting Members Absent</b>	<b>Non-Voting Members Absent</b>
Dr. Curtis Armstrong	Mr. Greg Holt
Dr. Jeannette Luna	
Dr. Thomas Payne	
Dr. Susan Wells	
Dr. Sandra Smith-Andrews	





would much rather get a refined policy out the door rather than put something out before it's ready.

Mr. Matt Smith asks Mr. Jason Luna if he does not mind getting with this group, and then they will try to make some changes before the next meeting, which will be in spring, and ask Ms. Angie Vick for the next meeting.

Mr. Jason Luna agrees.

Ms. Angie Vick says the next meeting is in February.

Mr. Matt Smith says that gives everyone a little over two months to make something happen and

and then they can have the final discussion before a vote is taken on policy 855. He asks Mr. Jason Luna to move on to the next policy, policy 856.

---

Mr. Jason Luna states that policy 856 is the same story as policy 855, and he is willing to accept the same fate for 856. He states that policy 856 does get into the weeds, and he is happy to have some eyes to pull some stuff out. The modifications were about adding more of the NIST language with standards from NIST. He is happy to get a lot of procedural-type stuff stripped out, but basically, the overview is the same. Expand on the purpose and overview, modify some language, change the labeling system to reflect the new one, restrict tags instead of sensitive ones, and make the data assignment and data handling section more in line with NIST 800-88. And then add some language to make it enforceable.

Mr. Matt Smith asks for any discussion on policy 856. He hears none. He asked Dr. Lisa Zagumny, Dr. Julie Baker, and Mr. Braxton Westbrook if it was possible to take this policy and apply the same lens that they are using for policy 855 and then bring it back to the spring ITC committee meeting. He continues by saying that the information will be shared before the meeting to give everyone time to consume the information and then be ready for discussion at the next meeting.

Dr. Lisa Zagumny agrees with this.

Mr. Matt Smith hears no objections to this plan

---

Mr. Matt Smith asked Ms. Angie Vick to put both policies in the next ITC meeting. These were the two main topics for the meeting. He asks if anything else has happened since the last meeting that others would like to ensure is on the agenda before the next meeting. In the last meeting's minutes, it was noted that several items were kicked down to subcommittees, and what Mr. Matt Smith wants to do is have a discussion with Mr. Brian Seiler about bringing back some summaries of what has been discussed in the subcommittee meetings. SEN. JEFF WELLS (R-10) 7/3/19 (M) 3:16 PM (P) 3.3 tn wa

general, or what the next steps are since there was such a significant discussion in the last meeting. He has been in several meetings this week where Read.AI pops up. As stated in the minutes of the last meeting, this AI trains another model, and it could leak sensitive information. He continues by asking what the plans are around solidifying whatever will be discussed regarding an AI policy and asks if further work is needed.

Mr. Matt Smith answers Mr. Eric Brown by stating that, in recollection, there was talk of moving that down to the strategic planning and innovative computing subcommittee to have a more in-depth discussion where more things could be talked about that are not restricted within an hour. He notices that Mr. Brian Seiler has his hand up via Teams.

Mr. Brian Seiler says the subcommittees are addressing this topic. There is guidance in place that has not been fully published. For the Read.AI and Firefly in teams, there is a plan at the beginning to remove the ability for new people to add those and then talk to the people who have already enabled those kinds of AI and get those disabled in their accounts. So, it will not be done harshly for the people that are relying on the AIs because ITS does not want just to take it away, but it will be disabled for new users to enable it and then move forward from there. There may be an option. This is going to be something that must be reviewed and looked at. That is separate from the policy. The policy is more general on AI and is about understanding where data is going, how AI works, etc.

Mr. Eric Brown continues by assuming that there will be more guidance in the future in terms of Copilot becoming a manageable or sustainable item in terms of an AI product that can be managed via policy for production use in various environments and one that would snap into the environments where staff and faculty members are working in now. He defers to Mr. Jason Luna.

Mr. Jason Luna shares his screen to show Read.AI purchasing screen with information on its software packages. Mr. Jason Luna and Mr. Brian Seiler have been discussing an overarching policy and overarching guidance until a policy is in place. He mentions this is a common discussion among other universities. What is being looked at with Read.AI is the Enterprise+ licenses, valued at \$29.75 per license per month. So, if someone's organization, department, college, etc., would like to buy Read.AI licenses, ITS would require enterprise support because, looking at security, Single Sign-On (SSO), and custom data retention – do not want data inputs to be feeding the larger language models without explicit consent to release inputs to large language models. Typically, this will be an enterprise- or professional-level license, or whatever the company calls it. For Read.AI specifically, it would be required to have the Enterprise+ level license because it has the needed SSO feature and allows for custom data retention..

Specifically, for Read.AI, since it came up in the discussion, this would be required for a customer to buy if the product was being pursued. Mr. Jason Luna stops sharing his screen, and the screen shows members with cameras on.

Mr. Matt Smith notices Dr. Jason Beach has his hand raised via Teams.

Dr. Jason Beach states that Mr. Jason Luna and himself have been discussing this and explain why he thinks looking at the enterprise solution with SSO is a good idea. He continues by stating that not all software is the same. So, in this software that has been discussed, enabling SSO is an extra

\$400,000 (10m0)-1 ( ) 5.989 0 TopTd (.) 0m0able(4)-1.530)-1r ( n T )

understanding that if someone agrees to software on behalf of the university, they can do that first. Second, do they really understand where that data is going? So, the data classification policy is something that must be understood, as well as where the data is living