Out of the Boardroom, into the Classroom: Information Security in Higher Education Eric J. Rzeszut, CISSP, University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) Universities have two constituent groups not

ABSTRACT: Just like Fortune 500 corporations, academic institutions need to protect their data. Yet the expectations, budgets, procedures, and levels of cooperation in these organizations can differ significantly from those in the corporate world. Common security tools and training are often aimed at formal business environments, and may not be applicable to other groups. Academic institutions also have specific legislation, such as FERPA, which have serious ramifications for data security. From several case studies and the presenter's own experience, learn the pitfalls and peculiarities involved in bringing acceptable levels of security to these institutions; and the unique requirements and challenges of working with faculty and students.

Just like in the corporate world, data at academic institutions can be compromised:



What are the unique challenges to information security in higher education?

- **Decentralization:** historically, universities have had very decentralized IT operations; this leads to non-standard, non-documented setups.
- **Autonomy:** especially at research universities like UAB, faculty control their own budgets, personnel, equipment, etc.
- **Diverse computing environment:** unlike corporate world, not standardized platforms. High numbers of Macs at most universities; Linux boxes; proprietary research software/hardware.
- **Transient population:** students graduate/transfer, new freshman/ transfers enter, faculty move to/from other institutions.
- **Relaxed environment:** generally, items like dress codes, work hours, etc. are less structured in academic when compared to the corporate world. These attitudes can spill over into information security.

Case Study: Encryption at UAB

Background:

- In March 2009, UAB's president signed a mandate requiring all laptop hard drives to be encrypted.
- This applied (and continues to apply) to all laptops used for "UAB business," regardless of ownership.
- Departments with their own IT staff were responsible for their unit's laptops; laptops in units without their own IT personnel are encrypted by central IT.

Reactions/responses from faculty:

"Most of us (labrat-types) do not keep confidential information on our laptops and it is a difficult sell to convince us that unencrypted data on our last chromatography experiment is going to compromise anyone's privacy."

"What even qualifies as 'UAB data?' The only data even related to UAB on my laptop is my research. There's nothing pertaining to HR, patient care, or anything else I can imagine the university caring much about.'

"If a laptop gets stolen with microscope images of cells on it who cares?"

Reactions/responses from IT perso

"Unless there is patient data on a machine, there is no reason for mandatory encryption; I can guarantee that it will only be an invitation for more problems for IT at UAB."

"While your concept sounds great in th try applying it to folks who generate money that pays you who do not want the technology on their machines."

"For machines that have no sensitive information encryption is a waste of What's going to happen is we time are going to tighten this campus down so much it becomes impossible or very burdensome to get anything done."



used with permission, xkcd.com

"Please take it [encryption software] off. It takes forever to boot up when I try and give talks."

onnel:		Lessons Learned:
		3.5 years after the mandate, central IT estimates that no more than 60% of covered laptops are encrypted.
e		Why? Several possible explanations:
or		1. Enforcement. The encryption mandate is only enforced retroactively , if a faculty or staff membod loses a lapton. There is no campus wide proactive
heor the his	У,	checking/reporting. Individual unit chairmen/ directors often don't take the time to enforce. 2. Communication. The mandate, and its repercussions, have never been clearly disseminat to the wider campus community.
n Y		 3. Autonomy. For reasons discussed at at right, research faculty control their own "kingdoms," and don't necessarily recognize the authority of centrol IT over "their" computers. 4. Mistrust. Due to the historic decentralization of UAB, the central IT department is a relatively new unit, without a great reputation. Faculty simply

don't trust them.

"Many academic institutions, just like hospitals, put these employees [faculty] on a pedestal and cater to their wants. They are often allowed to dictate what security measures they will and won't tolerate rather than allowing knowledgeable security and systems administrators to make the decisions on security controls."



found in the corporate world; groups that don't have clear analogs outside academia

FACULTY

Faculty (especially research faculty) have a great deal of autonomy. • UAB CDIB has 45 faculty members -- in many ways, this means that the administrative staff have 45 distinct supervisors!

The faculty in our department secure most of their own "extramural" funding (via grants from NIH, NSF, American Cancer Society, etc.) and make most of their own fiscal decisions.

• Money is power: Our faculty members manage over \$12.5 million in outside research funding (as of 6/2012).

• Academia is highly competitive. Universities regularly "poach" wellfunded faculty from other institutions.

• Faculty, in effect, grow accustomed to "being their own bosses": They hire/fire employees, accept students into their labs, purchase equipment as budget allows, and run their own kingdoms.

Ronald Woerner, CISSP, Professor & Director, CyberSecurity Studies College of Information Technology, Bellevue University

STUDENTS

• Students are not employees, so employee-focused discipline or training doesn't work.

• Students expect to be able to use their wireless devices anywhere on campus, at any time, for any purpose -- content filtering/restriction not found on most campuses.

• Universities have to decide – does student/faculty/staff traffic all use the same wireless network, same authentication scheme? Or are students placed in a "walled garden," a separately-managed network? What about the additional costs and workload of that configuration?

Eric J. Rzeszut, CISSP Information Systems Specialist III Department of Cell, Developmental and Integrative Biology University of Alabama at Birmingham ericrz@uab.edu 🔁 : @ericrz http://cdib.uab.edu