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| **Meeting Date** | Tuesday, June 14th, 2015 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. |
| **Meeting Attendees:** | Sam Chan, Glenn Cumming, John Di Marco, Rafael Eskenazi, Rachael Ferenbok, John Kerr, Martin Loeffler (Co-chair) , Sue McGlashan, Gian Medves, Sian Miekle, Paul Morrison, Kumar Murty, Daniel Ottini, Zoran Piljevic, Philip Poulos, Alex Tichine, Vicki Vokas, Philip Wright |
| **Regrets:** | Heidi Bohaker, Dan Hutt, Kelly Hannah-Moffat*,* Susan Senese, Leslie Shade, Sven Dickinson |
| **Guest:** | Bob Cook |
| **Location:** | The President’s Boardroom, 1st Floor @ Simcoe Hall, 27 King’s College Circle |
| **Notes taken by:** | Andrea Eccleston |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | | **Discussion** | | | |
| 1. **Meeting Updates** | | CIO provided the following update:  The FAS’s Dean's Ad Hoc Working Group on Cyber Risk Mitigation which also included some members from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering met with the Provost, VPUO and VPR. Discussions currently underway to address establishing sub-groups on 1) Terms of Reference for the ISC and 2) academic issues.  Members are being contacted to establish a meeting schedule for WGRIM (and ISC) for the next academic year. | | | |
| **Action Items** | | **Status** | **Who** | **Due By** | | |
|  | |  |  |  | | |
| **Agenda Item** | | **Discussion** | | | | |
| 1. **Matters arising from Minutes of Wednesday, June 24th, 2015** | | Group discussed Heidi Bohaker’s request re: a consensus model.  **MOTION:**  **Motion** by Rachael, **seconded** by Sian to adopt a process for the Working Group to vote on recommendations. Minutes will note how many votes for each position. Motion unanimously carried.  **MOTION:**  **Motion** by Philip, **seconded** by Paul to establish a quorum that 2/3 of the members should be present to conduct a vote. Motion unanimously carried. | | | | |
| **Agenda Item** | | **Discussion** | | | | |
| **3. Discussion of criteria to inform the Adoption of a possible framework.**  **Suggested criteria may include but is not limited to the following**: | | The WGIRM held extensive discussion on the following criteria required for a framework.   1. Auditable 2. Maintained/Updateable 3. Non-biased 4. Academically Recognized (and Relevant to the University of Toronto) 5. Recognized  by the University Audit Committee 6. External Alignment 7. Adaptable 8. Broad Scope   John Di Marco suggested including the word simplicity. All agreed that adoption of a framework should be simple but not too simple.  Kumar suggested that what we are looking for are general attributes to be used in getting more specific on a framework. Relevance will ultimately be determined at the level of the units and their academic mission. Suggested to amend the wording in Item “D” by adding – “academically recognized and relevant to the University of Toronto.”  It was also suggested that item “H” – Broad scope – required some more wordsmithing and for now is to be removed from the list of criteria.  John Kerr also confirmed that the criteria are “aspirational” and Daniel Ottini noted the Audit Committee has no preference on a framework.  **MOTION:**  **Motion** by Philip, **seconded** by Rachel to adopt suggested criteria items “A-G” with Kumar’s amended language. Motion unanimously carried.  **ACTION:**  “H” to be carried forward for future discussion. | | | | |
| **Agenda Item** | | **Discussion** | | | | |
| **4.Consideration of a Specific**  **Framework** | | Martin referenced the documents which were pre-distributed in the meeting package and suggested that a motion to recommend one framework would be helpful.  Rachel asked that those familiar with each framework provide a summary of the pros and cons of it.  A framework is an approach to achieve objectives from the perspective of a given audience.  Q: Do they differ in what they accomplish in any material way? If so, what are the differences.  Q: What do most academic institutions use?  John provided an overview of NIST framework.  Daniel stated that COBIT, NIST and ISO all map to each other. His preference is to start broad and narrow it down.  Philip commented that COBIT has strong financial controls. A narrower standard for higher education institutions based in the UK is UCISA which is based on ISO. He agreed NIST cuts across all major standards.  Gian requested clarification on whether we are building or choosing a framework. The committee agreed that we would select one to avoid unnecessary work and delay.  The committee decided it required further discussion of these 6 frameworks (ISO, NIST, Educause, COBIT, UCISA, Oxford). Therefore, it was proposed to use the next meeting to do so.  **MOTION:**  **Motion** by Sue, **Seconded** by Kumar, to change agenda meeting #6 to further discussion of frameworks noted above. All members to contribute documents on frameworks and come prepared for discussion at the next meeting. Motion unanimously carried.  **ACTION:**  Members to provide frameworks for discussion at next meeting to Martin Loeffler or [cio.office@utoronto.ca](mailto:cio.office@utoronto.ca). | | | | |
| **5. Adjournment** | | There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m. | | | | |