Higher Education Opportunity Act Task Force

Meeting #2

Wednesday, October 28th, Norlin Library M210 9:30-11:00 am

Attended: Brice Austin, Libraries co-chair (by phone), Rebecca Currey, Legal Counsel, Robert Dixon, Housing & Dining Services, Dan Jones, IT Security Office—ITS, Tom Nelson, Faculty—Leeds School of Business, Marin Stanek, CIO Office—ITS co-chair, Greg Stauffer, CIO Office—ITS, David Wood, ITS

Agenda:

1. Recap of what we do and what deterrents are possible – Marin, Dan & David

Types of deterrents:

A. Systems that block all P2P – regardless of it’s legal or not – doesn’t work once encrypted (not a lot of schools are choosing this, mainly smaller schools, but do see a significant drop)

B. Packeteer looks into ports and slightly inside/characteristics -- Just block Residence Halls, by reduce flow of traffic, slow it down, probably won’t reduce the number of complaints. Once a client has turned on encryption, we are limited to be able to stop it.

C. Implement solutions that monitor the traffic and look for signatures that match copyrighted materials. And block the traffic or send out something to the individual.

Some schools that appear to be doing this: University of Wyoming and University of Denver – at campus borderer. Limits amount that users can use, but provide exceptions. Slowing down the top 5-10%. University of Iowa – automated copyright process. Pass a quiz/sufficiently annoying – tie monitoring w/communication as deterrent.

Goal: Taking prudent reasonable steps to curb copyright violations through the use of technical deterrents. HEOA only requires students to comply.

How do we measure success?

2. Possible principles to discuss as group:

   • Students in the residential halls use the Internet for both academic and leisure activities and the network should enhance their experiences, not unduly restrict legal uses of the network.
• The University must not be the position of facilitating abuses of copyright but rather educating the campus about copyright law and deterring illegal activity while providing alternatives.

• The University should strive to reduce the number of copyright complaints and judiciously handle complaints (possibly through copyright process automation).

3. Questions to discuss:

• What extent should we attempt to “deter” (i.e. implement an in-line device to specifically address copyright and potentially interfere with core functions)?

• Should technical deterrent mechanisms be put in place for the whole campus or only for networks where copyright violations are problematic?

• Should technical deterrent mechanisms rely on actively monitoring content to determine if copyrighted material is being shared or do we continue to avoid monitoring individual content?

• Should technical deterrent mechanisms attempt to block all peer-to-peer, seek to restrict or slow-down such traffic, or provide notice to individuals responsible for possible P2P traffic?

• Should the campus look to implement smaller incremental changes or is there sufficient risk to warrant significant investments in new solutions?

4. Adjourn

Next meeting: November 17th, Telecommunications Building rm 215 10:00-11:00. Agenda: review draft report, review copyright website, discuss next steps.