

**STUDENT RECORDS & REGISTRATION**

**SAN JOSE STATE**

**Report Number 99-26**

**November 3, 1999**

---

**Members, Committee on Audit**

Stanley T. Wang, Chair  
Harold Goldwhite, Vice Chair  
Dee Dee Myers    Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Frederick W. Pierce, IV  
Ali C. Razi

---

**Staff**

University Auditor: Larry Mandel  
Senior Director: Norm Buettner  
Audit Manager: Jim Usher  
Staff Auditor: Daryl Patton

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

# CONTENTS

---

## INTRODUCTION

Purpose.....	1
Scope and Methodology.....	1
Background .....	2
Opinion.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4

---

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Student Record Policy Administration	7
Family Education Rights And Privacy Act.....	7
Biennial Reviews .....	8
Student Records .....	8
Transcripts.....	9
Grades	10
Grade/Grade Change Controls .....	10
Withdrawal “W” Documentation.....	11
Incomplete “I” Documentation .....	12
Student Fairness Committee.....	13
Reporting .....	14
Data Control, Security & Integrity	15
Disaster Recovery.....	15
System Integrity.....	16
User Training.....	17

## **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Campus Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AACRAO	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
A&R	Admissions & Records
CSU	California State University
EM	Executive Memorandum
EMS	Enrollment Management Services
EO	Executive Order
ES	Enrollment Services
FERPA	Family Education Rights and Privacy Act
OUA	Office of the University Auditor
PRs	Permanent Records
SIS	Student Information System
SJSU	San Jose State University

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

### PURPOSE

The primary purposes of this audit are to furnish an independent appraisal of the student records and registration functions; ascertain compliance with established policies and procedures; determine adequacy of internal controls; and identify opportunities for operational improvements which would promote achievement of goals and objectives.

Within the overall audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- ▶ systemwide requirements in executive orders 268, 320 and 382 have been implemented;
- ▶ only authorized grades/grade changes are posted to students' records;
- ▶ there are reasonable access and disclosure provisions for protected student records including safeguards preventing the release of personal and confidential information unless the written consent of the student has been received;
- ▶ students can examine the contents of their educational records and request amendments;
- ▶ campuses respond to requests for records within a reasonable amount of time;
- ▶ transcripts are controlled;
- ▶ there is a reasonable records management program;
- ▶ there is equity in registration priorities;
- ▶ touch tone and voice response technologies are appropriately used; and
- ▶ add/drop procedures are consistently followed.

---

### SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The scope of the student records audit as presented in Attachment B, Agenda Item 2 of the January 1999 meeting of the Committee on Audit included data base integrity, security and confidentiality and the enrollment process.

In the CSU, student records are defined by Executive Order (EO) 382 as follows:

Student records means any personally identifiable student-related information maintained by a campus whether recorded by handwriting, print, tape, film, microfilm or other material means.

The concept of “personally identifiable” defines the scope of student records subject to certain well-defined exceptions. These exceptions include:

- a) personal records kept in the sole possession of the maker and not accessible or revealed to any other individual, e.g., a professor’s notes;
- b) police records used solely for law enforcement purposes;
- c) employment records; and
- d) health records created by a licensed physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, or other recognized professional or paraprofessional in connection with provision of treatments.

The Office of the University Auditor (OUA) has established an audit universe for the CSU and a breakdown of the universe into potential audit topics for risk assessment and ranking. Several topics are closely related to student records such as: analytic studies/institutional research (includes enrollment reporting); data processing centers, security management and data communications; and admissions and evaluations (includes residency determinations). For purpose of this audit, emphasis has been placed on student records not otherwise covered in these other OUA audits.

---

## BACKGROUND

The main student recordkeeping systems on the CSU campuses are automated databases supported on different software packages as follows:

Banner	SIS Plus	SIMS/R	Champlain
Bakersfield	Chico	Fresno	Maritime Academy
Dominguez Hills	Fullerton	Northridge	
Humboldt	Hayward	San Diego	
Monterey Bay	Long Beach	San Francisco	
Pomona	Los Angeles		
San Marcos	Sacramento		
Sonoma	San Bernardino		
Stanislaus	San Jose		
	San Luis Obispo		

The Banner and Student Information System Plus (SIS+) systems are products of Systems & Computer Technology (SCT) Corporation. The Student Information Management System/Relational (SIMS/R) database is a CSU developed system in an Oracle client/server environment. The student administration module of PeopleSoft will eventually replace these systems. The current PeopleSoft implementation schedule has not been finalized. One recent plan has two different alternatives that carry forward the concept of campus groups or waves that will phase in over a period of time that may not start until late 1999 and not conclude until early 2006.

The Office of the University Auditor (OUA) completed an audit of student records in 1990 at the following seven campuses and summarized these audits in a systemwide report numbered 90-01:

CAMPUS	REPORT#
Chico	90-02
Humboldt	90-09
Pomona	90-08
Sacramento	90-05
San Francisco	90-06
San Luis Obispo	90-04
Sonoma	90-03

Student records and registration at the San Jose State (SJSU) campus is the responsibility of enrollment services (ES). Student records and registration is supervised by a director, who reports to the associate vice president for enrollment services. This associate vice president reports to the vice president, student affairs.

The automated system for student recordkeeping at SJSU is the Student Information System (SIS) from SCT Corporation that runs on an IBM mainframe computer. SIS is an earlier version of SIS+ that the campus elected not to upgrade because they wanted to evaluate different system options. They are now committed to PeopleSoft. Beginning in spring 1991, student records data was entered in SIS. Prior to spring 1991, student records were maintained on permanent record cards (PRs).

Registration at the SJSU campus is predominantly accomplished by students through a telephone-based system – SJSU Touch Tone. SJSU Touch Tone is augmented to the extent necessary through a manual change of program process.

---

## OPINION

We visited the campus from May 10, 1999 to June 18, 1999, and audited the policies and procedures in effect at that time.

During the course of the audit, we:

- ▶ interviewed management and operating personnel;
- ▶ inspected facilities used to store student records;
- ▶ reviewed various documents, policies, and procedures;
- ▶ tested selected controls and systems integral to student records and registration.

We found that the campus had a reasonable student records program and registration process. However, within the centralized student records area, the provisions for records management was in need of improvement. As described further in the report, there was some concern about maintaining the confidentiality of student information and campus compliance with established CSU and government policy.

Areas that warrant the attention of management are mentioned in the executive summary.

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this section is to provide management with an overview of conditions requiring their attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [ ] refer to page numbers in the report.

### **STUDENT RECORD POLICY ADMINISTRATION [7]**

#### **FAMILY EDUCATION RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT [7]**

The campus had not developed a written policy statement outlining the various procedures by which they intend to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Following an established student records policy decreases the risk of non-compliance with FERPA.

#### **BIENNIAL REPORTING [8]**

The campus was not conducting biennial reviews of information management practice concerning student records. Biennial reviews help to ensure that information practices concerning student records are appropriate.

### **STUDENT RECORDS [8]**

Protected student information was inappropriately distributed. Controlling the distribution of confidential student information decreases exposure to FERPA violations.

### **TRANSCRIPTS [9]**

Access to the transcript validation machine was not adequately controlled. Maintaining control over the use of this machine decreases the risk of unauthorized transcripts.

### **GRADING [10]**

#### **GRADE/GRADE CHANGE CONTROLS [10]**

Overall grades/grade change controls were inadequate. Enforcing grading controls provides an additional measure of protection against possible student record inaccuracies.

#### **WITHDRAWAL "W" DOCUMENTATION [11]**

Documentation to support student withdrawals was inadequate. Maintaining proper documentation for student withdrawals decreases the risk of incomplete student records.

#### **INCOMPLETE "I" DOCUMENTATION [12]**

Documentation to support student incomplete changes was inadequate. Maintaining proper documentation for incomplete changes decreases the risk of incomplete student records.

#### **STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE [13]**

The number of students included on the student fairness committee was below campus guidelines. Adequate student participation on this committee reduces the possibility of unfair review practices.

#### **REPORTING [14]**

The annual student grievance report did not include the disposition of each case. Including the disposition of each grievance case ensures compliance with EO 320.

## **DATA CONTROL, SECURITY & INTEGRITY [15]**

### **DISASTER RECOVERY [15]**

Records and registration had not developed and tested a disaster recovery plan. Developing and testing a disaster recovery plan decreases the risk of loss in the event of a disaster.

### **SYSTEM INTEGRITY [16]**

SIS security controls were inadequate. Strengthening the SIS security controls decreases the risk of security breaches.

### **USER TRAINING [17]**

SIS users were not provided training prior to obtaining access to the system. Providing end-user SIS system training decreases the risk of inappropriate transactions and operator errors.

---

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

### STUDENT RECORD POLICY ADMINISTRATION

#### FAMILY EDUCATION RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT

The campus had not developed a written policy statement outlining the various procedures by which they intend to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

The statement should include items such as:

- ▶ the appropriateness of campus policy statement on the privacy of student records;
- ▶ the types of student records maintained, and the titles and addresses of the officials responsible for maintaining them;
- ▶ procedures for disclosing information to students and others with legitimate educational interest; and
- ▶ procedures for recordkeeping.

Executive Order (EO) 382, *Privacy and Personal Information Management, Student Records Administration*, with an effective date of March 10, 1982, required each campus to adopt a written policy statement establishing the various procedures by which the campus intends to comply with the Federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). EO 382 superseded EO 267, dated April 19, 1977.

The director, student records and registration, believed that the policy statement was addressed in academic senate policy S90-5.

The absence of a current campus policy regarding student records increases the risk of federal FERPA interpretations and changes not being implemented.

**Subsequent to the audit fieldwork, the campus provided a copy of a 1977 campus FERPA policy statement, which had been redistributed in January 1997. The FERPA policy statement was updated in the spring of 1999 and has not been approved and distributed to campus population.**

### **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus develop a process whereby any updates or changes to the campus FERPA policy statement are formally approved and appropriately distributed.

### **Campus Response**

The FERPA Officer and the Executive Assistant to the President will work together to distribute the policy across campus under the signature of the University President by March 1, 2000.

## **BIENNIAL REVIEWS**

The campus was not conducting biennial reviews of information management practice concerning student records.

Executive Order (EO) 382, *Privacy and Personal Information Management, Student Records Administration*, with an effective date of March 10, 1982, requires the campus to establish procedures for reviewing the campus information management practice concerning student records. It further states that:

Such reviews shall be conducted biennially and the results shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by the President.

The director, student records and registration, indicated that the reviews ceased a number of years ago and have not been requested by the Chancellor's office.

The absence of biennial reviews increases the risk of inappropriate information management practices.

### **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus resume biennial reviews of information practices concerning student records.

### **Campus Response**

The Associate Vice President - Enrollment Services will identify an internal auditor to begin biennial review of information management practices in Spring 2000.

## **STUDENT RECORDS**

Protected student information was released without prior student approval.

The campus was completing requests for student information based upon non-directory information, such as ethnicity and national origin, without obtaining permission from the student. In the absence of

prior disclosures in a published EO 382 policy statement, there are questions as to the legitimate educational interests of a number of the requesting parties such as fraternities and sororities.

Executive Order (EO) 382, *Privacy and Personal Information Management, Student Records Administration*, with an effective date of March 10, 1982, states that each campus may disclose, but is not compelled to disclose, personally identifiable information from a student record to any authorized outside party designated by this Executive order. FERPA sections 99.31, 99.34, and 99.36 state that each campus shall obtain written consent of the student before disclosing personally identifiable information from the student record except as provided by FERPA sections 99.30 and 99.31.

The director, information system and training, admissions and records (A&R), indicated that there was no formal review of the requests. The administrative assistant, budget/personnel, A&R, indicated that she was not aware that internal organizations were included in the requirement.

By not controlling protected student information, the risk of disclosure and FERPA violations is increased.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus improve screening procedures for approval of requests for release of protected student records.

### **Campus Response**

The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services and the Director of Admissions will review all requests for release of protected student records by January 2000.

## **TRANSCRIPTS**

Access to the transcript validation machine was not adequately controlled.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative control includes a plan of authorization and recordkeeping procedures adequate to provide effective accounting controls over assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures.

The record's coordinator indicated that the practice of leaving the key in the machine would make it available to student assistants and others completing transcript requests.

Inadequately controlling validating machines increases the risk that unauthorized transcripts will be issued.

#### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus secure the transcript validation machine to prevent unauthorized access.

#### **Campus Response**

The Coordinator of Records has been charged with securing the key and assuring that it is removed and returned after each use.

Upon the move to the new Student Services Center (9th and San Fernando), the validator will be located in a locked fileroom that must be accessed by a key each time it is entered.

## **GRADES**

### **GRADE/GRADE CHANGE CONTROLS**

Overall grades/grade change controls were inadequate.

We noted the following:

- ▶ The campus grading procedures did not include a verification process back to the originating instructor for review. Further, if a letter grade on the grade roster scan form is written as one grade but bubbled in as a different grade, the scan will pick up the bubbled grade. These grading differences were noted on three of 25 rosters reviewed.
- ▶ Procedures for the delivery of late grade rosters were not always consistently followed. Interviews with academic departments indicated that instructors don't always deliver the late rosters to A&R in person. No identification is required for a late delivery.
- ▶ Five of 25 grade change documents were not located.
- ▶ Three grade changes were not approved by the department chair.
- ▶ One grade change document did not include an explanation for the change.

For each grade transaction, the Student Grade Change Form must be completely filled in, signed by the authorized signatory, and taken to the office of admissions and records.

According to the director of records and registration, verification procedures were followed in the past but fell by the wayside. Additionally, she indicated that the lack of resources and no real means to electronically store the images lead to the documentation issues.

Not maintaining an effective overall campus control system for grading and grade changes results in unacceptable risk exposures and potential inaccuracies in student records.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. include a confirmation process which would return the recorded grades to the originating instructor for verification;
- b. develop other alternatives for filing and retrieval of grade and grade change documents, and
- c. strengthen grade and grade change policies and communicate these policies to campus personnel.

### **Campus Response**

- a. Beginning with the end of the Fall 1999 grade cycle in January 2000, the Director of Records and Registration will generate rosters reflecting grade posting to be distributed to departments for faculty review.
- b. The Director of Records and Registration will ensure that Records staff members are trained and have access to scanners so they can image grade rosters and grade change forms by March 2000.
- c. The Provost (or designee) will work collaboratively with the Director of Records & Registration to strengthen the grade policies, ensure that grades are submitted in a timely manner, and verify chair's signature on grade changes by December 1999.

### **WITHDRAWAL "W" DOCUMENTATION**

Documentation supporting student withdrawals was inadequate.

We noted the following discrepancies with the 25 files reviewed:

- ▶ On six occasions, the campus could not locate the documents supporting the student withdrawals.
- ▶ On two occasions, the reason for withdrawal after census date was not compelling enough to warrant approval.
- ▶ On three occasions, student financial aid and/or the financial aid business office did not sign the leave request forms.

Executive Order (EO) 268, *Grading Symbols*, dated September 1, 1977, requires a progressively more difficult set of standards for acceptable use of the “W” (Withdrawal) grading symbol based on the timing of the action in relation to completion of the term as follows:

Withdrawals after census date and prior to the last three weeks of the instruction are permissible only for serious and compelling reasons. ...All requests to withdraw under these circumstances and all approvals shall be made in writing on forms prescribed by the campus. The requests and approvals shall state the reasons for the withdrawal. Copies of such approvals shall be kept on file.

The director, student records and registration, indicated that the process had been strengthened to assure that all approvals were based on serious and compelling reasons. She also stated that missing documentation could be resolved with document imaging.

Without appropriate documentation, there is an increased risk that the integrity of the withdrawal grading process is compromised.

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the campus strengthen procedures to ensure that all withdrawals are properly approved and documented.

### **Campus Response**

The Director of Academic Services has overseen the creation of a spreadsheet to track the receipt, processing and disposition of petitions for drops and withdrawals after census. The Director is also working with the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate to review the reasons students should be allowed to drop and the acceptable documentation to support these reasons by May 2000.

## **INCOMPLETE “I” DOCUMENTATION**

Documentation supporting student incomplete changes was inadequate.

The following was noted:

- ▶ two forms that support the resolution of students’ incomplete status were not found;
- ▶ two grades documented on the grade change form for removal of “I” were posted differently on the student’s SIS profile;
- ▶ one petition for an incomplete extension was not signed by the student;
- ▶ one incomplete extension did not have the approving signature of the department chair; and

- ▶ one form did not contain the date that the incomplete was removed.

Executive Order (EO) 268, 268, *Grading Symbols*, dated September 1, 1977, requires that the “I” shall be used only when the faculty member concludes that a clearly identifiable portion of the course requirements cannot be met within the academic term for unforeseen reasons. The conditions for removal shall be reduced to writing by the instructor ... with a copy placed on file with the appropriate campus officer until the incomplete is removed or the time limit has passed... . An incomplete shall be removed within one year following the end of the term during which it was assigned; provided, however, that extension of the one-year time limit may be granted by petition for contingencies such as intervening military service and serious health or personal problems.

The administrative assistant, A&R budget/personnel, indicated that there was a definite need for some revision to the process of reviewing and filing documents. The director, records and registration, indicated that the inconsistencies with documentation could be resolved with document imaging and retrieval.

Not maintaining an adequate review and approval process for incomplete changes and extensions increases the risk of record inconsistencies and errors.

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the campus strengthen procedures to ensure that an adequate review and approval process for the removal and extension of “I” is in effect and that appropriate documentation is maintained.

### **Campus Response**

The Director of Records and Registration will review the extension of incomplete policies with the Associate Vice Presidents of Curriculum and Assessment and Graduate Studies and Research. The Coordinator of Records will institute a quality control check to reduce errors in postings. The Director of Records and Registration will ensure that Records staff members are trained and have access to scanners so they can image documentation extending incompletes as well as the incomplete clearance documents by May 2000.

## **STUDENT FAIRNESS COMMITTEE**

The number of students included on the student fairness committee was below campus guidelines.

The campus policy states that the student fairness committee shall include the representation of seven students. For the academic term of 1998/99, only four students were on the committee.

Executive Order (EO) 320, *Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals*, dated January 18, 1980, indicates that one or more committees for hearing grade appeals shall provide safeguards to assure due

process for both student and instructor. Such committee shall include student membership. Student members shall not participate in assignment of grades.

Academic Senate Policy Recommendation S97-8, *Student Fairness Committee; Grade and Grade Appeals; Student Grievance; Student Rights*, dated May 5, 1997, indicates that voting members of the Student Fairness Committee shall be seven students (not more than two graduate students) ...student members shall be appointed for a one-year term.

The ombudsperson indicated that the goal was to have seven students on the committee. However, appointment to the committee is strictly voluntary and therefore, students are not always willing to take on the responsibility.

Not having appropriate representation on the student fairness committee decreases the likelihood that student and faculty members are given due process.

### **Recommendation 8**

We recommend that the campus strengthen procedures to ensure appropriate representation of the student fairness committee.

### **Campus Response**

In order to help ensure adequate student representation, the Ombudsperson will write to the Associated Students President and Board each Spring, informing them of the importance to students of having all seven student seats filled as the academic year begins. By June 2000, the Ombudsperson will also identify interested faculty, staff, and administrators so their names can be forwarded to the Academic Senate Office so incumbents can be more easily replaced.

## **REPORTING**

The annual student grievance report did not include the disposition of each case.

Ten cases were reviewed for 1997/98 academic term.

Executive Order (EO) 320, *Assignment of Grades and Grad Appeals*, dated January 18, 1980, indicates that the campus shall make provisions for annual reporting to the president and campus faculty senate/council on the number of grade appeal cases heard and the disposition of each case.

The ombudsperson indicated that no attachment for the disposition of the cases heard was accompanied with the report.

The absence of feedback from the student grievance committee reduces management effectiveness, oversight of grading, and the grade appeals process.

### **Recommendation 9**

We recommend that the student fairness committee prepare and submit grade appeal reports as required.

### **Campus Response**

By June 2000, the grade appeal report will be part of the Student Fairness Committee's annual report to the Academic Senate. It will include the number of cases reviewed and the disposition of each case. The Ombudsperson will oversee this part of the report.

## **DATA CONTROL, SECURITY & INTEGRITY**

### **DISASTER RECOVERY**

Records and registration had not developed and tested a disaster recovery plan.

Student permanent records and other student records from years prior to 1991 were not protected from potential water and fire damage. The campus maintains offsite microfilm and some paper documents at two offsite locations. However, since 1991, there has been no review or inventory of these items. Additionally, the backup microfilm held locally is maintained in the same location as the permanent records.

The 1998 update related to security standards in *Guidelines for Retention and Disposal of Student Records* by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), states that records managers must take appropriate measures to reduce the vulnerability of records to loss and alteration through human error, natural disaster, fire and water, sabotage, accident, negligence, fraud or technological obsolescence.

The director of registration and records stated that she was aware of the need for improved storage of the student records and has been trying to get document imaging approved. However, due to the lower priority of the item and lack of funds, she has been unsuccessful. The administrative assistant, A&R budget/personnel, indicated that the backup film is stored with the records because the reader machine is used for student record research and housed in this area. She was unsure as to the status of offsite storage materials.

Not taking adequate protective measures exposes the campus to the risk of loss of irreplaceable student record information.

### **Recommendation 10**

We recommend that, for purposes of disaster preparedness, the campus ensure that student records are adequately protected and recoverable.

### **Campus Response**

The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services and the Director of Records and Registration will make visits to off-site storage locations to determine if the microfilm is still usable. They have also submitted another request for funding to outsource the imaging of the permanent record cards. This request is for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. We know that the imaging process for the number of records we have will take 10 months; therefore, the earliest date we could complete the imaging would be in April of 2001.

### **SYSTEM INTEGRITY**

SIS security controls were inadequate.

Six employees in information systems had full security access to SIS, although such access is not required for their job responsibilities.

SAM §20003 requires, in part, that a plan be in place limiting access to State agency assets to authorized personnel who require these assets in the performance of their assigned duties.

The interim director of information systems indicated that full access to SIS security is not required for employees within this department to perform their duties.

Not maintaining adequate system controls increases the risk of unauthorized access.

### **Recommendation 11**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. re-evaluate the access and security levels of the employees in the information systems department;  
and
- b. strengthen policies to ensure that password changes on the SIS system are required.

### **Campus Response**

- a. By January 2000, the Director of Records & Registration will periodically generate security rosters to review employee access. The Information Systems staff's access will be limited and granted on an "as needed" basis.
- b. By January 2000, the Associate Vice President of Enrollment Services will require that Enrollment Services staff change their SIS passwords every six months. Notices will be sent reminding staff to do this. The Director of Records and Registration will send requests to staff across campus, asking that they change their passwords for security purposes.

## **USER TRAINING**

SIS users were not provided training prior to obtaining access to the system.

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), *Expectations, and Tasks for the 90's Report. Report of the Task Force of the 90's*, 1988 emerging issues, indicates that in addition to receiving requests and granting appropriate access to the information, the authorizer should have responsibility for training the user. The training process should also include discussion of the issues of confidentiality and security of the information.

The director, student records and registration, indicated that user training was not accompanied with system access. However, a confidential statement was included on the request for access form.

When system users are not properly trained, the risk of inappropriate use of protected student information and FERPA violations is increased.

### **Recommendation 12**

We recommend that the campus institute user training on the security and operation of SIS. The confidentiality of the information should be stressed before granting access to the user.

### **Campus Response**

By January 2000, the Director of Records and Registration will request that Information Systems redesign their access request forms to re-institute the statement on the privacy act restrictions. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services will direct the Enrollment Services trainer to create a training program for campus personnel. The training program will stress privacy considerations, as well as giving staff and faculty information on using the Student Information System. These training sessions will be instituted by April 2000.

---

## APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Robert L. Caret	President
Lisa Beltran	Records Coordinator
Michael Burke	Department Chair, Mathematics and Computer Science
Valerie Caviel	Supervisor, Student Data
Valerie Chapman	Coordinator, Resource Center Lobby
Jean Dahl	Consultant, Computer Center
DeAnna Diaz	Secretary, Mathematics and Computer Science
Anita Farris	Secretary, Aviation
Carolyn Flading	Secretary, Music and Dance
Kathryn Hill	Interim Director, Information Systems
Pearl Howell	Director, Payroll Services
Young Kang	Secretary, Urban and Regional Planning
Dennis Kyne	Director, Information systems and training, A&R
Ted Lukas	Department Chair, Music and Dance
Eric Matthews	Senior Network Analyst, A&R
Beverly Miles	Ombudsperson
Nellie Militante	Payroll Technician
David Neel	Department Chair, Aviation
Phyllis O'Balle	Supervisor, Student Resource Center
Dora Ozawa	Administrative Assistant, A&R
Marilyn Radisch	Director, Records and Registrations
Monica Rascoe	Vice President for Student Affairs
Paul Siegel	Manager, Accounting and Costing Accounting
Norma Tamayo	Clerical Assistant, Electrical Engineering
Linda Vasquez	Senior Director, Business Operations
Louisa Wang	Associate System Analyst, A&R
Leon Washington	Associate Vice President, Enrollment Services
Darcel Wood	Records Associate, A&R