

Vulnerabilities Across Campus Groups

<u>Persons of interest</u>	<u>Personnel Examples</u>	<u>Information Types Provided</u>	<u>Unique Vulnerabilities</u>	<u>Shared Vulnerabilities</u>
<p>Expertise: Individuals with expertise in fields or research on projects that have implications or direct applications for military or economic advantage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIs • Other project personnel • Faculty members • Graduate students • Research partnerships/private industry partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information concerning specific project - Service or assistance - Inadvertent “clues” about funded projects or research findings - Access or clues concerning obtaining access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eager to talk about research - Regularly receive unsolicited contacts - Collaboration valued and often requested - Frequent travel to present research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Face limited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salaries or Funding • Opportunities • Time • Understanding of Threat • Situational Awareness - Desire to feel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important • Respected • Appreciated • Fulfilled • Engaged • Challenged • Connected - Unaware of personal vulnerabilities and methods of exploitation - Disinclined to adopt “zero trust” mentality.
<p>Access: Individuals with privileged access to high-value or sensitive areas or items (labs, equipment, materials, substances, hard/software)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIs, project personnel, grad/undergrad students • Facility Security Officers or managers • Administrative staff • Information Systems staff • Cleaning crews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insider knowledge of access to spaces, items, persons - Insights to types of activities occurring in location - Understanding of work schedules and daily routines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May become desensitized to security protocols due to everyday access - Hard to spot suspicious “insider threat” activities from legitimate, routine ones 	
<p>Oversight: Individuals with extensive knowledge of university projects and operations and having influence to make or impact institutional policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive policy-makers • Department Heads and Deans • Empowered Officials • Technology Transfer • Compliance personnel • Information Security Officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broader, more cohesive understanding of various activities occurring across campus - Position and power to influence institutional policies and upper-management connections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focused on increasing research profile rather than risk profile - More likely to advocate for or support foreign collaborations to improve university prestige - Susceptible to appeals to ego 	
<p>Support: Individuals with insider knowledge about university employees and/or business functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Resources • Administrative Assistants • Student and Scholar Services • Financial Aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private personnel information (salary, resumes, visas, medical records, conflicts of interest, etc.) - Faculty coursework, schedules, contacts, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Able to ‘fly under the radar’ and avoid scrutiny of actions or behavior. - More likely to become disgruntled with lack of appreciation or recognition. 	

This chart was created by Laura Provencher (University of Arizona) and Jessica Graham (Vanderbilt University) as part of a collaborative training for AUECO members.