

## IT Governance Program – Architecture & Infrastructure Committee

### Meeting Minutes

February 15, 2018

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

*Computing Services Center Conference Room 004*

#### Attendance:

AIC Members		AIC Members		Ex- Officio Members	
	Chad Ballenger	X	David Kratz	X	Zac Sanders (Ex-Officio)
X	Erick Beck		Alan Kurk	X	Rudy Supak (Ex-Officio)
X	Andy Bland	X	Susan Neitsch		Future Chair - EAC (Ex-Officio)
X	Cheryl Cato	X	Elizabeth Schwartz		
	Dr. Prasad Enjeti				
	Justin Ellison				
	Dr. Donald (Rick) McMullen				
X	Richard King				

ITG Program Support		AIC Guests	
	Juan Garza	X	Adam Mikeal
X	Joshua Kisse		
X	Missy Mouton		
	Lea Ann Westmoreland		

#### Minutes: Scheduled Business

##### **Item 1: Welcome & Announcements**

Description: *General Welcome and opportunity for announcements and items of interest relevant to the committee.*

Cheryl welcomes the group and introduces ex-officio members.

Josh gave updates as to where the other committees are progressing. It was announced that the new VP for Research, Dr. Barteau, will join ITG at the SITC. After SITC meets tomorrow, ITG management

software will be back on track. There will not be much for the next couple of weeks. The Chairperson synchronization meeting will take place in March. There will be updates to the ITG Website coming soon. The Strategic IT liaison group meets in April, and the website will be updated to include that group as well.

**Item 2: Update on FY18 Objectives**

Description: *The committee will receive the finalized list of objectives from all other ITG committees.*

There is a document in the ITG-all folder that contains this document for viewing. All approved objectives from each committee is posted there. Since the last meeting, IRPSC and TTLTC objectives have been updated and added to that list.

**Item 3: Network Plan Benchmarking**

Description: *An open, round-table discussion reviewing the findings from individual benchmarking research.*

The group began the discussion regarding benchmarking. It was found that people published very little about their networks. Cheryl would like the team to view the University of Texas report. She feels it will give an idea of how we will put together our network strategic plan.

Erik Beck reported on University of Florida. They seem to be a little ahead of us as they are in the middle of their strategic plan. They are doing a lot of brochures and marketing publications. Their governance structure is equivalent to this committee. Their minutes are also posted online for public viewing. Their Network Policy documents address many aspects of interest, but are not for a very technical audience. Their group is aligned with the President's initiative, which is a plus.

Susan Neitsch reported that Penn State and their research network is totally separate from their academic administrator network.

Zac Sanders reported that the University of Michigan's research network is also separate and based on their FTE count.

Cheryl suggested the possibility of us having a cyber-infrastructure plan.

Cheryl checked out Purdue as we seem to be compared to them often. However, she found very few similarities. Purdue is primarily central funded.

Each of these are posted and Cheryl urged everyone to look over all of them. We need to see if this is a good format for our current state analysis or if we need to go with a different format.

Discussion on thoughts of how to do this and if we want to do a peer survey. The goal of phase one is a current state document. This will also help for faculty recruitment. Or should peer benchmarking even be a part of the first phase? Would it be better to focus on our own capabilities and what we can deliver? Do we go back and have general discussion about outlines? Do we know enough to start building an

outline to facilitate the collection of data? It was suggested to go back to the UT document and analyze what they did. Network related responses on the UT report was left open-ended. The concern is that asking customers random questions can be less than beneficial, so the questions would need to be very specific and detailed. We would need to ask them exactly what they were trying to do that they weren't able to do. What was preventing them from doing it?

It was suggested that we move forward with state of the network as it currently exists now. Erik Beck would like to advocate for this group to outline this document and build some version of it for our current state. As in, where are we now and where do we want to be? The question then would shift to Cheryl and Rudy as to what support is needed to build this outline. Cheryl and Rudy will see what measuring data is available and what of this can be accomplished with the tools we currently have. They will build a list of the type of data available and what our capabilities are, what we can know and how we can gather with our existing tools. As this data is built, Josh will help Cheryl to get that information out to the group so to build on that current state. We will focus on places where demand isn't met.

**Item 4: Ideas for Objectives 2 & 3**

Description: *Discussion on how to work toward the other objectives in parallel with objective 1.*

Keep these two objectives in mind while working on objective 1. ITAC just had a subcommittee assigned to working on something very similar to number 2. There should be a heavy overlap on these, and we may need to try to tap into what they are doing and work together with them. Richard King and Andy Bland are actually on that subcommittee, so it seems we can keep all three initiatives moving without losing momentum on any.

Andy Bland made a motion to adjourn and Erik Beck seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm