

IT Governance Program – Architecture & Infrastructure Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 20, 2020

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Computing Services Center Conference Room 004

Attendance:

AIC Members			Ex- Officio Members		
	Andy Bland	X	Jennifer Hutchison	X	Dr. 'Jon Jasperson
X	Cheryl Cato (Chair)	X	Susan Neitsch	X	Sean Michaelson
X	Francis Dang	X	Chris Nugent	X	Zac Sanders (Parliamentarian)
X	William Deigaard	X	Ed Pierson	X	Dr. Michael Sardaryzadeh
	Justin Ellison	X	Chris Wiley	X	Anthony JG Antonidis
X	Dr. Paul Gratz				

ITG Program Support		AIC Guests	
X	Sharon Mainka	X	Adam Mikeal
X	Missy Mouton	X	Chris Court
X	Ethel Vaught		

Minutes: Scheduled Business

Item 1: Welcome & Announcements

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

- Cheryl Cato welcomed the group.
- Sharon Mainka provided the following updates:
 - There is a TTLTC meeting on 02/21/20. This committee is working on a new task force for captioning tools on campus.
 - EAC has been asked to look at the use of Dropbox on campus. They are also working on the service catalog recommendations.
 - IRPSC will be asked to participate in an external IT security external program review happening in March.
 - We will not be using BoardEffect after the license expires due to the high cost, and will be looking for other options.
 - Inquires and comments about the

- If you did not receive the challenge coin for participating in IT Governance, please email smainka@tamu.edu. The coins were handed out at the IT Governance appreciation luncheon last semester.

Item 2: Technology Standards Subcommittee

Description: Reminder call for nominations

- Cheryl shared inquiries and comments that she has received about IT governance from former and current committee members and external people. AIC is listed as a foundational committee, and receives work from the other committees regarding architectural infrastructure. The AIC has not been receiving as much work as was anticipated.
 - Questions included “Why does the AIC meet monthly?” “Why do we make technology standards, only to have the technology dictated by the Division of IT?” “Does or should the AIC play a role when choosing a technology?” “Without mandates, what is the goal of the technology standards?” “Why have a committee when Division of IT has to do most of the work?” “Perhaps this committee should be a technical advisory group to the other committees, instead of a governance committee.”
 - Cheryl asked, “How does this committee feel about the charge of this committee, the work we should be doing? Should we meet less frequently? Is this a good use of your time? Is the composition of committee members correct?”
- Discussion continued:
 - Originally should have been like a standing technology subcommittee that worked on items requested by other committees. AIC was not supposed to generate its own priorities and objectives. Core group should be well-connected people who can reach out to their own networks in order to spin up appropriate task forces. Then we should meet on a quarterly basis or as needed.
 - Bear in mind that during the creation of the structure of IT governance, it wasn’t meant to be static. After two to three years in, the structure can be reviewed.
 - What is this group adding value that the other groups are not? What is left for the AIC to do that is not covered by the other committees? We shouldn’t be thinking up things to do while we are waiting for the other committees send us something.
 - Design of the network will need convening of core stakeholders, which will involve this committee. But this type of work is very rare.
 - Moving the active directory to the cloud and leveraging Azure is architecture, and something this committee should be keeping an eye on.
 - This committee should be focusing on three-five years out instead of real time.
 - This could be a strategic architectural committee with subcommittees focusing on specific areas, such as the new network with experts in the area.
 - Use of Dropbox and Office 365 affects architecture decisions. Applied use of software that’s built on an architecture. Where should these conversations be taking place?
 - Should we take on role of building out three to five year view of architecture/roadmap? Technologies can then fit into the architecture. This group meeting once a month can’t accomplish this. It will need specific task forces of experts.
 - IT needs to be aware and have oversight of technologies being used. For example, the use of Dropbox causes problems with open records requests and e-discovery.
 - Scope shouldn’t overlap with what the other groups are doing. It’s already hard enough with EAC, RITC, TTLTC, and IRPSC. Challenge is keeping the focus on the 3-5 year windows.

- Dropbox review was sent to the EAC, since the issue is figuring out how people share files. They focus on the people side, who uses it, how they use it, and write a recommendation. Then AIC takes a deeper dive to identify the solution that fits in strategically. And IRPSC writes policy about it.
- Stay plugged in to the work of other committees. Build a living document for the strategy of architecture and infrastructure. Example, network architecture document can inform people when they are purchasing components. Architecture needs experts from across campus because it's based on use cases. Don't need to specify the exact technology or vendors.
- Do we think it's time to write a recommendation that formally changes our role in IT Governance?
 - Is there another gap in the IT Governance structure? Yes, other committees are focused on the present. Also no structure in place to communicate about the products from IT Governance. Is this a gap that AIC should take on? No, each committee needs to get better at communicating out, or IT Governance at whole may need a communications entity.
- Takeaway from this discussion:
 - This committee does think it is time to write a recommendation that formally make changes to our role within IT Governance. Cheryl will try to gather what she heard and send out a draft to the group for approval before taking that to Dee.
- Other items will be tabled.
- Should there be a subcommittee on Azure?
 - Motion made for a subcommittee and seconded. This subcommittee's chair will be William Deigaard. Chris Nugent, Michael Sardaryzadeh, and Zac Sanders volunteered for the committee. All in favor, none opposed. Cheryl will put out a call for other members of this subcommittee.

Item 3: **New Committee Objectives**
Description: Review draft committee objectives

This item was tabled.

Item 4: **Control Catalog and SAP Review**
Description: Review controls and SAP's to identify additional technology standards that need to be written

This item was tabled.

Adjourned: 2:34 p.m.