IT Governance Program – Enterprise Applications Committee

Meeting Minutes

January 29, 2019
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
General Services Center Conference Room 2605

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAC Members</th>
<th>EAC Members</th>
<th>Ex-Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debiyoti Banerjee</td>
<td>Jon Griffey</td>
<td>Dr. Sue Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Michael Bolten</td>
<td>X Vanesa Heidick</td>
<td>Dr. Catharina Laporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Cato</td>
<td>X Dr. Jon Jasperson</td>
<td>X Ramesh Kannappan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X William Dell</td>
<td>X Dr. Melanie Moser</td>
<td>Dr. James Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purna Chandra Doddapaneni</td>
<td>X Dean Poppell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Laura Dohnalik</td>
<td>X David Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisa Falks</td>
<td>Joseph Towers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verna Fritsche</td>
<td>Rick Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Juan Garza (Chair)</td>
<td>X (Parliamentarian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITG Program Support</th>
<th>EAC Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Joshua Kissee</td>
<td>X Susan Edmisson for Jon Griffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Mainka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Ann Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes: Scheduled Business

Item 1: Welcome and Announcements
Description: General welcome and opportunity for announcements & items of interest relevant to the EAC.

- Overview of items the group is working on. 1) The Service Catalog and 2) The Contract process
- Goal for this meeting is to create some task forces that can start these processes and make recommendations to send to the SITC.
- IRPSC and TTLTC committees are both asking for guidance on what software I can use and what’s the appropriate process to acquire software that I may need.
- They need a mechanism to help find things and these sub-committees will help address these issues.
- Possibly create a website with this information and processes that provide guidance on how to procure software and what is already available.

**Item 2: Procurement Process**

**Description:** *Ramesh Kannappan will report the findings from discussion with Dean Endler (University Contracts) and next steps in the contract proposal.*

- Ramesh reported: Information that they have created to this point was shared with Dean Endler and Lindy Beasley?
- They were supported of the process presented and are willing to work with us on moving things forward.
- They had a question about existing IT SAP related to vendor access that requires some steps that they complete and they were asking how that would fit in with this process
  - Division of IT manages this now
  - Security Control SA-4 (replaced SAP 29.01.03. M1)
  - They want to make sure that this control is part of whatever process is developed
- This process has not been approved by or shown to Michael Sardaryzadeh
- One question is who has the authority to approve or revise this process
- Other questions:
  - What is an enterprise application
  - Is this process based on a dollar amount?
- What are the next steps moving forward?
  - We want to include contracts, as they have raised questions
  - Discuss SAP & Security reviews with Michael Sardaryzadeh
    - Get a meeting with him and the subcommittee and contracts
  - Do we want to include any of the TTLTC or IRPSC committee members in this group?
    - They can help build out the process that gets submitted to SITC
    - Discussion that yes, this is a good approach.
    - Two sides to this issue: customer facing and technical side
  - Customer facing side is impact and alignment strategy - TTLTC
  - Technical side dealing mainly with complexity
    - Student Services worked with Lon Berquist’s group to come up with a questionnaire to give to vendors that answers some of the security side questions. Developed a list based on that spectrum of questions
    - This list is an example of what we need to create for contracts to determine what the questions need to be in order make sure that they are satisfying all of the SAPs and security controls on the technical side that we have to have
  - TTLTC want to make sure they are in compliance and are in alignment. They are the customer side of the business and operational. This is what the processes will address
  - TTLTC wants to know:
    - What’s out there now that we can use and is available now
    - Should we be looking for anything else and if so, how should we do that
    - We need to make progress on these items because we have been discussing this for a year and a half
  - TTLTC broke this into perspectives in their meeting:
    - Operational – Is an information resource acceptable to use (FERPA, HIPPA, SAPs, Technology architecture). End result is some kind of authorization to purchase.
    - Strategic – Should we procure it? Is it the right fit for purpose? Are there other solutions already available that could be utilized, who should be paying for this? Is this a candidate for central funding? Is there a need for the information resource across the campus so that
we should do a shared contract. How do I make sure this fits in the pedagogical design (McGraw Hill Connect Software, Poll Everywhere, etc.)

- This committee (EAC) has only looked at the process to purchase and make sure it’s legal, secure and avoiding risk
  - The second part that we also need to consider the perspective of how do I know where to find stuff. The University does not have this now
  - Does this committee have the capacity to finish creating this process this spring?
  - Should we pull in other committees to be involved?

- This is mainly an operational process. It’s taking the procurement process and seeing what we can do to make sure we’re answering those questions about complexity.
- We should put a process out and as we move forward, we can make sure that everything is in the process.
- TTLTC might vet software with the faculty – selecting tools and then EAC gets involved and makes sure that the software is purchased following the process
- Does reviewing SAPs fall under IRPSC?
- If this process is defined, it can also help with vetting which items get added to the new LMS

- **ACTION ITEM:** Proceed with creating the process and report out in February
- **ACTION ITEM:** Meet with Michael Sardaryzadeh to ensure this process meets the security goals

**Item 3: Qualtrics Task Force**
**Description:** Jon Griffey will share progress from the Qualtrics Task Force and a timeline for review.

- Juan Garza gave an update of the Qualtrics progress
- Coordination meeting set up for January 21st with the clients
- Juan had a conversation with the provost’s office about the $3,000.00 that is needed to secure the contract. That will be covered and it will buy them time for three years.
- Now they have time to review and evaluate other solutions

**Item 4: SC Task Force Update**
**Description:** The Service Catalog sub-committee is asking for volunteers from the other ITG committees to create a Service Catalog for the University.

- David Sweeney shared a report that is also in the committee Goggle Drive
- Purpose of document was to provide a framework of what an Enterprise Application is
- Need to define **IT Services** and **Enterprise Application Software**
- Need to Define the scope of what Enterprise Application Responsibility would be
- Proposal is that EAC would then be responsible for the Governance of those particular applications as we move forward
- ITIL V3 Definition of IT Services: A means to deliver value to customers by facilitating outcomes that customers want to achieve.
- ITIL V4 Definition of IT Services: A means of enabling valued co-creation.
- CIO Glossary page definition
- IT services deliver value to stakeholders, those stakeholders can be both internal and external, and they are created through a collaborative process.
- Proposed Definition of IT Service: An Information Technology Service is a set of interdependent resources, (human, technological, and processes) which provide value to stakeholders.
Proposed definition of Enterprise Information Technology Service: An Enterprise Information Technology Service is an IT service that provides value to Texas A&M University stakeholders, collectively, or by groups (faculty, researchers, administrators, staff, undergraduate students, graduate students) in accomplishing the mission of the university.

Propose categorizing all IT Services into Centralized, Consortium, and Specialized Services. We propose that Centralized and Consortium Services be considered within the scope of Enterprise IT Services and thus under the purview of the EAC.

Scope of who provides the services is not in the document.

Definition can help set the frameworks for these services, such as funding. For example, centralized services are centrally funded, and specialized services are funded by the units that use them.

Proposed that one of the functions of the EAC would be to categorize all of the services in the IT Services Catalog into one of these categories.

Proposed that Enterprise IT Services be scoped to include Central and Consortium IT Service categories, but not Specialized Services.

Propose that the EAC provides strategic oversight for all Enterprise IT Services across the University, regardless of which group provides them.

Propose that the EAC seeks to align Enterprise IT Services based on the prioritized business needs of the university in order to reduce cost, facilitate innovation, and promote efficient communication.

Propose that the IT Governance Council Charter be revised to reflect the new definitions of services.

Discussion followed:

What do you define Governance as? Is government equal to management? Why would EAC not be concerned about specialized services.

All services should go in the catalog, which provides visibility across the campus.

EAC is providing the framework for the IT Services, so that is Governance.

Committee comes up with a recommendation for establishing the governance – what happens if someone does not follow the governance?

Scope is to define these terms and create a catalog. What are the implications of defining these terms and categorizing these services.

Next step is gathering information on for this catalog.

Motion to adopt these definitions
  o Jon Jasperson motioned to adopt the recommendation put forward by the sub-committee with one modification: Strike the “but not specialized services” in Item 4. Leave all three services in Scope.
  o Motion revised
  o Jon Jasperson motioned to adopt the recommendation put forward by the sub-committee as brought forward
  o Motion seconded

Discussion about the motion
  o This gives the committee some working definitions, but does not commit us to any kind of governance action or next steps
  o This direction supports the value chain (Teaching, Research, Service)

Call for vote

Motion passed unanimously. No opposition
• A motion was made to make a task force to build out the IT Service Catalog
• Motion was seconded.
• Discussion:
  o The focus to the task force will be to build the IT service Catalog
  o Then will determine how the catalog will be published
  o What will the catalog look like?
  o First part is defining what needs to be in the Service Catalog
  o Educause has a new article coming out about Service Catalogs
  o David recommended that his group take the next month for creating a charge for the task force.
• Motion withdrawn

Meeting adjourned 3:15 pm