IT Governance Program – Enterprise Applications Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 25, 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>X Debiyoti Banerjee</td>
<td>X Jon Griffey</td>
<td>Dr. Sue Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Michael Bolten</td>
<td>X Venesa Heidick</td>
<td>Dr. Catharina Laporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Cheryl Cato</td>
<td>X Dr. Jon Jasperson</td>
<td>X Ramesh Kannappan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dell</td>
<td>X Dr. Melanie Moser</td>
<td>Jeff Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purna Chandra</td>
<td>X Dean C Poppell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddapaneni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Dohnalik</td>
<td>X David Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisa Falks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verna Fritsche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Juan Garza (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITG Program Support</th>
<th>EAC Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Sharon Mainka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ethel Vaught</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.

Item 2: Discussion to create a TAMU Unified Web Presence Sub-Committee under EAC.
Description: Discussion on creating a sub-committee to report to the EAC to review TAMU websites and create a unified web presence.
Dr. Garza presented a request from Dr. Fierke to create a sub-committee under EAC to review TAMU websites and create a unified web presence.

- The idea is that as a whole, the University should have a similar look and feel.
- Produce a report of any existing outwardly facing websites.
- Down to the Department level, how should each page looks.
- Another possible outcome might be a review of faculty webpages

There was discussion about how this ties into the existing brand guides and the work that the Marcomm channels currently do and how this relates to the EAC committee.

- Response: because this is an Enterprise Application, it could fall under the domain of this committee.
- A sub-committee or task force can pull in expertise from outside the committee.
- The members of the task force won’t all be from this committee.
- This committee will recommend potential members for the task force.
- An exception request should be considered.

Scope of the task force will be to create a template that the University will use for all external, public facing-websites.

- Noted that without a central LMS, this will be difficult to implement.
- What about also considering a unified CMS system and active directory look and feel as well?
- The outcome should be one digital footprint for the whole University.
- The task force should also review peer institutions and benchmark our sites to those that are doing a good job with their consistent online look and feel.

The chair of the task force will attend the EAC meetings to provide updates on the task force progress.

Dr. Garza asked the committee to review the charter provided and send feedback and suggestions to revise the charter.

Question: Is MarComm the correct group that should be running the website or should there be another group that manages the websites? Should all websites be managed by one central group?

Motion made: The EAC should create and work with a Unified Web Presence subcommittee to respond to the University administration request.

Discussion: It would be better if the question was “Should we create an Enterprise CMS Service. ”Or is that up to the task force to decide?

- Do we see a value without that piece?
- Should we state that the committee should look at some unified centralized services that we could be delivered in respect to our digital presence? Such as expanding the digital catalog?
- Encourage the subcommittee to be thinking about some centralized web services that could be delivered and come together that is a better approach and is easier to think about and consider. Such as a centralized catalog that has all of the degree information.
- GoWeb has been attempting to do this for about the past 5 years and as far as they have gotten is providing some templates.
- We’ve been trying to get this done for years. The only way to get this done is if it’s all one site.

Vote: Motion passed 7 in favor, 1 No, 1 abstention.

**Item 3: Qualtrics Task Force**

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

- They are making progress. They have complied a draft requirements document
• Some conversation has been floating around campus about what the task force is doing and what is the purpose. Jon has spent some time speaking with concerned campus members to explain the Qualtrics task force purpose.
• 6 research faculty came to the past meeting to provide feedback and get clarification.
• The faculty did have representation on the committee from their colleges, but the information had not made it to them.
• There are some standalone Qualtrics instances on the campus also, which caused some confusion.
• Research population on campus depends on this product and will have to have a way to continue to use the product.
• One impression was that the committee or the Division of IT was going to tell them that they could no longer use Qualtrics, and that is not the case, so that was dispelled. This is not part of the committee charge.
• The committee charge is to investigate more cost effective solutions.
• On July 2nd Dr. Dorsey and a representative from AEFIS will present their survey tool. Which might be an option for some of the campus to use.
  o The task force realizes that this is not a replacement option for research surveys.
  o
• The Qualtrics contract ends December 31, 2019.
• The hope is that by the end of July we have some options to consider as a replacement product.
• They are also seeking out individual quotes from Qualtrics.
  o The problem is that in some departments, the research faculty use and depend on Qualtrics, but the IT department pays for it. The rising costs mean that they are going to have to find alternative ways to pay for the licenses.
• The recommendation will probably include a recommendation to find an additional funding model.
• All department heads will be invited to the AEFIS presentation on July 2nd.
• Question: Apart from the researchers, do we know who else is using the product for different uses?
  o They have not done a detailed breakdown of types non-research users.
• Discussion: Communicate through the Research Council so that research faculty know what is going on. Write a succinct summary and share that with this group.
• Current contract will about triple what we are currently paying and then it still increase over the next few years.

Item 4: Report out from the Service Catalog Subcommittee
Description: The Service Catalog sub-committee is asking for volunteers from the other ITG committees to create a Service Catalog for the University.
• The service catalog survey was sent out to ITAC members.
• 13 have responded so far, 16 have not. A follow-up email was sent out to those that have not responded.
• Responses will be collected through next week.
• The ECAR methodology is being used
• A ServiceNow committee representative has been added to the committee to assist with determining if ServiceNow will work to host the catalog.
• The data will be collected and analyzed once the survey is closed.
Item 5: Discussion on Committee Co-Chair
Description: Discuss the option to revise the committee structure to have co-chairs.

- Several of the other IT Governance committees have moved to having staggered co-chairs so that there is consistency in leadership from one year to the next. It has worked well for them.
- This would be instead of chair and parliamentarian.
- This is something that this committee might consider. Electing one co-chair from the existing committee membership and then electing another from the new committee membership in September.
- Conversation that these should be called Chair Elects and not Co-Chairs.
  - The term co-chair implies shared duties whereas chair elect implies a succession plan.
- There is a lot to be said for the Chair Elect concept so that the person knows that they are going to be the chair the next year.
- Motion to establish the position of Chair Elect on this committee. The Chair Elect would be chair elect 1 year and then act as a chair for 1 year.
- The committee chair would serve for 1 year.
- Vote: 8 in favor, 1 abstention.
- The election for a new committee chair will be held at the July meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm