IT Governance Program – Enterprise Applications Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2020
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
General Services Center Conference Room 2605

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Ex- Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Debjyoti Banerjee</td>
<td>Dr. Julie Harlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bolton</td>
<td>Venesa Heidick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri Brender</td>
<td>Carl Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefanie Davidson</td>
<td>Dr. 'Jon Jasperson (Chair)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Dohnalik</td>
<td>Joshua Kissee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Donais</td>
<td>Dean Poppell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Juan Garza</td>
<td>Chris Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Griffey</td>
<td>Dr. Hank Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Craig Coates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramesh Kannappan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Risinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jocelyn Widmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kris Wuensche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Deigaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Minutes: Scheduled Business

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

- Jon Jasperson welcomed the group.
- TTLTC working on a report on captioning software options.
- AIC looking into a 3-5 year roadmap on architecture and infrastructure on campus.
- RITC’s Research Storage Task Force is working on a report for the committee on options for research storage.

Item 2: Update from Service Catalog and Software Inventory Task Force
Description: Update from Service Catalog and Software Inventory Task Force
• The service catalog group has now had two meetings to discuss what has happened in the past and where to go from here with the service catalog. Looked at Ohio State, Florida, Notre Dame. Working on setting up a call with Ohio State.

• Four meetings are set up and we are continuing to meet.
  o Session 1: Review existing benchmarks and benchmarking artifacts.
  o Session 2: Proposal outline development.
  o Sessions 3 and 4: Proposal writing.

• The intent is to include both service inventory and catalog presentation. Also recommendation on continuously maintaining the list.

• Another team was working on a software inventory. A survey was sent out previously, and we should have results from the DOJ investigation. The intent is to include software as well and several peer examples include both. The peer examples also included cloud-based services. Also included data related to accessibility, FERPA, HIPPA, issues for each option.

• How will we get results from faculty using software not on an official list?

• Intent was to identify usage across campus so we can consolidate licenses. Identify ways to standardize on student technologies.

**Item 3: Call for Creation of a Drop Box Task Force**

**Description:** Respond to a request from the Provost to create a Task Force to review the usage of Drop Box on Campus.

- We have more specific details on this coming from the Provost. Dropbox contacted the Provost on this. They said that we currently have 33,000 Drop Box accounts with tamu.edu and it was suggested that we get an enterprise site license to save money. The request coming from the Provost is to look at the file sharing options we have available including Drop Box. Include Syncplicity, Google Drive, Microsoft One Drive, etc.

- We can work through Drop Box to have them provide better data and having task force determine the amount of Drop Box use as well as other solutions. The goal is to determine what we feel should be our preferred sharing and storage solution.

- Is this an architecture and infrastructure or an enterprise applications item? It was suggested to do a task force because it can be made up of people from any and all areas.

- A motion was made that the EAC create a task force for file sharing and storage. Motion seconded. All in favor, none opposed.

- We need someone to lead this task force. It was open for conversation on how to identify who these members should be and identifying a single member to lead this task force.

- Recommendation on how to present this information back to the Provost, what should the charge of this task force be? It was suggested to provide current options and recommendations on current usage based on different data classifications.

- Charge: what is current usage. 5 current products, Drop Box, Syncplicity, Google Drive, One Drive, Filex, plus others, comparison of features, recommendation include yes or no to Drop Box and recommendation on where to go for file sharing/ storage.

- Jon will work with Sharon Mainka to identify the members of this task force.

**Item 4: Call for Review of Educational Enterprise Applications**

**Description:** Review and Revision of Committee Goals and Objectives.
• The Faculty Senate forwarded a request to our committee: Julie Harlin briefly talked about educational enterprise applications. Julie is asking for a review of those pieces. The Faculty Senate feels like we need to make sure we are serving people at a high level of efficiency and effectiveness, and that we are where we need to be with those applications.

• Julie told the group that she has discussed with Jon and Joe Pettibon and that they both felt this committee was the best place to start.

• Discussion:
  What overlap does committee feel with Academic Innovations and where their responsibilities end and ours start. AI would be with LMS only and have a separate committee.

• EIS has their own advisory committee, which is not officially a part of the ITG committee, but representation here can take feedback to their committee. Several of these items are under the purview of the EIS advisory committee, and not EAC.

• Request is looking for opportunity to have this discussion with a large group of stakeholders and what we need to move forward.

• Does this committee feel it would be useful to consider the existing implementation of the student management system and is it meeting the needs of users across the university? This would be in the scope of this committee.

• Would the liaison subcommittee with EIS advisory committee be an option?

• Last on list was actively implementing a feedback loop with users. The EIS committee reviews work order requests as they come in. Need some way to come back to groups and look to see what needs to be resolved and improved.

• The scope of request and some items seem to fall in other areas of operation and not this committee. There are other groups on campus that have these responsibilities. The EIS advisory committee makes recommendations on what items should be improved in the student information management system. Others, such as the university advising council can provide feedback. We can help facilitate the conversation with EIS, perhaps through a subcommittee.

• Recommended action to be taken:
  Ramesh will follow up on getting representatives from Faculty Senate to the EIS advisory committee.

Item 5: **Update and Discussion on Committee Objectives**
Description: **Review and Revision of proposed Committee Goals and Objectives.**

• The group reviewed the document showing existing objectives, which is also currently available in Google Drive.

• Discussed the list of recommendations:
  ○ New ones to consider,
  ○ Number two to be stricken
  ○ New ideas for objectives were discussed
  ○ A replacement was suggested for number 3

• All of these changes/updates may be seen by reviewing the document in the Google Drive which has tracked all changes.

• We need an action plan to determine where we are going with this, looking for recommendations.

• Group agreed to create a new task force and see how what is being done there meets these objectives.
This doc will be revised, then 'Jon suggested existing members view this and make recommendation on that doc so it will be documented.

Meeting adjourned: 3:30 p.m.