

IT Governance Program – Enterprise Applications Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2021
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Zoom

Attendance:

EAC Members		Ex- Officio Members	
X	Dr. Debjyoti Banerjee	X	Joshua Kisse (Chair)
X	Lisa Blazer		Carl Ivey
X	Lauri Brender		Chris Reed
X	William Deigaard	X	Michael Ringham
	Laura Dohnalik	X	Daniel Roberts
	Jacob Donais	X	Dean Poppell
	Dr. Juan Garza	X	Mauro Sericano
	Jon Griffey		Dr. Hank Walker

ITG Program Support		EAC Guests	
X	Sharon Mainka	X	Kyle Paige
X	Missy Mouton	X	Dan Schmiedt
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.*

- Josh Kisse welcomed the group. No new announcements.

Item 2: Annual Review and Lessons Learned

Description: *Discussion of Lessons Learned from the committee this year and considerations for moving forward.*

1. The EAC has a clear and relevant set of [committee objectives and scope](#). Would you make changes to the scope or objectives?

- a. Dean – Years 1-2 held consistent membership, third year was a significant change in membership. Should update with new committee and leverage past work from scope changes.
 - b. Ramesh – Review is needed of the last 5 bullets of the EAC charter for the data management related scoped items. IDAC should review these bullets for their upcoming charter development if approved.
 - c. William – Consider how to adjust ITG scope/objective items in the context of potential changes at TAMU during the fall.
2. What do you believe drives the decision-making within the EAC? For example, the committee could be driven by its mission, vision, values, or any number of factors including committee dynamics.
- a. William – The EAC responded to items from the Provost. In other cases, an issue is raised by a member and brought further to discussion and action.
 - b. Daniel – Good progress made with subcommittees and task forces between meetings. A lot of progress has been made on projects.
3. The EAC focuses on the most appropriate strategic topics (why/if/who) and less on tactics (how/when).
- a. William – Crossed over between both strategic and tactical. Need to discuss “what should just be provided” in terms of delivering IT services.
 - b. Sharon – EAC was steered away from funding recommendations, but should be focused on the strategic recommendation and then EITC would decide.
4. Does the current committee member representation reflect the right representatives for the EAC scope? What would you change?
- a. William – Could consider including AgriLife (College of Agriculture) or TEES (College of Engineering). Could also include other system agencies or institutions.
 - b. Dean – Consider including the Library, VetMed, or other large groups to be specifically represented.
5. Do you believe the EAC has been an effective committee through its input, decision-making, and deliverables produced for other committees?
- a. Sharon – EAC created more reports than any other committee. Most recommendations were accepted, including Qualtrics, and Syncplicity.
 - b. Mike R. – We were an effective team.
6. Would you make any changes to the meeting times, days, agenda format, communication format, or other logistical items?
- a. Mike R – Well organized and no surprises.
 - b. William – Agree that the committee was well organized.
 - c. Josh – Agree that the committee was well organized.
7. What suggestions would you make for continual improvement for the EAC? For the entire governance program?
- a. Dr. Banerjee – Should send a representative from EAC to significant bodies across TAMU to highlight what is under development at the EAC and ITG in general. Groups could include Faculty Senate, Student Body, Staff Council, CPI, etc. The greater TAMU community should

receive updates from ITG.

Next meeting scheduled for August 24. At that meeting there will be an election and call for the new co-chair for the next term and install Daniel as the new chair in the upcoming year.

Meeting adjourned.