Meeting Minutes

February 16, 2018
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
JK Williams Building Conference Room 212

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITC Members</th>
<th>ITG Program Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Othmane Bouhali (TAMUQ)</td>
<td>X Tyler Raszick X Juan Garza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Leonard Bright</td>
<td>Leonard Rivera X Joshua Kisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Jeffrey Burton</td>
<td>X Dr. Simon Sheather X Missy Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Butler-Purry</td>
<td>X Dr. Jorge Vanegas Lea Ann Westmoreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. David Carlson</td>
<td>Mark Herzog (Ex-Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X M. Dee Childs</td>
<td>X Dr. Pete Marchbanks (Ex-Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Tim Davis</td>
<td>Chair – AIC X Dr. Barteau in place of Dr. Butler-Purry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Darren Depoy</td>
<td>X Chair – EAC – Adam Mikeal X Beverly Irby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Susan Edmisson</td>
<td>X Chair – IRPSC – Karen Hrncir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Harris</td>
<td>X Chair – RITC – Aaron Brender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wesley Highfield (TAMUG)</td>
<td>X Chair – TTLTC – Catharina Laporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Joseph Pettibon, III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes: Scheduled Business

**Item 1:** Welcome & Introductions
Description: Welcome and introduction of new members

Dee welcomed the group, the new chairpersons, and the new Vice President for Research, Dr. Mark Barteau, as a new member of the SITC committee. Round-table introductions followed.

**Item 2:** Purpose of the SITC
Description: Refresher on the role and purpose of the SITC for new members and ex-officio members.

Joshua Kisee addressed the group and explained the purpose of the SITC and how it works.
The next meeting dates for this committee will be May 23rd and August 9th. Josh will send a reminder to the group.

**Item 3: System Regulation Update**

**Description:** Review and discussion of revised TAMUS Regulation 29-01-03, rev 02052018.

Extended discussion ensued on the topic. Joshua Kissee suggested that a round table poll be conducted and those comments are recorded. A motion was made and seconded to conduct that poll. Comments and concerns from the poll were regarded as such.

- Dr. Tim Davis – Many concerns regarding the policy update. The wording needs to be fully analyzed. There is no mention of educational equipment related requirements or exceptions related to physical access. Concerned that the faculty will express dismay if proper exceptions aren't considered. The faculty need better access to computing resources than outlined in the policy. Concerned that such a policy change did not have any faculty input prior to publication.
- Dr. Barteau – The way it is worded, it is not clear what is meant or intended as policy outcomes. Definitions for interpretation and the exception process are warranted. The bullet points do not include the word “research.” How does such a policy change the concept of cloud computing? Requesting an exception is different than defining what is “out of scope.”
- Dr. Simon Sheather – Doesn’t understand how putting servers in the same location addresses the problem of risk. Seems to help with power or location but does not address the main risk.
- Dr. Darren Depoy – Does this really protect us? The goals of security and risk are very different. This hinges on the intent of the policy outcome. Is encryption the issue, because that can be done with other solutions. Not okay with educational machines being moved to a building 2 miles away.
- Dr. Beverly Irby – If we are to complete this in 18 months and offer a smooth transition, would it interrupt grant work? What about paying for space on these servers, is that going to be reclaimed? The payment and liability are all questions related to this.
- Dr. Jorge Vanegas – What about the other A&M Universities? Does this include Galveston etc.? What are the drivers for this being done? What is the great opportunity here? How was this policy developed? How will this be implemented and how will it be enforced? What are the consequences? What are the outcomes? What about collateral effects that are not considered? Another collateral effect to be noted – do we then incorporate rental and use of that space? If that roof leaks, what happens to our data center? Who will absorb those costs? If the system is requiring this, are they going to take liability of requiring everything to be in this building? What about staff related to maintaining our server rooms? Are they going to be let go?
- Dr. Catharina Laporte – As a committee, do we have a say so in this type of thing going forward? Does this committee possess the clout to be reached out to before something like this going forward?

From Dr. Laporte’s question, Dee was asked if this was her vision for the group. Dee says that was not her intent. IT Governance is intended for developing strategic initiatives using the voice of the university community. She did feel that IT Governance, i.e. the SITC committee, should be able to voice their opinion on matters such as this.

- Juan Garza – To clarify, this is not a Texas A&M policy, this is a Texas A&M System policy that is outside the scope of our control. As a group, if you feel this is something that should be a function of this group, that is your call and we can update the ITG framework.
• Dr. Leonard Bright – Has this policy been discussed with the System prior to release?

Dee replied that she had received information that a revised policy was being considered prior to its release, but was unsure whether there had been an input/review process or system governance committee used to develop the policy.

• Dr. Irby replied that maybe this is an opportunity to do something with TAMUS policy development in the future.

**Item 4: Next Steps for IT Governance**

**Description:**

- Executive IT Council (April 30, 2018)
- ITG Connection to the Budget-Cycle
- Strategic Plan for IT

Dee discussed her vision for the SITC, and the ITG program as a whole. When we come up with strategic initiatives, we will likely ask for resources from the university. Dee would like to align findings from the committee to annual and biannual budgets with the University.

**Item 5: FY18 Committee Objectives**

**Description:** Presentation and discussion of the FY18 objectives from each of the ITG Committees.

- Adopt and/or modify objectives?
- What may be missing?
- Where should SITC prioritize

Each committee presented their main objectives that had been chosen and voted on by each committee. AIC representative was not present, so Joshua Kissee presented their priorities and explained how they were determined.

Adam Mikeal presented for the EAC.
Karen Hrncir presented for the IRPSC.
Aaron Brender presented on behalf of Dr. Susan Bloomfield for the RITC.
Dr. Catharina Laporte presented for the TTLTC.

Dr. Jorge Vargas suggested that groups look at the possibility of teaming up and leveraging for shared resources. There is potential synergy there for both existing and new equipment.

Joshua Kissee handed out a depicting a synthesis of the needs expressed across the committees and the previous needs identified by the SITC.

Dr. Irby stated that she was concerned about item number 2 on the AIC objectives and how that will work with the new strategy of the West Campus data center and the updated TAMUS policy. If someone sees this as an item, will they then assume that this committee supports the new TAMUS regulation? Juan explained that all minutes are posted so this committees concerns and opinions will be transparent.
Joe Pettibon- Are the objectives an evaluation of what really is the most important and will this group voice what they feel the committees should be working on?

Joshua Kissee explained that the goal of the exercise was for the SITC to give feedback to the committees on their priorities.

It was asked if the committees should delay their work and wait for feedback from this group. The answer offered was “no.” It was expressed that if the committees felt it important enough to deem as a priority objective, then they should go forward.

Dee suggested that we circulate the results from the polling that took place today, and convene digitally via email as to what the group wants to do regarding the system regulation.

Meeting adjourned at 2:06pm