IT Council Steering Committee (ITC) Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 18th, 2016
0120 Patuxent

Attending
Eric Denna, Drew Baden, Paul Dworkis, Jim Zanhis, Sean Phillips, Marcio Oliveira, Chris Kernan, Gerry Sneeringer, Ron Yaros, Cindi Hale, Jan Plane, Alison Robinson, Robin Puett, Joe Drasin, Chris Kernan, and Amanda Petersen (minutes)

Excused
Paul Jaeger, Ron Yaros, Adam Porter, Kevin Prem

Agenda
1. GAFE Update/Risks
3. Non-DIT issues?
4. IT Governance - How do we identify, prioritize design, resource, and implement systems on campus?

1. GAFE Update/Risks
   a. DIT and ~200 early adopters have already moved to GAFE. We’ve had great support on campus, but we may have to pull back slightly to ensure bandwidth, structure communication, etc. runs as smooth as possible.
   b. DIT is working with people how they’d like to notify departments, as well as working on dates now through October to sign up (ARES). We want to work with people when they want to move. The first weekend is the early adopters, the third is those they’re supporting. The longer we drag out the conversion, the harder it becomes.
   c. Calendaring is the pain point for most people- trying to keep groups together in whatever way will make their life easier. It’s helpful to group around calendars- if people calendar together, we want to move them together.
   d. It’s ok to change as long as people feel like they can do their job. People are encouraged to watch the training; gut reactions are, “Wow, this is a lot of work!” Many are worried- they’re scared they’ll lose data. If someone could come talk to them it may help.
      i. Can we highlight features? Maybe the top 10 things that people use/need, and how they translate in Google? That may help them not feel like they need to watch the training in its entirety which may seem overwhelming.
ii. Searching is very different between Outlook and Gmail. It would help a lot of people to go into this knowing that it’s going to be ok- it’ll take some time to adjust, but we’re ready to help alleviate concerns.

2. Network monitoring [article in the NYT]
   a. Our data can save us, and has, saved us.
   b. We want people to know we’re not monitoring where they’re going, etc.
   c. 1) Disclosure, and 2) rationale are very important. Let’s share information: what the issue is, what we’re doing and not doing (not reading email or saving your data), what are the risks, what it’s preventing, etc.
   d. Miscommunication or lack of understanding triggers this sort of information.
   e. We don’t to only tell part of the story or reveal only part of the information. If the same message goes to everyone that will help people's level of comfort.
   f. Gerry will share all the information then we have with the IT Council and IT Security group, and the groups can pull out from there. This should be based on policy not mechanism- mechanism can change rapidly.
   g. Gerry will get facts to Jim’s security group and this ITC body. Reactions, questions, etc. can be discussed quickly. Next, Eric will work on a rationale (facts + letter) to send out by the end of next week; starting with the 3D’s and Cabined. Immediately thereafter he can send this out to all of campus (students included).

3. Non-DIT issues?
   a. The Senate website outlines what we should do (mostly DIT-related issues), but we need to do what we feel right as well- what do we do about non-DIT issues?
      i. Lyterati.
      ii. Course Eval system.
         1. This was a good faith attempt to better what we had before, but front end is worse. Have we made progress?
         2. This is shared governance. Can we talk and do better? This council can be a benefit.
      iii. Eric, Drew, and the 5 chairs will be included in a meeting- we’ll see how it goes then bring it to the ITC to discuss.

4. How do we identify, prioritize design, resource, and implement systems on campus?
   a. (Handouts)
   b. Systems are about process, people, and tools. Not technology.
      i. This definition by Eric has become “annoying” to people in recent weeks, but it’s important him.
      ii. If we don’t tackle our processes, we’re wasting money on technology.
      iii. Prioritizing is a real challenge here.
      iv. The real question is: is this about IT governance or systems governance? If it’s just IT, we should stop meeting. Do we believe we need systems governance, and if so, what does it look like? A lot of our current challenges are because
we have not looked at systems. What is the optimal governance for systems? Is this the right way to govern? Who is thinking about systems if we’re not?

1. i.e.: Course Charge Processor (CCP).

v. This committee doesn’t run campus- we shouldn’t be in the management of the systems, but we can talk about how as a university we can identify, implement, etc. resources across campus.

vi. The hardest part of tacking systems on campus is the people-side. We’ll likely “break some eggs” in the process.

vii. There has to be a sweet spot- we don’t want to “gum up” the process, but we’re making mistakes and they’re costing real money when we don’t have it; a lot of time the biggest cost is the loss in productivity. We could make life easier for the people, but there are risks. People are frustrated.

viii. We may need to go back to the Senate and say, “We need to reconsider the organization of this body.” Eric wants to come back with an answer to the question of this this topic: “how do we identify, prioritize design, resource, and implement systems on campus?”