

Information Technology Advisory Council
September 23rd, 2019 (3p-4:30p, Library 440)

Attendance:	Present :	Absent:		Attendance:	Present:	Absent:
Buckles, Jennifer	X			Liedtka, Theresa	X	
Carver, Ethan	X			Luehrs, Beth	X	
Chambers, Harriet	X			Matthews, Matt	X	
Crawford, Beth	X			Mustafa, Abeer	X	
Denniston, Terry	X			Pou, Laure	X	
Forrest, Tyler	X			Rigler, Michelle	X	
Gao, Lani		X		Rogers, Brian	X	
Gendron, Dennis	X			Rumbaugh, Stephen	X	
Jain, Hemant	X			Wilferth, Joe	X	
Guests: Tony Parsley	X			Guests: Dawn Ford	X	

Minutes:

1) Welcome and Announcements

1. Welcome new members: Beth Crawford (CHEPS representative),
2. Abeer Mustafa and Michelle Rigler (Enrollment Mgt and Student Affairs representatives)
 - i) Members went around the room and introduced themselves
3. ITAC website: <https://www.utc.edu/information-technology-advisory-council/>
 - i) Minutes and agenda posted here, along with other committee information.

2) Information Technology Updates

1. VoIP (Dennis)
 - i) A complicated project, that involves both infrastructure improvements, upgrades and personnel training
 - ii) Hoping to roll out in the next few weeks
 - iii) Integration w/O365 being explored
 - iv) Same group of people running this project running over projects
 - v) Emailing out soonish to October

2. CIO Recruitment (Theresa)
 - i) Chaired by Yancy Freeman
 - ii) Buddy LeTtureano is the consultant running the broader search as well as outreach
 - iii) Meeting on October 3rd to reduce to 10 individuals to do Zoom interviews
 - iv) Then determine individuals to bring to campus
 - v) Determining questions to ask as well as itinerary for on-campus
 - vi) Want to get IT staff on-the-ground to have facetime with candidates
 - vii) Assumption of bringing 3-4 to campus
3. Budget Request Outcome, 2019-2020 (Theresa)
 - i) Last year, IT put forth a budget request around \$1million
 - (1) \$650k was being ongoing money
 - (2) Campus asked for prioritization
 - ii) Received top priority - new Network Systems Engineer to base
 - iii) Second request was Classroom Refresh (\$260k - got it as one-time money)
 - (1) Refreshing 15-16 classrooms this year
 - (2) Will try to get money to base again for next year
 - (3) Rooms selected managed by Yancy - standard general classrooms
 - (4) Ongoing discussion of how funded vs. ownership
 - (5) Will begin in December during fall break
 - iv) Next request was \$100k for data center infrastructure
 - (1) Went to base
 - v) Next request was Banner position (recurring to base)
 - (1) Got most of base
 - (2) Budget office discovered 2nd Banner account (some money came from here)
 - vi) Also got \$50k for Duo to base (Two-factor Authentication)
 - vii) Requested a Client Services position (did not receive)
 - viii) Requested \$100k inflation money (got about \$40k)
 - ix) Campus budget process for next year is just starting
 - x) Question - move as much as we could off Technology Fee and to base budget?
 - (1) Tyler - we had moved all the people off the Technology Fee
 - (2) Tyler - otherwise a multi-year process
4. Qualtrics (Tony)
 - i) Background:
 - (1) 9 months ago - UTC & UTM opt out
 - (2) Campus committed to QuestionPro | Individual Qualtrics licenses
 - ii) Within the last three weeks - informed of a new contract
 - (1) UTC included but not informed
 - iii) Two survey options - QuestionPro & Qualtrics
 - (1) One year extension w/options | Communications to the campus
 - (2) Offered a three year extension, but UTK CIO doesn't want Knoxville to know

- iv) Comes down to features offered
 - (1) If you are new to Qualtrics, you're limited to 200 responses.
 - (2) We would have to send a request to bump that up.
 - (3) If you already have an account, it's unlimited responses.
- v) Stats:
 - (1) QuestionPro
 - (a) 552 UTC users have created accounts
 - (b) 316 surveys created
 - (c) 15,700 responses collected
 - (2) Qualtrics
 - (a) 164 UTC users have logged in
 - (b) 83 surveys created
 - (c) 19,000 responses collected
- vi) IT going to announce to campus this week
 - (1) Asked Qualtrics to send any potential new business back to IT
 - (2) Current information around Service Catalog points to UTK documentation
 - (3) Suggested to add Deans and Department Heads to outreach emails
 - (4) Thank you to Tony Parsley for taking lead on getting communication out
 - (5) Discussion about how to budget for it next year if we have to pay for it again
- 5. External Email Tagging (Tony)
 - i) Tagging of emails (not blocking) originating from outside UTC
 - ii) To help prevent phishing attempts against faculty and staff
 - iii) Will require training alongside roll-out
 - iv) Can request email be classified as internal by contacting the UTC Help Desk
 - v) Requesting a complete list of domains/emails to be whitelisted
 - (1) Library and other partners to add to this list
 - vi) Request to make color contrast of body banner is better for accessibility purposes

3) Classroom Technology Refresh, a new strategy – Theresa, Matt, Tony

1. Funding classrooms managed by Registrar vs. those managed by Departments, this issue hung up progress on funding needed technology in classrooms.
2. Department owned = first crack at space, then to Registrar for remaining space to Yancy's team
3. Ownership shut down a lot of conversation around refresh and budget
4. Recognized need for more general classrooms
5. As ITAC, we don't care who owns the room, or who pays for funding, we just care that they get refreshed
6. A subgroup for ITAC meeting next week to begin conversation to get a holistic room cost
7. Present the Chancellor with a large bottom line, then they can handle the budget aspect
8. Question - result in changes to capacity to room?
 - i) No is just a strict 1-to-1 replacement of hardware

- ii) Other meetings would address room structure
- 9. Comment - look at it from a furniture refresh perspective
 - i) Send list of existing rooms to Tyler
- 10. Suggestion - look at lighting too
- 11. Suggestion/Question - comprehensive audit + prioritization of hardware/furniture
- 12. Question - do we look at space utilization? Yes (if EMS)
 - i) If using EMS, we know about use
 - ii) As things degrade, the desire to use the room decreases

4) Training Task Force – Theresa

- 1. Draft documents (charge) sent to IITAC member in advance of meeting, any comments or suggested changes?
- 2. 3 years ago we had a version of this task force, but initial work was shut down when larger IT governance model was folded.
- 3. Training to include: Ubiquitous productivity software - trying to get something up and running for campus
- 4. Also around secondary software (for example - IRIS)
- 5. Departments represented on this group: IT, Human Resources, Walker, Library, Academic Affairs, Employee Relations, Faculty Senate, Employee Relations (1 or 2 others?)
- 6. Possibility that LinkedIn Learning licenses might be part of this

5) Help Desk Proposal – Tony

- 1. Looking at data to help make recommendations to Executive Team
- 2. For the last two years, we've been leveraging Ellucian for nights and weekends for 24/7 support
- 3. Tony shared data around tickets created, see attached.
 - i) Total of 56k tickets created in last two years
 - ii) 17% of tickets in last two years were created after hours
 - iii) 11% of tickets in last two years were created during weekends
 - iv) 28% of tickets were generated after hours
- 4. Why are people calling? Mostly passwords
 - i) 70-75% of tickets are password related
- 5. How can we reduce the number of tickets?
- 6. Option 1: Stay with CHD (\$90-100k to do that)
- 7. Option 2: Bring in-house (\$ depends on coverage, \$70k til midnight (M-F), ½ FT + students)
- 8. Option 3: UTK for after-hours support (no cost model present)
- 9. Option 4: Partner w/library to provide and walk-in support after-hours
- 10. Option 5: Go back to standard business hours (pre-Ellucian)
- 11. Question: Is SACS an issue here, for online students? | What do our competitors do?
- 12. Question: UTK operators would be able to help w/passwords?
- 13. Comment: UTK would be better than CHD at least in our world.

14. Comment: UTK option would require a lot of work, policies & processes
15. Comment: Issue is how to escalate (student satisfaction rate stayed the same)
16. Comment: Executive Team doesn't need an endorsement, they need how to address concerns
17. Comment: We do need 24/7 support (what does data support in terms of need?)
18. Comment: If providing online, provide 24/7
19. Comment: International students on different time zones, provide 24/7
20. Comment: Structure around current small demands vs. structure for the future?
21. Collective endorsement of 24/7 support going forth

Action Item:

- TL work with IT on statement of support and send past ITAC members

6) Technology Review Board, an idea – Tony and Brian

1. See attached Technical Review Board powerpoint
 - i) Idea been around for a long-time
 - ii) Sub-committee of ITAC
 - iii) Review of Purchases, Propose Standards
 - o Labs
 - o Signage -
 - o Online education
 - o Security
 - o Commons practices.....
 - iv) Lean, fast, efficient
 - v) Beth
 - (1) What about including the contract office....they can tell you about softwarethings that are big enough.
 - (2) You are right, need help from business offices
 - vi) Tyler
 - (1) Getting better
 - (2) Good idea, but I question, how do we integrate.....Canon.....how do I make you a part of the process, when, how....contract is ending, we are talking with canon and getting engaged....what about this contract from an IT perspective....do we need to be involved...IT and user perspective
 - (3) If we do the guidelines, the technical manual should cover.....
 - (4) We don't want to hold up thing and a challenge will be to stay nimble
 - vii) Laure
 - (1) Communication effort will be huge, let them know, the admins, Turn-around time, Identify instances of purchasing
 - viii) Tyler
 - (1) Push contracts to IT

ix) Hemant

- (1) Subgroup, higher level advisory....Some of TRB functionals are operational....should those come out, Make the TRB more visionary piece, proactive, not reactive, Different ideas from around the campus could come tot his group

x) Dennis

- (1) this group would look at IoT, we only have so many cycles in IT

xi) Theresa

- (1) Notes need for high level view on Internet of Things, but some group to approver operational issues like, lab standards (interior design student), login standards (emcs story), and signage (one signage system due to needs of emergency response)

xii) Brian

- (1) Initially we will be reactive....we are conditioned that way....would eventually be proactive, need to talking to the people doing the work

xiii) Beth

- (1) Fits our advisory role,maybe a task force for operational issue

xiv) ?

- (1) Need to be more thorough in our recommendations and investigations, and base our decisions on sounds knowledge of environment (technology, finance, culture)

xv) Theresa

- (1) For example the CHD decision, it's a support issue, but also a financial issue do we want 24/7 – in the absence of the budget – we made the recommendation to go 24/7, then someone else takes over

xvi) Joe

- (1) Suggested the ITAC compare its charge to the charge of the proposed TRB

Action Item:

- Compare ITAC Charge to TRB Charge; look for explicit scopes from both groups
- All, be prepared to continue discussion at our next meeting

7) ITAC Expectations / Guiding Documents – Theresa

1. Information derived from planning meeting w/Ellucian a few years back
2. One-pager pulled from those notes

Action Items:

- All please read document be prepared to discuss at next meeting

8) Review of action items from previous meeting

1. Any further need to be involved in directory conversation?
 - i) Nope. Eliminated all the folks who shouldn't be showing up.
2. Came up w/HR for offboarding process
 - i) There are often exceptions to the rule that complicate the process
 - ii) We don't have any policies around retention of campus software access
3. P drive has been in read-only mode since May
 - i) Disable access upon campus communication + archive for a year
4. ITAC guiding document
 - i) See above
5. Using automated time approval (IRIS through UT System - ESS Employee Self-Service)
 - i) Leave requests and such (Budget & Finance, Athletics piloted this last month)
 - ii) Chronos used via Arc, maybe want to use in UC
 - iii) Police department can't work with IRIS
 - iv) It's not a timekeeping, but a time requesting or time reporting in IRIS
 - v) Could help eliminate paper

Next Meeting:

Friday, October 25, 2019, 2pm to 330pm, Library 440 (SWR)

Summary of Action Items:

- Centrall Help Desk
 - o TL draft statement of support for 24/7 help desk support, not withstanding budget priiroities, and send past ITAC members
- Technology Review Board
 - o Compare ITAC Charge to TRB Charge; look for explicit scopes from both groups
 - o All, be prepared to continue discussion at our next meeting
- All please read document be prepared to discuss at next meeting