Attendees: David Sweeney, Tom Lyster, Allison Oslund, Erick Beck, Jim Bouse, Juan Garza, Jim Rosser, Adam Mikeal, Andy Bland, Ron Szabo, Becky Carr, Aaron Brender, Stephen Balfour, Michelle Osterholm, Dr. Marchbanks, Steve Conway, Mark Harris, Chuck Braden, Bill Chollett

Meeting Leader: Andy Bland

Recorder: Lori O’Bannon

Item 1: Approval of minutes: Minutes were unanimously approved.

Item 2: Announcements:

Essential Elements: Requests Additional Members

- Juan Garza solicits assistance from ITAC membership to join Essential Elements Committee.
- Juan reviews specific areas needing aid.
- Further, Juan states if individual ITAC members cannot provide assistance, perhaps people in their unit that might be considered as Subject Matter Experts (SME), and could provide input to committee’s work product; allowable if SME to provide input via written documentation.
- Examples of Chapters requiring support: Data classification, Data Management, Security, Platform Management, Business Continuity, Disaster Recovery
- Juan passed out Essential Elements’ Chapter Titles: brief summary of the level of content/guidelines for the chapters.
  - David Sweeney states the document is written as an overview of Essential Elements. He anticipates it will be revised continuously.
  - Adam Mikeal relays each chapter outlines philosophical approach; to include attach appendices of specific approach: The examples will be applicable to Business and Academic models and implementation while conforming to the philosophical approach.
  - The basic structure of each Chapter is in 2 parts: General Principles/General Approach
  - Ron Szabo adds the Essential Elements’ text is a living document that will be constantly updated, and asks for a date to be inserted as footer. Therefore, chronicling progress and validating to those individuals reading the document for guidance, that they are reviewing the latest version.

Item 2: New IT Trends: No member had input

Item 3: Mobile Strategies: Alison Oslund, David Sweeney, and Adam Mikael
(See IT Forum Presentation) http://itforum.tamu.edu/IT_Forum_Archive/June_6__2012.php

- Motto: “We are going to beat UT.”
- After months of spirited discussions, The Mobile Strategy Team has delivered some solid recommendations:
- David Sweeney announced Allison’s Oslund’s team has put together a new web source
Item 3: Mobile Strategies  
  cont.
  o Allison Oslund relayed the purpose of the website is to inform folks of the philosophical recommendation for web developers and IT managers.

  • The Go Mobile site outlines the key strategies, the framework, and the best practices proposed in designing the website to accommodate all mobile devices.
    o Website will be released end of June
    o For more information, go to “Go Mobile,” website address: gomobile.tamu.edu

  • David Sweeney continued this is the first year mobile devices outnumbered desktops. The new trend has begun. “End of desktop dominance.”

  • Eric Beck relays the paradigm shift is moving so fast to mobile adaptation; you have to adapt to mobile views or will be behind preferred mobile information distribution.

  • According to preliminary website testing, Erick indicated they have met the accessibility challenge.

  • Adam Mikeal states the team has investigated different website frameworks and ultimately decided on (RWD)
    o Responsive Web Design: RWD is the mobile design team’s recommendation. It uses a cascading style sheet and a small amount of javascript which allows for the design of a regular website that pushes content to all devices.
    o The RWD is appropriate to the device that is receiving the delivery, and it allows the developer to maintain one set of content.
    o Benefit: Websites scale down and provides full content.
    o Provides good experience for the “end user”: Takes into consideration interaction in a different environment. For example, the use of your finger for navigation with mobile device, and a mouse in other traditional computing devices- Not a clumsy transition.

  • Allison Oslund states there are some sites that are very complex and might need a different version for mobile systems. Allison conveys that her group is available to assist in that development.
    o Allison recommends that ITAC members join the listserv, and ask questions.
    o Allison challenges the ITAC members to evaluate how far away their unit/ dept. is from providing that mobile experience?
    o Sign up: gomobile-l@listserv.tamu.edu

  • Any Bland asked Allison Oslund, as time draws closer and production begins, perhaps readdress the issue to the ITAC committee and provide some updates. (Allison agreed to present at such a time).

Item 4: Columbia Advisory Group: Dr. Marchbanks, and Allison Oslund

  • Dr. Marchbanks, first commented on British Telecom (BT) audit findings:
    o BT located a lot of out of date patches on servers
    o BT located some remote desktops open through firewall
    o BT found some SSL certificates out of date.
    o Auditors still on campus and specifics for your organizations are coming.
Item 4: Columbia Advisory Group  cont.

- Dr. Marchbanks remarked, in his opinion, the chancellor, John Sharp, is looking to grasp the scope of the situation. Presently many departments with vulnerabilities, and the chancellor would rather “Put a thumb on someone,” instead of everyone in IT.
  - Dr. Marchbanks stated emphatically, Comp Admins have to become vigilant, and keep the systems running appropriate to standards /to auditor’s satisfaction. Make it the highest priority in your unit or dept.
- When CIS was audited: The auditor received privileged access; therefore they found some things that otherwise might not have been discovered.
  - Few instances had admin passwords on computer
  - As a reminder Dr. Marchbanks stated, “Reputation built over a lifetime and lost in a single hour or moment. “
  - Everyone is going to have to become attentive. Every person is responsible in preserving “TAMU’s IT reputation. “
- Dr. Marchbanks interjected a bit of good news. Texas A&M was listed as the 8th safest University in the nation for Networking Security.
- Everything British Telecom found can be found by asking Ellen Mitchell, Chief Security Analyst, Networking & Information Security, to execute a scan on webpages.
  - Ellen Mitchell’s group can detect any vulnerabilities, and assist in mitigating possible weaknesses.
  - Dr. Marchbanks stated the decision for CIS to make is “Are we going to wait until you ask, or are we going to get aggressive and run scans as a preemptive safeguarding measure?”
- Dr. Marchbanks stated he was disappointed in the Columbia Advisory Group’s (CAG) assessment. In his estimation, it was worded /geared for a business organization not Higher Ed, TAMU or the TAMUS.
- Dr. Marchbanks feels like Chancellor Sharp is very apprehensive.
- Dr. Marchbanks imparts advice to ITAC members to look at running as few systems as possible, backed by individual(s) with expert knowledge.
  - Andy Bland states, this is an opportunity to help ourselves / dept. and the University.
- Dr. Marchbanks states shared services is either going to be presented as “the way” of conducting business, or proactively as a dept. or group, you could began choosing a few areas of provisions that could be candidates for a shared services model. Then come to CIS and ask for assistance and guidance.
  - Neither Dr. Cantrell nor Dr. Marchbanks wants a forced customer; however, the IT community needs to understand that there is a real possibility for outsourcing of services.
    - Stephen Balfour asks, “Has the chancellor begun looking at the funding model so that there can be a reasonable way to fund Information Technology across campus?”
  - Dr. Marchbanks responded, “Not to his knowledge.” Dr. Marchbanks does add to the dialogue some overarching funding numbers for the committee’s consideration: IT personnel cost across campus is about 40-42 million- CIS represents about 17 million of that total personnel cost.
Item 4: Columbia Advisory Group  cont.

- Stephen Balfour expresses he is trying to figure out how to afford the centralized shared services. Those services available /offered thus far, such as hosted exchange are too expensive.
- Subsequently, Steve relays he has elected either not to have them, or pay someone else to run them for less.
- Steve Balfour is requesting for “someone “to come up with a reasonable funding model to make it work!”

- Dr. Marchbanks states we have to collectively look at the situation at hand: Dr. Marchbanks relays 2 examples: When more people are added to Exchange, it becomes less expensive. Neo presently has 85,000 accounts at a cost of 1 dollar a month.
  - Dr. Marchbanks declares he does not have the luxury to run email systems like the departments.
  - For example, CIS has to keep systems running, if a system is down, it is backed up, and if something happens to one data center, fails over to another data center.
- Steve Balfour states he does not contest that point, that is great for users, the problem is the funding model that the University uses has a ,“Huge barrier of entry,” that he cannot afford.

- Dr. Marchbanks states cooperatively ITAC members can present to executive management, “Why don’t you fund email like the power in the wall?”
  - If email is a utility funded from “the head shed,” then CIS does not have to charge individuals. If you are an employee of Texas A&M University you should be provided an email account whether you want it on Neo or Exchange. Email should be viewed as a commodity; an employee cannot function in today’s work environment without email.
  - Consequently, there would be “No cost for Neo or Exchange. However, If a dept. wants to run a different email system, it comes out of that department’s pocket.
  - Dr. Marchbanks suggests that ITAC get ahead of the problem, and suggest a solution to the chancellor.

- Dr. Marchbanks illustrates his point by stating Jim Riley, Energy Management, used to receive a budget and had to pay energy bills. Energy costs fluctuated so that finally his energy bills were paid by the “head shed.”

- Dr. Marchbanks asserts his hands are tied; he has to abide by service center rules.
- Juan Garza stated he migrated 1300 email users over to CIS’ hosted Exchange services.
  - He was able to get rid of seven Exchange servers.
  - Originally it was going to cost $10 per person, now it is $6.00 a person, due to volume of numbers; the price was lowered
  - Subsequently, his dept. has the availability of CIS hosted Exchange services, link, mobile link, etc.

- Stephen Balfour expresses the importance of coming up with a solution. He agrees, email should be seen as a commodity.
  - He does not want to strike up independent deals. Stephen Balfour did not know the cost fluctuated based upon number of users.
Item 4: Columbia Advisory Group  cont.
- Allison Oslund states (CAG) Columbia Advisory Group’s draft document was distressing, and Dr. Marchbanks agreed.
  - The draft document presented was a 2 page document.
    - It was obvious they had not reviewed the info they requested.
    - Everything (CAG) asked for was provided.
    - Dr. Marchbanks stated CIS prepared an “exercise.” of information. It would minimally take everyone present in the room a week to read what was provided.
    - Dr. Marchbanks does not think (CAG) reviewed the information.
    - Upon receipt of the draft, Dr. Cantrell spent an entire weekend adding recommendations to (CAG’s) draft.
    - It became evident that (CAG) did not have a full grasp as to the organizational structure of CIS, or Higher Ed.
    - The succeeding RFP responses are due back July 11th.
    - Allison Oslund stated the RFP did talk about consolidation, outsourcing, shared services, FAMIS, Banner Help Desk Center.
- Dr. Marchbanks ascertains, in his opinion, the numerous audits, and reports that followed has damaged the morale of his employees.
- Dr. Marchbanks relayed he hopes John Sharp, who was involved in the outsourcing of the Univ. of Texas Medical Center’s State Agencies in Austin, to a group in San Angelo is aware that that University of Texas and Agencies are not pleased with the outcome. (It was mentioned that the legislature knows that as well).
  - Andy Bland asks for the current cost of CIS hosted Exchange services?
  - Dr. Marchbanks states $6.00 a month today; Andy Bland states what do you get for 6.00 mailbox size, etc.?  
  - More discussion to follow regarding that topic.
- **Aaron Bender stated the security audit run by BT, the Nexus scan reports did not have right build dictionaries:** His dept. was identified with 20 different vulnerabilities- per OS systems, appropriate patch levels were in place. Aaron had to go back and provide BT with reference documentation; ultimately, his dept. was deemed secure and compliant.
  - Ellen Mitchell, NIS’s group was helpful. Question posed by Aaron to Dr. Marchbanks, “How much of that kind of possible false vulnerabilities made it back to the chancellor?“ In many cases, was it as bad as it was presented?
- Dr. Marchbanks replied: “I do not think it was as bad as it was presented; however, perception is reality.”
- Jim Bouse stated; If the chancellor decides the report is damning enough that he has to do something about it, he will act accordingly.
  - As a committee Jim wants to go on record as recommending that ITAC stand in front of that “perception.” Otherwise the chancellor will do something rash that will affect all of us.
- **Possible Action Item:** Ron Szabo asks Dr. Marchbanks, “What if ITAC writes a position paper regarding participating in CIS ‘hosted Exchange services, and present to Dr. Cantrell or the Chancellor?”
  - Dr. Marchbanks says that is a good idea. Historically; the question from where will the money come to fund a project?
  - ITAC committee to discuss in more detail
Item 4: Columbia Advisory Group  cont.

- Dr. Marchbanks has worked for every director and watched as they have tried to change CIS’ funding model. Not a one of them have been successful. Dr. Marchbanks wants to plant the seed, and let it organically develop on its own.
  - David Sweeney asks Dr. Marchbanks, What was his primary commonality for “them” conceding? What is the reason for opposition to modify a different funding model?
    - Dr. Marchbanks replied: “Primarily, the inability to show the source of funding.”
    - David Sweeney stated that ITAC needs to simultaneously concentrate efforts on answering that question?
- Dr. Marchbanks provided information to Dr. Cantrell to present to the provost regarding provisions/ costs for providing 12,000 exchange accounts for the University for just under $600,000. It was sent to Dr. Loftin.
  - David Sweeney, states he does not want to worry about running a commodity services.
  - David stated he would rather his IT professionals/ staff using his/ her time focusing on innovative provisions.

Item: 5: Shared Services: David Sweeney: (White Board Discussion Points)

- David starts discussion with questions for thought?
  - Have we not had good success with shared services?
  - Do we want to do this?
  - Why don’t we do it?
  - What we need to do to move forward?
1. Shared Services “is Good:” White Board Discussion Points
   - Advantageous
   - Have a CIO that has told us that one of his strategic objectives is to implement shared services on the campus
   - Outside forces push us in this direction
   - Provides Consistency of Services
   - Services are more efficient
2. Impediments to implementation to shared services:
   - Attitudes
   - Philosophies that have stopped the process
   - No flexibility
   - No customization
   - Unknown functionality
   - Give up control: Trust
   - Timing: “We can get it done faster; have to wait on someone else.”
   - Money: Too expensive, can’t afford
   - No funding model: Exchange, VOIP
   - Less Reliable /Belief based in fact or not, : we can do it better :ex: Zenworks
   - Shared Services offered prematurely: first model of NEO , shared document management
   - CIS / Dean level makes decision: without consulting the IT community
Item: 5: Shared Services  cont.

(David Sweeney suggests: ITAC is at a level of maturity that it can agree and champion the idea and make a point for shared services).

3. Slow to Act: Example: For example: How long have we been talking about Identity Management?
   - Have to overcome impediments decentralized IT groups have not moved forward with shared services. Have to figure out a way to overcome these impediments
   - Facts using centralized exchange, it may be more expensive for some, but not for all?
   - IT Governance Question as a committee: Overall in the scheme of things is it more advantageous for us to do this or not?
   - Possibility driven by other factors?
     - Maybe we gain reliability
     - Maybe we gain capacity: have personnel for innovation
     - Perhaps ITAC implement robust project plan
     - Trust overarching issue: CIS is in partnership with ITAC (changing thinking, we are a team).

Outcome: David Sweeney states there are a number of shared services that we could implement as an IT community? David Sweeney cautioned to choose one at a time.
   - 2 Shared services, sort of thrown out, as possible shared services contenders:
     - Identity Management and Centralized Exchange

David Sweeney outlines Identity Management:
   - Central authority
   - Want single sign on
   - Want CAS and Ldap, authenticate to AD.
   - Want to maintain control of security groups and AD so I can control access to resources.
   - That takes away account management off my plate.
   - I do not want separate credentials for exchange.
   - Juan Garza states ID Management is not vetted, except internally. Monitored on the back end, ID management. Proven approach is to take the mature service of Exchange
   - ID Management Office in place: Trez Jones is coming to update ITAC in August.
   - Dr. Marchbanks agrees that ID Management not as mature. Juan Garza is signed on to be a test group for the program.

   - Exchange Services more mature than ID management.
     - Ron Szabo conveyed that the Bush School decommissioned all Bush school accounts, all using net ids. It is a significant commitment to CIS’, and looking at exchange email services.
     - Ron Sazbo further states we need a commitment from ITAC, around the table, speaking with one voice, especially in this environment regarding a shared service.
     - Juan Garza echoed,” Now need a commitment, because it is a right thing to do, from a shared services strategy.”
       - Juan believes cost does not matter.
Item: 5: Shared Services  cont.

- Participating in shared services is good for everyone.
- It is a holistic view, not just what is good for “our area.”
- We work for Texas A& M first, everything else is a designation.
- Let CIS do their job
- Juan further relayed when he went to his provost, they said, “No, you are paying for it with your Instructional Technology money.”
- Individually have to rethink the way they do business, manage money.
- Where is the money in the colleges, “Have to change framework of thinking”
- For there to be success, someone big has to come on board....

- David Sweeney states he is on board. His dilemma is he is facing budget restraints, and reduction in employees.
- David Sweeney stops the discussion and asks Dr. Marchbanks in the report from consultants “Was there a legitimate security concern?”
  - Dr. Marchbanks responded: “No, there was not one.”
  - Chuck Braden stated as a recommendation, Id Management: The ability to deprovision accounts at time of departure-is crucial and frequently overlooked and IT will get dinged as a compromise in security.
  - Dr. Marchbanks stated as a result of a past audit, presently getting feeds from bbp not once a week. He receives feeds from 30 different organizations. HR will call, if a termination with cause occurs. The problem is if a retired employee is still in bbp- wants to run out leave. Auditor says,” Why do they still have an account? Answer: "They are still getting paid, not notified.”

Questions: Choose a service: ((White Board Discussion Points)

- Exchange:
  - Maturity- timeline, ready today,
  - Political: more visible.
- ID management: Unknown cost/risk
  - Dr. Marchbanks states if do not receive more money, can't present ID Management as shared services today.
  - Encourages dialogue, and adds ID management has been vetted, Microsoft, did feasibility study and security analysis.

Action Item: Next ITAC Meeting have an expert from Exchange and ID management.
Give a state of service report

- As a closing comment, David Sweeney asked if any other services that were interest to committee members. Jim Bouse stated VOIP: However, Jim relayed TCOM is “frustratingly expensive. “

- David Sweeney states ITAC in the coming year, has to choose a shared services that has a high degree of success. He cautions the IT community may not have the luxury of examination and choosing for themselves. Implores the ITAC committee to make headway now-Committee agrees.