



Project Management Office
UC Information Technologies (UCIT)
University of Cincinnati
PO Box 210658
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0149

Suite 400, University Hall
51 Goodman Drive
(513) 556-9089

MEETING MINUTES

CORE SERVICES AND SHARED INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

DATE: **NOVEMBER 14, 2013**
TIME: **10:00 AM TO 11:30 AM**
LOCATION: **UNIVERSITY HALL, ROOM 356**
CHAIR: **ANTON HARFMANN, CO-CHAIR: DIANA NOELCKE**

CALL TO ORDER

Anton Harfmann opened the meeting and apologized for his previous absence, he had a conflicting class meeting time. He asked for introductions again since not everyone was in attendance at the first meeting.

Present: Anton Harfmann, Pallavi Patel, Dom Ferreri, Gary Grafe, Tommy Krieger, Eric Anderson, Kerry Overstake, Steve Young, Rachel Frankel, Diana Noelcke, Nelson Vincent.

Apologies: Ken Hirsh, Priya Chawla, Robin Pittman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Anton asked if everyone reviewed the minutes and if there were any edits. Eric Anderson motioned the minutes be accepted, Steve Young seconded. Anton request a vote and it was unanimous to accept the minutes.

BUSINESS

The committee discussed the process for choosing their top priorities, identifying the pinch points, barriers, the need to eliminate duplication of effort and the silo mentality. Anton said the committee efforts will work in parallel with the IT Council and the other governance committees. They may need to develop working focus groups and subcommittees. The IT Governance structure will allow their work to go forward more aggressively. Anton asked Nelson to review the Committee charge.

Nelson said this committee has a tremendous opportunity to make a significant, positive impact in the University Community by leveraging enterprise systems and shared services investments in a more strategic, proactive and collaborative manner than has ever been done in the past. His goal in helping to select committee members was to involve pragmatic people who will actively engage other IT governance committees and bring issues to the IT council for acceptance, funding and implementation. He wants the members to be the voice for Faculty Senate, student groups, IT units, etc., to align and leverage our assets better. This is the group to start that dialog. The University needs the expertise of this committee to help make big initiatives successful, such as the digital signage project and the UniverSIS replacement system. This group should advise UC on new systems opportunities, updates on existing systems, and sound the alarm when core services are not working well.

The committee reviewed the shared governance model and the IT governance structure. Two of the top priorities for this committee are:

1. Focus on leveraging our enterprise architecture
2. Security

Nelson said the Board of Trustees most frequently asked question about enterprise systems is always security. He charged the committee to think about how all of systems fit together,

establish ad-hoc groups if the right members don't sit at this table and amend the member list if necessary.

Cellular coverage is one large enterprise system this committee should review. There are dead spaces all over campus. Lack of connectivity can cause safety concern in times of emergencies. Further, this committee should develop private/public partnerships where needed to accomplish their tasks. Nelson asked for a show of hands from members who served on the Blue Ribbon Committee Task Force and asked those members to insure that the issues raised in that committee that relate to core services and shared infrastructure get addressed here.

The IT Governance committees have the responsibility for developing the University's third century strategic plan.

The eLearning committee is championing the Bb upgrade process. More than 50 members are working on this initiative to rewrite courses, develop training, review technical requirement. The upgrade must be completed before start of fall semester FY2014-2015.

Nelson provided an overview of the UCIT security recommendations presented at the Board of Trustees meeting. UC is behind on Information Security, though we have done a good job on PCI and credit card issues, identity management, and email security. UC is not doing as good of job in some critical areas like security training for new employees. The on-boarding process does not include training for information security, not even basic information about using McAfee, email encryption tools, or even how to find help with resources for security. This group needs to take a leadership role in educating faculty, staff and students about HIPAA and FERPA policies. Approximately 60% of University research data has patient data that has HIPAA requirements. Who is overseeing this? Many different models are needed to address security issues relative to faculty, students, and staff, and Nelson asked this group to oversee developing them.

The Board of Trustees is a powerful ally in this endeavor. Security recommendations have been submitted to them and they have total buy-in. The Council of Deans and the new Provost are knowledgeable and invested in security issues. Initiatives will be funded. Nelson asked Diana to share the report submitted to the Board.

With BYOD, the average student has 5 devices and brings them all to campus. We will be a BYOD friendly campus but we have to have security policies in place to support them. The policies are awaiting approval from the Executive Committee but this group needs to help develop the implementation plan for them. Consider issues like where can faculty and staff go on campus to get stripped down equipment that meets all the security requirements for international business travel? Right now there is no central location. This committee can help address requirements and raise the security awareness on campus.

Anton instructed the committee to keep ease of use and cost in mind when implementing infrastructure systems. Select solutions that are cost effective and easy to use or academic and administrative units will look for less secure more affordable solutions on their own. Ideally, we need one single, secure login portal that grants access to all if the major systems.

The committee discussed the major change in the password policy; it may be moving to a 90-day expiration from the current 180-day expiration. Committee members indicated the need to comply with industry best practices, federal authentication standards, alignment with UC Health practices and Internal Audit recommendations.

Nelson wrapped up his summary of the committee's charge. He instructed them to have robust, far-reaching discussions but produce action. He asked for questions, feedback and promised an on-going dialog. The committee thanked him for his vision, ideas, and commitment to addressing problems that have been known but languishing with no solution for years.

Nelson left the meeting and the committee resumed the discussion for deciding priorities. They talked about some current core systems, how they are funded, lack of security associated with them, and how in the past systems have been purchased and implemented with the silo mentality, which ultimately did not turn out to be a good enterprise solution for the community.

Anton asked Diana about the future plans for SharePoint, as an example of a core system that is not meeting the campus needs. Diana said it is being evaluated now, and that UCIT is still trying to determine if SharePoint 2013 is really a better product before we invest our limited resources.

Pallavi suggested the group use mind mapping brainstorming techniques to identify their top priorities. The group also discussed funding models and how it impacts the ability to leverage scarce resources. Dom mentioned a recent visit to Children's Hospital data center with Data Center Upgrade Task Force. He said all were impressed with the infrastructure but what left the biggest impression was the central buy-in from all constituents and the willingness to pool funds to purchase the best solution for the whole organization.

The committee discussed the ITIE funding model. They would like to revisit how it and other funds are distributed. Anton provided the example of when UCIT changed the charge-back model for network jacks and how it positively impacted colleges. DAAP was willing to contribute money for better, centrally funded initiatives when they weren't forced to spend their own limited dollars paying for slower wireless network connections.

The committee also discussed marketing and communication issues to address the silo mentality. Dom said he thinks the University does an adequate job of communicating new initiatives but fails to continue with regular, frequent information to keep the community informed. This committee needs to address this.

Anton closed the meeting by asking the members to come back to the next meeting with ideas for short, mid, and long-term strategies. There are easily solved problems and he wants this committee to quickly address them for the short-term wins. Early success will help propel the positive momentum generated from the formation of the IT Governance Committees. All agreed that security is not a separate priority, but rather a principle threaded throughout all the issues this committee will address.

ACTION ITEMS

- Diana Noelcke - Email the security proposal submitted to the Board of Trustees and the one-page document from the IT at UC Strategic Planning Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.