INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT FORUM (ITMF)
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2006
GA. CENTER ROOM E
1:30-3:00

Present: Matt Blankenship, Mark Cherry, Bill Clayton, Bert DeSimone, Shefali Dhar, Debbie Ellerson, Steve Kane, Greg Ashley, Chris Wilkins, Tim Peacock, Barry Robinson, Cletus Stripling, Greg Topp, Stan Gatewood, Chris Adcock, Christine Miller, Corey Doster, Juan Machado, James Gilstrap, Carol Watson and Jerry NeSmith.


Also Present: Brenda Elliott (Recording Secretary)

Approval of Minutes:
Matt Blankenship called for changes or any discussion for the November Minutes. There was no discussion, deletions or additions so the minutes were approved. Matt added announcements to the agenda. Matt adjusted the order of the meeting presentations to allow Stan Gatewood to give his reports first due to a scheduling issue Mr. Gatewood needed to manage.

Introduction of New Attendees:
Steve Kane: new interim Associate CIO for Application Development and Integration, was welcomed to the Information Technology Management Forum meeting.
Juan Machado: Office of Information Technology Outreach Services.
James Gilstrap: Botanical Gardens.

Update Policies & Surplus Policy: Stan Gatewood
Password Policy: Stan Gatewood reported the networked devices and password policy have been ratified by the President’s Cabinet. Both policies can be viewed at www.infosec.uga.edu/policies/index.php. The strong password requirements, and the requirement to change passwords, are supported by a new University of Georgia password policy, The University’s administration is committed to information security and protecting our information assets. The ratification of this policy by the University Cabinet is testimony to that commitment.

Some discussion followed regarding the password policy such as the time frame for changing passwords. Several people indicated they felt the requirement to change passwords twice a year could result in less security since it could lead to more people writing down their passwords so they will not forget them, etc. Stan stated that the policy calls for an annual review and that the policy could potentially be revised at a later date.
Surplus Process. The DOAS will hold a conference call Monday to discuss the surplus process. The flowchart is being updated with input from UGANET and others. The flowchart, with changes, will be vetted with UGANET. The plan is to have a copy of the flowchart and the surplus policy back to the ITMF meeting on Jan. 11, 2007.

Matt Blankenship Discussed Policy relating to entering Student Grades:
Matt Blankenship interjected about policies and the creation of policies noting the difficult part, once language is agreed upon, is actually making a policy come to life in the institution and managing issues as they arise.

Matt Blankenship brought up the issues of clear consequential actions to be taken when policies or practices are avoided, not followed, or blatantly violated. Who acts as the enforcer when a violation occurs by ignorance or by boldness? The policing authority and policy ‘sellers’ seem to be staff (as is almost always the case with IT related issues).

Matt Blankenship posed the question whether other departments have issues regarding student grades. University policy and practices seem to indicate that the authority and responsibility for grade entry lies with the instructor and is non-transferable to administrative assistants and other personnel. Matt Blankenship recognizes current policy is not well accepted and viewed as burdensome by some faculty and therefore the task is often given to staff to complete. Jerry NeSmith was asked to clarify how the application for grade entry works. Per his understanding, the application is designed to allow a proxy to enter grades. It is up to the educator to assign that proxy, and the Registrar’s Office allows the proxy to assign grades. Matt Blankenship stated there seems to be a disconnect between the application and UGA policy. Matt Blankenship suggested committee members think about this situation and come to the January 11 meeting prepared to discuss suggestions and ideas.

Leveraging the Fred (Faculty Research Expertise Database)
Demonstrations by Bert Desimone & Jerry Nesmith
Jerry Nesmith provided an overview of the Faculty Research Expertise Database (FRED) developed by the OVPR office to assist people in locating faculty based on their research interests and their expertise.

Bert Desimone provided an overview of a similar system that had been developed initially as a result of the ITMF groups interest in developing a database where it would be easy to locate IT Staff based on various skill sets.

The group decided that a sub-committee should be formed to review the work that had been done and how to proceed towards getting an IT expertise database completed. The committee members are as follows:

gtopp@uga.edu  Greg Topp
bkr@uga.edu    Barry Robinson
shef@uga.edu  Shefali Dhar
cletus@grady.uga.edu  Cletus Stripling
tpeacock@uga.edu  Tim Peacock
NEW BUSINESS:
Is it time to do a stat check on the Recruit, Reward and Retain IT Jobs project and empirically examine the dataset we looked at last year to see how many promotions, increases, and other positives may have occurred through the effort?

Matt Blankenship wants ITMF to talk with HR and see what strides have been made with IT salaries at UGA in comparison with the Board of Regents/Georgia Tech and other comparable Universities in the southeast, etc.

Sandi Glass (College of Education), Brad Hunt (Terry College) and Christine Miller (Franklin College) have inquired of HR for this data so that we can measure the progress made since last year’s big push with Job Classifications. It is the current understanding that this data request is still under evaluation or collection. It is recommended that Mr. Duane Ritter or his designee from HR attend our meeting and help us understand the progress in this area. The empirical evidence should also weigh heavy in our discussion. The hope is that we will see some improvement through the data and that it will guide us to reinvigorate momentum that may have been lost as the result of HR reorganization.

IT Security Committee:
Matt Blankenship mentioned that we might want to ask for new volunteers that might be willing to be involved in the IT Security sub-committee. Discussion followed surrounding exactly what role the committee would serve and whether the committee should just be an ITMF committee or should include other members and a few representatives from our group. He will obtain clarification from Dr. White and we will address this at a later meeting.

Voting:
Matt stated that while not everybody that attends the ITMF meetings is able to vote that everybody who attends the meetings has a verbal chance to be heard and can discuss any issues that are on the agenda or that happen to be brought up for discussion.

Motion made and moved to have our next meeting January 11, 2007.

Matt called for the meeting to adjourn.