INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT FORUM (ITMF)
THURSDAY, April 3, 2008
GA. CENTER ROOM R
1:30-3:00 p.m.

Present: Chris Adcock, Greg Ashley, Melanie Bone, Sharon Burch, Michael Cheek, Mark Cherry, Bill Clayton, Maria Cleghorne, Sherry Clouser, David Crouch, Jeff Daniel, Mark Ellenberg, Debbie Ellerson, Shawn Ellis, Sarah Fraker, Stan Gatewood, Sandi Glass, Brad Hunt, Stuart Ivy, Brett Jackson, Alan Katz, Paul Keck, Rehan Khan, Will Laney, David Matthews-Morgan, Christine Miller, Jerry NeSmith, Matt Payne, Tim Peacock, Timothy Phillips, Brian Rivers, Barry Robinson, David Stewart, Jeff Teasley, Greg Topp, Carol Watson, Dr. Barbara White, Chris Wilkins, and Brad Wolfe


Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the March 6, 2008 meeting were approved.

Welcome of Visitors:

Featured Speakers/Discussion:

Security Accountability Model – Stan Gatewood/Sandi Glass
We now have four security awareness modules for all faculty and staff that will be tracked. A letter with the compliance of each unit will go out in November. We are also fitting it into the evaluation cycle of all staff.

There will be eight more modules created by the end of May. Everyone will take four a year. The next one will be on phishing.

Training Component: EITS will be working on providing certificate programs. The training component will be where we will focus on our IT professionals that do systems, data, and security or faculty who assume those roles based on grants or research.

Managers and Leaders in IT: This summer we are committed to creating one to two hour modules in WebCT/Vista. One of the modules will be on IT jobs--getting the right person with the right skills in the right job and knowing what you need. Another module will be on the role of security liaisons which will include ASSETs and risk management.
We will probably start building on incident response and a communication module that focuses on how IT leaders work with their Deans, Vice-Presidents, and executives to have a conversation on security. We are asking the instructional staff to help us create template that shows us how to write learning objectives with activities. We are planning one to two hour case study models at Staff Training and Development. These modules will be offered and tracked through their catalog.

I would like to give kudos to Brian, Stan, Jeff, John and staff who worked over the Easter Holiday to make this happen. We are aware of the comments that we are getting. I urge you to start focusing those comments to people who can help and know how to respond. Brian and Stan are leads on this project. If you have any information about the modules, you can contact me. We are working quickly to get all the modules done by the end of May.

We are also looking at improvements on tracking to see if we could have some group presentations so there could be a facilitator. We are hearing that some organizations want to do the one-on-one and want a facilitator to lead this and have them tracked.

*Institutional FAR (Faculty Activity Repository) committee update – Christine Miller*

This initiative was lead by Karen Webber, the outgoing director of Institutional Research. She is transitioning into a faculty role. To give you some background on this project: a cross-functional exploratory group consisting of both faculty and administrators was formed in the fall of 2006 to discuss the feasibility and desirability of an institutional system for faculty activities. The driver for this discussion was the upcoming SAC accreditation process.

Several subgroups were formed to look at both the homegrown UGA faculty activity reporting systems and commercial software products. Another sub-group met to identify and set common data elements for the purpose of capturing faculty activity. At the same time there was also a need for an institutional assessment system for the Program Review process.

The findings converged and the information was given to the Provost. Based on his needs, he decided to purchase a commercial product called Activity Insight from Digital Measures. The goal was to address both of these needs: The Program Review System and the Faculty Activity Reporting System. The product has been shown to the majority of deans. There was also a group that we are now calling the Advisory Group that consisted of Associate Deans who are their college representative for the reaffirmation process. This group has been presented with the product. There should be a couple of people in every college who have been exposed to this project at this point.

Where are we now: There is a working group that of consists of remnants of the initial exploratory group and subgroups. That group is looking at logistics and the technical side of things.

Some of the goals of this project are:
1. Reaffirmation which is driving the timeline for this project.
2. To help facilitate data driven decision making.
3. To help improve external and internal reporting capabilities.
4. Create an integrated source of faculty information and an integrated source of program review data.

One of the ambitious goals of this project is to utilize data from existing authoritative sources. They are hoping to populate the system with faculty credentials, courses and so forth to reduce the burden of faculty members entering in all of this data. The core data element has been identified and EITS has identified the institutional authoritative sources of data. We also hope that part of the process will include the ability to correct institutional data when it is incorrect. We just completed a beta test with approximately 20 faculty members.

**Reports from Committees:**

*Bylaws – Christine Miller*
No new business in the Bylaws committee. We are still waiting to hear from Academic Affairs about another voting member for their area. I will follow up with the Provost.

*CESS Process Review – Corey Doster*

Comments: Dr. White
I was asked to put some groups together to look at how we can streamline the CESS process, how colleges and administrative units can have enough time to plan and not wait until the last minute of the fourth quarter to get things in and then we all get into a backlog with the BOR for signatures and that sort of thing. There were three working groups: The first group put together a set of processes and how we were working. The second group looked at how we can actually improve the processes to streamline it to get more information out and/or process it faster. The third group was working with Procurement because the controller’s office had a concern that we be careful because again whatever those processes are they have to go to Procurement. Procurement needs to have some engagement on what those processes look like.

The third group is the one that is actually working right now. I think they are trying to bring forth the summary recommendations for how:

(A) We can streamline that process in the Office of the CIO
(B) Be sure that we have looked at the request to insure that it will not get bounced back. They have come back because of issues of compatibility or change in the BOR, and
(C) The third piece has to do with working with Procurement to be sure that we have the most efficient process in place for those particular pieces. Scott Woodson from the state BOR and the auditing office has been involved in taking a look to make sure that the process is efficient.
The committee should have some recommendations coming soon.

Comments: Sara Fraker
I attended the last meeting and some of the programmers were in attendance. Some of the items addressed were the definition of a project and the ability to pre-approve a project in theory before you get into the minor pieces of it rather than a CESS form being tied to a PR specifically. You would have a routable, web accessible CESS form that could become a multiple PR. So if you are thinking about big projects, which are the ones that get kicked out, you would involve EITS more upfront before you get into a bid process.

We discussed integrating the security questions into the initial form so that you could answer these first two questions upfront and then as you go through, the additional questions that vendor might have to fill out.

We would have a web process that would give you an authentication number that you could use across multiple PRs in the Procurement System that allows Procurement to look to see if this PR is approved and allows it to be routed appropriately.

Finally, we talked to the programmers about the website and about changing the IMS as well. The set of recommendations are still in draft.

Comments: Dr. White
I think that the last piece that Sarah talked about is really important. She was talking about the vendors. There is a lot of sourcing going on at this campus and HR has sourced out several pieces. There is a lot of discussion about more individual packages and with the security piece tied to it; and we have to make sure the vendors have a certain level of compliance etc. So I think that piece is extremely important for this group to look at.

Central Backup – Brad Hunt
At the last meeting a volunteer list was circulated. Brad will follow up with volunteers later this month.

Security – Matt Blankenship
Comments:
One of the things that we discussed was the ASSETs program moving forward and what we can do with the data that we’ve collected. We are looking at using that data as part of developing a Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan as well as integrating that into EITS Vulnerability and Assessment Program. We want to be able to scan the right systems to make sure we are identifying the problem with systems with critical and sensitive data on them as well as tying it into our Incident Response Program. When sensitive assets are compromised that would raise a bigger red flag. We are also looking at both process integration as well as technical integration.

Another thing that we discussed was the various social security numbers initiatives and developing a better mechanism to communicate the differences. I think there is a lot of confusion around Rehan’s project (ID Management) and Will Laney’s project which is to
help us clean SSNs off of the systems. So hopefully, we will get a very comprehensive explanation coming out of the Security Committee so that when we have these discussions, we can come up with a common set of terms that people will understand who is responsible for what and making sure that we are not overlapping our efforts.

We discussed the EITS Security Checklist/Checkit website which was launched in conjunction with the awareness module. We get a lot of positive feedback from the Security Committee and the feedback that is probably worth mentioning was that this should be targeted toward System Admin. We are going to be presenting this to UGANet at the next meeting to get their understanding and get some feedback from them as well.

Comments: Stan Gatewood
The UGA Privacy Policy has been recalled. The reason it is being recalled is that we’ve had some proposed changes to FERPPA as well as the Electronic Privacy Act and federal rule changes. I’m going to put a couple more pieces into it and send it back through Legal Affairs and then back to the Security Committee and get it back on the road again.

Comments: Dr. White
The President’s Cabinet’s last meeting will be this month. They will not meet again until the fall. These policies are ratified by the Cabinet. So what I’ve asked Stan to do is get this ready and present it to the EMT on May 5th. We requested that it be ratified electronically by the Cabinet. This is done periodically when the Cabinet does not meet for a period of time so we don’t have to wait until next fall to get this ratified. So if we can get that to the EMT and then with their recommendations go to the Cabinet, we can get approval electronically before the first of July.

Email/Calendar – Matt Payne  See Attachment I.
The committee has met twice. We started with an introduction around our committee to find out who we had at the table and their background. We had a good cross-section of the University. We felt that we could start to look at the overarching need for an email-calendaring solution across the University. We broke out and had each department go through and give the committee information about what their departments is currently using, how the staff is using it, the different products, and different feature set that they want. We then compiled the list that you see on pages two, three, and four. This is just a high level list of functionality that each of these departments was looking to use.

From that we brought about what you see on page one which lists some of the high level concerns that came up. While you might not see exactly the features that are listed here, basically everything that you see on the first page was pulled from a feature set and came out of the discussions among the committee during our two meetings.

Next steps: We are looking at one more meeting coming up this month to get everybody together to get sign-off on these high-level issues as well as to go through and look at the basic feature set. We are really trying to put some specific requirements.
Hopefully, by the next ITMF meeting we should have a set of recommendations for you to look at. From the committee viewpoint on security, we were looking at it more from an end-user standpoint and what the features are that the user can actually look at when it comes to administrative features of the servers or the back-end systems. When the full project begins for replacing this, I would think that security of the email system would need to be looked at by EITS. This was more from a client side.

This is the committee’s opportunity to present their thoughts on what they would like to see in an email/calendaring solution and then hand off to EITS as they start their process.

**Wireless – James Gilstrap**

David Stewart Comments:
The wireless network covers about 48% of the instruction seats on campus. We are continuing with this effort. We recently installed wireless in the Main and Science Library.

One thing that we are working on is testing radius authentication to replace the bluesockets. Right now it looks like a very good solution. Once we are finished testing, we will come up with an implementation time-line. The radius authentication will give us more options. It is more robust and will give us some more security options.

We are mainly looking at radius on campus to replace our centralized bluesocket systems. Once we finish evaluating it, we will start looking at its use with the extended campuses and see what the recommendations are on how to access it. The student experience will be very similar for all campuses.

Tech Services Telecommunication unit will be joining EITS beginning July 1, 2008. The group will not have to move. This unit will be under David Stewart.

**ITMF Annual Conference – Brad Hunt** See Attachment II.
The conference is scheduled for May 27th. We are combining with the 50 Years of Computing at UGA event with a morning schedule of meetings and then the special event in the afternoon. Dr. White has been very supportive of this effort and suggested that we combine the luncheon with the special event that she was planning. I think this is going to be a pretty exciting event for all of us.

These are the ideas that we are working on. If you have contacts or other suggestions, I would appreciate hearing from you. We are still lining up the speakers. Apple has confirmed to sponsor lunch for us and has arranged for a distinguished speaker for lunch. We still are working on a few of the other details. One thing I do need from this group is moderators for the six break out sessions.

We would like to have a member of ITMF be present in the room with a list of questions prepared should any awkward silences occur. That would be part of the moderator job.
along with the introduction. We are trying to arrange this for this to be more of a
discussion than a presentation.

We are bringing in a few of the subject matter experts kick-off the discussion. It is not
meant to be here’s the answer, but here’s the issue. What are you seeing, and what are
you thinking doing? How do you think we ought to engage in this particular topic? So
that’s the goal of these break out sessions. How effective we are in organizing that
remains to be seen, but that’s the objective.

The Recruiting and Retention session should be focused on IT management and related
issues, but if there are generic recruiting and retention best practices that’s fine too.

The Student Laptop session is to have a discussion about the ins and outs of student
laptop programs. We are trying to get an institution that has done it, or about to do it.
We hear that Georgia Tech is putting in a requirement next year.

The question of funding was raised for bringing guest speakers to campus for this event.
There is a strong possibility that funding might be available to help bring speakers to
campus.

*Common Training Interests Committee – Chris Adcock*
We have committee members who have volunteered. I have a web survey that was
submitted today. The information that we gather from the survey will serve as a basis for
further discussion and analysis. Basically we are trying to get an idea of what the needs
are for this fiscal year and next fiscal year and what the behavior pattern has been in
previous fiscal years

There is a vendor who has been fairly aggressive about contacting folks. His name is
Jonathan Cork from Global Knowledge. This committee has not endorsed this vendor. If
he does contact you; it is up to you to decide if you want to speak with him.

**Unfinished Business:**

*Update on Compact Planning Efforts – Greg Topp*
Please continue to check the Compact Planning website. A more in-depth briefing is
scheduled in May for this group. A lot of progress is going on.

*Student Computing support Committee Proposal – Jerry NeSmith*
I notified several of you several months ago about joining the committee to see if we
could make some recommendations particularly about supporting student computing
repair. I will be sending out an email requesting volunteers for the committee.

**Q.** Will the committee focus on just student hardware related issues?
**A.** I think the committee can set whatever range of discussion they want. But my goal is
first of all to discuss at a minimum student laptop support. But we can take it wherever
people want to take it.
Q. Would access to student related services on an enterprise level be too broad of a subject for that group?
A. No, not at all. That is what TEC Services is doing now. So we want to look at the model and see how we can improve it.

**Assets - Brad Hunt**
Assets will be moved to finished business by the next meeting for this year. We have until April 15th to complete.

**ID Management: Rehan Khan**
We have six vendors who have responded to our RFP. We will be reviewing the documentation and by the end of this month, a group of us will make a selection on the vendor consultant who will come to campus to work with us on ID Management.

Q. In terms of actual delivery of the solution, the only money commitment at this point is just for consulting?

A. Yes, that is right. Part of the RFP scope was to develop detailed requirements and specifications for a solution. So no further work will need to be done on the requirement, specification or design of the solution. We would simply be talking about the implementation scope these three months. So the next three months we will be working with the consultant in defining actually what the steps of create, change, and terminate workflow will be; what our identifiers will be; and resolving some of the issues around CAN vs. SSN vs. other identifiers.

In principle we have more funding than just the consultant. We presented a proposal that included the consultant piece in it and they approved the proposal. Then they funded the first piece of that proposal which was to come back with more detailed specifications on exactly what we are going to do. So that is the way I’m looking at that proposal. I fully expect that it will get funding because it an important area.

Additional funding was received just for engineering out Social Security processes which is a parallel effort. We got a little bit of funding to remove SSN from the business process. We are going to concentrate on the core enterprise systems first and then also work with all of our schools and units that interact with that data. We have an RFP out there. We have vendors that are now coming back with questions. We are working with vendors to try to clarify what we want done and then we will go through the process of selecting certain vendors. Three vendors have responded to the RFP so far with questions.

**Leadership Certificate Program: Brad Hunt**
I will be sending out a very brief survey to the group to see who is interested in actually participating then I will give the information to Dr. Watson.

**New Business:**
Student Portal Upgrade - Rehan Khan

We are in the process of upgrading the student portal. We got some funding from the Student Tech Fee area to do something about our current unsupported student portal. It is running on an old Novell platform which is not supported by them anymore. So we are in the process of planning and moving to a new using perhaps uPortal as an alternative. We hope to have something ready for the students sometime this fall as a phase one release and then we will start building on top of that.

VOIP Update – Greg Ashley

The RFP is out there. We are going to have a conversation with GTA about moving forward. That’s the current status.

Meeting Adjourned.