MINUTES
Technology Architecture Committee

Objective: Guide the direction of information technology across the enterprise, making recommendations as appropriate to the IT Governance Council

Date: August 25, 2020

Participants: Sean Banner, Alex Birkovsky, Dave Borschel, Louis Brooks, Andy Bucior, Alexander Chisler, Tom Doughty, Matthew Earhart, Lori Gormin, Andy Hanlon, Jason Henderson, Matt Hohmeister, Fred Jordan, Chuck Kemeny, Jason Lammert, Shawn Lewers, Ray Marky, Michael McDonald, Tom Morgan, Matt Mortimer, Becky Price, Bobby Sprinkle, Sasank Vemana, Johnny White

ACTION ITEMS

- Give feedback to Bobby re: the draft work order replacement system ITN and any vendor recommendations within the next couple of days (TAC).
- Be prepared to assess work order replacement system proposals (TAC).
- Schedule a meeting with the Working Group to define approaches for formulating DR service offering recommendations (Chuck)
- Begin scheduling biweekly assessment meetings (Chuck)

DISCUSSION

Call to Order, Introductions, and Opening Remarks

1. Chuck called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He asked everyone to document their attendance via the TAC Teams Chat.
2. Chuck reviewed the agenda and welcomed guest presenter Becky Price, who will deliver the Ring Central Overview.
3. Chuck reminded everyone that Tom will post the draft meeting minutes in Teams and the TAC will have one week to review it for potential edits prior to the minutes being posted on the website.

TAC Assessment Web Content

4. Chuck reported that the TAC Assessment section of the website is now live and reflects all changes proposed and agreed upon during the last meeting. See https://its.fsu.edu/about-its/technology-architecture-committee/tac-assessments.

Ring Central Overview

5. Becky reported that FSU soon will be launching Ring Central, which will enable fifteen call centers to migrate away from their existing ACD systems. She explained that this new cloud-based product will alleviate several ACD system weaknesses, including lack of third-party integration, limited reporting capability, and others.

6. Becky introduced her project team members via a slide photo. She praised Jane for her strong support as project sponsor, and she expressed appreciation to Bobby and Ken for delivering the resources needed for success.

7. Becky further explained that the new system will facilitate future integrations and enhancements, including integration with Salesforce. Agents will have a much-improved ability to work remotely, which is highly important in the current COVID-19 environment. There will be significant improvement in the ability to incorporate new agents. The overall agent experience will be greatly improved.

8. Becky reported that the Ringling Museum will be added, and that 900 Centex phones on campus still need to be converted to VoIP. These phones are in older building that are targeted for infrastructure upgrades.

9. Chuck noted that Ring Central is a leading call center solution within the higher education marketplace.

10. Becky explained that Ring Central will be rolled out in three phases. Phase 1 will include the SAFER team and its 30 agents. Phase 2 will include the FSU Service Desk and the Office of Distance Learning. Phase 3 will include various medical clinics operated by the College of Medicine. Phases 1 and 2 will include integration with Salesforce.

11. Becky reported that Ring Central includes a chat option.

12. Becky explained that Undergraduate Studies will not be able to utilize Ring Central because they do not have an ACD system.

13. Becky explained that the project start date has not yet been decided but that the project will start soon. She stated that more information will be forthcoming.

Work Order Replacement System ITN Draft

14. Bobby presented the draft ITN for replacing FSU's legacy work order system. He explained that initially the plan had been to implement the Salesforce work order module as phase 3 of the Salesforce rollout, but a determination was made that the Salesforce functionality is too limited. The decision then was made to pursue a third-party solution, hence the creation of the ITN under review.

15. Bobby stated that full integration with PeopleSoft and Salesforce is a requirement.

16. Bobby explained that several ITS groups have reviewed the ITN, and that he would welcome any feedback on the ITN from TAC members. He would also appreciate any recommendations re: potential

vendors. Bobby will need any feedback and vendor recommendations within the next couple of days because he expects the ITN to be released with the next one to two weeks.

17. Bobby noted that TAC might be asked later to help with assessment of the proposals.

ITS Disaster Recovery Service Assessment Update

18. Chuck explained that the DR planning and operational DR solution gaps among campus departments are generally inadequate to nonexistent, and that the ELT has directed TAC to perform a formal assessment that is expected to lead to an ITS DR service offering recommendations.

19. Chuck explained that the assessment process will include the following steps:

    - Involve ISPO
    - Form a Working Group
    - Gather Requirements
    - Architect Potential Solutions
    - Propose Solution Options
    - Provide Recommendation

20. Chuck explained that this initiative will complement an upcoming ISPO initiative to enhance DR planning across the University.

21. Chuck stated that the goal will be to identify and recommend solutions that will meet the majority, but not necessarily all, of the requirements across the University. Cost is expected to be a major constraint for some units, and a few units may have requirements that are too unique to consider as service offerings.

22. Andy asked what the timeline requirements would be for the assessment. Chuck replied that he will schedule meeting(s) with the Working Group to define the approaches. Chuck stated that a rough target would be to provide a formal recommendation to the ELT in six months.

23. Lori asked whether it would be realistic and appropriate to define what DR services we could currently offer to departments. Bobby replied that ITS has no official service offering yet, and that requirements must be gathered before anything is offered.

24. Chuck explained that to satisfy an audit finding, ISPO is working on a risk assessment policy that will be released to the campus in October. Requirements gathering sessions then will be scheduled with campus units.

25. The question was asked whether ITS DR systems could be leveraged for smaller campus unit DR needs. Bobby replied that network costs and several other issues would have to be worked out.

26. Chuck explained he anticipates different levels of tiering based on RPO and RTO requirements, and that multiple service options are likely to be available. He noted that cost will be a major consideration for the campus units. One member stated that he does not believe his department would agree to fund a DR solution. Bobby suggested that this department might have to negotiate this position with the auditors.

27. Shawn L, stated that he is looking forward to seeing the recommended solutions and how compatible they are with units' budgets.

28. Bobby explained that recommended solutions may not necessarily involve ITS, and that he would like to see DR handled like electricity (i.e. a "no brainer") from a budgeting perspective.

29. Chuck suggested that a very simple DR plan would be to shift backups from on-prem to the cloud. This might prove to be cheaper than current practices. To determine if this is the case, options and costs would have to be defined and evaluated.

Scheduling of Future TAC Meetings and Assessments

30. Noting that the current monthly TAC meeting schedule did not allow an opportunity for TAC to assess the Ring Central proposal, Chuck asked whether special meetings should be scheduled for assessments and whether the scheduling of the TAC meetings should be adjusted. He suggested that one option would be to shift the TAC meetings to bi-monthly or quarterly and then schedule assessment meetings as needed (i.e. "just in time" scheduling).

31. Lori suggested scheduling meetings two meetings per month. One would be the TAC meeting and the other would be a placeholder for an assessment meeting. The latter would be cancelled if not needed. Andy offered a similar suggestion.

32. Chuck explained that a Program Director soon will be hired, and that it is likely that TAC will become more involved with project development. Chuck anticipates that this will lead to more dynamic and on-demand requirements for TAC, and therefore more flexibility re: the scheduling of meetings.

33. Bobby noted that TAC may not be able to assess everything, but it should be able to assess most.

34. Louis suggested retaining the monthly meeting and scheduling the assessment meetings as needed.

35. Chuck stated that his "takeaways" include: (1) scheduling 60 minutes every two weeks for assessments, (2) continuing the 90-minute monthly meetings, (3) recording all meetings, and (4) for assessment meetings lacking majority attendance, using the recording to establish a quorum for voting purposes.

NEXT MEETING

Chuck will email options.