



MINUTES

Technology Architecture Committee

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

Date: February 19, 2021

Participants: Shawn Banner, Alex Birkovsky, Dave Borschel, Andy Bucior, Alex Chisler, Trace Cooper, Rebekah Dorn, Tom Doughty, Matthew Earhart, Mary Eichen, Matt Hohmeister, Fred Jordan, Chuck Kemeny, Jason Lammert, Ray Marky, Michael McDonald, Tom Morgan, Matt Mortimer, Mike Repchek, Bobby Sprinkle, Sasank Vemana, Johnny White, Kathy Wilkes

ACTION ITEMS

- TAC member who receive the Colocation Survey are requested to complete it.

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 Zoom chat.
2. Chuck reviewed the agenda.
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.
4. Chuck welcomed Kathy Wilkes as a first-time attendee. Kathy manages the User Experience Department and will be partnering with Rebekah in delivering the Voice of the Community Presentation.

Voice of the Community Update

5. Rebekah reviewed VOC work accomplished during summer 2019. She complimented the contributions made by TAC in advancing the collaboration improvement objective. She also cited the COVID-19 responses, including coordination and communications re: testing and vaccination centers, as another collaboration success.
6. Rebekah reported that the implementation of Salesforce was a major accomplishment in addressing the contact and process confusion remediation objective.



7. Rebekah reported that a huge emphasis has been devoted to improving ITS internal and external communications. Communications now are much more proactive and transparent overall.
8. Rebekah reported that the implementation of Knowledge Base has been a major enhancement to the ITS Service Center. The tiered presentation structure has made it much easier for users to engage in self-support. Rebekah cited IT ProPath as another upcoming service enhancement that will enable experienced professionals to access service request queues more expeditiously by bypassing Tier 1.
9. Rebekah explained that during fall 2020 improvement emphasis was shifted from the four main service improvement objectives to Cybersecurity, the heightened importance of which was driven by the challenges posed by the campus COVID-19 response. The User Experience team under Kathy's leadership is leading this "Voice of the Community II" campaign.
10. Mary asked when IT ProPath will be coming. Rebekah replied that it will be soon and will rely later with a more precise date.
11. Kathy cited a complimentary quote from an IT professional who praised the diversity of ITS' work.
12. Kathy explained the following goals of the cybersecurity campaign:
 - ISPO is working on cybersecurity strategic plan and we needed to gather information to help create that plan.
 - Articulate expectations and experiences from campus partners,
 - students and faculty about cybersecurity practices throughout FSU.
 - Communicate to the students, faculty and staff we serve that we are listening and care about their perceptions of our organization and how we protect the user and the user's data.
13. Kathy explained that the research approach included five focus groups and five one-on-one interviews. The 34 total participants included 17 academic department representatives, 5 faculty members, and 12 students. The academic department participants included IT professionals, IT managers, administrators, and staff.
14. Kathy presented a quote from a student that states that cybersecurity is intangible to many students.
15. Kathy reported the discovery of two cybersecurity gaps: transparency and shared responsibility. Users have stated that they want to know more information about cybersecurity breaches and why specific cybersecurity protective measures are needed. They want to be informed of real issues and how to solve them.
16. Kathy reported that shared responsibility for cybersecurity across campus is another area in need of improvement. One interviewee cited the need for more information on policies and procedures. Cybersecurity challenges have proliferated due to COVID-19 responses, including the widespread use of home devices, home networks, etc.



17. Kathy presented solutions suggested by interviewees and focus group participants:
- Unified effort: Funding and enforcement is needed to complement policies and procedures.
 - Training and education: Cybersecurity training should be mandatory, including for new student and new employee orientation, and ongoing. Training should be offered in multiple formats tailored to the specific audiences. Training materials should be readily available online.
 - Communications: A university-wide awareness campaign is needed to guide campus users to online policies, procedures, and training materials. Communications need to be targeted to specific audiences and easy to understand.
 - Reports and publications: ITS needs to provide proper support and clear direction to campus IT professionals who receive vulnerability reports. Advanced training is needed for highly technical audiences.
18. Kathy presented a quote from an IT-knowledgeable faculty member stating a lack of personal awareness of the biggest cybersecurity concerns and risk points for the university.
19. Kathy closed by stating that in spite of the cybersecurity gaps and concerns, the good news is that campus users and leadership are interested in learning and in helping to make the university more secure.
20. Kathy vigorously praised and thanked the members of the project team.
21. Responding to a methodology question from Tom D, Kathy explained that another COC topic will be explored next summer and suggested that TAC provide ideas for this study. Kathy also explained that comprehensive VOC assessments will be done every five years, and that individual topics will be studied annually between the five-year major assessments.
22. Kathy encouraged TAC members to consider volunteering to serve on future VOC committees, emphasizing the personally rewarding and knowledge-enhancing participation outcomes.

Student Technology Fee Presentation

23. Tom reviewed the agenda, explaining that as mentioned in the January TAC meeting, TAC will be involved in reviewing the tech fee proposals received for 2020-2021. He explained that in the past the review and decision-making process has been done by the Tech Fee Committee comprised mainly of faculty and student government leaders, with no consistent or systematic focus on the adequacy and appropriateness of the technology solutions.
24. Tom explained that the technology components of some proposals have been reviewed in the past, but mainly on an ad hoc / exception basis by an ELT member. When Jane came on board as CIO, she reviewed the tech fee program and had concerns re: several aspects of governance, one being the lack of due diligence review of the requested technology. The ELT felt that TAC would be the most appropriate entity to improve technology governance.



25. Tom stated that at end of his presentation he will ask for volunteers to participate in a working group to review the proposals.
26. Tom explained how the tech fee awards program is structured. He explained that the tech fee was established by the Florida Legislature in 2008 with the statutory language that tech fees "*shall be used to enhance instructional technology resources for students and faculty.*" Tom noted that the brevity of this language gives considerable latitude for interpretation.
27. Tom reported that for the 2020-2021 proposal awards cycle 115 proposals have been received, with requested expenditures totaling \$5.2 million. Since the proposals budget is \$1.4 million, the awards process will be very competitive.
28. Tom explained the process flow for submitting and reviewing proposals. He reported that the current Tech Fee Committee consists of 4 faculty members, 3 student government representatives, 1 senior staff member (thank you Charlotte Souffront-Garcia), and 2 ITS/TAC members (thank you Dave Borschel and Lori Gormin). He explained that during their reviews Dave and Lori will identify proposals that may be of interest to the TAC working group.
29. Tom explained the historical and 2021 proposal submission and review workflows. The historical workflow has been: Proposal Submitters → Tech Fee Committee → IT Governance Council. The 2021 workflow will be: Proposal Submitters → Tech Fee Committee → TAC Working Group → Tech Fee Committee / TAC Working Group Reconciliation → IT Governance Council.
30. Michael McD asked whether tech fee funds could be utilized for research projects. Tom replied that in his opinion this would not be appropriate, and that to receive tech fee funding a proposal must demonstrate a reasonable relationship to the delivery of instruction.
31. Ray asked how many proposals the TAC working group might be asked to review. Tom explained that the Tech Fee Committee will develop a list of proposals recommended for funding, and the working group review will be limited to these proposals. Based on historical percentages, Tom estimated that of the 115 proposals received, the working group might have to review 55-60.
32. Tom explained that the working group reviewing approach will focus on (1) appropriateness of the technology relative to ITS standards (i.e. the proposed technology is "bad" or "deficient"), (2) whether technology is already deployed that meets the proposal's instructional purpose, and (3) whether the proposed technology is redundant with other proposals. Tom noted that due to the limited review window, there will not be time for "deep dive" analyses.
33. Tom explained that any proposal flagged by the TAC working group will need to be referred back to the Tech Fee Committee and then a joint decision will be made on how to proceed with that proposal.
34. Chuck emphasized that TAC, as an advising entity, is responsible for making recommendations and is not a governing body that will make funding decisions. Chuck explained that the proposals do not provide a lot of detail on requested technology.



35. Tom reviewed the timeline for the review of proposals by the TAC working group:

- Tech Fee Committee will complete its reviews by Friday, April 2.
- Tech Fee Committee will meet during the week of April 5-9 to decide which proposals to recommend for funding.
- TAC working group will review recommended proposals during the two weeks of April 12-23, flagging those that are problematic and referring them back to the Tech Fee Committee with recommended dispositions.
- Tech Fee Committee will jointly decide final funding recommendations re: flagged proposals during the week of April 26-30.
- Tech fee program admins will submit the final list of proposals recommended funding to the IT Governance Council during the week of May 3-7.

36. In response to a question, Tom explained that the historical funding amounts for individual proposals has ranged from \$200,000 down to less than \$1,000, with the average funding amount being around \$45,000. Tom noted that since some proposals are partially funded, the average requested amount is around \$55,000.

37. Chuck asked for a working group of 5-8 volunteers, explaining that the two-week review window requires a small group of focused members rather than the overall TAC. Volunteers include Tom Doughty, Mary Eichen, Chuck Kemeny, Jason Lammert, and Matt Mortimer. Also serving will be Dave Borschel and Lori Gormin to provide a bridge from the Tech Fee Committee to the TAC working group.

38. Matt M. asked whether reviewers would be excluded from reviewing their own proposals or those submitted by their respective departments. Tom replied that there is no restriction because the review process is so competitive that the ratings of other reviewers offset any ownership or affiliation bias.

TAC Member Rotation Proposal

39. Chuck reminded the TAC re: previous discussions of establishing term limits for serving on TAC, and offered some observations:

40. Member turnover for the first year was 20 percent, largely due to members leaving FSU or switching jobs within FSU.

41. Meeting attendance has been excellent overall, with every meeting having a solid quorum.

42. Meeting dialog has been excellent, with broad participation.

43. Several working groups have been active during the year, and about 50 percent of TAC members have participated in working groups.



44. Chuck explained that a key purpose of member rotations is to maintain appropriate diversity of thought, background, and experience.
45. Chuck explained that upon further reflection, he believes that it is premature to establish term limits and begin rotating members. TAC is still maturing and needs continuity of members and experience.
46. Chuck explained that rather than focusing on term limits, a more useful exercise would be defining and adopting member participation expectations. The TAC Charter does not contain member participation expectations. Chuck believes that based on turnover during the past year, enough natural attrition will occur to satisfy the term limit benefits.
47. Gerardo and Chuck briefly discussed the possibility that Gerardo will be replaced by another Enterprise Applications representative due to upcoming workload demands.
48. Chuck proposed to the TAC that performance expectations be adopted this year and that the need for term limits be reviewed each fall during the TAC Charter review and update process.
49. Chuck proposed adoption of the following participation expectations: (1) Each member must participate in at least 65 percent of the monthly meetings, and (2) Each member will serve on at least one working group each year.
50. Fred asked if meeting attendance and working group participation is being tracked. Chuck replied that meeting attendance is officially recorded and that working group participation is tracked.
51. Matt M asked whether it would be useful to establish working group attendance requirements because working group meetings sometimes are harder to attend than the monthly meetings. Chuck replied that he had considered this but decided against it since working group activities often involve multiple layers of participation.
52. Several members endorsed Chuck's proposed participation expectations via Chat. Andy B moved to adopt Chuck's proposal, and Tom D and Jason L jointly seconded Andy's motion. In the absence of articulated objections, the vote to approve was declared unanimous.

DR Service Development Update

53. Chuck reported that Phase 1 – the initial data collection from targeted campus units and results tabulation is now complete, yielding the following:
 - 61% completed the survey (33 of 54 campus units)
 - 70% are supporting non-desktop infrastructure
 - 22% of units supporting non-desktop infrastructure **are not** performing backups
 - 34% of units supporting non-desktop infrastructure **do not** have offsite backups



- 52% of units supporting non-desktop infrastructure need to recover systems in < 72 hours
- 73% of units who completed the survey would like to participate in a DR focus group (24 units)

54. Bobby asked how many of the 52 percent in bullet # 5 is also included in the 22 percent and 34 percent referenced in bullet # 3 and bullet # 4 respectively. Chuck replied this would be covered in the focus groups and reported that every units having offsite backups reported needing to recover with 72 hours. Chuck explained that the question of whether units having offsite backups also plans for restoring their respective infrastructures was not posed but will be addressed within the focus groups.

55. Chuck explained that the next step is to conduct focus groups during March 2021. The working group will evaluate the results and formulate a recommendation that will be presented to the TAC for further refinements and approval. The final recommendation then will be presented to the ITS ELT.

Colocation Service Development Update

56. Chuck reported that a ratings survey has been developed and will be distributed to campus IT managers on March 9, 2021. The survey's purpose is to determine the interest of campus IT managers in the service and its associated features and benefits. The working group will evaluate results and formulate a recommendation that will be presented to the TAC, which then will agree on a final recommendation that will be presented to the ITS ELT.

57. Chuck reported that the working group addressed in depth the following topics: security (facility and equipment access, power, networking, cable management, rack management, change management, and miscellaneous / other.

58. Chuck asked that any TAC members who receive the survey to please complete it. He explained that the survey consists of only five questions and should require only about five minutes to complete.

Storage ITN Update

59. Johnny reported that the ITN was released on February 11, 2021 and that 89 questions have been received from potential bidders. Responses to these questions are due February 25, 2021 and the final ITN responses must be submitted to FSU by March 11, 2021. The negotiation date is March 22, 2021.

60. In response to a question from Matt M, Johnny explained that this ITN is to replace Isilon file storage and that both cloud and on-prem solutions are being considered.

Closing Discussion

61. Tom D complimented the value of participating in TAC and its working groups. Dave agreed.

NEXT MEETING

The March meeting will be scheduled by Chuck and held via Zoom.