



MINUTES

Technology Architecture Committee

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

Date: March 26, 2021

Participants: Alex Birkovsky, Dave Borschel, Louis Brooks, Andy Bucior, Alex Chisler, Tom Doughty, Matthew Earhart, Mary Eichen, Jonathan Fozard, Lori Gormin, Matt Hohmeister, Bill Hunkapiller, Fred Jordan, Chuck Kemeny, Ray Marky, Michael McDonald, Tom Morgan, Matt Mortimer, Mike Repchek, Johnny White

ACTION ITEMS

- None

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 Deputy CIO Jonathan Fozard and Chief Information Security Officer Bill Hunkapiller as first-time attendees and guest presenters.

Catching Up with Deputy CIO Jonathan Fozard

5. Jonathan reported that he has worked in higher education for over twenty years, including Oklahoma State University, University of Oklahoma, and George Washington University.
6. Jonathan explained that since arriving at FSU he has been spending considerable time reviewing and evaluating IT funding and finances, including how IT is funded both within ITS and across the university. The goal is to develop a sustainable IT funding model, one of ITS' six strategic priorities. Jonathan will be defining, evaluating, and promoting IT-related strategic investment needs and opportunities. He also will be focusing on people and culture, seeking to enhance ITS' strategic alignment with campus academic and business needs and priorities.



Cybersecurity Scorecard Presentation by CISO Bill Hunkapiller

7. Bill explained that the goal of this presentation is to expand awareness of the scorecard concept and to obtain feedback. He reported that the concept has been shared with other university leadership and professionals and has received much positive feedback. He noted that the scorecard is still being introduced to the campus community and will undergo additional refinements based on feedback.
8. Bill explained that during the creation of the Seminole Secure program 307 campus units were consolidated into 54. For each of these 54 units, the scorecard would involve developing a technology and risk profile, defining and measuring key performance indicators, identifying areas of concern, and formulating remediation recommendations. Bill emphasized that the intent is to help rather than punish or shame units. Bill wants the units and members of ISPO to agree on the metrics and the scoring of those metrics. ISPO will partner with each unit's Information Security Manager and Unit Privacy Coordinator.
9. In response to a question, Bill explained that the "university units" are defined in the Information Security Policy. The criteria are that a qualifying unit is one that provides critical business processes to the university and that if interrupted will cause financial or reputational harm.
10. Bill displayed a list of the 54 units, explaining that these are the same units that will participate in the Seminole secure program.
11. Bill explained that he envisions a color-coded scoring symbol that will mimic traffic signal lighting – green, yellow, amber, red – and that up or down trends will be portrayed as arrow symbols. Bill later explained that the compliance percentage values for each rating symbol are arbitrary but were reviewed and agreed to by Chief Audit Officer Sam McCall.
12. Bill explained that the sizes of the 54 campus units vary dramatically, resulting in dramatic differences among units in the level of difficulty of managing cybersecurity risk. This is posing a challenge in formulating a process for measuring units' comparative performance in mitigating cybersecurity risk. Bill invited the TAC members to offer suggestions.
13. Bill identified and described three major components to a unit's technology and risk profile: digital footprint (amount of technology), data compliance requirements (FERPA, PCI, etc.), and population (students, faculty, staff). He explained that the greater the presence of these components, the greater the level of risk.
14. Bill presented key performance indicators (KPIs). These include basic cybersecurity awareness training, data center location and configuration, and potentially others, including Seminole Secure compliance, vulnerability management program, standard technology protections, risk assessment program, incident management, IT staff knowledge and sufficiency, and IT budget for security. For each KPI, Bill wants to establish (1) a definition, (2) a rationale for its importance, and (3) a ranking.
15. Bill reported that when cybersecurity awareness training was evaluated by the OITS auditors, the compliance rate for training completion was about 40 percent. The completion rate has increased the 94 percent, and Bill explained that this compliance measurement process gives him the ability to report the



security awareness completion rate for each unit. The performance for each unit will be portrayed using the color schema described above.

16. Bill explained that he has reviewed a commercial product named “Security Scorecard” that assesses technology risk from an external perspective and is used by many organizations. The product has a 1.5 percent false positive rating and measures dimensions such as network security, DNS health, IT reputation, hacker chatter, information leaks, etc. Performance can be measured by IP range, making possible the measurement of unit level performance. Bill is continuing to evaluate other products.
17. Bill explained that he wants the risk assessment and scoring process to (1) be fair and equitable, (2) provide a means for units to identify areas needing improvement, and (3) provide a means to report areas and levels of risk and associated remediation funding needs to university executive leadership.
18. Responding to a question about scoring methodology from Andy, Bill explained that because of the extreme diversity across the 54 units, it is likely to be impossible to develop a valid and meaningful comparative performance ranking of all the units. Chuck suggested considering a multi-dimensional approach that would entail categorizing the units by size and technology composition / complexity and comparing units within each category. Mary suggested grouping the units by size and risk first.
19. Responding to a question from Chuck, Bill explained that peer universities have not implemented this type of cybersecurity risk assessment and scoring methodology and that FSU is a pioneer in this regard.
20. Chuck asked whether ITS is one of the 54 units and whether ITS will be undergoing this risk assessment and scoring process. Bill affirmed that ITS is one of the 54 units and has improvement opportunities in some areas.
21. Bill asked for opinions of the concept in general. Andy replied that the tool should prove to be very valuable. Mary replied that technology risk needs to be explained properly to executive leadership so that the reported results and recommendations are fully understood.
22. Chuck asked whether the reported results will include recommendations for remediation funding. Bill replied that this is the intent because a major goal is to help the units improve. Bill’s objective is to present the risks and gaps to executive leadership, thereby eliciting executive decisions of whether the risks are acceptable or not acceptable. If funding is not awarded for the latter, executive leadership would be accepting the risk by default.
23. Mary suggested that adequacy of IT resources and compensation for IT professionals be included among the recommendations. Bill agreed.
24. Michael McD explained that smaller departments tend to be very IT resource-constrained and would not be able to remediate without adequate funding.
25. Fred suggested consideration of outsourcing / staff augmentation for remediation, especially utilization of local vendors that are familiar with FSU. Bill agreed that this could be an option.



26. Bill closed by inviting volunteers to participate in this initiative and by acknowledging the resource concerns raised by Mary and Michael McD.

Student Technology Fee Proposals Feedback Presentation by Dave Borschel and Lori Gormin

27. Dave reported that the experience of evaluating 115 instructional technology enhancement project proposals as a member of the Tech Fee Committee has been a very interesting and enlightening experience, and a considerable amount of work.

28. Dave explained that as members of the TAC, Lori and he were asked to watch for considerations that would be pertinent to the TAC's mission. Key evaluative questions were:

- Does FSU have any existing technology that can fulfill the proposal's business and technical needs?
- Are there any overlapping or duplicated proposed technology solutions?
- Do any of the proposals embody opportunities for new ITS service offerings?

29. Dave explained that he tried to separate the proposals into categories that he perceived as he reviewed the proposals. He noted that the categories are somewhat subjective and sometimes overlap within the same proposal. He suggested that these categories might prove useful in the future for engaging the assistance of category-specific subject matter experts in reviewing the proposals, and possibly for splitting up the proposals by category and assigning category-specific teams of reviewers. The latter would make the review exercise less overwhelming for individual reviewers.

30. Dave reported that he was surprised by the number of proposals that focused on video production and associated services, including video production, creation of a video lab, or creation of a production studio.

31. The complete array of proposal categories identified and defined by Dave are:

- Video Production/Services -16 Proposals
- VDI, FSUV-Lab, Virtual -6 Proposals
- Specialized - (Research Equipment / Mission Unique License Subscriptions) -26 Proposals
- Servers - (Storage / Email / HPC) -5 Proposals
- Projectors Cameras AV (Instructional) -26 proposals
- Network Equipment Requests -(Switches / Wi-Fi) -2 Proposals
- Desktop Computers (Faculty / Staff) -1 Proposal
- Classroom Technology and Lab (computers/podiums) -33 Proposals



32. Dave Identified and explained the following potential opportunities for the TAC to assess and consider recommending consolidation or centralization based on common needs across proposals:
- Mersive Solstice -Licenses and hardware
 - RDP or Remote access software? Bomgar expansion or use FSU-VLAB
 - Crestron consulting, installation, and programming
 - Expanding VDI / VLAB/Virtualization
 - Assistance with video production services or consulting? (Especially production studios or media labs)
 - Lifecycle replacement
 - Storage (subsidized)
 - GoReact (Video assessment)
33. Dave reported that several departments have difficulty establishing or maintaining life cycle replacement for computer labs. He cited storage as another common need and suggested that the offering of additional centralized storage or centrally subsidized storage might be considered.
34. Lori suggested the possibility of developing category-specific standardized questions for proposal submission.
35. Chuck reminded the TAC that the Tech fee Committee will be recommending which of the 115 proposals to fund, and then the TAC working group will have two weeks to review the recommended proposals to identify any that need further consideration based on the evaluative questions cited in line 28 above. He noted that that so far there are five volunteers for the working group, and he invited other TAC members to consider volunteering.
36. Dave describes some weaknesses that he perceived in some proposals. These include no or inadequate timeline for major project activities, weak technical specifications, inadequate explanations of rationale for equipment requested, lack or insufficient explanation of required companion services, lack of or inadequate detail of required personnel, and appearance that the ITS Service Catalog was not reviewed as a resource. For this last weakness, if an ITS service was reviewed and considered, a brief explanation of why it was not selected would be helpful.
37. Mary asked whether the proposals primarily focused on hardware or whether software was also a significant component of the proposals. Lori replied the software was often a significant component.
38. Lori noted that some proposals are requests to cover recurring costs, requiring the proposals to be resubmitted each year to maintain sustainability. The ITS virtual computer lab is a longer-term example.



39. Citing computer lab upgrades as a key example, Lori stated that there are opportunities to save money through consolidated procurements that are not being recognized, pursued, and realized. She suggested that centralized life cycle replacements for computer labs be pursued to remove this burden from the departments.
40. Dave questioned whether all campus departments are aware of the ITS virtual computer lab and whether there are additional opportunities for departments to leverage this service rather than seeking to create their own local virtual computer labs via the tech fee proposal process.
41. Chuck praised the insights and recommendations presented by Dave and Lori, and he stressed the importance of presenting this information to the ITS ELT and appropriate members of the IT Governance Council, possibly to the ITGC working group that is reviewing the overall utilization of tech fee revenues, including the Student technology Fee Awards Program. He asked Tom M to take the lead in organizing this session with executive leadership.
42. Chuck delivered one final request / invitation for additional TAC members to volunteer to join the working group that will review the tech fee proposals recommended for funding by the Tech Fee Committee. He cited the planned two-week window of April 12-23 for the working group to complete its reviews and agree on recommendations.

TAC Charter Revision – Participation Guidelines

43. Chuck presented the recommended verbiage for TAC Participation Guidelines that will be recommended for incorporation into the TAC Charter if there are no objections. The verbiage reads: “Voting members must participate in at least 65 percent of the monthly meetings and serve on at least one working group each year. The committee chair reserves the right to request a member be replaced if they fail to meet the participation guidelines.”
44. Chuck asked for any objections or concerns. Since there were none, Chuck stated that the new verbiage would be incorporated into the TAC Charter ~~and would be presented for official approval during the next TAC meeting.~~

DR Service Development Update

45. Chuck asked for feedback and / or questions regarding the DRaaS working group’s draft proposal that he had sent to the TAC for advance review. He explained that upon the TAC’s approval the proposal would be sent to the ITS ELT for review and approval.
46. Matt E moved to approve the proposal and forward it to the ITS ELT. Matt H seconded the motion.
47. Chuck asked the TAC members to record their yea or nay votes in Chat. There were no dissenting votes, and the proposal was approved as written.



Colocation Service Development Update

48. Chuck reported that the survey data has been collated by the working group and that the results will be distributed to the TAC. The working group will be developing a recommendation that will be presented to the TAC for approval.

Storage Refresh Update

49. Johnny reported that six vendor proposals were submitted, and that questions have been directed back to the vendors. The vendors' responses are due next week (March 29 – April 2), and a meeting will be scheduled to review the responses. Johnny stated that the initiative is progressing well and remains on schedule.

NEXT MEETING

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