Technology Planning and Policy Committee Meeting
March 13, 2014
Minutes

Present: Hernan Bucheli, Chris Carter, Evette Castillo Clark, Maria Grazia de Angelis, Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Peter Greco, Lance Hourany, Pat Kreitz, Bridget Lanigan, ASSMC, Zhan Li, Pete Michell, Michael Nathanson, Julia Odom, Sheila Pallotta, Jeff Sigman, Gregg Thomson, Ed Tywoniak, Michael Viola and Larry Nuti.

I. Announcements
Peter introduced Hernan Bucheli, our Vice Provost for Enrollment and Communications, to the committee and welcomed him to the group.

II. Approval of Minutes
Peter asked if there were any comments or questions pertaining to the minutes of the December 12, 2013 meeting. A motion was made to approve the minutes as submitted. It was seconded and approved.

III. Subcommittee Reports
A. Administrative Technology Subcommittee
Julia reported that the committee received two proposals which were both approved at their last meeting. One was for Terradotta’s web based data management package, from International Programs. This is a travel risk and study abroad database to help manage insurance and travel for those who participate in study abroad activities. A proposal was also submitted by Vice Provost Richard Carp for some Advising needs through Student Success. We approved some customizations and functionality that would allow faculty advisees to email their student advisees, also some functionality for department chairs to have better access to information for student majors, advisor assignments and change of majors. We are meeting tomorrow to review a proposal from Advancement & Alumni Department for a database program called RaisersEdge.

B. Educational Technology Subcommittee
Jeff Sigman shared that the group met virtually over the semester to discuss some grants, two of which were approved for Google Glass. The group is interested to see the outcomes of these grants. They also met a couple days ago to discuss grant process and proposal process, but mainly to discuss the Janterm hybrid project. Barry, Jeff and IT Services have been meeting weekly to discuss support strategy. Barry and Jeff met separately with the Janterm committee to get their feedback and make sure they are on board.

We recently emailed interested faculty, and a little more than half of the 19 came to the meetings that Barry and Jeff held. They later sent out emails to confirm their desire to participate. There are eight who have committed so far, which was the initial cap, but there is one other faculty member who has expressed an interest, so it may increase by one course. They are excited as it represents a broad spectrum. Some have already taught hybrid courses in Graduate Business.
C. ITIS Subcommittee

Peter reported that the subcommittee spent their meeting discussing infrastructure progress. IT Services is charged with the infrastructure and is budgeted to maintain the infrastructure at Saint Mary’s College. There weren’t any proposals to review because IT Services has been focused on the maintenance area.

The subcommittee also discussed the IT Security Policy & Procedure, which is on our agenda today.

IV. IT Project Portfolio Update

Peter called the committee’s attention to the IT Project Portfolio Timeline – Existing and Projected Launch Chronology report dated March 13, 2014. The second page of the document is titled TPPC Projects by Date with Stakeholders and TPPC Review Committee, also dated March 14, 2014.

As he went through the Timeline he noted that we are starting to get things closed out. He added a status indicator to the report. There is only one project that is in the “trouble” category, which is the Faculty Web Profiles.

We have few projects that need attention. We aren’t doing as well as we were at planning for our future. There is a bunch of projects in the present, but as we look forward to the end of calendar 2014 and into 2015 and beyond, there really aren’t many projects. These are the cues that Peter takes from the report. He invited anyone to contact him for clarification of the project titles or with any other questions. We will have the portfolio online at some point.

The second page is the response to what was requested at the last meeting, to get an idea of the projects that went through the review process. Some of these are legacy items that were started before our current structure. He used colors to differentiate areas. Peter missed adding one advisory, which can be corrected in item 2). It should read as “Digital Literacy and Decision Support are prominent in the Technology Strategic Plan…” Decision Support is termed different things in the industry, such as Business Intelligence. It’s associated with big data. It is the domain of institutional research, which is Gregg’s area. This is something that Peter is paying attention to, and he asked for feedback as to whether these are the right things and if we should add anything. He thanked Lance for the work that he has done with his teams to accomplish a significant amount of progress under the fourth advisory, Development of IT Infrastructure. He has gotten us through a large quantity of work, including saving money. He asked Lance to provide a brief summary of the infrastructure progress that we’ve made.

Lance shared that IT Services is very proud of how far we have come in a short amount of time as a team. He shared some of the projects that have taken place since the last meeting of the TPPC:

- Galileo has been completely rewired. All new infrastructure, with all new wifi throughout entire building. This is building number two, following the Garaventa renovation.
- Dante will be done during the second week of August. This will provide a significant effect, with Dante having the most classroom space. In addition to updating infrastructure, we have been updating the AV equipment so that every room is the same.
- We found ourselves hung up with VDI, the virtual desktop project. There was a change in the technology, so we switched gears. We do plan on doing this by piecing it out. We are going to start with two classrooms in GV, a large lab of computers, with the goal to implement in classrooms and labs. Then if it is successful to move on to staff workstations,
and then faculty. All of this is to move towards BYOD and increased mobility/productivity. Among the many advantages this will provide is the ability to switch software within minutes for faculty that change classrooms.

- We have gotten rid of all of our trunk servers. The hardware boxes were ten, twelve and fifteen years old. These legacy items were migrated to a vm instance. This provides greater stability. We've moved some other servers to vm as well as moving some items to the Cloud.
- We've worked on the fiber plant on campus with Garaventa and Galileo. Now we are looking at doing more of this type of work by breaking it into zones. The north east corner (St. Joseph to front of College, with Filippi, BJW, Sichel, will be replaced with single mode fiber which is faster and more reliable than the current multimode fiber that is in place. In some areas we are down in crucial numbers, notably Assumption. This is a high priority for IT Services.
- We have the XP to Windows 7 migration which needs to be done by April 8th for security reasons. There are 244 machines that need to be migrated. IT Services is going to work to address the issues that arise one way or another. Peter shared that the issue is the network. It is not insurmountable.

V. IT Strategic Plan Progress

Peter distributed copies of the Strategic Plan. This document was not sent out with the email. It was put together in 2012. He wanted to change the process to show how he got to the Advisory Section on page two of the Project Portfolio report. Direction A, Direction B and Direction C are the areas where we have some weaknesses in addressing the Plan. Specifically, these were the sub-bullets, a refining process. Peter summarized a little, and asked people to look at the screen where he projected the Project Portfolio. He pointed out the areas where we aren’t paying as much attention as the Strategic Plan would call us to do. He put these things together and came up with a more simplified view. It is important to pay attention to some of these. There’s quite a bit in terms of what happens on our Academic side. He wanted the group to understand that the ETG puts forth a great effort in terms of academic technology. He wanted to make sure that in pointing out the items, it did not reflect on any subcommittee and their work. He suggested that there should be more titles in the academic technology area, among Teaching/Learning, Student Support, and Faculty Development. There are some great grants and innovation going on, but he would like to see more proposals regarding what we can do in and around the classroom. IT security is there because we are focusing our attention in this area. It is Peter’s job to focus on IT resources and support for those three directions and the sub-bullets where they are. Peter has been working hard to try to generate more activity and he thinks things are on the way, but we’re not there yet. He wanted the TPPC to know that this in on his mind.

He asked for thoughts and comments. The following ideas were shared:

- Library and SOE recently had a discussion with the idea of a set of developmentalists, like a sandbox to play in, of potential ideas. Session with Pat was so productive.
• Peter tried to do this with the italicized titles in the project portfolio. He took them off because he could not find a sponsor. Pat thought it could be “an idea space”. Using context as Pat suggests, might be a way to get sponsors.

• Setting up an Open Forum on the Future of Technology at SMC for the faculty - because it would align well with the Strategic Plan on behalf of the TPPC and Strategic Planning Committee. We could set aside time to discuss our identity in relationship to technology and what do we envision, where will that take us in the next 10 years. This idea was well received. It will offer an opportunity to show how the Strategic Plan is being distilled.

• Part of Peter’s role as the IT evangelist, to find a ground swell support that would lead to sponsorship along the lines of the ideas that are generated. They would hopefully turn into proposals.

• Pat suggested using Faculty Tech Camp as a possible forum. They share what they’ve been doing and it is very exciting to hear about them. Further the Hybrid Janterm project will feature some of the technologies, not lecture capture, but screen capture to upload that will be presented.

VI. Technology Use Policy Update

Peter shared that the policy was updated, largely on a semantic level, e.g. “CaTS” was changed to “IT Services”, and the date has changed. The next item refers to this policy. It was over 20 pages and we’ve gotten it down to 17, but it could be shorter so that it is approachable.

VII. IT Security Policy and Procedure

Dennis shared that the policy was reviewed by Larry, by Peter, and by the ITIS. He expressed hope that this committee would advise whether there are further items for review or if it could be forwarded to the Cabinet. He then walked the group through the document.

A discussion followed the presentation. There was support for then need for the policy and the work that has gone into it.

Provost Dobkin raised concerns about Training and Awareness and the policy’s impact on Intellectual property issues.

Peter suggested this may need more discussion and will likely be an agenda item for the May meeting.

He thanked the committee and adjourned the meeting at 2:30.