

Campus Technology Policy

December 11, 2006

1:00 – 2:30 pm

TechZone

Present: Bob Aaron, Sam Catanzaro, Dan Hayden, Trish Klass, Jim Moon, Bob Rariden, Beth Schobernd, Mark Walbert, and Shari Zeck

Absent: Sara Campbell, Alan Lacy, and Brent Paterson

Mark welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Old Business

Mass email on Trash retention procedure

Announcement of this new service was postponed until January and will be implemented in February. Mark will send committee members a draft document for discussion in January. Bob asked if the Trash folder will be a Trash folder on the Exchange system as well as the Sun system and Mark indicated that it is the same no matter which you are on.

Interim Exchange proposal (second draft version)

Mark announced that he had forwarded to committee members the second draft version that Dan Hayden had sent to him on the interim *Exchange* proposal. He then turned the discussion over to Dan. Dan went over the AIS proposal for temporary migration from *Meeting Maker* to *Exchange*. Trish had an editorial change on page 1. Dan inquired who else this document would be going to and Mark responded that he would be presenting this document to the Vice Presidents requesting financial assistance. Dan explained this proposal would take care of approximately 700-1,000 current *Meeting Maker* users who do not have an exchange account or calendar. Mark suggested that the number was closer to 1,100. Beth asked about the cost of the backend server. The number of resource accounts that would need to be created was clarified and it was pointed out that GroupSheild licenses will still have to be purchased for resource accounts. Dan further explained that it will not be a problem to give an Exchange account to new hires to the University, but current employees who do not use an electronic calendar at all now will probably have to wait if they request one depending on the circumstances. The committee discussed what options were available to these new Exchange users for email. The committee discussed removing from the proposal language that repeats the relative Exchange backgrounds of staff in AIS & CISS in order to make it more clear for external audiences. Mark would like to keep this same management model that was approved in the Exchange Working Group proposal approved in October. The group agreed. While it may slow things down for 3 weeks to a month the long-term benefit will be positive for the campus.

Shari asked about the Proposal's recommendation regarding Meeting Maker calendar data migration to Exchange. Dan pointed out that if we do not buy the service and have everyone manually reenter only the meetings they have proposed, it would be a learning process for all the users and would be training-of-sorts on the new *Exchange* system. Shari pointed out that even though there is a \$35,000 one-time cost to have this done automatically, not providing this will still impose a time cost as people move meetings from *Meeting Maker* to *Exchange* manually. Mark mentioned that the other part of this equation is the time it will take for repeating meetings to be manually reentered may result in people or resources being double booked. Mark said Carla is looking into whether a new estimate would reduce the \$35,000 cost since we are now talking about moving the calendar for fewer people. Sam asked about an archiving issue since some employees may have to prove they had been in a meeting on a specific date. After June 30, *Meeting Maker* can still be run off-line, so all calendars currently stored locally in a Meeting

Maker data file would be available for review even if we don't pay for complete calendar migration.

Mark asked Dan to make sure the numbers are all the same throughout the document and to work on the costs table. Shari added that she felt that a one page document saying this is what we are recommending, with various proposals as appendices would be beneficial. Mark asked about back-up of *Exchange* and Dan shared with the group that *Exchange* is backed up.

Shari asked if the e-mail client available to employees should be required or if it should be left it up to the users. Dan said they have to create a mailbox for each person no matter what their e-mail client is, but if they forward their e-mails, it would save disk space. Mark indicated that he is still in favor of telling people that they have an option to use any e-mail client pointed to the Sun server to get off-campus e-mail. The Council asked if Mark will pare the document down to one page after Dan sends it to him in Word.

Mark announced training can be done wherever each area wants to but he requested all local support staff to work closely with CTLT.

Jim asked if the proposed solution is the one that we are going to long-term and the committee all agreed that this is the direction the campus needs to taking with shared calendaring. Jim asked if we could now announce this in our respective areas and Mark indicated that this we could.

Discussion of Dan's commentary on Goal 3

Mark asked if there were others who wanted to discuss Goal 3 (which proposes an Office of CIO) and asked Dan to briefly describe his commentary. Dan explained why he felt Goal 3 should be rewritten. He discussed Andy Clark's ECAR Research Bulletin *IT Governance: Determining Who Decides*, the article Mark had sent to the committee earlier in the year. He indicated that decision making at lower levels rather than at the CIO level (who may not have direct access into these decisions) seemed more logical in ISU's environment. He briefly explained the chart that he had sent to committee members showing who has input rights and who makes IT decisions in the division of Finance and Planning. He added that it did not take long to create the chart and to get buy-in from others. He suggested that if each of the Vice Presidential divisions would follow a similar procedure, a CIO would be unnecessary.

Others felt that a CIO is needed for a University-wide vision for IT and it would be hoped that decision making at the local level would not be taken away by bringing in a CIO. Dan added that he does not believe a CIO will have any more influence than he and Mark have now on how decisions are made since each Vice Presidential area has their own budget. He added that he has trouble understanding how a CIO could have a campus-wide perspective. He explained that since coming to Illinois State University, he has learned to work within the University environment of shared governance and felt that people putting their heads together makes more sense than one person having all the authority and making the decisions. Mark added that the CIO would be an over looker or overseer even though each area would still have their own people to make decisions. He added that the CIO position is about managing relations and not technology; so they need to provide as well as sell an IT vision to the campus community. Dan added, and many agreed, that the culture and missions is different in the Colleges than it is in the or administrative Vice Presidential divisions. This would make it difficult for one person to understand and be fair to all. Mark added that it is about vision, leadership for the entire campus. Previous attempts at ISU to hire a CIO were discussed.

Mark asked if this subject needed further discussion. Bob Rariden indicated that he felt the crux of the issue is the fact that the CIO would not have sufficient authority and that this verbiage is missing in Goal 3. Bob suggested that the committee add wording in the document that would give the CIO the authority that they need, which would be authority at the Vice Presidential level. Dan added that he did not feel that this would receive buy-in but Mark disagreed with him on this point. Bob added that it needs to be clear this position would have the top level authority of budget and that this would not merely be a cajoling position. Otherwise, we would be setting this person up for failure here at Illinois State. Jim Moon added that this would be completely different funding than we have now. Mark added that he will try to draft a change in Goal 3 to reflect what is missing.

Mark added he still needs edits from several committee members and asked them to get those to him as soon as possible. When we begin meetings in January, we will split up the document for edits. Mark added that he will send out an end-of-the-year draft of the document.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sam Catanzaro

Sam announced that Ann Beck would be taking his position on the Council after the first of January but that he will stay involved with the Strategic Plan until we have that finalized.

AGENDA ITEMS TABLED FOR JANUARY 22 MEETING:

Old Business

- *Comments on Mark's suggested changes and additions to the IT Plan (emailed November 17th)*
- *Comments on general feedback of the Public 'Beta' version of the IT Plan (emailed December 5th)*
- *Discussion of Action Item ranking*

New Business

- *IT Policy - Discussion of current list of IT policies and presentation of a draft of "Policy on IT Policies" by Bill Blomgren.*

Mark announced that he will have Bill present at a meeting early next semester.

Next Meeting

January 22, 2007

DeGarmo 551

1:00 – 2:30 pm

Submitted by Georgia Bailey