AGENDA
IT Professionals Committee
May 25, 2016 (10:30AM-12:00PM)
Technology Commons 1 #102C

Approval of April 27th Minutes (All)
CIO Update (Joel Hartman)
Meeting Dates for 2016-2017 (Larry Jaffe)
Transition Team Update (Joe Alcala)
ServiceNow Update (Joe Alcala)
Submitting Initiatives/Projects to IT Strategic Governance Committee (Larry Jaffe)
Data Strategies and Data Security (David Canova, Marc Cassidy, Chris Vakhordjian)

Next Meeting Date (10:30AM-12:00PM)
June 22, 2016
IT Professionals Committee

Minutes

May 25, 2016

Committee Members Present:
Joe Alcala, Craig Anderson, Richard Caldwell, Adiaak Gavarrete, Bryce Jackson, Larry Jaffe, Chad Macuszonok, JP Peters

Committee Members Absent:
Michael Callahan, Craig Froehlich, Andrew Holloway, Bob Mello, Aaron Misiano, Tim Neubrander, Andrew O’Mara

Others Present:
David Canova, Marc Cassidy, Adam Glover, Joel Hartman, Joanna Rodgers, Chris Vakhordjian

MINUTES

Larry Jaffe called the meeting to order at 10:34AM.

Larry asked everyone to review the minutes from the previous meeting.

- Adiaak Gavarrete voted to approve the minutes, JP Peters seconded.
- Everyone agreed on approval of the minutes without any changes.

Joel Hartman gave a CIO update.

- I believe you have all seen the timeline created for the transition to UCF IT. We are laying the groundwork to make these transitions occur in the order and the sequence indicated.
- I wanted to talk with the IT Pro Committee and the transition team to be sure that as the transitions begin to happen, the machinery is in place to make it work and to have people understand what they are going to do, where they are going to go, how they are going to interrelate, etc.
- I want to make sure everyone is comfortable and prepared for when the transitions begin to occur from an HR point of view in order to make it succeed. If anyone has any questions or concerns, please bring them up as soon as you can and we will work with you on them.
- What I would like the IT Pro Committee to think about is what steps we could practically take to go from where we are to a more diverse workforce. There are two kinds of things that we could do, one of which is at the level of searches. We can look to be sure that the searches we undergo and the sources we tap for candidates give us the greatest potential of a diverse pool of candidates for new hire. The other thought would be to leverage the intern program and attempt to bring diverse individuals into the IT workforce and give them a track in which they can develop.
- The second has to do with getting employee’s certifications into PeopleSoft. I think it would be worth updating the list of certifications. We need to develop a way of actually getting these certifications into PeopleSoft. One way to go about this would be to do it as a part of the transition as people come into UCF IT. We can harvest their credentials and certifications as a way of making sure they remain updated from that point forward.
The timeline and functional org chart are online and open for comment. We are on the verge of being able to review and publish the first actual org chart, which will come out in versions that equate to the transitions that are coming.

Joe Alcala gave an update on the transition team and ServiceNow.

- The transition team has been working rather aggressively on the communications plan. The team has come up with a good timeline and drafted messages, which Dr. Hartman has approved.
- I discussed with ServiceNow our upcoming renewal, memo of understanding, agreement between Internet2 and ServiceNow, and how that relates to UCF.
- Larry mentioned that for the asset management piece of ServiceNow there is a workshop on June 6th-7th. The workshop is to help all groups going into ServiceNow have a standardized asset system. F&A is willing to provide UCF IT with tags for standardizing tagging of appropriate IT items under $5000.

The next item on the agenda was data strategies and data security. Larry turned the conversation over to David Canova, Marc Cassidy, and Chris Vakhordjian.

- David mentioned that as far as data strategy and governance, from my standpoint, defining the ownership of the data and having a standardized workflow for provisioning that information out to other groups needs a well-defined governance model.
- Joel commented that we need to define who has a right to see the data, and what do they have a right to do with it once they have access to it. We are looking into the possibility of an integration platform like MuleSoft to standardize data.
- Marc stated that we are in the very beginning process of identifying and inventorying all of the apps across campus. We started with questions such as what do we currently have in inventory, what does it do at a high level, what are the plans coming forward, are there plans to build it, and do we already have an app similar to this one?
- Chris mentioned one of our challenges historically here at the university has been that there is no discussion or negotiation as to what else exists when an application is wanted or needed. We have isolated systems that are out there and that is why there are over 850 applications today. One issue is obviously controlling and governing the development, who and what body makes this decision? What is the best place to develop something? We need a governing body to make these decisions across the university. This is just the development piece, and then we need a governance body for data itself. I believe we need a data governing body that has representation from HR, the Registrar’s Office, and other major organizations on campus that have unique data, etc.
- JP commented that it sounds like we need governance of the ownership of data, which Joel has already started to talk about, governance of how the data and managing systems are developed, and then build business processes that support those decisions.
- Joel stated that in order to get accurate data, one of the principles we established in the beginning was that data going into PeopleSoft had to be data only associated with the university business process, only managed by a functional office, and only processed by employees who had the necessary training in order to handle the data accurately. This allows for accountability and some sense of consistency because their business function depends on it being right. Whereas if nobody owns it or multiple people own it, the sense of responsibility, accuracy, and timeliness degrade to the point that you may end up with data that is no longer functionally usable.
• Marc stated that before anybody can share resources across colleges, we need a central repository where code is stored and shared rather than all of these silos of information. Mike Callahan has already requested a service for GitHub and GitLab, which is the very first step to build that platform for everybody to collaborate.

• Joel commented we need a more efficient and effective process to meet enterprise business needs. Part of this is acquisition, and part of it is application and development. These both need review processes on how best to meet business needs, prioritize these needs, and establish a more efficient lifecycle way to meet these needs.

• Joel suggested creating an adhoc group to meet outside of this committee and draft some bullet points on data strategies to bring back for the next discussion. Joel suggested asking relationship managers what new application development requests have occurred in the past.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:56AM.