SUMMARY FOR STRATEGIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
DATE: November 15, 2016
TIME: 2–4 p.m.
LOCATION: Dumke Room, Eccles Broadcast Center

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mary Burbank	Holly Christmas	Bo Foreman	Demian Hanks
Steve Hess	Mike Kirby	Nancy Lombardo	Harish Maringanti
Ken Nye	Mike Strong	Jim Turnbull	Rob White
Amy Wildermuth	Joanne Yaffe		

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Emily Rushton, Scott Sherman

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Cathy Anderson	Melissa Bernstein	James Elder	Aaron Fogelson
James Herron	John Horel	Jakob Jensen	Andrew Olson
Mary Parker	Kevin Runolfson	Ryan Smith	Rick Smith
Jess Taverna	Jeff West		

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Review of student email options
- Learning spaces/student computing fee allocation process
- Two-factor authentication update
- Holistic web strategy review
- Open floor

Review of student email options

Common Infrastructure Services director Mike Ekstrom reviewed the three options available to address student email: staying with the current practice, moving to the cloud, or creating Utah.edu aliases for student emails. Ekstrom said there is only one other PAC-12 school maintaining its own on-premise student email, which is the university's current practice. Creating .edu alias addresses that forward to a student's personal account is the path Brigham Young University took many years ago, but Ekstrom said the BYU IT staff now says if they had to do it over again, this would not have been their preferred method due to the need to maintain additional infrastructure for the aliases and email forwarding. Ekstrom recommended moving student email to a cloud provider, which would mean gradually moving student emails over the next 4 to 6 months. Student employees sometimes handle secure data (financial or medical, for example) that would be excluded from being moved to the. At this time, only students who are not also employees would have their mailboxes moved to the cloud.

There are several positives of moving to the cloud: the size of the mailbox is much larger (50GB) than what UIT provides by default; eventually UIT would not need to supply as much server support once

the students are totally moved to the cloud; students would also be able to retain their email address when they leave campus if the university made the policy decision to allow that.

One member asked why Microsoft's Office 365 was the assumed cloud provider. Ekstrom said we already have a business associates agreement (BAA) with Microsoft, which protects the university's data in the event that the company fails, and there is no additional cost with using this service. Google's Gmail is an alternative but the integrations to the current Exchange environment do not exist. One member made a motion that SITC do a review when the process is complete, and then again after another six months. There was agreement from the group on this.

One member raised the scenario of a student being moved to the cloud, then obtaining a job at the University after the fact. Would they need to move back off of the cloud to keep their data secure? Ekstrom said no – the data is secure in the cloud and there is no reason to move their email back off just because they've gotten a job with the U. However, there are some cases where usability would be better if the student's mailbox were moved back from the cloud to on-premise systems, and that is an easy move with Office 365.

The committee voted to approve the plan to move forward with transitioning all student email accounts over to the Microsoft cloud, and to review the process when complete and six months after completion.

Learning spaces/student computing fee allocation process

Teaching & Learning Technologies director Jon Thomas gave a review on this year's process for allocating learning spaces funds and covered critical dates over the next 4-6 months regarding the application process. There will be open houses on January 18-19 for both health sciences and main campus to talk about the process this year. The Teaching & Learning Portfolio governance group is attempting to move the process up by a month to better align with budget season for departments and colleges.

Thomas asked the committee to review and approve a handout showing typically requested items divided into three request categories: funding priorities, possibly fund, and do-not-request. There was a considerable amount of discussion regarding the do-not-request category, and various members brought up cases where certain things on the do-not-request list should be moved to the possibly fund list. These included installation labor costs, facilities charges, network backbone fees, and building maintenance and repair. Members discussed how the do-not-request category was created, and what set the precedent for what should/shouldn't be funded. It was pointed out that there are certain restrictions for using student computing fees for things such as facilities costs.

The committee chair, Amy Wildermuth, suggested the T&L portfolio revisit four specific items on the do-not-request category, as well as see what the original policy states regarding what student computing fees can/cannot be used for, and consider moving those four items over to the possibly fund category after determining historically what is allowed to be funded and taking into consideration current student needs (via the student survey coordinated by the T&L portfolio).

Thomas expressed concerns with timing, so the committee agreed to hold a December meeting to discuss the final learning spaces decisions after the T&L Portfolio has had a chance to discuss.

Two-factor authentication update

Interim Chief Information Security Officer Corey Roach gave a brief update on two-factor authentication (2FA). While there has been good progress with users enrolling in 2FA, it was discovered that the original deadline (Nov. 21) could cause some potential issues with instructors and student employees during finals week. In order to mitigate those potential issues, the deadline was moved to December 28. Therefore, 2FA challenges will not be required until then.

Holistic web strategy review

Deputy CIO Ken Pink reminded the committee that a group of content and web managers across campus convened for a three-day workshop to talk about the current state of the University's web presence, the future direction, and goals. That group came up with the idea of setting up a web governance committee for the university, and Bill Warren (University Marketing and Communications) and Ken Pink are the co-sponsors of this effort.

Strategic Planning and Process Team director Paula Millington then talked about the proposed vision, which is that the U's online presence will provide web visitors with an exceptional, engaging experience. Millington covered the current state and issues, the campus web mission, and proposed goals, and asked the SITC to endorse the proposal and allow the creation of a committee to see the proposal through.

There was a brief discussion amongst the group, during which Millington clarified that the committee would ideally consist of many of the same people who attended the three-day workshop (or suggestions from those people). There was general agreement that the Senate Advisory Committee should review the policy once created by the web governance committee.

The committee voted to approve the creation of the new web governance committee consisting of the same or similar people who attended the workshop, as well as endorse the web strategy. It was agreed that Millington could start the committee, but would eventually recommend another person to be chair or co-chair.

Open floor

The committee agreed to hold another SITC meeting in December to revisit the learning spaces and student computing fees question. There were no further topics for discussion.

Action summary			
Action	**Topic**	**Person/Group**	**Next step**
Approved	Review of student email options	Portfolio	Begin the 4-6 month process of moving all student email accounts over to the Microsoft cloud.
Approved	Holistic web strategy update	Portfolio	Create the web governance committee and move forward with the proposed strategy.