IT Architecture and Infrastructure Committee
9:00 – 10:30 a.m., September 11, 2015, FAC 228D

I. Committee Member Introductions

II. IT Governance Overview (Brad Englert)

III. Building Access Control System Approach (William Green)

IV. Office 365 Toolset Project Charter (Bob Gloyd, Chris Carter)

V. 2015-2016 Priorities – Discussion

VI. Chair Election
About IT Governance

The IT governance structure, under the auspices of the Chief Information Office (CIO), establishes the strategic, operational, and technical decision-making process required to ensure IT enables the University to excel in its mission. IT governance provides strategic leadership, establishes campus-wide IT priorities and policies, and is accountable and transparent to the University community. The following diagram illustrates the committee structure for IT governance at the University.

General Responsibilities of IT Governance Committees

The IT governance structure as a whole is responsible for the following:

- Establishing and communicating a campus-wide IT vision that supports the University mission and goals
- Establishing IT policies that support strategic, campus-wide IT priorities
- Establishing an overall IT budget structure for total IT spend on campus, starting with ITS
- Defining technical architecture and standards for the University
- Establishing best practices and tools for IT across campus

IT Governance Values

For IT governance to be successful, the committees must hold the following values:

- Transparency — Governance structure and process must be clear. How decisions are made and who has input rights and decision-making rights must be readily apparent to campus.
• Communication — Communication must occur into, out of, and across the committees and with campus.
• Accountability — Committees and task forces must be held accountable for delivering on their responsibilities. Clear escalation paths for issue resolution must be defined and outlined in charter documentation.
• Responsibility — Governance structure must focus on decision making and results more so than implementation and project management.
• Appropriate representation — Constituency groups across campus must be represented.
• Active support — Governance structure requires staff to support the process. Agenda setting, meeting logistics, issue tracking, and communication are all essential aspects of active support.

Governance Membership

Committee membership is designed to be representative of the campus population. Generally, members are selected to represent academic and research units of varying size, administrative units of varying size, and the student body. Specific details of the membership designated for each committee can be found in the SITAC report.

Members are recommended to the current governance Chairs by governance members, by members of the campus community, or through a research process to identify potential members who represent a specific unit or group that is not currently represented in the governance membership. If specific expertise is desired or required for a particular project of governance, experts are researched and recommended to the governance Chairs. After recommendations are considered and research is conducted, committee members are finalized by and recommended to the President of the University by the current IT governance Chairs.

Agenda Setting

Members of each committee propose agenda items to be discussed in their respective committees. Agenda items can also be suggested by anyone in the UT community by directly contacting a committee member, a committee chair or the CIO’s office. Agenda items reflect campus IT priorities and emergent topics and are collected on a monthly basis and organized into a timeline for presentation that is determined by the committee chairs and finalized by the Chief Information Officer. To support transparency and full participation, topic presenters are asked to create a one-page brief of their topic. These briefs are compiled with the meeting agenda, administered to the committee for discussion, and published on the CIO website.

Reporting

The IT governance structure is supported by strategy, administrative and communications personnel who report to the Chief Information Officer.

Agendas, presentation briefs, and notes for each regularly-scheduled IT governance meeting are available on the respective committee web pages. In addition to the meeting notes and
executive summaries, IT governance progress and updates are communicated via the CIO’s Weekly Update. Any policy related materials are posted on the CIO website.

Some decisions and projects may need additional communications due to their scope. These communications will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Projects

IT governance committees focus on setting direction, decision making, and ensuring accountability rather than implementation responsibilities or IT project management. Committees can, however, ask for and receive presentations and updates on projects from any project teams or steering committees as needed.

Funding Continuum

Projects are funded through four mechanisms; local funding, aggregate funding, aggregate funding with partial central support, and common good funding. Local funding is derived completely from the unit employing the service or administering the project. Examples of services that are completely funded by the local unit include Echo 360 and Computer Aided Design. Echo 360 is a service funded by Liberal Arts that is available to their unit and training for which is available for campus based on special agreements with their staff. Computer Aided Design is a service funded in total by Engineering to serve the specific needs of their population.

Aggregate funding involves the cooperation and coordination of funding through multiple units to save money by buying a service in bulk. By aggregating funds and purchasing power among and across units, the service can typically be acquired at a lower cost. Examples of those services purchased through aggregate funding include Media Site, Apple Educational Licensing, and general use CrashPlan. When a service funded aggregately is identified as essential to a majority of units across campus, it may qualify for partial funding from the central IT budget.

Common Good services are general and global in use. They are available to and serve all campus units and members. Examples include Encryption software, the IT Help Desk, CrashPlan, UT Mail, and Austin Exchange. Common Good services are funded entirely through the central budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Governance</th>
<th>Continuum of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally Funded</td>
<td>Aggregate Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo 360</td>
<td>Media Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas for Non-Traditional Students</td>
<td>MatLab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Aided Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy and Funding Decisions and Exception Handling**

Each committee in the IT governance structure is responsible for identifying and drafting IT policies for the University. Policy decisions are vetted by the CIO and through the entire governance structure. For example, a policy originating in the IT Architecture and Infrastructure Committee is vetted through the Operational IT Committee before endorsement by the Strategic IT Advisory Board. The CIO and committees may solicit the review and expertise of personnel outside of the governance structure in making policy decisions.

IT policy decisions are available at [http://www.utexas.edu/cio/policies/](http://www.utexas.edu/cio/policies/).

If decisions involve funding, they may first be vetted by the IT Architecture and Infrastructure Committee, the Business Services Committee, or the Research & Educational Technology Committee. Questions considered during the vetting process include the audience impacted or served, demand for the service, impact to campus, entities responsible for management of project or service, governance process for project or service, resources necessary to implement project or service, immediate and maintenance costs, timeline of project or service implementation. Funding decisions must be endorsed by the Operational IT Committee. The IT governance structure is also tasked with establishing processes for handling exceptions that meet unique business needs. Exceptions are also useful means for collecting feedback on current structures and determining when established standards become obsolete.

**Subcommittees and Task Forces**

Subcommittees are defined as ongoing groups responsible for issues and decisions in a certain area of IT at the University. Task forces are defined as time-bound groups assigned specific problems to solve or tasks to accomplish.

IT governance committees can form subcommittees and task forces as needed. Existing committees may be asked to establish formal relationships with the IT governance committees, such as the one created between the BSC and the Administrative IT Leaders groups.

There is an intermittent need to create task forces to investigate issues and explore different IT solutions. Task forces can be appointed by any of the IT governance committees on an as-needed basis. The task forces meet for a set timeframe to accomplish specific objectives related to resolving an issue or implementing an IT strategy; they are not be considered standing or ongoing governing bodies. Task force membership can consist of IT governance committee members or any qualified personnel identified by IT governance committee members.

**Customer Steering Committees**

Customer steering committees serve as representative customer groups that work with IT project teams to determine the best course of action and to provide accountability for IT projects at the University. Customer steering committees help project teams:
• Develop a project charter that directs the project towards what customers need most from the service
• Create a thorough and effective communication plan to distribute information to affected customers across the University
• Refine the project plan and be accountable for changes to that plan
• Direct research about the project or service at the University and peer institutions
• Deliver the projects and services that the University truly needs

Customer steering committees may be called upon to present information and updates to IT governance committees.

**IT Governance Meetings**

The IT governance committees meet according to the following schedule:

**Business Services Committee**
First Friday of every month, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

**IT Architecture and Infrastructure Committee**
Second Friday of every month, 9-10:30 a.m.

**Research and Educational Technology Committee**
Third Thursday of every month, 8-9:15 a.m.

**Operational IT Committee**
Fourth Wednesday of every month, 3-4:00 p.m.

**C-13 Information Technology Committee**
TBD

**IT Governance Chairs (BSC, AIC, R&E, C-13, OIT)**
Third Thursday of every month, 11-11:30 a.m.

**Strategic IT Accountability Board**
Quarterly, scheduled according to availability of members
BACS Operations Manual – Endorse

Overview
The Building Access Control and Security (BACS) Operations Manual codifies how those systems are managed and supported at the university.

Specifics
An IT Governance Business Services Committee (BSC) Task Force made up of Campus Safety, Liberal Arts, McCombs, Moody, Natural Sciences and ITS oversaw development of this manual, along with review and requirements from the Information Security Office and Office of Internal Audit. Key points include:

1. Security standards, requirements and oversight are defined for different types of spaces
2. Campus Safety is the owner and ultimate decider for BACS services
3. Governance is through BSC and Campus Safety and Security Committee
4. ITS is responsible for operations, in consultation with applicable University Operations units as noted
5. Units have responsibilities for operations of delegated components
6. BACS is supported primarily through fees:
   a. Units requiring security fund that security
   b. External door support, not installation, is provided as a Common Good
   c. False alarm fees are instituted to ensure proper usage
7. Financial impact: new construction/renovation must adhere to new classifications, or as required by authority (e.g. Audit, EH&S, ISO)

Next steps
$3M BACS Remediation; form committees (policy/appeals); new security system

Endorsements: Campus Safety and Security Committee, Operations IT Committee, Business Services Committee
Executive Summary

The UT System Office 365 licensing agreement covers a number of tools that UT Austin is not currently leveraging. This project will provide experiential data from customer platforms, through pilot groups, to support the deployment and operation of this valuable toolset across campus. Starting from staging that took place in the Summer of 2015 as this charter was being prepared, through larger scale evaluations planned for the Fall of 2015, an increasing user-base throughout this project will lead to providing all licensed campus users access to these tools in the Summer of 2016. From experiences and capabilities already documented in the staging of this project, the provisioning and support of this toolset are anticipated to be low relative to the significant institutional productivity to be gained. The integrated nature of the instant messaging chat capabilities, alongside the high quality videoconferencing and rich collaborative tools, offer a compelling set of capabilities across the core platforms used by many faculty and staff across campus.

Business Need and Background

The Office 365 suite of applications offers a rich set of capabilities far beyond the basic Outlook/Exchange “email in the cloud” service. The Messaging, Meeting and Collaboration tools, in the form of Skype for Business (formerly Microsoft Lync), OneDrive, and Online Office Apps deliver a tightly integrated toolset that can enhance productivity across a broad spectrum of platforms and devices. These applications are also already integrated with the campus identity management and Active Directory systems.

To further illustrate this point, the core functionalities that apply are as follows:

- **Messaging**
  - Chat/Instant Messaging (IM)
  - Presence (Availability / Calendar)
- **Meetings**
  - Collaborative Videoconferencing
  - Desktop and application sharing
  - Presence (Availability / Calendar)
- **Collaboration Tools**
  - Shared Notes (OneNote)
  - Shared Documents (OneDrive)
  - Web Productivity Apps (Online Apps)
For units that are already using Office and Office 365 Exchange as foundational tools, the additional capabilities offered by the full Office 365 Toolset can be quickly and simply added to existing workflows through familiar interfaces. Existing support infrastructures are largely in place so that the marginal support costs and/or learning curves should be low while the benefits in increased productivity will be immediate and significant.

It should also be specifically noted that an enterprise Chat/IM tool could permit the decommissioning of several Jabber servers across campus and eliminate the need for any additional ad-hoc Chat/IM tool implementations.

**Project Description and Scope**

This project will be a pilot conducted in phases by at least seven different CSUs on campus who have already migrated to Office 365. Each unit will define specific use cases to test and will identify a set of users in the CSU to do the testing. Test groups will be as small as several IT staff from one unit and as large as the entire administrative staff in other units.

Each unit will document their experience in deploying, using, and supporting the full Office 365 toolset. This documentation will be collected and reported back to AIC. The three categories of Messaging, Meetings, and Collaboration Tools listed above in "Business Need and Background" define the scope of what will be tested with the Office 365 toolset.

**Project Goals**

The primary goal of this project is to assess the capabilities, cross-platform compatibility, and necessary support requirements to implement the full Office 365 toolset in a CSU. The units participating in the pilot are managed desktop environments and the expectation is that each unit will deploy the technology to end users itself and communicate to them how to use the tools and how they can benefit from doing so.

When the project is complete, we will have documented what it takes to get the tools up and running in a CSU and how individuals and work groups can benefit from using them. We will document ongoing support requirements and will have a best practices recommendation for future CSUs who choose to opt-in to these tools.

**Project Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Summer '15</th>
<th>Fall '15</th>
<th>Winter 15/16</th>
<th>Spring '16</th>
<th>Summer '16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staging - Completed 8/2015</td>
<td>Exploring &amp; Validating</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Expanding &amp; Integrating</td>
<td>Grand-Opening for entire campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer 2015 Phase: Staging**

Preliminary investigations have already unearthed a broad spectrum of easy to use, high quality tools for instant messaging, on-line meetings and document collaboration. Interestingly, the only snags have been in the misconfiguration of the tool at the infrastructure level.
It should be noted early on in this project that we are not developing tools, instead we are using a toolset that is rapidly becoming an international industry standard and that is already in use at numerous educational institutions across the country and within the UT System.

Very early on, core partners will develop usage/platform evaluation matrices. The project team has already engaged the ISO to help address and mitigate any security concerns.

Documents are in progress to help various platform users determine the optimal application option for their environment. Support staff for early-adopters will consult with them to ensure they have access to the tools and know how to use them. Automated installation methodologies have already been identified for organization using management tools such as SCCM or Absolute Manage.

The toolsets are being considered on an opt-in basis by CSU or workgroups through phased deployments. It should be noted, though, that the compelling nature of the tool may inspire rapid adoption.

Core partners will take an advocacy approach toward the toolsets, combining their experiences as soon as is practical.

- James Lewis, for example, will be the Apple advocate and focus on any end-user training that may be needed.
- Chris Carter will bias toward how staff may be able to leverage the toolset.
- Ty Lehman will engage with colleagues within his school, selected by his dean.
- Bob Gloyd will key on Academic and Research opportunities to engage the toolset.

**Fall 2015 Phase: Exploring and Validation the Toolsets amongst campus pilot participants**

Core project members will pursue pilots to validate usage scenarios with targeted customer bases. At about the mid-point of this phase additional campus participants will be actively engaged to evaluate their targeted scenarios (these are documented in the original proposal, attached).

The pilot will include enabling the full Office 365 functionality for all faculty and staff users in the Jackson School and all staff in the UT Libraries. For both units, it is necessary for all of the staff in their environment to be activated in Office 365 to integrate the messaging component into business workflows. Instant messaging, in concert with the collaboration tools, will improve productivity even if the audio/video meeting component is only used by a subset of staff who have the required hardware. Desktop support in each unit will deploy software, train users, and test scenarios of business cases for how the university can benefit from the new features.

Select groups will be enabled within Engineering and the Shared Services Program, including all ATS support staff and core Shared Services staff.
Communication, iSchool, Law and LBJ plan on engaging in the middle of the Fall 2015 semester to evaluate benefits while leveraging the insights from earlier adopters.

Additionally, the Tech Deans group will be engaged to use and evaluate the toolset within a collaborative environment. These stewards, who manage a wide range of IT environments on campus, will contribute to the platform functionality matrix - directly documenting from within the tool.

Documentation, training and deployment plans will be developed as needed and tailored to particular platforms and usage scenarios.

**Winter 2015/2016:**

Report Fall findings to the AIC and make plans for the Spring based upon the Fall 2015 experiences. We will target the February 2016 AIC meeting.

**Spring 2016 Phase: Expanding and Integrating use scenarios**

It is hoped that at least the core project members will be able to achieve parity with the Business School’s implementation of these tools by Spring and thus permit broader collaboration.

More challenging and far-reaching tools will also be engaged. Ideally we will include faculty and graduate students (who are nominally staff) to explore the rich toolset capabilities in the OneNote Class Notebook Creator and engage colleagues from other institutions who are already using the Office 365 suite. We may also integrate industry colleagues when it is appropriate.

**Summer 2016 Phase: Full Grand-Opening unveiling of the full Office 365 suite to the entire campus envisioned**

Demonstrations are imagined to targeted groups. However, due to the general prevalence of these type of tools to our constituency, little formal training is anticipated. Rather, we would expect individuals to explore the tools and expand their skills rapidly through experimentation with their colleagues.
## Project Management and Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name(s)/Organization(s)</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Sponsor(s)</td>
<td>Lorraine J. Haricombe, Vice Provost and Director UT Libraries</td>
<td>Largely interested in the productivity benefits these tools can bring to their organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Sharon Mosher, Dean of the Jackson School of Geosciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Steering Committee</td>
<td>Bob Gloyd, Engineering, James Lewis, Academic Technology Support, Ty Lehman, Jackson School of Geosciences, Chris Carter, Libraries, David Moss, ITS with a bias towards project management</td>
<td>Oversee project and maintain communication between participating units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Bob Gloyd, Engineering</td>
<td>Keep things on track...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>James Lewis, Academic Technology Support, Ty Lehman, Jackson School of Geosciences, Chris Carter, Libraries</td>
<td>Do the heaving lifting of the project :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security Officer</td>
<td>Cam Beasley, ISO</td>
<td>Inform project team of security concerns or limitations of toolset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS-Systems Point of Contact</td>
<td>Trice Humpert, ITS</td>
<td>Coordinate changes needed to enable tools for participating CSUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS-Customer Support Services Point of Contact</td>
<td>Susan Roy, ITS</td>
<td>bring a campus help-desk perspective to the engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder(s)</td>
<td>CSUs listed in table below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Units who have volunteered to be a part of the pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSUs</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cockrell School of Engineering</td>
<td>Bob Gloyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Tim Fackler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Charles Soto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson School of Geosciences</td>
<td>Jeffrey Ty Lehman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Mike Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>Caren Troutman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Chris Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCombs School of Business</td>
<td>David Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(already running these tools in their own 365 instance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Information</td>
<td>Sam Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Services Program</td>
<td>James Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Resources</td>
<td>Roy Ruiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Facilities and Resources

The primary infrastructure for the project will be this existing Office 365 service framework. Only minor adjustments are expected, most likely to adjust permissions to facilitate the use of the tools being deployed.

- The current system administrators, within ITS, would need to adjust participant permissions, unless a distributed proxy mechanism could be identified.
  - Additional configuration changes may be needed, such as correcting DNS entries so that schools with vanity email addresses can use the auto discover when configuring their clients.

- ATS, ITS & CSU Help Desks would need to be aware of this project and develop necessary knowledge and training to support their customers appropriately, as they are contracted to do.

- The ISO will need to appropriately certify components of the tools for general usage, if this has not already been sufficiently accomplished via the UT System or other system components.
  - The security, category, and status of the Online apps and OneDrive are of special interest initially and at some point the Class Notebook tool should be assessed.

- TSCs, within the participating units, will be on the front line of this project, as usual, and will contribute to the knowledge bases to gather nuanced insights about using the toolset.

Impact Analysis

For CSUs that opt-in to using these tools, users in collaborative work-groups will see the most immediate positive impact. Teams that communicate regularly and collaborate on projects and documents will find the integration of the tools with their existing system to be efficient and productive.
While there will likely be an initial increase in support requirements, which one would expect with the introduction of any new IT application, we expect this increase to be minimal given the general familiarity of these office productivity tools within our environment. Units that choose to adopt the toolset will self-select, knowing what is familiar to their users and what approach will best enable increased productivity.

**Assumptions**

The core licensing and infrastructure is already in place through UT System negotiations and corresponding UT Austin implementation of the Office 365 service. However, a number of the available services have currently been disabled and this project strives to pave a path forward for the additional services to be brought online as soon as possible.

IT service organizations around campus, to include CSUs, ATS and ITS will want to familiarize themselves with the offerings, as part of this project, in order to be able to support customers as the service offerings are unveiled.

The Office 365 suite of applications is targeted at a broad user base and will encompass traditional operating systems and mobile platforms such as tablets and phones. Each venue will have slightly different capabilities and it is a goal of this project to help customers understand the nuances of each so that they may choose a tool appropriate to their business needs.

It is assumed that ITS will maintain the core infrastructure, as part of the Office 365 offering, and we suggest that this component of the ITS portfolio be incorporated into an appropriate Customer Advisory Board (CAB) to ensure that all components are being maintained at appropriate version, permission, and capability levels.

**Constraints**

The Windows and web versions of all these tools are well-developed and ready for full testing with no constraints.

Initial testing of the Mac and iOS clients indicates that they are viable. The Mac web plug-in version of Skype for Business offers additional functionality.

If a new Mac OS or iOS version of Skype for Business is released during the pilot, we will thoroughly test these new products.

**Risks**

Essentially no institutional risk is perceived as part of this project, especially since core negotiations and licensing were resolved at the UT System level and the UT Austin campus already has the core infrastructure in place. As mentioned above, adequate training and support for both help desk staff and new users of the tools will be needed to ensure a positive experience.
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