

Scheduled meeting – 1:00 – 2:00 pm in RCB355

Agenda 1: Call to order by Mr. Ken Wester 1:09 PM

Attendance: 7

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Mr. Ken Wester | Mr. Brent Drake | Mr. Wyatt Watson |
| Mr. Matt Pipkins | Mrs. Jessica Brock | Mrs. Jessica Holloway |
| Mrs. Laury Fiorello | | |

Not in attendance: 6

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Dr. Jeff Robertson | Mrs. Amy Pennington | Mrs. Sandy Cheffer |
| Dr. Johnette Moody | Mr. Clinton Hall | Ms. Hinkle |

NOTE: Mr. Clay Moore has dropped off the committee, waiting on Elections results and appointment from Staff Senate

Agenda 2: (Review/Approval of Minutes)

Mr. Wester asked if everyone had a chance to review October minutes. All stated they had and there was a motion by **Mrs. Holloway** to approve the minutes, second by **Mrs. Fiorello** and none opposed, minutes approved.

Agenda 3: (Discussion of Email and AD Account Process/Procedure)

Mr. Wester started the conversation with a review of the history of why AD, Email Accounts and OneTech Access and that over time we have accumulated over 100 thousand accounts that have and continue to cause review and management and license issues. Noting that now there is no reason for accounts to existing much past a person is no longer an employee or student. With the Registrar using Parchment for Transcripts and HR/Payroll having specific procedures for obtaining documents from those offices, it is no longer necessary for anyone who has left to have access into OneTech (The primary reason for maintaining all these AD Accounts). **Mr. Drake** brought up questions on E1 email addresses within Banner (causes issues with Advancement) and would these removals finally remove these addresses, **Mr. Wester** stated that he would need to investigate that and get back an answer. **Mr. Watson** had questions concerning changes to the 3rd Party Email address as well.

There was some discussion around the time frame for the acceptable reuse of an eID/OneTech ID. **Mrs. Holloway** suggested a minimum of 7 years before recycling IDs. The group agreed with this suggestion, and except for priority change requests from EC, then we would set that as the standard.

Technology Prioritization and Impact Review Committee
11/15/18 – RCB355 kdw 11-20-18 grammer correction kdw Approved 2-14-19-kdw

The current process is in the review area - *See I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2018\Nov\Review Items\Proposed AD-Email Changes-072518.docx*

11-16-18 – Amended. Mr. Wester had a conversation with Mrs. Carol Adkison over the E1 and E3 email addresses, and she noted that they could and would change the script. If the account is deleted from AD, then the script would change the Primary Email Indicator providing there was an E3 email address available. Testing and confirmation would be done with Mr. Drake and Mr. Watson before finalizing this process.

Agenda 4: (Discussion of Proposal of Campus Support Center 3rd Shift Operations)

Mr. Wester started the conversation by explaining the history behind the CSC shift operations and support of the Online Programs. Like other departments, OIS is supporting the review of operations looking for efficiencies and productivity opportunities. While studying the 3rd shift operations, we noted a significant gap in actual need between the hours of 1:00 am and 6:30 am. **Mrs. Motley** is proposing a necessity to shift operations to accommodate the actual need of the 1st and 2nd shifts while providing coverage of emergency and continuity of operations for the 3rd shift through AI, On Call and Physical (during finals and 1st two weeks of school). *See I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2018\Nov\Review Items\Proposal – email copy*

Agenda 5: (Discussion of IT Financial Review)

Mr. Wester started the conversation with a conversation on the IT Budget and changes within the University concern budgets overall, the process and the need to understand how IT is spending the money it does have and if we are meeting present and future funding needs. He has had a meeting with the WTC Consulting group to establish scope and cost for an IT Cost and Funding review. He hopes to have that information in the next couple of weeks. **Mrs. Holloway** reminded that if the cost rises above 100K that it would need legislative review. **Mr. Wester** said he was hoping not to spend that much on the process, but we would have to wait for the quote for the engagement. - *See I:\IT Priority-Impact Committee\Committee Work\2018\Nov\Review Items\Review of IT Finance.docx*

Agenda 6: (Round Table)

Ran out of time for additional discussion.

Meeting closed at 1:58 PM