



Faculty Senate

Information Technology Committee

DRAFT Minutes of meeting of Tuesday, February 8, 2022, 2:00 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Roll Call (Screen Verification via Zoom)

Present: Lee Dotson, Joseph Harrington, Adam Wells, Anya Andrews, Athena Hoepfner, Matt Nobles, Shengli Zou, Thad Anderson, Francisca Yonekura, Elizabeth Klonoff, Pieter Kik, Viatcheslav Kokouline, Sumanta Pattanaik, Matt Hall, Chad Macuszonok, Hank Glaspie

- Call to order at 2:03 pm
- Approval of the Minutes for January 25, 2022
 - No amendments to minutes
- Mass E-mail policy
 - Review of information from other institutions
 - Contacted MIT and looking at policies from other institutions
 - Topic is part of a broader communication strategy with input from Faculty Senate and other areas.
 - Expect to have information for feedback for next committee meeting
- Process/policy for evaluating software in the common good and charging
 - If you have information from a previous institution or contacts he should reach out to, please send to Hank.
 - Discussion about UCFIT drafting rules/standards/policies for the committee to provide feedback.
 - Enterprise IT projects and operations include information technology programs, projects, services, and initiatives that have at least one of the following attributes:
 - used by a majority of campus
 - have a significant impact on the campus
 - critical to the campus
 - have a high degree of risk (i.e., carry the potential for adverse impact to reputation, or loss of confidentiality, integrity or availability of information resource operations or assets)
 - Two parts to this topic
 - Policy
 - Impact on campus
 - Cost impact

- Accounting reduction
 - List of software
 - UCFIT needs inputs from faculty and others. Example used was Harvard's curated list
 - Time considerations - some licensing is up in May of this year
- If not in the common good, is it possible to determine potential savings?
 - Can pull list of purchases if done through TPC but can't currently detect if purchased via PCard
 - Possible to use the available info to review and make cost savings projections
 - Future goal is to assist with cost savings and remove unnecessary duplication
- Review of information collected from other institutions
 - <https://procurement.ufl.edu/uf-departments/how-to-purchase-software-subscribe-to-software-as-a-service-saas/> (Glenn Martin via email)
 - <https://hosting.it.ufl.edu/services/> (Glenn Martin via email)
 - Common-Good Resources Philosophy from the Oakland University Tech Services
<https://oakland.edu/uts/common-good-core-resources/common-good-resources-philosophy/>
Oakland U also has a useful section on Funding Models, including criteria for analysis and from the Faculty Senate <https://www.oakland.edu/uts/faculty-and-staff-services/software/#funding> (Athena Hoepfner via chat)
 - Colorado State University OIT page touches on Common-Good software (not centrally funded) and appears to have some criteria
<https://oit.colorado.edu/services/software-licensing> (Athena Hoepfner via chat)
 - Please send additional examples to Hank Glaspie or Matt Hall
- Other/New Business
 - Training/workshops available with existing licensing
 - Chad shared that through current licensing they can bring subject matter experts to provide training as well as self-paced courses for MATLAB. MATLAB is an example to determine how to start reaching out and potential offerings to faculty/students. Possibility of doing similar for other software (SPSS, SA, Power BI, etc.). How best to disseminate and communicate this information?

- Leveraging the tools currently available. How can we leverage to maximize use?
- Open Source tools don't have the same training opportunities available like traditional vendors. Do we invest UCF dollars as a part of any common good dialog into supporting Open Source tool training and support? Currently relying on UCF talent for some of those such as Python and Unix.
- Suggestion for Shafaq to attend future meeting to discuss workshop series and training opportunities.
- The Open Records Law and software purchases
 - Open Records Law requires us to save all written records for three years. This was written before the modern internet and cloud computing. The General Counsel is currently attempting to negotiate mods to EULAs for few-seat software purchases.
 - Discussion about the need for a process and policy that avoids a lengthy purchase process
 - Difficulty in negotiating extended access for small licenses where data is stored in someone else's cloud
 - Question of how to curate the data when subscription expires for SaaS
 - Growing concern with increasing use of SaaS and cloud storage
 - Solution was to keep a local copy of everything that is in the cloud
 - Matt will discuss with Youndy Cook
- Meeting adjourned 2:57 pm