Call to Order: Chair Larry Tague called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Intro of new members:

I. Welcome and New Members Introduction: Members were welcomed back for the new fiscal year. New members included Steve Adams (COM–Chattanooga, Professor of Family Medicine and Chief Medical Informatics Officer at Erlanger); Chandra Johnson (Employee Relations Committee in the Physician Assistant Department in Health Professions); returning member Phyllis Richey (Faculty Senate Faculty Computing Committee; Department of Preventive Medicine).

II. Proposed Agenda Approval:
   i. Committee Charge based on the CIOAC Bylaws: See Bylaws.
   ii. Article II: Vision and Objective(s): Included on the agenda. Approved at the June meeting, Chair Tague read it for membership hearing. Noted: The revised Article falls within the UTHSC objectives as a whole.
   iii. Roundtable Introductions: Individual introductions were done by the membership and ex-officio members.
   iv. Approval of the Agenda: Members were reminded that they can add comments to add/ delete items on the proposed agenda (see CIOAC Agenda Dev link in Blackboard). With no additions to the agenda, Daniel McGarry motioned that the agenda be approved. Charles Cossar seconded the motion. The agenda was approved by a unanimous vote.

III. Approval of Minutes: A quorum of the membership approved the 6/23/14 meeting minutes in Blackboard.

Old Business

I. Evaluating CIOAC Tools and ITS Division
   i. Short Blackboard Map (Tague): A demo overview of the Advisory Committee site was provided for the benefit of new members.
   ii. CIOAC Functional Areas:
      a. Announcements: The proposed monthly agenda is posted here and includes Adobe Connect instructions for remote and on-site members unable to physically attend a meeting.

c. ITS Reports (Tague): Blogs are posted monthly from all ITS directors are posted. To review reports, select the director’s name from the index (to the right). Reports purpose—to inform the Committee of what’s going on in ITS. Tague encouraged members to provide feedback under Comments. Reports should post a week before the meeting. The agenda will include links to posted reports.

d. Discussion Board: Use for membership discussions, such as new technology as with Cloud-based applications and revised Bylaws, Article II (updated the objective and developed a vision statement). Subcommittees were also formed with an ITS directorship focus. With little activity (except in 3 to 4 areas addressed by Paul Gahn and guests Bill Brescia and Elizabeth Webb), Chair Tague discussed deleting the subcommittees link. McGarry motioned to abolish the standing subcommittees working groups and have a project-based, subject-area focus. The motion was seconded. The vote was unanimous: project-based focus.

e. Minutes: Posted for members review and vote (see Comments at the end of the page).

f. Members Email Link: Used

g. CIOAC Calendar: Do not use; this link will be removed.

h. CIOAC Attendees: Membership roster

i. Documents: Includes documents discussed. Bylaws—new members should review.

Tague noted a main purpose of the Advisory Committee is to propose and prioritize innovative ideas and technology, and create subcommittee(s) that will report back to the entire Committee.

iii. Current ITS Projects List (Tague): Members should review the list to see how it fits with needs they may have. Feedback included:

a. OU Campus (Baber): Training will be provided for a small subset of campus users and others as needed. Version 10 user interface schedule release is expected today. EdTech will then provide face-to-face training. Colleges/departments have staff that regularly updates their web pages. (Members should email Barber at cbarber@uthsc.edu, if interested in knowing their web contact person).

   o OU Campus will be open to departments on a need basis in editing web pages. Some departments are not eager about updating their own pages. McGarry noted the current version is not easy to use. Rollout is slow. A schedule will be developed. The aim—have a more user-friendly interface.

   o Tague wants the option available for departments that want to take advantage of updating their web content. A limited number of licenses (that is a cost factor), distribution will be to users who actually update their pages. Licenses will be increased to cover required users.

   o CIO van der Aa noted it is necessary to have an approval process in place for making and reviewing web updates. Once implemented, OU Campus will enable department/college-level content updates, rather than requests sent to Web Services, Barber noted. Campus users to be contacted are those who do department/college content updates. Communication will be sent out once OU Campus becomes available for use.

Campus Homepage Redesign (van der Aa): UTHSC is charged with redesigning the our website. It will offer a role for a number of groups to make updates. Feedback: Every department needs to have its own infrastructure on how their web content will flow into the UTHSC page as a whole. Execution of OU Campus across campus is not very efficient. To make an effort to establish a reporting and information flowing across departments and ITS,
Representative Richey also noted that the Advisory Committee or Faculty Senate Faculty Computing Committee needs to help facilitate it. Concerns voiced: departments do not know they need OU Campus and/or they do not have staff to edit their web pages. Some do. A solution is needed to develop a coordinated facilitation effort. An over-arching process will be developed for editing content and picture/document uploads. OU Campus will be added to the Discussion Board.

II. ITS Directorship Oriented Subcommittees: Retain or dissolve
   i. Subcommittee or Working Groups: See Old Business item Discussion Board above.

III. CIOAC Information on the ITS Campus Web Page: See
   http://www.uthsc.edu/its/cio_advisory_cmte/index.php

New Business

I. Creating and Publishing Process Maps for Current and Suggested ITS Projects (Tague): Maps are needed for our Committee. Highlights from Lisa Hall were:
   i. Process maps are currently centered around current business processes and will also include future processes. They are used to show how projects flow through the process.
   ii. Projects Process (Vikki Massey): ITS utilize process maps for priority purposes in planning, executing and closing projects and it helps in making decisions about what ITS does. Massey will have something available on the Initiation Phase for the next meeting.
   iii. A process map of OU Campus will be developed recommending to departments how to use it for content changes with editors/publishers privileges and access permissions, to show how the whole campus will benefit from it. Hall and Barber will develop it with current users McGarry and Tricia Page. Since the redesign and so many other things depend on it, OU Campus was taken through the prioritization model and received a very high priority score. Massey clarified that this is a tool to accomplish a two-part process: (1) making web updates and (2) provide the tool that supports the process. Systems Development is working within the established process to make public the process with transparency to campus users.

II. Using CIOAC Survey Instruments for Both Committee Business and Campus Opinion: See agenda for comments.

III. Fall ITS Technology Fair (Ebony Smith): Tentative date is 11/4, 11A–1P, GEB Café for more space and student traffic (not much last year). There will also be an auditor classroom for breakout sessions. Smith is also trying to get support from corporate partners. The first fair last year was a success.
   i. CIOAC Table: Tague wants the Committee to have a table this year, so people can see what the Committee is about. Membership representation is needed at the table.

IV. ITS Open House (Tague): An official tour of ITS, 7th Floor Alexander, will be scheduled for the Committee. CIO van der Aa is in agreement with the idea. Details to follow. This may be an annual event.

Other Item(s):

I. Survey Results Calculated: Do IT Priorities impact the campus community or just a subset of users? Due to time limitations, this was tabled until the next meeting.

Next Meeting:   September 22, 2014

With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn. With a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.
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