Minutes
CIO Advisory Committee Meeting
The University of Tennessee Health Science Center
910 Madison, Room 502
May 18, 2015

Members Present (10): Larry Tague (Chair), Daniel McGarry (Vice Chair), Charles Cossar, Yan Cui, Paul Gahn, Ramona Jackson, Judith Nyabando, Phyllis Richey; Travis Turner and Jada Williams (Adobe Connect)

IT Services (ITS): Jan van der Aa, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and CIO, Lisa Aitken, Customer Technology Support; Todd Barber, Web Services; Peter Fox, Jr., Computing Systems; William ‘Billy’ Hatcher, Jr., Infrastructure; Vikki Massey, Project Management Office; Ebony Smith, EdTech

Secretary: Judy Johnson

Other: Michael Pointer for Bryan Lemieux, Safety Affairs

Absent (7): Stephen Adams, Anna Montgomery, Sajeesh Kumar, La’Keith Miller, Tricia Page, Rakesh Patel and Netia Watson

Mediasite Recording: The recording of the May 18, 2015 meeting is provided for members’ review.

Meeting Materials: Agenda; Minutes of the April 27, 2015 meeting.

A. Call to Order: Chair Tague called the meeting to order at 9:01 A.M.
B. Welcome: Members were welcomed to the meeting.
C. Proposed Meeting agenda was approved. The April 27, 2015 meeting minutes—also approved.
   I. Printable Agenda: A PDF agenda is available on Blackboard. Log-in should be done first before clicking agenda links.
D. ITS Reports (Tague): Posted reports for May total 5. Members should read the posted reports and add comments as necessary.
E. Old Business
   a. Cloud-Based Applications Subcommittee (Tague): The Committee is considering electronic signature (also Cloud-based), with the number of signatures needed on campus. Vikki Massey along with some of the members will introduce it to the campus, identify potential users, and look into providers and cost. Additional highlights:
      i. A DocuSign article “Universities Improve the Value of Higher Education with e-Signatures” was shared and will be posted on Blackboard for members to review.
      ii. e-Signature documents are electronically delivered. Administrative support staff can manage the process for their college/departments/units. Outcomes: improved efficiency on campus (though not inexpensive); and meet external signature needs. Comments: This needs to be a system-wide effort (Hatcher). UTC is beta-testing e-signature from a local provider (van der Aa). Additional e-signature tools:
         1. CAS-Authentication (Hall): Internal workflow tool. Users sign digitally using their NetID that’s unique to them. IT recommends the campus project owners review their individual needs with Legal to ensure the signature is binding for their purposes.
         2. Nolij: The campus electronic document management system was purchased a few years ago. Now owned by Lexmark, Nolij is combined with another tool, Perceptive’s ImageNow. Over the last few years, Lexmark developed a new tool—Perceptive Content 7 (PC7) that will replace both Nolij and ImageNow. Once the transition is
made (timeframe 2018), Lexmark will no longer support Nolij. PC7 is more user-friendly. Knoxville will also go with PC7. A migration plan will be developed.

3. Transforms: Another Lexmark tool, Transforms increases efficiency and effectiveness; facilitates the paperless transition; and streamlines business processes. Forms can be:
   - created within the tool or saved as an active PDF; access is CAS-authenticated and only by authorized users.
   - easily moved online and used on any device.
   - printed for external use, unlike Qualtrics; it also integrates into the electronic document management systems: Nolij and PC7.

Web-based, a unique URL is provided. Data is captured in a database, and there is no manual input. Data in all fields can be saved to a database. Additional uses: I-9s and other university forms with similar needs. Data-accessibility supports internal use, like Qualtrics (unsure if Qualtrics integrates with Transforms).

Start-up: IT resources would be needed. Cost for the tool (hardware/software, annual maintenance, training materials) is $108K.

b. CIOAC Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary Nominations:
   i. Chair: Daniel McGarry was the single nomination.
   ii. Vice Chair: Four (4) nominations; Jada Williams, Judith Nyabando, Phyllis Richey and Sajeesh Kumar (if reappointed by Health Professions by June 1). Williams and Nyabando declined. Voting will be a Qualtrics online election.
   iii. Secretary: With no nominations by the Committee, current incumbent, Judy Johnson, (CIO assistant/Committee Secretary), agreed to continue to serve in this role.

   It was motioned, seconded and unanimously accepted by roundtable vote (10 members present) to elect by acclamation the Chair and Secretary.

F. New Business

a. Bylaw Changes – Article IV: Officers (Tague): Proposed changes were reviewed to support the Chair–Elect suggestion by Vikki Massey to (1) reduce the number of CIOAC annual elections for Vice Chair and (2) provide continuity of officers. Feedback highlights:
   i. Ramona Jackson and Richey questioned the need for changing the current CIOAC election process.
   ii. Richey clarified that Faculty Senate officers are President and President-Elect, both serve a one-year term; and elections are held annually for both.
   iii. If the CIOAC Chair vacates the position, the Chair-Elect would assume the Chair role. The Faculty Senate model requires a new election for President in this instance.
   iv. Bylaws Language Recommendation: To provide continuity, Todd Barber suggested adding under the Vice Chair responsibility “attend all planning meetings with the Chair, CIO and Secretary of the Committee”. It was motioned and seconded to add this addition. The vote will be done at the June meeting.

b. ITS Policies and Standards Responses (Tague): Standards and practices are drafted for CIOAC review. Standards posted in Blackboard for review/feedback received only two responses—the same for original documents forwarded to members. **Action Item:** All members should respond—note if there are change(s) and note if no changes. Standards Approval—it was reiterated that this is a responsibility of the CIOAC.
   i. Groups that review standards are ITS directors, ISAC (Information Security Advisory Committee), and CIOAC. Format: 1-2 pages with bulleted content. Titles range from technical security, laptop configurations, malware, etc. CIOAC feedback is needed. This will ensure guidelines are reasonable and appropriate.
   ii. Next Steps: Going forward, standards will be distributed for a 15-minute forum
discussion in CIOAC meetings, and will continue to be posted in Blackboard.

c. Meeting Minutes Approval (Tague): With only 6 votes in Blackboard, it was motioned, seconded and a unanimous roundtable vote to approve the April 27th minutes. Also reiterated, members should disseminate meeting updates to their constituents and solicit feedback. See approved minutes also on the CIOAC website.

d. Office 365 Spam Filter (van der Aa): Outlook spam filter is being tested with the impending move of Exchange email to the Cloud. The Barracuda filters are still in place and scans block 80% of incoming spam mail. Spam options were clarified: 1) ignore spam, 2) forward spam to the user’s Inbox, or 3) notify Microsoft that the email is not spam. The latter is not preferred. Additional feedback:
   i. “Quarantined” is the label on bundled spam messages by the Outlook spam filter. Users can either review messages individually or delete them.
   ii. O365 filter shows a drastic reduction in spam and phishing emails.
   iii. Messages forwarded to abuse.uthsc.edu are also dramatically decreased.

G. Next Meeting: June 22, 2015

H. With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn. With a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 A.M.