

Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee

Wednesday January 17, 2017
Chancellor's Office Sacramento

TTAC Members Present: Bill Scroggins, Craig Rutan, Ginni May, Gregg Atkins, Jannett Jackson (online), Jay Field, John Freitas, Robert Coutts (online), Rudy Besikof (online), Laurie Vasquez, Paul Bishop (online), and Tim Kyllingstad

Chancellor's Office and Staff: Ann Volk, Bryan Miller, Christopher Anderson, Gary Bird, Jeff Holden, Joe Moreau, LeBaron Woodyard, Lou Delzompo, Omid Pourzanjani, Russell Grant (online), Ryan Fuller, and Tim Calhoon

Welcome and Introductions:

John Freitas opened the meeting at 10:07 am and everyone introduced themselves.

Van Ton-Quinlivan charged Omid and Ann Volk to figure out how projects align with new initiatives and with direction from the Chancellor and Governor. Areas for alignment include Guided Pathways, AB 705 with multiple measures, and the proposal for a fully online college. Today, Omid and Ann would like TTAC to look at the major initiatives and determine projects that need to be taken on.

Member Onboarding:

Information

John provided a review of basic member responsibilities, especially the need to read materials and report back to constituent groups. The TTAC website has all documents from past meetings and retreats along with a member directory.

TTIP funding and TTAC were set up a little over twenty years ago. That funding requires an annual report to the legislature. The Chancellor's Office website has links to those reports. Each summer TTAC has a retreat meeting to set the agenda for the next year. Up through about eight years ago that work was incorporated into the Tech Plan. Meeting agendas include recommendations for legislative and funding changes, like the Cyber Security Fund. Through this process TTAC has direct input into recommendations for legislation and funding.

Previous Minutes:

Action

There were no changes or updates to the September 9, 2017 minutes. Members approved adoption of the minutes.

Information Security Update:

Information

Jeff Holden summarized results of the 2017 Information Security Survey. Surveys about both Information Security and Accessibility went out to all 114

colleges and about 100 total colleges responded; half were responses to the Information Security questions. Overall results show the system still has a long way to go. Only one responding college has fully implemented the Information Security Standard. Additionally, only two percent of campuses responding require information security training for all staff, and only nine percent require background checks for all staff with access to college data. Most colleges have this requirement for full time or regular employees, but not for volunteers and student workers who often have access to data. Only four percent of colleges responding do regular risk assessments and have a risk registry, only eleven percent a formal access control policy for all assets, and only nine percent a data loss prevention program in place. Additionally, only five percent encrypt data in transit and at rest. Most encrypt in transit but not at rest. Finally, only nineteen percent do frequent vulnerability assessment. Survey results were anonymous.

The Security Center team has done vulnerability assessments and penetration testing at twenty-five campuses over the last two years. They were able to compromise twenty of those systems. They were able to download user names and hashed passwords and then resolve seventy-five percent of hashed passwords. Five times they were able to get full root level access to the SIS and could have done anything they wanted. They had access to imaging systems storing driver's license and other information collected by Financial Aid.

Many colleges think they are not required to do things in the Information Security Standard. However, there is an act which applies to financial institutions now being applied to colleges. That along with NIST needs to be kept on the radar.

Members talked about where responsibility ultimately falls, and about lack of campus information officers and teams. The CSUs have an Information Security Officer and team on every campus, but the community colleges in general are not funded to have either. The ultimate responsibility for information security is both with the Chancellor's Office and with the individual colleges and districts. LeBaron Woodyard compared this to accessibility and explained the Accessibility Auditor called out the Chancellor's Office for guidance and providing consistent information, but emphasized the seventy-two districts are ultimately responsible for meeting accessibility requirements. The same logic applies to information security. In a lawsuit the district would be responsible.

Issues of accessibility and information security are similar and closely aligned. Often each college reinvents its own solution but there are common themes and issues to solve. It makes sense to make recommendations about how to fix problems and make fixes at scale. There are a set of Information Security Controls that make clear what should be done. Information security is a systemic issue and a system level need.

Efforts have been made to put information out at CC League, but there was not support without a legislative or liability requirement. The League would not add

the Information Security Standard as Board Policy; only as a recommendation reference. However, the Department of Education is starting to send out letters notifying institutions they are required to meet some legal requirements for financial institutions, which will start to impact colleges.

Technology is no longer just a nice thing to have, it is essential to productivity and college business operations. There needs to be executive level review of what happens when technology goes down. Bill Scroggin's campus has a fully funded security team completely integrated in the campus. They established a Business Analyst as part of the technology team, which is embedded in Financial Aid and A&R. They added staff positions for compliance, which also provides efficiency and effectiveness. However, that level of system maturity and ability to fully fund is not something all colleges can do and might be challenging for smaller more remote schools. Leveraging resources could really help medium sized and smaller institutions. These are the kinds of discussions and solutions TTAC has recommended and advocated over the years; Chancellor's Office guidance and oversight, with funding for training, resources and compliance.

The Information Security Center is providing centralized services for: Spirion, Splunk, Tenable scans for vulnerabilities, In Common Federated Identity and also unlimited SSL certificates. SAN information security training is available and there are many information security documents colleges can use. Jeff would like to expand scans and the ability to provide alerts. Multi-factor authentication would be useful. Services are marketed to the CCC system and Information Security Workshops are also offered twice a year.

Ann suggested talking offline about ways to structure information into stories that people can connect with and better understand the potential for loss and what is involved in recovery and remediation. Those stories could be used to bring information forward so the message doesn't get lost. Bryan Miller and Sandoval Chagoya could assist as members of the communication team.

Members talked about the challenges of getting interest in this area outside of the technology staff. Colleges don't usually pay attention until after there is a problem. Instead solutions should be woven in along with audits and gap analysis. Bill suggested having an accreditation team model, with dedicated resources to work with colleges to identify a plan and move forward. This could be like Technical Assistance Teams. Having these teams could help address inequity, since some districts are never going to have the capacity to hire qualified personnel, due to size or remote location. Bill also felt the Information Security Standards needed authority in Title 5.

Accessibility Update:

Information

At the end of November an email from the Chancellor's Office announced they would continue to support the work of the Accessibility Standards Work Group through the academic year June 2018. Laurie Vasquez reported the charge is to

finalize the Accessibility Standard Policy Statement, expand the policy statement with FAQs, and align the statement with the CC League of California. They will also catalog existing accessibility resources, collaborate with IEPI to determine if/how to create an Accessibility focused Applied Solutions Kit, design workshops and resources for the PLN and further develop a college accessibility compliance framework. December 19th a subset of the Accessibility Work Group met, and the first full meeting will be on February 8th. They want coordination between groups so everyone is speaking with one voice.

Chancellor's Office Update:

In addition to organizational changes in the Chancellor's Office, Omid updated TTAC on some personnel changes. Laura Hope has been promoted to Executive Vice Chancellor and hired two Vice Chancellors, Rhonda Mohr, who is in an interim position right now, for Student Services, and Alice Perez, who was a Dean at Santa Barbara City College, for Academic Affairs. Van is hiring a new Vice Chancellor for Digital Innovation and Infrastructure (DII). DII replaces TRIS and is part of the Workforce & Digital Futures Division. Laurie requested a Chancellor's Office organization chart be available at the next TTAC meeting.

There is work on building a Digital Futures Lab which will focus on technology impacting students. They will look at how data is being aggregated and integrated for a seamless experience in the students' educational journey.

In September Van began the executive search process for a new Vice Chancellor for DII being very specific about requirements, qualifications, etc. A comprehensive job description was developed and put out through internal and external networks. The review committee consisted of HR, members of the Chancellor's Office, and some members of TTAC. There were ten qualified candidates after the initial screening and through a process of multiple interviews four came to the top. Reference checks have been conducted and Van is preparing to extend an offer by the end of the week. The new person should be on in February and fully functioning within a month's time.

Members asked about the role the new Vice Chancellor will play with respect to TTAC. The Chancellor's Office plans to revisit formation of steering committees and refreshing charters. Logically the Vice Chancellor of DII will have to be embedded as a technology sponsor for projects with a technology component. The Chancellor's Office will ask advisory groups for their perspective on how existing structures align with and can respond to the new vision.

Student Journey Maps:

Information

The committee discussed a variety of ideas that come up in the field about common ERPs, and connections that don't currently exist between projects and data or that aren't well connected. For example, there are different metrics for Hispanic students; in one Hispanics are defined differently than in another set of metrics. As a result, the system ends up with two different types of data and

there are questions about cleaning up that difference. The goal is to focus metrics around the student journey and out of separated categories or divisions. The focus is on taking student journey maps to completion and on the ideal experience for the student. However, there isn't just one type of student, so there are now seven different journey maps. There could be more or less, but the goal was a manageable number.

Omid is proposing metrics used be ones that track performance of support work by staff and performance of students as they go from recruitment to completion. TTAC members thought that made sense. Tim Calhoon and Omid explained it is possible to look at the seven journeys and find common things that show up over and over again; those could be priorities for focus. Omid asked members to review these composite student journey maps to see if anything important was missing. Ginni May and another member expressed some concern that seven student journeys might not provide adequate information.

John felt the journey maps resonated at a high level. However, he had concerns about wording that might be misinterpreted. The transfer student profile, for example, says, "Not able to schedule classes with the most popular teacher." John cautioned about taking care with descriptions. On the other hand, another member felt that sentence did resonate with students who had gone to Rate My Professor or asked friends or relatives about teachers. The student journey profiles were shared with over 1000 people, including focus groups with students.

Developing a comprehensive understanding of existing systems is a necessary step to the work being done in the Chancellor's Office. The I Can Afford College website, for example, has great information, but the application to college was three clicks away and not easy to find. Those kinds of things can be barriers to students. Out of around 2.1 million students who start an application to college, only around 600,000 of them enroll; that is a 71.7% decrease. There can be many reasons for that decrease including duplicate applications, just wanting to get an edu email address, etc. But if the CCC could increase the number enrolled from 600,000 to 700,000, it would have a significant impact on student earnings.

In a cafeteria model the student has to know what to look for and where to look for it. Instead, it is really critical to walk students through that process. Most students don't know how to do it on their own and there are not resources for everyone to meet with a counselor. Bill's college started asking for text numbers and permission to use them. He has data about response every time they sent a short link directly to whatever the student needed, for example, a direct link to the application.

There is a gap from time of application February until the student can take a course eight or nine months later. There should be a way to engage the student during that time perhaps with career exploration or planning. Bill thought that would be a good time to have mandatory online orientation and an opportunity to

connect with a self-diagnosed set of resources. Omid felt orientation was important, but perhaps with smaller, just in time modules, rather than one large block of information. Of course, SSSP funding comes one time for that big block of information. Many processes are based on funding and built on a student that doesn't exist anymore; the student straight out of high school, planning for transfer, who has no job and no family. Having just in time components and processes would be more helpful, provide more touchpoints, and be more relevant. It would be helpful for the Chancellor's Office to mine best practices by identifying common challenges and choke points. There needs to be a better way to walk the student through and also to collect data regarding what pages they engage. The Student Journey Map presentation has been shared with Educational Services and Academic Affairs. The Student Senate was at the table for one of the sessions.

Laurie asked for more updated information on activities that occur between TTAC meetings. That could be a website update on progress on activities and projects.

Forty to forty-five percent of students statewide have financial challenges. The MyPath team has been helping with the BOG fee waiver and College Promise. Right now there is now a drop down menu to click for downloading a pdf to print and fill out. Omid suggested prepopulating forms; the goal is to use technology to make it easier for students. Regulatory requirements are complex, but OEI brought people together to discuss complicated processes. Then LeBaron walked their vision through legislative, regulatory, and policy review.

Members discussed how student journeys would be used. Bill expressed concern about a path that shouldn't be encouraged because students who take it path are less successful at course completion. Students who enroll after the first day of class are 10% less successful in course completion and underrepresented groups are 20% less successful. It might be better not to encourage those paths since they are known to lead to less success at course completion. TTAC members were asked to think about what activities should be taken on, what should be done differently, how that changes the work of TTAC, and how to change touchpoints with students.

Update on Activities:

Van wanted a complete understanding of the activities, organizations and technology involved in the Ed Tech portfolio. What exists today and how does that support the vision moving forward and for Guided Pathways? Ann reviewed concerns expressed about existing processes including: loss of control in what was delivered, lack of reflection of what was happening on the ground, staff turnover and programmatic issues with low adoption or high abandonment of tools. Key areas for improvement were: desire to make progress, move away from silo thinking into a more collaborative approach, and desire to look at the bigger picture.

Architecture workshops allowed Ann and Omid to confirm how products and data related to Guided Pathways, try to streamline it, and to create a foundation for strategic planning and a roadmap. The main focus was on business architecture with some on data architecture; they reviewed over forty products. Going through information they saw the level of collaboration increase, and they also started to see the level of duplication or triplication of efforts. This started some productive conversations and built an inventory of educational technology for the system, an awareness of the current state of data flow structures, and the student journey maps. One of the last meetings around data involved how to move forward with a light and lean data management and governance system. The idea was to be able to make adjustments to a prototype, measure value, and build on that. Now they are reviewing these ideas with CISOA and TTAC to get feedback. They also want to solicit feedback around Guided Pathways and how existing platforms need to feed and get into the integrated roadmap. They want to move toward integrated strategic planning on an IT strategy that supports Guided Pathways.

Data Governance and Management has been reframed and now involves: setting up a proof of concept for a one year framework, defining roles and responsibilities, defining decision authority, coming up with baseline processes and policies, and bringing the idea of Master Data Management (MDM) to a defined group of data sets. There will be a small team focused mainly on MIS, CalPASS Plus, CCCOpen, CCCApply, Canvas, and MyPath. These system wide data sets and platforms have been deployed within colleges in separate instances, so there is the ability to look across colleges at the best fit for the proof of concept to see if it is feasible and can scale. They will start with a proof of concept, then adjust, learn and grow while developing some baseline artifacts, data definitions, roles, and authorized processes. At this point it is out of scope to set up a separate steering committee. For the proof of concept TTAC and the Chancellor's Office will be used for steering. After a year, discussion can move to year two and three for scaling out with more colleges and data sets.

Data Management is a challenge. Some data is owned by the Chancellor's Office and some is more globally owned by the colleges. A collective approach to data management and governance needs to be figured out. It must represent that complexity and make use of best practices by colleges that are more mature in this area while moving to a more consistent approach. The team wants a consolidated understanding of data sets and a known decision authority as well as access rights to data. The Chancellor's Office doesn't have the data the colleges have, but also doesn't have the right to go and just get the data. For example, there are four colleges right now that want to have their Canvas data in the data warehouse along with the rest of the Chancellor's Office data so they can work with it. The President of each college has to sign a very specific letter allowing Chancellor's Office access to that data along with who can access it. The Chancellor's Office is very sensitive to the question of who has to give permission and who has access to particular sets of data.

This one year project is about source ownership of the data and how that plays. There will be Data sharing agreements and MOUs to lay everything out. The goal is to get to a master record of all the agreements, policies, authority, as well as access rights across the system. In the original draft charters for Data Management and Governance, the Chancellor's Office was given overall decision authority over the process. Van, Omid and Ann discussed this, and thought while Omid was transitioning he should probably be primary Chancellor's Office stakeholder in that work.

This sort of issue is moving ahead with key solutions with the OEI Course Exchange. Data elements like prerequisites and registration priority are important in the Course Exchange and policy gives the authority to the districts to define those elements, but there is a necessary crosswalk that has to exist. Not all of that information is in CCCApply, some has to come directly from colleges in a way that honors the security of that information. It is not a small issue. It is complex. The goal for year one is to start small, fail and adjust, look at value and develop from there. Looking at scalability and engaging around data sets. This will expand institutional research abilities while reducing risk of data exposure. It would be useful to decide on a baseline measurement; maybe a goal of 10% reduction in data security risk. There should be a SMART goal to validate.

Laurie suggested getting the word out about the story of this project. As soon as some details are locked in, Omid and Alex Jackl can start telling that story. Bryan and Paul Feist can help get that message out as well.

If the plan is to bring this back to TTAC for evaluation/adjustment, Guided Pathways champion constituents on TTAC may be needed. Representatives with skill sets and expertise with data and also with technical aspects might be important. Additionally, there will be a need for legal expertise and in Title 5. It might make sense to have some experts in existing work groups for MyPath, MIS, and CCCApply bubble up to TTAC. Bill emphasized including the authority that established the rule for the data sets, like SSSP coming from the Student Success Act of 2012; it is important to identify why the data set exists. Ann will bring back draft changes to the plan in the March timeframe to be included as an update agenda item.

Ann and Omid suggested a goal of having some results and items to share at the TTAC Retreat. Perhaps finding a data element needed in the process of moving a student from progress to completion, putting it into production, and then seeing where it can go from there. Lou Dolzompo explained the timing of the TTAC retreat doesn't necessarily mesh with what the project is doing right now.

There was some confusion or question between Ann and Lou about whether the MOU, etc. would need to come back to TTAC for review before moving forward operationally. The Technology Center has been working on a consolidated institution agreement across all of the projects that have MyPath, CCCApply, etc.

built in. It includes the data sharing agreement, data stewardship, etc. They now have it in final draft form. It will go to Gary Bird, as grant monitor, to be taken to Chancellor's Office Legal Counsel for review. After review, it would go out to colleges. This has been done in the past. There were institutional agreements for CCCApply, but there are so many agreements in place now, it isn't reasonable for colleges to review and signing five to ten separate agreements; they will be in a consolidated agreement. This is not about sharing data with other colleges, it is basically saying, "I understand where I am putting my data and have access."

Ann felt the existing buildout process assumes data where it exists today and with current authority access. This proof of concept is not about moving data but about building out a framework for governing data. This is a single repository, a data information authority, and the escalation process for accessing and provisioning that data which is unique to each data set. She didn't think anything needed to change from what was already in place. Tim Calhoon explained that products, like MyPath which were operating on pilot agreements, are moving out of pilot into production. There are so many products they need an agreement with colleges to operate it for them. Ann felt this was a different model from supporting the actual database instance for each Canvas instance. Tim explained pulling Canvas data into the Data Warehouse is an option in the agreement. Ann thought in some cases within this structure they would be able to measure the value and not go out of the existing structure, and in some that would not be the case. Ann asked Lou, Omid and Alex to look at timing in parallel to see if some progress could be reported to TTAC by April.

Ann's recommendation is to keep this pilot small, simple, and leverage continuing data sharing agreements, and not to broadly share the context for data sharing agreements. Get the base framework in place and later additional scope can be identified to scale up for what is next in the pipeline. She did not think there was a check box needing an agreement from TTAC for this work; this is a small pilot project which will have a proposal for next steps later. Lou felt the Data Warehouse could be released under the existing structure in place.

Jannett Jackson recommended as part of the Chancellor's Office report to CEOs, they be given an update at their next meeting on January 27th about where TTAC is on this project. Rudy would also like a presentation at the next CIO meeting in a week. Omid took both of those as action items.

The recommendation is for a one year proof of concept project with TTAC as an advisory group. The project will use the existing data warehouse and report back to TTAC, maybe quarterly, on what they are finding, what they are facing, and where there is potential value to the system. It will probably not be completed by the TTAC Retreat April 26-27, but there may be a progress report.

Role of TTAC:

Discussion

As TTAC increases focus and work in Data Management, Omid hopes attention will be on solving a problem that will specifically improve student success. Then the reasoning extends to the need for a data warehouse and spending a year to get it up and running. He would rather not see it become two years to get the data warehouse into production and then have researchers play around with it for a while without any increase in student success. He would like for there to be specific, measurable accomplishments. Lou suggested that might include cost savings to the IT budget of the college for not having to run everything. Omid expressed hope that if the system helped colleges, the colleges would use that help to remove barriers for students.

The committee refreshed the charter in May of last year, but recognized it needed to be revisited due to Chancellor's Office restructuring. There may need to be adjustments in constituencies or skill sets to make sure correct strengths and leadership are at the table. Adjustments may need to take into account the role of the new Vice Chancellor of Digital Innovation and Infrastructure. There is also a need for focus on Guided Pathways, the student, engagement and proactive data driven decisions to help the student get to completion. The Ed Tech portfolio spans across groups, and although Guided Pathways is very much student focused, there is also an aspect of providing support of administration, faculty, etc. and their ability to drive that mission.

Jannett mentioned that last year at the Retreat Chancellor Oakley looked at changing the culture and makeup of the Chancellor's Office and the technical support around how the system office is organized. She wanted to ensure both Chancellor and Vice Chancellor are aware of recommendations made by TTAC. Members take time to devote to this work because it is important and critical to better serving their students. It is important TTAC's work not be marginalized.

As everyone moves forward into a Guided Pathways framework, the Technology Center recognizes there are both student facing applications and supporting applications and services that support the student facing applications, like CENIC, C-ID and CO-CI. They are backend but provide important supporting mechanisms for Guided Pathways.

TTAC is a combination of three voices: the field represented by constituent groups, the Chancellor's Office staff including the Technology Center and project directors, and the third being TTAC's members acting as translators to the legislature, LAO and so on. TTACs underlying purpose is to look for technology solutions that can be ubiquitous and advance the common good, while at the same time being efficient with resources. Bill acknowledged that has often been done in silos, but throughout TTAC has worked with several models: policy mandates, funding incentives, and "sign on and we'll do it for you." There hasn't been just one solution strategy and that has been a major strength. TTAC's role is to be visionary, to see what technology might solve, but it doesn't just look at

the end shiny object. TTAC has been a tough audience in making sure solutions work. Today TTAC got a challenge to transition to a new framework; the system has got to change. Bryan felt TTAC built and held a standard for the system and tried to find resources to bring all of the colleges up as a steward of equity across the system. Over the years, TTAC has reacted to opportunities that came along. It built infrastructure for the fiber optic plan and got it in the Central Valley and almost in Northern California. TTAC has been able to get economies of scale into place, especially with CENIC and work with CCCApply. Those economies of scale help move other money where it is needed. Ann and Omid thanked the committee for helping them understand the history and ongoing efforts and focus of TTAC.

Next Steps:

TTAC members decided to have a sub-group take another look at the TTAC Charter. John appreciated Ann's offer to be a new set of eyes. What is the goal in reviewing the charter? Members mentioned adding a Data Management focus and possibly constituents with expertise in necessary skill sets. Omid suggested considering initiatives and projects TTAC has on its agenda and figuring out which are platform type activities that take two to three years for results and which can get quicker results and could be removed. There wasn't time in this meeting to look at those activities.

Bill suggested a theme for the retreat, perhaps "Technology Solutions for Guided Pathways." TTAC could look at what data is available, what is not, and whether there might be a gismo piece to it. Additionally, going back to a fundamental TTAC role, is there a technology piece that is equitable, saves money, and serves students? That has been done in the past, but needs to be integrated. There also needs to be strategy for using the outcome of work focused on Pathways, to look at the map to prioritize and make decisions. That could also shine a light on the charter, skill sets for the work, and if any structural changes are needed. More marketing of the need and use for technology might be necessary and perhaps even in discouraging the legislature from creating too many new initiatives.

Members thought it would be useful to meet the new Vice Chancellor sometime in March before the April retreat. Bill suggested having a TTAC reception, not too formal but to get to meet up. Everyone agreed that would be a good idea.

Members discussed SISs and ERPs that are out of date across the system. There are three districts that will be piloting going to the cloud for their ERP. They hope to showcase a proof of concept of to the state for having an integrated set of tools. That work will take about one and a half years. Omid wouldn't share names of the districts because negotiations can be undermined when vendors try to work one district and then another. The CCC hasn't leveraged its size in negotiating with technology vendors and the goal is to help colleges motivate vendors to negotiate and integrate desired pieces. Lou thought it would be ideal if

that work piggybacks with colleges out for RFP with Canvas. Tim Calhoon encouraged colleges to become aware of differences between second generation tools that are just moved to the cloud and true third generation completely cloud native technology that is not programmed but configured for each college.

Bill summarized meeting outcomes:

- a) TTAC members understand the direction the Chancellor's Office is going
- b) TTAC members appreciate Chancellor's Office attention to Data Governance they brought up. That has advanced and there is now quite a bit more to do.
- c) The metric issue related to that Data Governance effort
- d) The group understands more about integration and knocking down silos that may change TTACs work and charter a bit
- e) Work will continue on the integration project that has been going on to make Canvas and the other projects work because it is on a pilot basis. The next phase is going forward and will enable TTAC to understand the Chancellor's Office paradigm. Guided Pathways, student orientation, and the technology solutions go with that, but TTAC will also keep its basic philosophy of supporting the field with ubiquitous solutions that work for small, large, urban, and rural districts. Those solutions should make sense in how they integrate with existing practices
- f) Some projects are in silos and need to be integrated
- g) There is natural overlap with Glue and other projects; that will continue
- h) There will be a celebration of the new Vice Chancellor sometime in March
- i) TTAC knows the new Vice Chancellor will have significant input into the Retreat
- j) The TTAC Charter may change, but that will happen at or after the retreat and may move voices, result in more messaging, or result in more work with other Chancellor's Office units
- k) There was a vigorous discussion of information security and the strategy of having audits based on the Information Security Standard. There will be work to provide resources and maybe technical implementation teams to assist and balance between initiatives and compliance and figure out where that balance is.

Tim Kyllingstad reminded the group about the idea of looking into some kind of IT inventory at the system level, kind of like FUSION, in order to determine what the system has and where colleges might have gaps.

Gary or Russell put out a Doodle poll out about the date/time for the March Zoom meeting.

The TTAC Retreat will be April 26-27th

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.