ADMAN Board of Directors

Agenda

May 15, 2014 (3-5 p.m.)

357 Hutchison (moved to 176 Hutchison)

**Attendees (All ADMAN members are welcome to attend):**

-Lisa Blake, Plant Biology

- Michelle Hammer Coffer

- Tracy Lade, Physics

- Nora Orozco, CAES Dean’s Office

- Shannon Tanguay, CAES Dean’s Office

- Chris Harlan, Metro Cluster

- Sally Harmsworth, Ag & Natural Resources

- Lourdes Gomez, Student Housing

- Dee Madderra, Plant Sciences

- Chris Hale, School of Medicine

- Susan Sainz, Languages & Literature

- MaryAnn Mellor, School of Education

- Sara Reed, BFTV Cluster

- Allison Mitchell, ARM

- Rosemary Martin-Ocampo, Grad Studies

* **Approval of April Minutes**
* **Standing Committee Reports: 3 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee Reports:** | **Representative:** |
| ABOG (Academic Business Officers Group) | Sally Harmsworth/Lourdes Gomez |
| AADI (Administrative Application Development Init) | Tracy Lade/Janet Brown Simmons/Karen Nofziger |
| CCC&D (Campus Council on Community and Diversity) | Tammy McNiff |
| CCFIT (Campus Council for Information Technology) | Nora Orozco  |
| FIS Steering Committee (Kuali) | Karen Nofziger |
| Ed Tech (Subcommittee within CCFIT) | Kerry Hasa  |
| Kuali Rice (collection of middleware) | Dee Madderra  |
| UC Path Steering Committee | Susan Sainz |
| HRIC/HRAC/Career Compass(Human Resources Implementation Committee/HR Advisory Committee) | Rosemary Martin-Ocampo |
| SDAAC (Staff Diversity Administrative Advisory Committee) | Lourdes Gomez |
| SSC (Shared Service Centers) | Teri Sugai |
| TIF (Technology Infrastructure Forum) and TAC (Strategic Technology Advisory Committee) | Tracy Lade |

**May 15, 2014:**

**3:15 – Smoke Free Campus Follow up (Barbara Brady and Carol Shu)**

[**http://breathefree.ucdavis.edu/**](http://breathefree.ucdavis.edu/)

**-** Addressing the situation is the first step

- Wrote answers to key questions; answers for managers and supervisors

- Smoke Free reminder cards

- Goal is an educational approach

***Question: What type of enforcement would you want to have?***

* Training option when ticketing
* Concerns about enforcement agency; need to consider that there needs to be an enforcement mechanism

Where to report violations: <http://breathefree.ucdavis.edu/feedback/index.html>

***Question: How do other campuses enforce?***

UC Santa Cruz is going through the process of fining people

Share your story of quitting smoking at: <http://breathefree.ucdavis.edu/stories/index.html>

***Question: What can we do to help someone who is trying to quit smoking?***

Refer to the multitude of resources available on campus (e.g. ASAP, etc.). Provide work release time, being understanding, etc.

**Shannon Tanguay – Visibility on SAVED documents in KFS**

**Problem:**

**•** With the implementation of SR 16655, all KFS documents with a status of SAVED are no longer included as PENDING transactions in PPS DS and DaFIS DS reports. Account managers may still want the option to view the results and potentially revise KFS documents before routing them to other account managers or having them reach FINAL status.

**Workaround:**

**•** Create a KFS Group in which the account manager is the sole member and ad hoc route documents to the Group first for approval.

• Benefits to this workaround include:

1. Initiators decide which documents they want to be able to include in PPS DS and DaFIS DS reports in advance of normal routing.
2. KFS documents with a status of SAVED will not be visible on DS reports until they are submitted.
3. Since not all account managers were reviewing saved documents previously, we expect that only some will use this workaround.

**Steps Needed to Implement Workaround:**

Create a Group (workgroup) that includes yourself only, then Ad Hoc Route these documents to this Group for approval.

**Step 1: Create a Group for yourself only**

**•** Login to the Kuali Financial System (<https://kfs>.ucdavis.edu/)

• Click on the KFS “Main Menu” tab, then select “Group” within the “Workflow” menu on the left side of the page.

• Click on the “create new” button in the upper right corner.

• In the “Document Overview” section, enter a description of this document, such as “Creating a new workgroup for <your name>”

• In the “Overview” section’s “Group Namespace” dropdown menu, select “KFS-SYS – Financial System”

• In the “Group Name” field, enter the name you wish to use, such as “<your initials>SAVED” (SATSAVED, RMSSAVED, etc.). Note: this name is case sensitive and will need to be entered every time you wish to Ad Hoc Route a document.

• If you want, add information in the “Group Description” field, such as “Documents for review by <your name>”

• In the “Assignees” section, “Type Code” should = “Principal”

• Click on the magnifying glass to the left of the “Member Identifier” field. Use the search tool to find your name and click “return value”

• The “Active From Dt” and “Active To Dt” fields can be left blank

**•** Click the “add” button under “Actions”

• Click the “submit” button. The document will be automatically finalized and the functionality will be available to you immediately.

**Step 2: Procedure for Ad Hoc Routing individual documents for review**

**•** Identify an INITIATED or SAVED document that you wish to view in PPS DS and DaFIS DS reports before routing them to other KFS users for approval.

• If it is hidden, expand the “Ad Hoc Recipients” section by clicking on the “show” button.

• In the “Ad Hoc Group Requests” subsection, ensure that “Action Requested” = APPROVE.

• In the “Namespace Code” field enter “KFS-SYS”. Note: this is case sensitive and must be entered in all caps and with no spaces.

• In the “Name” field, enter the name of your newly created “Group” such as SATSAVED (also case sensitive).

• Click on the “add” button under “Actions”

Once you submit this document, it will first route to your “Group” for approval and will be available as PENDING on PPS and DaFIS reports the next day. You will not be able to make any changes, however, you can use the “recall” feature on BA and GEC documents to pull it back and make adjustments. For document types with no “recall” feature, you can “disapprove” the document, copy it and make the necessary changes before submitting it.

**Do we want the Service Request (SR) to continue or rescind?**

Follow up on if ADMAN wants to support and/or prioritize the SR. Request to have feedback from the different colleges/schools. (**June topic)**

**General Ledger Review System Update**

Campus will be getting rid of the “thumbs up/thumbs down” type of ledger review. It will be replaced with the sample report V4 (example). Account managers will be expected to review their ledgers monthly for activity. There will also be a “Balance Analysis” report for CAOs, Chairs and Deans to view the organization at a high level to check for overdrafts, outstanding travels, etc.

 It is anticipated that an announcement will come out from accounting in June to provide a heads up to folks on the changes and prepare in advance. We can talk more at the ADMAN meeting, but wanted to give you some insight to what is occurring.

 There will be ***mandatory account manager training*** (1 hour on line video), and refresher will be needed every 2 years. Plus all new account managers will be expected to take the course prior to being approved as a fiscal officer aka account manager.

More information will be coming out in June. Sample reports follow:

 

**Tracy Lade – ACAD (Advisory Committee for Application Development)**

**Subgroup: User Groups**



Solicited feedback, held focus groups, resulted in four recommendations (see attached).

Requesting feedback in the next week (late May).

**Recommendation: Create an ADMAN-share email list for sharing ideas, concepts, etc.**

**ADMAN Board member discussion**

Requesting Executive Board nominations:

* Vice Chair
* Membership/Historian
* Standing Communications Committee
* Mid-Management Conference Chair (can select Vice Chair)
* Recorder/Secretary

MaryAnn and Sara will send out solicitation/request nominations.

**General ADMAN Membership discussion**

* Managers who have independently responsibilities for teaching, research, extension, or administration
* Remind non-board members that they can attend all meetings.
* Potentially look at soliciting more volunteers for requests.

**SmartSite replacement**

* Vendor showcase on May 23; if you actively use SmartSite, it is worth attending to provide feedback.

======================================================================

Future meeting dates for Academic Year 13-14/14-15 – with appreciation to Janet Brown-Simmons for reserving Room 357 in Hutchison Hall for all our ADMAN meetings next year.

* June 19, 2014
	+ Membership discussion
	+ Follow up on SR (Member: Shannon Tanguay)
* July – no meeting
* August 21, 2014
* September 18, 2014
* October 16, 2014
* November 20, 2014
* December 18, 2014

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

***Committee reports***

**ABOG:**

Over 200 UC business officers attended the 2014 ABOG conference hosted by UCLA on April 27-30. If you attended please complete the online evaluation at <http://tinyurl.com/lgg6hf7> to help the committee shape the conference for next year. ABOG 2015 will be hosted by UC Santa Cruz at the Chaminade Resort & Spa which overlooks Monterey Bay and the Santa Cruz mountains and where we will have exclusive use of the property. The ABOG committee will meet in Irvine during the summer to tour and select a hotel for ABOG 2016.

In recognition of her 10 years of service to this committee, during which time she has served terms as Chair and Treasurer, Meshell Louderman was presented with a gift card and thanked by all current members of the ABOG committee. Lourdes Gomez has now taken Meshell’s place on the committee.

**AADI :**

AADI Meeting - April 23, 2014

***Engineering Corporate Connections Database:*** Jamie Butler (IT lead for College of Engineering) came to the meeting to discuss the new application. This application will help engineering to develop a better relationship with corporate partners. The second idea is to help students bridge the gap from student to employee. The tool is being developed from the corporate perspective. The employer would be able to be very selective about getting information for students as potential for leads to employment. Jamie's team has worked through the legal and administrative issues surrounding the program. The program is about to go live in engineering. The primary goal is to increase visibility and relationship with the corporate sponsors. There was a discussion about how this might be scaled to meet the needs of multiple groups. He will come back later in the summer once he has something to demo.

***ESP*** - onboarding and key management tool. Allison Mitchell will be stepping back from the onboarding and key management tool as she has accepted another position. AADI will be finding a new Steering Committee Chair for this group. Allison has suggested someone who works in the Finance area at Facilities. The AADI committee agreed with Allison's recommendation, so Allison and Tom Kaiser (Chair of AADI) will talk with her, and if she agrees to Chair the Steering Committee, she will be put in contact with Peter Blando (IET), who has already agreed to be the Project Manager for this effort.

Allison will also be stepping down from her ADMAN role on AADI, so AADI would like to have an ADMAN replacement on this committee, probably from the admin side. A few people were suggested as potential replacements and Tom Kaiser/ADDI will follow up.

***IPA*** - course academic scheduling. The business process analyst is no longer with the program, but she provided a great deal of data that Jeremy and Meshell are still going through. They are talking with people at the Registrar's office to line up connections. They hope to have something to demo in the Summer.

***Gifts Processing*** - There are a lot of issues that this team is working on with regard to what the system will and won't be able to do.

***ACE*** - 2200 class times were evaluated; 43K evaluations were completed; 1300 instructors used it; 70% response rate average with over 50% had much higher rates. Everyone seems to be happy with this project.

**CCC&D:**

No update for May 2014.

**CCFIT:**

**CAMPUS COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**Friday, April 18, 2014**

10:30-12:00 noon

1003 Kemper Hall

**AGENDA:**

**Transition to campus learning management system (SmartSite replacement)– David Levin & Andy Jones, Academic** **Technology Services**

Reasons that transition is necessary

* Discouraging Sakai (Company that operates SmartSite) OAE (Open Academic Environment) Project demise. Key universities have pulled out due to lack of nimbleness of project; architecture was not scalable to larger universities.
* Pace of innovation no longer adequate for our needs
* No mobile solution offered by Sakai; students using mobile phones more than computers
* Insufficient customizable options
* Insufficient access to data analytics
* Accessibility concerns
* Lack of modern design and delivery

Faculty needs of an LMS system

* Grading and assessing student work
* Sharing course content
* Communication with students
* Encouraging collaboration

Survey to faculty – In Fall 2013, a survey was sent to faculty that had used SmartSite in the past. A more thorough survey will be sent soon to include all academic senate, academic federation, graduate students, undergraduate students, and staff. Essentially will hit the community at large.

LMS Offerings needed

* Interoperability with learning applications
* Integration with campus systems
* Usability and accessibility
* Mobile solutions
* Nimble pace of innovation
* Data and learning analytics
* LMS market leadership and scalability

Progress of Transition of Project

*Summer/Fall 2013*

* Establishment of LMS workgroup
* Examination of comparable intuition transitions
* Faculty-led review of prospective vendors
* Initial discussions with prospective LMSs.

 *Winter/Spring 2014*

* Development of rubrics and checklists
* Write Request for Proposal
* Discuss request with Purchasing

Prospective LMSs

* Canvas\*
* Desire2Learn\*
* Sakai\*
* Moodle
* Blackboard
* Other?

\*Attending vendor showcase schedule for May 23rd.

Preparing RFP

* Expectations for $100K+ purchase
* Evaluation of rubrics
* Fall Pilot survey of LMS Tool priorities
* Receive request for proposals

Transition Project Timeline

* Spring survey (coming soon)
* Publish request for proposal (done)
* May 23rd Vendor Showcase
* Pilot/Trial of 1-3 LMS systems in Fall 2014
* Report what has been learned from showcase, pilots and feedback received. Present to EdTech, CCFIT, CIT, CIO and Provost
* Contract complete in Winter 2015
* Feb – Sept 2015 implement new LMS system
* Fall 2015 – Live transition
* Support dual LMSs in 2015-2016

Concerns

* Concern about accessing data from SmartSite in future years (after SmartSite is no longer in use)
* Concern about collection of personal data from new system and its use.

Transition Project Needs

* Support the LMS Showcase on May 23. Will be held in MUII from 9am to 3pm.
* Create an RFP Evaluation Team. Would consist of senate, federation, ASUCD representative, GSA Representative. **NOTE: I asked about staff representation since I know that a number of staff use SmartSite for project or group purposes. They said they would include a staff representative. I will recommend that it be a member of ADMAN.**

**ADDITIONAL NOTE: It is not yet clear if the replacement system will be capable of being used as a project management system. Some staff in academic departments have tailored the current SmartSite program to meet their needs. We may need to consider alternative sources for project management.**

**ED Tech:**

CCFIT Ed Tech Subcommittee

March 27, 2014

Attendees: Delmar Larson, Jim Carey, David Levin, Andy Jones, Elias Lopez, Dan Comins, Paul Salitsky, Chris Thaiss, Tim Leamy, Mary Stewart, Amy Kautzman

***SmartSite Evaluation***

* David and Andy are working on a presentation for the next CCFIT meeting; they will talk about the timeline: sending out the RFP asap, the showcase we’re planning for May 23, the pilots in Fall 2014, making a decision in January 2015 (contract award in February 2015), and moving to the new system in Fall 2015.
* How will you go about assessment?
	+ The RFP is very comprehensive. We will be conducting surveys and focus groups, as well as collecting student and faculty feedback during the showcase and pilots. We will also consult with Marco and with the assessment folks in CETL.
	+ We cannot say that the vendors are required to attend the showcase, though we are hoping we can urge our top picks to attend.
* Publicizing?
	+ Presentation at CCFIT and the presentation to the senate committee on information technology are happening next month. Prasant, Bruno, Andy, and David are also meeting next Thursday.
* Do we have a favorite LMS that we’re hoping for?
	+ The Steering Committee is leaning toward Canvas or Desire2Learn, but we won’t know for sure until we’ve heard from the other vendors. We are trying to stay as open as possible and will let a lot of the decision depend on the showcase and faculty feedback.
* Will we be able to pull data from the new LMS to export it to places like the Student Portal?
	+ That’s certainly something we’re looking into—it’s in the RFP, and we are going to ask the vendors to provide scripted demos at the showcase.
	+ One of the nice things about going to a new LMS is that we can start fresh with these types of integrations and make sure they are working properly from the onset.
* Elias also brings up the importance of looking at how data is stored and categorized. Banner and the student portal are the most important for the Registrar.
* Will we test to make sure the RFP responses are accurate?
	+ Yes. That’s part of what the showcase and the pilots are for, but the LMS Working Group will also be looking at scripted demos and the materials they send as we evaluate their RFP responses.
	+ We also hope to require the new vendors’ technical folks to talk with our own technical folks (probably during the pilot phase).
* Paul has two concerns: First, in the past, purchasing has required committees to select the lowest bidder, and he wants to make sure we are aware of this and making sure we get the best possible option not just the least expensive. Second, what if a big company like Blackboard gives a very impressive presentation and makes it look better than it is?
	+ We’ve made the RFP complex enough so that we aren’t going to be swayed by something that’s not actually high quality.
* Elias is going through an RFP process right now where they have multiple phases—some scoring for the paper application and a second round of scoring for the demo phase and they weight the demo more heavily.
* Analytics? Marco Molinaro has been helpful on this front. He says we need to have access to raw data, not just the LMS’s interpretation of that data, so that we can direct the data analysis.
* Our recommendation to CCFIT would be that they endorse our continuation of the investigation into the second year, and maybe that they co-sponsor the showcase.

Digital Video

* Jim just got back from running a workshop in Nairobi; they were all recording their own one-minute videos by the end. Jim would like to do something similar on campus.
* He’s thinking of doing a boot camp from 12-1pm on May 12, 14, & 16 for 20 people.
* Tim: Within ATS, we’ve been talking about creating a framework or policy for video distribution. If faculty make a video and put it online, what is the university responsibility to maintain those videos? In 10 years, they will have to be re-encoded or re-formatted; realistically, we can’t keep everything online forever.
	+ Dan: If we could time this in a way that we roll out Kaltura at the same time, then they would be in charge of storing them.
	+ But it is probably not sustainable to pay for that kind of storage ($70K a year, and that’s based on how much storage).
	+ Why not just load it all onto YouTube? Not everyone is comfortable doing that and the only other option right now is to load it onto our Limelight servers. Kaltura is more like a plugin that we can integrate into the new LMS.
* Faculty motivation is a big issue. We need to provide tools for faculty and students to use that are easily accessible, and then we need to make sure it’s easy for them to distribute what they create.
	+ Faculty are often asking Dan where to put these videos. On YouTube? iTunesU? Directly into the LMS? Somewhere on the library page?
* The video initiative will depend on the LMS, too—in many of the new ones (we know for sure about Canvas and D2L), there are ways to create video feedback or video notes directly in the LMS.
	+ In the instance of Canvas, they are actually using Kaltura; D2L is probably using a homegrown solution. Most of these LMSs have limits on how much you can create within a given class.
	+ We’ll have to ask about how and where this sort of content gets stored and the extent to which we are able to locate it.
	+ Privacy? If a YouTube video is unlisted, it is not in the Google search engine (you just give viewers a direct URL). But that means we aren’t getting UC Davis branding. It sounds like this is also the case with Kaltura.
		- Kaltura is a robust video platform and the analytics on the backend are even better than YouTube. You can see what parts of the videos students are watching the most.
	+ We have funding for a one-year trial of Kalutra, but we will need additional funding for a continuation. We are in the process of negotiating the price and how to roll it out.
* Chris: In CETL, we’ve been resisting a focus on just the technology. What is the larger educational aim of teaching with video? How can we foreground the pedagogy? So when we come up with an “ask,” it needs to be couched in pedagogical aims.
	+ It also has to be incredibly easy to use—faculty go to one place and are just able to use the tool, create the video. Camtasia Relay may allow for this.
* What we really want to do is showcase different ways faculty can use video (including statistics and examples of how video benefits students).
	+ Perhaps we should be finding examples and showcasing them on a website, a place where we can point people to. There’s a lot of examples we can draw from—Arnold Bloom, Jim, and Bob Blake have certainly done a lot with this (as have Bryan Enderle, Dawn Sumner, Liz Applegate).
* So what’s the “ask”?
	+ This year we may just be giving CCFIT a head’s up that we will need ongoing funding. We can give more of a report rather than a request for funds because funding requests will go through the usual budget processes.
	+ We need to emphasize that this is not a one-time project; it’s a long-term commitment to support future uses of video in education.
	+ We’d like to move from an “ask” to a “tell.”

**FIS Update**

No update for May 2014.

**HRIC/HRAC:**

HRAC/HRIC Meeting Agenda

May 7, Mrak 203

2:00-4:00pm

Introductions

*Information: Administrative Officers for the Future (AOFTF) in Review – Carina Celesia Moore*

Carina provided a final report on the new AOFTF program. There were 30 participants approximately half from the Davis campus and half from the medical center. Carina is providing information to leadership about the feasibility of offering future learning opportunities such as this program. The following website was developed to provide more information for existing and aspiring chief administrative officers interested in continuous learning and increasing their competencies.

http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/sdps/ao-toolkit/ao-development-toolkit?searchterm=Administrative+Off

*Information: Performance Management Training Presentation – Steve Green*

Steve Green and Beth Cohen have developed a 4 hour training they plan to make available to supervisor groups in departments. The focus is basic information about supervision and how to address situations when “performance management” is required to address a problem (i.e., tardiness, absenteeism, etc.). We were also reminded of additional training resources for supervisors found at the HR Management website (Supervisor Development Certificate Programs):

<http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/sdps/catalog/human-resource-management>

*Discussion: Strike Communications Overview – Steve Green*

Steve Green wanted to discuss when/how much “strike communication” is appropriate. His main interest was to confirm whether he was sending out too much, too little, or just the right amount of communication. It was determined that sending out information to the HRAC/HRIC membership is appropriate and other campus leadership, as necessary, based on the situation.

*Information: EPAR – Irene Horgan-Thompson/Marion Randall*

Irene wanted to check in with the group to ask if there were any questions related to the recent distribution about EPARs. She reminded us that UCOP sets the salary programs, not the campuses. This year the pay for performance applies to MSP employees reporting to a dean/vice provost/chancellor. Next year all non-represented staff will participate in the pay for performance program. It is especially important to develop and establish your FY14/15 goals such that the supervisor will be able to “rate your performance”. Attached is a “Schedule of salary actions” for all represented and non-represented employees.

*Information: HR Strategic Transformation Update – Susan Gilbert*

Marion Randall shared there would be a short delay in the progress of this change initiative due to organizational changes in the Administrative & Resource Management (ARM) unit.



**KC:**

No update for May 2014

**UC PATH Steering Committee:**

• On May 27th there will be a “Road Show” from the UC Path system-wide staff. (Representation from Adman will be forthcoming.) When I hear I will let you two know.

• UCD is Wave 2 (after UCLA and Merced) but when that is, is still to be determined. (there is talk of other waves…like 5, 6 etcetera). They are trying to figure out what a good length of time is between implementation of campuses so there is the benefit of addressing what went wrong.

• All groups have been working on business practices and agreeing to practices system wide. This is a huge project and is still going on, but lots of headway is being made.

• Lots of data conversion in PPS, cleaning and entering information to convert to People Soft.

• TRS there is still modifications being made and other enhancements. A lot of collaboration with other campuses to make this the time reporting solution for all campuses.

• Sales Force is the new case management system.

* UCOP scheduled for December 2014; “testing by using”
* Could be the “key” to identity management

**SDAAC:**

No update May 2014.

**SSC:**

See attached Spring 2014 update.



**TIF -TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE FORUM :**

TIF Meeting 4/30/14: Notes for ADMAN Tracy Lade

# Box.com

There was discussion on the use of Box to store sensitive data. While the business agreement addresses FERPA compliance, use of the tool at UC Davis has not been vetted by Student Affairs so the recommendation at this time is to not put sensitive student data in Box. According to current understanding, the campus unit responsible for policy compliance for a particular area that entails sensitive or confidential information needs to have an opportunity to weigh-in before data can be stored in a cloud service such as Box. Campus Security Officer Cheryl Washington is in discussions with Student Affairs and campus legal counsel. **In the meantime, do not store student information in Box until more clarification has been issued by campus.**

The process for off-boarding employees who have a UCD Box.com account has not yet been figured out. Campus needs to be clear about how UCD Box accounts are transitioned to personal accounts and what happens to the university data that’s stored in Box at the time that an employee off-boards. TIF will evaluate and assemble recommendations.

The settings on the recycle bin/trash in Box.com for UCD are such that the trash will not actually empty deleted data for 30 days. This setting was chosen to protect the employer from potential loss of important information at the hands of a disgruntled employee. However, note that data in the Trash bin counts toward a user’s account 50 GB quota. If a user reaches his/her quota (not likely to happen very often) that user must contact IT EXPRESS and request the recycle bin in their Box account be cleared. The process for IT EXPRESS to evaluate when it’s OK to empty a recycle bin for a Box user has not yet been worked out.

The TIF-CSI subgroup will be evaluating ways to promote greater use of Box.com across campus.

# Security Vulnerabilities

Windows XP: Campus will employ a Warn/Delay/Deny strategy for machines/users logging into the Central Authentication System (CAS) that are still using Windows XP operating system. Recall that this operating system is no longer patched by Microsoft and thus is a security problem. The “Warn” phase will go into effective April through July 15; Delay (slower login) with a warn message will be July 16 through end of August; Deny (block) will begin before the fall quarter begins in late September 2014.

IET is developing messaging to reach unmanaged groups of users who will be logging into CAS, e.g., affiliates, former employees, etc.

Heartbleed: Campus recommends that local incident response plans be current and effective.

Internet Explorer vulnerability: A blanket “do not use” recommendation is not viable since some campus applications require the use of IE. Microsoft’s Enhanced Mitigation Experience Toolkit (EMET) may be a good solution to mitigate the vulnerabilities of IE for those who must use this particular web browser.

# Campus Email

Mark Thonen reported on the status of campus transition away from Cyrus mail services to either DavisMail (Google mail), Office 365 (Microsoft in the cloud), or Office 365 on premise (UConnect). Of the 413 departments at UC Davis about 30% have been reached. Of those, 18 have completed the transition, 30 are in progress, and 64 are in a testing/piloting phase.

So far the calendar tool has presented the biggest problem for Office 365 users: the calendar is fully functioning between users who are on the same service, i.e., cloud or on-premise, but the calendar delegation feature does not work between users who are on different platforms (one in the cloud and one on premise). A user is able to assign Reviewer rights but not full delegation. Given these technical difficulties, IET recommends all users in a single business unit be on the same email system.

Transitioning users who store email data locally (POP) is still a labor-intensive process. IT is willing to help – let them know.

Future features:

* Use of Office Mobile App is being piloted in May 2014. A user will need to have an upgraded subscription which adds about $2/mo to the user account cost for the Edu A3 subscription.
* SharePoint is piloting May 2014. Policy and governance decisions need to be made.
* Development of a Privacy and Security Information Sheet is underway.
* Adding student email addresses to the campus global email directory is being analyzed.
* Additional domain names will be accommodated, e.g., ANR organization

# Ignite Topic: Virtual Desktop Imaging

Basic message is that this is a cost-savings when scaled to larger numbers, but even with smaller utilization its use can save staff time (less time to support a virtual desktop), save energy (power), and reduce end user downtime (due to viruses or misconfiguration of a system).