Members in Attendance:
John Charles, Vice President for Information Systems and Technology
Professor Denny Freeman, Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor Karen Gleason, Associate Provost (Co-Chair)
Professor Frans Kaashoek, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Anthony P. Sharon, Deputy Executive Vice President (Co-Chair)
Glen Shor, Vice President for Finance

Guests:
Chris Hill, Principle Research Scientist
Eamon Kearns, Sr. Director, IS&T
Professor Gregory Rutledge, Department of Chemical Engineering
Mark Sils, Associate Vice President for IS&T

I. 12.18.14 Meeting Minutes approved.

II. Committee on Research Computing Update
• Chris Hill provided a recap of the vision, background, and roadmap for the Committee on Research Computing (CRC).
• At the six-month mark, all activities are currently on track and well received with no major surprises. There has been a lot of progress on co-location and shared systems with more work to do on the governance side. Several co-location moves have been completed with other interested groups emerging. Remote support seems to be working well. The first phase of shared hardware is in place. There are currently 300 nodes now and a total of ~400 anticipated by summer. One NSF hardware proposal has been submitted and one NSF cloud evaluation contract is in discussion, and two cyber infrastructure proposals are in development.
• MGHPCCC and Bates footprint for shared systems are on target this year for 400+ nodes at MGHPCCC, 40+ nodes at Bates, and 15,000 cores total by summer.
• Chris reviewed the shared system pilot project interest and feedback form – a web form that provides a mechanism to get an account to access the resources and check that the systems align with what the user was expecting/need.
• Work has been done on updating the website and broadening awareness through a print and online brochure. Professor Gleason expressed that the brochure sounded like a good idea and asked if there was any tie to purchasing. The brochure will state that there is a mechanism for buying.
• Professor Rutledge shared that CRC is trying to provide representation from each school. They have developed a charter and meet once a semester. He expressed that Chris Hill has made headway with the set up of a shared facility. The CRC is discussing cost recovery models for a shared facility that faculty would find palatable. The brochure will be a helpful tool to start a dialogue with faculty.
• The CRC is using off the shelf software for infrastructure as opposed to developing software. Professor Kaashoek asked about the status of AWS and referenced colleagues receiving lower
rates. There are many advantages to using AWS that are not just cost benefits – it can’t be just a
cost decision. It is important to pursue AWS.

III. Admin Systems: Research Administration Update
• Glen Shor provided an update on research administration. It is part of the larger administrative
systems roadmap and is a sizeable if not exclusive component.
• Glen identified the key work streams: (1) Uniform Guidance – provides assistance for
compliance specifically related to buying requirements and award closeouts. This requires
attending to buying requirements and the development of a seamless buy to pay system. The
team is trying to execute the visioning and overall implementation of this ambitious project in
an agile way. An important compliance date is end of June 2016. (2) Effort Tracking and
Management – the immediate focus is to provide enhancements to the tool that was deployed
last summer. There’s an effort to move it into production in April. (3) Kuali Coeus –
implementation is underway and will happen he first weekend in May. This a VPR led project. (4)
Best practices in financial management – RAFT (research forecasting tool) is under the
microscope. There is an effort to understand how the tool works and to identify if there are
options for modifications or if it should be retired.
• There are a range of other work streams including financial review and control, financial
reporting to sponsors, and data hierarchy assessment and recommendations. This is an
ambitious fleet of activity. Glen stated Professor Zuber was in agreement with the list of
priorities and eager to see progress.

IV. Administrative and Student Services Roadmaps Update
• Eamon Kearns provided an update on the roadmaps for administrative and student services. The
previous roadmaps were very technical and tactical. The approach now is to look at the
roadmaps differently by taking a programmatic approach to help prioritize outcomes, focus on
data and reporting (in the past it was a separate roadmap), and think about how to manage
work related to IT@MIT.
• Eamon has assumed responsibility for the Administrative Roadmap. Input has been gathered
and Eamon would like to step back and think more strategically about the roadmap over the
upcoming months. August is the target month to have a final version that will incorporate the
programmatic outcomes approach.
• The development of the Student Services roadmap followed a similar approach of outreach and
information gathering. Programmatic outcomes were discussed in meetings with sponsors and
shared with the Student Systems Steering Committee to obtain buy-in. It is anticipated that the
final roadmap will be signed off on by June.

V. Anthem Data Breach and MIT Duo Two-factor Authentication
• Mark Silis provide an update on the Anthem Data Breach. Anthem is a healthcare and health
insurance provider that suffered a personal information data breach. In the last 10 years if you
had used these services you were within the window of being impacted. Massachusetts is
independent and if you received care in in the state you are not impacted. An effort is underway
to obtain a list of impacted MIT staff/students.
• The Data Incident Response Team (DIRT) met and decided to notify the MIT community in
advance. Anthem will communicate via postal mail.
As a result of these types of issues the security of systems on the back end becomes increasingly important. IS&T has piloted Duo Two Factor Authentication since middle of January to try and raise the level of security.

The next step is to expand beyond IS&T and have the community use it. A good approach would be to target some systems that IS&T primarily operates first. The timeline would be different for each system with the goal of rolling out two-factor authentication gradually. It will require working with governance committees to develop a plan.

The ITGC agreed that two-factor authentication should be required for certain systems.

VI. Budget Update for IS&T’s IT Portfolio

John Charles provided a budget update that integrated the new operating model. The four-quadrant model represents the lifecycle. Starting in the lower left quadrant with Discovery, a pilot project is broadly label as “innovate”. Some of those projects get deployed as scale and move up to the upper left quadrant. While they are still in a growth mode or still creating some differentiation or competitive advantages, invest heavily, but over time the system starts to age so it moves over to the upper right where it is maintained.

John shared a first cut at trying to map FY15 investments that are under the purview of the ITGC and the advisory committees against the new operating model and asked for feedback and suggestions on how to shape the environment strategy.

The ITGC discussed what should be in the retire quadrant and where the greatest effort should be focused. For example, IS&T is runs three version of email – the cost is small but retiring some of the email clients could free up staff time. Based on the finance and insurance industries the target on the innovate side is 35%.

Professor Gleason requested a list of systems and services plotted against the operating model to help understand the opportunities.

VII. IT@MIT Transformation Update

John Charles provided an update on the IT@MIT transformation. John held an All Hands meeting and launched the transformation February 19. IS&T transitioned from seven areas and thirty-seven teams to three areas and fourteen teams.

IS&T is using a more agile approach to recruiting with the implementation of a core hiring team to apply a consistent and streamlined approach. IS&T engaged a recruiter who starts March 20 to help find candidates with relevant experience.

IS&T has leveraged a Change Management Team to help engage with staff and manage the transition. The team includes a mix of leadership and individual contributors who were charged with reviewing proposed changes to ensure there are no significant gaps, assisting IS&T leadership with communications related to upcoming organizational changes, helping staff with their transition to new roles and responsibilities, ensuring operational integrity of current IS&T efforts underway during the transition period. They are leading and coordinating the work during the transition period – working with staff to identify current responsibilities and if those responsibilities will be retained, transitioned out (and to what team/individual and when), and any net new responsibilities.

As part of this effort IS&T is identifying all training needs to take a programmatic approach to training. A custom curated web site for MIT is being created to allow for “self-service” agile/scrum learning opportunities.

All IS&T staff will have the opportunity to make the transition.