

May 30, 2016

IT User Experience Governance Group Meeting

In attendance: Sarah Bernardi; Martin de Bernardo; Michael Burjaw; James Duncan; Ian Fisher; Brent Furneaux; Trevor Hanekamp; James Humphreys; Paul Khangura; Julia Kraveca (Chair); Wes Mathieu; Don McCulloch; Vito Picicci; Howard Simkins; Rod Stewart (Minutes); Joseph Varrasso

Regrets: Holly Ashbourne; Jordan Carlson; Michael Evans; Bryan MacFarlane; Derrick Millard; Ausim Mobeen; Usama Pervaiz; Wes Tanney; Brandon To

Review of Action Items from May 18 Meeting

Review Windows 10 and Office 2016 technical constraints

The following details/constraints regarding the implementation of **Office 2016** were noted:

- Office 2016 licenses are currently available to us
- Can provide for download via AccessSheridan
- Can release to certain programs (based on Program code)
- Cannot concurrently be installed with Office 2013
- Faculty required for testing if it is to be included in the desktop image (2-3-month process)
 - Is this something faculty want? Do we want to test during summer?
- VDI capacity is maxed; cannot provide 2 versions at this time via VDI

The following details/constraints regarding the implementation of **Windows 10** were noted:

- Licensing now currently available
- Image for Windows 10 is hardware specific; would need hardware details from faculty within next week to make this available for fall
- further testing required by academic partners
- Microsoft's Systems Centre Configuration Manager (SCCM) is a new tool for software imaging - allows for customized images (workflows) and updates through SSCM
- VMware View 6 upgrade required for Windows 10 (3-4-week process)

Agenda

Agenda

Office 2016 availability timelines – final discussions and a vote

Based on a review and discussion of the details and constraints highlighted above, two votes were held:

1. Make Office 2016 available in Teaching & Learning environments (Podiums; Labs)
 - a. 0 votes for Fall 2016 implementation
 - b. the group unanimously voted against making Office 2016 available in in teaching & learning environments

September 2017 was the groups unanimous recommendation for making Office 2016 available in teaching and learning environments.

2. Make Office 2016 available for download via AccessSheridan for faculty and administrative staff.
 - a. The group was unanimous in their support to make Office 2016 available for download for the September 2016 semester (while providing a caveat to users that it is untested).

Windows 10 availability timelines – final discussions and a vote

Based on a review and discussion of the details and constraints the group voted whether or not to roll out Windows 10 to faculty and administrative users for September 2016.

The group unanimously voted (with 2 members abstaining) to hold off on rolling out Windows 10 for fall 2016.

The group was also unanimous in their recommendation to implement Windows 10 for Fall 2017 (along with MS Office 2016).

Methodology for assessing end user computing requirements

Presented by Vito Picicci

Vito noted that he and other members of the subcommittee (Martin de Bernard, Brent Ferneaux, Michael Evans, James Duncan, Wes Tanney, Paul Khanguara) agreed upon the following points for assessing end-user computing requirements:

1. Feedback (in the form of a survey) should be sought from
 - a. on the Academic side: Program Coordinators;
 - b. on the Admin. side: person best suited as determined by each admin. user group or department
2. The survey information (feedback) be compiled by IT and used to create the system specs that would be included in the procurement RFP's;
3. The criteria or HW system specs should be based on the user's function(s) – the tools necessary for that individual to carry out their responsibilities, be it admin. or academic related tasks;
4. Specialized programs will require higher-end HW in order for those academic users to deliver their respective curriculum;
5. IT, in order to deliver quality support, would still need to standardize these more demanding systems ie. images of each specific type;
6. End users would not be given the option of selecting HW brand or O.S., unless it is critical to their Program as it relates to item 4;
7. The onus of determining HW specs would lie with each end user group and facilitated by I.T;
8. The podium computer HW specs match those of the academic users for their respective faculty's program coordinators (academics)

Some members expressed concerns regarding hardware choice being left to program coordinators and suggested faculty are the curriculum experts. It was also noted that Program Advisory Committees (PACs) should

be considered/consulted in determining how end-user requirements are defined—details about PACs are available from program Deans.

Members also highlighted the following concerns:

- Who pays for specialized equipment in general spaces?
- Should defined standards prevail in multiuse spaces?
 - “higher standards can help/benefit everyone who uses these spaces”
 - facilities should accommodate the highest-level (requirement wise) user
- Disparity of technology between FT faculty with College-issued laptops vs. PT faculty who have nothing (or lesser BYO equipment)

Some members also argued whether it was better to invest in higher-end systems and keep them longer vs. buying/leasing baseline hardware.

IT was agreed that the proposed methodology could not be adopted at this time and that further analysis/discussion would need to take place at a future meeting.

As there is some urgency around determining hardware requirements for administrative staff (there are impending lease turnovers), IT will be working with Purchasing to establish these standards.

UX360 Public Website Walk through

Presented by Rod Stewart

A public version of the IT User Experience website was presented to group members. The website was created with a goal of providing transparency to the Sheridan community. The following features were highlighted:

- An overview of the group’s mandate along with the terms of reference
- A listing of group members and their affiliations
- Meeting details, including schedules, minutes, agendas, presentations and other relevant documentation
- A summary of the recommendations/decisions made by the group

While the group felt comfortable with the proposed level of transparency for the most part, some felt that the meeting minutes should not be so specific as to call-out or quote specific members.

- <http://it.sheridancollege.ca/aboutIT/IT-Governance/UX360/index.html>