Minutes (available on web and already distributed by listserv)

Attendees: Chair Chris Foote, Vice Chair Alfonso Cardenas, Christine Borgman, Cliff Brunk, Alison Bunting, Janet Chiang, Brian Copenhaver, Jim Davis, David Kaplan, Mike McCoy, Tom Phelan

Guests: Marsha Smith, Esther Woo-Benjamin, Don Worth

1. Reports

   a) The Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) is intensifying actions against music sharing/downloading. UCLA does not monitor content, so it is hard to know the extent of this problem on campus, but the pressure is building to take stronger action. Many issues are involved, including privacy issues and 1st amendment rights. The current strategy is to defer to the UC position.

   b) The Chancellor has approved the IEI Fee increase.

   c) Winter Quarter meetings will be scheduled on Tuesdays and one Friday in order to accommodate as many schedules as possible.

2. Project Process for Large Scale Projects: Specific Examples

   a) Orion 2 Replacement Planning

   The ITPB requested this report as an example of how planning and project assessment for a large-scale IT project can be done. Alison Bunting reported that many key players and advisory groups were involved in the planning process, including an Orion 2 Oversight Committee, a Functional Sponsors Group of users outside the Library, Library staff, UCLA Faculty and Administration, and partners external to UCLA, such as the California Digital Library.

   The Functional Sponsors Group was appointed to advise on how to incorporate faculty and student input into the project and was a valuable part of the process. It gave key advice on 1) whether to issue an RFP; 2) key factors to include in the RFP; 3) structuring the quality point assessment of the RFP responses; and 4) strategies for gathering faculty and student feedback during the evaluation phase. RFPs are due December 6 and the evaluation phase will continue through March.
Among the Function Sponsors’ (and its Database Subgroup) contributions were feedback from several different points of view and system users’ perspectives to balance the Library’s views.

Lessons learned in working with Function Sponsors include: 1) use their time selectively and wisely by defining 2-3 clear and specific decisions for each meeting and providing background documents in advance; 2) be clear about their role by structuring the process to define their role in giving advice but don’t try to control the process too tightly; 3) clarify the scope of the project and keep the group focused on the services and functions that are specific to the system in question; 4) share your expertise by giving background to clarify issues you are asking about without narrowing the choices to the point that you miss the valuable ‘outsider’ perspective; 5) recognize that such a group can never be fully representative of such a large and diverse campus so expand the input process to be as broad as possible; and 6) maintain momentum without short-changing discussion and factor consultation time into the project timeline.

b) Data Warehouse Planning and Strategic Capabilities

The goal of the Data Warehouse project is to integrate financial and student data. The original project scope included: 1) an Operational Data Store (ODS) with a near-real-time copy of the transaction data; 2) a Data Warehouse (DW) which integrates disparate sources and presents data in an intuitive way to use for analysis; and 3) a Managed Reporting Environment (MRE) which provides tools for analysis and reporting. The scope has since expanded with the additional requirement of identifying the needs surrounding the collection of data in the transactional systems, provisioning of data to locally managed data marts, and assessing the needs for training and changes in departmental systems dependent on existing data stores.

The project is beginning a 6 month planning phase with the goal of producing a Project Control Document (PCD) that describes the functional requirements, architectural approach, schedule, scope and resource implications for the development and implementation of the ODS, the first subject areas of the DW, and the acquisition of a reporting tool and creation of a MRE.

Don Worth reported that, like the Orion 2 Replacement Project, a Functional Oversight group is also essential to Data Warehouse planning. Because there is no clearly defined single owner of the project, it is crucial to have sponsors. Identification of key stakeholders to serve as a functional oversight committee (FOC) has just been completed. The Board noted that although there is broad campus representation on the FOC, it lacks faculty representation. They recommended that some be added. The planning process broadly includes: 1) develop functional requirements; 2) develop architectural proposal; 3) get technical evaluation and impact assessment from CSG; 4) get appropriate funding and technical design approvals; and 5) submit proposal for funding.
3. Project Process for Large Scale Projects: General Application

The Board strongly supported the proposed Institutional Project Assessment Process and the Project Development Flow and Decision Points for Large Scale Projects process. The assessment process defines what information is required at project initiation; how the Common Systems Group (CSG) does a preliminary analysis; how the ITPB measures the project against threshold criteria for cost, duration, risk, and scope; how the project goes through functional and technical reviews; and how the technical recommendations get back to the ITPB for endorsement decision. The decision points process defines how a project develops and flows through a series of multiple assessments, approvals, and progress reviews.

4. Future Meetings:
   - Tuesday, January 7, 2:00-4:00 @ 2121 Murphy
   - Tuesday, February 4, 2:00-4:00 @ 2121 Murphy
   - Friday, March 21, 3:00-5:00 @ to be determined

5. Action Items
   - Make minor adjustments to the process charts based on ITPB comments (Jim Davis)

6. Adjourn