AGENDA

1. (1:00-1:05): Approval of November 9, 2012 Meeting Summary


   [Endorsement Context: The Funding Structures Review Committee has established a framework of specific principles and recommendations for funding “Infrastructure Service Offerings” and “Common Good Software/Licensed Services,” including the process and expectations, and is now requesting initial input on the framework. The item will be brought back to ITPB (and CITI) at respective next meetings for formal endorsement. CSG will provide formal input.]

3. (2:25-2:55): Role of ITPB relative to the Senate Committee on Instructional Technology (CIT) and Senate and Executive Administration organizing for Online Learning (John Mamer/Jim Davis)

   [Discussion: The Academic Senate and Executive Administration have formed two bodies to delve into instructional technology and online learning issues. The groups would like to share the principle and policy concerns they are examining, as well as to define the ITPB’s role with respect to the two organizations.]

4. (2:55-3:00): Next meeting and adjournment (Jerry Kang)
Information Technology Planning Board  
Meeting Summary  
Friday, November 9, 2012  
Murphy 1215

ITPB Attendees: Julie Austin, Cameron Campbell, Jason Cong, Jim Davis, Todd Grappone (for Gary Strong), Jerry Kang, John Mamer, Jack Powazek, Janice Reiff, Jeremy Reynard, John Riley, Guy Rodgers, Joseph Rudnick, Robert Trelease

Michelle Chen, recorder

Absent: Jonathan Furner, Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr., Christopher Lee, Warren Mori, Neil Netanel, Chon Noriega, Vincent Riggs

Invited Guests: Meg Buzzi, Mike Levine, Annelie Rugg

Resources:

Chair Jerry Kang called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM.

**Agenda Item #1: Introduction of New Members and Approval of May 14, 2012 Meeting Summary**

The new Board members this year are:

- Julie Austin – Director of SEASnet Computing; Chair of CSG
- Cameron Campbell – Professor of Sociology
- Jason Cong – Professor of Computer Science
- Janice Reiff (serving in a new capacity) – Vice-Chair of Academic Senate; Associate Professor of History/Statistics
- Robert Trelease – Professor of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine

The summary from the May 14, 2012 meeting was approved.

**Agenda Item #2: Major Decisions with Opus Project (Mike Levine/Meg Buzzi)**

The Opus project is going to be brought to CITI in December to seek funding for the next phase of detailed planning, and the project team is looking to ITPB to gauge support and surface concerns of their plans at a major milestone point.

The purpose of the Opus project is to design, build, and release a faculty information system of record for UCLA. The team would like to provide transparency when working with campus units, coordinate with other campus initiatives, and leverage data that already exists on campus that would go into a faculty dossier. The major functional components of the project are:
common import/export interface for data integration, faculty CV profile tool, academic review and business workflow, and reporting/decision support.

The highest priority requests are for a standardized electronic dossier, clear definitions for scholarly activities, specific guidance on reporting service, criteria to be included in the self-statement, and best practices for teaching evaluations. One standard dossier outline will be created, and the group will try to accommodate the entire campus, with the ability to give users the ability to include self-statements. Some categories will be irrelevant for certain departments.

Only academic appointees will be included in Opus. The group will be deploying UC Recruit at the end of the month, which is a system-wide software out of UCI. UCLA will be launching it as a pilot for next year and it will be integrated with UCPath and Opus.

There are a number of privacy, public access, and appropriate use issues to be resolved, and the project team has met with the Privacy Board to discuss issues such as public records requests and other required reporting. A diverse interview team is being formed to look at Book of Record/Master data Management issues, and the group will conduct interviews with campus data stewards to help identify authoritative data sources for various data elements.

The plan is for Opus to be implemented at the end of 2014, assuming UCPath is deployed on schedule. The actual technological aspects will only take about 18 months, but the policy issues will need to be resolved before implementation.

The ITPB raised concerns about the complexity of the project and that it has many moving parts. Members also asked questions about the functionality of faculty profiles, such as the ability to attach additional media or files, which the project team is considering. They also suggested that the project team look into what other universities are doing with respect to the policy questions. Overall, the tone of the board was one of support, with the project team convincing the ITPB that all critical areas had been identified and were being addressed.

If there are any additional questions or concerns, please contact Meg Buzzi at mbuzzi@conet.ucla.edu.

**Agenda Item #3: Next meeting and adjournment (Jerry Kang)**

The next ITPB meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2012, 1pm-3pm, in YRL 11348. The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 PM.
Recommendations

IT Funding Structures Review of Infrastructure Services

Background

The proposal to review and align IT Funding Structures was brought to ITPB, CITI and CSG in early 2012. All three boards supported the proposal and agreed to participate in the review. Funding structures is defined as the combination of funding, service, cost, incentive, management and accountability to form a structure that encourages/ensures desired outcomes.

The members of the Funding Structures Recommendations committee are:

ITPB Chair & Vice Chair – Jerry Kang and John Mamer
CITI Co-Chairs – Steve Olsen and Gary Strong/Robin Garrell
CSG Chair & Chair-Elect – Tom Phelan and Julie Austin
Jim Davis – Office of Information Technology
Glyn Davies – Academic Planning & Budget
Jack Powazek – Administration
John Power – CAO School of Law
Marcia Smith – Office of Research Administration
Andrew Wissmiller – Information Technology Services

The committee agreed to examine case studies for establishing recommendations on funding structure principles. The attached prospectus documents the recommendations for the first groups of services:
Case Study #1 and #2: Lower LH and Lower RH Quadrant Infrastructure Service Offerings

Case Study #1 is characterized as lower left-hand quadrant infrastructure services with respect to the IT2020 plan – “IT infrastructure services (lower left quadrant) are based upon institutional or regional instantiations with blended delivery of services - local deployments are by exception. (e.g. data centers/machine rooms)” These services are further characterized as infrastructure services (e.g. data center, server, storage) commonly used throughout the campus but which function is generally independent of facilities deployment (unlike middleware for example). The proposed ITS data center, server and storage services were used as the specific test cases.

Case Study #2 is characterized as lower right hand quadrant services with respect to the IT2020 plan. By definition these services are market driven. There is no a priori expectation of shared services. They are developed only if there is research demand and value. “Specialized research and educational IT infrastructure services (lower right quadrant of earlier graphic) must be deployed locally - sharing occurs when value can be demonstrated.” The proposed OIT archival storage services for researchers were used as the test case.

Case Study #1

- The expectation for campus units to use common infrastructure services provided by ITS or as substantial regional services is generally supported.
  The services offered in the lower left-hand quadrant are campus-wide, common infrastructure services. Benefits of using campus services include:
    - IT infrastructure that is more productive, leaner, greener and cost effective
    - Supports consolidation of data center / server room space and the transformation of legacy IT assets to modern private or public cloud type solutions
    - Other benefits could include improved service levels, lower total cost of ownership, optimized power and cooling usage, higher resource utilization rates, increased operational efficiency and reduced information security risks
  The group agreed that campus units are expected and encouraged to take advantage of these enterprise-level services where possible.

- Because of the extensive installed base of investment in distributed facilities and staff, the opportunities for transition are with inflections in investment, e.g. major upgrades, building moves, etc.
  The committee agreed that because the maturity of systems and investment status within different units varies widely, the opportunity for a local unit to transition its services over to a central or regionally shared infrastructure service is when there is a transition need for hardware/software upgrade, building moves, staffing issues, etc.

IT Services presented two case studies where a local unit transitioned its data center over to IT Services when presented with a major investment decision. One group needed to hire its own group of IT staff in order to run its own data center, while the other was considering an upgrade
to its current data center room. After analysis, both groups determined it would be more cost-effective to make use of IT Services’ offerings.

- **A market-driven, fee-for-service structure ensures value and commitment for client and ensures service-cost alignment.**
  Even though the IT2020 plan states an expectation for shared, consolidated services, a market-driven funding structure allows the cost for services to be kept at market value to attract clients, while the fee-for-service structure provides commitment to the client that they will receive the level of service they pay for. This structure is also beneficial for the provider of the IT services in that it can ensure alignment between the cost to provide the service and the fee to charge clients.

- **Use of the services should not be mandated (market decides).**
  In order to have a market-driven approach, the committee agreed that the use of common infrastructure services should be encouraged, but not mandated. It is up to the client/market to analyze and determine the cost-effectiveness of the service offerings for their units.

- **Procedures need to be established for flagging investment inflections and ensuring an appropriate value analysis.**
  The committee recommended establishing a procedure for flagging major investment decisions, such as when a unit requests quotes from Facilities or a major hardware/software purchase, so that the unit can be provided with more information about the common infrastructure services. The decision to use a campus-service resides with the local unit provided that they have completed a value analysis. The committee further recommended there be a checklist and protocol for the value analysis in determining whether it is worthwhile to move over to the campus service.

  At this time, the group agreed to let IT Services deploy their initial communications plan to inform units of their services before discussing the procedure for flagging investments.

  **Case Study #2**

- **With Case Study #2, lower right hand quadrant services, by definition market driven, the recommendation that Case Study #1 be market driven causes the funding structure for both to become nearly the same**
  The committee established that the requirements for storage services were sufficiently different to warrant separate researcher oriented archival storage services. There can, however, be overlaps. The market driven approach will require researcher and general campus markets to review feature sets and costs to determine value. OIT will also work with the campus to flag archival storage purchases.
With Case Study #1 and #2 together

- For infrastructure services to be both attractive and cost effective for units there needs to be a full array of services in place upfront. This implies upfront investment potentially involving campus investment or a campus loan while the client base builds. CITI is the designated Governance Committee for resolving recommendations on requests for campus investment vs. loans.

  In order to attract clients, IT infrastructure services need to include a full suite of managed services. It is not sufficient to provide piecemeal services and expect to grow toward a full service array. Upfront expenditure is also the way to drive costs down.

  IT Services will request investment capital from the campus to build up the infrastructure and services from the beginning of the project and to create incentives for not only cost recovery, but recovery of other benefits such as space. OIT will request a loan to build the upfront services infrastructure which will be aimed at cost and research data preservation benefits. In both cases the client base is expected to grow and the service is expected to become self supporting or it needs to change.

- Pricing will be set through POSSSE.

  POSSSE is the responsible organization for approving the rates of the service offerings.
Recommendations

IT Funding Structures Review of Discretionary and Mandatory Common Good Software and Services

Case Study #3 and #4: Discretionary and Mandatory Common Good Software and Licensed Software Services

Scope
Case Study #3 encompasses software and license software services in which there may be a common good basis for institutional procurement and management. This recommendation focuses on end-user based services only – individual and/or department, and does not include business-critical software, such as financial systems, or common good infrastructure services, such as middleware. Existing examples considered included Lynda.com, Microsoft, and Cayuse. These have been funded respectively by the university, a pass-the-hat approach, an institutionally managed license that allows for individual units to decide and pay. This case study is important because licensed services (Software as a Service) are proliferating. As an example, Box.net is a new service the university is considering.

Case Study #4 includes common good software and license software services that are procured to comply with mandatory or mission critical needs, including but not limited to: legal compliance, security, and standardization of administrative tasks. Existing examples include Sophos and Cognos. Historically, Sophos has been funded institutionally, while the campus-wide license for Cognos was funded by IT Services.

Recommendations Working Principles

- The default assumption is that user software and licensed software services are decided and funded locally
- The ‘market’ should make decisions on discretionary user-based software licenses and services, NOT the University
  - University funding and pass-the-hat funding are rarely sustainable because value and funding are typically not aligned with subsidy
    Subsidies whether university or unit may not reflect market value. Common good is not sustainable unless value and funding are aligned.
  - Technology changes
    Another justification for market-driven approaches is that technology changes. The market will determine the usefulness of the product and the time to change.
• There are ‘market driven’ reasons that ‘market-driven’ services should be considered for institutional funding and management:
  
  o **Economies of scale**
    If there are cost-savings involved when funding software licenses institutionally, such as volume purchase agreements or efficiency of administrative overhead, then an institutional approach to management and/or funding could be justified.
  
  o **Leveraging network effects**
    Software and services could be funded institutionally or centrally in order to prevent duplication of systems or the cost of dealing with a diversity of systems. The benefits of having a single system could justify the campus shouldering the cost, since it often outweighs the cost involved for various units to implement different versions of the same system.

• There are institutional reasons that services should be considered for institutional funding and management:
  
  o **Regulatory and policy mandates or to avoid negative externalities**
    Justification for institutional funding is if the software is needed to prevent external issues that would hinder the work of others on campus, such as copyright and privacy issues or computer virus infections. Policy 401 requires all computers connecting to the campus network meet a certain level of security. Having Sophos available to users free-of-charge through central funding allows them to easily comply with the campus policy.
  
  o **Critical to a business or operational need**
    The more business-critical a software or service is, the more justification it holds for institutional funding and prescription. For example, the institutional use of Cognos to standardize end user reporting.

• The principles for institutionally funded software licenses and services include:
  
  o **Efficiency**
    Licenses and services should be more cost or operationally efficient when provided institutionally than if units were to procure them in a distributed fashion.
  
  o **Avoid mandatory use of central services**
    Services should only be funded institutionally when it makes sense that they are. If a distributed system is more effective and its benefits outweigh the cost of having multiple systems, centralization should not be pursued. Institutionally funded services
should only be purchased because campus users find that it adds value, rather than a service that is imposed on units.

- **Minimize incentives for people to opt-out**
  These services should be overall more attractive when funded institutionally than those units are able to provide for themselves. Units cannot otherwise lose benefits. Users should not prefer to opt-out of institutionally funded services, either from a cost perspective or a features perspective.

- **Transparency**
  Centrally and institutionally funded services need to provide transparency in process, cost, benefits, usage, etc. in order to prove value to the campus and be able to justify why it should receive central funds.

- **Fairness**
  Services provided institutionally should strive to be fair to all constituents, from price to access to service quality.

**Recommendations Operations**

- **There is a high bar for mandatory or required end user software services at a campus level.**
  Mandatory or prescribed software services require unit sponsorship and IT Governance endorsement whether institutional funding is sought or not.
  - Software licenses and services are generally deemed discretionary unless (as above) the case is made for mandatory or prescribed. It is also important to clearly define what is being “mandated.” In the Sophos example, virus protection is mandatory, but the use of Sophos as the tool to meet compliance is not.
  - CITI and/or ITPB endorsement is required for mandatory or prescribed software services
  - The University generally expects the sponsoring unit to fund campus-use software (cost of operation), especially if there is internal savings
  - Institutional funding including TIF, Department Fees and/or user fees and loans may be sought through CITI, ITPB and POSSSE processes.

- **Institutional discretionary software licenses and services involve unit sponsorship for market driven management**
  - It is assumed that a sponsoring unit will set up a sales and service model for end users and/or department fees that will be approved by POSSSE.
  - A unit that sponsors a discretionary software service can benefit from the savings/value, but must also assume the risk in procuring the license and/or delivering the service. The sponsor can work with POSSSE to set prices to recover costs, including costs of evaluation, overhead, keeping services up-to-date, as well as funds for evaluating new technologies and services.
The unit can request a loan (to be paid back) through the POSSSE process.