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Meeting Summary

Minutes (available on web and already distributed by listserv)

**ITPB Attendees:** Chair Chris Foote, Kathy Atchison, Jack Beatty, Russel Caflish, Jim Davis, Adam Harmetz, David Kaplan, Greg Kitch, Kathleen Komar, Sam Morabito, Tom Phelan, Lisa Spangenberg, David Sears, Gary Strong

**Guests:** S. Kumar (Anderson), Larry Loeher (OID), Tamara Malamuth (BICS), Nick Reddingius (OIT), Margo Reveil (ATS), Ruth Sabeau (OIT), Mike Schilling (CTS), Eric Splaver (College), Kent Wada (OIT), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT), Don Worth (AIS)

**Agenda:**

1) **Portal Development**

A panel consisting of Nick Reddingius, S. Kumar, Margo Reveil, Eric Splaver, and Don Worth presented an introduction to Portals and an overview of 4 UCLA portal initiatives. The panel started discussion on institutional issues such as: multiplicity of portals, how to achieve interoperability, how to share common infrastructure, and how staff acquires new skills. The Board agreed to consider these issues over the next several months with the objective of providing a framework and charter to develop a portal roadmap for the campus. The Board recommended that a UCLA portal strategy should also include looking at UCLA in context with system wide efforts and using the power of the UC system to help push development with vendors.

2) **Repositioning IT**

The ITPB approved the following proposals:

a. Nominations to the Functional Oversight Committee (ITFOC)
b. General approach of the email consolidation project in Administration as a campus demonstration
c. General approach and framework of an external network review
d. Professional Development Program (PDP) project for gathering information on data centers

**ITFOC membership**
- Jackson Beatty
- Alfonso Cardenas
Approach to Repositioning analyses

The approach on the Repositioning projects is to move through successive phases of precision in analysis:

- **Phase 1** is an approximation; these are the numbers stated in the Repositioning IT document; the precision is plus or minus 30-40%.
- **Phase 2** is a categorical analysis to see where there is potential; these have a little more detail; some categories are: architecture relative to campus objectives, procurement practices, and fiscal model.
- **Phase 3** is detailed planning and assessment in a pilot or demonstration.
- **Phase 4** is a detailed analysis; leveraged into a campus wide or broader analysis.

The project that is farthest along is Administration’s email consolidation project - it is in Phase 3.

The network review is in the Phase 2 categorical analysis stage. The purpose is to see where there is potential. The proposed framework on the network review is to bring 4-5 external reviewers on campus in late January or February for 3 days. The first day’s focus will be on getting an overview of the campus by visiting with faculty, administrators and perhaps students to understand what the network is being used for. The second day’s focus will be on meeting with network coordinators and central and distributed CIOs, perhaps in a town hall type discussion and Q&A session. The third day will be devoted to pulling together a high level bulletized report to be delivered before leaving campus. The review team will be include people who have: experience with research institutions similar in quality and size to UCLA, networking expertise, gone through a similar process, done reviews before, a vision for trends with networking. In preparation for the review, the campus will be asked for updates and corrections to existing information collected 1.5 – 2 years ago. New information requested will include network maps, services, and management and operation structure. The objective at this stage is to get information as it exists rather than generate new information. It is important to understand what we don’t know as well as what we do know.
The Data Centers project has not entered the process yet. The proposal is to proceed on a Professional Development Program (PDP) project to gather and model data.

**CCC Comments on Repositioning Initiative**

Tom Phelan presented a collection of thoughts brought up by various IT directors regarding the repositioning initiative:

- There is general agreement that some consolidation is necessary especially in Administrative areas where a consolidation would bring their operations roughly to the current size and configuration of a number of academic units.

- There are complexities on the academic side that are not characteristic of the administration side; these differences, which involve technical considerations, should be thoroughly understood prior to any action.

- A few IT directors appear strongly in favor of repositioning, especially those from units that are currently considered weak in the area of infrastructure support.

- The IT directors agree that there are definite opportunities for collaboration among academic units.

- With the exception of a few problem units, the IT directors are unclear what problems are perceived to exist on the academic side. They request that these problems be clearly stated, and they would welcome the opportunity to address them.

- Economies-of-scale arguments appear too easily accepted. Internal University monopolies tend not to be robust, not to be innovative, and not to provide good value.

- It is felt that any unit claiming it is able to provide better or cheaper service than is currently available should first demonstrate this capability and then offer it on a voluntary fee-for-service basis. Academic units would gladly engage in collective actions that save them money, there is no need to mandate such involvement.

- It is felt that the current focus on savings in distributed units is not very significant compared to savings that could potentially be attained with a thorough examination of the organization, projects, and expenditures of the much larger central IT units.

- The IT directors perceive a widespread belief on campus, with which
they concur, that a very significant organizational change which should be
discussed by the ITPB and senior administrators is the issue of central IT
units possibly reporting to OIT. It is believed that any repositioning
initiative should closely examine this fundamental issue.

Greg Kitch presented additional general views:

- Anxiety stems from uncertainty so steps, decision points, measurements,
  should be documented and made visible as soon as possible.
- There is room for improvement; shouldn’t reject anything out of hand.

3) Educational Technology

Due to lack of time, this topic was deferred to the October meeting.

4) Future Meetings

- Monday, October 25, 3-5 p.m. @ 2121 Murphy
- Monday, November 22, 2-4 p.m. @ 2325 Murphy
- Tuesday, December 14, 2-4 p.m. @ 2121 Murphy