SUMMARY FOR OPERATIONAL IT COMMITTEE MEETING  
DATE: December 4, 2013  
TIME: 12:30-1:30 p.m.  
LOCATION: 300 Park

IN ATTENDANCE:  
Michelle Ballantyne  Rich Brown  Alberta Comers  Eric Denna  
Cynthia Furse  Michael Kay  Mike Perez  Wayne Samuelson  
Raymond Tymas-Jones  Jim Turnbull  Ruth Watkins  Jeff West  
Amy Wildermuth

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Josh Wall, Rene Eborn

UNABLE TO ATTEND:  
Martha Bradley  Tom Cheatham  Gordon Crabtree  Pat Hanna  
Chris Ireland  Quinn McKenna  Mary Parker  Michael Strong

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:  
Steven Corbató, Deputy Chief Information Officer

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:  
• Approval of Sept. 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes  
• UIT Services – Common Resource Decisions  
• IT Governance Membership

Approval of Sept 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes from Sept. 25, 2013 were approved. It was also agreed that starting in 2014, OITC would meet after the Council of Academic Deans meeting, which is the third Thursday of each month. The meeting will be held in the Marriot Library and will begin at 1:45PM.

UIT Services – Common Resource Decisions

The OITC reviewed a number of UIT resources to determine if the service fit the criteria of a common resource. As had been approved in a previous OITC meeting, common IT resources are defined as:

• Large, cross-functional user base:
  – A large University population that crosses colleges, departments, and organizations consumes the service.

• Similar service characteristics:
  – The service characteristics are common across the University or require minimal adaptations.
• Opportunities for efficiencies:
  – The service can be delivered more efficiently for the University as a whole.
• Addresses institutional compliance or risk:
  – The service allows the University to comply with federal and state regulations or mitigate risk.

The following UIT services were discussed:

**Software licensing**

There was a recommendation from the group that the Office of Software Licensing (OSL) should be a centrally available resource for software distribution for the entire campus. OSL would serve as a hub for software distribution, however the software available within OSL may be fee-for-service.

Decision: OSL is a common resource and the software available through OSL may or may not be fee-for-service.

**Cabling and fiber installation**

Decision: The installation of copper cabling and fiber should be fee-for-service. Maintenance of the cable and fiber infrastructure should be a common resource.

**Website services**

A distinction was made by the OITC that University website templates, ADA compliance, and basic look-and-feel standards should be established by Marketing and Communications and should be considered a common resource.

Decision: The build and maintenance of a website is fee-for-service.

**University TV**

A recommendation was made that this service should be evaluated for opportunities for efficiencies with new technology that is available.

Decision: Fee-for-service

**Teaching Technology Core Platforms**

Decision: Common resource

**Video and Event Services**

Decision: Fee-for-service
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Course deployment and delivery service

Decision: Common resource

Telephone and communication service

Some work on this service needs to be done and vetted through the governance process.

Decision: Common resource

Software application development and integrations

Currently this service is not fee-for-service. There was discussion that because of this, there is more demand than the University has available resources to meet. To better align need and resources, these services will need to transition to a fee-for-service model in the coming years.

Decision: Fee-for-service, with details and timeline to be worked out in the future

Data Center services

It was discussed that the University needs to have a global view on the use of data centers. Historically there have been a number of little data centers all across campus. The Downtown Data Center has allowed us to consolidate a number of data center spaces, but there are still many that exist.

It was suggested that Jim Turnbull and Eric Denna bring back a model for defining our data center services. The need was recognized to provide incentives to centralize data center services across campus.

Decision: TBD

Governance Membership

As our governance model has matured and is being socialized more, we need to determine the representative makeup of the governance bodies. It was suggested that this is run through the Council of Academic Deans for their buy-in.

Some specific recommendations were given in OITC as to the current makeup of the IT governance portfolios. The recommendations are listed below.

University IT Support Services Portfolio (USS):

Request two faculty representatives respectively from Health Sciences and main campus. A suggestion was given to use Senate elections as a basis for representation on IT governance. The co-chairs of the USS portfolio (Pat Hanna and Michael Kay) will bring a proposal to the OITC.
Teaching and Learning Portfolio:

It was suggested that graduate student and undergraduate student be represented. An online-learning faculty member also should be represented.

University IT Infrastructure:

The Faculty IT Advisory Committee will suggest a representative for the Infrastructure Portfolio.

University IT Research Portfolio:

It was recommended that a post-doctoral and graduate student be represented on this portfolio.
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