

SUMMARY FOR ARCHITECTURE & NEW TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

DATE: June 26, 2017

TIME: 10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

LOCATION: Dumke Room, Eccles Broadcast Center

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mark Beekhuizen	Pieter Bowman	Joe Breen	Tim Ebner
Jeff Folsom	Demian Hanks	Matt Irsik	Josna Kotturappa
John Levandowski	Jim Livingston	Jim Logue	Chris Roberts
Steven Seal	Chris Stucker	Daniel Trentman	Rob White
Thomas Wolfe			

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Scott Sherman, Emily Rushton

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Rebwar Baesmat	Derick Bingman	David Blackburn	Steve Dean
Matt Harting	Sylvia Jessen	Jon Thomas	Wes Tolman

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- Introduce new CISO Randy Arvay
- Computer lab statistics monitoring
- Software Anywhere preliminary report
- Email Q&A and future direction
- Campus-wide printing effort update
- Open floor

Introduce new CISO Randy Arvay

Dr. Randall (Randy) J. Arvay, the U's new chief information security officer (CISO), introduced himself to the committee and gave a brief history of his background and experience leading up to accepting the position with the U.

Computer lab statistics monitoring

Matt Irsik, Marriott Library director for user support and computing services, presented the findings and recommendations from the ad hoc group tasked with evaluating how the U can better collect lab usage statistics. The group decided on specific data to collect, including basic lab info (e.g. location, number of seats), number of logins, max/peak usage, time spent on machines, and software usage. The group proposed a two-screen form, with the idea that each department asking for student computing funds would also need to fill out the form for each lab/classroom for which funds are being requested. Two possible options were identified for tracking (LabStats and StacksWare). The group had three questions for ANTC: 1) who should pay for the cost of the software, 2) who should be responsible for

system administration of the software, and 3) what should the timeline be to implement it? The group suggested having a solution in place by August 24, 2017, in time for the start of school.

The committee considered and discussed these questions. One member suggested that the question of funding is beyond the purview of ANTC, but since the timing is so tight, the funds could potentially be covered this first year by the existing surplus of student computing fees. In regards to administration of the software, one member suggested a central management software solution and to have three groups (Eccles Health Sciences Library, Marriott Library, and College of Engineering) manage all of the sub-groups that would be using the software. The committee also discussed whether it should be a requirement to provide this data in order to receive student computing funds, and there was general agreement that this should be a question for SITC. The committee also agreed that it would be best to get data from all labs that have a student curricular delivery component, rather than wait for a student computing fee request to begin collecting the data.

The committee ultimately decided to vote to approve a few items: 1) that the software solution should be funded through centralized funding, whether student computing fees or another source; 2) three different administrative groups should handle the sub-groups using the software (and that Cory Stokes would be the temporary data steward until a more permanent solution is determined); and 3) the solution should be in place by August 24, 2017 (or as close to that date as possible).

Software Anywhere preliminary report

Clayton Barlow, associate director for Enterprise Architecture, gave an update on the Software Anywhere working group and its findings thus far. The group has worked through the first deliverable, which was to identify current use cases, by holding student focus groups with transfer students, undergraduates, and student employees. The overall theme from these focus groups was that students just want to use the software they need on their own machines – not on a lab machine. Students also said the current methods for accessing software are confusing, frustrating, and ineffective.

The group's recommendation, based on the student feedback gathered, was: invest in a well-designed, comprehensive software catalog that's easy to use; create a process to propose, license, manage, and integrate software crucial for class work; implement standardized data reporting to enable a better understanding of lab and cloud software usage and inform strategic lab funding decisions; continue the working group with the next focus on recommending campus collaborative software access solutions; and invest in an enterprise printing solution (which this group acknowledged is out of its scope).

The committee discussed the recommendations. Chief Technology Officer Jim Livingston pointed out that the working group was originally assigned by SITC to focus on virtual desktop infrastructure and determining whether a campus-wide solution should exist. Cory Stokes, UOnline director and associate dean for Undergraduate Studies, recommended releasing the student computing funds currently being

held for departments that have their own VDI solutions so that those immediate needs can be met (and so that a hasty decision about a campus-wide VDI solution isn't made). There was general agreement from the group on this. Another member pointed out that some applications are not good candidates for virtualization, and that the group should be careful that those types of applications are able to remain on-campus and not pulled into the virtual-software solution.

After further discussion, the committee voted to approve three items: 1) urge the release of student computing funds previously set aside for groups with software virtualization solutions; 2) allow the Software Anywhere group to continue working toward identifying an architectural recommendation; and 3) create a separate ad hoc group that will look into creating a more consistent experience for students regarding software. The committee also agreed that SITC should make the final decision regarding timeline for these items.

Email Q&A and future direction

Mike Ekstrom, director for Network & Communications Infrastructure, gave an update on UMail, explaining that the student email migration to Office 365 is complete, and showing a targeted date of FY2019 for the majority of UMail accounts to be moved over to O365. Ekstrom covered a few of the challenges related to moving everything entirely to the cloud, and Livingston pointed out that large organizations are already doing this, but that it will take time to ease a transition into a new environment for UMail users.

Ekstrom also addressed some questions from a prior meeting, covering mailbox sizes, on-premise online archives and how to acquire one, and current processing of bulk email. Ekstrom also proposed an idea for improving the current method by which bulk email is processed, and the committee briefly discussed the pros/cons of this.

This was an information-only item.

Campus-wide printing effort update

Livingston updated the committee on the campus-wide printing effort, which is two-fold: 1) to identify a copier/printer fleet service and standardization around devices; and 2) to identify a print management solution that brings that capability to departments and builds a consistent user experience around printing. Livingston explained that one solution, uniFLOW, has already been implemented on the small scale with mixed results. The working group has been evaluating uniFLOW along with use cases to determine if it is the right holistic solution for the U, and determined that while uniFLOW meets a few use case requirements, it doesn't completely meet all requirements (especially in regards to 24/7 support, as currently deployed).

The decision was made to create an RFP to find a solution that meets the functionality, capability, and supportability requirements of the U. Livingston suggested an RFP for a print management solution that also considers completely outsourcing the IT component, as well. The RFP has two components: copier/fleet service and maintenance, and a print management solution.

The committee briefly discussed this and asked how the RFP review will be handled. Livingston explained that the current working group will need to be expanded so there is broad perspective when scoring the RFP responses. There were no further questions.

Open floor

A few items were brought up during the open floor, including suggestions for future meeting topics, and a reminder that Kronos will be upgraded July 16.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approved	Computer lab statistics monitoring	Committee	The group’s suggestions will go to SITC.
Approved	Software Anywhere preliminary report	Committee	The group’s suggestions will go to SITC. A separate group will be identified to create a more consistent student software experience.