AACC Meeting Minutes – February 3, 2003

Present: John Anderson, Irma Arellano, Debbie Arseneau, Rosemary Bowker, Navjit Brar, Anthony Colvard, Leigh Elfrink, Chris Hicken (SC3), Bonnie Krupp, Jim Maraviglia, David Mason, Craig Nelson, John Pietsch (IACC), Rick Ramirez, Holly Sletteland, Mary Spady, Susan Sparling, Susan Stewart, George Yelland (Chair)

Apologies: Barbara Melvin, David Ross, and Vicki Stover

Guests: Jerry Hanley, Johanna Madjedi, Craig Schultz, Mary Shaffer, Richard Walls, and Tom Zuur

Minutes
The minutes of the January 6 meeting were approved as written.

PolyComm Messaging and Calendaring Project Update
Schultz distributed and reviewed a brief update. He noted several updates to the website (http://polycomm.calpoly.edu). The task forces are in full swing and the project is on schedule. Members were asked to encourage their constituents to respond as soon as possible on the functional and specialized needs per a targeted e-mail that generated about a 10% response rate. There were 819 survey responses as of yesterday (65% from students). These results, combined with input from the major functional areas and ITS, is providing good coverage. The first student focus group is scheduled this week. The next step involves outreach to the colleges starting with Liberal Arts this week. The Academic Senate, deans and department heads have also been contacted. Spady invited Schultz to attend the SISU meeting in two weeks. SC3 is actively involved in the student focus groups. The RFP framework is completed. The scheduled dates for contractor visits are listed on the website. These are marketing presentations only; formal presentations with respect to campus requirements will be conducted as part of the RFP process. Questions were raised as to Management Staff’s awareness of the project and funding requirements. Hanley said this is driven by loss of support and functionality, which gives it more urgency than a project such as imaging. The ITS Directors discussed a strategy for accommodating this within existing budget constraints.

Student E-mail Accounts
Yelland distributed a draft recommendation that the campus adopt a policy of using e-mail as an official means of communication with students, that all students be required to have access to e-mail, and that the campus outline the associated responsibilities and policy requirements for students. The draft was reviewed in detail and members made specific suggestions, e.g., including physical location notification at the same time, specifying a timeframe for requesting a Cal Poly account, eliminating language about the campus approving specific vendors. Should students be limited to one account, i.e., should they be precluded from getting a Cal Poly account if they have an external e-mail account? (Probably not.) Arellano wants to ensure that matriculated continuing education students are covered. Zuur suggested implementation planning be addressed at the same time, e.g., who is responsible for publishing and disseminating the policy? AACC agreed on the basic content of the recommendation. Yelland will wordsmith and issue a final draft with a deadline for comment. He will finalize and forward it to IRMPPC.

State of the Infrastructure
Madjedi distributed and reviewed revised reports based on input at the last meeting. The revised report provided stages ranging from Envisioned to Institutionalized, a scale of 1-6 indicating the status of each stage, and a legend indicating best practice (ad hoc, some process standards, strong process standards). Madjedi reviewed sample readiness reports based on PolyComm and Blackboard and asked if this would meet AACC needs for more clarity. Yelland felt it would. Spady and Ramirez suggested adding percent completed or acceptance of the project to the report. Mason suggested providing a way to drill down into the project details at each stage, e.g., “scope of work identified” for PolyComm. Madjedi clarified how the stage “in operation” applies to prospective projects and services. The readiness report indicates the ability to provide a service; how well a service is being delivered is addressed by metrics. Madjedi will return with an updated version within the next month or so.

Madjedi distributed and reviewed a revised handout on metrics. Two categories were described: “Capacity Planning / Proactive Monitoring” (volume, usage) and “Availability” (absolute – up/down, relative – performance). She clarified that the e-mail problem last week was a performance issue, not an availability issue, i.e., systems were available but performance was impaired. She explained that a lot of data is being collected, but this data does not readily translate into terms understood by users. She cited the account summary as an example. Just showing log information is not useful; how to translate this data into a useful metric is the question. With respect to Availability, she distributed and reviewed two histograms: Service Availability - Absolute for Calendar Year 2002 and Hours Service was Unavailable Calendar Year 2002. The root cause would be different than which services were affected. It was suggested that it be on an application/service basis. AACC can help by providing input on what services users want to see listed. A distinction was made between scheduled and unscheduled availability. Unavailability is not an absolute indicator if a service is scheduled to be up 30% of the time. This needs to be factored into the metric, along with prime time vs. off-hours, level of impact, other system (network, telephone, etc.). System Status is becoming institutionalized, and is currently being upgraded to a portal channel, which ITS will demo for AACC once it is ready. Madjedi acknowledged that entries are inconsistent and not very “user friendly.” The new version should help automate the process. The goal is to move towards providing a list of services and status indicator (red, yellow, green). What are the Top 10 items to report on in that context? Ramirez suggested ratios or indices that would be easy to consume, e.g., hours of availability vs. hours scheduled over time, number of unscheduled events, impaired events, range of duration of events (minutes, etc.), and include historical trends (good and bad). The target state may need to be adjusted. Spady suggested it be tied to academic/administrative calendars and timeframes for peak processes, e.g., registration, grades, etc. Yelland will consolidate the input from the committee and draft a list of top 10 services and other feedback on metrics.

**Academic Technology Planning Committee (ATPC)**

Members were reminded of the upcoming sessions on Wednesday.

**Software Acquisition Framework**

Hanley distributed copies of this document for discussion at a future meeting.

**Meeting Schedule**

Members were asked to consider whether to meet more often to address the issues.

**Minutes presented by:** Mary Shaffer