AACC Meeting Minutes – December 2, 2002

Present: Yelland, Bowker, Ross, Irellano, Anderson, Maraviglia, Mason, Sletteland, Stewart, Brar, Colvard, Elfrink, Melvin, Krupp, Ramirez

Apologies: Arseneau, Hicken (ASI), Pietsch (IACC), Nelson, Spady, Sparling, Stover

Guests: Hanley, Kohler, Schultz, Shaffer

1. Workstation Program

Kohler distributed the handout: “Staff Workstation Program: FY 02-03 Preliminary Outline.” Last time, ITS only had funds to refresh Windows machines; this time, the program will address Macs as these are integral to staff supporting faculty. Approximately 70 workstations will be replaced for $76K based on processor cutoff points and surveys returned by college logistical coordinators: 45 Windows machines below 400-650Mhz and 25 Macs below 400Mhz. The remaining $4K will be used to purchase external zip drives for the Macs. The handout included college allocations and preliminary models. The goal is to update existing staff workstations not to add workstations for new positions. Sletteland cited problems she’s encountered with Dell pricing, which she will discuss further with Kohler. There are no plans to expand the program beyond the academic units at this time due to limited funding. The initial goal is to ensure that college staff can access CMS; the ultimate goal is to full staff refresh if funding permits. Specific business units have established disciplined, self-funded staff workstation refresh programs. This is aimed at those areas with the most need and least funding. Plans for workstations being replaced are left up to the individual colleges; however, there may be needs on campus for those units, e.g., ASI e-mail stations. Colleges will be asked to contact ITS about repurposing workstations they cannot use.

2. Messaging and Calendaring

The rest of the meeting was spent on this topic. Schultz distributed and reviewed four documents: “AACC Update: Campus Messaging and Calendaring Project,” “Working Group Composition,” “Steering Framework,” and “Engagement and Requirements Gathering Process.” He described the process and his intent to provide regular updates at future meetings. Schultz, who will serve as the point person and chair of the working group for this project, reviewed expectations, e.g., a unified messaging solution that scales and will support integration in the future. He cited reasons for replacing the current system, e.g., performance issues, the product being at the end of life, etc. The project will consider the concept of integrating messaging with business processes as well as the necessary architecture and platform to make best use of the functions. Schultz briefly reviewed the projected size (up to 50K users) and scope (to enable integration of “electronic islands” of messaging, calendaring, voice, etc, e.g., fax integration is a given). Schultz reviewed the steering framework using task forces, representing users, with linkages back to the working group and computing committees. He reviewed assumptions, representation and accelerated project timeline. Yelland expressed concerns about the large size of the working group in getting things done.
Mason asked about executive support and the ability to meet the timeline compared to imaging which still lacks formal acceptance. While the project is driven by ITS, management staff support is expected. Schultz said this replaces an operational system (not implements new technology like imaging), so there is better data to support any decisions. There are major issues and policy questions that require executive input, e.g., should the campus provide e-mail to students? E.g., about 95% of incoming students have their own e-mail account; about 1,000 students have never activated their campus e-mail account; 5% have activated forwarding, etc.

Hanley discussed the role of the IRMPPC in reviewing and approving major business case decisions and recommendations. The final package, including recommendations and tradeoffs, will go to IRMPPC for review, discussion and affirmation and then brought to management staff for final review and approval.

Regarding the timeline, the best window for making a major change is summer. If missed, the campus will have to wait a full year to implement a new email solution. The working group is committed to getting it done. The process and requirements will drive the evaluation and decision. Schultz is meeting with Matt Roberts this week to structure the procurement process.

Anderson asked if Cal Poly could benefit from what’s been done at other CSU campuses? Not really since the definition of services and support levels are very different. However, Cal Poly will examine collaborative funding from a software licensing perspective. Sletteland asked about funding constraints. Schultz does not see any at this time, but this will be addressed once a solution is known. Questions were raised about staff backfill. ITS will adjust workloads to accommodate this project, and look to the working group for perspectives on implementation.

Finally, Schultz said that questions posed in previous venues are addressed in FAQs posted on the website. The working group will meet in the next week. Subsequent AACC meetings will provide specific updates on requirements and other topics.

Submitted by Mary Shaffer