

Campus Technology Policy & Planning Council
February 27, 2006
1:00 – 2:30 pm
DeGarmo 551

Present: Sara Campbell, Sam Catanzaro, Dan Hayden, Trish Klass, Jim Moon, Brent Paterson, Mark Walbert, Jeff Wood, and Shari Zeck

Absent: Beckie Benner, Galen Crow for Bob Rariden, and Beth Schobernd,

Guests: Carla Birckelbaw, Steve Coan, Scott Genung, Bill Hamann, Eric Hodges, Ryan Johnston, Pete Juvinal, Kevin McCrone, and Dean Plumadore

Mark welcomed everyone to the meeting.

New Business

Mark welcomed members of the Exchange Consolidation Working Group to the meeting and turned the meeting over to Eric Hodges, the chair of the Group. After introducing members of the Group, Eric started his presentation by explaining that this committee started their work in February, 2005. He began by going through the charge on page 4 of the report (which he had distributed). He explained that there are twelve exchange servers on campus. Two of those servers are the front end servers for the entire University. It was noted that the other ten back end servers are interrelated. Since they are, if one goes down, another one will pick up for it. Eric went through the recommendations that the committee is making. The proposal recommends creation of a core administration team, made up of Pete, Kevin, Bill & Dudley, who take care of the front end servers. This proposal also limits provision of Exchange server provided email (and calendaring if approved) to faculty and staff only and will not be used for students since the email services provided by the SunJES server we already have in place works fine for the students. A data center space would have to be established. The group discussed the operational policies. He explained that group did not have consensus regarding project administration. They came up with three different ideas. Some of the committee thought AIS should administer and some of the committee thought CTSG/CISS should administer. The group ultimately had a vote on this with some people abstaining. No decision was made.

Budget: The budget for this project estimates \$75,000 needed in hardware and software expenses with \$28,000 of it already spent. The net new cost of consolidating Exchange servers would be about \$48,000 and the annual cost to maintain would be about \$25,000 annually. We would have approximately 3500 mailboxes. CTLT would probably be tapped to train on MS Outlook. Whether or not a load balancer is needed would still have to be discussed.

The meeting was then opened up for questions. There was discussion regarding how much more or less work the local administrators would be doing. It was noted that we need an estimate on the benefits as well as the cost of consolidating Exchange in order to report to the President's Cabinet. Someone asked to see the consequences if we decide not to adopt Exchange. The committee would like to see those numbers in order to make this decision. What will be lost? What will be able to be made up in other ways? The committee is interested in knowing what

percentage of *Exchange* users use only a portion of the functionality. Could some of those who do not use *Exchange* have a mailbox and work with it for a time in order to understand the advantages of *Exchange*? The committee asked for a demonstration of what advantages there are in the *Exchange* environment and the *SUN Java* environment with a live demonstration. A written list would be helpful that would list both *Exchange* and *Sun Java*.

Mark proposed that the Exchange Consolidation Working Group report to the Council within three weeks (March 20) with a list of what Exchange can do and what it will cost to do it well and reasons why the campus should make this choice to keep using Exchange. We ultimately need to have this information to make our recommendations to the Vice Presidents with costs attached. We also would like to see test accounts for those who want one. Status quo is not an option because of the desire to get everyone on one calendaring system. It was noted that dismantling Exchange would have some costs associated to it also.

Old Business

Mark announced that he has met with all the Strategic Goal working groups at least once. Out of those discussions a new Goal has been recommended for further discussion based on requests from campus surveys on the “Top Ten IT Concerns”. The tentative wording of that Goal is:

Provide outstanding technologies in support of client needs.

Action Items under this Goal would include expansion of existing technologies such as wireless, or implementation of new technologies that enhance productivity. Mark said he would send a summary of all the working groups discussions to the Council later this week.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: March 6, 2006

DeGarmo 551

1:00 – 2:30 pm

Submitted by Georgia Bailey.