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Meeting Notes

Participants: Lyle Nevels, Patricia Donnelly, Liz Marsh, Neil Maxwell, Brian Waechter, Jenn Stringer, Kevin Cornish, Eric Fraser, Erik Mitchell, JR Schulden, David Fullmer, Jon Conhaim, Ben Gross, Bill Allison, Angela Dai

IT Workforce Retirement Projections Data Review
Liz Marsh discussed how the operation of campus IT services may be impacted by the fact that a significant number of campus IT staff will be eligible to retire during the next five years. The campus will need to establish a strategy for succession planning to adapt as current staff retire. Retirements will impact a number of IT areas including:
- Application programming
- System administration.

IST and SAIT are two areas that will potentially be heavily impacted by these retirements.

Role of existing architecture groups in relation to the new governance model
The group discussed the role of CIAT – Campus Infrastructure Architecture Committee (formerly known as DCAT) and ARC – Architecture Review Committee (new). CIAT focuses on architectural coordination and the sharing of information among campus IT operations managers. ARC performs architectural reviews of existing and proposed campus systems and recently reviewed BeeHive, a new advising system being developed by the College of Letters and Science. BeeHive may be extended for campus use beyond the College of Letters and Science as part of the SIS project. There was general interest among ITAIC members in coordinating the activities of these groups with those of ITAIC; a decision was made that these committees would be advisory to ITAIC. Further definition and clarification of the relationships will be needed. Lyle Nevels will coordinate this and future engagements between the groups.

ITAIC Areas of Focus
There was a discussed ITAIC areas of focus. The themes that came up included:
- What do we stop doing?
- How do we recoup costs when necessary?
- How do we collaborate to solve problems? (for example, currently there is a problem with SurfacePro Tablets and AirBears2. Is it possible a department could partner with the AirBears team to work towards a solution?)
- How do we ensure that solutions work for both large and small schools?

Kevin Cornish suggested that the group employ a framework for our discussions and he proposed one that distinguishes systems of record, systems of engagement and systems of innovation.


**Figure 1**

This model would divide campus IT systems into one of 3 possible categories

1. **Systems of Innovation** – refers to campus systems that are designed to experiment with new services and technologies.

2. **Systems of Engagement** – “...refers to the transition from current enterprise systems designed around discrete pieces of information ("records") to systems which are more decentralized, incorporate technologies which encourage peer interactions, and which often leverage cloud technologies to provide the capabilities to enable those interactions.”

3. **Systems of Record** – refers to those tools, repositories, and systems upon which organizations have built their business processes for the last several decades.

There was agreement to see if this framework works for us and, if not, to find another framework. The committee also discussed that it be would be helpful to establish operating principles including standard questions that could be used to review campus systems and architectural issues to ensure that campus software, hardware, networking, and architectural choices appropriately address the needs of the campus community, integrate well with existing campus technologies, and can be well-supported by campus IT staff.

**Public Computing: What is it and who’s involved?**

Finally, there was a discussion about public computing issues which Erik Mitchell from the Library, Jenn Stringer from ETS and Paul Robles have been grappling with. For these purposes, public computing includes a number of services:

- Computer on desks and in computer labs
- Virtual computers
- Service desks
- Student facing computer services

Erik discussed the value of collaboration among the different campus units that provide public computing to maximize limited resources. In some cases, it may valuable for units to specialize
in specific services areas of public computing in which the provided services could be consumed by other campus units. One interesting statistic that was shared is that 13% of students who borrow laptops from the library laptop loan program do not own a laptop. Many universities require students to own a laptop meeting certain requirements and that standardization makes it easier to provide support; there is interest in pursuing further whether that makes sense for Berkeley.

Ben Gross talked about EEI’s roadmap to develop a more secure image for public computing. We talked about innovative ideas for providing support to students like Genius Bars.

**Actions / Follow Up**

- Further definition of the relationship between CIAT, ARC and ITAIC (Lyle)
- Development of the discussion framework and principles (all)
- Contact Erik if you are interested in participating in further conversations about public computing (all)