



**Project Management Office**  
**UC Information Technologies (UCIT)**  
University of Cincinnati  
PO Box 210658  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0149

Suite 400, University Hall  
51 Goodman Drive  
(513) 556-9089

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **CORE SERVICES & SHARED INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** **OCTOBER 10, 2013**  
**TIME:** **10:00 PM TO 11:00 PM**  
**LOCATION:** **UNIVERSITY HALL, ROOM 454**  
**CHAIR:** **DIANA NOELCKE AND ANTON HARFMANN**

## **CALL TO ORDER**

---

Diana Noelcke opened the meeting with introductions and reviewed the committee charge.

Present: Diana Noelcke, Ken Hirsh, Eric Anderson, Kerry Overstake, Steve Young, Dominic Ferreri, Robin Pittman, Gary Grafe

Apologies: Anton Harfmann, Rachel Frankel, Priya Chawla, Pallavi Patel

## **BUSINESS**

---

Diana compared the old IT committee structure with the new one. This committee is similar to the former Infrastructure and Technology Planning and Institutional Management Technology Committees. However, the new IT Governance Council is a completely different model and was structured to be an integrated decision making body. The topical committees have wide representation across academic, administrative and IT units and they report up to the IT Council.

The committee will meet monthly with a flexible format that accommodates all the members' schedules, especially the ones from branch campuses. Diana agreed to have periodic online meetings using Adobe Connect, Lync, or some other technology in addition to face-to-face meetings.

The main focus for the meeting today was to think about how the university should implement strategy, policies, processes, security, and services in the context of core services and shared infrastructure. The committee reviewed the selected scope of responsibilities and identified the need to develop a prioritized list. Ken Hirsh thinks it is important to note the minority opinion when consensus can't be reached.

Dominic Ferreri mentioned that one outcome of the Blue Ribbon Task Force was noting the duplication of services and low sophistication of implementation across the university. The IT managers committee also discussed duplication of services but until now a structure has not been in place to make strategic decisions. Shared services is not just an idea for IT but a theme across higher education and has a direct correlation to college affordability. This committee has the opportunity to provide leadership and direction and make recommendations to the IT Council, and can also rely on the IT Managers committee to implement the decisions that come from this group to leverage our limited resources better.

After some discussion it was decided that priorities often are based on one's perspective and place in the community (academic, administrative or IT unit), but there was general consensus that the data center upgrade is a high priority. Gary Grafe also clarified that the Architecture/Cloud/Data Center discussion should include disaster recovery, emergency planning and mission continuity.

Diana asked what role the IT Senate committee has in IT decisions. Ken said the IT senate committee makes recommendations to the full faculty senate but no formal communication with the IT community exists.

Robin Pittman reported that the IMTC has not met for some time, it included faculty and administrators and they recommended policies and strategies.

While developing a prioritized list, Diana said keep in mind higher education needs to better understand industry needs in terms of the skills our students graduate with. Local industry clearly communicated that we are not meeting their needs during the IT Summit earlier in the summer.

She also wants to ensure that the committee addresses different communication styles and preferences to ensure that the information is available and communicated not just vertically through the committee structure, but also reaches faculty and students.

Kerry Overstake identified Interoperability as one of his priorities. He echoed the importance of communication and the need for different systems on campus to be better integrated. As an example, he mentioned how critical communication is for crisis management, but many of the systems on campus are segregated and don't communicate to each other. This silo mentality means that the message has to be posted many times in many places, for example Blackboard and CQ.

Eric Anderson agreed with the priorities identified so far and said that prioritizing core services and shared infrastructure is important, and that it requires a big picture view. He hopes this committee can help play that role. Kerry agreed and hopes that the committee can help catch issues before we've invested our limited IT dollars poorly.

Diana mentioned the role Purchasing might be able to play and gave examples such as the Dell purchasing contract and previous work with Cisco to standardize networking equipment across campus. A partnership with Purchasing may help us determine where funds are currently being spent.

Regarding budget issues, Steve Young mentioned that a common problem he's experienced is that core IT initiatives (or communications about them) don't always match budget planning cycles, which prevents Clermont and other branch campuses from being able to implement them.

Dom also pointed out that in terms of financial management, there are often disincentives for shared services built into the processes we use and that might be another area to examine.

Diana asked each member to bring their top 3 priorities to the next meeting, but most said they had already identified their top concerns.

Ken mentioned the data center, infrastructure and network, and security as his top issues. Dominic agreed the data center is a high priority and in reference to the earlier discussion about industry needs added emerging technologies and industry/higher education trends as his top priorities.

Gary identified Architecture/Cloud/Data Center, Security systems, practices, and policies and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP, i.e. HR, Finance, Student Information System and other core systems) as his top three priorities.

Steve Young agreed the data center was a high priority and included infrastructure and capacity. He shared his concerns about the Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) initiative. We must have the infrastructure and security in place to support the BYOD paradigm, which is a major shift from the old computer lab model. Diana agreed and added that students are bringing to campus an average of 5.5 devices each. She said IT needs to be nimble and flexible enough to support the legacy systems while phasing in new technologies.

Eric said the data center is one of his top priorities and asked if any progress had been made on addressing the critical issues already identified. Dom said there is a data center task force committee chaired by Mary Beth McGrew and Megan Pfaltzgraff that is developing short, medium and long-term strategies. They are in the process of implementing the short-term solution now, which is upgrading the UPS systems and connecting the generator to the CARE building. The short-term solution will be in place by December 2013. Diana noted that the UPS upgrade and generator connection will require two separate

outages of 8 hours each. She is working with the design team to reduce the time if possible and involving the major stakeholders on campus to determine the best date for the shutdowns.

Gary said let's use the lessons learned from the data center outages of the past couple years - include disaster recovery and mission continuity in every element of design. Dom said they are considering 3 main requirements for designing the long-term solution:

- Patient research
- Non-patient research
- Everything else

We may need a portfolio of best options, such as pods and other hybrid approaches to insure we are meeting compliance standards (HIPAA, FERPA) instead of just building a bigger data center. Dom recommended the book [The Big Switch: Rewiring the World, from Edison to Google by Nicholas Carr](#) for anyone interested in learning more about this subject.

In closing, Diana summarized the issues discussed and asked if anyone had anything else to add. She reviewed the meeting dates and format and reminded everyone to bring their final top 3 priorities for this committee to the next meeting.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

---

- Committee members – Review the Scope of Responsibilities and bring your top three priorities to the next meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

October 10, 2013 11:00 AM