Common Systems Group (CSG)

June 22, 2004
Meeting Summary

CSG Attendees: Jim Davis, Steve Duim, Jason Frand, Bill Jepson, Carol King, Robert Konishi, Peter Kovaric (for Max Kopelevich), John Lennon (for Paul Craft), Michelle Lew, Kathleen O’Kane, Tom Phelan, Nick Reddingius, Ruth Sabean, Mike Schilling, Stephen Schwartz (for Terry Ryan), Marsha Smith, Steve Wesson, Esther Woo-Benjamin, Don Worth

Guests: Rose Rocchio (OIT)

Agenda:

1) Library System Update

   Stephen Schwartz announced that the cutover to the new Library system is planned for July 7th. Although there has been extensive usability testing, the user interface can still be adjusted, so input is welcome.

2) Academic Personnel System Update

   The Dossier Action Tracking (DAT) Project extends the College’s existing Dossier System to include a module that will track Academic Personnel (AP) actions throughout their review process. It is an example of an application that has gone through a local process that parallels the campus-wide ITPB Project Development Flow Process and is now being brought to IT committees to raise awareness and surface impacts. The project’s functional sponsors include representation from LEAD1, the College, APO2, CAP3, Law, Business, Engineering, GSEIS4, and TFT5. A major DAT Project objective is to facilitate the AP review process by creating a single action tracking data repository and official electronic ‘historical record’. It will also consolidate AP action tracking data from the existing AP databases (e.g. in the College, APO, CAP, SOM’s6 Action Tracking, and Engineering) to seed the new DAT database. DAT will be hosted by the College and will be integrated with the following UCLA systems: ISIS (AIS), SOM, Info Ed (ORA7), LEAD (AIS), QDB (AIS), and PP-QDB (CHR). System deployment is expected in the first quarter of 2005. The ‘Dossier

1 Longitudinal Electronic Academic Database
2 Academic Personnel Office
3 Council of Academic Personnel
4 Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
5 School of Theater, Film and Television
6 School of Medicine
7 Office of Research Administration
3) **Voice/VoIP/Technology Funding Model Recommendations and Review Process Update**

Mike Schilling reviewed and updated for the Group, CTS’ financial planning progress: the CTS portfolio, existing infrastructure, CTS operations, current funding model, cost reduction strategies (including contracts for local/long distance and cell phone services) and external factors affecting CTS.

CTS has started the process of introducing a new phone bill format to the various IT committees and the broader campus. The new billing format will be implemented in July 2005. The new phone bill disaggregates technology from voice. CTS is currently testing alternative funding models (e.g. phone lines, head count, FTE, knowledge worker head count, knowledge worker FTE) for the existing set of technology/infrastructure services (including future phases of the Connect project). Mike’s ‘CTS Financial Planning’ presentation is posted at: [http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents.htm#June2004](http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents.htm#June2004)

Implications of these voice/technology cost models will be discussed at future ITPB, CSG, CITI and other committee meetings.

4) **Access to AIS Applications**

Don Worth brought to the Group AIS’ proposal to restrict access to applications that contain sensitive or private information, limiting access to UCLA, UCOP, UCDC and UC Merced IP addresses only. This would apply largely to mainframe applications, QDB, and online financial web reports but not URSA or ISIS. Access to these applications from outside networks would require a VPN (either departmental or the CTS campus VPN) and this has support implications that will impact departmental IT organizations and CTS.

14 members were present and all agreed to restrict access and require use of VPN for access from outside networks. Three members were absent and were contacted separately for input on this issue: two agreed and one has not responded.

How to implement this recommendation requires more planning. The Medical Center has had experience with VPN support issues and Robert Konishi offered to share his data. It was also thought that UC Irvine had done a similar thing and there was a suggestion to get their VPN experiences.

**Actions:**

- Don Worth to gather UC Irvine and UCLA Medical Center data on VPN support experiences.
5) Email Model PCD

In September 2003, the Email Model Task Force provided a set of recommendations to facilitate the University’s ability to rely on email for doing business. The objectives were to provide a persistent email address for all students and ensure that all students, faculty and staff have an email account for conducting University business. Those recommendations were endorsed by the CITI, CSG and ITPB.

Since then, an implementation team has been designing a directory model to meet the recommended functional specifications. Don Worth gave an overview of the proposed implementation strategy. The ‘Draft Email Model PCD’ and proposed ‘Email/Directory Model’ are posted at: [http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents.htm#June2004](http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents.htm#June2004)

Two unresolved policy issues are 1) who should be included in the ‘all staff’ category (e.g. should non-knowledge workers be included?); and 2) should individuals (faculty, staff) be allowed to update the directory and if yes, which directory fields should they be allowed to update and which fields must be restricted?

**Actions:**

- On the ‘all staff’ issue, Don Worth to talk with Jack Powazek and Mike Foraker to gauge their plans for providing email to their non-knowledge worker staff
- On the directory policy issue, Don Worth to coordinate a meeting with CHR, Payroll, and CTS Directory personnel

**Meeting Schedule for Remainder of 2004:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>July 26(^8)</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>December 28</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) Note date change