

UWEX-UWC IT Subcommittee
Updated Report to AISC
1/23/2006

1. The IT subcommittee continues to meet weekly.
2. The Server Consolidation Work Group continues to make progress and is now working on identifying our various network topologies and recommending solutions. They are analyzing our options for 'backup' and 'UPS' (universal power supply) solutions. Security and SAN (storage area network) analyses are next in queue. The UW Madison Physical Plant engineers should have a preliminary analysis for the proposed Pyle Center site by the end of January. UW System IT is now participating in this work group.
3. The Helpdesk Work Group has been identified and began their work with a meeting on Jan.12. After identifying existing helpdesks, clientele and categories of questions, the work group is identifying areas of common helpdesk activity which may be candidates for consolidation. UW System IT is a participant in this work group. We have agreed to standardize on the Footprints software since Colleges and System already use it and two UWEX divisions are already beginning to use it.

UPDATE:

After a two hour meeting the work group concluded that they could not move forward in any meaningful way. The bulk of help desk issues have to do with user desktop problems; logins, passwords, connectivity. Because there are at least four distinctly different Novell LANs within UWEX there is no common ground upon which to build. The group concluded that until a common infrastructure is actively in planning, the group's best efforts would be to continue to bring up the separate Footprints instances underway at CES, Infosys, and ICS and that LI would actively learn the Footprints environment. The group agreed to continue to share experiences. Given the situation, the potential for meaningful UWSA participation in a common help desk is even more distant than ever.

4. A Portal Work Group is being identified. This stems more from the press of outside events and the need to manage change than an IT Subcommittee desire to tackle this issue now.
5. The IT Subcommittee believes that there are no more 'low-hanging fruit' on our commonly identified IT services list. Our next task must be to begin consideration of 'identity management' which is our most complex task but is critical to the analysis of most remaining IT services.
6. The IT Subcommittee is acutely aware that it will be called on to make recommendations about whether specific IT services should be centralized or de-centralized and is developing an analysis framework within which to conduct that activity. That framework includes such

concepts as the degree of 'mission-specificity', 'limited vs. wide scope', 'institution-wide vs. local', 'resource adequacy', 'resource distribution', etc. as push-pull forces for centralization vs. de-centralization. We expect to produce a document within the next several months.

7. It is far too early to know with certainty but the results of the various work groups and IT integration discussions may well be the identification of staff savings. It becomes critical that any 'identified' staff savings are not lost by simply reverting to the division or institution in which they have been identified.