Conference Call Minutes, 2008-10-02

DRAFT Minutes
ITANA Conference Call
October 2, 2008

Attendees

Jim Phelps, University of Wisconsin (chair)
Marina Arseniev, University of California -Irvine
David Bantz, University of Alaska
Tom Barton, University of Chicago
George Brett, Internet2
Michael Daley, University of Michigan
Michael Enstrom, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Mike Fary, University of Chicago
John Giltner, University of Colorado
Mike Halm, Penn State University
John Hammond, University of California-Santa Cruz
Piet Niederhausen, Georgetown University
Steve Olshansky, Internet2
Chris Phillips, University of Maryland-Baltimore
Mark Poepping, Carnegie Mellon University
David Walker, University of California-Davis
Ann West, Internet2
Dean Woodbeck, Internet2 (scribe)

Agenda
1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Bash
3. Accept minutes of last call
4. Data Management Survey Results - Klara, Mike Fary

- 1.http://www.itana.org/wp-content/DMS_Results/SurveySummary.html
- 2. Data Management Survey Questions
- 3. Data Management Page on the Wiki

5. Meeting schedule for next year

- 1. EDUCAUSE CG
- 2. Face2Face in Boulder in January
- 3. Another Face2Face?
  - 1.http://net.educause.edu/ENT09 - Enterprise 2009---The EDUCAUSE Enterprise Information & Technology Conference
  - 2. Internet2 meeting - Member Meeting or other...
  - 3. What other meetings?
  - 4. Role of each of the meetings
  - 5. Survey of Members https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/itana/Face2Face+2009+Survey

6. Social Software

7. Next steps, next call

Future Agendas:
• Social Software - LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, et al

Items on the shelf:
1. Architecture Tool discussion (All)

- 1. UC Irvine's work with Protégé (http://protege.stanford.edu)
- 2. Chicago's I.T. Ecosystem Tool (Tom B)

2. Paul's piece on Standards for Arch Documents - standards for architectural documentation (Paul H)
3. UC-Berkeley Roadmap document (Hebert)

Action Items
(Mike Fary) will ping the DASIG list and (Jim Phelps) will ping the ITANA and CIO lists to encourage more responses to the data management survey.

(Michael Enstrom) will share his working definition of business intelligence with the ITANA email list.

(Jim Phelps) will place business intelligence on the agenda for the next call.

(Jim Phelps) will draft some initial survey questions concerning Face2Face meetings. This will be done on the wiki.
(Other working group members) should read, revise and contribute.

(Jim Phelps) will explore ways to aggregate conversations from various social software sites (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn), with the goal of making them accessible from one location.

Data Management Survey

Mike Fary reported 56 responses so far on the data management survey, including about 20 from the EDUCAUSE DASIG constituent group list and 30 from the CIO and ITANA email list mailings. The results track closely from each group, with clustering in certain areas. Respondents tend to rate themselves low in data governance and high in database management.

The responses also indicate that, for future surveys, business intelligence should be a separate question from data warehousing.

Results are available at http://www.itana.org/wp-content/DMS_Results/SurveySummary.html

(AI) (Mike Fary) will ping the DASIG list and (Jim Phelps) will ping the ITANA and CIO lists to encourage more responses. The survey will remain open for another week, then Mike will compile results and create some graphs.

Once the data has been compiled, there will be follow-up with institutions that rate themselves high in certain areas to see about documenting best practices. The Data Management Association (DAMA) also has some suggestions and best practices to map against.

Mike Fary will use the survey results as part of the DASIG constituent group meeting at EDUCAUSE in October. Jim will also use the results for the ITANA constituent group meeting at that same conference.

Business Intelligence

There was a discussion about the area of business intelligence, whether there is a common definition for the term and the types of things universities are doing. Are people interested in dashboards and real-time data or historical reporting? The answer is, both.

(AI)(Michael Enstrom) reported that he has a working definition of business intelligence that he will share with the email list. He believes that a good program needs to accommodate data warehousing and also unstructured data, and that it should not be platform-specific.

Jon Giltner reported on implementing a business intelligence solution at the University of Colorado. He is finding that, whether it is real-time or historical data, the interpretation of the information is still subjective and users need help with that. This adds a service layer - helping users understand and interpret data - on top of the technology layer.

(AI)(Jim Phelps) will place business intelligence on the agenda for the next call.

Meetings 2009

There was a discussion about upcoming meetings, as well as the need for Face2Face meetings in 2009.

There is a constituent group meeting at EDUCAUSE in October, which provides an outreach opportunity.

Tentative plans include a Face2Face in conjunction with the CSG meeting in Boulder. ITANA would meet on January 6, 2009, and CSG meeting January 7-9.

The discussion centered on a cycle of three Face2Face opportunities per year. The EDUCAUSE constituent group meeting is short and an outreach opportunity. A full-day Face2Face in conjunction with another meeting (like CSG) would provide the opportunity for a working session to do some business, develop models, work on white papers, and otherwise develop deliverables. A third meeting would provide an opportunity for a strategic planning session. This could also be in conjunction with another meeting, perhaps the EDUCAUSE Enterprise Information and Technology Conference, which is scheduled for May 6-7, 2009, in Indianapolis.

Several institutions reported on reduced resources for conferences and travel. Pigging-backing on other meetings might help. There was also a suggestion to explore virtual meetings, using EDUCAUSE tools or other video and/or audio solutions.

A survey was suggested to determine the level of interest in the three-meeting concept (i.e. EDUCAUSE outreach, working session and strategic planning session). The survey would focus first on whether there is support for this programmatic proposal, but there should also be some discussion of logistics. This comes at a time when EDUCUASE, Internet2 and CSG are all re-evaluating their meetings, in terms of purpose and frequency.

Ann West mentioned that Internet2 would be willing to host a meeting once a year with a modest registration fee, depending on the logistics (such as meeting location and whether meals are involved).

(AI) (Jim Phelps) will draft some initial survey questions on the wiki. (Other working group members) should read, revise and contribute.https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/itana/Face2Face+2009+Survey

Social Software

Jim Phelps reported setting up ITANA groups in Facebook and LinkedIn. There are about 20 members on Facebook and 30 on LinkedIn. Working group members expressed a concern about fragmenting the group, with different discussions occurring in different places. (AI)(Jim Phelps) will explore ways to aggregate such conversations, with the goal of making them all accessible from one location.

Next Call, Thursday, October 16, 2008, 2:00 p.m. EDT