Conference Call Minutes, 2010-03-18

ITANA Meeting - Minutes, 18-March-2010

Attending

Jim Phelps, University of Wisconsin-Madison (chair)
Marina Arseniev, University of California Irvine
Geoff Bouchay, University of California Berkeley
Mike Daley, University of Michigan
Scott Fullerton, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Keith Hazelton, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Christian Johansen, Pennsylvania State University
Jim Leous, Pennsylvania State University
Piet Niederhausen, Georgetown University
Oren Sreebny, University of Washington
Steve Olshansky, Internet2
Todd Piket, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Rich Stevenson, University of Maryland University Campus
Ann West, Internet2
Eric Westfall, Indiana University/Kuali
Dean Woodbeck, Internet2 (scribe)

Cloud Computing to be rescheduled
Shel Waggener was ill, so the originally scheduled cloud computing discussion was postponed.

Action Items

(AI) The face-to-face planning group will further discuss the concept, given the thoughts and ideas put forth on this call (piggybacking on AACRAO Tech or another meeting, or a campus-based stand-alone meeting).

Minutes
Minutes from March 4, 2010, were approved and will appear on the wiki.

Face2Face and AACRAO Tech

Jim discussed options for the proposed face-to-face ITANA session.

One option is to piggyback on AACRAO Tech (July 18-20 in Kansas City; www.aacrao.org/tech10/index.htm). This conference advertises itself as bringing together technology practitioners and managers from the offices of admissions, bursar, enrollment management, financial aid, registration, and central IT departments supporting student services.

AACRAO Tech has offered to have ITANA organize a track of five sessions for Monday and then have a room for an ITANA meeting on Tuesday. There was a general discussion about topics for these sessions, many of them centered on the student life cycle. Thoughts include:

• Initial student access to systems is dependent on processes controlled by registration offices - the speed with which students are entered into the system.
• Needs of federated applications for information vs. the tendency of registrars to guard the release of information.
• Within the life cycle, the time at which IDs need to be issued changes - typically moving earlier in the process, since necessary information is accessible only via portals and other applications.
• What to expect from your IT architect
• Student life cycle is a great concept - one of the few times when a university can examine a process end-to-end.
• Perhaps a panel consisting of IT architects and registrars - maybe from the same institution.

IdM topics the emerged from this discussion:
• Role of the registrar office in IdM
• Releasing attributes and associated issues
• Extending identity to other populations/functions (sports camps, etc.)
• Preparing for Kuali and/or other service-oriented architecture
• Who owns the student life cycle? Getting buy-in on campus
• Panel on the student lifecycle (architects and registrars)
• How IT arch supports strategic planning

One potential goal - if someone came to all five sessions in the track, they would leave with something in their hands.

Other F2F Options

Other options discussed were:
• A separate F2F on a campus - Boulder has offered to host such a session.
• Piggybacking on another meeting, such as CSG, Internet2 or EDUCAUSE. CSG is a smaller group and Educause would be unwieldy. The Internet2 Fall Member Meeting might be a feasible option.

Travel costs are still somewhat of a concern, particularly in California. If there were a stand-alone F2F, it would be good to consider remote participation.

(AI) These thoughts will be discussed by the planning group.

Next Meeting - Thursday, April 1
2 p.m. EST / 1 p.m. CST / Noon MST / 11 a.m. PST