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Discussion Topics

• Why is this activity important and what is the scope?
• Quick overview of Reimagining IT activities
• A slightly deeper dive into a couple of the activities
Importance and Scope

• Cornell has over 800 IT staff at an annual cost of around $78M with little planning or coordination of activities
  – Our processes are inconsistent
  – We invest in duplicative efforts that are not necessarily strategic
  – Community needs are often not being met
  – The community is generally unhappy with IT support or systems

• Scope
  – Limited to staff time and expenses not directly associated with sponsored funds
Significant Activities

- IT governance and decision making
  - Align IT investment with institutional direction and need
  - Creation of the IT Governance Council
    - Provost, CFO, CIO, Dean of CIS
- End user and desktop support
  - More later
- Academic computing
  - More later
- Application and service development
  - More later
- Data center needs
End User and Desktop Support

• Challenge
  – Can we optimize the ways we support Cornell users and maintain our computer systems while not being overly constraining?

• Emerging recommendations
  – Standardize on a smaller set of computers, operating systems and configurations
    • 1-3 types of desktop, laptop and operating system
  – Update our technology and processes
    • Managed desktops – NOT controlling the desktop
    • Remote troubleshooting rather than IT staff dispatch
  – Cluster IT resources to preserve local efficiency and focus while ensuring sufficient talent and consistent process
  – Some faculty will have special IT needs that need to be supported
    • Sponsored research may need to pay for a higher level of service
Academic Computing

• Challenge
  – How do we build a strategy to better support the academic mission of the institution by identifying strategic investments and critical IT support for our faculty and students?

• Emerging recommendations
  – CUL, CTE, CIT and local units must more clearly define roles and responsibilities to eliminate duplication and confusion
    • Example: CUL takes more direct responsibility for frontend faculty support while CIT provides the infrastructure
  – Build an academic computing strategic plan to identify needs, goals, roles, investment and direction
Application and Service Development

• Challenge
  – How do we ensure our development investment is strategically aligned, optimally performed and sufficiently maintainable?

• Emerging recommendations
  – Move from a build-here-first approach to one of outsourcing or purchase
  – Cluster IT resources to preserve local efficiency and focus while ensuring sufficient talent and consistent process
  – Define consistent QA and requirements processes, architecture, release management, outsource management and etc.
Timeline

• Consideration by President and Provost in May
• Initial changes in place for 2010-11 academic year
  – Focus more on application development, while develop standards for end-user support
• Multi-year process, with goal of most changes completed in two years