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Finding This Presentation

Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/16/2014</td>
<td>IT Forum (April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2014</td>
<td>March 2014 Systems Speak Information Session (Timekeeping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2014</td>
<td>Business IT Forum (February 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/2014</td>
<td>ALLN02 Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/2014</td>
<td>January 2014 Systems Speak Information Session (Connect Email &amp; Calendaring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2013</td>
<td>December 2013 Systems Speak Information Session (Financial System)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Case

During 2010/2011, email & calendaring service platforms were evaluated by the ITPG Campus Calendaring Work Group with two primary goals:

a) replace the Oracle Calendar service; and

b) replace many of the departmental and divisional email services across campus.

This group focused primarily on calendaring needs.

Email service requirements were not given careful scrutiny.
In July 2012, Office365 was selected as our next-generation collaboration platform.

In late 2013, Office365 was implemented to provide email service for 2,000 accounts across academic and admin units.

We encountered myriad problems with the Office365 service. Academic customers who tend to use messaging clients other than Microsoft Outlook were primarily impacted.

To date, Microsoft has been unable to resolve these issues.
The Past 5 Months

A holistic email & calendaring needs analysis was performed.

Other platforms were evaluated.
Connect Project

ACTIVITIES
Activities

**Fall 2013**
Migrated 2,000 academic and staff users to Office 365

**Nov 2013**
Email client issues arose for many non-Outlook users resulting in major impacts to academic and staff users

**Dec 2013**
Stopped the planned migration of 1,300 Oracle Calendar customers to calendaring on Office 365

**Jan 2014**
Announced proposal to implement an on-campus Exchange server to deliver email and calendaring functionality

**Mar 2014**
Connect Customer Satisfaction survey revealed while a narrow majority of users were satisfied with Office365, a significant minority were dissatisfied

**Apr 2014**
The Connect Governance Group convened a taskforce to investigate alternative solutions to Office 365

**May 2014**
Determined that Microsoft has not addressed UCSB's outstanding issues with the Office365 platform
Activities

- **May 2014**: Connect Governance Group recommends to the IT Council that Google Apps for Education be researched and implemented.
- **May 2014**: IT Council asks ETS to proceed with a proof of concept of Google Apps and to assess the requirements of a multiple platform solution.
- **Jun 2014**: Implemented Google Apps platform.
- **Aug 2014**: Migrated ~160 accounts from Office365 to Google Apps.
- **Sept 2014**: Tested Google Apps and Office365 platform co-existence; conducted technical analysis of calendaring features available within Office365 and Google Apps.
- **Oct 2014**: Conducted needs analysis of existing calendar-only use-cases.
- **Nov 2014**: ETS is scheduled to report its findings to the IT Council on November 5.
The report includes...

- Business needs assessment for email and calendaring services
- Google Apps proof-of-concept
- Testing methodologies used to compare the Office365 and Google Apps platforms
- Analysis of the Google Apps and Office365 service offerings
- Detailed implementation scenarios for Office365, Google Apps, and dual-platform co-existence
Our Campus Reality
# Client Environments (May 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>End-Users</th>
<th>Client Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>IMAP/SMTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSIT</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>IMAP/SMTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCG</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>IMAP/SMTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIT</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIST</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>IMAP/SMTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>IMAP/SMTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly 9900 individuals use IMAP clients; 3300 use Outlook.
Email Platform Requirements

The following analysis methodology was used:

- Identify features critical to email service customers in the participants’ respective departments.
- Score each feature with a numeric value based on relative importance.
- Weight each feature by the estimated number of individuals by whom that feature is used.
- Evaluate each of the platforms to determine which features were available.
- Calculate a weighted score for each platform based on the presence or absence of each feature.
Calendar Platform Requirements

The following analysis methodology was used:

• Identify required and desired features from the perspective of the meeting scheduler.
• Score each of the scheduler features with a numeric value based on a survey of current enterprise calendaring “power-users”.
• Evaluate each of the proposed configurations from the “scheduler perspective”.
• Evaluate each of the proposed configurations from the “invitee perspective”.
• Calculate two weighted scores for each configuration: overall ability of the platform and scheduler AND ability of the recipient to read and respond to meeting invitations.
Google Apps Proof of Concept

The Proof-of-Concept platform was structured as follows:

• 169 accounts were migrated from the Office365 and ARIT Exchange platforms to Google Apps.

• Participant demographic was comprised both from individuals who had a preference for Office365 and from those with a preference for an alternative solution.

• The use of Microsoft Outlook as well as third-party and web-based clients were encouraged.
CONNECT SERVICE

Desktop Clients

- Outlook
- OWA
- Thunderbird
- MacMail

Cross Calendar

- Administrative Services
- Student Affairs

- All-in for Email & Calendar
- Calendar Only
Connect Project

GOVERNANCE & NEXT STEPS
Connect Governance Group
Membership

Matt Dunham, Enterprise Technology Services
Doug Drury, Enterprise Technology Services
James Frew, Bren School of Environmental Science & Management
James Kinneavy, Student Affairs Information Systems
Bill McTague, Student Affairs
Elise Meyer, Enterprise Technology Services
Alan Moses, College of Letters and Science
Ben Price, Administrative & Residential IT
Andy Satomi, Office of the Chancellor
Lisa Sedgwick, Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor
Eric Sonquist, Institutional Advancement
Libe Washburn, Department of Geography
IT Council’s Role

The IT Council is the single campus mechanism for evaluating, prioritizing, and recommending enterprise level projects and initiatives for eventual approval and funding (if required) by the IT Board.

The IT Council is a critical control mechanism for promoting the manageability, impacts, and timing of far-reaching IT projects.

All proposed enterprise level projects must undergo IT Council evaluation.
IT Council Membership

(membership is expanding)

Doug Drury, Enterprise Technology Services
Chuck Haines, Budget & Planning
Karen Hanson, Office of Research
Tim Sherwood, Computer Science
Alan Liu, English Department
John Longbrake, Office of Public Affairs
Bill McTague, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Elise Meyer, Enterprise Technology Services
Lisa Sedgwick, Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor
Martin Shumaker, Housing & Residential Services
Denise Stephens, Library
Christian Villasenor, Graduate Division
ANNOUNCEMENTS
IT Forum

Who: Campus IT Staff

When: Tuesday, November 4 from 9 – 11am

Where: Loma Pelona Center

Topics: Governance model
        IT Council update
        Common Good Fee
        Campus IT needs assessment results
        Update on enterprise projects
Business IT Forum

Who: Directors, Business Officers, admin staff

When: Thursday, November 6 from 10am - noon

Where: Corwin Pavilion West

Topics: Governance model
IT Council update
Common Good Fee
Campus IT needs assessment results
Update on all projects
QUESTIONS