Email Upgrade Task Force Meeting
November 13, 2012
8:00 a.m., 207 K-State Student Union

Participants: Rob Caffey (co-chair), Bill Chestnut, Steve Coulson, Eric Dover, Rebecca Gould (co-chair), Larry Havenstein, Brian Lindshield, Anne Longmuir, Josh McCune, Michael Raine, Scott Schlender, Theo Stavropoulos, Steve Waldron, and David Williams.

1) Three products will be considered: Google Apps, MSN Live 365, and Zimbra with a different host.

2) It was agreed that all three products meet the majority of the matrix requirements.

3) Discussion points:
   a) Hosting onsite is a cost issue. Current staff is inadequate.
   b) Approval from the university attorneys to use a cloud environment will be required. Vet Med has received approval to use a cloud environment for a previous implementation.
   c) If the only impediment to using Zimbra is that the host is not reliable, those issues could be covered through PR.
   d) Other Zimbra hosts accommodate a much smaller number of users, and are not interested in trying to support a user base as large as K-State would require.
   e) Rackspace may be another option.
   f) The need to provide email for students should be weighed. The University of Maryland study deliberated over this issue.
   g) Students want a ksu.edu address. This could be accomplished without provisioning inboxes.
   h) A single K-State address is advantageous when sending email. However, if students were allowed to use a different mail client, and designate their preferred email address in their user profile, a centralized service could provide the appropriate address when a name is typed in.
   i) Eliminating student email would only provide a cost benefit if we stayed with Zimbra.
   j) If a cloud solution is selected, the provisioning of email is a moot issue.
   k) Using a combination of products is a possibility, but feedback from Educause on this option was negative.
   l) After the pros and cons for each product have been established, the cost of each product will be determined.
   m) The top two clients used for email forwarding are Gmail and Hotmail. An iMAP connection could be used.
   n) Adopting Google Apps would have non-trivial implications for various K-State programs, e.g., Connect, KSOL, etc. This would require a substantial effort and commitment on our part.
   o) A previous issue with Google involved the ownership of data, but that may have been resolved.
   p) The retention of data within the U.S. is another potential issue. Live365 meets that requirement, but Google needs to be checked.
   q) Previous survey indicates that staff/students want Google.

4) Product pros and cons:
   a) The IM in Live 365 is equivalent to a large conference room.
   b) The university community has a negative perception of Zimbra.
   c) Live 365 can be hosted onsite, offsite, or as a hybrid combination.
   d) There would be a smaller learning curve for Zimbra.

5) Moving forward:
   a) Obtain contracts on all options and ask attorneys to review. This must be done prior to moving forward on the other items.
   b) Determine options for consideration for email
   c) Using the matrix provided, determine if each product meets the requirements
   d) Survey K-Staters. This could be in the form of a town hall meeting, online survey, discussion at open forums, etc.
e) Discuss the issue of email forwarding – to offer or not to offer
f) Draft the proposal documenting requirements, methods, options and strengths and weaknesses of each option
g) Obtain cost data for all options
h) Develop a basic plan for moving forward including identifying the technical team
i) Review K-State email policies
j) Propose a pilot of the solution chosen and conduct a post evaluation of the pilot. Include a group of high-level administrative staff in the calendaring pilot.
k) Discuss implementation of Google and Live 365 with other universities that have had recent implementations
l) Review APIs in Google and Live 365
m) Communicate, communicate, communicate: put an update in K-State Today each week; provide a list of strengths and weakness of the product options and welcome campus feedback

5) Action items:
   a) Rebecca will research each of the three products to determine if they all meet the requirements in the matrix.
   b) Eric and Rebecca will contact universities that have implemented either Live 365 or Google.
   c) Steve will look into Live 365 APIs to determine if they are as robust as those in Google Apps.

6) The next meeting will be held on November 20 in K-State Foundation Room 146G to discuss product pros and cons.