Recommendation title:  APP Store Concept

OOC TEAM:  David Carmichael, Logan Jordan, Tim Korb, David Shaw

Summary:
The committee’s charge was to consider the possibility of developing some form of internal “App Store” such that the colleges and administrative departments could more broadly utilize the creative work of campus IT units. The committee sees the expected benefits are enhanced productivity by utilizing the created apps; and second order efficiencies from having visibility on available existing solutions, so teams do not duplicate already completed work. The committee broadened the term “App” to include not only the popular mobile program concept but a range of ‘Apps’ - from Enterprise Applications to toolbar add-ins and other widgets. Recommendations include an update of the 2011 Departmental APP OOC effort; a directive to AITL and DCM to devote meeting times and report out comes to the Departmental App effort; and creation of a searchable software and license catalog to ensure efficiency and eliminate redundancy.

Discussion:
The committee realized there existed a spectrum of both the use context for “Apps” and their creative source and deployment mechanism. We thus characterized the categories of “Apps” as:

- Common community, by choice
- Departmental specific
- Enterprise applications mission enabling
- Core enterprise Apps mission critical

The characterization of deployment context was defined as:

- Freeware / Open source / external
- Open source / campus community
- Closed source / provisioned / free
  - Purchased
  - Created
- Closed source / provisioned / fee
  - Purchased
The two dimensions allow for a matrix to be formed to guide analysis and suggest preferred practices (Exhibit 1).

The greatest discussion centered around the break point between open source community developed solutions, and closed source campus provisioned services when a fee might be involved. The pros of the open source approach were:

- Lower cost to departments, using existing staff
- Tailored approach to business needs
- Best thinking of the collective

The pros of the closed source approach included:

- Adherence to standards
- Support for implementation and system interconnects
- Presence of a solution champion
- Potential that fee would be less than local cost

A fundamental challenge we face is reluctance for departments to consider the financial costs of current processes and the financial benefits of consolidated application approaches. The case of testing Kadmissions is instructive. The savings of a few hours a week or month in each unit are nearly impossible to collect and consolidate. However, in some cases units have acknowledged incurring additional student labor or overtime, but prefer that approach to an automated service that would be cheaper, but requires payment. Units would be more willing to adopt the common solution if it were centrally funded.

The committee acknowledged the work of a prior OOC committee report (Exhibit 2) on leveraging IT resources that compiled a campus catalog of “Departmental Apps.” While some progress was made on the committee’s suggestions (i.e. Campus Camtasia Licensing); other items waned (key/door application and the directors project portfolio for AITL / DCM was never established).
Based on our discussions we believe our best course is reenergizing the prior committee’s recommendation, thus:

**Recommendation:**

- Follow up on the OOC recommendation to create an AITL and DCM key departmental App project catalog. Devote 1 AITL meeting per semester to review of projects for synergy, and limit the amount of duplicate work.
- Update the departmental App catalog from the 2011 OOC committee. Ask the AITL and DCM to perpetually update each May-June of a fiscal year, and devote 1 meeting per year to seeking synergy across units and driving adoption. Consider existing applications that could be enhanced and made more flexible for general campus use.
- Catalog mobile App development on campus in the same fashion as departmental application. US standardized campus information sources for the data feeds to allow for quick rebranding and broader campus use.
- Catalog and makes searchable existing software applications, in units, so that we can identify additional license synergy (like Camtasia) or narrow the suite of similar approaches. One possible target here is the use of @Risk by both Management and Engineering.
### Exhibit 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeware / Open Source External</th>
<th>Enterprise mission enabling</th>
<th>Enterprise Core Mission critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Source Campus Community</td>
<td>Katalyst</td>
<td>Linux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Source Provisioned/free</td>
<td>- Green screen</td>
<td>Exchange Black board Banner Timetabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Source Provisioned/fee</td>
<td>Sharepoint SCCM Keys/ Kaddmisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Outsource</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply yourself Taleo Symplicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 2: Leverage IT Resource, OOC Idea Submission Template document (attached)