UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Minutes of Meeting
April 25, 2008

I.   Consent Calendar
ACTION: The minutes of the February 1, 2008, teleconference were approved as noticed.
ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on the following systemwide review items:
  • Proposed Amendment to APMs 220-85-b, 335-10-1, 740-11-c; and Proposed
    Rescission to APM 360
  • Amendment to Senate Bylaw 337
  • BOARS' Revised Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy
  • Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140- Committee on Affirmative Action and
    Diversity
  • Code of Conduct for Health Sciences

II.   Chair's Announcements
Stanley Chodorow, Acting UCCC Chair (UCSD)
Acting Chair Chodorow outlined the goals of the day's meeting and the requested actions
for each agenda item.

III.   Minimum Guidelines
ISSUE: The minimum IT standards for teaching and learning (see Enclosure 2) were
drafted last year as a potential tool to empower local faculty to get better IT support from
their departments/colleges. Simultaneously, establishing systemwide standards would
allow UC to leverage its acquisition of technology. The draft should be finalized and
submitted to Academic Council.
DISCUSSION: Members noted that IT is a moving target and thus the guidelines must be
general and minimum; but, because IT does move so rapidly, regular, periodic review of
the guideline will also be necessary. Members also stated that the University needed
funding mechanisms, not just review bodies. Some members asked whether the
guidelines should include systemwide infrastructural items and supercomputing. The
consensus was that while the University needs such components of its
cyberinfrastructure, they are not necessarily part of a minimum standard; instead,
members suggested that the University should advertise the availability of advanced
technologies better than it does now. Perhaps, the University should create online
primers on how to access and use higher level facilities. Members agreed that local
support was a key aspect of any minimum guidelines.
ACTION: Acting Chair Chodorow will draft a revised statement on the minimum
guidelines for review and eventual transmittal to Academic Council.

IV.   Committee Structure and Activity
ISSUE: Given the historical ebb and flow of UCCC activity and the overlap in areas of
interest with the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
(UCOLASC), it has been suggested that UCCC and UCOLASC become one committee.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that while some issues of common concern come before each committee, there is a significant enough number of independent issues and a significant difference in point of view between the two committees. Consequently, the committee thinks that UCCC should continue to be separate from UCOLASC. One example of the different foci of the groups is that UCCC focuses more on adapting to and forecasting change in the technological environment while UCOLASC focuses more on information management. Further, the memberships of the two committees are chosen based on different criteria. Nonetheless, some members recommended that the Council establish a closer working relationship between the two committees, such as an annual joint meeting or making cross-chair *ex officio* memberships into full memberships. **ACTION**: Acting Chair Chodorow will draft a memo to Academic Council explaining the committee's reasons for remaining independent.

V.   Consultation with the Office of the President
Kris Hafner, Associate Vice President for Information Resources and Communication
ISSUE: AVP Hafner provided background on the formation and charge of ITGC: to suggest strategic investments for systemwide IT initiatives based on efforts that 1) require a set of institutions acting together, 2) maximize UC's competitiveness and innovation, and 3) leverage UC's scale. The report is intended as a set of priorities, not a plan of action.
DISCUSSION: Members noted that the products of the six work groups were only linked to the report on its last page and that the specifics those work groups put forth should be given more attention. AVP Hafner indicated that ITGC felt a summary report that included high-level recommendations would be more effective with the target audience; as a result, specific recommendations, like "remove redundant FTE", were replaced with general priorities, such as, "be more efficient in providing desktop support." Members also observed that the funding mechanism for these priorities is unclear. AVP Hafner concurred, noting that at present, IT is funded from within operating budgets at the campus level and major initiatives are funded on an ad hoc "pass the hat" basis. Finally, members thought that a better mechanism for the sharing of best practices should be established.
ACTION: Acting Chair Chodorow will draft the committee's response to the report and submit it to Chair Naugle for transmittal to Academic Council.

ISSUE: OP's IR&C unit was the first group to be consolidated under the current restructuring effort in the Office of the President. The consolidation was necessary to improve security, delivery, and efficiency. Future consolidations will include institutional research, communications, budget units, and business operations.
DISCUSSION: Members questioned how various aspects of the changes would affect the delivery of service, and AVP Hafner indicated that the ticket-system/help desk process is similar to that found on many campuses and is working well so far. Members also noted that increasing demands regarding reporting and compliance could be best monitored centrally. AVP Hafner stated that a central data warehouse is in development, as are other security and logistical upgrades.

VI.   Systemwide Review Item

- ITGC Report, "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure"

Note: See Item V above.

VII. Follow-up Discussion
None.

VIII. New Business and Future Issues
ISSUE: Santa Cruz is exploring requiring undergraduates to have laptops. Issues under consideration include financial aid considerations, support, bandwidth concerns, and perceived increases in the cost of education/attendance.

DISCUSSION: UCSF Representative Hudson noted that (graduate) medical students at her campus are already required to have laptops. Others noted that the provision of adequate tech support could be more daunting than other financial considerations. Members raised questions of liability and physical security, and they inquired as to the future of computer labs. UCSC Representative de Alfaro indicated that the labs would be redesigned to have fewer desktops, more printers, and better connectivity. Members also raised concerns about attendance—if all course materials, including the lectures themselves, can be downloaded to a laptop, the quality of education will be impacted.

ACTION: UCCC will continue to monitor this issue.

ISSUE: UCSC Representative de Alfaro inquired about how other campuses are dealing with changes in learning management systems, noting that current software options are unable to meet his campus's needs.

DISCUSSION: Members concurred that current learning management software is not satisfactory and noted that many campuses are engaged in efforts to find an alternative to whatever program they now use.

ACTION: Members will share information via the listserv campus contacts to facilitate information exchange between local campus IT specialists.

ISSUE: Members asked about the viability of setting an order of importance for supercomputing technologies at UC.

DISCUSSION: UC's supercomputers are in jeopardy of losing their NSF funding and so must become self-sustaining. Cooperation in this area has been scant; different groups are building clusters independently and not advertising their actions. Space and cooling capacities are also implicated.

ACTION: UCCC will continue to monitor this issue.

Adjournment: 3:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Analyst.
Attest: Stanley Chodorow, Acting UCCC Chair; Lisa Naugle, UCCC Chair