

Minutes of Meeting**April 24, 2009**

Attending: Lisa Naugle, Chair (UCI), Anthony Joseph (UCB), Felix Wu (UCD), Tony Givargis (UCI), Leonard Mueller (UCR), Joel Primack (UCSC), Brett Stalbaum (UCSD), Donna Hudson (UCSF), Naomi Lew (Undergraduate Student Representative), Catherine Candee (Executive Director, Information, Publishing and Broadcast Services), David Ernst (Vice President for Information Resources and Communication), Harry Powell (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Martha Winnacker (Academic Senate Executive Director), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *David Ernst, Vice President for Information Resources and Communication*

The response to Council's letter on the Shared Research Computing Project is being prepared by OP therefore it is not appropriate for Vice President Ernst to discuss it. Regional data centers in San Diego and at NERSC will be used for expansion of general campus computing. A business model and a rate sheet have been created. Many campuses are creating space in their computing centers to meet demand from schools and departments to have their services run by the central facility. IR&C is working on Apply UC, a project to change the centralized administrative side of the undergraduate admissions system. UC has been paying Educational Testing Service several million dollars annually for these services. There is a two year project to clean up the data so that UC does not have to use ETS which will result in near and long-term cost-savings.

A systemwide data warehouse is being developed. Many operational transactional systems will feed into the data warehouse automatically, with a goal of reducing the requests to campuses for data used for various reports. Institutional Research and IR&C are working with the campuses to develop the specifications to ensure that the warehouse is accessible to OP and the campuses. A new project is mainframe consolidation. Campuses that do not want to operate mainframes for administrative computing will have them transferred into the Kaiser mainframe facility. OP will offer the facility at a price that is affordable or less than what it currently costs the campuses.

Planning is underway for a new Human Resource payroll project. Currently eleven different systems are used by UC. The systems started with the same source code but campuses diverged from it. An old report quantifying the cost of using different systems indicated that over 6,000 FTEs are involved in processing the payroll in departments and schools, and one third of them are responsible for tracking down data entry errors. It will not be technically difficult to develop a common system. A committee comprised of controllers and vice chancellors of administration will agree on a common set of business processes with the assistance of an outside firm that has benchmarked the data required for various processes. Campuses with health science centers will continue to use their custom systems. Using established best business practices will save time and effort and allow UC to devote resources to support teaching, learning and research. The committee will decide which best and/or common practices can be adopted.

During the ITLC planning retreat, the group identified that its charter is to identify initiatives that can be done better or only if campuses work together. Brainstorming resulted in a list of 30 different initiatives which will be reduced to 3-5 initiatives that can be done in collaboration and benefit the campuses. Faculty were not at the retreat but the initiatives will be vetted with the UC community. Initiatives identified include creating a common optional email system across the campuses. Email systems now used do not communicate with one another and there is not a common directory. A unified mechanism for refresh and build out of campus networking was also suggested. Campuses are in different places in respect to networking. The question is whether UC can have a capital investment across the system to have a baseline standard for inter and intra campus networking that every campus would be funded to meet. Issues such as networking standards for every building and how many smart classrooms should a campus have need to be addressed. The CIOs will collect the information that they are aware of related to the current state of networking. There will have to be agreement to move to these new systems. ITLC also discussed looking at best practices for providing support to faculty with technology that supports teaching and learning. What every campus should have in terms of a central resource for faculty has to be determined. Currently some campuses do not have this support and there are faculty who would use the technology if they had access.

Planning and the application of technology resources at OP must be improved. Over the years all the departments have selected the technology it wants to use, but these systems do not work with one another. Technology resources in the building need to be identified and consideration given to how these can be applied and used more effectively. IR&C will be the starting point when a department has an idea about technology and connect the department with the correct resources. This will improve operations at OP and prevent IT projects from negatively impacting campuses.

Another area IR&C is working on is technology accessibility and ADA compliance. There have been efforts at campuses to address accessibility for people with disabilities but there has not been an organized and strategic effort systemwide. OP needs a policy about accessibility and a plan for activities over the next few years will be developed. UCCC should be involved in this effort early to ensure that IR&C focuses on the right things. OP can borrow from existing models at other universities. Grants or federal and state funds will be sought and there may be collaboration with the community college and the California State University systems.

Discussion: IR&C could help with the minimum IT needs survey by posting it on the UCCC website. A second videoconferencing room and portable sets will be added. IR&C will also evaluate the software that can be set up with individual computers. Products like Ready Talk have features that enable a person to conduct presentations remotely. Another question was whether a “standard” administrative user at campuses could benefit from cloud computing. Cloud computing was discussed at the retreat and the CIOs are interested in it, but advantages and disadvantages have to be considered. One concern is losing control to an outside provider. The types of computing that could initially utilize the cloud have to be identified. One campus is considering setting up a private cloud for disaster recovery, which would be a low cost solution. UCCC discussed cost savings, how savings will be distributed, and federal stimulus money.

With respect to greater campus use of the San Diego supercomputing center and NERSC, it was noted that alternatives to UC investing in computational software exist. Whether it is cost

effective for UC to compete by having its own is being investigated by IR&C. The goal is to utilize existing capacity at the two UC sites but if alternatives have better prices these should be considered. ITLC discussed minimum standards for networking and establishing a workgroup to identify and develop standards. Looking at the work done at other institutions will facilitate this process. Network connectivity within buildings is an issue and large area WiFi might be a solution to bring campuses up to a standard. Rewiring in the usual way will be cost prohibitive but there may be places where wireless can fill in the gaps.

ITLC meets monthly by phone and about three times per year in person and agreed that OP should pay for the UCCC chair or designee's travel to the in person meetings. The committee discussed UCCC's communication with OP and that it is important for UCCC to be consulted. Members agreed that it should examine the systemwide and campus IT budgets.

II. Announcements

The Chair announced that the UCB representative is the chair-elect and the UCSC representative is the vice chair-elect. UCCC was informed about the retirement of the UCLA representative. Chair Naugle reported that Council unanimously endorsed UCCC's recommendations about the Shared Research Computing Project and forwarded the recommendations to the President. There is a revised concept paper on the Seminar Network and comments are due June 5, 2009.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes were approved.

IV. Restructuring of Academic Affairs

- *Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

Executive Director Winnacker provided an overview of the restructuring of Academic Affairs. The restructuring started a few months ago and key experts have left OP. Several Senate committees rely on OP staff for analysis and information such as analysis of faculty salary data, the contents of the Academic Personnel Manual, or the analysis used to develop the eligibility reform proposal. Staff in Academic or Student Affairs have access to large databases to which the Senate does not. To work on behalf of faculty and play its role in governance, the Senate needs access to analysts in OP. Analysts from Student Affairs and Academic Advancement have transferred to the new Institutional Research unit. Communications has been centralized with the absorption of people from other units. Academic planning is growing and this unit is involved with analysis related to establishing new schools. The Education Abroad Program is being reorganized. The new Education Partnerships unit will consolidate smaller outreach programs to K-12. Recently the president decided to not outsource the administration of UC benefits. Staff at OP has been reduced by about one-third, partly through transferring a few units to campuses.

Discussion: The committee discussed the president's response to Chair Croughan's letter about the restructuring and the Senate's need for analytical support from OP. A central question is how much shared governance is taking place. The impact of future budget cuts to OP are unknown.

V. Minimum Information Technology Guidelines

Chair Naugle indicated that the goal is to finalize the survey questions and determine how it can be implemented. One idea is to have a link to the survey on the UCCC website. A short letter could be sent to faculty explaining the survey and providing the link. IR& C may be able to help UCCC with this. Faculty would identify their campus and discipline and be asked “what equipment and services would you list indispensable as an absolute baseline for essential communications and lowest common denominator computer usage?”

Discussion: The committee discussed the format of the survey and the types of questions that should be asked. Having information about the number of faculty using certain software would help UC purchase bulk or site licenses. The simplest approach is for faculty to check off the technology they utilize and write in additional technology. Survey Monkey would be a good tool to use. An email with a link to the survey could be sent to faculty from the divisional Senates. The categories could include: input devices, output devices, storage, and networking. The survey could specifically ask if faculty use live connections on their desktop like Skype and to indicate the quality.

Action: Chair Naugle will work on the survey and send it to the committee for feedback.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Catherine Candee, Executive Director, Information, Publishing and Broadcast Services*

Executive Director Candee provided an overview of the projects under Information, Publishing, and Broadcast Services, a program of Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination. The IPBS unit was formed in the past few months and is responsible for systemwide services that create and produce original content. The UC Portal is being created and it will give the public more information about UC activities. The portal will have a number of features and will allow the public to easily find the information they want. One feature is the expert finder – the user can enter a subject and find the expert. Data on experts will be gathered from existing sources and integrated. A prototype has been developed and will be tested in September 2009. A portal pilot will be released in October. The top layer will be an editorial level with articles about current topics. Expanding the portal will be a long term project and there has been outreach to a number of outside entities about the portal.

The Seminar Network will allow participation in lectures by people at other campuses. The California Digital Library will help guide implementation of the project and Steve Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, is involved in this effort. Academic technology leaders at the campuses have formed a group to discuss the requests being made. Infrastructure required to support education overall needs to be determined by UC. A similar project is “Conference in a Box” and CDL’s scholarship repository will archive papers submitted. Information generated at the conferences will also be part of the portal.

The issue of textbook affordability was discussed. There is a project developing open textbooks that currently includes 34 online courses. An overview of UC College Prep was provided. The

open textbook movement has been driven by the community colleges where students have pushed community college faculty to not require the use of the new textbook editions. The 21 courses that must be taken at the community colleges were identified and the textbooks for these courses will be developed into open textbooks. UC should figure out where to address this problem. Open textbooks are promising but there are details with the business model that need to be examined and the review process of these books needs to be defined.

Discussion: The expert finder will be different from Google Scholar in that it will more comprehensively find the experts. In terms of the seminar network, it was noted that faculty in some fields make extensive use of slides during lectures. Executive Director Candee indicated that the network will be driven by the varying needs across disciplines. Campus budgets have not been determined. Assistance from campus audio/video offices will be required in some instances. Some campuses have built the infrastructure to record and broadcast lectures.

International versions of the textbooks cost significantly less than the US versions. One faculty member has asked a publisher to set one international price for the textbooks. Another issue is that faculty who write textbooks benefit financially. A goal is to make faculty aware of the burden on students. Discussions are beginning with publishers to encourage them to consider a new business model. UC may need to be in a licensing arrangement in order for the textbooks to be affordable and maintain the benefits to faculty effort. UC needs to take control away from the publishers. One question is who will produce the materials. Students have also been charged for add ons including clickers and electronic homework systems. The homework systems significantly restrict the type of responses that can be entered. The prices charged would be sufficient to pay for senior undergraduates to grade homework.

VII. Member Items/Campus Reports

Berkeley: A committee looked at how to pay for infrastructure and considered a per FTE recharge. Special grants from the chancellor have been used in the past but this is not a sustainable long term strategy. The biggest question is how the departments will pay for upgrades. Faculty are charged for IP addresses. Funds come from the departments but not all departments have funding available to purchase new network equipment.

Santa Cruz: This campus is now charging the dean a per person charge for internet access. Departments are charged for the student users but this change in the future. The campus has standardized on one brand of clicker.

San Francisco: This campus will begin charging the department for internet access in July. There are co-CIOS, one from administration and one from faculty, and the faculty has just retired. The consequences of this are not clear.

San Diego: The local committee is looking at open source software and implementation that would save money and the additional costs associated with it. The accounting costs are problematic. The committee has also been investigating a home grown online system for graduate applications. Requirements of individual departments for application materials vary and this will impact the Arts and Humanities where diverse media is included in the application.

Davis: This campus is working on an online course evaluation system and the divisional Senate has a number of concerns about this. The campus is also looking at an alert notification system. Now faculty register the preferred method of notification and the proposal is to expand this to be more like a social networking site. The recipients of the notification will be restricted so that not everyone gets the notice. It was noted that Twitter might be useful for notifications.

Riverside: There is a call out for proposals on the instructional use of technology and small grants are available. The electronic evaluation of teaching is being explored and the annual savings would be \$50,000. Strategies to provide incentives to get good returns for using the system have to be determined.

VIII. UCCC Priorities for 2009-2010

Discussion: Potential topics for discussion by UCCC next year include: continued work on the minimum IT guidelines and how IT will be funded in future years; using technology to create new business streams; textbooks and open access; clickers and electronic homework systems; using mobile phones instead of clickers; the ITLC initiatives; the Shared Research Computing Project; using videoconferences for Senate committee meetings; cloud computing.

IX. New Business

- *Harry Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Senate Vice Chair Powell explained what is currently happening with UC's budget. Language for the standing order has been drafted and sent to the Senate and this will go out for systemwide review. ICAS met with the state legislator to discuss the impact of the budget on UC. The state's response was that UC should consider raising student fees. Campuses are in different situations so they will have discretion on how they handle the budget cuts. There are no specific plans for furloughs or layoffs.

Discussion: The committee discussed concerns with power being given to the president. The language will go out for systemwide review. There is also an issue with the propositions on the May special election. The committee discussed whether programs would be closed and if tenured faculty can be laid off. Laying off program staff might result in the reasoning that the tenured faculty could be laid off. A couple of campuses abolished departments 30 years ago. The dean of the school can dissolve a project.

UCCC members thanked Chair Naugle for her wonderful service as chair. Chair Naugle thanked the committee members for their participation and contributions.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45
Minutes prepared by Brenda Abrams
Attest: Lisa Naugle