

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY (ITTP)

**Minutes of Meeting  
February 2, 2007**

**I. Consent Calendar**

**ACTION:** The minutes of the November 9, 2006 meeting were approved unanimously.

**II. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Messerschmitt provided an outline of the day's agenda, stressing the three main topics on which the committee will focus its discussions: the proposed amendment to Bylaw 181, the suggested minimum IT standards for effective teaching at the University, and the feedback to be provided to the Information Technology Guidance Committee. It is the Chair's aim to finalize each of these documents and submit them to the Academic Council for endorsement and disbursement at the earliest possible date. If these goals are accomplished, the committee's spring meeting may be converted to a teleconference, depending upon emergent items that may request the committee's attention.

**III. Amending Bylaw 181**

**ISSUE:** The committee's name and charge are no longer reflective of its responsibilities, actions, and scope.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed and debated the proposed amendment and justification, paying careful attention to both the connotative and denotative meaning of the proposed language.

**ACTION:** The committee approved the amended document for submission to the Academic Council.

**IV. Establishing Minimum IT Standards for Teaching at UC**

**ISSUE:** ITTP seeks to advise the Office of the President on the minimum IT requirements necessary for effective teaching at the University.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee continued its discussion of the relevant minimum standards, incorporating feedback provided by several divisional IT-related Senate committees, member responses, and perspectives offered by its consultants and guests. Of particular importance were the foci on issues such as

1. the inclusion of particular software/hardware and whether this might be construed as prescriptive, rather than inclusive and illustrative,
2. the proposed inclusion of classroom-based technologies as opposed to faculty-based technologies, and
3. whether the provision of technical support should be included by name as a minimum standard.

The committee agreed that the document was clear in its illustrative nature regarding named software and hardware. The committee further agreed that classroom-based technologies were beyond the scope of the present recommendations, but it plans to return to this important area in the future. Finally, the committee agreed that the

provision of technical support is, for many faculty, part and parcel of any minimum IT standard and should therefore be included.

**ACTION:** The committee will finalize the recommendations via distance collaboration and submit them to the Academic Council for endorsement and disbursal to the Office of the President.

## **V. Feedback to the Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) and the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC)**

**ISSUE:** ITTP continues its drafting of comprehensive responses to ITGC regarding the future role of IT at the University.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Messerschmitt submitted that a reorientation of the committee's feedback trajectory might better serve the needs of the committee's faculty constituency and ITGC. An examination of the preliminary recommendations submitted by ITGC's working groups in December 2006 suggests the need for a unifying theme or vision. Accordingly, Chair Messerschmitt shared with the committee his statement of "Grand Challenges" facing UC in the IT realm, based on the idea that the specific actions of ITGC should be governed and informed by a statement of where UC should be in 10 years, technologically speaking. Both the committee and its consultants agreed that this approach would be an effective method of presenting faculty ideals and of collecting the specific recommendations made by the ITGC working groups under a single overarching goal. The committee and its consultants and guests then turned to the content of the "Grand Challenges" statement and discussed and debated the merits of each sub-topic.

**ACTION:** The committee will continue to revise the "Grand Challenges" statement via email.

**ACTION:** AVP Hafner will then share the statement with the ITGC as informal feedback.

**ACTION:** The topic-specific feedback garnered to date will be vetted and submitted to ITGC informally via ITTP's consultants.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President**

\*Note: The committee's OP consultants were present for the discussion of items VI. and V. above, and their participation in those discussions obviated the need for a separate consultation period.

## **VII. Systemwide Review Items**

**ACTION:** The committee elected not to opine on either of the items currently out for systemwide review. Analyst Feer will communicate this decision to the Senate leadership.

## **VIII. New Business and Planning**

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Messerschmitt reminded members that revision of the minimum standards recommendations and the "Grand Challenges" document would be undertaken via email. Further, he proposed that the spring meeting could be converted to a teleconference, if no new significant issues arose which demand an in-person meeting.

Vice Chair Naugle raised questions regarding membership turn-over, consecutive years of service, and the impact of sabbaticals on Senate service. She and the committee

expressed their thanks to Chair Messerschmitt for his exemplary committee leadership this year.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Distributions:

1. DRAFT ITTP Bylaw Amendment Proposal
2. ITGC Website Comments

Attest:

David Messerschmitt, Chair, ITTP

Prepared by:

Kenneth Feer, Analyst