

ITTP Teleconference Minutes

October 12, 2006

I. Collaboration with Systemwide IT Groups

The Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) is an ad hoc administrative group, with faculty representation, that has an 18-month charge to develop a systemwide IT strategic plan. Specifically, it is investigating where UC should be going in IT, what more UC can do as a system, and how the campuses can coordinate better. It is also addressing financial aspects of IT in addition to organizational issues. At the end of its lifespan, ITGC will present its recommendations to The Regents. ITGC has six working groups:

1. Advanced Networking Services
2. Stewardship of Digital Assets
3. Common IT Architecture (business)
4. High Performance Research Computing
5. Instructional Technology
6. IT and the Student Experience

ITTP's role regarding this group is to establish consensus points of view on behalf of the Faculty and to provide official responses from the Academic Senate. ITTP Chair Messerschmitt is a member of both ITGC and the ANS subcommittee.

II. Collaboration with Campus IT Groups

Each campus has at least one IT group, and ITTP should collate and present their opinions and activities to the Senate as a whole and to ITGC and the Office of the President. Further, ITTP should facilitate this exchange of information by soliciting questions from both the campus committees and OP administrators and then presenting the queries to the other parties.

ACTION: Members will identify their campus's lead IT committee(s) and chair(s) and present that information to Analyst Feer for collation and distribution.

ACTION: Chair Messerschmitt and Analyst Feer will contact ITTP's OP consultants and request sets of questions for ITTP members and the campus committees to address.

ACTION: Members will solicit questions from their campus committees for ITTP to pass to its consultants for responses.

III. Establishing Minimum Computing and Communications Capabilities for Faculty and Students

Information technology hardware and software have become part of the core infrastructure necessary to successful completion of the teaching and research mission of the University. Unfortunately, not all faculty have equal access to new hardware and software because not all faculty have 1) adequate technical and administrative support from IT staff, who are often dispersed across campuses by department, or nonexistent in some departments, and/or 2) research grant money to acquire new hardware and/or software. Thus the question arises: What are the minimum IT hardware and software capacities that each campus should make available to all professors and instructors more generally to meet the teaching (and research) mission of UC?

ACTION: We will develop a preliminary “wish list” of minimum hardware, software, and support requirements. ITTP members will then carry this list back to the campuses for refinement and present their ideas to ITTP, which will develop a final consensus and communicate it to the University.

IV. Online/Distance Collaboration Tools

Several software options exist for distance collaboration, collaborative authoring, and reviewing and commenting on drafts. However, they are not used by the Senate, largely because they have been unavailable to Senate members. ITTP is the logical choice to test and evaluate these programs. Several campuses are making headway on this topic, and they may be willing to share resources with the Senate to foster investigation. Although the Senate has committee web-pages, it is felt that at present, they are not flexible enough to meet the needs of distance collaboration: multiple posters, discussion threads, etc. Among possible programs to test are: InvisionPower, Confluence, Sakai, JIRA.

ACTION: Several members offered to identify solutions available on their campuses and ask if they would be used to ITTP on an interim/experimental basis.

V. Possible Amendment of By-Law 181

Members agree that the name and tone of ITTP’s by-law, 181, is dated and needs some freshening up.. Given the constantly changing nature of IT, members agree that the committee should undertake the exercise of redefining ITTP’s name and charge. The issue was raised that sending this to the Senate for approval would create quite a bit of work, so it was agreed that we will create a modified name and charge and then decide if it is sufficiently compelling to submit this for approval.

ACTION: Chair Messerschmitt will create a preliminary write-up for discussion at the Nov 9 meeting.

VI. Member Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Members observed that redundancy in IT is rife on and between campuses, whether it is between “rival” IT departments on one campus or between campus A and campus B. The duplication of time and effort spent solving a problem which another campus or department has successfully addressed is of major concern. To ease and reduce this problem, ITTP will explore options for greater sharing, communication, and collaboration between IT departments. One option is “open source” sharing: A program is made available to other IT departments, who can then select, a la carte, the features best suited to meet its specific needs. OP would have to be involved in this process to address intellectual property issues, governance, licensing, etc. Obstacles to this process include campus specificity and specialization in many areas, incompatible hardware or software platforms, territoriality/independence, and logistical issues, such as training and cost.

All topics will be discussed further at ITTP’s regular meeting on November 9, 2006.

Call ended at 3 p.m.

Members participating:

David Messerschmitt, ITTP Chair

Lisa Naugle, ITTP Vice Chair, UCI

Michael Hogarth, UCD

Jackson Beatty, UCLA

Donna Hudson, UCSF

Attest:

David Messerschmitt, ITTP Chair

Prepared by:

Kenneth Feer, Committee Analyst