

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY (ITTP)

**Minutes of Meeting
November 9, 2006**

I. Welcome and Introductions

2006-2007 ITTP Chair David Messerschmitt introduced himself and his field of expertise, and encouraged the members to the same. Each in attendance did so.

II. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of meeting of May 12, 2006
- Minutes of teleconference of October 12, 2006

ISSUE: As a topical introduction for new members and to refresh the memories of continuing members, Chair Messerschmitt discussed many of the topics from the two sets of minutes (see Attachments 1 and 2).

DISCUSSION: Members asked for clarification of the scope of the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) versus that of ITTP. Chair Messerschmitt responded that while ITTP was a Senate faculty committee, ITLC was an administrative body. Others asked about the goals of the Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC): is it to devise basic, minimum computing standards or cutting-edge, high performance technology? Chair Messerschmitt indicated that ITGC, through its various workgroups, would address these as well as other aspects of information technology; he added that ITTP could influence their direction and output through strategic communications (see Item VI. below). The committee also discussed the risks of duplication of effort by information technology teams on different campuses and the limits of the current state of information technology infrastructure at UC. Finally, representatives from UCLA and UCSF commented that their joint administration/Senate campus-wide IT leadership group tended to be dominated by the administrative members, and thus had a considerably different feeling than a Senate committee.

ACTION: Both sets of minutes were approved.

III. Minimum IT Requirements for Teaching and Learning

ISSUE: What IT, both hardware and software, should be routinely provided to faculty in support of their teaching mission? (See Distribution 2.)

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that today, IT in the classroom and teaching is as basic as light and heat. They cautioned, though, that base-line standards are fluid and will continue to change over time. Nevertheless, it may be cost effective for UC to establish minimum requirements systemwide as doing so will enable an economy of scale to leverage lower prices for products and their maintenance. Members noted that it may be unfair to force everyone to use the same software, and wondered as to the feasibility of having separate minimum standards for Mac, Windows, Linux, etc. Members emphasized that compatibility must be guaranteed. The question was raised If IT is now basic to teaching and learning, would UC be expected to provide computers to students as well as instructors? Members wondered whether research and scholarly communications

needs should be included in these minimum standards. It was posited that the needs of research and scholarly communication would likely exceed the needs of teaching, and those advanced needs could be supported separately, extramurally. Finally, members noted that securing funding for systemwide minimum hardware and software standards would be difficult.

ACTION: Members will consult with their campus IT groups to provide feedback on the draft list of minimum requirements developed during the meeting. The draft will be edited and discussed via the Wiki Chair Messerschmitt will set up following the meeting (see Item VII).

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Mária Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director, Academic Senate

Executive Director Bertero-Barceló began by indicating that, currently, the Academic Senate is at the apex of its influence, and encouraged members to be active yet prudent. Next, she highlighted some important Academic Senate policies and procedures. Finally, she discussed with the committee various options for distance collaboration, observing that the Academic Senate document depository was expected to be fully functioning by early next year. She cautioned members that the use of other sources must be considered in light of security and licensing concerns.

V. Amending ITTP By-Law 181

ISSUE: ITTP's current by-law, 181, seems dated, both connotatively and denotatively. For example, "telecommunications" has become synonymous with "telephones", while the opportunity for scholarly communications has become much broader than that.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the title and charge of ITTP were in need of updating. Executive Director Bertero-Barceló indicated that such changes can often be difficult, given committee history, committee leadership changes, and the reactions of other committees. One member suggested that continuity within the committee might be enhanced by having a longer-termed chair. Executive Director Bertero-Barceló then discussed the procedure for submitting by-law amendments. Finally, members discussed the draft changes submitted by Chair Messerschmitt (see Distribution 1).

ACTION: Members will consult with their campus IT groups and provide their feedback and edits to the draft. These changes will also be edited and discussed via the Wiki.

VI. Strategic Communication with Campus IT Committees and the Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC)

ISSUE: The goal is to facilitate broader input and communication lines between the campuses and the Office of the President, mediated by ITTP. Specifically, ITTP seeks to foster communication with the ITGC.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed and edited the draft list of questions from ITTP (on behalf of ITGC) to campus IT groups.

ACTION: Chair Messerschmitt will distribute the final list of questions to each campus's IT group leader and their ITTP representative, if she or he does not fill both roles.

VII. Online/Distance Collaboration Tools

DISCUSSION: Many members have tested and used various distance collaboration tools, both personally and professionally. Based on their recommendations, ITTP will test PBWiki as a means for editing and commenting upon draft documents and engaging in discussions of various issues.

ACTION: Chair Messerschmitt will create an ITTP PBWiki page for use by the committee.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Policy on Stewardship of Electronic Information

Joined by Jacqueline Craig, Director of Policy, Information Resources & Communications (IR&C)

ISSUE: Director Craig indicated that the policy statement currently out for review represents a commitment to a standard, while the specifics of implementing that standard are put forth in the guidelines referenced in it. (See Distributions 3-5.)

DISCUSSION: Members asked who the intended audience of the policy statement is. Director Craig indicated it was designed primarily for IT managers, not faculty. Two issues were discussed at length: First, how the policy statement and the attendant guidelines could be streamlined to be more accessible to non-IT personnel, and second, how promulgation of the policy could be guaranteed. Regarding the former, members thought that the documents, considered as a whole, were too voluminous and technical for non-IT UC personnel. The suggestion of role-based versions was put forth; that is, a digested version each for deans, for instructors, for human subjects researchers, etc. Regarding the second topic, Director Craig noted that the IR&C website serves as a repository for relevant documents, and that compliance would ultimately rest with the campuses. One member suggested that an on-line training tutorial for UC personnel, similar to that used in promulgating the new HIPAA regulations, might be an effective means of educating UC personnel in this important area. Others noted that documents and regulations sent via and endorsed by departmental deans have a higher probability of being read.

ACTION: ITTP will endorse the proposed Policy on Stewardship of Electronic Information.

2. Senate Bylaw 16 – Executive Director

ISSUE: The proposed Senate Bylaw codifies the obligations, duties, responsibilities and policies governing the systemwide Academic Senate's Executive Director.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that stating explicitly the duties and obligation of the Executive Director position was needed. Further, they agreed that the proposed bylaw met the needs of both addressing the unique needs of the Academic Senate while preserving and operating within the principles of shared governance.

ACTION: ITTP will communicate its endorsement of proposed Senate Bylaw 16 to the Academic Council.

IX. Consultation with the Office of the President

Kris Hafner, Associate Vice President, IR&C

David Walker, Director of Advanced Technologies, IR&C

Paula Murphy, Director of the Teaching, Learning, and technology Center (TLtC)

- UCTrust

ISSUE: Director Walker updated the committee on recent developments with UCTrust (see Distribution 6). Because it builds on EDUCAUSE's InCommon authentication capacities, UCTrust will enable greater cooperation between UC researchers and researchers at other InCommon universities. Progress is being made in creating a federated authentication function as a means to realizing a single sign-on. Because concerns remain about single sign-on practices given individual propensities to share passwords, investigations are being made into back-up password protection or other authentication technologies for areas of high security.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the possibility of creating temporary passwords and/or crypto-cards for non-secure areas. Director Walker responded that those options are also being investigated. Members also queried as to the correspondence between levels of identity management and authentication. Director Walker indicated that UCTrust authentication levels are based on the federal government's four-tiered assurance guidelines, with UCTrust matching level two, enabling access to grant administration and similar levels of security.

- Strategic Communication with ITGC

ISSUE: In reference to the questions developed in Item VI. (above), Chair Messerschmitt asked as to the preferred time frame for and method of feedback submission. He indicated that ITTP planned to ask for responses from the campus committees by January so they could be vetted by ITTP at its February meeting, prior to being passed along to ITGC through ITTP's consultants.

DISCUSSION: AVP Hafner agreed that the proposed ITTP timeframe appears workable. Further, she outlined the broader timeframe under which the ITGC is working. Members asked as to the means of keeping ITGC's recommendations relevant, given that IT changes so rapidly. AVP Hafner indicated that a process for on-going review is under discussion. Members also asked to what degree faculty have been consulted by ITGC, and whether more was desired. The consultants responded that while each ITGC work group has faculty representation, greater input would be welcomed. Additionally, AVP Hafner and Director Walker visited most of the campuses recently, and met with faculty and local administrators to hear their views on the future direction of IT at UC, as well as UC's current IT needs (the notes of these visits are available on the IR&C website, [here](#)). While the question of vision is important, it is unclear how to best incorporate those ideals into the working groups' recommendations. Indeed, because of the fast moving pace of IT, many wonder if a vision statement or a set of guiding principles would be out-dated before it is completed. Members inquired as to the possibility of creating a universal UC IT website, mentioning that navigating between the different groups on the different campuses is difficult. Finally, the question arose as to how best to solicit feedback from UC faculty not participating in the ITGC work groups or campus IT groups. Several methods were mentioned, including a "press release" to be run in faculty newspapers,

greater specificity in the “contact us” section of the ITGC website, and a mass email to all UC faculty.

ACTION: TLtC Director Murphy will update the ITGC feedback form to include more specific and guided questions.

ACTION: IR&C will draft a press release for circulation in faculty newspapers that encourages them to visit the ITGC website and provide feedback there or through their divisional senate offices.

ACTION: Analyst Feer and Chair Messerschmitt will explore the possibility of sending a mass email to UC faculty that would include similar text to the press release being prepared by IR&C.

- Current State of the ITGC Work Groups

Many of the groups have met several times, whether by teleconference, in-person, or virtually through distance collaboration tools. Director Walker indicated that the networking work group has posted many of its reference materials, such as white papers, online. Further, they are addressing the issue of improving UC’s cyberinfrastructure to accommodate high end networking as well as collaboration tools and end-user support. AVP Hafner noted that UC’s intercampus infrastructure is provided by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC), an endeavor which includes many of California’s other institutes of higher learning, and potentially in the future, some K-12 efforts, as well. She cautioned, though, that UC should be mindful of the unique needs it will have above and beyond what CENIC provides.

- UC-wide Grid

IR&C is currently developing a UC-wide grid which will enable greater coordination by providing remote access to IT assets and aggregating processing power. Currently, the builders of the UCLA grid are looking at ways to build a UC-wide grid. Obstacles to be overcome include allowing sharing or trades between clusters and advertising the availability of spare processing capacity. That is, problems arise as to how to broker arrangements that allow one campus to use another’s unused computing capacity and how to inform faculty on different campuses of the availability of need-meeting technology at another campus in order to prevent duplication of effort and resource investment. AVP Hafner stated that a new model for advertising sharable resources and sharing the investing in them needs to be developed.

X. Inter- and Intra-Campus Cooperation

ISSUE: In order to avoid redundantly investing resources on each campus for similar software applications, technologies, and such, UC should develop systemwide IT investment and cooperation strategies.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that currently, campuses act mostly autonomously, and there is currently greater duplication of effort and resources than necessary. There are many options to address this need, such as the UC-grid under development. Other options include developing open-source processes, the procurement of licenses by OP for sign-up by and distribution to the campuses, and multi-campus start-up of large IT efforts. Obstacles to improving systemwide cooperation include lack of vision, trust, and free riding. Nevertheless, because of the central role that information technology now

plays in UC, members agree that systemwide technology investment must be considered seriously and hopefully made a priority.

ACTION: ITTP will formulate a statement indicating the necessity of pursuing systemwide IT initiatives for transmittal to the campuses and to the Office of the President.

XI. Summary and Planning

Prior to the February meeting, ITTP will consider a teleconference to discuss and vet the campus feedback to be sent to ITGC.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: David Messerschmitt, Chair, ITTP

Prepared by: Kenneth Feer, Committee Analyst

Distributions:

1. ITTP name and charge revision
2. Minimum computing and communications for faculty and instructors
3. UC Policy on Stewardship of Electronic Information Resources (Summary)
4. Stewardship of Electronic Information Resources Policy and Guidelines
5. UC Guidelines for Stewardship of Electronic Information Resources (Draft)
6. UC Identity Management Progress as of 10/24/2006

Attachments to the Minutes:

1. ITTP 2006-06 Attendance Record