UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 11, 2013

Attending: Jim Chalfant, Chair (UCD), Niels Gronbech-Jensen (UCD), Sreenivas Jammalamadaka (UCSB), Anthony Joseph (UCB), Lizhi Sun (UCI), John Mamer (UCLA), Jacob Thomas (Graduate Student Representative) (UCSC), Mark Cianca (Interim CIO, Information Technology Services), Stephen Lau (Policy Director, Information Technology Services), Lucy Greco (Electronic Accessibility Leadership Team) (UCB), Pete Siegel (Vice Provost, Information and Educational Technology), (UCD), Bob Powell (Chair, Academic Senate), Bill Jacob (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I.   Announcements and Introductions

Chair Chalfant welcomed committee members to the meeting and reviewed the recent history of UCCC. Members shared their interest in various technology issues. A focus for the committee this year should be on online education, especially now that the governor has proposed allocating $10M for it. The Executive Vice President for Business Operations, Nathan Brostrom, has asked the Information Technology Leadership Council to develop a strategic IT plan and UCCC should monitor this process.

Discussion: It was reported that UCSB does not have a computing committee and at some campuses there is no Senate involvement in the technology issues. Decisions now being made by administrators with respect to IT have direct consequences on course delivery and on how faculty interact with their students.

II.   Executive Session

Minutes were not taken in Executive Session.

III.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership
*   Bob Powell, Chair, Academic Senate*
*   Bill Jacob, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*
*   Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

In light of the president's announcement about his retirement, a search committee is being established. The provost is involving the Senate leadership in preparations for a report to the Regents in March on teaching productivity. A collaborative administrative-Senate effort is now underway to collect data to illustrate how much teaching is done. The president and governor have both said that UC should not expect a restoration of historical student-faculty ratios.

Chair Powell announced that there will be UC-wide summits on online education in April to which faculty will be invited. In the past several months, the discussion at UCOP has shifted from a primary focus on UCOE to a broader framework that emphasizes the independent campus online activities. Chair Powell remarked that it is important for UCOE to focus on UC students.

Discussion: The committee and Senate leadership had a general discussion about online instruction. Faculty have access to different degrees of support at the campuses. A portion of the $10M will likely be utilized to facilitate cross campus registration. Significantly more funding would be needed to address campus IT infrastructure. Vice Chair Jacob stated that it will be important to not use all of the $10M to address technology needs. The rebenching process was discussed.

IV.   Member Items: Major Campus or Systemwide Issues

Davis: On the administrative side of things, e-textbooks are being discussed and faculty have concerns. Chair Powell reported that SB 1052 and 1053 require the development of 50 open textbooks in the next three years for all three segments of higher education. By March 31st a nine member workgroup will be established to begin development of these resources. This work is being done under the auspices of the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates. UC is not mandated to do anything other than to collaborate with the other segments. The UCD committee has also discussed online education.

Berkeley: The campus is in the midst of its large shared service deployment. The majority of IT staff is moving to a new Fourth Street facility which is very inconvenient for faculty. The goal is to provide better baseline support to faculty. Hardware purchases are being standardized. The campus has site licenses for Microsoft Office and Windows Suite, Adobe CS Suite, and Mathematica. The licenses cover students as well. Campus email has been migrated to Gmail. The campus had trials with Udacity and Coursera, and has since joined EdX. Webcasts are available through iTunes U and YouTube. The campus is completely replacing its wireless network which will be partially funded through a deal with AT&T. Visitors will be able to access the network for a fee and the campus will share in the revenue. Google agreed in its contract to store UCB's data in the United States. After students leave UCB, their data may be stored out of the country. Committee members are interested in reviewing the UCB contract with Google, which also covers Santa Cruz and Davis.

Los Angeles: The campus is moving to Google mail but the status of this project is not clear. The CIO has convened a workgroup to think about strategies for funding public goods like site licenses. The campus Senate Committee on Instructional Technology is a clearinghouse that provides guidance on online courses and general course technology to undergraduate and graduate councils. The committee is beginning discussions about the tools used for online technology, including tools for building community. The campus is planning a May summit on online instruction to provide faculty with best practices and the information needed to develop an online course. The committee is helping to inform the Senate. The goal is to make the development of the courses predictable. Classroom infrastructure and connectivity issues are also being addressed.

V.   UC Online Education
  • *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UC Online Education*

Director Williams reviewed the implementation of UC Online Education. UCOE began before massive open online courses (MOOCs) began to hit the news. The market for non-matriculated students is not as large as once thought. What happens with the MOOCs will inform how UC treats credit for its online courses. Director Williams indicated that the April meetings will be an opportunity to focus on what has and has not worked.

Discussion: Three campuses have agreements with Coursera and at least two other campuses are in discussions with the company. The campuses are likely interested in sharing any revenue as well as the marketing capacity. A member remarked that if UC as a system partners with a company, UC will have an opportunity to influence decisions. People have expressed interest in the cross-campus enrollment issue, and a member noted that it will be critical to make sure funding is available to the campuses. Discussions with the EVCs about the cost model have begun. Director Williams has given them a specific proposal that models what is already done with the Education Abroad Program. In these discussions, the EVCs proposed to not exchanging any money in the first two years. The real demand for cross-campus enrollment is not known. Understanding bottlenecks at each campus will help determine what types of courses would be useful. The UCI representative remarked that the activities being conducted

related to UCOE are occurring with the continuing education program at this campus. Some campuses are working with different vendors and Director Williams believes that UCOE is developing the expertise it needs to provide similar support.

Different learning management systems are being used across the campuses and even within a campus multiple systems might be used. Director Williams noted that UCOE attempted to identify one learning management system that has the flexibility to meet different needs. It has been noted that it is important for students to have one system. UCOE will consider how it can leverage the instructors' and students' experiences. A member asked about the metrics that will be used to determine the success of UCOE. In the future, data elements may be built into the learning management system that will help UCOE learn what is and is not effective. Director Williams reported that the UCSB Center on Education Evaluation is evaluating the project. UC might want to invest in a UC-branded learning management system.

Director Williams was asked why the cross-campus enrollment has been prioritized over other efforts which might be undertaken to support UCOE. The director has heard reports about how difficult it currently is for students to receive credit for courses taken at other campuses. A work group will focus on the data hub. A member suggested that UCOE should look at the courses being offered by MOOCs that attract tens of thousands of non-matriculated students. It will be up to the Senate to determine if there are rewards related to promotion and tenure for faculty who teach online courses. UCOE provides support for the development of a class which takes different forms. According to Director Williams, the president will announce an incentive program in the near future. UCCC would like to see the details about the incentives provided.

VI.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Mark Cianca, Co-Interim Chief Strategy Officer, Information Technology Services*

Chief Cianca described the ITS unit at UCOP. The primary focus is to provide enterprise support to OP most of which is invisible. ITS manages certain key systems, and will be replacing PPS with UC Path in the next several months. ITS maintains the data and reports on the applicant pool. ITS supports systemwide policies as they relate to IT, including privacy and security for example. ITLC has a number of working subcommittees that support inter-campus initiatives in whatever form they take. There is a coordinating and interoperability function at ITLC. Chief Cianca is also working on the Regents directive, policy 5100, to support wherever practical the deployment of common administrative systems across the campuses. ITS is the primary point of engagement for the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

Executive Vice President Brostrom has asked ITS to devise a systemwide strategic plan. As a result of various initiatives, ITS has learned that it is critical for campuses to have a roadmap and investment advice. There are a number of initiatives the campuses are being required to deal with that have technology components. ITLC's strategic plan has two pillars. The first pillar seeks to formalize relationships with the various leadership groups across the system to begin the process of creating roadmaps that will inform campus and OP planning processes over time. Currently, these groups collaborate very little. The second pillar is to design the enterprise architecture and enabling infrastructure that lower the barriers to collaboration across the campuses, and this process will present difficult challenges. A draft of the strategic plan will be submitted to EVP Brostrom at the end of this week and the plan will be shared with UCCC.

Discussion: With respect to the data hub discussed earlier in the day with UCOE interim director Williams, the registrars could produce a data file that can be translated and this is probably an easier solution than asking all the registrars to use the same system. The Post Secondary Education Standards Commission is engaging in a multi-year process of defining data standards for higher education in a

number of domains. ApplyUC uses the PSESC standard admissions data model which every campus has adopted. As PSESC makes progress in the student model, work should be done with the registrars to understand adoption rates and implications of adoption. Based on his experience at UC, Chief Cianca believes that conflicting data models are a problem for the university. UCI, UCB, and UCSB are currently looking at replacing their student systems. Chief Cianca reported that ITS has the analytics that will illustrate applicants' behaviors. The important point was made that there is a difference between centralization and standardization and this is often missed in the UC system. A good deal can be accomplished in a decentralized way by standardizing.

VII. Senate's Online Instruction Pilot Project Blue Ribbon Panel Report and Recommendations
- *Diane Harley, Chair, Senate OIPP Blue Ribbon Panel (UCB)*

Chair Harley provided the committee with the history of the Blue Ribbon Panel and a summary of the UC Evaluation Center's report. The Panel convened one year ago and reports to UCEP. The Panel has tried to keep track and make sense of the efforts of UCOE. A report from the UC Evaluation Center at UCSB was provided in August which included only a summary of information about the courses. A critical analysis was written by the Panel and in November, the Panel recommended that development of new courses should be stopped until data on the current courses offered was received. This November report was not released. A final interim report was received in December but the Panel still has a number of outstanding questions. There are concerns about methodology and the evaluation has not addressed big picture issues such as faculty workload.

Chair Harley indicated that the Panel's November report is going to become public. Based on conversations with the Senate leadership, a variety of activities are going on and things are moving quickly.

Discussion: Specific details about the April summits on online education are not known but it may include a discussion about evaluation. Whether an evaluation will be done has been discussed and a new competitive RFP would be developed. It is possible that UCOE will assume responsibility for centralized development and delivery of online courses. There is evidence that suggests that courses offered at campuses with good infrastructure have been the most successful. Decisions about the best organizational structure need to be made but there are no data to inform these decisions. The Panel has concerns about the common learning environment, having heard that it does not work. However, the UCEC report recommends moving forward with COLE. UCCC could help figure out what technical infrastructure is needed for the delivery of online courses.

VIII. Information Security and Privacy Initiative and IT Accessibility Policy
- *Stephen Lau, Systemwide Information Management and Technology Policy Director, ITS*
- *Pete Segal, ITLC, CIO and Vice Provost for Information and Educational Technology, UCD*
- *Lucy Greco, Universitywide Electronic Accessibility Leadership Team, Web Access Analyst, UCB*

Director Lau reported that the systemwide Information Security and Privacy Initiative started two years ago and involved a cross-section of people from UC. The workgroup's report is almost finalized. One recommendation will be to review all information security policies in the near-term and to review privacy policies at a later date. Several security policy frameworks and standards have been reviewed, and UC will likely adapt ISO. ITS would like input from the Senate early to ensure that the policy which is drafted is viable for faculty. The chair and vice chair of the Senate, and a few other faculty members, have been formally involved with developing the policy.

Lucy Greco, chair of the Electronic Accessibility Leadership Team (EALT) and UCD CIO and Vice Provost Pete Siegel, a member of the ITLC, joined the meeting by phone to discuss the IT accessibility policy. The draft policy is the result of significant informal discussion at the campuses. It is hoped that UCCC can provide feedback on aspects of the policy that the committee will endorse or recommend should be revised. One aspect the CIOs watched closely is whether there will be mechanisms to make the proposed model for electronic accessibility work. The policy and program should work with each campuses' style. EALT is considering the types of tools that could be invested in jointly. A goal was to avoid creating a major compliance mandate. Each campus has to determine its priorities and decide how it will comply. Another goal is to address the challenge as efficiently as possible for the students and faculty. Chair Greco noted that accessibility is difficult to achieve because most people are not aware of what it means to have an electronic accessible environment. It is hoped that the policy will encourage people to work on this issue with the support of EALT. Director Lau reported that by developing this policy, UC is in the forefront of addressing the accessibility issue. It was important that the policy was not developed using a compliance-based structure. The Electronic Accessibility Leadership Team and the ITLC subcommittee worked with ITS to develop the policy which has been shared with each of the CIOs.

Discussion: The positive way the accessibility policy has been created will be appreciated by faculty. UC faculty members who offer online courses outside of UC are still required to meet accessibility standards, and Chair Greco would like to provide these faculty with recommendations which will help them be responsible for the accessibility of these courses. With UCOE, there is no way to know the profile of who is enrolling in an online course and what needs they have with respect to accessibility. Campuses will be asked to establish IT accessibility committees. EALT wants to raise awareness of the various issues so that thinking about accessibility should become second nature. CIO Siegel suggested that accessibility will not be framed as the faculty member's problem to solve, and that funding will be provided to address some accessibility issues. Chair Greco commented that UCEC only evaluated the original platform that UCOE was using, COLE. UCOE is discussing accessibility and the idea is for the online courses to be evaluated before they are taught so accessibility issues are identified.

The committee members will take the draft proposal back to their campus committees for feedback. Members will report back during UCCC's next meeting and submit a response. Chair Greco indicated that Senate representation on the EALT is desired. Accessibility issues for everyone on a campus are the focus. Currently there is no comprehensive list of the types of things that create barriers to accessibility, and UCCC thinks that even a short list of the top five things faculty should be aware of would be helpful.

IX.   New Business

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Jim Chalfant