Summary of Actions

ITPB Attendees: Chair Chris Foote, Jack Beatty, Christine Borgman, Brian Copenhaver, Dana Cuff, Jim Davis, Adam Harmetz, David Kaplan, Kathleen Komar, Mike McCoy, Sam Morabito, Tom Phelan, Lisa Spangenberg, Gary Strong

Guests: Bonnie Allen (AIS), John DeGolyer (OIT), Max Kopelevich (CCC Representative), James Muh (MDDS), Nick Reddingius (OIT), Jackie Reynolds (AIS), Terry Ryan (Library), Ruth Sabean (College/OIT), Mike Schilling (CTS), Kent Wada (OIT), Steve Wesson (OIT), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT)

1) Endorsement of Development Plans for ITPB 2003 Strategic Decisions
   a. Wireless

   The ITPB endorsed these recommendations for wireless:

   1. CTS’ Phase I wireless implementation plans to establish production level service for existing pilot areas
   2. Current business model where services are subsidized but with option to revisit the funding model, leaving open the possibility of usage fees in the future
   3. The Campus Wireless Team’s proposed Networking Standards and Policies for open common areas
   4. Proceeding with assessment of current and alternative management and policy models for extending wireless into academic spaces and addressing insecure networks established by individuals
   5. The vision of wide mobility while supporting of local needs

   for the complete and detailed recommendations.

   b. Electronic Business via Email

   The ITPB endorsed these recommendations for electronic business via email:
1. Requiring faculty and staff to publish their email address in an internal directory (not visible outside UCLA) as the default; but they may petition to opt out for cause.

2. Persistent email for undergraduates. Who has purview over the email addresses (schools or External Affairs) is recommended for resolution at the VC level.

3. The BruinPost operating assumptions for ‘Official Notifications’ and for the Weekly Digest. See [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.3.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofeBusinessviaEmail.pdf](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.3.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofeBusinessviaEmail.pdf) for the detailed BruinPost assumptions.

c. Increased IT Security

The ITPB endorsed all the campus-wide security recommendations and the specific recommendations for incident response, campus investment in desktop antivirus software, scanning, patch management, campus mail gateway spam identification and virus detection, and BOL virus detection. See [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.4.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofIncreasedITSecurity.pdf](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.4.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofIncreasedITSecurity.pdf) for the complete and detailed recommendations.

d. Project Assessment Process

The ITPB endorsed the Project Assessment Process recommendations to continue to apply the process to all high impact, campus-wide projects; and to continue to refine the process from the perspectives of communication, review, and operationalization. See [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.5.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofProjectAssessmentProcess.pdf](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2003/September192003retreat/2.5.1RecommendationsforEndorsementofProjectAssessmentProcess.pdf) for the complete and detailed recommendations.

The Campus Computing Council (CCC) through Tom Phelan expressed the viewpoint that the CSG should adopt the practice of formally voting on recommendations and endorsements prior to ITPB review. Tom read the following memo from the CCC:

*The CCC met today to review the materials for the ITPB retreat and provide input to our representative member, Tom Phelan. While Tom will provide input on many of the materials, it is the majority opinion of those CCC members present (12 out of 13) that the words "endorsement" and "recommendation" attached to many of the summary materials are premature and may imply that the CCC and the Common Systems Group (CSG) have had time to thoroughly review the materials, vote, and write informed recommendations and/or dissenting opinions to the ITPB. Equally there is majority concern that the stated process - specifically that*
the CSG vote on recommendations and endorsements prior to the ITPB review - is not being uniformly adhered to across all projects.

The Board felt that endorsement by consensus of the ITPB is valid for some issues but agreed that the process should include formal voting on recommendations and that those recommendations need to be specified more exactly. Formal voting is also a mechanism for conveying minority views, facilitating information transfer and ensuring closure. Tom Phelan agreed to help with exact specification of recommendations by recording them on paper before they go to a vote.

2) Policy and Compliance

a. Copyright Infringement

The Board agreed to the principles of education, due process for students and efficient response to the industry while taking a soft approach that respects privacy. UCLA has been in discussion with entertainment companies and the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) about possible joint efforts in the area of digital copyright. One problem being addressed is the notification process. Currently, it is manual and very labor intensive. The Industry is willing to work on developing a standardized electronic format for notification that would streamline the process. The ITPB approved of this effort but was cautious about other types of collaboration. It suggested perhaps proceeding on parallel tracks rather than engaging in further collaboration. Some members are concerned about what could happen in the media. Public Relations implications must be understood and UCLA must not appear to endorse the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). The University leadership needs to be fully aware of the implications of this before proceeding. Since the retreat, the University leadership has been briefed and thoroughly discussed the issues.

b. Privacy Board

The ITPB approved the recommendations of the Task Force on Privacy and Data Protection to establish an Advisory and an Operational board. The ITPB recommended that the Task Force collaborate with the EVC and Chair of the Academic Senate on forming the Advisory board and to decide on reporting relationships and function (i.e. does this board make policy decisions or is it purely advisory?).

3) Deferred Action Items

Due to lack of time, the following actions were deferred to future meetings:
• Approve proceeding with plans and analyses and approve priorities outlined in response to Chancellor’s Cost Reduction (October meeting).
• Agree on strategic objectives that will drive planning for next year.
• Agree on highest priority issues to investigate next year.