Information Technology Planning Board
Meeting Summary
Thursday, February 2, 2012
YRL 11360


Michelle Chen, recorder

Absent: Dana Cuff, Deborah Estrin, Jonathan Furner, Franklin D. Gilliam, Sara Kim, Christopher Lee, Warren Mori, Chon Noriega, Jack Powazek, Janice Reiff

Invited Guests: Julie Austin, Meg Buzzi, Mike Takahashi, Carole Zaima

Resources: Ross Bollens, Larry Loeher, Jackie Reynolds, Rose Rocchio, Libbie Stephenson, Kent Wada, Andrew Wissmiller

Chair Jerry Kang called the meeting to order at 1:04 PM.

Agenda Item #1: Online Education Project (John Mamer/Jim Davis)

The presentation for the Online Education Project can be found online at: http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2010/ITPBComponentForcesv4.pdf.

This is a reprise of the Online Education discussion from the previous ITPB meeting. UCLA began experimenting with online courses, and when the UCOP initiative launched, the heavy capital requirements of the initiative influenced our experimenting. There is a need to figure out how to approach the topic of online education institutionally. Over the past year, there have been discussions about the institutional position, institutional expectation, faculty expectation, interface & platform, production, media, and tools in relation to UCLA Online Education. What is now imminent is the measurement and oversight. The group will be looking at statistics and putting together a framework for oversight.

The ITPB agreed that cyberlearning is inevitable and that the role of the ITPB is to provide strategy-level blessing and the setting of principles after the issue has been more fully developed. Currently, ITPB will take a more reactive stance and vet issues that arise from FCET and CSG. Eventually, there will be a need to develop principles of online learning, such as comparing quality vs. cost-saving, using common platforms, etc.

This topic will be brought to ITPB again for future discussions.

Agenda Item #2: Approval of December 6, 2011 Meeting Summary

The summary from the December 6, 2011 meeting was approved.
**Agenda Item #3: Policy 411: UCLA Domain Names (Mike Takahashi)**


Policy 411 states that if one wants to create a new .ucla.edu domain name, they will need to submit a request form that goes through the Communications office and the Communications office will determine approval of the domain name. This version includes a few small updates, mostly in response to how to deal with vanity and short-lived domain name requests. This is to decrease the potential for domain-name squatting, vanity domain name requests, and more department-internal domain requests. A suggestion from the ITPB was to include a “power to reclaim” clause in the amendment so that the Communications can take back a domain name if necessary. If a dispute or appeal were to occur, it would be up to the discretion of the Vice Chancellor of External Affairs.

**Agenda Item #4: E-Dossier Project (Meg Buzzi)**


The purpose of the E-Dossier project is to design, build, and implement a faculty information system of record for UCLA. A survey was conducted that showed support for a 3-faceted system: an electronic CV, Academic Personnel Action Tracking System, and a database backend. The goal is for the faculty information system to be implemented by 2014 for actions effective July 2015.

Meg will leverage ITPB input at key milestones to help flag issues. Meg hopes the ITPB can weigh in on privacy and data ownership issues. Although the E-Dossier Steering Committee will issue a recommended template of what information should be included in the system to CAP, it is difficult to get every department to agree on a standard template. Also, the group would like to import data from other enterprise systems on campus.

This topic will be brought to ITPB again for future discussions.

**Agenda Item #5: Proposal to Review UCLA IT Directions, Initiatives, and Funding Structures Relative to the IT2020 Plan (Jim Davis)**

There have been a significant number of new projects and infrastructure changes as compared to 3 years ago, and the governance chairs agree that there are some issues that the group needs to start tackling, such as the funding structure. Funding structure is not just about the funding itself, but includes service, cost of service, incentive, oversight, accountability, etc. There is a section in the plan that states how initiatives in each quadrant are traditionally funded. Campus applications (upper-left quadrant) are funded out of general funds, unit funds, unit tax, total cost of operation, or pay-per-use. Lower-left quadrant initiatives are funded out of the Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF), total cost of operation, and pay-per-use. The right-hand side quadrants are funded out of unit operations, chancellor matching funds, course materials fee, unit tax, grants, revenue, public-private partnerships, and pooled funds.

The questions to be discussed are whether the funding mechanisms we have in place align with projects going forward. There are a number of different funding structures, such as a “market-driven” model or a “tax” model. The vocabulary around these structures needs to be determined and standardized. The goal of the exercise is not to review every individual service, but the group will group the different projects and look at the principles so that the campus has a clear vocabulary and direction going forward. There is also a need for a campus inventory of projects.

The governance chairs planning group will meet and discuss more fully before a proposal back to the committee.

**Agenda Item #6: Next meeting and adjournment (Jerry Kang)**

The next ITPB meeting is scheduled for April 4, 2012, 1pm-3pm, in 11348 YRL. The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 PM.