Information Technology Planning Board
Meeting Summary
Friday, February 22, 2013
Math Sciences 5628

ITPB Attendees:  Julie Austin, Cameron Campbell, Jason Cong, Jim Davis, Jonathan Furner, Robin Garrell, Todd Grappone (for Gary Strong), Jerry Kang, John Mamer, Warren Mori, Janice Reiff, Vincent Riggs, John Riley, Guy Rodgers, Robert Trelease

Michelle Chen, recorder

Absent:  Franklin Gilliam, Jr., Christopher Lee, Neil Netanel, Chon Noriega, Jack Powazek, Jeremy Reynard, Joseph Rudnick

Invited Guests:  Jackie Reynolds, Annelie Rugg

Resources:  Ross Bollens, Larry Loeher, Andrew Wissmiller

Chair Jerry Kang called the meeting to order at 2:07 PM.

Agenda Item #1:  Approval of December 10, 2012 Meeting Summary

The summary from the December 10, 2012 meeting was approved.

Agenda Item #2:  Funding Structures Review – Recommendations for Shared Infrastructure Service Offerings & Common Good Software/Licensed Services (Jerry Kang/John Mamer/Jim Davis)

Since the last ITPB meeting, the Common Systems Group conducted a review of the Funding Structures Framework proposal and has provided their recommendations and a number of issues for ITPB to consider.

The CSG wanted to ensure that the “flagging and evaluation process” for investments would be transparent and timely, as to not delay the work for anyone who has an urgent need. There needs to be more definition in how the process would work. The CSG thought it would be beneficial for them to be involved in establishing the process and is willing to help ITPB determine how best to approach the process. The ITPB suggested that funding for services be provided for a limited duration to ensure review of the investment after the given time.

The CSG also suggested that they help POSSSE and CITI review future budget requests to determine if the details are reasonable and they could also help make suggestions to the sponsor if there is a more efficient way to achieve the same results.

One of the biggest discussions CSG had was over the “mandatory” or “discretionary” nature of Lynda.com. There was disagreement over whether Lynda should be considered “mandatory” or
“discretionary,” which led the group to decide that the process for categorizing software/services should be more clearly defined and that Lynda.com should be removed as a use case in the proposal until this issue is resolved.

The ITPB determined that including Lynda, as well as any use case, could imply judgment on the classification of the software/service, so language that lists any examples should be removed from the document. There was also an edit to change “avoid mandatory use of central services” to “avoid mandatory funding of central services” in order to clarify that there is a high bar to pass in order for a service to be considered for central funding.

**Action Item: Motion passed to endorse the Funding Structures Framework proposal with the edits discussed during the meeting. The presumption is that the principles will inform discussion around specific cases as they arise.**

**Agenda Item #3: Recommendation for UCLA engagement with MOOCs (Jim Davis)**

A joint Senate and Administration committee has been discussing UCLA’s engagement with MOOCs (massively open online courses) and has put forward a recommendation to conduct evaluations and negotiation of available MOOC platforms/providers.

The committee has come up with principles for online education:
- Enhance UCLA’s academic programs
- Support the quality and excellence of UCLA courses
- Support faculty interest in providing quality education
- Be able to create new opportunities for UCLA to engage in its public mission
- Be prepared to engage in the entrepreneurship that MOOCs present

The UCLA committee has also put together a number of criteria for evaluation:
- Be extremely careful with the UCLA brand
- Avoid exclusivity in agreements.
- UCLA’s student demographic, degree value, and high enrollment demand have long set the stage for online instructional technology for program and experience enhancement.
- Faculty/Instructor interest in MOOCs is foundational and must be sufficiently present to proceed
- Experimentation. The advent of MOOCs has brought about opportunities for experimentation and massive research data. UCLA has placed a premium on open architectures and data policies that allow UCLA researchers and instructional technology practitioners to explore the effects of online teaching at scales and scopes previously unknown.
- Alignment is present on several levels. There is reasonable convergence in the EVC’s Senate-Administration Online Group on (1) public service, (2) certificate course offerings, (3) student recruiting, (4) potential student preparation (5) new degree course approaches and (6) UCLA brand promotion.
Coursera and EdX are the top choices for evaluation and the committee will be contacting them to see how they fit UCLA’s needs. The recommendations will go to EVC Scott Waugh, who will make the final decision.

The ITPB made recommendations for the committee to solicit feedback from people who have taken courses from Coursera or EdX to get a better understanding from the students’ perspective, as well as to talk to other universities who have worked with MOOCs to get insight on how they handled risks for copyright violations and dealt with sensitive or controversial course topics.

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

**Agenda Item #4: Next meeting and adjournment (Jerry Kang)**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:06 PM. The next ITPB meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 18th, from 1pm-3pm, in Math Sciences 5628.