Information Technology Planning Board  
Meeting Summary  
Tuesday, June 10, 2014  
Murphy 2121

ITPB Attendees: Jason Cong, Jim Davis, John Mamer, Paul Phillabaum, Jack Powazek, Dhavalkumar Suthar, John Riley, Joseph Rudnick, Annelie Rugg, Virginia Steel, Renee Tajima-Pena, Robert Trelease

Michelle Chen, recorder

Absent: Joel Aberbach, Jonathan Furner, Robin Garrell, Mario Gerla, Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr., Warren Mori, Neil Netanel, Chon Noriega, Gary Ren

Invited Guests: Davida Johnson, Chris Testa, Albert Wu

Resources: Ross Bollens, Kent Wada, Andrew Wissmiller

Chair John Mamer called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM.

**Agenda Item #1: Approval of February 14, 2014 Meeting Summary**

The summary from the February 14, 2014 meeting was approved.

**Agenda Item #2: Review of Change in TIF Portfolio (Andrew Wissmiller)**

The materials for the TIF Portfolio and Box.com item can be found online at: [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm#Jun2014](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm#Jun2014).

This is a reprise of the Box.com discussion from the previous ITPB meeting.

Box.com was brought to ITPB in February 2014 and was endorsed by ITPB to deploy as a campus service. IT Services is proceeding with CSG’s recommendation to fund Box out of central funds and bringing forward the proposal to fund the service out of TIF (Technology Infrastructure Fee). In 2010, the TIF Review Committee and EVC Waugh designated the ITPB as the body to review, comment, and approve changes to the TIF portfolio. POSSSE is the body to review and approve rate changes.

The TIF funds “common good technology” infrastructure and was originally a per-telephone line charge. It was changed to a per-FTE based charge in July 2006 and is calculated monthly using actual FTE data. TIF-funded services include: campus backbone and internet connectivity, campus low voltage wiring, Bruin Online services, campus Exchange services, campus systems, campus wireless services, campus 800 MHz services, and TIER funding.
When conducting the review and recommendation of the Cloud Services and Collaboration Tools project, CSG recommended that the Box cloud storage service be funded out of TIF. The projected operating costs for Box for the next three years are: $382,100 in FY14/15, $351,140 in FY15/16, and $358,847 in FY16/17. The service is justified by the Funding Structures principles, so it meets the high bar for central funding.

In this case, the TIF rate is not being changed. The deployment of Office 365 and termination of Bruin Online email would negate any increase in the rate. The addition of Box would just be a change in the portfolio. The ITPB believes that the portfolio of services in the TIF portfolio should be self-evidently public goods, and that Box fits the criteria by providing a secure collaboration solution for the entire campus.

**Action Item: Motion passed to endorse the addition of Box.com to the TIF portfolio of services.**

**Agenda Item #3: Online Training (Chris Testa and Davida Johnson)**

The materials for the Online Training item can be found online at: [http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm#Jun2014](http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm#Jun2014).

CSG is recommending Lynda.com as the platform for online training for the campus because of the additional features and higher quality it offers in comparison to other products. A CSG subgroup was charged to analyze usage of the service over the past year, as well as conduct cost analysis for alternate sources of training.

Many ITPB members have used Lynda.com and agreed that Lynda is a one of the best tools available for online training because of its consistent design and assured quality. The value of Lynda.com and providing training to the campus was not in question. It has obvious benefits in that it augments staff knowledge, increases efficiencies, and can also be used to supplement instruction.

The discussion focused on the current breadth of use, the role of licensing structure, and the reports holding back on use because the license has not been assured from year to year. There was also discussion around the fund source and whether the license should be funded out of the TIF. One concern was around fairness and alignment of the TIF portfolio, since the TIF is an FTE-based charge and not everyone will be using the service. The ITPB also recognized that online training could be considered infrastructure, but is different than the operations infrastructure currently in the TIF portfolio. Another concern was that there has not been enough justification for campus investment and the market should decide whether to continue the service by paying into it.

There was also significant discussion about alternative individual and department funding mechanisms. Some suggestions included paying for the license on a pay-per-use or recharge model. The Lynda.com license is offered at an unlimited, campus-wide model, so there is no way for individuals to pay into the campus license directly. There are individual licenses available
through Lynda, but at a much higher rate. The recharge model would result in high administrative overhead costs, since the sponsoring department would need to have an administrator process numerous small transactions across all users.

A recommendation was put forth that Lynda.com use met a sufficient threshold to be considered a common good that could be funded out of the TIF. The recommendation recognized there was a high probability that use would increase if the license was ensured. There was also a request to review the license and agreement after three years, since Lynda.com's licensing structure was not desirable.

**Action Item: Motion passed to endorse the addition of Lynda.com to the TIF portfolio of services for a three year period, with the caveat that a review of the license and agreement be conducted after the three years.**

**Edit: In reviewing the vote after the meeting, a quorum was not reached at the time of the vote, so therefore the vote from the meeting cannot be taken as an official endorsement. The vote was extended to all Board members who have not yet voted via an online vote after the meeting. The results of the vote remained in favor of the motion, so the motion has been formally endorsed.**

**Agenda Item #4: Governance Trends and Statistics (Michelle Chen)**


UCLA’s IT Governance currently operates under a three committee structure: the Information Technology Planning Board (focused on planning, vision, and policy), the Committee on IT Infrastructure (responsible for funding recommendation), and the Common Systems Group (provides technical expertise).

The governance review process has seen 40 groups of topics since Fall 2009. There have been a large number of informational agenda items that have come through the process compared to endorsement items, but the gap between the two is slowly diminishing over the years. With the development of the IT Strategic Plan in 2009, the endorsement items tended to be of a policy or directional nature during that time. However, once the direction of IT was established, UCLA experienced a shift towards funding endorsements to implement new projects in recent years.

There have always been more administrative agenda items than academic, which could be due to some administrative initiatives having broader reach on campus and that academic items tend to be market-driven, so decisions are made by the market (users).

The number of meetings has been consistent throughout the years – ITPB meets twice a quarter, CITI meets once a quarter, and CSG meets monthly. Average attendance per meeting has also been relatively stable for the committees. However, there tends to be a drop in attendance for meetings where no action is requested. ITPB has an average faculty to administrator attendance ratio of 9:5.
Since 2009, the governance process has “closed” 19 items, which includes projects that were either informational in nature, have been endorsed and implemented successfully, or were disbanded or concluded. It does not include projects that need to return to the committees for additional funding for continued development.

**Agenda Item #5: Next meeting and adjournment (John Mamer)**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM. Doodle polls for the Fall 2014 meetings will be sent out to the Board.