ITPB Attendees: Julie Austin, Cameron Campbell, Jim Davis, Robin Garrell, Jerry Kang, Christopher Lee, John Mamer, Warren Mori, Susan Parker (for Gary Strong), Janice Reiff, John Riley, Guy Rodgers, Robert Trelease

Michelle Chen, recorder


Invited Guests: Annelie Rugg

Resources: Ross Bollens, Kent Wada, Andrew Wissmiller

Chair Jerry Kang called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM.

Agenda Item #1: Approval of November 9, 2012 Meeting Summary

The summary from the November 9, 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)

The Funding Structures Review is aimed to ensure funding structures are aligned with incentives and technological changes, rather than fund sources. The review committee, made up of the chairs of each governance group and a few executives, have created recommendations on the funding structure for 4 different categories of initiatives. The recommendations are meant to be a “statement of expected practice,” and are going through the governance process for ITPB and CITI endorsement.

Case studies 1&2 deal with infrastructure service offerings in both the lower left-hand and lower right-hand quadrants. The difference between the two quadrants is that with the LLH quadrant, there is an expectation of campus use unless there is an exception, and for LRH, there is no a priori expectation of using the shared service. In both studies, the group focused on data centers, storage, and servers. The group reaffirmed the expectation to use common services where possible, that inflection points are opportunities for transition, and that the services should be provided using a market-driven, fee-for-service structure that is not mandated. If a loan or investment is needed in order to be competitive, the sponsoring group can go through CITI. Pricing will be set through POSSSE, though it will be up to the sponsoring group to conduct thorough analysis and provide good projections.
Case studies #3&4 are about end-user based common good software/licensed services. The difference between the two is that Study 3 deals with discretionary services while Study 4 deals with mandatory services. The default is to use local funding and the two cases to flip out of the default are an economic case or a policy case. Reasons for the economic case are economies of scale or leveraging network effects; and reasons for a policy case would be how mission-critical the service is, negative externalities, copyright, or privacy issues. In an economic case, the sponsoring unit sets up a sales/service account and charges users for the service. In a policy case, institutional funding may be possible.

The review committee will be exploring other areas of the IT2020 strategic plan and will bring additional recommendations back to the Board. The current recommendations will be going to CSG for formal input, and then brought back to the ITPB for an official endorsement.

Agenda Item #3: Role of ITPB relative to the Senate Committee on Instructional Technology (CIT) and Senate and Executive Administration organizing for Online Learning (John Mamer/Jim Davis)

This is a reprise of the Online Education discussion of previous ITPB meetings.

The UCLA Online Education initiative is currently aimed at undergraduate degrees. The principle for online education is to use it to enhance the education of enrolled students by integrating with current in-class learning. There are a number of issues still to be determined, such as: a technology framework that is mainly faculty driven, how to define and assess the quality of academic performance, program administration, infrastructure, and more. There are currently a number of committees involved to discuss these issues: the Committee for Instructional Technology, Senate and Executive Administration committee, and the Instructional Enhancement Initiative committee. ITPB’s role in the Online Education discussions is to deal with some of the policy or directional issues involved, such as treatment of faculty intellectual property for online courses.

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 2:47 PM. Doodle polls for the Winter 2013 meetings will be sent out to the Board.