Information Technology Planning Board
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, May 4, 2011
11348 YRL

ITPB Attendees: Jim Davis, Todd Grappone (for Gary Strong), Jerry Kang, Patricia Keating, Kathleen Komar, Jonathan Kuo, Mike Kusunoki, Andrew Leuchter, Michelle Lew, John Mamer, Warren Mori, John Riley, Libbie Stephenson (for Jan Reiff), Christopher Waterman

Stephanie Hokama, recorder

Absent: Deborah Estrin, Derrek Hibar, Christopher Lee, Sam Morabito, Janice Reiff, Alan Robinson, Tim Stowell, Gray Strong, Arthur Toga

Invited Guests: Julie Austin, Arash Naeim, Steve Olsen

Resources: Ross Bollens, Michelle Chen, Bill Labate, Larry Loeher, Jackie Reynolds, Rose Rocchio, Kent Wada, Andrew Wissmiller

Chair Kathleen Komar called the meeting to order at 11:04 AM.

Agenda Item #1: Approval of the Meeting Summary (Komar)

The summary from the March 11, 2011 meeting was approved.

Agenda Item #2: Budget and IT (Steve Olsen)

Steve Olsen distributed an executive summary of current budget issues. The projected cut to UC will be $500 million, of which $96 million is UCLA’s share. However, that $96 M may change depending on decisions by the state. Although there is a shortfall in the current fiscal year, UCLA is okay on a cash basis. The state had restored $57 M, spending was decreased, faculty and staff openings were left vacant, and the campus received some additional revenue from UCOP. That revenue is being saved to mitigate future cuts.

UCLA has absorbed $111 M in increases. Last April, contributions to the retirement fund began again, which increased UCLA’s share from $31 M to $86 M. There will eventually be a $400 M impact due to retirement.

The Chancellor is invested in technology. The level of investment is based on approved projects through the CITI process. Approval is similar to capital projects, although IT is more structured in decision making. Buildings are viewed as stable for thirty years or more, whereas IT does not work that way. There are no specific guidelines that direct how much to invest and funding sources. CITI is lacking depth; it has no counterpart of capital spending to match (how projects affect the mission of the university) in decision making. Certain decisions are made based on
lifecycle of equipment and systems. UCLA needs to confront issues with faculty identifying important IT issues.

Consolidation of IT is still an important task. Decision making and those involved need to keep the university competitive and innovative. While specific initiatives are able to identify tangible hard savings, other systems will not necessarily save a specific dollar amount. For example, the new PPS as conceptualized explicitly decreases the number of people, while the e-dossier system will not result in specific savings, but would decrease time expended by faculty and staff. With such a large freshman class coming in, there are a number of important support issues.

Kathleen Komar thanked Steve Olsen and said that discussion would continue on these issues and we would like to invite him back for a future meeting.

**Agenda Item #3: Outsourcing E-mail (Julie Austin)**

In 2009, a task force to review outsourcing e-mail was assembled as part of a possible cost cutting measure. The task force focused on students and alumni as the requirements are different for staff and faculty.

Students want Google e-mail and they take advantage of Google apps. Google would agree to no ads e-mail while they are students, but ads would appear when they become alumni. Privacy tends not to be an issue for students, but the University is obligated to teach them about privacy concerns. Students employed by the University may be required to maintain a separate work account. E-mail is not a great concern for students. Graduate student issues are a local decision and staff/faculty e-mail have separate issues.

The cost of shifting to Google would be neutral (it would not saving the University any money, but it would not be a cost, either.) The single most important aspect is to be flexible and not lock the University into a specific system that may not fit our needs in the future. UCLA would retain control over the flow of e-mail by having the MX records and determining how it goes to Google. This would be over sending only, not receiving of e-mail. UCLA must also continue as the owner of the data, and must determine where the data resides (within the country). It was suggested that ITPB request an analysis of this topic from CSG regarding technical and cost issues.

Please submit any concerns on outsourcing e-mail to Stephanie (stephanie@oit.ucla.edu).

Kathleen Komar thanked Julie Austin and the task force for their efforts.

**Agenda Item #4: Online Education Project (Mamer)**

John Mamer, FCET chair, reviewed the recent online education project proposal. He reviewed the original purpose of the UC online education project, which was to alleviate the burden on over-enrolled undergraduate courses using external money. However, the proposal has been
changed to reflect a $7 million loan from UC, with the target audience being junior college undergraduate transfers. In essence, UC would be funding a start-up and will not recover costs.

There is consternation in the Academic Senate about this proposal. With no discussion, a new proposal is presented utilizing internal funding that could legitimately be applied to needs within the University. Where is this “loan” coming from? The UC mission is not to teach junior college transfers. Additionally, the courses that were selected for the pilot lack coherence, as they did not choose over-enrolled courses.

*Action Item:* Motion passed to strongly oppose this proposal as written. ITPB is in agreement with the FCET on this matter.

**Agenda Item #5: Online Software Training (Reynolds)**

A new contract has been approved with Lynda.com to provide online software training for the campus community. Fifteen administrative units contributed to funding this agreement and usage will be re-evaluated next year.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM.