1. Reports:

**Mini Retreat with EVC**
Last week, EVC Dan Neuman hosted an all day mini IT retreat attended by Brian Copenhaver, Jim Davis, Chris Foote, Paula Lutomirski, Sam Morabito, Steve Olsen, and Roberto Peccie. Chris Foote reported that subjects covered included: funding mechanisms, IEI fees, and Academic Personnel System.

**Instructional Enhancement Initiative (IEI) Fee**
Brian Copenhaver reported that in addition to a $1.6 million rescission, the College has been directed to reduce its budget by $4.5 million (and perhaps more) in the current fiscal year. Without revenue to replace reduced allocations for instructional technology and equipment, there will be a large impact on vital services such as: 1) student access to computer labs; 2) staff support to faculty for building and maintenance of course web sites; and 3) replacement of instructional equipment.

The Instructional Enhancement Initiative (IEI) of the College was introduced in 1997-98. This fee was assessed on a temporary basis in the framework of the UC Course Materials Fee policy. A comprehensive review in 2000 which showed the IEI significantly improved the quality of undergraduate education resulted in the fees being made permanent. Another review was planned for the end of 2003-2004, at which time a fee increase would have been proposed. Due to the cuts in state funding, the timeframe for that proposal has been advanced. The College is asking for an increase in fees from $4.00 per unit to $7.00 per unit, to be implemented for Winter 2003. This represents an increase of approximately 2.5% in total fees for a fulltime student in the College.

The student representative at the meeting emphasized that course websites and computer labs are indispensable to undergraduates: course websites are so integrated into instruction that students depend heavily on them for information exchange and
rely on them as much as on in-person course lectures; and easy access to computer labs is integral to completion of coursework. The Board noted that this dependence on information technology to support instruction is not limited to the College. Most other schools that support undergraduate students have identical needs and are trying to solve them in isolation. It would be beneficial to leverage existing university-wide resources and implement a coordinated application of these fees to all undergraduate students. In addition, a technology fee would be reasonable. Many other Universities have this fee. This fee would not be as limited in its application as the IEI fee, and could be extended to infrastructure. This issue needs to be raised at the UC Regents level.

The Board voted unanimously to support an IEI fee increase and recommended that this fee be extended to the remaining undergraduate students outside the College. It was agreed that the board would write a letter to Chancellor Carnesale in support of these proposals.

3. ITPB Retreat Summary of Main Points and Action List
   The Board briefly reviewed the draft position statements that were generated as a result of the September 24th ITPB Retreat discussions. These are intended to be used as guidelines and principles for processes to be developed. There was unanimous agreement that these positions are the right direction but some issues are not covered and the wording of some statements needs refinement (especially statements 1 and 5). The Board is asked to review and comment on the ‘Summary Portfolio Discussions and Position Statements’. This document will be sent to the listserv as an attachment. Issues of actions, prioritization and sources of funding will be addressed in future meetings.

4. Web Policy Council Issues
   Kent Wada and Michael Stone gave an overview of three issues that the Web Policy Council is currently working on. These can be found at: http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm

   a) Draft Guidelines on Advertising and the Web
      Demand from across campus for guidance about how existing UC/UCLA policy for advertising applies to the web has been frequent and increasing, so the Council took this on. It is expected that these guidelines will be incorporated into UCLA Policy 110, Use of University Name, Trademarks and Seals. The Administrative Policies Coordinator is working on how best to accomplish this. The Council is seeking input from the ITPB prior to initiating a wider review by the campus.

      The Board advised that 1) these should remain guidelines rather than become policy as they may not be enforceable; 2) the Council should rethink guidelines for student (personal) web sites; and 3) banner or other ad space for third party product or service on academic or administrative unit web sites should never be allowed.
b) **Draft Definition of Official Web Sites**
   As part of the UCLA implementation of the UC Electronic Communications Policy, the Council was asked to look at defining what an ‘official UCLA web site’ is. This draft document captures wide-ranging discussion on this topic over several meetings. The Council is seeking input from the ITPB prior to initiating a wider review by the campus.

   This issue generated much discussion – one outcome was the conclusion that a course website is ‘official’ if it is funded by the IEI fee. The Board did not have any issues with the draft document.

c) **Web Accessibility**
   This topic was raised several times during Council deliberations on other issues. With Federal legislation and President Atkinson’s letter on the subject: [http://www.icdri.org/DD/dd_universitystudy_letter_sen.htm](http://www.icdri.org/DD/dd_universitystudy_letter_sen.htm), the Council feels it is an important area for discussion. The Council is seeking input from the ITPB on what may be appropriate vis-à-vis the UCLA Advisory Committee on Disability, the Disabilities and Computing Program, etc.

   The Board advised that a UC view of this issue would make sense.

5. **Future Meetings:**
   - Tuesday, November 5, 2:00-4:00 @ 2121 Murphy
   - Tuesday, December 3, 2:00-4:00 @ 2121 Murphy

6. **Action Items**
   - The ITPB to write a letter to Chancellor Carnesale in support of the College’s IEI fee increase proposal
   - The board to review and comment on the Retreat position statements
   - David Sears to talk to Frank Gilliam about faculty involvement in UCLA in LA Community Information System
   - Tom Phelan to discuss the course web site “official” nature with CCC

7. **Adjourn**