

Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB)

www.itpb.ucla.edu

November 29, 2005

Meeting Summary

ITPB Attendees: Christine Borgman, Alfonso Cardenas, Brian Copenhaver, Jim Davis, Bill Jepson, Kathleen Komar, Richard Meng, Sam Morabito, Alan Robinson, Vivek Shetty, Gary Strong, Chuck Taylor

Guests: Joel Bellon (Jim Davis' PDP mentee), Jonathan Curtiss (Student Affairs), Jason Frand (Anderson/Sakai Pilot), Tim Groeling (Communication Studies/FCET), Pat Keating (Linguistics/FCET), Michelle Lew (OID), Rose Rocchio (OIT/Sakai Pilot), Ruth Sabeen (OIT), Mike Schilling (CTS), Judith Smith (College), Marsha Smith (OIT), Joseph Vaughan (Humanities/Sakai Pilot), Kent Wada (OIT), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT), Don Worth (AIS)

Agenda:

1) UC-Legal2Share

UCLA has had a dual approach to curbing illegal sharing of copyrighted digital content: 1) educational outreach and 2) quarantine area for offending computers in the residence halls. It is now proposing to add a third approach: providing legal services through vendor agreements.

A broad-based UCLA Legal2Share workgroup has been working in conjunction with a UCOP/UC campus consortium to identify legal alternatives to illegal acquisition and use of digital copyright material. UCOP has formed agreements with a number of vendors who provide a variety of legal music and video acquisitions programs, and several UC campuses have introduced such programs on their campuses. UCLA is poised to offer similar programs, with a target rollout in Spring Quarter 2006. The UCLA workgroup studied the vendor alternatives and is recommending three programs that offer a variety of features.

Action:

The Board (with 1 abstention) endorsed the campus position to provide legal, opt-in services for digital copyright material through vendor agreements.

2) ITPB Strategic Focus Areas

One of the ITPB's organizational goals is to use meetings primarily for discussion and decision making on IT policy and strategy, rather than for presenting information. Other work will continue being done in small groups or subcommittees, with recommendations presented at meetings for decision-

making. The objective for this meeting was to surface, discuss, and prioritize or start prioritizing those institutional strategic areas and directions that the ITPB will address during the upcoming year and beyond.

Prior to the meeting, each Board member was asked to identify areas or issues that are most urgent to address in the 2005-2006 academic year. A compilation of more than 30 suggestions organized around the ITPB's Strategic Areas of Emphasis where appropriate: Student Integration, Research Leadership, Scholarly Interaction, and Increased Productivity, was presented for discussion. The list is posted at:

<http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/2005/November292005/ITPB%20Strategic%20Focus%20Areas/ITPB%20Strategic%20Planning%20Suggestions.pdf>.

Two areas stood out as being identified as issues by the most number of members: Student Integration and Connectivity and Communications and Access Infrastructure. There was recognition that many issues cut across all the Areas of Emphasis and that more time was needed to prioritize. The Board agreed to further discussion at a future meeting, including areas cited by Board members in next order of importance, some of which have been or are being addressed by the ITPB.

Action:

To inform the next discussion about strategy for telecommunications and next generation wireless, the Board members agreed to send email to the ITPB Chair and Vice Chair with their vision of facilities or services for the campus supported by technology.

3) Educational Technology

In Spring 2005, the FCET recommended to the ITPB that UCLA should “select a single application to support collaboration and teaching tools for instructional, research and administrative groups”. The Executive Sponsors (Jim Davis, Larry Loehrer, Pat O'Brien, Judith Smith and Gary Strong) have already endorsed this recommendation and the FCET is now seeking ITPB endorsement. There was discussion and debate about the specific terminology used in the recommendation that was not resolved in this meeting. The Board agreed to hold a meeting in late January to continue this topic. The Board also agreed that the work plan proposed by the FCET could move forward if the terminology “single application” is amended to “shared framework”. ITPB requested FCET to clarify what was intended with the terminology and to return to the ITPB to succinctly explain the recommendation.

Action:

Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE): The ITPB (with 1 abstention and no 'NO' votes) endorsed the launching of the work plan indicated on p. 4 of the document submitted: “Common Collaboration and Learning

Environment, ITPB Review, November 29, 2005”, to select a shared framework for UCLA using the ITPB full review process:

- Form Functional and Technical Sponsors Groups
- Establish functional and technology criteria
- Evaluate possible solutions against the criteria
- Recommend a shared framework for UCLA
- Recommend approaches for implementing a shared service model that combines institutional, regional and local responsibilities