

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY**Minutes of Teleconference
May 4, 2007****I. Minutes of February 2, 2007**

ACTION: The minutes of the February 2, 2007, meeting were approved as noticed.

II. Chair's Announcements

David Messerschmitt, Chair

1. ITTP's proposed by-law amendment, designed to rename the committee and expand its charge, is currently out for systemwide review.
2. The Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) and the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) met, and Chair Messerschmitt participated by teleconference. Chair Messerschmitt and Analyst Feer also met with Kris Hafner, David Walker, Paula Murphy, and Dan Greenstein at the Office of the President and presented ITTP's Grand Challenges as informal feedback to the group. The group received the Challenges well, and it is believed to have served its purpose of expanding the ideas of ITGC to more visionary ones. The question now before ITTP is how best to proceed with the committee's drafted Minimum (IT) Standards for Teaching. More on both of these topics will be covered under items IV. and V. respectively.
3. ITGC has drafted an interim report, which is available on the web, and will be discussed more fully under item IV.

III. Proposed Open Access Policy (out for systemwide review)

ISSUE: The proposed Open Access Policy is based on the Special Committee for Scholarly Communications white papers drafted and reviewed last year. The proposed policy requests faculty to retain a portion of the copyright of published material to facilitate parallel or slightly delayed (six months) publishing in Open Access repositories. The goal is to increase access to and circulation of scholarly materials. As proposed, the policy is a default opt-in one; faculty must request to opt-out.

DISCUSSION: Members had several reservations about the proposed policy:

- Many members were concerned about placing the onus on faculty to opt-out of the policy, rather than providing them the option to opt-in to it.
- Members were also concerned about the impact on academic advancement: Publication in a non-peer reviewed open access repository could hinder advancement; burdening faculty to maintain a list of each subsequent publication location seems unfair; and differences within disciplines regarding publication requirements for advancement further confuse the issue.
- Members were wary of asking faculty to pay publication fees, especially since in the past, the University negotiated waivers or subsidies; the continuance of this practice is unclear.

- Members were uncertain whether peer-reviewed journals would allow open access publishing, either in tandem or after such a short period of time.
- Members also expressed concern on the impact to fee-supported scholastic societies and publications in light of the potential withdrawal of such funds given the policy's implicit preference for open access publication. Others disagreed, arguing that such entities should not be dependent on fees for livelihood; rather, they should rely upon donations and better business practices to remain solvent, especially in the long term when residual income could reasonably be expected to diminish significantly.
- Members were unclear as to who would be the lead negotiator with each publisher under the policy: individual faculty or UC. If the University is the negotiator, the impact and potential blacklisting of non-compliant publishers raises concerns.

ACTION: The committee will endorse the proposed policy on a limited basis—support for open access as a principal, but caution on many specifics of the policy.

IV. ITGC Update

David Messerschmitt, Chair

ISSUE: ITGC has issued an interim report with several preliminary recommendations. Among the recommendations is the inclusion of collaborative technology, which had not been discussed prior to the sharing of ITTP's Grand Challenges. Another potential recommendation is the establishment of a central nexus for educational and student technology.

DISCUSSION: Members were unclear as to what role ITTP could and should play in the vetting of these preliminary recommendations, even though information technology is the basis of each. Members wondered about the lack of particulars in the recommendations, such as detailed cost analyses and implementation strategies.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will circulate the web site with the interim report.

ACTION: Members will review the recommendations and provide feedback either to Chair Messerschmitt, who will then share the concerns informally with ITGC, or via ITGC's website.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will contact the analysts for other relevant committees and encourage them to act similarly prior to the issuance of final recommendations in the fall.

Action: Members will present the topic to their campus committees and urge similar action.

V. Minimum Standards Update

David Messerschmitt, Chair

ISSUE: ITTP has drafted a set of minimum IT-related standards required by faculty for effective teaching at the University. The question before the committee is how best to proceed in realizing this goal.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that evidence of need must be presented, and therefore a joint study to illuminate the problem is a necessary first step. Some members queried whether this was indeed a systemwide problem, which further underlined the need for additional research on the topic. UCR Representative Payne indicated that his campus budgets a set amount for IT support for each department, and members agreed that this could serve as a good model for other campuses. Timing considerations, however, put

into question whether a study could be proposed, conducted, and analyzed prior to issuance of ITGC's final recommendations, or alternatively, if conducting such a study *ex post facto* would be worthwhile.

ACTION: Chair Messerschmitt and Analyst Feer will discuss options with the committee's consultants and the Senate leadership.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

David Walker, Director of Advanced Technologies, Information Resources and Communications

ISSUE 1: Director Walker informed the committee that the proposed policy on the stewardship of electronic information is pending before the Academic Council, and he thanked the committee for its feedback during the drafting process.

ISSUE 2: Director Walker also mentioned that the ITGC's interim report and recommendations were available on the web.

DISCUSSION: Chair Messerschmitt asked for clarification on the systemwide educational and student technology office included in the ITGC's recommendations. Director Walker indicated that the goal of the proposal is technological enablement, but that much discussion on the matter still lays ahead. Further, he stated that ITGC itself may have gone as far as it is able because its charge limits it to theoretical and ideational development; campus vetting and addressing voluntarism and structural issues need to be addressed in the future. To that end, Chair Messerschmitt inquired as to how the Senate could best assist during ITGC's remaining tenure, in the hopes of avoiding either a *fait accompli* to or a sinking of the proposals once finalized.

ACTIONS: See Item IV. above.

ISSUE 3: Minimum standards for effective teaching: These standards are included in the interim report and recommendations only tangentially, and probably ought to be included more explicitly. At present, the recommendations are grouped by section: research, instruction, administration, and a miscellaneous category, critical success factors. The last includes cyberinfrastructure in a weak form.

DISCUSSION: Chair Messerschmitt summarized the committee's previous discussion on proposing a joint study to assess 1) current levels of IT assistance available to instructors, 2) what needs are noticeably outstanding, and 3) how to remediate shortcomings found in (2). Again, the question of timing arose, and Director Walker indicated that ITGC will be conducting campus visits over the summer, and it might be possible to begin assessing the issue at that time. Further, he noted that success factors tend to be overlooked because they arise last in the brainstorming process.

ACTION: See Item V. above.

ISSUE 4: Grand Challenges: Director Walker indicated that including the recommendations as an information item on the ITGC website as a consulted resource would be helpful to those evaluating ITGC's work.

ACTION: ITTP will submit the Grand Challenges to the Academic Council as an information item with a request that they be received for posting on the ITTP website.

VII. New Business and Planning

Members

In addition to following-up on the ITGC's recommendations and the progress of the minimum standards, members suggested other topics for consideration by the committee next year. One topic is the standardization of course management systems, such as might be accomplished through the SAKAI program. This topic again raises the issue of whether common IT efforts are best handled individually by the campuses or centrally through the Office of the President. Santa Cruz Representative de Alfaro recommended investigating his campus's evolving effort to require laptops for students. Finally, current Google initiatives, and the negotiations and legality surrounding them, was posited as a future topic for ITTP deliberations.

Adjourned: 11:50 a.m.

Attest: David Messerschmitt, Chair

Prepared by: Kenneth Feer, Committee Analyst