

Campus Council for Information Technology
Monday, January 14, 2008
203 Mrak

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome and approval of minutes – Chair Francois Gygi

Chair Francois Gygi welcomed committee members and called for an approval of the December minutes. Minutes were approved as submitted.

II. Administrative IT Services Road Map update – Mike Allred (Accounting & Financial Services), Lora Jo Bossio (Student Affairs) and Dave Shelby (IET)

Lora Jo Bossio discussed the documentation developed in Phase 1 of the Administrative IT Services Road Map initiative: Executive Summary, White paper, PowerPoint presentation and final report. All these documents and ongoing updates to the initiative can be found at the following url: <http://vpiet.ucdavis.edu/itroadmap.cfm>.

The next step in the initiative is for the Administrative IT Services Road Map Work Group to develop general recommendations based on the documentation developed thus. As the recommendations are developed they will be brought forward to CCFIT for further review and discussion.

Pete Siegel thanked the CCFIT members and their constituencies for their participation in the initiative to date. Siegel encouraged members to forward any ideas or thoughts regarding the initiative for consideration by the Work Group. For submitting comments or questions, contact Dave Shelby (drshelby@ucdavis.edu), Mike Allred (jmallred@ucdavis.edu), or Lora Jo Bossio (ljbossio@ucdavis.edu).

III. Wireless Sub-Committee Proposal – Matt Bishop (Wireless Sub-Committee Chair)

Matt Bishop discussed the CCFIT Wireless Sub-Committee proposal presented to CCFIT at the October meeting and the principles used by the sub-committee in developing a prioritization criteria to guide wireless expansion within the core campus. The approach taken by the sub-committee focused on cost efficiency as the primary driver in developing the draft prioritized list of buildings.

Mark Redican (IET-Communications Resources) indicated that the most cost effective way to install wireless across the campus would be to install it throughout each building, building by building. However, this approach would treat all spaces within a building equal, whereas there may be a campus priority to install wireless in particular types of spaces (i.e., labs, conferences rooms, classrooms, office spaces, etc). The prioritized list of buildings could be reevaluated based on identified priorities. For example, if it were determined to deploy wireless in all the classrooms first, the list would be re-prioritized to first install wireless in the classrooms, and then to re-visit the same buildings later to add wireless to the other areas.

Tor Cross stated that she wouldn't need to have wireless installed in the classrooms she teaches in and felt that meeting rooms may have a higher priority for the campus. Caroline Bledsoe added, on the other hand, that there may be times when it could be useful for students to download materials at the start of class and then use those materials as aides throughout the lecture. This would prevent the professor from spending the time and

expense in producing hard copy materials. Roger McDonald asked “how much money of what we are spending today will not be used three years from now?” Redican answered that most hand-held wireless devices will use the wireless infrastructure three years from now. Signs in the industry point to the fact that we will continue to move in this direction, with smart phones being developed and enhanced at increasing rates. Jon Wagner noted that online course evaluations be part of the consideration for wireless in the classrooms.

In answering the question of how many faculty were consulted by the sub-committee in the development of the sub-committee’s prioritization list, Bishop stated that a small sampling was conducted and there was not a clear preference identified amongst those in the sampling with regards to wireless in the classrooms. Redican added that there may be a greater appeal to faculty if they could simply choose to turn wireless on or off on a class per class basis. This rule is not currently being applied; though it is technically possible. Anna Pruitt (GSA representative) stated that as a teaching assistant she would use wireless access in her classes immediately. The idea that students may be too distracted by the wireless access is a non-issue as she believes students would be distracted if they want to be regardless. Michelle Hwang (ASUCD representative) stated that the idea of wireless access in classes that require a laptop would be very beneficial; but for other classes, there could be concerns. Hwang added that wireless access in the outdoor areas is very important to students.

The question was asked if it was possible to plan for wireless in a building, but not activate the wireless until a later point in time. Redican answered that yes, wireless could be designed into the building and “turned on” at a later point in time. It costs more money to parcel it out in this way, but it is possible and planning for it during the building design phase helps offset the costs when a department is ready to move forward with wireless. When asked how much more, Redican stated that it is difficult to quantify the cost differential as it is truly a case per case basis.

The committee was encouraged to send forward any additional feedback to Professor Matt Bishop at bishop@cs.ucdavis.edu or Mark Redican (IET) at mredican@ucdavis.edu. The CCFIT Wireless Subcommittee report can be accessed on the CCFIT Web site at http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu/agenda/wireless_recom_100807.doc.

IV. Strategic Approach to Investments in Computing Facilities – Pete Siegel (IET)

Pete Siegel introduced a new committee recently appointed by Interim Provost Horwitz to provide recommendations for space used for computers and server rooms. (See <http://vpjet.ucdavis.edu/computingfacilities.cfm> to view the charge letter). Currently, these are hidden costs to the campus because the decisions are made at the department or unit level. However, departments could potentially save money and resources if they knew they could co-locate their equipment with other departments. Additionally, these types of spaces have a large impact on the power and cooling costs across the campus. Once more information is gathered, decisions could be made on how better to handle the electrical and cooling issues and co-location facilities could have an impact on greater efficiencies in this area.

The committee is co-chaired by Pete Siegel and John Meyer (Office of Resource Management and Planning) and includes representation from the School of Medicine. The first official meeting will be scheduled shortly. Rob Kerner asked how the committee’s work will benefit departments as it seems to be incorporating a road-block into the process of developing server rooms within department-controlled facilities. Siegel stated that the

purpose of the committee is to assist in planning for these types of spaces and that the overall planning discussion should help ensure a sound implementation approach.

More information will be brought to CCFIT as the committee begins its endeavors. For submitting comments or questions, contact Pete Siegel at pmsiegel@ucdavis.edu.

V. Technology Innovation: Collaborative uses of SmartSite – Kirk Alexander (IET Academic Technology Services)

SmartSite is the new campus online course management collaboration system. Most of the emphasis to date has focused on the system's course management capabilities as more and more faculty and students are making use of it. However, SmartSite also makes it possible to place documents and emails online and to collaborate on those documents remotely. Additional features will be coming in the next few months such as live conferencing, library searches, and a course evaluation system.

To date, 1500 project sites have been created in SmartSite including 500 new sites since September 2007. A few of the campus projects/organizations that have recently used SmartSite as a collaboration tool are: the campus book project, the Women's Resources Center and ASUCD in piloting a student master calendar for events and activities. Caroline Bledsoe asked if there were any copyright issues with using SmartSite to collaborate on documents or articles. Alexander stated that it would be the same type of rules that apply to using pdf documents. Alexander noted that there have been some issues with granting non-UC guests access to collaborative and research sites. To help with this issue a couple of changes have been put in place: the Temporary Affiliate Form will soon be an online process which will speed-up the current paper-based process; and, SmartSite administrators will provide guest access on a site per site basis.

Alexander stated that it takes as little as 30 seconds to build a site, and up to an additional hour or so to add links and documents into the site. Alexander mentioned that there are "drop-in" classes available through the Teaching Resources Center (<http://trc.ucdavis.edu/TRC/>) that would be beneficial for those just starting out in SmartSite.

SmartSite is an open-source product with virtually no licensing costs. To date, the biggest cost has been the resources needed for enhancing the course management tools and integrating them into one environment. Now that these are well under way, there are more resources available to focus on project related functions of SmartSite. Alexander added that SmartSite has replaced many of the individual course websites that existed in the past, and those numbers continue to increase.

To access SmartSite's web page, including tools, training, FAQs and other SmartSite relevant information, see: <http://smartsite.ucdavis.edu>. For questions or feedback directly to Kirk Alexander: kdalex@ucdavis.edu.

Meeting adjourned at 4:28pm