

Campus Council for Information Technology
Monday, November 19, 2007
2203 Social Sciences and Humanities

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome and Approval of Minutes -- Chair Bledsoe

Chair Caroline Bledsoe welcomed committee members and called for an approval of the October minutes. Minutes were approved as submitted.

II. Introduction of the incoming CCFIT Chair – Pete Siegel, Information and Educational Technology

Pete Siegel introduced Francois Gygi, who is the the incoming chair of CCFIT, effective January 2008. Gygi is a professor of Applied Science and has been part of the UC Davis community since 2005. See http://das.engineering.ucdavis.edu/pages/people/faculty_pages/gygi.html for additional information.

III. Graduate System for Management of Admission, Alumni & Records Tracking (Grad SMAART) Update – Jeff Gibeling, Cathy Jurado and Annik Hirshen

Jeff Gibeling briefly provided background information on the 4 components of Grad SMAART.

1. EMBARK, the online admission system for accepting online applications – launched Labor Day weekend
2. GARD (Graduate Application Review Database) – This component enables faculty and staff to electronically review applications - launched October 15, 2007. GARD is based on a pilot system in production for several years.
3. Student tracking module – not yet in design phase
4. Alumni Tracking module –not yet in design phase.

Cathy Jurado demonstrated the GARD system. A Kerberos login is required to gain access. The program is a role-based system which allows each user access to the various screens depending on their assigned role within the system. The project team worked closely with the Graduate Studies staff to ensure as much data as possible was captured, so that shadow systems within departments would be unnecessary.

Questions and Answers:

- How many people can access the same application? (Every reviewer role can access the applications, i.e, faculty reviewer, chairs and program staff reviewers).
- Are there any access issues for those applying online? (The vast majority of applicants have some sort of capability to apply online. Graduate Studies provides assistance on an individual basis for those exceptional cases when online access isn't feasible).
- How do you know the application was processed correctly? (EMBARK has an auditing feature that creates daily error logs for any application that was submitted but didn't get processed correctly.)
- Has Grad SMAART helped increase efficiency? (Yes, there is less paper to deal with but, there is still a need to handle paper transcripts. It will take approximately 3-5 years to truly realize the full benefits and efficiencies of the system).
- Is the electronic application process faster? (The turnaround time should be shorter. The goal is to make life easier for all those involved and the benefit of being able to participate in the review process no matter where you are in the world is a big benefit. The Fellowship process also is shorter).
- Are there funding implications linked to the system? (It is difficult to gather all the different sources of funding, and funding wasn't meant to be part of this process. Today, funding calculations are happening outside the system).

- How did you work with the departments to replace their shadow systems? (There were a lot of meetings across the departments. Admission practices vary across the departments so the system had to be flexible enough to accommodate the differences).
- How do you handle personal information? (Social Security Numbers are obtained in the application process, but they are not viewable to any of the reviewers or users of the system).

IV. Telecommunications Strategic Directions – Mark Redican, IET Communications Resources

Mark Redican presented an overview of the strategic directions for campus telecommunications with a recommendation for a 6 year plan to incrementally upgrade the campus infrastructure and to provide a more consistent funding model. Two current issues are: (1) integration of stand alone systems (voice, video and data), and (2) development of integrated networking services. Carriers, service providers and manufacturers are all moving towards a convergent IP (internet protocol) environment.

Redican outlined the three basic options for the campus:

Option 1: Continue to invest in the old legacy equipment knowing that eventually it will need to be completely replaced.

Option 2: Invest in UCDNet3 that would replace infrastructure equipment incrementally over the next 6 years. (Recommended option).

Option 3: Invest in xNet which would provide the campus the richest infrastructure available in today's market at a very high cost.

Questions and Discussion Points:

- How would you balance upgrading hardware and providing high speed network connections? (The six year plan includes upgrading building wiring. Priorities would need to be determined as to what buildings would be upgraded and in what order).
- Siegel stated that the Administrative Coordinating Council of Deans (ACCD) would determine the priorities once IET has provided them with the information on what buildings need to be upgraded.

See [Telecommunications Strategic Directions](#) to review the presentation. For additional information, contact Mark Redican, mredican@ucdavis.edu; 752-9500.

V. Administrative IT Services Roadmap – Dave Shelby, Information and Educational Technology

Dave Shelby discussed the latest developments of the UC Davis Administrative IT Services Roadmap, an initiative jointly led by IET, Office of Administration, and Student Affairs.

By way of background, the campus has contracted with the Exeter Group, a third party consulting company, to assist in building a campus-wide administrative IT services inventory through discussions with campus leadership and oversight committees. The purpose of this initial phase is to understand the current systems on campus, where we want the systems to be in five years, and the work required to meet those goals. Once completed, this foundational document will be used to plan and coordinate improvements and investments in technologies. This can improve information-sharing and benefit of students, faculty, and staff. Approximately 30 campus groups participated in the information gathering process (Phase 1). These groups will have an opportunity to provide comments to the Phase 1 draft report

Shelby distributed a working diagram of campus information systems (“Administrative Road Map”) that was developed through campus group meetings. The map is separated into 9 domains with 73 campus systems placed in their appropriate domains. Shelby stated that one of the significant insights gained from the diagram is the focus on domains. Many campus oversight

committees have been charged to oversee individual systems, but they should oversee the entire domain, not just individual systems. Siegel added that, in the past, functionality for schools and colleges was often second priority; as a result schools and colleges had to build their own shadow systems. The Administrative Roadmap highlights the importance of building a hybrid environment where schools and colleges can get the information they need without shadow systems. The current structure is complex and a simplified model would be better. Systems need to interact with the "information bus" that controls rules (access, security, etc.) and governance. Paul Drobny said that the campus has developed administrative systems based on transaction needs which complicates the ability for systems to interact with other systems.

Shelby stated that there is still opportunity for input into the Phase I process and referred the membership to the online survey tool. See <http://vpiet.ucdavis.edu/itroadmap.cfm>.

VI. Technology Innovation: Fast Content Publishing – Liz Gibson and Paul VerWey, Academic Technology Services

Liz Gibson provided an overview of the meaning of "Fast Content Publishing." In today's environment there is the ability to place content on the web with a fast turnaround: real-time posting, or 24-48 hours to place content on the web after slight editing.

In 1999, Microsoft created a way to save a PowerPoint presentation online as html. This paved the way for more creative uses of PowerPoint online, which led to the merging of Powerpoint and webcasting, using hardware and software feeds from the classroom. Now, these technologies have advanced to the point where these classroom captures can be placed on the web in an automated way with "chalk-talk streaming" of the lecture, and indexed, powerpoint slides.

Gibson demonstrated how Adobe Presenter software (formerly known as Breeze Presenter) can take a PowerPoint presentation and sync it with the audio to each slide. On the screen, users would see the headings of each slide, a middle column showing a thumbnail of each slide, and a notes section that is used to deliver the transcribed text from the audio for each slide. Additionally, there is a search engine to allow easy word searches through the slides and the software allows for a basic quizzing tool that can be tied directly to the slides.

Gibson stated that faculty can schedule their classes for the quarter to use the Adobe Presenter software. The cost for edited files with the maximum editing ranges from approximately \$500-\$700 per class. There are lesser expensive solutions available, with less editing and no search capabilities. The question was asked how many faculty want to make available their classroom lecture. Gibson stated that podcasting use has grown dramatically over the past year. Fast content development is also growing in popularity, however the cost is limiting. However the availability of this software provides many faculty with options – e.g. the opportunity to have their lectures available online so that classroom time could be used for other purposes, such as group discussion.

For those interested in seeing a more in-depth presentation on the Adobe Presenter software, there is a presentation scheduled for December 5th. Contact Academic Technology Services for additional details on the presentation at 752-2133.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm

###