California State University, East Bay
Information Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes from the meeting of October 17, 2016

Present: Andrew Carlos, Chair (LIB)
            David Fencsik (At-large)
            Jiansheng Guo (CLASS, COBRA)
            Pei-Hui Hsu (CBE)
            Mark Karplus (CSCI, Senate Chair)
            Phoebe Kwan (Interim CIO)
            Rita Liberti (At-large)
            James Mitchell (CEAS, CIC)
            Jessica Weiss (CLASS, Faculty Development)
            Roger Wen (Presidential Appointee)
Apologies: Patrick Huang (CSCI)
Visitors: Matt Collins (Associate CIO)
            Gene Lim (Director, Systems and Infrastructure Engineering ITS)
            Eric Neumann (Director, Academic Technology and User Support, ITS)

1. Introductions
2. Election of Chair and Secretary
    a. Mitchell nominated Carlos as chair. Carlos elected by consent of the committee.
    b. No nominations were forthcoming for secretary. Mitchell offered that when he had been secretary, he had scripted the meeting, sent a draft to the CIO for corrections, then to the committee. Fencsik volunteered to serve as interim secretary.
3. Approval of Agenda
    a. Karplus asked to add 5a. **Technology Support for Teaching (check title)**, referral from ExCom.
    b. Liberti asked about the charge of ITAC. This was deferred to just before adjournment, or the next meeting.
    c. Agenda approved unanimously.
4. Reports
    a. Report of CIO: Kwan began in August as Interim CIO. She was at SFSU for 18 years, retiring as CIO. Her role is to keep ITS projects and services moving. She has been meeting with VPs, deans and AVPs.
5. Business Items
    a. **Technology support for teaching (check title)**.
    Referred by ExCom to ITAC. The goal is to determine the current state of faculty support services in ITS and Online Campus, including the physical location of such services, and recommend changes to those services. The results may lead to ExCom requesting recommendations, but currently

the goal is to just understand the current state of affairs and report back to ExCom.

The committee discussed whether ITAC was the best group to handle this task. Karplus suggested that there were other options, but ITAC seems the best place to start.

Karplus specified that the initial goal is for the Academic Senate to know what services actually exist and where so the faculty can know the current state and consider recommendations for future plans. For example, the MATS website states that they are in the library annex, which is incorrect. At present, there is no timeline for these recommendations, so ITAC can determine it.

Motion: Discuss process and procedures for the report at the next meeting (Guo/Fencsik) Approved unanimously.

Kwan requested that recommendations also go to ITS.

b. Computer refresh draft
Neumann presented a draft policy that had been provided to members prior to the meeting. Currently there is no formal policy, though the draft reflects current practice. The draft has been approved by IT Coordinating Committee (ITCC - the administrative version of ITAC).

Current refresh is every 4–5 years. ITS also tries to update computers in shared labs on a similar cycle. There are 1200 computers in shared labs, 600 of which are controlled by departments (which should fund the refreshes). Actual refreshes depend on funding, obviously. ITS spends about $550,000 upgrading around 400-500 computers per year. As the number of CSUEB employees continues to increase, the cost will too.

Guo asked about faculty who need features beyond those in the baseline models, and how to find out what computers are assigned to a particular person or unit. Neumann responded that ITS pays for the baseline model, and the department must pay any additional costs. There is an online source where you can find out what assets are assigned to you.

Fencsik asked about new faculty receiving a new computer from ITS. That has never been the case, but an old computer that is no longer being used can be given to the faculty, who then becomes eligible in a future refresh.

Weiss mentioned that it's limiting to put new computer purchases on department budgets. Guo suggested that hiring funds could be used instead. Neumann pointed out that the baseline models are pretty good,

so most faculty probably don't need more, especially if they know they'll get a replacement in 4 years.

Kwan asked that committee members comment on the online document before the next meeting so we can finish discussion then.

Guo asked if this would be a Senate or ITS policy. Kwan responded that by putting it through ITAC and ITCC, it could be raised at the President's Cabinet. Karplus said he would notify the Senate of ITAC's decision.

c. Lecture Capture - upgrade of Panopto
Neumann stated that the current Panopto hardware is expensive to purchase, maintain, and upgrade. The cost of staff to edit the video is also high. ITS would like to know what is actually needed. They are planning to upgrade Panopto to 5.2, but they are also considering competitors such as Zoom. Panopto is easy to use and has more options, but is expensive.

Mitchell asked why lecture capture is needed. Liberti praised it for recording short clips for online classes. Collins stated that ITS had been promoting Panopto for several uses, but may not be the best for all of them; the original purpose was to record a whole lecture.

Guo requested usage data, and suggested speaking to faculty who use it. Weiss requested student usage data in particular, and suggested that we determine recommendations for a policy, and best practices for accessibility. Mitchell suggested we consider other technologies.

Neumann pointed out that our current storage (7.4 TB) is approaching the limit, and there is no retention policy, so everything has been kept. He will send usage data.

Carlos suggested putting data retention on a future agenda. Wen asked that ITAC should provide requirements of faculty for lecture-capture technology.

d. Classrooms of the Future
Neumann reported that Facilities developed a project to renovate classrooms. Faculty survey suggested that the biggest concern was flexibility in terms of seating, tables, and lighting; technology was not a major concern. A total of $900,000 was spent on renovating 4 pilot classrooms over the summer. The general contractor was not able to complete the entire project in time for the start of the quarter so ITS and Facilities had to develop workarounds – although they are still working to finish the project as originally planned.

Mitchell pointed out that this matter has proved contentious in the Senate because of the $10-12 million dollars set aside for classroom renovations.

Karplus stated that the Senate was aware of the renovations, and COBRA is looking into how the money was spent.

Weiss asked who oversees the projects to ensure mistakes are not repeated.

Kwan requested that the committee skip to 5f, after which the committee returned here.

Kwan asked if faculty in each college could be asked about the classrooms of the future. Guo said that COBRA will conduct surveys. Kwan asked if it would be helpful for Neumann to attend the COBRA meeting when the survey is discussed, to discuss the ITS aspects.

e. Skipped
f. New password policy – in process

   Kwan stated that an ITS audit revealed that the current password policy is inadequate. The main change will be to require passwords of at least 10 characters instead of the current 8. In exchange, passwords will expire in 180 days instead of the current 120

   Carlos and Guo requested more and clearer instructions on the password change page.

Adjournment (Guo/Fencsik) Approved unanimously