Research, Teaching and Learning Technologies Committee
April 20, 2015

Action Items:
- Clarify the relationship between JCCIT and IT governance vis-à-vis IT strategic planning and priority setting. (Larry)
- Schedule a discussion about different funding models for IT (recharge, tax, central funding). (Liz)
- Send information about the upcoming Research Data Management summit (David G.)

Meeting Notes

1) CIO updates (Larry Conrad, 10 minutes)
   a. Joint Committee on Campus Information Technology (JCCIT)
      - Committee suggested by Academic Senate Chair Panos Papadopoulos to help campus IT better engage with the faculty community.
      - There has been one meeting, where a strong interest in IT strategic planning was expressed.
      - Any work towards an IT Strategic Plan will need to be aligned with the campus strategic planning work lead by Andrew Szeri, as well as informed and vetted through the IT governance model.
   b. IST Structural deficit
      - In the beginning of FY15 IST had identified a structural deficit of $8.8M
      - Through a variety of mechanisms (retiring services, budget cuts, removal of recharge service subsidies, etc.) this has been reduced to $2.2M
      - We will return to this committee for feedback on other options for further deficit reduction. Options will likely include retiring more services, moving services to recharge, exploring other funding models, etc.
      - Cathy Koshland expressed an interest in taking a hard look at recharge campus wide; looking at different models for paying for Common Good services. Topic will be added to the pipeline.

2) ETS Structural Deficit update (Jenn Stringer, Cathy Koshland, 5 minutes)
   a. Update from the discussion at the February 6 RTLTC meeting (see presentation here):
   b. ETS followed up on some of the suggestions made in the room (e.g., look at what other departments are doing; look at charging departments to cover costs of public distribution, etc.). None of the options looked viable
   c. DECISION: Webcast lectures will no longer be distributed publicly. Will only be available to students.
Hope is that there will be an uptake in demand by faculty who had originally declined to participate due to concerns about public sharing (currently only 17% of faculty make use of the web-enabled classrooms).

3) IT Strategic Planning (Larry Conrad, 10 minutes)
   a. Larry talked about the interest from the new JCCIT committee in exploring a strategic planning process. Questions were raised about how this fits in with the charge of the IT governance structure, which also includes campus wide IT strategic planning. Larry clarified that any strategic planning work the JCCIT wanted to do would need to be aligned with the work Andrew Szeri is doing and also coordinated with IT governance.

4) Research and Academic Engagement (RAE) Benchmarking Work: progress to date and next steps (Jenn Stringer, David Greenbaum, 45 minutes)
   a. See presentation located here.

5) What’s Ahead (Cathy Koshland, 20 minutes)
   a. See pipeline list on the next page.
**RTLTC Topics/Issues Pipeline**

- **Accessibility in Teaching and Learning and Research** - There is a need on campus to support accessibility across ETS, IST, DSP, and others who are currently providing support. This committee could look holistically as a part of preparing for next year's resource allocation discussion.

- **CTL/ETS/BRCOE** - We need to continue to coordinate across these groups as the landscape evolves and adjust and clarify our faculty support model. We provide course design support for both UG and grad “residential” T&L as well as support for the development of online degree programs.

- **Faculty consulting and engagement model**: How can we better coordinate our many campus consulting efforts in both the teaching and research technologies areas so that faculty can have a much better experience learning about tools and methods, finding support, and securing grant funds.

- **IT Strategic Planning** - The University has no current strategic plan and the academic plan has not been updated since 2002. The RAE benchmarking work shows Berkeley to be significantly behind many of our peers with regards to the IT services we provide to faculty and students. With all the focus on the University’s budget woes, we are at risk of missing new transformational opportunities. Developing a strategic IT plan for the University would help ensure we are making the most enlightened investments in campus IT.
  - **Campus Cyberinfrastructure Plan for Research and Education** - Making strategic choices about which new campus wide services to significantly improve --- such as Data Visualization, or Research Software Support, or Software Licensing --- is critical. Such a plan should build from the substantial work the National Science Foundation has done to help define campus and national “cyberinfrastructure” to support both research and education. In this way, Berkeley can define the kind of future advanced computing infrastructure it needs and take much better advantage of NSF grant opportunities and multi-campus partnerships.

- **How, in 3-5 years, can we make Berkeley a national leader in our support of research, teaching, and learning technologies?** The RAE benchmarking work showed us that we have much to improve in comparison to our peers. We can not expect significant new campus funding to address these issues. However, we do have extraordinary initiatives and people distributed across many campus colleges, schools, ORUs, and service units. How, by better coordinating, federating, and leading these efforts could we substantially improve services in the next 3-5 years?

- **Faculty Common Good Computing Support / Faculty Allowance**: What are the core research and teaching tools and services we should provide to each faculty member at no cost as being part of the Berkeley community? e.g. Berkeley Research Computing now has a Faculty Compute Allowance of 200,000 core-hours per year for each faculty member. Much of the T&L services (bSpace, webcast, etc.) are common good, but there
is not a lot of individual support for faculty. Should we offer a certain amount of consulting around these services? Other ideas?

- **LBNL partnership**: There are two sides to this issue (at least). First, LBNL has important and very high quality IT resources and expertise --- such as those from NERSC and ESnet --- that could be better shared with the Berkeley campus. Note as well that staff from these areas have indicated a new willingness to partner together to provide services and consulting. Second, how can we continue to make it easier for those faculty and others with joint appointments to use resources at Berkeley.

- **IST Budget**: IST has made significant progress over the past 10 months on our structural deficit, having reduced it from almost $10M to about $2.3M. We will come back to the group to tell that story, as well as to review recommendations on options for closing the deficit gap.

- **Policies**
  
  - **Project Management**: Larger campus-wide computer projects have had mixed results. We believe a more focused and disciplined approach is needed to help campus units be more consistently successful and are working on a proposed policy to provide better guidance on project management best-practices.
  
  - **Campus Computing standards**: There are presently a set of hardware (JACS) and software (Berkeley Desktop) standards for purchasing new computer workstations. These have been focused on “administrative” units. An initial assessment from CSS indicates a substantial difference in life-cycle support costs to the campus for standard vs. nonstandard configurations. We think a campus-wide policy is needed to further encourage units to adopt the standard configurations and hence reduce IT support costs for the University.

  - **Information Security**: We have been pursuing a more robust information security strategy for the Berkeley campus to significantly reduce the exposures to compromise and misuse of University data and other assets. We are working on a set of proposed policies to support the reworked strategy.

- **Learning analytics and data support** - As we move more of our T&L activities online we are collecting a lot of data about student activity. This enables us to build tools and reports that better support students and faculty to impact student learning. How should the campus be investing in this space?

- **UG initiative and new campus IT needs** - As the campus rolls out the UG Initiative it is important for this group to weigh in on the T&L and Research IT needs to support its success.

- **Policies around data use and retention for Teaching, Learning and Research** - We need to articulate policies and practices around data retention for the data that we house in our systems (bSpace, online course evaluations, webcast, google, etc.). This includes courses data, analytic data, and student data. In addition, federal agencies such as the
NSF, DOE, NIH, and others are steadily rolling out new policies and possible requirements for research.

**Data Intensive Research, Data Science Education ... Data, Data, Data:** With the creation of BIDS, the D-Lab, the Undergraduate Science Data Education initiative, and a range of other data intensive research and education grants and program, the campus is taking a growing leadership role in data science and data curation. Two lines of questions to explore: 1. How can groups such as ETS, the Library, IST ensure we are providing the right kind of help across these initiatives (and how can we be ahead of the game in terms of understanding what will be required)? 2. Can we help to better align and coordinate some of these programs?