### Committee on Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>fluctuates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total proposals Reviewed: (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year</th>
<th>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:  
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:  
None

Issues considered by the committee:
- Student Evaluations on line
- Kuali Coleus: proposal to implement an administration system for research
- Outsourcing UCD email for staff and faculty
- Release of grades in aggregate
- Downloading and editing podcasts
- On-line courses

**Committee’s narrative:**

The Committee on Information Technology (CIT), in its fourth year of existence, is the Academic Senate’s resource for providing recommendations and insight on IT issues. The committee has continued its strong link to CCFIT as the natural means of communication between the administration and the Senate on IT. This has reinforced the essential Senate leadership in academic oversight of IT at UC Davis. CIT actively participated in the activities of CCFIT during the year. The committee also continued to recommend Senate members to Committee on Committees for appointment to CCFIT subcommittees. It is the experience of the outgoing committee Chair that the workload of the committee is much larger than indicated by the number of meetings and issues. This is due, in part, to the many meetings, such as CCFIT and CCFIT sub-committee meetings attended by CIT members, in part to the cases where IT (especially educational technology) initiatives are incubated and pursued outside the sphere of the Academic Senate. In such cases the workload of the committee can be greatly increased and involve an additional element of time pressure for the Senate to carefully consider the long-term consequences of the important issues at hand.
The Committee on Information Technology considered the following items during the 2009-10 academic year:

- The committee discussed the issue of Student Evaluations on line. It as apparent that the discussion would be campus wide; the Senate established a Special Committee on Student Evaluations. CIT nominated Niels Jensen to serve on that committee.

- The Committee responded to the Kuali Coeus proposal for implementing a research administration system. Due to a search this year for a new Vice Chancellor for Research and a restructuring to the Office of Research, the committee suggested this was not the best time to introduce a new electronic tool. The committee recommended deferring a decision on Kuali Coeus until a new Vice Chancellor for Research was in place.

- A major topic of discussion throughout the year was outsourcing faculty and staff email. Several faculty concerns were raised in CIT’s memo of December 20009. In late April, the Vice Provost-IET, and the Chairs of the Academic Senate Committee for Information Technology and the Campus Council for Information Technology, issued a joint statement announcing the decision to discontinue consideration of outsourcing options for faculty and staff email. The communication cited, among a list of issues, concerns related to the UC Electronic Communications Policy and Google’s privacy practices. CIT later reemphasized the rationale that a single email service be reestablished for the campus. A campus-wide UC Davis Email Committee was established jointly by Information and Educational Technology and the Academic Senate to chart a strategy for central campus email services. The committee’s discussions will be informed by the reports from the Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology and the three groups who studied email alternatives this past year. Each of these perspectives will be critical to defining a functional, reliable and secure email system for UC Davis that is operated by the University of California.

- Conversations on the following issues will continue into the 2010-11 academic year:
  - the release of grades in aggregate
  - downloading and editing podcasts
  - on-line courses.

Respectfully submitted,

Niels Grønbech Jensen, Chair
Giulia Galli
Paul Gepts
Douglas Kahn
Felix Wu
Wrye Sententia O'Toole (AF Representative)
Peter Siegel (Ex-Officio)
Matthew Blair (ASUSD Representative)
Matthew Lange (GSA Representative)
Nancy Kilpatrick, Analyst, Academic Senate Office
To:       Robert Powell, Chair  
          Davis Division of the Academic Senate  

From:     Niels Grønbech-Jensen, Chair  
          Committee on Information Technology  

Re:       CIT Response to Consultation Request: Kuali Coeus Project Proposal

The Committee on Information Technology met on February 17 and discussed the proposed project. The committee discussion was brief and focused more on the issue of timing than on the details of the proposed project.

Given that this project is very closely related to the Office of Research and the faculty's interaction with same office, given that an open search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research is imminent, and given that OVCR is in periodic restructuring, we believe that now may not be the best time to introduce a new electronic tool. We submit that it may be better to wait with this decision until the new Vice Chancellor for Research is in place.
To: Robert Powell, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Niels Grønbech-Jensen, Chair  
Committee on Information Technology

Re: CIT Consideration of Gmail for Faculty and Staff

Following your request for input to the discussion on possible transition of faculty and staff email service from campus (gecko-mail) to a Google (gmail) service, the Committee on Information Technology met on November 20th. A synopsis of the discussion and subsequent comments and conversations follows.

The objective of the endeavor is multi-fold and includes perceived cost savings, enhanced sets of communication tools beyond email, and a unification of email platforms across campus. All these goals are worthwhile. However, the committee has some observations and discussion points that pertain both to the specific gmail proposal and to a broader perspective regarding IT at UC Davis.

Given the transition that has already happened for student email from UC Davis to Google, it seems almost inevitable that the campus will move the remaining email services to the same platform/vendor. It is regrettable that a comprehensive discussion regarding email service did not take place in regards to all campus email at the same time. The details of the developing contract with Google are not clear to the committee, so, in turn, our discussions have been conducted in somewhat vague terms. Highlights are:

The projected cost savings have been mentioned to be of the order $100K-$300K per year. While it is desirable to save precious funds, this magnitude of savings is not impressive compared to the amount of time and effort put into the possible transition. Also, it is not clear if there is a mechanism for validating these projected savings against actual savings some years from now.

How does the proposed change in email service impact the overall IT competency on campus? Seen in isolation, this may not be a dramatic shift in campus identity, but given other current and recent efforts in outsourcing IT services to third party vendors (e.g., smartsite), the committee sees a trend leading to a campus with very little actual IT development and activity outside of contracted services. This may be what the campus wishes to strive for, but it would then be useful for the campus community to articulate a long-term vision for how IT is projected to evolve at UC Davis. A given proposal, such as the gmail endeavor, can then be directly evaluated against the common vision.

The Committee was informed that the contract includes an opt-out provision with six months notice, allowing the campus to terminate the contract and choose to either identify a different vendor or resume the services in-house. We are concerned that the campus will be in a very disadvantaged position to shift vendor or resume a campus service once a contract with Google has been signed. To attain the projected cost-savings the campus will relinquish both technical and physical capabilities necessary for running an effective email service. It seems unlikely that
the campus would be in a position to resume the service without major new investments; investments that by then will be unforeseen and outside the budget. The other option of contracting with a different vendor also seems easier said than done in that only very few companies can provide a service on the scale and consistency required by UC Davis.

There are questions regarding ownership of data, physical location of the hosting of data, privacy regarding indexing and data mining, and the ultimate control of the information. These concerns pertain both to the institution as well as to individual efforts on campus. For example, is the information understood to be UC Davis owned such that, e.g., intellectual property of new developments and research results are protected as sole UC Davis data? If so, how is UC Davis certain that the information is protected against indexing, searches, and, of course, illicit activity; and who is ultimately responsible? Can UC Davis email users permanently delete information and how is this guaranteed? Is off-campus/off-shore hosting and handling of data in conflict with confidential university business and proper handling of proprietary or sensitive information?

Does the campus need to inform funding agencies, government, industry, and, e.g., National Laboratory collaborators that UC Davis communications and research data is being stored and managed off-campus/off-shore by a third party vendor, who is subject to interests and regulations other than those of UC Davis?

There are questions regarding the campus adopting a single third-party vendor standard for electronic interaction between faculty and students. One of the attractive components of adopting a Google platform for email is the impressive portfolio of accompanying tools far beyond email service. However, adopting a single-vendor platform based on a free email service as the campus standard for electronic interactions has potential implications for other instructional and IT discussions on campus and UC-wide regarding, e.g., online course offerings and online curricula, where the campus might wish to impose its own culture on the tools used for student-faculty interactions. Again, it would be beneficial to have a broader and longer-reaching campus (and UC-wide) view on IT direction and priorities.

In short, the committee recognizes the technical opportunities in switching faculty and staff email into a Google service. Given the previous adoption of Google mail service for student email this will unify email on campus. However, we have many questions about the details of the arrangement, its flexibility for the campus, and its long-term consequences for academia and research. Some of the above-mentioned questions also pertain to other Senate committees, such as Committee on Research, Budget and Planning, and, in case gmail will have an impact on student-faculty interactions, committees that are directly involved with courses and instruction. We are further wondering about the significance of the anticipated cost savings. In general, we recommend that seemingly independent projects, such as this, be considered in a broader context of a campus vision for IT, academic, scientific, and administrative, instead of being considered in isolation, where interconnectivity between IT decisions and their broader consequences cannot be fully comprehended.

c: Vice Provost—IET Siegel
CCFIT Chair Kiskis
CIT
April 30, 2010

To: UC Davis Faculty and Staff

Re: Discontinuation of Assessment to Outsource Email for Faculty and Staff

We write to inform you of a recent decision to discontinue consideration of “outsourcing” UC Davis email for faculty and staff, including to Google. Vice Provost Pete Siegel made this recommendation to the Chancellor and Provost based on extensive community consultation as well as a campus assessment of the UC Electronic Communications Policy and increased privacy risks that have come to light in recent weeks. The Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology and the Campus Council for Information Technology concur with this decision.

First, there are new concerns that outsourcing email may not be in compliance with the University of California Electronic Communications Policy. The policy states that the University “does not examine or disclose electronic communications records without the holder’s consent” and that "in no case shall electronic communications that contain personally identifiable information about individuals be sold or distributed to third parties without the explicit permission of the individual.” Though there are different interpretations of these sections, the mere emergence of significant disagreement on these points undermines confidence in whether adopting Google’s Gmail service would be consistent with the policy.

Second, and of greater importance, were the views of faculty and staff. We especially appreciated the active involvement and contributions of many faculty, both as participants in the Gmail pilot project and in discussions of potential risks and opportunities. Although preliminary feedback from volunteer testers was positive, many other faculty expressed concern that our campus’ commitment to protecting the privacy of their communications is not demonstrated by Google and that the appropriate safeguards are neither in place at this time nor planned for the near future. These concerns were echoed in recent news reports and in a letter released last week by the privacy commissioners from ten countries. The letter criticized Google's perceived inattention to protecting user privacy and called on the company to incorporate fundamental privacy and data protection principles directly into the design of new online services. Perhaps this broad international attention to Google’s privacy practices will lead to progress.

Although outsourcing is no longer under consideration, the need to provide UC Davis with a more flexible and effective central email system remains. As a next step, we suggest that, jointly with the Academic Senate, a committee be established in the coming months to identify essential campus email features and capabilities. Its discussions would be informed by reports from the Gmail Assessment Committee, the Unified Communications Workgroup, and the UC Email Task Force. All three initiatives, as well as the experience and perspectives of faculty and staff involved in them, will be critical to defining a functional, reliable and secure email system for UC Davis.

We express our sincere appreciation to the faculty and staff who participated in the Gmail pilot project, to the faculty who have come forward with comments and concerns, and to the staff who work so diligently to create and support our campus systems. We also appreciate the collegiality
that has characterized this assessment of email outsourcing, and we look forward to more collaboration in defining a central email system that can meet the needs of our campus.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Siegel  
CIO and Vice Provost  
Information and Educational Technology

Niels Jensen,  
Chair, Academic Senate Committee for Information Technology  
And Professor, Applied Science

Joe Kiskis,  
Chair, Campus Council for Information Technology  
And Professor, Physics
To: Robert Powell, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Niels Jensen, Chair  
Committee on Information Technology (CIT)

Re: Future of UC Davis email service

Following the discontinuation of IET’s gmail pilot project and the announcement of VIP-IET Pete Siegel on April 30, 2010, endorsed by CCFIT and CIT (representing the Davis Division of the Academic Senate), the committee discussed the issue of email service at UC Davis.

The committee, again, supports the notion of not outsourcing UC Davis email to third party vendors. This is consistent with our reading of the UC Electronic Communications Policy and with the expectations of, e.g., privacy and data protection that have been communicated through the Academic Senate. We therefore fully endorse the development of functional, reliable, and secure email service for all on campus. We recognize that locally developed and/or locally operated functionality cannot compete with all the latest features and capabilities of the applications offered by commercial vendors. However, the Administration and the Senate, in consultation with the rest of the campus, should determine a level of service and capabilities that approaches that provided by commercial vendors, while remaining practically and economically feasible for an institution like the University of California.

The new UC Davis email service should become the default, ucdavis.edu, for all at UC Davis. The committee does not support continuing a fractured platform in which different services, system behaviors, and governing policies apply to different user groups on campus. Recognizing that the campus functions by heavy communication between students, staff, administration, and faculty, a single homogeneous email service is not only desirable for campus interactions, but also a natural consequence of the considerations that led to the decision of not outsourcing email for faculty and staff.

The committee is eager to become an active participant in developing the guidelines for, and direction to, this new core email service for all on campus.

C: VP-IET Siegel  
Asst VP-IET Shelby  
CCFIT Chair Kiskis  
CIT