Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-2011
Davis Division: Academic Senate

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>2</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>fluctuates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Requests for Consultation responses: (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>11</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:
- Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing)
- Graduate Tracking System (PPM 200-45 Review)
- Information Technology Shared Services Concept
- Conceptual Framework: Implementation of Regents Resolution on Administrative Efficiencies
- I&R Faculty Tracking System (FacTrac)-PPM 200-45
- SmartSite Concern
- PPM 200-45: UC Davis Active Directory/Unified Communications Design Whitepaper
- HR & Finance Case Management for Shared Service Center Concept (PPM 200-45)
- Polling/Secure Voting System Concept: PPM 200-45 Review
- PPM 200-45: Conceptual Review Construction Project Management and Accounting System
- IT Excellence Committee Report Review

Committee’s narrative:

The Committee on Information Technology (CIT) is the Academic Senate’s resource for providing recommendations and insight on IT issues. The committee has maintained a close connection with CCFIT as the natural means of communication between the administration and the Senate on IT. CIT actively participated in the activities of CCFIT during the year. We note that, in addition to the issues mentioned above, several CIT members have had to address related issues as members of CCFIT and CCFIT sub-committees. Some CIT members have also expressed the wish to be better informed of the possible impact of their recommendations after they are submitted.
An important issue discussed this year was the development and improvement of the SmartSite system, and in particular its Gradebook2 component. While the feedback provided by IET to CIT has substantially improved, it appears to be important for CIT to continue to carefully monitor ongoing developments related to this system. A number of other issues were submitted as part of the PPM 200-45 review process and often proposed the development of new software systems in the goal of reducing processing costs. The committee generally felt that many of these proposals were not including a sufficient cost/benefit analysis, in particular regarding the displacement of processing costs from administrative staff to Faculty.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francois Gygi (chair), Anupam Chander (member), Edward Dickenson (member), Paul Gepts (member), Felix Wu (member), Keith Brandman (AF Rep.), Pete Siegel (Ex-Officio), Matthew Blair (ASUCD Rep.), Mathew Lange (GSA Rep.)