IN ATTENDANCE:
Eric Denna    Rich Brown    Raymond Tymas-Jones    Michele Ballantyne
Jeff West     Tom Cheatham  Martha Bradley       Cathy Anderson
Amy Wildermuth Alberta Comer

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Josh Wall

UNABLE TO ATTEND:
Gordon Crabtree Michael Hardman    Quinn McKenna   Cindy Furse
Mike Perez     Wayne Samuelson  Mike Strong        Michael Kay
Mary Parker

Items of Business

- Michael Hardman was unable to attend, Tom Cheatham was asked to chair this meeting.
- Welcome Alberta Comer to the Committee. We are excited to have her join the OITC.

Previous meeting minutes

Martha Bradley was added to list of those attending the previous meeting.

Minutes unanimously approved with amendment.

Teaching and Learning Portfolio Update

Martha Bradley reviewed the agenda items and decisions that have been made in the Teaching and Learning Portfolio. The following themes have been identified and discussed in the portfolio;

- Identify strategic needs for Teaching and Learning
- Establish a process framework for supporting teaching at the U
- Identify foundational Teaching and Learning services
- Determine funding and resource allocations to enable needed services

The Teaching and Learning Portfolio has approved a quality course framework for the University of Utah that can be found at http://qcf.utah.edu
The portfolio has also approved a foundational classroom configuration for general use classrooms on campus. From this point forward, general use classrooms will be configured with the following technology:

- Bulbless projector or up to a 50” flat panel
- Crestron Air Media wireless and mobile device display system
- 84” x 84” screen
- Blu-ray/DVD player
- Touch-screen control panel
- Digital receiver, amplifier, switching unit
- Room audio speakers (2)

A question was raised around the ability to connect devices to the projectors. This new solution allows for wireless connections to most devices.

Currently, the Teaching and Learning Portfolio is discussing whether the University should provide the service of building programs that are fully online. Issues were discussed around faculty ownership vs. University ownership of content. It was also being discussed that a need for a good instructional design team would be required. This may change the role of faculty for developing online courses in the future. It was mentioned that Social and Behavioral Sciences has expressed some strong interest in this type of initiative.

Future agenda items include student computing funding and a strategy for labs across campus.

**Research Portfolio Task Force**

Tom Cheatham gave a brief update on a subcommittee of the Research Portfolio that is being formed to look at technology for research and high-performance computing. This subcommittee will be reporting to the Research Portfolio.

This subcommittee is charged with:

- Conducting a rapid assessment of the current scope, impact, and future research service requirements for research computing and data services on campus
- Identifying priorities and risks within the current and future models for support
- Reviewing the organizational and service models
- Identifying new opportunities for collaboration and support
- Exploring more diversified funding models for delivering central research computing and data services on campus, including those provided by CHPC
Update on USS Portfolio

Because of the directive from President Pershing to improve the student academic planning and registration processes, the USS Portfolio is reviewing a list of software-development projects that are being discussed or currently worked on (in-flight). This list was presented to the OITC in addition to a list of applications that are in production and supported by central IT resources.

The USS portfolio will be generating some criteria for evaluating and prioritizing projects that will consume central IT software-programming resources.

A question was raised around how projects got on the list. It was clarified that this is the list demanding UIT resources only. The list does not include college- or department-specific IT projects and resources. Various resources within UIT and feedback from the University Support Services Portfolio generated this list.

Some question was raised as to how the level of effort required was determined for each project. It was communicated that any level-of-effort questions needed to be communicated to Rene Eborn, who is maintaining the list.

A need was raised that these types of discussions as well as general governance discussions need to be communicated to other campus bodies such as CAD. There needs to be feedback into these types of lists by deans and senior leadership.

A need was also raised around matching longer-term goals with shorter-term goals and resource implications. This is something the USS Portfolio will be looking at with an eye on processes and students.