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INTERACTING SEAMLESSLY WITH OUR STUDENTS

Requirements Definition Phase

1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This Project Control Document requests a budget and authorization to start the planning phase of a student portal to deliver the administrative back-end applications currently served by URSA and/or MY.UCLA.

The initiative most directly responds to the strategic principles of “Student Integration” and “Increased Productivity” but it is also expected to be a significant enabler for initiatives in the “Scholarly Interaction” area. It is one of several UTIPP-2 initiatives to upgrade the University’s information technology infrastructure in the coming decade.

The initiative mitigates security and other risks associated with obsolete technology and will at the same time improve the student experience at UCLA by (1) providing a consistent and seamless interface for students’ administrative, instructional and research interactions with the institution, (2) migrating all of URSA and related content of MY.UCLA to that platform.

The UTIPP-2 budget proposal contains a very preliminary estimate of resources needed for the technical upgrade of URSA and for the migration of the Registrar’s SRDB. Maintenance of MY.UCLA was not specifically included in UTIPP-2, but is included in this proposal since MY.UCLA offers services that are complementary and/or alternative to URSA, and relies on SRDB for much of its functionality.

The scope of the initiative will be to provide an integrated portal for student administrative processes (academic and financial) that are currently provided by URSA and MY.UCLA. The students’ electronic instructional interaction with the institution is the subject of the Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE) initiative—as are collaboration tools to facilitate research. While the CCLE functionality is outside the scope of this project proposal, we intend to design the student portal and its administrative back-end systems to be sufficiently robust to allow subsequent integration with CCLE.

The work to be authorized in this first phase will create a business process model for administrative transactions, identify candidate technologies, provide the programmatic blueprint and develop a detailed proposal for implementation of the components. Institutional value and urgency of functional needs, as well as technical/operational issues will pace the implementation schedule of this and most other infrastructure initiatives.
1.1 Purpose

Today’s technology-literate students expect administrative and academic processes to be seamlessly delivered in a coherent, consistent and intuitive manner. This is not the current reality at UCLA. We have a patchwork of systems that evolved from efforts of individual units to provide individually useful, but often disjoint, services to our student population. This lack of coordination is not just an embarrassing subject of Daily Bruin editorials and unfavorable comparison to peer institutions; it is a very inefficient way to conduct business.

The University is well aware of the fundamental issues. In 2001 the Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB) adopted the guiding principle to “Provide Information to Increase Productivity and to Enhance the Relationship of Individuals to the University,” and “to transform UCLA’s institutional data into a more useful campus resource by utilizing information technology to improve accessibility.”

The initiative “Interacting Seamlessly with Our Students” responds to these specific goals:

- Provide timely and accurate data resources and transaction services that are accessible and usable for faculty, students, staff, alumni, and parents.
- Provide timely and accurate business systems that are accessible and usable for faculty, students, and staff.
- Provide timely and accurate student systems that are accessible for faculty, students, and staff.

Where other initiatives primarily focus on building systems that provide timely and accurate data, this initiative primarily focuses on accessibility and usability of those systems and data. There is, however, a significant system development component. The “business logic”—the rules embedded in URSA and MY.UCLA—is built on obsolete technology (Microsoft Visual Basic and ASP) that will soon no longer be supportable and must therefore be replaced. This presents us with a unique opportunity: we can, at little incremental cost, incorporate changes that will allow integration of the back-end systems through a student portal.

1.2 Institutional Requirements for and History of the Project

The administrative interactions between the University and its (prospective) students have over time been adapted to make use of information technology: from punch cards to “green screens” to access over the web. Like most institutions, UCLA followed the standard pattern of IT adoption: reducing costs and improving efficiency. Considerable value was generated for the institution from the technologies available at the time, but operational efficiency for the University resulted in a fragmented experience for the student.

Today, social as well as technical factors combine to make it attractive—even necessary—to revisit the processes and systems by which university and student interact. Students entering the University have grown up using the web as an integral part of their experience and expect it to be part of their academic experience as well. They are entirely comfortable transacting business over the web, but they do expect a level of usability and process integration that UCLA currently cannot provide (see Appendix A, The “Parent Experience”).
Fortunately we are at an opportune time to address this issue. Developments in the world of technology force us to make significant changes in our systems in any event, and solving the student experience problem can be a natural result if we use the right architectural approach and replacement technologies.

The technology upon which much of MY.UCLA and all of URSA depend is becoming obsolete, that is, its vendor will soon stop providing the technical support required to keep these applications running. This means that these systems will be increasingly vulnerable to security breaches, which we will be largely helpless to prevent. Further, as other systems evolve, we may be unable to make the changes to keep pace with UCLA’s needs.

The solution is for these systems to be rewritten for a more modern technology. This gives us an opportunity to redesign them to provide a contemporary quality of student experience at little incremental cost. Consolidating complementary and duplicative functionality in URSA and MY.UCLA into a single framework is not enough; it does not provide integration. That won’t be achieved unless the focus shifts from making tasks more efficient to making processes more effective.

What’s the difference? Current systems have evolved by “automating” individual steps in a “unit-centric” improvement model. The “Registration Packet,” for example, evolved into today’s URSA as the Registrar made successive improvements; and on-line payments have taken the place of writing checks as the Finance organization made use of upgraded tools and technology. But seen from the student’s point of view, these are not disjoint events but components of a larger registration and enrollment process.

While the technology changed, the process did not change. For example, enrolling in a class used to require three paper documents (Registration Packet, Catalog and Schedule). Each was independently “automated” to obtain some benefit: reduce printing costs, avoid “crunch times” at the Registrar’s windows, etc. The student, instead of using 3 pieces of paper, now must login to 3 or 4 systems (URSA, the on-line class schedule, and the catalog and/or a class website).

While scanning across three printed pages is a simple task, it is nearly impossible to do with three browser windows. One interacts quite differently with a piece of paper than with a screen image. Students have complained that the electronic enrollment process is now more confusing and more difficult to use than the paper-based process that it replaces.

Different media require different process designs. Contemporary design practice, therefore, focuses on how the end-to-end business processes are to be performed. Viewing individual functional tasks as a part of a process workflow of actions and services has more profound consequences than may at first be apparent. It requires the business or institution to think in a fundamentally different way about its processes.

Tasks are not individual activities, performed within a unit (typically on or with some kind of document), but are part of larger institutional processes. In the traditional model the form and the data that it captures are inextricably linked. In an electronic model, form and data are separate entities that are used by the institution to perform a collection of basic services.
What holds the process together is not a form (whether paper or an electronic image thereof), but the workflow model and the integration capability of a “portal.” The resulting systems are, therefore, quite different. A “form-metaphor” system typically requires programming to make even minute changes to a process. In a process model system, process steps are easily reordered, are usually readily moved to a different implementation—and such configuration changes can often be made by a business analyst instead of a programmer.

This far greater flexibility in adapting processes to new circumstances is what makes service-oriented architectures (SOA) so attractive. And, as a byproduct, it can make a process that has many tasks supported by many systems appear nearly seamless to the user. Note, though, that “service orientation” is not an information technology “trick” to make changes more easily. It is first and foremost a different way to view operations and design IT systems that embody that view. Improved flexibility is only a (highly desirable) byproduct.

Thus it is that the proposed project intends to lay the framework for implementing a service-oriented architecture. Instead of replicating today’s systems in a new technology, the project will plan for the development of a collection of services that can be arranged to meet current needs and rearranged to meet future needs. Portal technologies and workflow engines—“middleware components” in technical jargon—will be used to deliver these services in a coherent but flexible manner.

This will accomplish two goals: the institution gets a flexible process infrastructure that minimizes long-term cost of adapting to change, and the students will have a far better experience in their on-line interaction with the university. Consolidating administrative processes into a student portal is a beginning. Once the infrastructure is in place, it can also be leveraged to support other Student Integration and Scholarly Interaction initiatives.

1.3 Project Structure

1.3.1 Executive Sponsors

The Executive Sponsor group is made up of University executives with responsibility for the University’s relationship with its students and/or whose budget or organizational responsibility includes the enterprise-wide computer systems affected by this proposal as identified to date. The project will be directly accountable to these sponsors, who will receive the deliverables and provide executive oversight on behalf of the University.

- Assistant Vice Chancellor Susan K. Abeles
- Assistant Vice Chancellor Thomas E. Lifka
- Vice Chancellor Sam Morabito
- Executive Dean Patricia O’Brien
- Assistant Vice Chancellor Albert C. Setton

1.3.2 Functional Sponsors

The Functional Sponsor group is made up of University management with operational responsibility for the university’s business and academic relationship with its students
and/or whose organizational responsibility includes business processes served by the enterprise-wide computer systems affected by this proposal as identified to date.

- Assistant Dean Daniel J. Bennett
- University Registrar Anita Cotter
- Associate Vice Provost Betty J. Glick
- Director Marsha Lovell
- Associate Director John D. Min
- Associate Director Kathleen A. O’Kane

1.3.3 Other Stakeholders
Other stakeholders than those in § 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 above will be identified as part of the planning process. Student input will be actively sought through focus groups assembled from various sources (e.g., the above sponsor groups, Student Government, individuals who have volunteered comments) and, to the extent feasible, such individuals will be active participants in the project.

1.3.4 Project Organization and Management
The Office of Information Technology will be responsible for the planning phase of the project. The core will be formed by a small team consisting of the OIT Director, Architecture and Infrastructure Practice, the AIS Executive Director, a project manager and staff support. To jump start the planning effort and meet timeliness constraints, the core team will make use of formal and informal external resources and relationships to obtain best practice methodologies and quickly gain expertise in tools use.

This core group will depend on contributions from functional and technical personnel from the sponsoring organizations for the substantive content. The executive and functional sponsor groups have committed to OIT that they will make these resources available on an ad hoc basis, that is, as required to inventory present and develop future processes, structures and capabilities. Initial planning activities may lead to adjustments of the core team membership.

The focus of the project is to develop the detailed plans for the migration of obsolete platforms and the concurrent “portalization” of student administrative processes. Functional Sponsors have stated their strong desire to continue making interim improvements to the existing systems. Maintenance activities (e.g., single sign-on for URSA, MY.UCLA, Parking, Housing, etc. web sites) will, therefore, continue in parallel with the planning project. Other immediate / short-term improvements may present themselves as a result of the planning process.

Since maintenance activities and redesign will call upon many of the same individuals, Functional Sponsors are expected to manage potential conflicts and insure that near-term

---

1 The present funding request only covers the project manager during the planning phase, but we do anticipate that this individual will join the implementation project to provide seamless continuity.
stop-gap changes do not endanger their resources’ ability to complete the Student Portal plan and implementation tasks.

The existing governance process for URSA maintenance will continue, but will now also need to consider whether an improvement should be made in the installed system or be deferred until the student portal. Once the plan is approved, sponsors will decide when no further changes to the old system will be made and all work effort directed toward the student portal’s development.

1.4 Summary of Work to Date

No prior work on this project has been performed.

1.5 Deliverables

1.5.1 Process Models for Student Academic and Financial Services

Our current “legacy” systems are task-centric; they enable accomplishment of function-specific tasks. To integrate these tasks into a student-centric process, one must “model” (understand in a very formal way) that end-to-end process. Such process models are for a business process what data models are for a database application.

The requirements definition phase, which is being proposed here, would develop the set of process models to be implemented as part of the functionality of a consolidated URSA/MY.UCLA student portal. These models will embody the functional requirements of the initial services provided through the student portal.

By specifying the services/capabilities needed to implement the “to be” process, one can determine which capabilities are already provided in suitable form, which need to be modified to meet the future needs, and which will need to be added. The process models will provide the roadmap for disaggregating the current systems and reintegrating their (augmented) functionality in the new portal environment.

1.5.2 Taxonomy

Our current “legacy” systems and websites present information as well as transactions to various audiences. The structure of the information and the processes is largely ad hoc and may vary from one system or context to another. This is confusing to the user as she moves from one web page to another. Providing a consistent and predictable navigation experience through a portal requires a logical grouping of human readable information and related processes. The taxonomy is the artifact that specifies how the information and processes available through the portal are organized.

Not all user interactions with a portal result in business transactions. A web site may simply publish information that is of interest but not actionable in the portal, for example, a narrative of UCLA’s history. Or, a user may go to the information about Admissions and simply acquire knowledge about the process, even though the portal provides the means to start and guide the user through the admission process.
1.5.3 Recommendation on Implementation Technologies

The student portal will, by definition, bring many systems together into a unified framework. Several combinations of hardware, software and middleware are potential infrastructure platform candidates. Choice of the platform is highly dependent on its ability to provide a robust integration environment that can accommodate the technologies that UCLA is currently using and those that will likely have to be supported in the future.

The requirements definition phase, which is being proposed here, would investigate the middleware feature sets, acquisition cost, maintenance cost, skills required to maintain, fit with the UCLA technology portfolio and other relevant dimensions to arrive at a technology architecture that is effective and can affordably be supported by the University.

1.5.4 Implementation Plan and Budget for High-Priority Development

Migrating student administrative interactions into a new environment will entail significant work on the technical as well as on the functional side. Thus, a strategic plan and timeline for implementation will be one of the deliverables of the requirements and planning phase. The previous deliverables—process models, informational content and taxonomy, and technical infrastructure—allow scenarios to be developed and priced, upon which implementation recommendations can be based. These will be presented to the Executive Sponsors for further decisions based on available budget, logical sequence and implementation priorities.
2 SCOPE

The proposed project intentionally limits its scope to harmonizing and rationalizing student financial and academic processes currently delivered through URSA and/or MY.UCLA. The temptation to solve “all” integration problems must be resisted—such grandiose endeavors almost always fail. It is far better to start by solving a few critical problems by building upon a framework that can be leveraged for other projects. The modular nature of a service-oriented architecture will allow others to build their applications on the same infrastructure.

2.1 Project Objectives

The objective of the Requirements Definition Phase is to give the Executive Sponsors detailed scope definition and a budget proposal for the implementation of a UCLA student portal. The budgets proposed in the UTIPP-2 document are essentially “placeholders;” they are at best preliminary guesses of the effort required to rewrite URSA and migrate SRDB. Combining these two activities into a larger programmatic effort is expected to yield a robust framework for delivering future services while at the same time accomplishing the original objectives of the individual projects.

2.2 Planning Process

2.2.1 Identify Candidate Tasks and Services

Working with the stakeholder group, identify candidate tasks and services that condense into a set of end-to-end processes. Use focus groups and questionnaires to include input from the student population. Prioritize the processes for analysis and implementation.

2.2.2 Develop Taxonomy

Working with the stakeholder group, identify the information domain, existing content, and any gaps that may exist. Develop the layered and hierarchical models that allow the information to be organized for coherent and consistent user presentation.

2.2.3 Develop Process Models

Based on input from review of the processes by Executive Sponsors, Functional Sponsors and Stakeholders develop a first process workflow concept and vet with these groups. Update the models as required and develop the conceptual architecture to support these process models. The models will identify both the data needed by the process as well as the human-consumable information that will enable the user to understand the context of the interaction and perform the necessary tasks or process steps.

2.2.3.1 Acquisition of Modeling Skills and Tools

One can develop process as well as data models with generic tools (Visio, Excel, Word, etc.) and considerable human effort. Models are not static; they are affected by changes in business practices anywhere along the workflow as well as by changes in technology.
Process modeling tools make creating (and refining) the models less labor-intensive\(^2\) and, once updated, they can generate a considerable portion of the workflow and information technology infrastructure needed to implement the revised model.

Since UCLA has little experience with process modeling and other architecture tools, we intend to use this modeling activity to select an appropriate toolset and familiarize a first group of architects and designers with these tools. The knowledge and skills gained are immediately transferable to other process-oriented projects as well as to various business continuity planning efforts.

2.2.4 Analyze Technical Environments
Select options for technical implementation of the business processes. Consideration will be given to the functionality required to implement the emerging process models, robustness of the middleware suite, higher education acceptance and deployment of the technology, the UCLA technology base, and capacity to interoperate in the UCLA and inter-institutional arenas. Concepts, designs, technologies and components developed and deployed at peer institutions and within the UC system will be evaluated for potential leverage. Implications for and inventory of the UCLA technical skills mix will also be analyzed. (Candidate technologies can be investigated in parallel with process model development.)

2.2.5 Develop Business Cases for High Priority Development
How quickly and how much of the present functionality will migrate to its new environment is an important decision. To enable the Executive Sponsors to make these decisions the project will develop the business cases for each of the identified processes and assess the costs and risks of each migration step.\(^3\) Tie-ins with other UCLA IT initiatives will be taken into account and they may, at times, be an implementation constraint or driver.

2.3 Processes / People Affected
This section is not applicable to the planning phase of the project. Discovery of the specific processes and people affected is one of the deliverables of the requirements phase.

2.4 Technologies / Systems Affected
This section is not applicable: an assessment of the specific technologies and systems that will be affected and/or added to the UCLA portfolio is one of the deliverables of the requirements phase.

\(^2\) An integrated toolset built on a metadata repository makes updates immediately visible to all users.

\(^3\) We propose to migrate functionality step by step, enabling campus benefits to be realized as quickly as possible and allowing mid-course corrections to the roll-out plans when and if necessary.
2.5 **Budget**

2.6 **Formal Reporting and Reviews**
The project’s formal reporting and review processes will be developed during the planning phase.

2.7 **Management of Changes to Scope, Schedule and Assumptions**
The project’s change management approach will be developed during the planning phase.

2.8 **Exclusions**
It is recognized that URSA, MY.UCLA, and the SRDB that supports them, serve other stakeholders and academic processes. The project is focused on migrating components that are immediately affected by the end of support for Visual Basic/ASP, but it will make specific recommendations for the migration of the remaining components. Conversely, activities in CCLE and other areas will be considered, but only to enable their eventual integration into a common student portal.
3 SCHEDULE

3.1 Lifecycle Model
The selection of the project development lifecycle will be an outcome of the planning phase. We do, however, expect to take the following approach.

- An initial phase in which detailed plans and final scope options are worked out.
- Parallel maintenance activities of legacy systems, until a new, comprehensive plan is approved.
- Upon approval, the migration will be done incrementally, that is, first the portal framework will be set up, then functionality will migrate to the portal as individual components are ready to come into that infrastructure.

This approach would allow the migration of the preponderance of URSA/MY.UCLA during the 2007-2008 academic year as modules are ready. This approach will allow the benefits of single sign-on and functional integration to be realized as quickly as possible, and will allow parallel development and deployment of capability to the portal by multiple units.

Implicit in this fairly aggressive implementation schedule is the assumption that infrastructure components already deployed at UCLA and/or our sister campuses can be leveraged, and stakeholder organizations can migrate their systems in parallel. Even if not all internal capabilities can be accommodated, it would allow the student-interaction activities to use the new portal. This limits institutional risk, since internal use is more easily isolated and thus secured than outside use.

### Table 1 – Major Milestones and Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Milestones</th>
<th>Major Activities</th>
<th>Associated Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2006</td>
<td>CITI approves approach and funds planning phase</td>
<td>Initial draft PCD (i.e., this document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2007</td>
<td>CITI funds implementation</td>
<td>Detailed plan (see § 1.5, pg.6–7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Dependencies
The planning project will identify the detailed interdependencies between the Student Portal and other systems and/or systems initiatives. The project’s major dependencies are the end of technical support for Visual Basic and integration with the SR2 student records system.

3.3 Staffing
A detailed staffing plan will be developed during the planning phase.
Table 2 – Critical Resource Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Member</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Potential Disruptions to Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Subcontractor Management

In order to “jump start” this project we expect to make use of external expertise in business process analysis, modeling and design, as well as in the use of relevant tools. The consulting activities will be in support of the project members and not to “outsource” these tasks. Quite the opposite: we believe that it is crucial for UCLA to develop internal expertise and to have UCLA personnel acquire and analyze the planning data so it can be leveraged throughout the institution.

### 3.5 Risk Management

This project will lead us in new directions. To minimize the risks inherent in these changes, the Office of Information Technology (OIT) will provide support to the project with change management (coordinating inter-organizational collaboration as representative of executive sponsors in their role as management oversight group) and external expertise will be used to assist in bringing the institution up to speed with new architecture, portfolio management, inventory and design tools.

The desire to make short-term, stop-gap changes to the existing systems may cause resource allocation prioritization conflicts for the affected units. Achieving the proper level of effort balance will require on-going attention. The potential to attempt to resolve present issues within the current technology is recognized. Careful attention needs to be paid to the scope of these interim measures, since their useful life will, in most cases, be very short while their long-term potential to disrupt the project’s ability to perform is large.

### 3.6 Contingencies
4 ASSUMPTIONS
This chapter normally contains the planning assumptions for the project schedule, it will be generated during the planning step.

4.1 Planning

4.2 Third Party Commitments

4.3 Expected Loads and/or Transaction Volumes

4.4 Technologies – Hardware and Software

4.5 Non-Schedule Risks

4.6 Non-Schedule Contingencies

4.7 Deployment

4.8 Funding
5 SIGNATURES

This space will be used for sponsors to express their concurrence with and support of the project proposal that will be generated during the planning phase.
6 REFERENCES AND ATTACHMENTS
This space is reserved for the planning team to provide references and other attachments.
APPENDIX A THE “PARENT EXPERIENCE”

I am sure you have heard this before, but in a spirit of constructive criticism I submit the following. It is very frustrating dealing with the non-integrated student and financial systems at UCLA:

- URSA, Enterprise messaging, MyHousing, BOL - why all these separate systems
- Housing and Fees billing accounts are separate
- Financial aid instead of being applied against account is endorsed by UCLA officials and sent back to me

Here on Sunday October 8, 2006 9 - 11 AM PT is the most recent example of my typically frustrating sessions on UCLA student systems. I wanted to pay the October Housing payment which has a $25 penalty if paid after Oct 10. I went to URSA to view my son’s account and check payment due amount, and make payment. No luck, URSA down for regular maintenance until this evening. But I recall that there are other potential ways to access and pay bills.

Next, I check a previous email from Housing about bills, and it tells me to go to www.housing.ucla.edu/myhousing and it takes me to Enterprising Messaging which I try all usernames and password ( as you know there are inexplicitly, at least two separate at last count URSA, BOL). I cannot get in. Then I give it one more try and go to MYHousing.

I go to back to Home, Current Students and get to myHousing page, then try NEW! View Account Balance (beta): I log in successfully, and check my account to see a new Oct Housing payment due. Great. I click on Make a Payment and the screen says Your scheduled monthly rent is $0.00. So, I think that perhaps one of my loans has finally been applied properly to my account. However, I decide to go back to MyHousing and click on Housing Payments: Submit your monthly or quarterly housing payment using your credit card. I click show all and finally, I see a payment schedule which shows a balance of $1,325 and I go ahead a pay it.

My humble suggestions:

- A single student portal with a single username/password.
- This portal allows access to all other systems - financial and otherwise
- Combine all financial related accounts into a single student financial account for housing and fees
- Apply financial aid against this student financial account
- Send email messages each month to announcement account balance and payment due info, along with link to make a payment.

Oh, and don’t do maintenance all day the day before payments are due
APPENDIX B THE “STUDENT EXPERIENCE”

B - 1 A Graduate Student in Computer Science Writes

Here are some comments regarding URSA.

- the enrollment menu

this is the area of most frustration to me (as I hear many of my colleagues) selecting classes is made very difficult with the URSA system. It is more complicated than just flipping through a printed catalog of courses -- at least then you can directly compare classes, see the full name of teaching professor, and the scheduled times.

to break this comment down into specifics, here is some currently missing functionality (that should be available from the "enrollment->search for classes area"

- the courses need to have their titles showing instead of a string of numbers. currently the user is forced to have at least two windows open (the school's catalog web site, and the URSA site, keep flipping between the two, searching for a course in one, copy pasting the number string into the other browsers' find window and locating that course. this entire obfuscation could be done away with just by showing the title of the course.

- naturally the title of the course should link to the registrar's course description for the class.

- there should also be a second link to the actual course page for the class (available directly from the course-listing-result in URSA's search (not on the catalog page)). I understand this problem is a bit beyond just the scope of URSA, as each school/dept will have their own web preferences. But in either case, it should be really easy for the professor to specify his/her desired web address for that link. Often the professors choose to use their own homepage instead of the default school page, and then it's very difficult to learn about the class in advance (or if one has to miss the first lecture, when the professor then verbally communicates that address -- otherwise it's often near impossible to find).

- searching for a class

One like the registrar's page is needed. it's got all the basics and is the saving grace of this whole process.

Below are some of the examples of features that are in the registrar's search that should be available in the URSA enrollment find a class search

- search by professor, to see all the courses he/she is teaching in a give quarter (without having to specify a department --> very important, as sometimes professors are listed under their less expected appointment)

- search by keyword -- in course descriptions, titles, and prof. names

- search with time restrictions

-the page : Find a Class & Enroll - Select Class, should really be the search page, where you can set constraints on the list that will be presented as a result (as suggested above).

- i've attached (see below) a sample screenshot of the course listing currently produced as the result of using "find a class". this looks like a screen the registrar could potentially handle, full of information to a reader who knows what is what and is only interested in numbers. as a student, i am more concerned about seeing the names of the courses and professors, and the times of offering, so as to allow quick comparisons (the class size and # students registered is important too however).
- one of the solutions to potentially gain more space for the above mentioned items, is to collapse "add", "exch class", "exch sect" into a pull down menu of "actions". very intuitive, and does not take up much space.

- conflict resolution . i don't recall very specific details about this process here, except some frustration with the process. often fueled by the consistent need for me to copy and paste long strings of numbers between browsers. i can't attempt this at this time on URSA, but will try to find some more specific comments if it happens when i register next.

- a desirable feature:  
  - ability to check if the class is offered next quarter? or when next?  
  this sounds like a dream, and i understand it has implications that go beyond URSA and into scheduling and administration, however in many cases classes are offered on a regular schedule. making this indication more salient would be fantastic.

- lack of global navigation menus. When a user enters into sub-menus, they are unable to directly access another region of the system, without having to locate and click the "main menu" button, and then selecting the new destination.

- financial aid  
  financial site is a bit weird. i have not had to use it very much.
- my ucla
  - i also don't have any use for it. email page. don't use it. it's also pretty obtuse.

-campus events
  campus events calendar is an example of a really useful feature, that works well, is accessible to all (especially visitors).

- campus calendar
  http://www.calendar.ucla.edu/ it's very great and i appreciate it a lot.
  
  one feature i would love to add is a static address for the day's events like http://www.calendar.ucla.edu/today instead of
  
  http://www.calendar.ucla.edu/search_results.cfm?string=&category=&location=&Beginning_Date=06%2F05%2F2006&Ending_Date=06%2F05%2F2006&orderby=Meeting.MtDate&EndRow=0&StartRow=-24&NextCount=25&form=0&search=Search (but that's minor)

-more on URSA
  sometimes the system is down (which is understandable), but sometimes it's early in the morning, which is not so understandable.

  - with URSA registering for classes is made more difficult than with a printed catalog and a piece of paper. For instance with a printed catalog one can quickly compare courses and their descriptions, teaching faculty, and offered times to make decisions. Such comparisons are currently near impossible to make under URSA constraints.

my background:
  - I am a PhD student in the Computer Science department
  
  - I've had a chance to use other school's online registration systems, and in both cases they have proved easier to use and more powerful than the system here.

    - starting in 1997 at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI), NY. they had a fully functional web-based course registration system. while it was simple at first and matured with time, from day 1 it was designed for the students, and not to accommodate the "technical limitations". ie. the design was user-driven not equipment driven (ie. database format). Thus the resulting system made it easy to search for classes, compare classes, resolve time conflicts .

    - the second system i have used was at NYU. while it was a bit more obfuscated than at RPI, it still made it possible to quickly figure out what courses were offered during the term, who was teaching them, and what they were about.

Thank you very much for considering my comments about URSA. I much appreciate it and hope that URSA continues developing to facilitate the interactions its intended for.

Best regards,
B - 2  A Graduate Student in Public Health Writes

Subject: suggestions for student website improvement

To MyUCLA, URSA, BOL email, and Registrar IT people:

Welcome back to another academic year at UCLA. I am a doctoral student beginning my 5th year of graduate study here and once again find myself horribly confused by all the different websites I need to go to.

Is there any way to create a single portal for students that would include university records system access, official notices, course descriptions, and email? I did my bachelor's degree at the University of Michigan, and all of these important student services were accessible through a portal called Wolverine Access. In fact, alumni have Wolverine Access as well, and can order transcripts, print student financial account information, and check email just as we could as students.

Let me explain why I find the multiple websites at UCLA confusing, by offering my understanding of the different websites:

MyUCLA: not good for much for grad students. Only useful if your professor is using the grade reporting system (very few profs in the social sciences or public health use this). Webmail via MyUCLA looks different and has less space than mail accessed through BOL email. In addition, I was supposed to have received a "missing paperwork" notice from grad division fellowships office on Sept. 21 via MYUCLA, but it isn't there (not to mention that I go on MyUCLA about four times a year, so I wouldn't have seen it there for months anyways. MyUCLA has nothing of use or interest to me.)

URSA: Good for checking BAR account, but usually my direct deposits are in my bank account before they actually show up on the URSA BAR accounts page. Also necessary for enrolling in classes, though you can only see the course number, not the registrar course description, via this page. That means that on the day of your enrollment appointment, you have to constantly flip between the URSA webpage and the Registrar [Schedule of Classes] page in order to know for what you are enrolling.

BOL email [mail.ucla.edu]: straightforward, basic email system

Registrar: Good for getting the academic calendar and finding out what courses are offered when.

Keep in mind, too, that these multiple websites are over and above those for financial aid ([https://www.fao.ucla.edu/myfao/](https://www.fao.ucla.edu/myfao/)), the Ashe Student Health Center ([http://www.studenthealth.ucla.edu/](http://www.studenthealth.ucla.edu/)), and all the different sites for classes. I hope you can understand how hard it is to keep track of all these sites, all the passwords, and all the different message/notice systems for each.

That is why I suggest that at the very least, the main student services websites of MyUCLA, URSA, BOL email, and the Registrar's office be linked in one portal that would require one login.

I do hope you take this idea into consideration.
APPENDIX C  THE DAILY BRUIN COMMENTARY

C - 1 Editorial: UCLA ought to unify, update Web services

Eight years ago, UCLA was a pioneer online. But the digital aspect of our university has become stagnant. From MyUCLA to class Web sites, UCLA is stuck in the era of dial-up – to the detriment of its students.

Every quarter, undergraduates must trudge through an unnecessarily complex set of Web sites of varying usefulness: department homepages to check requirements, the registrar's course listings and MyUCLA to plan classes, UCLApromessors.com to read reviews, URSA to enroll and pay, then a mix of Blackboard, E-Campus and social science Web sites (all with unique interfaces, login requirements and features) to interact with their classes.

The fragmentation is hardly useful and, as the pace of Internet innovation has quickened, UCLA looks painfully stuck in 1997.

In those eight years, the Internet has unquestionably become a tightly woven aspect of undergraduate education. For example, on the first day of classes this quarter, more than 21,000 undergraduates logged on to MyUCLA 73,000 times, according to UCLA College, which maintains the site.

The magnitude and speed of the university's initial online push was impressive. Ask any alum (even from the Class of 1996) about standing in line at Murphy Hall to register for classes or pay fees, and you'll appreciate the strides MyUCLA and URSA has made for students. The jump from zero course Web sites to thousands is equally impressive. But UCLA has been dragging its feet. What we need today is an equally exciting period of innovation. Technology has matured, but Web sites at UCLA have not.

It would be naive to pretend the resources aren't available. UCLA has ample access to 24,000 undergraduates who have lived and breathed zeros and ones for much of their lives. Even if every student can't program, they can suggest and critique ways to bridge the digital divide between the university's current offerings and its potential. Administrators say they plan to actively tap the minds of students – smart, but long overdue.

Those same students are also forking over $6 per unit for most classes, which generates nearly $3 million annually. The instructional enhancement fee funds much of the software, hardware and manpower behind UCLA's current set of digital offerings – but because there is so much isolation and duplication in utility among the services, it's easy to suspect some of the fee money is going to unproductive waste.

Students should be able to use MyUCLA for every aspect of their academic lives. MyUCLA should host the schedule of classes and, after building your study list each quarter, automatically enroll you when your appointment arrives. Course and professor evaluations should be searchable (despite the reluctance of the university to make such data accessible). And, MyUCLA should aggregate messages from classmates, notices from professors and due dates for assignments directly on your homepage.

MyUCLA doesn't need to serve as the portal for student life – thefacebook.com and bruinwalk.com serve that purpose.

Unifying, centralizing and updating UCLA's academic Web services is a daunting task, but the pace of change should quicken under strong and focused leadership.

The Internet is no longer a novelty. It's a vital and still under-utilized component of our education. The quicker UCLA addresses the fragmentation and stagnation plaguing its online presence, the quicker its students will benefit.
COLUMN: COMMUNICATION AS A PIPE DREAM

UCLA NEEDS TO REFORM INFORMATION NETWORK TO ENSURE THAT STUDENTS STAY AWARE AND SAFE

By Noor Hashem

DAILY BRUIN SENIOR STAFF

nhashem@media.ucla.edu

Late Wednesday night, my friend online had the away message "water water everywhere and not a drop to drink." She's a lifeguard with late-night training, and considering her earlier away messages, I just assumed that was what she was referring to.

It wasn't until Thursday afternoon that I found out what she was talking about – after three classes and lunch, when I finally came out of my midterm cave and talked to some friends.

Good communication is one of the keys to a fruitful relationship. And I expect the most out of my relationship with UCLA. So when I found out about the water issue almost a full day after the fact, I felt like I had slipped through the cracks of a huge system that I like to call home.

The water turned out uncontaminated in the end, and the boiling measures only precautionary. I was safe from possible stomach discomfort. In retrospect, it actually seems a little silly to have worried so much. But I realize my anxiety came more from a leaky information system than from a leaky pipe.

I have to appreciate that at a sprawling, decentralized campus such as UCLA, the effort to reach everyone is quite complicated. According to Assistant Vice Chancellor of University Communications Lawrence Lokman, e-mail is "by no means the primary method which we would rely on to communicate to the campus community." It is only a support means, along with other information networks that are used. "The emergency mass e-mailing system is meant to get the message out faster," he said, but other means ensure that everyone will be informed.

But, somehow, I was not informed.

The e-mailing system, it turns out, works in a tree-structure method. The university, to save time, sends out one e-mail to each campus e-mail system (consider all the different servers some professors are on, like humnet.ucla.edu).

That server is then required to send the e-mail to all its members. With this method, using third-party e-mail services such as Yahoo! and Hotmail becomes problematic because they can mistake the mail as spam and filter it out.

Don Worth, director of administrative information systems, mentioned a move toward centralizing the e-mail system in order to keep students better informed. The problem is not gathering all the e-mail addresses – 99 percent of students have registered an e-mail with Murphy Hall – the problem lies in that the majority are not Bruin Online accounts.

Worth said that the university was looking at getting consistency in e-mail addresses for students,
which would involve every student using the UCLA e-mail system.

I think that's a smart move. It seems the most natural thing to use the UCLA e-mail system for is important UCLA-related e-mails. I myself have three e-mail addresses that I try to keep separate – one for personal use, one for school use and one for The Bruin.

If all students checked their official UCLA e-mail accounts, information dissemination would be much more reliable.

But my Bruin Online e-mail address is the official address I have listed on URSA, and I did not get the emergency e-mail mentioned above. I'm not the only one – I know a good number of people who did not get the e-mail.

Considering that e-mail is only a support method of information communication, I have to give credit where credit is due – the Department of Water and Power signs were everywhere.

But they were missing one vital piece of information: Who does this affect? I stood reading the sign, drinking my tap-filled water bottle, wondering how many people actually drink from on-campus water fountains.

It would have seemed most natural to me to get a message from MyUCLA. When speaking with Director of College Information Services Eric Splaver, he agreed. However, no one put in a request to post a notice about the water, and he said it slipped his mind to add it himself. He said he realized that if he lived in the area he might have found it more urgent.

I am glad for the precautionary measures that were taken. Securing the campus in two-and-a-half hours is quite a feat. And the information turned out to be there – if you looked for it. Still, the initial announcement to the students was lacking.

Getting the students to all use Bruin Online does not seem unreasonable. Requesting posts on MyUCLA would also be helpful (it was very helpful, for example, when the posting on MyUCLA informed me that the water was finally declared safe to use and drink).

If they can fix a major water pipe leak, then we can fix our information leak and improve UCLA as a whole.
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I. Executive Summary

On June 23, 2006 over sixty staff, faculty and students representing UC’s ten campuses and the Office of the President met in Oakland to participate in a discussion about how information technology is being and could be used to inform, engage and support prospective and current students.

Context – Exploring Information Technology Opportunities Systemwide

The discussion was the first of several being planned with various UC stakeholders by the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/). The ITGC has been established by Provost Rory Hume to engage in a consultative, 18-month systemwide planning process to identify and recommend strategic directions to guide investments in information technology (IT) and the academic information environment for the University of California. The ITGC has identified six initial areas of exploration:

- Advanced Networking Services
- Common IT Architecture
- High Performance Research Computing
- Instructional Technology
- IT in Student Experience
- Stewardship of Digital Assets

Take Away Messages

Several key themes emerged during the discussion:

1. Enriching and improving the experience of students throughout their lifecycle (from prospective, through current, to graduated students) is both strategic and mission critical for the University of California.
2. Information technology provides essential tools for UC to communicate and transact essential business with, cultivate affinity among, and enrich the lives of its students throughout their lifecycle.
3. As part of the ITGC planning process UC has the opportunity to identify leverage points for cross-campus or systemwide investment and action that will lead to efficiencies in, and increased capacity for, offering IT-mediated services and support to students.
4. UC needs increased capacity for experimentation and innovation in creating student-facing systems and applications so that it can be more responsive to student IT needs and expectations.

The organizers of the discussion took away the message that these things can and should happen and that the UC Office of the President can play a useful role, particularly by facilitating dialogue across the many functional areas of the University that intersect with students.

Working Definition of Student Experience

For the purposes of the June 23 discussion, student experience was defined as: “How current and prospective students engage with and experience the University (outside of classrooms and labs).”

Participants

The participants in the June 23rd discussion on IT in Student Experience were drawn from diverse functional areas, including Academic Preparation, Admissions and Enrollment,
Focus and Outcomes of the June 23rd Discussion

The focus for the five-hour session was emerging issues and IT opportunities related to student experience, rather than a complete inventory of current IT needs. Led by Associate Vice Provost Dan Greenstein, who is a co-coordinator of the ITGC along with Associate Vice President Kristine Hafner, and ITGC Consultants Katherine Mitchell and Paula Murphy, participants engaged – in small groups and as a whole – in a series of activities to brainstorm and synthesize ideas to:

- create a better understanding of the prospective and current student experience, and the trends that shape it, at UC;
- explore the implications for IT;
- develop a list of potential opportunities for systemwide and/or cross-campus IT collaboration or coordination; and
- engage in meaningful discussion across “silos” and functional areas.

Hearing from Students

During a lunchtime panel session the students in attendance gave examples of how they use technology in a typical day. Examples include:

- Being required to use “clickers” (remote-control voting systems) to take pop quizzes in class;
- Engaging in online chats with other students to try to understand certain points being made by instructor during class;
- Participating in conferences and panel discussions via video conferencing;
- Getting the day’s news by reading Blogs and checking RSS feeds.

They also made several suggestions for how UC could use IT to enhance their experience, including:

- Students are an untapped resource. Involve students on the front end, instead of the backend, when developing student-facing systems.
- Make the content of the University open.
- Leverage the work students are doing, in classrooms, for example, for benefit of all.
- Keep Wikipedia entries about the UC campuses up to date.
- Use blogs and RSS to communicate information to students.
- Publish an integrated systemwide online course catalog and online directory so that students can find courses and information across the system.
- Develop a systemwide Wiki environment so students can create, share and stay in sync while working on project collaborations.
- If you want technology to be a factor in students’ selection process of campuses, put information about it on the Admissions section of the campus web sites.

Describing IT in the Student Experience Now and in 5 Years

We asked participants how they would describe “IT in the Student Experience” as it exists now and how they would like to describe it in five years from now. The most commonly expressed ideas were:

---

1 A complete list of invited participants can be found at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/itgc/focusareas/student/062306_attendees.pdf.

2 RSS stands for Really Simple Syndication. It enables content to be delivered to web browsers by subscription. A definition can be found on Wikipedia at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RSS_(file_format)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words to describe NOW</th>
<th>Words you would like to describe 5 YEARS FROM NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confusing/frustrating/challenging (most commonly expressed concept by far)</td>
<td>• Integrated/seamless/easy (most commonly expressed concept by far)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Silo-ed</td>
<td>• Virtual/high-tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging/dynamic/exciting</td>
<td>• Fulfilling/satisfying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse/multi-dimensional</td>
<td>• Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social</td>
<td>• Social/Collaborative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also asked for ideas for how UC might get from now (confusing) to the future (seamless). Suggestions were:

- Create UC-wide list of majors with prospective applicants
- One portal for all university information
- Usability testing in context of breadth of student services, student-centered design
- Consistency; all course web sites have baseline and accurate information
- Assess value to student; what’s the middleground? Pick low-hanging fruit to address
- Provide “sandboxes”; encourage creative solutions
- Put all course reserves online
- Use only one course management system
- Make information easier to find on web sites
- Centralized agreements on definitions, data, standards, formats (on selected topics)
- More money

**Big Ideas**

We asked participants to write down big ideas for how UC could enhance the student experience. A full list of those ideas is attached at the end of the document. Some of the themes that emerged are:

- Build portals to provide integrated and easily accessible information
- Centralize help desk operations
- Use social networking software, such as Facebook, to engage students and build community
- Make more use of podcasting for distributing course content as well as public events
- Develop applications and systems so that they are standards-based and can be integrated with other systems and across campuses
- Standardize e-transcripts
- Encourage collaboration by providing useful collaboration tools and funding
- Involve students in the development process of student systems
- Provide more professional development opportunities for IT professionals and facilitate sharing of expertise and best practices across the system

Although the primary focus of the June 23rd discussion was intended to be on how students engage with and experience the University *outside of the classroom and lab* (because the ITGC has a separate work group focused on instructional technology), a good portion of the discussion was in fact on academic uses of IT. We discovered that for students IT use is ubiquitous and it is almost impossible to have a conversation about the student experience and not talk about course web sites, how instructors use technology in the classroom, etc.
This experience reaffirms the ITGC’s plan to closely link the Student Experience and Instructional Technology activities.

Several themes and ideas emerged throughout the course of the day. Outlined in the next section is a list of those themes that the ITGC plans to explore in more depth this fall and winter through a variety of consultations with UC stakeholders. A list of those activities can be found in Section III of this report.

II. Preliminary list of focus areas/themes for further exploration by ITGC

Participants generated many ideas about IT opportunities for UC systemwide activity (a complete list of ideas is attached). Below is a preliminary list of focus areas (which includes many of those ideas) that will be explored in the coming months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area/Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>May have implications for these ITGC Work Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open vs. closed content and courseware</td>
<td>A growing number of institutions of higher ed have committed to openly sharing their intellectual resources on the web. The ITGC will explore how the UC system might benefit from participating in this movement, how the campuses might work together to do so, and the policies (e.g., IP) and practices (e.g., faculty reward) that may need revising to encourage and enable the production and distribution of open content.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also an overall “Big Idea” identified for exploration by the ITGC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity management</td>
<td>Students (prospective, current and graduated) often are required to log in to several systems in the course of a day (e.g., email, learning management system, financial aid system, etc.) And if they need to enroll in a course on another campus, they must manage multiple ids. A shared identity management strategy across the system has the potential to reduce duplicate/redundant systems and to improve service to students.</td>
<td>Common IT Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information interoperability of, and access to, student-facing systems</td>
<td>Students complain about a lack of consistency among student-facing systems as well as the sheer number that they must access. Staff time is not used efficiently when information must be duplicated or re-created and when developing systems without building on the expertise already attained by others. More efficient and smarter services could be provided if systems were built to standards, access was made easier (via portals, for example) and if practices were put into place that encouraged sharing of information across functional areas.</td>
<td>Common IT Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eportfolio/persistent data storage for students</td>
<td>UC could provide a valuable service to students throughout their lifecycle by providing them with an online repository to store and access their academic output. Such a system would allow them to set permissions for access so that they can share with potential employers, other institutions of higher education, etc. Because eportfolios have not been widely rolled out on any of the UC campuses, the timing may be right to engage the system to develop and implement in a coordinated fashion.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area/Theme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>May have implications for these ITGC Work Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline IT provision for every student</td>
<td>The student experience could be greatly enhanced if every UC student could expect a baseline level of IT service, and was required to meet an established standard of information literacy. Such a standard could result in more effective design and delivery of services because they are built upon basic assumptions about students’ access and competency with information technology. It could also lead to efficiencies if there were systemwide licensing for equipment, support, training, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online social networks and how they can be leveraged for community development</td>
<td>Today’s students are accustomed to interacting with peers via online social networks and developing friendships and communities of interest online. Incorporating best practices and tools from these online social networks into UC systems and practices that enable community building for UC students could add a supportive resource for students, for both academic and extracurricular endeavors. The campuses could explore together the potential of harnessing the power of online social networks for benefit of the student experience and any policies or practices that might need to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online courses</td>
<td>Students increasingly expect to have more choice and convenience when it comes to taking courses. A growing number of students must work to pay for their education, requiring more flexibility in scheduling in order to get to degree in a timely manner. The UC system could work together to develop the technological infrastructure, as well as policies and practices, to enable this convenience, choice, and affordability, leveraging the unique strengths of the campuses in deciding which courses or roles they contribute.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing stability &amp; innovation in provision of student-facing services</td>
<td>Explore how UC can become a more innovative place in which to develop web-based services for students and how it can leverage the expertise that exists on the campuses for benefit of all. Explore how students factor into this equation and how to give them more of a voice, and stake, in the development and provision of their services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Proposed ITGC Activities related to IT in Student Experience

Proposed activities to explore how to build community, foster discussion, identify potential systemwide activities and move toward practical implementation:

- Meet with UC enrollment management and technology professionals to further explore strategic directions (systemwide meeting on Oct. 17-18, 2006);
- Convene a small group to review the input gathered and discuss how best to advance the issues raised;
- Establish a listserv to continue the dialogue (details can be found in the next section of the report).

Additional possible activities include:

- Consult with external relations, alumni relations, university relations folks from across the system about alumni experience; review preliminary focus areas based on June 23 discussion;
- Gather data about IT in Student Experience from across system, state, and nation;
- Convene regional symposia to explore focus areas that emerged from the June 23 discussion; include students from the UC campuses as well as people who serve prospective, current, and graduated students.

IV. Ideas for community building/continuing the dialogue

The overwhelming response to the invitation to the systemwide discussion, including more participants than had RSVP’d, as well as the feedback from the participants after the meeting suggests that there is an urgency and strategic importance in continuing the dialogue that was initiated on June 23. We discovered that part of the eagerness to participate in a UCOP organized discussion is that at most campuses, student experience functions are distributed across several divisions, often making coordination and clear decision making challenging at a campus level.

In addition to continuing its consultation activities in this area, UCOP will explore how communication and collaboration can be facilitated on an ongoing basis between students, staff and faculty across departments, campuses and functional areas.

As an initial step, a listserv for IT in the Student Experience (ITGC-SE-L@listserv.ucop.edu) has been established. The subscription list was pre-populated with all of the people who were invited to participate in the June 23 discussion.

If you wish to unsubscribe, send a message to listserv@ucop.edu with the following command in the body:

Unsubscribe ITGC-SE-L

To recommend that additional people be added, please send their names to paula.murphy@ucop.edu.

The ITGC will occasionally send updates to the listserv on its activities, specifically those relating to IT in the Student Experience. As subscribers, feel free to use the list to send out messages and inquiries as appropriate. If demand warrants, additional listservs can be established for specific issues so that this list remains relevant to a diverse audience.

If you have additional ideas about how systemwide communication about IT in the student experience could be facilitated, please send them to the listserv or directly to paula.murphy@ucop.edu.
Appendices:

1. Suggestions from Systemwide Discussion on IT in Student Experience (OptionFinder exercise to vote on ideas on IT implications for UC)

2. “Big Ideas” (Participants wrote these down during the June 23 session)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas on IT implications for UC (sorted by average)</th>
<th>% no potential (1)</th>
<th>% low potential (2)</th>
<th>% high potential (3)</th>
<th>% Systemwide only (4)</th>
<th>Total % chose 3 or 4</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide directory for students, faculty and staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Identity &amp; Security)</em> Lower bar to access to security tools (site licensing)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open vs. Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent branding for all official UC web pages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Social Networking)</em> Policy implications for social networks (e.g., confidentiality,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging campus strengths/best practices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Interoperability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Diversity)</em> Enable K-12 students to develop skill sets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Wireless; anytime, anywhere)</em> Proper structuring of resources (centralized, distributed, allocation of funding)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent data storage for students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Greater student indebtedness)</em> Administrative systems must be efficient</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Integration of technology; optional physical campus)</em> Create level playing field for technology (access/provision)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Increasing student IT sophistication)</em> Create incentives for institution to meet student expectations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Identity &amp; Security)</em> Identity management/lifelong relationships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard administrative systems across campuses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Wireless; anytime, anywhere)</em> Changing model to enable anytime, anyhow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct (database) access to all public information</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Higher tuition &amp; fees)</em> Online courses to get students to degree quickly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Greater student indebtedness)</em> Balancing stability and innovation re: provision of IT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Social Networking)</em> Choosing technology that is flexible and has grown organically for social networks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Diversity)</em> Framework for student control of education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Increasing student IT sophistication)</em> Do better job of involving students in design of services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Integration of technology; optional physical campus)</em> Respond to faculty/student IT needs and wants (for recruitment and retention)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus student computing groups (to communicate with administration, etc.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Higher tuition &amp; fees)</em> Campus services social network (to enable quicker time to</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants wrote these "big ideas" down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

| One stop page for students to manage the campus ListServes & newletters they belong to. |
| System wide student focus groups & other forms of assessment to keep abreast of students' use of information technology both in & out of the classroom. |
| Students want to be able to author rich content in order to express their ideas -- audio, video, web pages, presentation. We need to provide them with hardware, software, IT human resources, & computing resources in order to meet this need. UCSF struggles in this particular area because other campuses have CS/CIS programs that can assist with such needs. This lack of computing resources needs to be recognized in order for it to be corrected. |
| All campus entities move to RSS for news delivery. |
| To move from now (confusing) to easy (streamlined): better online collaboration tools, communication tools, student feedback, & student integration into systems design. |
| Greater UC systemwide leadership in encouraging systems integration (I'm thinking primarily about student systems, but this would also apply to administrative systems). Eliminate silos. |
| Systemwide facilitation of discussions about "best practices" in terms of IT development on individual campuses. |
| Systemwide "minimal standards" for IT services & systems, not in the sense of imposing new requirements, but rather to share expertise & positive experiences & success stories. |
| We need to have a broader/clearer/more robust definition of IT. |

| IT discussions would be more useful if they took place in broader contexts (for example, in exit interviews. How much student satisfaction even has to do with IT issues as compared to other issues). |
| How do the different stakeholders in the higher ed experience talk with each other re these issues? Today's conversation about student experience outside the classroom, for example, paid little attention to whether/if the educational experience (in or outside the classroom) was even important in the UC mission. How does that absence skew the whole set of larger questions about the role of IT? |
| User-driven cf. provider-driven. |
| Define standard web services for core student system functions, i.e., display class list; verify registration; enroll in courses. Have each campus build to these standards. |
| Elevate profession of user interface professionals, i.e., those people responsible for presenting info to users. We have similar efforts for "managers" (mgmt institute), meetings of high level admins, COC, VC meetings, etc. |
| Open-source one campus's student management system. Poll the students, accept patches. See what happens, |
| Provide hosting for school-related apps & allow students to get hostnames for them (e.g., myapp.uccampusdomain.edu). This would be for Wikis & other things. Give them access to a database … etc. |
| Make it so that students can see how their feedback is being handled. Semi-public bugtracking/feature request system? |
| Email accounts shouldn't go away after students graduate. |
| Strengthen privacy protection in systemwide policies regarding student data to levels of private firms. |
| Offer anonymous email addresses for use in reporting issues that people don't want to come from them. Establish coordinated/standardized campus websites/info to enable easier comparison across campus for prospective students and parents (e.g., an on-line tool allowing students/parents to compare financial aid awards/education financing options). Or, if coordination is not possible, at least a road map (links) to comparable information on a topic at all campuses. |
Adoption of higher federal standards required for electronic signatures and use of electronic notification in areas where such higher specialized standards (over and above the esign act) are specified (e.g., financial aid, W-2 report, etc.)

Use of webcasts as outreach tool to prospective students in outlying area.

Way to separate important UC email communication from spam/junk.

Develop standard definition of frequently requested data items as prerequisite to defining standardized informational websites to provide comparable (apples-to-apples) info.

Don't be afraid to use what the students are using (facebook, ipods, etc) & don't let the process of implementation get bogged down in a bureaucracy.

Use campus radio station for communicating with students, use for voice work on podcasting, using music majors who can sing for voice work.

Put a T.V. with campus station in dorms, student center, etc.

Make students subscribe to a ListServ.

Provide portals -- students are all about customization.

Provide students with cell phones & send them messages like the phone company does.

Provide all students with laptop option.

Videoconferencing.

Web cast education

Real-time chat @ help desk -- much like commercial sites.

In 5 years: communication between departments to streamline.

Statistics about UC, its campuses, salaries, retention, finances, enrollment, etc., in one place that is searchable.

More usability testing with students.

Easier remote access -- one system.

Systemwide resources for facilities & ergonomic upgrades to support technology enhancements.

More filmcasting of concerts, lectures, art openings

Productive search capabilities for campus/dept. web sites

Student portals (as well as staff/faculty portals) conformable to each student showing available resources depending on major, extracurricular interests and class schedule.

Email priority system to specially tag emails from Deans/Faculty/TAs & Advisors.

Method to determine ID of student with returned email after forwarding to hotmail, yahoo, etc.

"Reverse directory" so students can be ID'd by email address

Email protocol training for students (use name, be polite, student ID#, wait 24-48 hr for response.

Make IT affordable for students if implemented.

Make sure the IT works before implementing it.

Make all professors use what IT is on hand.

Have an IT training class (intro) for Google for both faculty & students .

Wi-Fi=Good. Bad Wi-Fi=Insanity.

Message boards across campuses b/w same majors. [Poli Sci msg board, Bio msg board, etc....]

Campus-endorsed and -run "facebook" accounts.

Announcements made through facebook, mySpace, Xanga, Livejournal, etc.

Make all course reserves available online.

Blackboard or WebCT - choose! PLEASE!

Engage & capture in ongoing way the IT perspectives of prospective UC students and alumni to help UC student affairs keep evolving re IT.

When working systemwide, also focus on/recognize individual campus perspectives and activities, i.e., a systemwide approach needs to balance & foster both the individual campus interests & the systemwide activities.
"Big Ideas" generated at UC Systemwide Discussion

Participants wrote these "big ideas" down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemwide focus on sharing &amp; collaborating on these issues across campuses, but having OP take lead in encouraging such conversations &amp; providing a central point of information (e.g., thru a website).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have student affairs counselors and UC student on each campus schedule interactive video conferences for high school students (esp. for rural schools &amp; community colleges).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize importance of having OP (or someone) work on building communities to move some of these ideas along.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foster interoperability & standards across campuses, e.g., for student data collection, for developing digital content resources, for authentification, to achieve economies of scale & consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will the UC student college experience be in 2020?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involve students in the planning and deployment of new IT initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow access to data/courses/lectures across campuses via web technologies such as streaming videos or podcasts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer training courses to students and faculty who need to improve their tech skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a culture of innovation integrating best of class ideas from around the UC system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more opportunities for cross-campus meetings and sharing of ideas. This could consist of virtual spaces such as message goards and Webex type meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify technologies that are needed, but stay cautious about jumping on the latest thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrated systems from the beginning of the student experience at UC (when they apply -> when they grad)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content management &amp; creation -- supply campuses with necessary tools (within budget &amp; easy to use &amp; implement) to better manage electronic information, i.e., vingette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to encourage &amp; facilitate information sharing &amp; technology collaboration between campuses &amp; OP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full interoperability of campus IT infrastructures at the level of remote API/service standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposing coursework of all classes to the internet for read-only access.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further incorporation of student efforts into a vetted and secure IT infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of funding models to promote small, agile projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s okay to outsource if we’re developing systems in which we are not leading experts. We don’t have to develop everything just because we’re “innovative educators.” I am constantly amazed at the funds universities sink into recreating the wheel or having people with other defined roles become IT experts in their spare time. Of course we’re not retail but it doesn’t mean we can’t think like retail in terms of efficiently developing and leveraging technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully integrate campus apps into portal (one location).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow students to take classes at other UC [campuses] easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn all development into open/open source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep going on/increase support for Sakai, Uportal, Kawaii, PBX, SIS, HR, PPS, GL-AP-AR, CASA -- how do we do it better & break out of "we are different." If UCOP is ever ready for last point, call me. 
<fgorham@ucmerced.edu>

UC-wide student community software, where "official" UC student organizations, i.e., band, honor societies, chess club, etc. can have space to collaborate, can manage & administer acces (public, UC only, camus only, organization only, etc.). This organizations can have these collaborative spaces if they comply to "rules" established by UC student affairs administration. Collaboration spaces have functionality like: chat, discussion, document control, survey creation & data collection, membership lists, web publishing & authoring, calendar, events, etc. ... Benefits -- great for recruiting and admissions! 
Great for UCs to have student groups collaborate between campuses. Students love technology's virtual spaces... let's give "official" student organizations this capability.
Campus or systemwide UC laptop program for students: negotiated/special system below edu discount; imaged system for campus student is enrolled at; manufacturer reps weekly visits to do warranty repair.

System wide student portal system versus campus to campus portal for enrollment, grades, etc.

More physical space allotted for IT services for students

Campus dedicated learning labs that incorporate technology and student learning/group study.

Actual student portal which links students their enrollment site, IT tools and resources, bulletin boards, calendar, email, etc. Basically a one stop shop for all student needs.

Prospective student site where they can search for UC schools that offer the degree program they are interested in. The site would provide a side by side view of each school's program and overall college rating.

Campus architecture design which allows access to/from applications developed by distributed entities. Ex: student sites; student applications developed & reviewed to meet campus standards.

Central prioritizing of funds for development & enhancement of mission critical/central services for students. Ex: portal info; class enrollment; advising online; faculty services -- class rosters, submit grades.

User-driven vs. provider-driven (silo) in design.

Greater uses of online instruction to give students broader options.

A more robust IT infrastructure to meet students' demands.

Focus on Business and Admin IT systems. Antiquated, inefficient systems in these areas -- payroll, purchasing -- need more attention. They may not be as sexy as Sakai or Digital Libraries but cost the university far more in time and money and are more outdated than any of our educational technology.

Look closely at the physical state of classrooms. This is where students still spend the bulk of their class time, not on websites. Money is spent more readily on networks and websites but classrooms are in need of attention.

Online course evaluation for transfer students before they apply -- reduces duplication of credit at CCCs, UC.

Use IT more effectively to facilitate internal systemwide communication with staff -- disseminate poicy changes, talking points, best practices, campus distinctions -- so all can be more effective reps in field -- word of mouth is one of the most powerful influences on potential students, and all of us know very little about what is happening on our own campuses & across the system. We aren't making best use of our best resources -- us. Intranet? ListServes? Message Boards? Chat rooms/events for specific day.

New office for student leadership who just directed campuses on meeting with students regarding their IT needs.

"UC Facebook" for each student -- systemwide.

Instant messaging capability in admissions offices, with dedicated staff to respond.

Administrative & academic offices have an IT liaison person who is mostly an administrative (ex: admissions office representative) who is technologically savvy to interact with IT. IT solutions are developed as a partnership.

Systemwide student advisory group to advise UC on the tech solutions they want to see implemented.

Shared access to student outreach databases -- Names of students participating in early outreach programs don't make to Admissions for recruiting.

More integration of UCTV with tech resources.

More training opportunities for staff. Provide funding for staff to attend conferences that expose them to tech solutions that can be implemented on their campuses.

Create a web page for UC where depts doing impressive things with tech can post descriptions of their systems. I could then long in for ideas and contact them for more info.
“Big Ideas” generated at UC Systemwide Discussion

Participants wrote these “big ideas” down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

| Accessibility -- technology should be accessible to all students. |
| Online courses - courses that get together but incorporate a virtual component. |
| Podcasting -- campus news & information delivered to students via RSS feeds. > News & information to incoming students regarding campus resources, policies, admission guidelines & requirements, etc. > Virtual tours -- using iPods for campus tours with audio & video content. |
| Campus-wide/System-wide directory of ListServs. |
| Find a way to level the student personal computing devices playing field (at least to some extent) inc. laptops, iPods, etc. |
| GET MORE STUDENT INPUT! Encourage & fund their suggestions if appropriate. |
| Match or exceed commercial best practices in on-line service. |
| Provide some persistence for students’ digital material. |
| Reduce barriers to relatively rapid adoption of new techniques & ideas. |

| Emulate the yahoo “hack day” within the entire UC-wide staff (an entire day devoted to pet projects). |
| A place UC-wide to (??)brag about what tools you have built internally. |
| An open group (yahoo group?) for any/all UC IT issues and employees. Fully open discussions. (What are you afraid of?) |
| Standard XML/web svc for every campus, mandated. |
| Make the UC-Approved logo have a click-for-bug-or-help option built into it. (Mandate accessibility, reachability, openness to feedback) - for every page. |
| UC-level help desk/ticket software. |

| Standards -- this of course will be difficult to do but well worth it in the final analysis. UCOP should lead a discussion to build policy that defines & standardizes student administrative business process standards to which all campuses must conform. It would eventually save high $ in automation development. |
| Improve consistency and reliability on administrative websites by doing a systemwide site licensing for content management software, and provide training dollars to install them by mandate at each campus. This could also be done with customer management software. |

| To ease move from confusion to comfortable/clear: 1) Automation systems should be clearly broken into data layers and presentation layers. Administrative systems often confuse the two. 2) Developments have to start with students interacting with analysts with rapid development mode for presentation layers. |
| Create incentives for faculty research to create solutions to the IT needs identified in meetings like these. |
| Help faculty make a change in their culture to address students’ need/desire for an anytime/anywhere educational environment. |
| Really want to support the idea of using technology to enhance K-12 education statewide so that students are better prepared when they get here. |
| Strong support for technology that allows user to create their own virtual learning environment and to get personalized. |
| Faculty training space & resource allocation for use of student/faculty services. |
| Resources to promote the use of students to develop IT services (space, $, infrastructure) “ideally off, but near, campus. |
| Emphasis on “continuity” for student services (counseling, tutoring, etc.) |
| Centralized help desk resources. |
| Leverage power of the UC to have vendors involved in student services delivery products work more closely with the UC. |
| Insure minimum level of IT services on each campus. |
| Create (as this group) a more coordinated IT development process. |
| Create staff and student incentive awards for IT development. |
"Big Ideas" generated at UC Systemwide Discussion

Participants wrote these "big ideas" down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemwide IT professional development training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist in creating IT funding models for campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of one systemwide statement of legal residency process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a systemwide user satisfaction survey that rates the usability (ease of use) of each campus system as a benchmark/incentive for continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous synopsis/environmental scans of IT trends &amp; enhancements 5 years out that can be used/referenced by campus IT developers. Capture faculty expertise (UC Gartner Group).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater leveraging of UC-wide site licenses to drive down costs/campuses &amp; encourage &quot;like&quot; developments (so campuses can minimize platforms/soft[ware] they have to support).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Help Desk &amp; knowledge-based systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcripts between CCC/CSU/UC &amp; LSAT/MCAS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtual meeting spaces (social networks, e.g. web CT environments) could transform how TA discussion sections are conducted, both on-line (live) and in a bulletin-board environment. Office hours for TAs and faculty could happen in a chat-room environment. Some students can't make it to in-person office hours.

UC systemwide "facebook"/online directory

Give students a space & resources -- a student computing group. Direct input/connection with IT administration on campuses. Bring the students (reps from thes groups) together once a year for a "congress" where they can meet to discuss ideas/applications that can be shared/utilized at other campuses. Students are one of our best resources for innovative IT dev.

Visit other non-UC institutions (large & small) to see what's already working.

Set up UC-wide contract for Podcasting resources/infrastructure.

Could the UC adopt an open source CMS system-wide (e.g. Sakai) and then leverage UC talent/resources to extend this tool to do whatever else needs doing instead of relying on a third-party company to develop (and own) the new technology/tool?

Professional Development on how to teach in a wired classroom.

Dedicate funding at the top level for *student* IT infrastructure. Too often good ideas are sidelined due to lack of funding.

Bring together IT services that serve students under one umbrella.

Create student computing advisory panels at both the campus and system levels.

Recognize that student IT needs (support, systems & infrastructure) are different than that of faculty and staff.

Recruit faculty to interact with students on IT initiatives.

Consider a laptop computer requirement for all students.

Provide significant resources/outreach to encourage faculty to use technology.

Common undergraduate admissions guidelines for all campuses.

UCOP student database for student info/data to move from campus to campus when taking classes elsewhere "open campus".

UCOP centralization of electronic transfer course work to send to campuses.

Future: 1) Standards 2) Lead/expect

Early outreach & recruitment in K-12

UC ID used as credential for proof of ID/login on commercial & other systems & continues on as alumni. Help solve the Web 2.0 Identity 2.0 problem.

Help desks that keep track of Ids & use history of calls to give better, more personalized service throughout college career.

Explore & develop truly useful collaborative tools for IT staff UC-wide. Create virtual brain trusts for any given problem.

MySpace or Facebook for UC staff & faculty, to help in collaboration efforts & help students find more about faculty.

Promulgate informal solutions as a way to keep ahead of the curve.
"Big Ideas" generated at UC Systemwide Discussion

Participants wrote these "big ideas" down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

| Systemwide sponsorship of open source initiatives a) for UC only b) national or international |
| Systemwide facilitation of archival & capture of lectures, including intellectual property management & access management. |
| Single sign-on (revisit). |
| Systemwide VPN? Or, guidelines for each campus |
| Pay for print solution |
| Reallocate campus money to support more IT in areas where needed: staffing, S/W licensing, backup & contingency, etc. |
| Help executives understand what it takes to manage/run/provide IT to students & staff. "IT different than it was 5 years ago." |
| More better collaboration & data sharing between the depts who have the data & those who need it. |
| A UC-wide portal. |
| Centralized (UC) help desk & repair facilities. |
| UC Merced hosts all help desk calls (instead of India). |
| Enable life-long relationships with and among students. |
| One university, not a collection of departments or campuses. |
| Integrate with non-university resources, particularly social networking. |
| Emphasis for course materials (e.g., podcasts) should be on breadth, rather than (media) quality. |
| Student-centered design > front-end > back-end > processes behind back-end |
| Usability testing across all services |
| Common look and feel |
| E-transcripts that are standardized & usable for campus. |
| Localization of various elements (admissions info) on web page so various text can be read in multiple languages (the same website can be viewed by native speakers in other countries) |
| Centralized official documents & misc documents vault from applicants that can be electronically accessed by campus reps to facilitate admissions, financial aid, housing & campus advising. |
| Student portals for incoming undergrad classes at every UC campus. |
| E-courses for staff & faculty on relevant technology (SAS -> survey development tools -> marketing & data base management) for those non-IT folks who need basic understanding to direct various activities or who want to enhance their professional training (pursue certification) while in current capacity; centralized course listing & site for info updated my academic computing or outsourced vendor. |
| Offer subsidized professional development for IT professionals. |
| Tools for campuses to develop central events sites for public on campus activities rather than have pockets of decentralized unconnected campus listings. |
| Community website: Students asking questions - community members answer. |
| Creating social/cultural infrastructure (teaching with & through technology requires new skills) to support IT-based instruction. |
| Providing info about parking |
| Interactive, on-line course catalog |
| ***E-transcripts that are STANDARDIZED & usable for the campuses! |
| Student portal. |
| Develop tool that allows front-line staff to share student information across service units (global view, referral, tracking system) |
| Develop language translation tool for important content. (localization) |
| Modify OP site to make it easy for prospects/applicants to navigate to the campus of their choice. |
Participants wrote these "big ideas" down during the June 23 session. They are not listed in any particular order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allow/create system to allow students to update their contact info centrally (@ O.P) &amp; update campus system daily.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized e-transcripts for each campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a current &amp; accurate syllabus for each course offered online (preferably in the course mg system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Wiki to allow sharing class-notes among students -- embracing the existing online collaboration that already exists among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share/post instructor's teaching evaluations (students use rating myprofessor.com to get this info)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[illegible] to engage students more in planning, designing, building, &amp; implementing any system that is for them or their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/resources should become available (maybe give priority) for those of us building open source applications who would be more than happy to share the source code and collaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-wide collaborative learning environment that links admin as well as academic dept data, research, discussion, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single student login acct web portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/make baseline IT competence (defined by each campus) a factor in performance review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralize admin systems allowing campuses to re-allocate IT staff to other needed (local) areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide central control over AV in classroom so that faculty/staff need to only learn one set of controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide PDAs to first year students and request faculty to offer class material for download (e.g. podcasts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-transcripts standardized (from high schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of proprietary/closed source software systemwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased support for home grown projects which have the potential to benefit universities world wide if open sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for common data standards for database interoperability (e.g. 64 vs 128 char address, country codes, student ID standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of inter campus paper exchange for student cross registration, transcripts and other common activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasting -&gt;UC wide itunes University (UCLA’s rolling out their own in fall 2006) -&gt; information delivery in multimedia format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online/web camera based collaboration -&gt;between faculty -&gt;between students -&gt;between administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic transcripts that are standardized and usable for each campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat room for parents &amp; high school students to get questions answered about campuses, majors, admissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>