

Advisory Council on Technology

3/13/98 Minutes

2:30 p.m. to 5:00.p.m.

309 KSC

Kent Campus

Present: Johnnie Baker, Cathy Bakes, James Boyd, Dave Cannon, Helen Carpenter, Ray Craig, Paul Farrell, Rosemary DuMont, Peggy Doheny, Alice Iden, Mary Tipton for Alan Evans, Barbara Hanniford, Terry Kuhn (chair), Pam Mitchell, Darrell Turnidge, Christine Shih for Steve Tapp (Secretary) and Denise Zelko

Guests: Greg Seibert

Absent: Lowell Croskey, John Kerstetter, Alan Evans, Bruce Petryshak, Pam Ramey and Steve Tapp

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

*Dr. Terry Kuhn* (Chair), welcomed everyone and started the meeting at 2:42 p.m.

II. Discussion and Approval of 1/30/98 Minutes

*Terry Kuhn* asked for discussion, comments and/or approval of the minutes from the 12-12-97 meeting. *Rosemary DuMont* suggested that the second sentence in the third paragraph of number IV, letter A be removed entirely from the minutes. *Terry Kuhn* requested that the words "about redistribution" be added to the last sentence of the same paragraph. In number VI. letter H Rosemary DuMont's corrected title should read Director of New Media Services.

Discussion was had about changing the membership slightly in particular with ex-officio members and getting the charter back to where we are now with the existing charter. It was decided that there have been no formal approvals so the council has a degree of freedom to change things.

*Johnnie Baker* made a motion stating that if members are added from an administrative area whether an ex-officio or voting member, faculty members should be added to keep the numbers balanced. This motion was voted on and approved.

The minutes were approved with the changes noted.

III. Informational Items

A. Classroom Enhancement

1. Support from President

Terry Kuhn distributed a copy of an article that appeared in the Stater regarding the Classroom Quality Committee. *Peggy Doheny* stated that she is a member of this committee and the first meeting was held with President Cartwright in attendance to give the charge to

access the quality of the classroom environment. The committee is to look at things like pull down screens, plugs, chairs, and curtains. Technology will be looked at, but the bottom line is how the classroom looks. The committee will start with \$250,000 and will develop a criteria on how this money will be spent. **Rosemary DuMont** stated that John Kerstetter has been invited to attend meetings as a resource person to talk about technology in the classroom so there is some interest in technology.

## 2. Classroom Technology Plan

**Terry Kuhn** informed Peggy about the classroom technology plan that was done in November or December and is in a draft document. Terry stated that was done before the classroom enhancement committee was established but felt that the committee should be informed of its existence. Since Peggy is a direct link, it would be put in her hands and the council will rely on her judgment to see if it includes rooms, shades, and other related items. Peggy stated that she feels this is the focus that they will take with technology being secondary. Peggy stated that the group expressed there are a lot of people on campus involved in technology but there are not many looking at plugs, screens and chairs. Terry stated that he hoped that the committee would not hold technology hostage only to that. Peggy stated that she would make that known.

**Paul Farrell** questioned the source of funds asking if this was the same money that was earmarked for technology. Terry referred to the Stater article that was distributed to the committee that stated that the money is part of year-end funds not spent by the end of the last fiscal year

**Paul Farrell** stated that he felt we should keep the pressure on to pursue our recommendations and to ask questions on how things were going. Paul also stated that Peggy would probably be the liaison since she also had an interest in technology. Peggy stated that she would have a discussion with John Kerstetter in this regard. **Rosemary Dumont** stated that John has a comprehensive survey of all the rooms on campus and what is in them. Peggy stated that this should help bring back the technology issue.

**Rosemary DuMont** stated that the auditorium is a very good example of what can happen. The space was renovated without a cent being put in for technology so we could not project anything in that room. As an afterthought, the President made a commitment to funding it, but it was not in any plan. **Terry Kuhn** stated that it was his understanding that in the renovation of Lowry Hall networking technology considerations were not part of the original design. This is one of the reasons why he is raising the question now about what kind of input, not to tell them what to do, but to keep the questions there so this aspect is not ignored. Peggy stated that the charge was to look at criteria on how the money should be spent.

**Ray Craig** stated that the committee could build momentum with renovating classrooms if they would tap into technology and committees worked together they would generate more support. **Terry Kuhn** offered the UCT as a sounding board to provide input, recommendations or just responses to questions or whatever they would like.

**Paul Farrell** recommended Facilities Planning be made aware that it would be useful to consult with the offices of Greg Seibert and John Kerstetter. It should also be recommend that departments do so when in the process of planning renovations. Paul suggested asking Lowell Croskey if having a formal motion would help his office rather than making one now.

## B. Remote Access Task Force: KSU as ISP

**Greg Seibert** stated that the Remote Access Taskforce was constituted and charged by the committee to set policy and procedures for accessing the new dial up lines. 136 lines have been recently

brought up that support full digital dial up with another 46 lines to be added this semester. There is a full PPP dial up bank now available and open for all faculty and contract administrative staff. The UCT previously asked the taskforce for an endorsement of a policy for access. Greg referred to the Remote Access Task Force Update, a handout that was distributed at the beginning of the meeting. Previously the council voted and endorsed the idea of remote access for all faculty and staff at the university and with the 184 lines there should be no problem. Access for student groups have been discussed and there is a very strong feeling that dial-in access is critical for graduate students with appointments. After looking at the ratios and numbers for the potential balance between the number of people who have appointments versus the number of non contract staff, the task force is proposing through the document that we open this up to all faculty, all contract administrative staff and all graduate students with appointments including graduate assistants, teaching assistants and research fellows. The non-contract administrative staff would have access via an approval form that could be obtained from the chair or department head. It was suggested that this be open to faculty, all non-contract staff, all staff and all graduate students with appointments. Greg stated this is still an unadvertised service and that there are already 28-30 people dialing in. Even though there are more lines, the population is large so some mechanism needs to be in place. The proposed policy would prevent the group from getting so large that it would become oversubscribed and useless to people. If access for the non contract staff a little bit limited, not eliminating anyone, but asking for a signature that would put the eligible group manageable and not swamp the 184 lines. Ilee expressed that he did not want to separate the administrative staff into definable have and have-nots. He is going to work on getting the money and that is in the endorsement that we are going to encourage the university to come up with the money or identify the funding so that all staff can have unrestricted access.

The issue of access for undergraduate and postgraduate students is not being examined. We have examined the issue of going to an ISP and also funding it. We are trying to identify funding to do it ourselves. The taskforce has come to the conclusion that it is necessary to survey the student population to find out what the real demand might be. We will be working with Undergraduate Student Senate to put together a survey of questions that are already being posed to the group and we will execute and analyze that survey before the end of the semester and create a recommendation and find out how many people are out there and put together a funding or budget requirement and come back to the group with the findings.

**Rosemary Dumont** stated that undergraduate courses are being developed on the web and that it is going to be the issue because many students don't even know about this. Greg stated that the survey asks if they have a computer or if they intend to get a computer. The survey does not ask if you know how to use it. We are saying that if they have a computer hopefully the faculty will encourage its use. We are assuming that if they have a computer or have plans to get one they are going to dial in.

**Rosemary Dumont** questioned the sound capability in the labs because many web sites will have sound. **Terry Kuhn** stated that their lab had sound via speakers and not headphones, which is not a good idea. **Paul Farrell** stated that sound is an issue. He stated that Ohio University provides access for students but there is a per hour charge. **Greg Seibert** stated that they are looking into different options such as outsourcing completely to an ISP and then have the clients absorb the entire cost, which is between \$10 and \$22 per month. Another option is to completely do it all internally which is probably cheaper and more effective. The problem with that is we would not support a long distance access so if you are in a long distance area you are going to have to pick up the long distance call. This is the major drawback to us doing it ourselves. A hybrid approach that the taskforce is looking for is to contract with an ISP

An estimated log-in time is one of the items that the survey will address and in addition to what

resources are out there and how long the students are likely to use them. Greg stated that the larger ISP's are willing to negotiate a fairly aggressive rate but we have to guarantee 10,000 accounts are going to pay. If they don't get them the university has to pay the difference. The survey will also show if there is enough demand to sign one of these agreements. **Terry Kuhn** stated the students do not realize the instructional potential and that we cannot stop and not do it because we don't know what the growth rate will be. Terry stated that as an educator, he feels we should be providing as close to state of the art that we can and that is part of why they pay tuition.

There was discussion of long distance charges, Greg stated that there has been discussion about joining with Akron, Youngstown and Cleveland and form a consortium. This has been talked about but has never gone anywhere.

**James Boyd** stated that direct access from the dorms identifies the users most likely as our students, if off campus, and we are not charging, any household that has an internet connection through the University does not limit it to just the student, it is the whole household's access. If we are not charging for this there is no way make sure it is used for what it is intended. Another problem he has with an ISP service from the University to the household is that a child may get into something that is undesirable and the parent finds out: who gets blamed? We should not have to deal with this. **Greg Seibert** stated that whoever has the association with the University and allows other people to use it assumes the problem.

Greg stated that this is the update and we will be kept posted on the debate of the undergraduate access. The results of the completed survey with the results will be brought back to the council. If the council endorses what is being proposed today, advertising will begin. There are diskettes available at the help desk and the web page will be open for downloading.

**Johnnie Baker** questioned why we have an excess of 50,000 active e-mail accounts. He stated that this is more than double the student population and asked if they were all still affiliated with the university. **Christine Shih** stated that the 50,000 includes everyone that has accounts including all freshmen that enrolled and then did not return the next semester. The current policy is that undergraduate graduates have six months access to their accounts after graduation. Then a procedure is followed that allows all accounts to be looked at and purged six months after graduation.

**Greg Seibert** asked for approval to provide unrestricted full visual PPP access to all faculty, contract administrative staff, graduate students with appointments including graduate assistants, teaching assistants and all research fellows and taking all non contract administrative staff and asking them to get approval from the department head or chair for access. Greg stated that this was his request because he was concerned that if this was completely opened up it would swamp the service. Greg also stated that Ilee is uncomfortable with the have and have nots and will try to come up with the money. An approval form has been created, but may never come to be used.

**Paul Farrell** made a motion to accept this endorsement, it was voted on and approved.

### C. Web Page Responsibilities.

1. Ownership
2. Maintenance
3. Editorial Control

**Terry Kuhn** stated that he placed this on the agenda because of it coming up most recently at Faculty Senate and asked for discussion. **Greg Seibert** stated that web management is widely disbursed. Greg stated that there is a lot of information there and many people rely on the information and become accustomed to using this. Many departments have excellent pages

and provide information that is fresh and regularly updated. However, several departments have made a great first effort but now the information is stale. **Terry Kuhn** stated that he was a member of the accreditation team for the University of Iowa and the web was a large part of what the team was presented with. Terry stated that the questions remain to three issues, who owns, who maintains and who exercises editorial control over the site and do these things go together. **Helen Carpenter** stated the Kent State website is officially owned by Mark Lindemood with Margaret Garmon as the designated webmaster having primary responsibility for evaluating all the websites and making sure that they are updated appropriately. **Rosemary DuMont** stated that this is only for a certain level stating that it was only those links directly off the Kent home page.

**Christine Shih** stated that the web policy subcommittee is in the process of drafting the final document regarding the policy issue. Some of the issues like timeliness and accuracy are being addressed but only in the first two levels and possible the third. The committee wants official pages to be approved. Christine stated that there is much that needs to be looked as a group and using coordinated efforts instead of everyone doing their own thing would be helpful.

**Greg Seibert** questioned if pages could be identified or certified as official pages so an outside user would know the information is accurate. Christine stated the committee is recommending that official department pages be designated to a person who will maintain the page getting information from the chairperson or whoever is responsible for that office or department. The page would also show the date that it was updated and always an e-mail address provided for any questions.

#### IV. Standing Committee Report

##### A. Academic Computing Committee

Steve Tapp was absent so no report was given

##### B. Administrative Computing Committee

Bruce Petryshak was absent so no report was given.

##### C. Distributed Learning Committee

No report given.

#### V. Old Business

##### A. Membership of Standing Committees

##### B. Nominations for Membership Rotation

**Terry Kuhn** put this on hold but stated that he would get a draft letter out to request the constituents put nominations forward.

##### C. School of Technology Representative

**Terry Kuhn** stated that he had contacted Dean Chowdhury but has not received a response yet as to who the representative would be.

##### D. UCT Web Site: [www.kent.edu/uct](http://www.kent.edu/uct) needs updating

No report was given because Steve Tapp was absent.

E. UCT Charter Change [2 3] :

**Terry Kuhn** stated that this is to make explicit membership rotation

F. UCT Charter Change [2 1 2]

**Terry Kuhn** stated that this is to revise the title from "Director of Distributed Learning" to "Director of New Media Services"

G. UCT Charter Change [new: 2 1 4, renumber remainder]:

**Terry Kuhn** stated that is to include the Director of Learning Technology Services as an ex-officio member. Terry stated that this item brought up the first motion that the council had today to recognize by person that this director would be Lyle Barton. Terry stated that this would be tabled until he has a charge.

H. Approval Process for UCT Charter

**Terry Kuhn** stated that this has already been talked about.

I. Constituency Representation/Membership concerns

1. Manager of Network Services

**Greg Seibert** stated he was asked to create a charge to stimulate the need for an ad hoc committee and what the standing and leadership of the committee should be. Greg stated that he has no official standing with the council and was a guest, but it was pointed out to him that there is a feeling that the leaders of committees should have some official standing on the council. Another option is, if the council chooses not to create an ad hoc committee it can carry out the work as it is now with just task forces.

**Terry Kuhn** reminded everyone that the charter under committees Item I. says there shall be a standing committee on Academic Computing, Distributed Learning and Administrative Computing. Terry stated that there would be a change there if we were to make this a part of the charter.

**Paul Farrell** pointed out that there is no longer a Director of Distributed Learning and asked if there should still be a committee. Terry stated that this is one of the reasons we ask for charges from the other committees. Terry asked for the committee's thoughts.

**Paul Farrell** stated that he was inclined to reintroduce a motion that we establish a standing committee on them. Consistent with that, it would be logical to ask that the Manager of Networking Services be an ad hoc member of the UCT. **Terry Kuhn** stated that this means bringing on two extra ex-officio members.

2. Systems Manager, Residence Services

**Terry Kuhn** asked if the feeling was strong for the Systems Manager of Residence Services. Terry stated that he felt this could be provided for by the appointment process rather than by a charter change.

**Pam Mitchell** stated that if it was by appointment there is no guarantee that they will be here. It was agreed that this was the downside. Terry asked if residence hall development is so consequential to technology influence on this campus that we feel this position should always be here or do we trust the vice president of that area to see that those areas of importance are represented.

**Greg Seibert** stated that if we go by appointment we feel the representation is there and by the title

of his job he is up to date on they are doing and is comfortable bringing in the information that is required.

**Ray Craig** stated he felt that standing committees are being formed around administrative positions when they should be formed around systems. Other members of the council agreed.

**Terry Kuhn** stated he would prepare a new version of the charters and try to get it circulated before the next meeting.

## VI. New Business

**Paul Farrell** stated that the question was asked of him, does faculty refresh apply to full time temporary faculty and if not is it ever intended to?

**Helen Carpenter** said that after a conversation she had with Steve she is pretty sure he was starting with tenure faculty.

**Paul Farrell** suggested putting on the table for discussion the issue of whether the university would extend refresh to full time temporary faculty. Paul suggested that a survey on the role of full time faculty could be done. Terry stated that this is not for the council to decide and that we are just seeking information. Paul stated that he was conveying that this question may arise because they are aware that the refresh is going on.

**Greg Seibert** stated that after much research and background work, the University has decided to go with a one-card unification. Several committees have been formed and have been meeting. A sample of the proposed card was passed around. Photos will be taken starting with incoming freshmen. There will be a letter from the president sent to the students, there will be lots of publicity so students can go to and have their photos taken. Faculty and staff will be addressed later in April and over the summer. We will be going live beginning fall semester. 30,000 cards need to be produced between now and August, there are 2 stations here now with 4 more coming on a short-term basis. The initial uses were mentioned with greater expansion as time goes on.

## VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Next Meeting April 24, 1998