



UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, May 6, 2011

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

310 Kent Student Center

Attendees: Paul Albert (Educational Technology), Cathy Bakes (Faculty Senate), Barb Boltz (EMSA), J. P. Cooney (Graduate Studies), Ray Craig (Arts & Sciences), Paul Farrell (Faculty Senate), Pam Grimm (Chair), Deborah Huntsman (Continuing & Distance Education), Jason Piatt (College of Education), Jeff Pellegrino (FPDC), Arden Ruttan (Vice Chair), Carol Sedlak (Nursing), Rose Tran (Undergraduate Studies/Research Graduate Programs)

- I. Welcome and Call to Order – Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.
- II. Minutes – Deb Huntsman advised for item III. C. Distant Learning Fee Update on the draft minutes from April 22, 2011, that the estimated revenue reported is for the full fiscal year. The fee will cover some hardware and software but is specifically for staffing cost and investing back into faculty and development.

Draft minutes from April 22, 2011, were approved with the noted correction.

- III. Review of the report from UCT to Faculty Senate – Distributed draft report for review, deletions, additions, and modifications. Paul Albert noted for item III. a. Funding of Technology under RCM that UCT does not have membership or knowledge to address this. Chair Grimm responded that the point discussed was to be transparent in cost and allocation, but we do not know which technology costs are being funded by the 50 percent RCM tax money. It is understood that it is a complex issue, but the decisions were made two years ago. It was understood that UCT would be brought into those discussions, and this has not happened. Issues involving technology are fluid because of tensions between the deans and the administrative side. Also, there was a period of time in which the formula was being re-examined. Having Ed Mahon discuss what he knows would be useful. The one he would like to bring in is the vice president of Finance. As associate dean, he hears about things that impact us directly. Currently, priorities are set by each of the executive officers. That set up and transparencies were discussed but in the end, the executive officers said that they wanted to maintain their control. IS went forward and tried to sell the concept, and the people in control of the budget said they wanted to maintain control of it.

This year UCT accomplished a lot of good things: lots of problems were brought to the table, things were solved, and information was shared. The way the funding is allocated has a tremendous impact. If we are an educational institution with a product of new knowledge, why are these tools not allocated funds? Paul Farrell noted that part of the UCT charge is to review priorities within and recommend to them. If UCT does not get information on the budget, it is failing to carry out its duties. Vice Chair Ruttan recommended that perhaps our first step should be to ask him to have Paul Albert bring back a report on what happened to involving UCT at those meetings. Paul Albert responded that the executive officers decided that they did not want another group looking into it. UCT should still make recommendations, but the Provost sets the priorities for Academic Affairs. The group as a whole allocated the budget across the executive officers. Vice Chair Ruttan noted that we now have a new chair faculty senate. Hopefully, Faculty Senate will address this issue in the fall by providing additional information on trying to get transparency on funding. Paul Albert added that he saw no reason why a list of who is managing them cannot be distributed publicly. Vice Chair Ruttan suggested exposing these priorities by getting the information, posting it on the UCT web page, and listing comments; make it a high priority for fall. Paul Farrell recommended attaching the executive officer's name to it if they are making those decisions.

Vice Chair Ruttan suggested making the bullet points more prominent and organizing by successes and no progress (or failures). Paul Farrell added that the results for much of this year were due to the budget chaos. Chair Grimm added that she hopes to push training of the students next year.

Voted held to proceed; unanimously passed.

IV. Elections – Nominations of Arden Ruttan for chair and Rose Tran for vice chair were received at the last UCT meeting. The floor was opened for further nominations; none were received. Vote held; the unopposed nominations were unanimously elected.

V. Discussion on 2011-2012 Meeting - Fridays are preferred, except for the first Friday of the month. Afternoons are preferred by regional personnel. Meetings should be scheduled jointly with the teaching council and the research council. A vote was held for Fridays with a starting time of 2:00 p.m.; unanimously approved.

VI. Member Concerns

A. Summer Exploratorium by Jeff Pellegrino – Summer Exploratorium will take place on August 17 and August 18. Along with Jason Piatt and Jeff's area, Distance Learning is hosting, and they will get the details out. Jason will be presenting.

B. E-Mail Accounts and Retiring Staff by Chair Grimm – A faculty member was set to retire at the end of the semester, and it appeared that their e-mail account was going away. The thought was there was a period of time between when it goes away and comes back. It goes by the separation date. Paul Albert advised that a workflow is being worked on. Security people do not see the comment section. A request has been put in to change the workflow so that security sees it. Chair Grimm asked if we can have a lag to termination. Paul Albert responded that would depend on who, what, where, etc. Given the required flexibility of the University, we can do better on the comments field and how to use them. If a separated faculty member receives bills, they will want their e-mail to continue to come to the University. Paul Farrell indicated that part of the problem is that the separation date is in May, but they are really here until the end of the summer. Paul Albert suggested tabling this matter until next year when we can work on a recommendation and bring Brendan in. Paul Farrell noted that most faculty goes to emeritus status and are moved over to Google. Chair Grimm added that the secretaries, who process the paperwork, do not do it very often; so, it is not on their radar. They sent out this separation form saying it needed to be filled out. Carol Sedlak suggested adding this to the UCT report. Rose Tran noted that this also happens with researchers. They have to have a sponsor. The form works when the communication gets there. Chair Grimm will mention it in the report as an issue on the table, seeking clarification.

C. Vista/Clicker by Jason Piatt – Jason suggested as an item for next year increasing interest, knowledge and acceptance of Vista/clickers at all levels. Jeff Pellegrino advised that for the first year courses, they are given to the departments; some centralized, some decentralized. All colleges agreed on the learning options; one was Vista and the clicker. There is no universal experience around those two. Paul Albert will ask Preeti to set up an introductory course for faculty. Jason Piatt: Clinics on campus with distributive learning.

VII. Informational Items

A. Wimba – Paul Albert reported that Wimba will be available soon. Legal is done. IS sent contracts to Wimba and are waiting on their signature. Funding is done. No problems are expected. Grimm: Training over summer? Albert: Will ask Preeti to throw something out. Piatt: Asked for clarification on if it is part of Vista or can you use it as a stand-alone item. Albert: Does not think so but will ask

Preeti to send out something on Wimba training. Grimm: Maybe early in the semester hold a Wimba informational meeting. Give them some basics and they can probably figure it out.

- B. Identity Management by Paul - May for faculty and students.
- C. McAfee - McAfee is still going away; it will be replaced by Microsoft Forefront.
- D. Blackboard – Production is scheduled for fall; there will be a summer pilot. We will be testing out a few more tools over the summer.
- E. Google interface - Will probably not happen until spring. It basically sets up groups in Google for your class and maintains rosters so you can set up things to be shared easily. Many like to play in Google, and this pushes the roster out there.

Grimm: Is there a mechanism in place to get grades in Banner without adding them one at a time?

Albert: It is on the list. The project is to use an Excel spreadsheet and upload it. This is priority set by the Provost Office. SunGard gave us a very loose interface that works, but you are able to put invalid grades in even though they would be rejected. Feedback was not quick, and the rejections may be missed. The idea with the Excel spreadsheet is to send it up for review first; runs through Banner and sends it back, and if all is ok, hit submit. The whole thing was to ensure that they are all valid grades when submitted. Bakes: Is there a way to look at historical grades on Banner? Boltz: In Cognos, you can pull up a progress report. Grimm: Back to grades, teachers are teaching mega classes, and it does not seem like we are asking for much, especially with the amount of the RCM tax. Albert: It is believed that GPS will help the students get through school quicker, and higher graduation rates will be achieved. It is a very important system, and it has bumped a lot of other priorities. Grimm: But we were told there was no data to support it. The amount of time that individuals have spent with no supporting data is shocking.

- F. Blackboard by Paul – We went to the chairs and directors and mentioned the new approach of bringing training to the departments if interested. Please provide feedback on interest. Three have responded positively (English is one). We will send out a reminder to the group. Ruttan: Distance learning training for faculty? Albert: There are a lot of online training tools for Blackboard as opposed to Vista. Grimm: Faculty may be able to figure it out while they are playing on it on a Saturday night.

VIII. Old Business

- A. UCT Research on Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Helpdesk – Chair Grimm reported that the non response on the survey was not successful. We cannot reach anyone by phone. A link under UCT will be sent. We will advise if it is not identified, will get a call.
- B. UCT Bylaw Revisions – Not discussed.
- C. Process for Increasing Faculty/IS Interaction – Not discussed.
- D. Report on Results of Mapping Priorities with IS Organization Structure –Not discussed.
- E. UCT Web Page by Vice Chair Ruttan –Boltz created a page in CommonSpot, but the latest information out there is for 2006 and 2007; so, data is needed. Send it to her. It is in her test area now. Ruttan will try to find out from Farrell and earlier chairs where the other information is for it. Grimm will send this year's.
- F. Use of e-Inside Management Update – Not discussed.

IX. New Business – Distance Learning by Deb Huntsman - We are entering the second generation on Distance learning. Rubin as the associate provost joined us. He spent a lot of time listening to needs, writing strategic planning, and beginning implementation. We created a soft launch—this is the center for online pedagogy. Val will be launching for fall, a website that will start bringing tutorials, tools, and resources to faculty that they can access 24/7. In addition to the virtual site, we brought in an associate who is working on enriching this constantly. Ruttan: Who will they talk to and how will they make their determinations? He found it disturbing that some determinations were made by talking to the vendor over faculty. Huntsman: Rick is referring to this as sitting at the elbows of faculty. This is just the front end of it. Rick is also working with RPIE on enrollment data. Deb suggested that we bring Rick in. We spent the last couple months working with the Tiger team. There is now a lot of information developed by the Tiger team that we can draw on regarding the expense of delivering an online course. We now know one-third of the students have taken an online course. In the 2010 calendar year, we registered 31,000 students across the University online; we are seeing 30 percent to 40 percent increases. Summer school increases have been online. We do not know how it has impacted face-to-face and in which departments.

One other challenge is the new department regulation that relates to online Distance Learning; we were told to comply by July 1, 2011. We have to apply for certification in any state where we have a student who is applying online. No two states have the same regulations. Reasonable or not, we have to begin this process. This is so new, that only yesterday she learned a few institutions have received cease and desist letters from some states. She sent out a request to RPIE for a list of students applying for online, and their response was that we have students in all the states. We need to look at the permanent address. They are concerned with where they are physically located; where their feet stand. We do not want to duplicate effort. We believe we can simplify this going forward. Have someone from OCR to look at compacts. We could not get a rescindment, but we got the enforcement delayed until 2014. For online classes, ten states represent about 80 percent of them, the most populous states.

X. Acknowledgments

A. Chair Grimm acknowledged and expressed the committee's appreciation of the efforts of Debbie Dobrilovic for recording the UCT minutes.

B. Deb Huntsman acknowledged and expressed appreciation of the management efforts by Chair Grimm.

XI. Meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Debbie Dobrilovic