

# **Undergraduate Curriculum Forum**

## **AGENDA**

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A

Thursday, Feb. 17, 2011

- I. Call to order
- II. Announcements
- III. Approval of UCF minutes of Dec. 16, 2010 and Feb. 3, 2011
- IV. Standing committees Reports
  - a. NPIC
  - b. NMC
  - c. PRAC
  - d. UWIC
  - e. WACC
  - f. LEPC
- V. Old Business
  - a. Approval of UCF By-Laws
  - b. Office of Information Technology (OIT) Support on Campus
- VI. New Business

# Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

## MINUTES

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A

Thursday, February 3, 2011

Present: M. Hartog, R. Vaters-Carr, G. Kowalczyk, K. McNamara, L. Bower, J. Rumrill, M. Fede, J. Strawn, K. Lacey, D. Smith, E. Keenan, S. Latorre, J. Mielczarski, K. Barnett, K. Burke, S. Graves, B. Glynn, P. Beals, L. Lancor, S. Clerc, K. Laing, S. Keller, T. Lin, P. Kahlbaugh, M. Vancour

Absent: M. Narumanchi, K. McGill, M. Das, S. Felsenfeld, S. Kopaczewski, S. Grubacic, M. McClain, E. West, B. Nakamura, J. Liu, J. Hong, C. Dellinger-Pate, G. Brady, R. Kustin, J. Irving, K. Gatzke, K. Cummings, J. O'hara, J. Tait, T. Abdulaziz, G. Adams, W. Elwood, G. Cochenet, M. Shea, D. Bentley-Drobish, J. Mills

Guest: A. Marsoobian

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.
  - No Quorum (27 people in attendance)
- II. Discussion of Agenda Topics for Spring 2011 and related issues included:
  - a. Technology:
    - i. Technology resources, storage space, email capacity
    - ii. New Learning Management System replacing VISTA (decision by July 2011) – there is a RFP and faculty are invited to provide input on evaluation criteria for the LMS products that will be reviewed through an online tool called IdeaScale (<http://csus-lms2012.ideascale.com/>).
  - b. Schedule
    - i. Marty invited Selase to come to UCF to discuss changing the course schedule beginning in fall 2011. We discussed earlier start to days, M/W and T/TH classes with Fridays saved for 2.5 hour classes, and more Saturday offerings.
  - c. LEP
    - i. Concern that changes are not funneling out to campus community. Confusion persists regarding items including double dipping, capstone courses, and department role/participation. Departments need notification that Tier I and Tier II courses cannot count towards the major. Clarification about how Tier III courses do or do not count towards a major is also needed.
    - ii. New Degree Evaluations for fall 2011 with LEP. Kim needs these early Feb. Departments need to fill out the Degree Evaluation for Departments form found on the LEPC website and turn them in to Kim Laing. UCF members should talk to chairs and encourage them to submit their degree evaluations.
    - iii. LEP link under UCF shows courses being approved for LEP and is updated on a regular basis.
    - iv. Caps on Tier I/II – 23 proposed cap for Tier I (document called for 20), but no cap for Tier II released yet.
- III. Approval of UCF minutes of December 16, 2010
  - a. Tabled (no quorum)
- IV. Standing Committee Reports – no meetings held for subcommittees
  - a. NPIC

- b. NMC
- c. PRAC
- d. UWIC
- e. WACC
- f. LEPC

V. Old Business

- a. Approval of UCF revised bylaws (handout on *Guiding Principles* distributed) - **tabled**

Meeting adjourned at 10:23 a.m.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Michele Vancour.

Called to order at 9:35am

Present: G. Adams (Chair), T. Abdulazis, M. Bay, G. Cochenet, G. Kowalczyk, K. McGill, Kelly McNamara, Rachael Vaters-Carr

## **I. New Business**

A. Notification of 7 special topic sections were presented and logged.

<u>Course #</u>	<u>Transcript Title</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Times taught</u>
ART 498	The Earth as Medium	Fall 2011	1
ENG 398	Writing Tutoring and Mentoring	Fall 2011	0
HON 298	Sustainability: Food/Culture	Fall 2011	0
MDS 398	Propaganda in Media	Fall 2011	1
SOC 298	Medical Sociology	Fall 2011	0
SOC 398	Drugs and Modernity	Fall 2011	0
SOC 398	International Migration	Fall 2011	0

### **Description of logged courses**

#### ART 498 – The Earth as Medium

This course explores the use of the earth as an artistic medium from prehistory to the present. Taught by two professors, the course has both an art history component and a studio art component. Projects include original earth artworks and term papers. Prerequisite: 9 credits in art or instructor permission

#### ENG 398 – Teaching and Learning Writing One-to-one and in Small Groups: An Introduction to Writing Tutoring and Mentoring

An introduction to Writing Tutoring and Mentoring is meant as a welcome to some of the key issues, trends, and methods in both the more specific subfield of writing center tutoring and practice and the broader fields of peer education and collaborative learning.

#### HON 298 – Sustainability: Food and Culture

Any sustainable civilization requires a sustainable food supply, which in the modern world means an agricultural system. Increasing populations place agricultural practices under pressure, while technological developments promise to increase food supplies. Unfortunately, increases are often short-lived and often bring adverse environmental consequences. This course will address the major issues that demand resolution if modern western agricultural practices, and therefore western societies, are to survive.

#### MDS 398 – Propaganda in Media

Explores historical and current forms of propaganda in various media forms that affect and shape attitudes, beliefs and perceptions. Explores propaganda at institutional and personal levels.

#### SOC 298 – Medical Sociology

This course focuses on health issues from a societal viewpoint. It presents changes in medical thinking and its impact on society, the medical professional-patient relationship, medical information in the media, community health, national and international health care systems, and the challenges of medical technology and bioethics.

#### SOC 398 – Drugs and the Making of the Modern World

This course examines social evolutionary change in the meaning of mind altering drug use, the effect of the changes in drug production, and the impacts of intoxicant use on commerce, groups and social organizations. Critical attention will be paid to contemporary drug policies and the problems they're intended to address, inviting an in-depth discussion of alternatives.

### SOC 398 – International Migration

This course focuses on the impact and outcome of international migration for receiving and sending countries. It discusses factors for migration such as supply and demand/push and pull, explains the integration of migrants and connected theories such as assimilation and transnationalism, and describes the impact of globalization in the migration process. It also compares earlier migration streams with modern-day migration issues and the experiences of migrants. Focus is on the U.S. but will also include European migration issues.

- B. NPIC began working on creating a clear format for the revision of minor and certificate programs with fewer than 18 credit hours required.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 am.

Respectfully submitted by: Gregory Adams

**Undergraduate Curriculum Forum  
Notification Management Committee Minutes  
February 10, 2011**

Present: Cindy Simoneau (Co-chair), Karen Barnett (Co-chair), Laura Bower, Scott Creamer, Margaret Das, Sean Grace, Corey Hannah, Shana Kopaczewski, Kim Laing, Erin Larkin, Sobeira Latorre, Nuncia Moniello, Jinjing Liu, Julie Rumrill, Sophia Myers (UCF Secretary)

Absent:

**Meeting called to order at 9:35am**

Discussion on NMC by-laws

**New Course Proposals**

ACC 202 – Financial Accounting Assessment Course

**Motion to approve:**

**Motion: S. Latorre; S. Grace**

**Motion passed: 12-0-0**

**Revised Course Proposals**

EDU 452 (SCE) - Secondary School Student Teaching

EDU 453 (SCE) – Student Teaching Seminar

EDU 493 (SCE) – Science (Secondary School)

**Motion to approve:**

**Motion: S. Kopaczewski; L. Bower**

**Motion passed: 12-0-0**

**Revised Program Proposals**

BA English/Concentration: ALL

**Motion to approve:**

**Motion: S. Kopaczewski; C. Hannah**

**Motion passed: 12-0-0**

BS English/Secondary Education

**Motion to approve:**

**Motion: S. Grace; M. Das**

**Motion passed: 12-0-0**

**Tabled Revised Course Proposal (Require Clarification)**

**New Course Proposals**

**Revised Course Proposals**

**\*\*Proposals submitted to UWIC for LEP approval:**

**Meeting adjourned at 10:30am**

PRAC minutes for February 10, 2011

Attendance: Susan Clerc, Karen Cummings, Charlie Dellinger-Pater, Marybeth Fede, Susan Felsenfeld, Scott Graves, Patricia Kahlbaugh, Tricia Lin and Tom Radice,

Not Present: None

Meeting began at 9:40 a.m. in ASC 229

Geography's review: The committee reviewed the Geography department's **revised** self-study. Comments on the 17 standards had been circulated via a newly established Myscsu group and email before the meeting with the intent to help time management. After some discussion, a vote was taken for each standard as Met or Not Met. All standards were voted "Met" by a majority vote (8 yes, 1 abstention). In addition, an overall vote of Met or Not Met was taken for the program review as a whole, and the committee voted "Met" by a majority (8 yes, 1 abstention).

Members of geography came to the meeting at 10:20 and we were able to discuss the program review with them. A few suggestions for editing and revision were offered with the understanding that these can be part of the next review cycle. They were thanked for their diligence in their work on their self-study, and they thanked us for our careful attention to their program review.

Other issues discussed in our meeting were: 1) the possible revisions of some of the wording in the prac guidelines to clarify materials submitted by departments, and 2) uses for the Myscsu groups to aid our discussion. Any revisions to the prac guidelines will be brought to UCF at the end of the semester.

The spring 2011 calendar was adjusted for the snow day 1/27 and is posted on the UCF website. Programs to be reviewed are Education, World Languages and Literature, and Public Health. Accounting and Economics and Finance (BS) may be worked into the schedule as well.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:50.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Patricia Kahlbaugh

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

*University Curriculum Forum*

Undergraduate Program Review Report: Geography – School of Arts and Sciences

*February 10, 2011*

The Geography Department in the School of Arts and Sciences submitted a self-study report to UCF – PRAC on November 24, 2010. PRAC met December 2, 2010 to discuss the program review and to meet with Dr. Eric West and Dr. Patrick Heidkamp, the department assessment coordinators, and Dr. Leon Yacher, the department chairperson. These three individuals represent the full-time tenure track members of the department. During this meeting, PRAC requested revisions and a revised program review was submitted on January 25, 2011. We met again February 10, 2011 to discuss the program review and to meet with members of the department.

The self-study covered Standards 1-17 of the Academic Program Review document. PRAC reviewed all submitted materials. All standards were met and PRAC recommends ***continuing approval*** of the program. PRAC's summary report is submitted to UCF for the February 17, 2011 meeting.

PRAC commends the hard work done by the Geography Department and appreciates their thoughtful engagement in the process. The following are some specific observations of Standards 1-17:

**Standard 1:** The department/program's mission supports the University's mission

Met

The mission of Geography Department is well articulated and supports key concepts from the University's mission statement. For example, Geography mentions how their mission supports instilling the value of liberal education, training new professionals, and empowering students with knowledge for active participation, ethical leadership, and life-long learning. Geography approached this standard in a novel way, and as such provides an interesting alternative example for other programs.

**Standard 2:** The department/program has clearly stated program goals and objectives

Met

The Geography Department identified three central program level goals that encompassed goals for student learning as well as goals for faculty within the department. Again, they have taken a slightly different approach than others have done so far, and thus serves as an informative model for how this standard can be developed.

**Standard 3:** The department/program has clearly stated program -level expected student outcomes and methods for measurement

Met

The Geography Department has identified three categories for expected student learning outcomes: geographic knowledge, geographic skills and methods, and geographic thought. "While these goals have been the focus of teaching in this department for years, it has not been until this program review was started that the department has been able to develop specific student learning outcomes that allow for the overarching goals to be addressed in more specific detail."

A curriculum map was developed to show how the learning outcomes are addressed and reinforced in the core curriculum and an assessment strategy and instrument have been planned (e.g., a pretest and posttest assessment at various points in the curriculum). Out of this discussion, the Geography has determined that key additions are needed to their curriculum in order to proceed with this assessment.

**Standard 4:** The department/program actively uses data about student learning to improve its programs

Met

The Geography Department has actively engaged in the review process, and while still in planning phases, has initiated plans that will make meaningful changes. “The program review process has helped us to realize that we should align our classes more closely with our goals. We would like to bring our courses current with the new program-level objectives... “

**Standard 5a:** Evidence of quality instruction

Met

The Geography Department provided a thorough description of their program and necessary narrative clarifications for various graphs provided as evidence. The appendices included an impressive collection of scanned pages with quality tables on assessment links, vitae and syllabi. PRAC hopes that having this set of documents helps them further plan and develop their program. One interesting comparison they made was between the evaluations of majors versus non-majors. For example, majors expected to work hard in Geography courses, to reason from evidence and to use outside resources to a greater extent than non-majors (see document for complete survey results). The Geography department also surveyed faculty and determined that a strength of the department was faculty member’s dedication to communication and sense of community.

**Standard 5b:** Evidence of Teaching effectiveness

Met

The Geography Department presented results from an assessment of two courses (GEO 270 and GEO 371) that documented teaching effectiveness and the proficiencies students acquired from the experiences in these two courses. Survey of faculty indicated that interest in students’ intellectual development, enthusiasm in classroom and use of engaging instructional methods are high.

**Standard 6:** The department provides evidence of a coherent and current program

Met

The Geography Department provided evidence to suggest that revisions to their curricular structure are needed. Such revisions are planned and are described in the appendices. These revisions will “bring the department to the cutting edge in terms of course offerings and meet work force needs as well as meet graduate school expectations.”

**Standard 6a:** The Department clearly describes the relationship between graduate and undergraduate programs

Met

**Standard 7:** The department has an appropriate number of qualified faculty, students, and staff

Met

Faculty represent diverse backgrounds and expertise, but the department is understaffed. CVs were included in the report for this standard. Time committed to the program and courses taught were indicated; however, it is recommended that in later reports the allocation of faculty to courses be specified (i.e., majors are not taught all courses by same professor). Documentation of student enrollment patterns was provided and interpreted. Profiles of students and staff were provided. Recruitment strategies were developed, including participating in the Tier 1 of the LEP. Staffing is inadequate with only one part-time secretary and is an issue for labs. They provide rationale for a specialist in information technology who can serve the unique hardware and software needs associated with GIS, "a core platform in geospatial technology, which the US Department of Labor lists as one of 14 high technology growth areas."

**Standard 8:** The Department provides high quality student advisement and maintains adequate tracking procedures of its students

Met

Again, a thorough description of the high quality of student advisement and tracking. Faculty report strong commitment to students.

**Standard 8a:** Undergraduate Program Direction

Met

**Standard 9:** The department offers an appropriate number of courses and sections to meet the needs of students. Statistical data concerning admissions, graduations, courses offered and cancelled, and other relevant statistics are provided and analyzed

Met

The Geography Department provides detailed information about enrollment and graduation trends, including number of sections of courses offered per semester. They offer interpretations of these trends and the challenges faced due to the opposing forces of decreasing enrollments, increasing class sizes, and increasing need to diversify course offerings to better prepare majors.

**Standard 10:** The department/program demonstrates a climate of intellectual/professional curiosity and achievement among faculty and students

Met

The faculty of the Geography Department are extremely productive. The document provides an impressive summary of faculty achievement. We especially applaud them for encouraging part-time faculty to engage in scholarly activities. The level at which students engage in scholarly activities is also commendable.

**Standard 11:** There is evidence of faculty and student research, scholarship, and/or creative activity.

Met

The summary provided makes clear the level and nature of faculty research and scholarship. Examples of the types of student projects undertaken further document the extent to which the department (both faculty and students) engage in scholarship. Although the level of activity is not what is being evaluated here, we found it very impressive for a department of this size.

**Standard 12:** The department/program has adequate library resources to meet its needs

Met

The library report was very thorough and provided a clear picture of library resources allocated to the Geography Department.

**Standard 13:** The department/program has adequate facilities and non-print resources, such as audio-visual, computers, labs, practica to meet its needs.

Met

The Geography Department identified some resource issues (e.g., teaching assistants, nonteaching personnel, IT and lab support), particularly to support programs like GIS &T, and GPS technology for research and teaching purposes.

**Standard 14:** Periodic Review and Evaluation

Met

The Geography Department provided a thoughtful analysis of issues associated with alumni and the alumni/employer surveys, and are honest about what will or will not work for their department. Feedback loop between assessment and implementation (and back to assessment) is still in formative stages, but they are making those plans particularly with how assessment relates to changes in curricular structure.

**Standard 15:** The department's activity in community service and outreach is appropriate to the mission of the program and the university

Met

The Geography Department has engaged in a variety of outreach and community service. Student clubs have worked in soup kitchens, beach clean-ups, etc. , while faculty members visit K-12 schools to expose students to geography. Finally Dr. West organized 15 2- and 3-day classes in GIS, reaching nearly 100 members of the community.

**Standard 16:** The department provides an analysis of program strengths and weaknesses

Met

The Geography Department offers an honest assessment of where they are, the challenges they have faced due to recent events (e.g., Urban Studies, steady loss of faculty positions), and where they are planning to go. They have an academically strong faculty committed to student learning. Their faculty are trained in cutting edge technologies that could bring the department to the forefront of many areas within the field given the right resources.

**Standard 17:** The department describes a vision and action plan for the future

Met

The Geography Department has a vision and action plan for the future that captures the strengths and weaknesses brought to light by their self-study.

## Summary

PRAC appreciates the work that Dr. Eric West, and Dr. Patrick Heidcamp, the department assessment coordinators, and Dr. Leon Yacher, the department chairperson, have done in the preparation and presentation of this self-study report, and has evaluated standards 1-17 as “met.” PRAC recommends to the University Curriculum Forum that **Continuing Approval** be given, and in doing so, understands that Standard 1-17 have been met.

University-Wide Impact Committee  
Minutes 2/10/11

**Present**

P. Beals, J. Fullmer, K. Gatzke, E. Keenan, J. Irving, L. Lancor, H. Lockwood, A. Marsoobian, M. McClain, J. Mielczarski, B. Nakamura, T. Regan, M. Shea, W. Yu.

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 am.

**II. Old Business**

The standing committee continued to review LEP Tier 1 & 2 proposals.

- A. UWIC voted 11-0-0 to approve CHI 200 (Chinese III, T1 MC).
- B. UWIC voted 10-0-1 to approve with minor corrections HBR 200 (Hebrew III, T1 MC).
- C. UWIC voted 10-0-1 to approve SWK 200 (Intro to Social Work, T2 SSSC)
- D. UWIC voted 10-0-1 to approve CSC 200 (Info Management & Productivity, T1 TF)
- E. UWIC voted 0-13-0 to reject BIO 105 (DNA in Health & Disease, T1 CT)
- F. UWIC voted 0-12-1 to reject EXS 212 (Lifetime Physical Activity, T2, MB)

**III. New Business**

No new business

**IV. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 am.  
Minutes prepared by Byron Nakamura

# Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

## Meeting Minutes

February 10, 2010

Present: K. Lacey (Chair), D. Vasquez-Levy, K. T. Ferrucci (ex-officio), S. Corbett, S. Ellis, D. Petroski, D. Smith, S. Grubacic, M. Diamantis, E. Schmitt

1. Call to order 9:45 a.m.
2. Welcome and thank you to new members: M. Diamantis, E. Schmitt
3. No proposals requiring review
4. Transitioning W-courses to the Liberal Education Program (LEP)
  - a. Discussion regarding how best to transition current AUR (all University requirement) W-courses into the LEP. The committee is working on a guideline for a smooth transition.
5. W-Course Caps
  - a. Discussion regarding concerns with recent announcement by Provost Williams that caps for W-courses as well as Composition (INQ) courses will be increased from 20-23.

Adjournment 10:50 a.m.

Liberal Education Program Committee  
Unapproved Minutes  
Wednesday, December 15, 2010

**Members present:** L. Lancor (chair), T. Bennett, J. DaPonte, J. Fields, D. Weiss

**Ex-officio Members present:** P. Beals, N. Henderson, K. Laing, M. Shea

1. Call to Order

- Meeting convened at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of minutes of previous meeting

- The minutes from 12/8/10 were approved as presented.

3. Chairperson/Director Update

- Faculty Senate Colloquium on “The Implementation of LEP” report  
The general feeling is that the colloquium went well.

- Meeting with Academic Advisement on 12/14

Concerns were raised about the learning communities and whether students will have a choice about the CT or TF course for which they are registered.

Students that don't get to take CT in the fall are at a disadvantage for Tier 2 courses in the spring. Staffing issues are a problem if adjuncts are hired for CT and we only have courses for them in the fall.

The following resolution was moved and seconded:

During the transition period, the option of taking Tier 2 courses will be available to students who have successfully completed INQ and either CT or TF, as long as the students satisfy the other prerequisites of the given Tier 2 course.

Approved: 5-0-0

Academic Advisement also expressed worries about losing students because we have a different WLL requirement than the other CSU schools. Other universities waive the requirement based on how many years language is taken in high school. Recommendations: we should communicate better to high schools and students what our requirement is and why we require the language. A public relations campaign should be initiated with Public Affairs to promote the merits of the LEP.

- i. Status of Catalog updates and plan for UCF meeting on Thursday.  
M. Hartog has talked to all departments and will present a list of “simple” changes to UCF tomorrow.
- ii. D. Weiss will be on sabbatical next semester. A replacement will need to be chosen from the School of Health and Human Services.

4. Business

- Discussion of PHI 215 (transition course) - some Philosophy faculty want to teach sections of course following LEP; others do not. Appropriate sections of PHI 215 will be utilized as CT sections in the learning communities as needed.
- Review of document combining LEP Guidelines/ Recommendations

Some suggested edits were made. We will revisit these on our meeting on Jan. 19<sup>th</sup> with the goal of approving a document to send to UCF for their first meeting of the spring semester.

5. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 5:12.

Respectfully submitted by T. Bennett. These minutes have not been approved.

Wendy's comments to original questions are in red. After these comments you will find the discussion from today's September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting between Wendy and the Committee.

To: Dr. Wendy Chang, Chief Information Officer  
From: Senate Technology Sub Committee, Dr. Todd Rofuth Chairperson  
Date: September 17, 2010  
Subject: Technology issues and questions

Hello Wendy, I am serving as the Chair of the Senate Technology Sub Committee this academic year and will be occasionally forwarding a list of issues and questions that are of concern.

We met on September 15, 2010 and generated our first list. Please forward me a response at your earliest convenience. Thanks. Here is the list:

1. Technology survey from Stan Walonoski office - Can the results be forwarded to this committee and the university? The committee would have been happy to provide input on the questionnaire design.

The survey conducted last semester will be released soon. We are finalizing the cover letter that will accompany the report. I am happy to share the report with you prior to its release (attached). The response rate is very low (i.e., 15%). I hope we will get at least 30% response rate this year.

Meeting discussion: Low response to survey, perhaps it was timing. Was conducted in April. Teaching and Learning Technology committee put it together. Some ideas on how to improve survey. Use 80% of same questions next time. This Committee will pass on any other questions to Stan so they can redesign slightly. Key findings: 40% of respondents have not used service offered by Stan's group. Most don't know what service is being offered. 90% would like to use and learn more about Smartboard. 80% want to know more about plagiarism software. We have not actively promoted, maybe we can, have a workshop on some of this software. What kind of approach in a new technology would faculty like to learn? Most suggested hands on workshop instead of webinar. Stan's group has equipment for faculty to borrow but interest is low. Most don't know so need to advertise it the availability of this loaner equipment.

2. Spam filter - How is it working? Some committee members have sent emails from an SCSU laptop at home to the office and some of the email has been spammed. Is there an explanation for this?

I haven't received any complaints about spam filter for a while. It sounds like an isolated incident. If you provide the account information, I can ask Matt LeSieur to look into it.

Meeting discussion: Committee – spam filter has greatly improved. Why would a student's owl's account go to Exchange junk mail? In Exchange the spam filter looks at words for identifying spam. Can set to let some in, but if you let them all in may get some malicious email.

3. Hires for tech support for high tech classrooms - Has a person been hired for all hours of classroom operation?

We are getting close to hire a high-tech classroom coordinator (i.e., Tom Struble's replacement). We also restructured AVTV operation and extended weekend hours. Separately, President Battle has approved two

new instructional technologist positions. One of the positions is a second shift position and will provide the much needed classroom and Vista support in the evenings.

Meeting discussion: just hired a high tech class coordinator, Philip Bryant. At UConn he managed high tech classrooms. Plus two additional instructional tech positions approved, one for Bob Cuddihee's office (instructional support specialist, to help faculty with curriculum design such as incorporating a clicker into teaching, or how to use Smartboard) and one equivalent to Karen's position in eLearning Vista. One will work 12:00-8:00, so some overlap with Karen, so we can cover adjunct faculty. Doing an active search for both positions. Congratulations in getting these positions approved, hopefully they will be filled before there is a total freeze.

We are 15 full time positions behind Central in high tech positions. Plus lost a couple more recently. Maybe about 10 positions behind but may be ahead of Eastern. We have 43 positions. We are the only campus that has 4 programs online. We are the leader in the system for course management systems. So having instructional tech support is key. 70% of respondents to survey have used elearning vista in their courses and 20% have taught fully online.

4. Are there any issues the committee needs to know about?

Classroom technology will continue to be an issue for the foreseeable future. It is already seriously underfunded and the funding was further cut from \$138K to \$112K this year. More than 50% of the equipments are approaching end-of-life.

Meeting discussion: Bond funds were cut 20%. Classroom tech is part of bond fund so it was cut 20%. Have over 100 smart classrooms and only \$138 K a year to support them does not add up.

Is there a way to have another access point for a laptop, so a faculty does not have to reconnect everything (if the computer in a classroom has been disconnected)? Faculty should not disconnect desk top when using laptop, just use the extra port. It says it right there on the desk.

5. Rollout of new computers – Is it on schedule? And what happened to the money that was saved under the new contract?

Yes. The computer rollout is on schedule. We made some changes of our strategy. In the past, all lab computers were purchased with ITF money and faculty/staff computers were purchased with bond fund. Last year, we waited 6 months to get the faculty/staff computers because of the new CSUS 2020 purchasing procedure. This year, we try to be creative. Currently, all faculty/staff computers are purchased with ITF fund and lab computers are purchased with bond fund. We are also getting better with the purchasing process. All bond fund purchases now take approximately 4 instead of 6 months.

Although we saved some money with the new contract, the saving was used to offset the 20% funding cut this year (from \$800K to \$640K for administrative computing). Without the saving, we would not be able to sustain the 3-year replacement lifecycle this year. Further funding cut will put the replacement program in doubt.

Meeting discussion: This year we are switching the funding source. Use OE instead of ITF for purchases, faculty machines are purchased with OE money and therefore don't have to go through approvals, but lab machines do need approval from DPW. Is there a list of departments that are getting new lap tops this year? Contacted

faculty in May or June and sent out form to be completed concerning new computers. Wendy will ask Brian Russer if he has a department schedule.

6. Technology fee – This fee was merged with the larger fee. Where is technology fee money going and does your office get its fair share of the fee?

My office has received the same amount as previous years. Although it was merged with general fee, we still follow the old guidelines and limit the use to student-related activities.

Meeting discussion: Wendy has mixed feelings about new arrangement, could increase tech fee separately. Now everything is merged and if general fee is increased the extra amount does not go to technology. What would be the top priority if had extra money: software licensing and support costs; vendors have increased licensing fees dramatically, Apple won't sign a three year contract, they want to do yearly contract and want increases each year. Microsoft, SunGard and Banner also increased. Blackboard has some pricing which we cannot afford. Thinking of dropping Apple support. If this occurs we will send broken computers to Apple and pay for repair. Also server support is on a 3-5 years contract and it is expensive. HP is increasing cost of server. Need to use OE for these costs because we cannot use bond funds. More than 50% of ITF dollars developed to software and licensing support. ITF funds need to get increased. Do you get accounting of printing money? In past don't receive any income from printing. All income goes into one account and expense comes out of same account and it is negative right now (toner and paper costs); hope is it will be balanced by end of year. If you drop contracts, will need some more machines around for loan. Are you in favor of having tech fee or not or are you happy for general fund allocation? Preference would be something in writing under general fee, what % of fee used for technology and students should know this also. With Vista, there is a fee we might not be able to afford? May have to look at other alternatives, there are open source alternatives such as "desire to learn" alternative. Would university be able to support open source alternatives? This would be a system wide choice, picking an open source. Even Banner, we cannot afford Banner package. Working with other CIO's at other campuses on where we should go with programs. Recommend having a faculty group (system wide) to convene to review choices in selecting, taking into account financial, technical and pedagogy factors.

7. Lab support hours cut - Where are students supposed to go for basic software help and Vista help? What is the role and responsibilities of people who work in the lab? Can we have a job description? If role doesn't involve tutoring on computer related questions where should students go for it?

We simply cannot afford to staff the lab 24/7. Even if we can afford it, we always have difficulties in recruiting student workers with adequate technical skills. The role and responsibility of lab staff are as follows:

- a. Respond to questions in IT organization, policies, and procedures.
- b. Distribute IT forms, policies, procedures, and hardware/software instructions
- c. Resolve account log-in problems
- d. Report/document common problems in Knowledge base
- e. Demo how to use printer/scanner and other peripherals
- f. Conduct initial hardware failure assessment and put in a ticket. Label hardware equipments that are out of order.
- g. Fill in printer papers
- h. Clear up the jam and restart printers

The lab consultants are not trained to tutor software applications. For Microsoft Office, students are directed to Microsoft E-training (<http://www.southernct.edu/oit/instructionalresources/technologytraining/>). For

eLearning Vista, students are directed to online tutorial (<http://www.southernct.edu/departments/oit/vistastatus/vistapilot/>).

Meeting discussion: None.

8. Vista - Who do students call for Vista problems? Don't we need another individual who can help students with Vista? Help desk can provide some of the simple questions. Vista will be down all day tomorrow; this type of information needs to be communicated well in advance. Students want to know why they are scheduling this at this time in the semester. Shouldn't it be done before school or during break?

What kind of problem? Karen Musmanno is our eLearning Vista administrator. She is responsible for roster-related issues. We do not offer in-person tutorial to students. I agree that September 16 is not a good time to shutdown Vista. I am told that they (i.e., System Office) need to conduct a mandatory upgrade. The announcement was posted on OIT website, MySCSU, and eLearning Vista in mid August – before the start of the Fall semester.

Meeting discussion: don't know what to do when a student has a vista problem. If a student goes to help desk the response is tell your professor it is not working. If it is an issue of not getting into Vista, that is Karen's domain. Once they log in we really don't have a program in place on how to tutor them. Ex – student got in, uploaded file and submitted documents and teacher cannot answer them, then the faculty has to call Karen and cannot articulate what is going on, student needs to be able to call someone. Vista will put a link extension on student work and faculty cannot open these documents. These kinds of questions should go to Karen. Stan's group does support 20 students per day. But these issues should not really go to Stan's group which is for faculty.

Can help desk answer simple questions such as have you run the browser check?

Could we do vista orientations for new students at orientation (only given 30 minutes at orientation)?

Recommend that faculty invite Karen or Bob Cuddihee to first class for a few minutes of instruction. Plus create a short quick guide on how to use Vista (one page).

9. Help desk technicians - The help desk staff seem to only assign ticket numbers for assistance. Why can't they have additional responsibilities and provide some basic support for quick problem resolution? Faculty don't need to call Help Desk and get a ticket number. They should do ticket requests online and then someone can call them. As we move into more online classes and hybrid classes we need more support from the Help Desk on basic problems.

The Help Desk (and labs) are staffed by undergraduate freshmen and sophomores. Although we do provide on-the-job trainings, but very few of them have the expertise to resolve technical issues. At our sister institutions, help desk is staffed by full-time IT employees. It is a luxury that Southern cannot afford.

Meeting discussion: None.

10. Student use of southernct or owl - Is southernct forwarding and when will it be cut off? The student southernct addresses are sitting in Banner, Library records, who will update these? MYSCSU still has the old southernct address. OWL is not listed everywhere.

Although almost all students have already on OWLS, the deadline for migration is October 1. Therefore, the records in Banner, MySCSU, and Vista have not been updated. We will update Banner, MySCSU, eLearning Vista

later this year. Our challenge is to update departmental applications (such as applications used by Library, Health Center, and Disability Resource Center). Until all applications have been updated, we will continue to forward student emails.

Meeting discussion: What are the timelines? Will old addresses not forward at all? Cannot really distinguish students, faculty, and staff. Don't have a way to update in current software. We might be forwarding this for a long time. Is there a way when someone graduates – first five years being in Owl, then at five years become alum?

11. Students paying for printing - Students don't know that they will have to pay for printing. Have not notified all students. Printing upgrade going up now has caused some confusion it would have been better if this change was done prior to the start of the semester.

We started charging for printing on June 1 – not the start of the Fall semester. The announcement was made in mid April. Not only the announcement was emailed to students more than once, we also posted it in the labs and Southern website. There was also an article about it in the May issue of Southern News. I don't know what else we can do to get students' attention.

Meeting discussion: None.

12. Communication problems - There were Vista problems the first week of courses. IT knew that passwords for students had changed. It would have been better to have sent an email on issues with VISTA passwords earlier, telling everyone that they may need to call in and get passwords reset. Faculty lost a week or more of class work. Recommend not making changes in Vista close to the beginning of classes.

On the contrary, we did not make any changes to Vista password. As you know that we synchronized Windows and MySCSU passwords last spring. The change were rolled out gradually – whenever the passwords expire, the new passwords must be in synch. Many students were still using separate passwords for MySCSU and Windows at the end of fall semester. When they came back for the Fall, their passwords expired over the summer but they still tried to set separate passwords for Windows and MySCSU.

Meeting discussion: we are having trouble with password synch, people don't pay attention. We are rolling out all of this quickly. Password changes every 180 days, will push to two years, but will need to change to 15 characters pass phrase (just type in a sentence), then do not have to reinforce password reset. Will do this in November; roll out for students when their password expires. For faculty and staff do switch on one date. Committee would like to see article on password problems and comparisons between 8 character symbols and 15 character phrases.

Send out technology expected problems, to faculty so they can inform students if necessary. A lot of adjuncts hired a week before classes and so they did not get any earlier messages. Recommend sending a second email first week of classes on important things.

13. Banner - Problems with students not being able to register, need for overrides extensive. Will there be a new version of Banner?

I need more information. We are running the latest version of Banner.

Meeting discussion: can banner time limits be removed. Who can department meet with for Banner software issues? Go to registrar's office. If you need special programming then see IT.

Kim Laing is interim registrar.

14. Windows 7 - When are we going to have Windows 7? Is there any plan to upgrade software on campus such as Microsoft Office and Adobe?

Yes. We are planning to migrate to Windows 7 starting Spring 2011. We are looking for ways to make Microsoft Office 2010 available via SCSU Share. With Office 2010, Microsoft imposes new licensing regulation and our current protocol needs to be modified to stay in compliance.

Meeting discussion: None.

15. Fixing desk tops - The wait for fixing desktops can be extensive (there is one on Social Work that has waited for more than a week now). Maybe each department should have one extra computer that people can use when theirs is down.

Who is using this desktop? Is it assigned to a staff? Is it a secondary machine? If it is a secondary computer, sometimes it is not worth for us to fix it. We also have a serious shortage of secondary computers. Therefore, an extra machine for each department is not possible.

The average work order resolution time has improved dramatically in the past year. As you can see from the attached document, excluding the summer period (June, July, and August), in FY09, we logged 10,563 work orders from September to May and 45% of them were resolved within 24 hours. A total of 75.5% of work orders were resolved within a week. In FY10, we logged 18,836 work orders from September to May. Over 70.6% of work orders were resolved within 24 hours – a 56% improvement even though the volume almost doubled and with no additional staffing. Almost 90% of work orders (89.6%) were resolved within a week.

Of course, there is always room for improvement. However, I believe that we are moving towards the right direction.

Meeting discussion: None.

16. In computer cabinets in classrooms - Desk top carts are getting in way of controls, on the third floor. Should they be removed from these rooms?

Which rooms? We can take a look.

Meeting discussion: the rooms are on the third floor in Engleman (303, 305 and one more) in laptop classrooms. They are supposed to be picked up by AV last spring. Take out whole carts.

17. Faculty mailbox size: Discussion: Expand to 1 giga byte and increase quota for email from 10 megabyte to 20 (attachment and message). Will take place in November. Then will move on to expanding network capacity.

18. evista versus TK20 competition on collecting student learning outcomes

Meeting discussion: Conflict between using TK20 and elearning Vista? Does not appear to be any.