LMAC Committee Minutes -- March 22, 2005

Present: Randy Bentson, Bill Barry, Geoff Proehl, Matt Warning (chair), John Hanson, Michael Nanfito (ex officio), Karen Fischer (ex officio), Sigrun Bodine, Norman Imamshah (visitor), Rob Hutchinson

Warning called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

Barry announced that notices have gone out describing the Mellon/NITLE workshops. UPS will host a GIS workshop this summer. Barry encouraged interested faculty to apply to attend these workshops since we are trying to get a feel for what this organization does. The applications are short and easy to prepare.

The minutes from the February 22 meeting were approved.

The rest of the meeting was spent discussing the draft LMAC Strategic Planning Documents prepared by Nanfito and Barry. (These documents are appended at the end of these minutes.)

Nanfito described the process that was used to generate these documents. Nanfito looked at the Nov. 30, 2004 LMAC minutes, along with the various faculty "wish lists" and prioritizations that LMAC had generated earlier this year, to get ideas for what were important areas for the development of academic technology at UPS. He looked for themes and grouped these items into seven categories. (See "LMAC Strategic Plan, Part 1" memo below.)

Nanfito and Barry then met together and drafted a second document in which these seven categories were prioritized and further grouped into 3 main areas: Teaching Spaces, Access to and Development of Resources, and Faculty Development and Support. (See "LMAC Strategic Planning, Part 2" memo below.) Nanfito suggested that this document can be fleshed out by considering where we are now, where we want to go, and how we will measure if we've gotten there.

Barry emphasized the need to come up with a process by which we can develop this strategy. Because technology changes so fast it is hard to chart out a long range plan, Barry asserted that what is most important is to come up with a process for consistently reviewing and updating priorities. At the same time we want to avoid having a new LMAC committee every year have to grapple with these issues from scratch. He suggests that the Director of Instructional Technology (currently Michael Nanfito) be charged with taking the lead on this process. This individual would consult with the LMAC committee on a regular basis to update the strategic priorities.

In response to a question from Warning on how we might proceed. Barry suggested that we address the following issues:

1. Is the list as it now stands sufficient? Are there any additional areas that should be added?

2. Is the organization into the 3 major categories appropriate, or should there be some other organization?

3. What is the process/strategy for ongoing development of this document and meeting faculty needs regarding technology?

4. Is the highest priority the need for more classroom spaces that are equipped with technology? Bill asserted that this is the highest priority currently, since without adequate infrastructure for using technology efforts in other areas won't result in any significant improvement in the use of technology.

Lively discussion about the importance of putting together a coherent program for prioritizing, implementing, and assessing the success of academic technology ensued.

Eventually the committee returned to the 4 issues highlighted by Barry. In response to question one (Is the list sufficient?), Bentson mentioned that although network capacity was implicit in the list, it should be made explicit. Proehl and Warning both stated that having a comprehensive list of academic technology issues was helpful.

In response to question two (Is the organization into the 3 major categories appropriate?), there didn't seem to be any objection to the organization, but there was some discussion about the prioritization of items. Barry reiterated his feeling that what we really need are more technology-enabled classrooms.

Commenting on the third question (What is the process/strategy for ongoing prioritization of faculty needs regarding technology.) Barry suggested that the Director of Instructional Technology could prepare and maintain a document that could serve as a focal point for discussions with LMAC about academic computing priorities. Bentson noted that this document could be a component of a "carry-forward" document for next year's LMAC committee, and might help to solve some of the problems associated with a lack of continuity from year to year. There seemed to be general consensus that this was a good idea.

The committee then discussed what the form this document should take and arrived at the following:

1. A listing of the important areas that need to be addressed when considering academic technology.
2. A description of the process by which priorities are selected or changed.
3. A list of LMAC's current priorities for academic technology.
4. A description of what needs to be done to achieve the priorities.
5. A description of how we will assess progress in implementing the priorities.

The committee asked Nanfito to prepare a draft of this document that the committee can then comment on. Nanfito agreed, but noted that he would need some time to prepare it. Warning suggested that in the interim we resume our discussion of security and privacy issues.

The meeting was adjourned around 4:30 pm.

Submitted by: John Hanson

Date: March 7, 2005
To: LMAC
From: Michael Nanfito and Bill Barry
Subject: LMAC Strategic Plan, Part 1

Below are seven categories of faculty concern and interest around the use of technology in teaching and learning at the University of Puget Sound. The list is a distillation of previous LMAC discussions in the 2004/2005 academic year.

1. **Access to academic information and resources.**
   a. Network connectivity: both wireless and wired.
   b. Acquisition of and support for appropriate network connected devices (e.g., fixed workstations, laptops and handhelds).
   c. Appropriate software on faculty/student devices to access and use academic resources.
2. **Classroom/Lab development and design.**
   a. Classrooms with data projectors.
   b. Layout of the classroom
   c. Adequate lab facilities

3. **Infrastructure development.**
   a. Server space. (for both multimedia content and for static storage)
   b. Student computing (E.g., Projects server)
   c. Software/hardware acquisition for faculty and students.
   d. Network security and privacy. (Two separate but related topics.)

4. **Curriculum development.**
   a. Funding and staff to support development of technology-based applications and activities that support the curriculum and aid the faculty in designing curricula that make the best use of technology to support learning.
   b. Define discipline specific needs for instructional technology.
   c. The Library and electronic/streamed reserves.
   d. Learning Center/Instructional Technology Center

5. **Faculty development.**
    a. Workshop and conference participation.
    b. Faculty training and follow up so that faculty make and use web pages
    c. Unit release time to develop resources.
    d. Dissemination of examples of effective use of technology in teaching.
    e. Partnership and consortial agreements for collaboration and sharing of information technology services among campus providers and among peer institutions (NITLE)

6. **Staff development.**
    a. Define levels of specialization (e.g., "a specialist who is experienced in both commercial and open source software.").
    b. Training opportunities.
    c. Access to appropriate hardware and software resources to remain contemporary.

7. **Digital Resources**
    a. Support for creating and maintaining digital collections.
    b. Plan for conversion of analog resources into digital versions.
    c. Support for streaming collections into classroom environment as necessary.

Date: March 7, 2005
To: LMAC
From: Michael Nanfito and Bill Barry
Subject: LMAC Strategic Planning, Part 2 (Priorities)

This document lists three major areas of development in strategic planning for academic technology at Puget Sound. These areas have been reorganized from a previous document (Part 1) which listed themes from LMAC minutes and supporting documentation. This document offers a suggested prioritization of those themes.

All areas listed below are key and are inter-related. Given the rapidity of developments in technology, we believe it would be foolish to offer at this point a long term grand scheme for how each area should or will develop. The best that we can do is to create a set of processes and mechanisms that ensure coordinated development of all three areas. This approach represents a change in strategy. In the past all three areas have experienced some measure of independent development. This development has occurred, however, in a reactionary manner and without a unified approach. We recommend that LMAC explore and help to define the processes and mechanisms of coordination required to move forward smoothly in instructional technology.

In the near term (and to offer here a general direction for discussion), we believe that the development of teaching spaces should take immediate priority and require initial focus. We know that the demand for new “smart” classrooms exists. Moreover, we know from experience that introduction of new digital resources and development of faculty skills

around use of those resources is most effective when the faculty have a classroom in which to practice what they've learned. Access to and development of resources as well as faculty training and development in the use of academic technology will continue to receive attention and funding.

Teaching Spaces

1. **Classroom/Lab development and design.**
    a. Classrooms with data projectors.
    b. Layout of the classroom
    c. Adequate lab facilities

2. **Infrastructure development.**
    a. Server space. (for both multimedia content and for static storage)
    b. Student computing (E.g., Projects server)
    c. Software/hardware acquisition for faculty and students.
    d. Network security and privacy. (Two separate but related topics.)

Access to and Development of Resources

3. **Access to academic information and resources.**
    a. Network connectivity: both wireless and wired.
    b. Acquisition of and support for appropriate network connected devices (e.g., fixed workstations, laptops and handhelds).
    c. Appropriate software on faculty/student devices to access and use academic resources.

4. **Digital Resources**
    a. Support for creating and maintaining digital collections.
    b. Plan for conversion of analog resources into digital versions.
    c. Support for streaming collections into classroom environment as necessary.

Faculty Development and Support

5. **Curriculum development.**
    a. Funding and staff to support development of technology-based applications and activities that support the curriculum and aid the faculty in designing curricula that make the best use of technology to support learning.
    b. Define discipline specific needs for instructional technology.
    c. The Library and electronic/streamed reserves.
    d. Learning Center/Instructional Technology Center

6. **Faculty development.**
    a. Workshop and conference participation.
    b. Faculty training and follow up so that faculty make and use web pages
    c. Unit release time to develop resources.
    d. Dissemination of examples of effective use of technology in teaching.
    e. Partnership and consortial agreements for collaboration and sharing of information technology services among campus providers and among peer institutions (NITLE)

7. **Staff development.**
    a. Define levels of specialization (e.g., "a specialist who is experienced in both commercial and open source software.").
    b. Training opportunities.
    c. Access to appropriate hardware and software resources to remain contemporary.

Date: March 7, 2005
To: LMAC
From: Michael Nanfito and Bill Barry
Subject: LMAC Strategic Plan, Part 1

Below are seven categories of faculty concern and interest around the use of technology in teaching and learning at the University of Puget Sound. The list is a distillation of previous LMAC discussions in the 2004/2005 academic year.

1. **Access to academic information and resources.**
   a. Network connectivity: both wireless and wired.
   b. Acquisition of and support for appropriate network connected devices (e.g., fixed workstations, laptops and handhelds).
   c. Appropriate software on faculty/student devices to access and use academic resources.
2. **Classroom/Lab development and design.**
   a. Classrooms with data projectors.
   b. Layout of the classroom
   c. Adequate lab facilities

3. **Infrastructure development.**
   a. Server space. (for both multimedia content and for static storage)
   b. Student computing (E.g., Projects server)
   c. Software/hardware acquisition for faculty and students.
   d. Network security and privacy. (Two separate but related topics.)

4. **Curriculum development.**
   a. Funding and staff to support development of technology-based applications and activities that support the curriculum and aid the faculty in designing curricula that make the best use of technology to support learning.
   b. Define discipline specific needs for instructional technology.
   c. The Library and electronic/streamed reserves.
   d. Learning Center/Instructional Technology Center

5. **Faculty development.**
   a. Workshop and conference participation.
   b. Faculty training and follow up so that faculty make and use web pages
   c. Unit release time to develop resources.
   d. Dissemination of examples of effective use of technology in teaching.
   e. Partnership and consortial agreements for collaboration and sharing of information technology services among campus providers and among peer institutions (NITLE)

6. **Staff development.**

a. Define levels of specialization (e.g., "a specialist who is experienced in both commercial and open source software.").
b. Training opportunities.
c. Access to appropriate hardware and software resources to remain contemporary.

7. Digital Resources

a. Support for creating and maintaining digital collections.
b. Plan for conversion of analog resources into digital versions.
c. Support for streaming collections into classroom environment as necessary.

Date: March 7, 2005
To: LMAC
From: Michael Nanfito and Bill Barry
Subject: LMAC Strategic Planning, Part 2 (Priorities)

This document lists three major areas of development in strategic planning for academic technology at Puget Sound. These areas have been reorganized from a previous document (Part 1) which listed themes from LMAC minutes and supporting documentation. This document offers a suggested prioritization of those themes.

All areas listed below are key and are inter-related. Given the rapidity of developments in technology, we believe it would be foolish to offer at this point a long term grand scheme for how each area should or will develop. The best that we can do is to create a set of processes and mechanisms that ensure coordinated development of all three areas. This approach represents a change in strategy. In the past all three areas have experienced some measure of independent development. This development has occurred, however, in a reactionary manner and without a unified approach. We recommend that LMAC explore and help to define the processes and mechanisms of coordination required to move forward smoothly in instructional technology.

In the near term (and to offer here a general direction for discussion), we believe that the development of teaching spaces should take immediate priority and require initial focus. We know that the demand for new "smart" classrooms exists. Moreover, we know from experience that introduction of new digital resources and development of faculty skills around use of those resources is most effective when the faculty have a classroom in which to practice what they've learned. Access to and development of resources as well as faculty training and development in the use of academic technology will continue to receive attention and funding.

Teaching Spaces

1. **Classroom/Lab development and design.**
    a. Classrooms with data projectors.
    b. Layout of the classroom
    c. Adequate lab facilities

2. **Infrastructure development.**
    a. Server space. (for both multimedia content and for static storage)
    b. Student computing (E.g., Projects server)
    c. Software/hardware acquisition for faculty and students.
    d. Network security and privacy. (Two separate but related topics.)

Access to and Development of Resources

3. **Access to academic information and resources.**

a. Network connectivity: both wireless and wired.
b. Acquisition of and support for appropriate network connected devices (e.g., fixed workstations, laptops and handhelds).
c. Appropriate software on faculty/student devices to access and use academic resources.

4. **Digital Resources**
    a. Support for creating and maintaining digital collections.
    b. Plan for conversion of analog resources into digital versions.
    c. Support for streaming collections into classroom environment as necessary.

Faculty Development and Support

5. **Curriculum development.**
    a. Funding and staff to support development of technology-based applications and activities that support the curriculum and aid the faculty in designing curricula that make the best use of technology to support learning.
    b. Define discipline specific needs for instructional technology.
    c. The Library and electronic/streamed reserves.
    d. Learning Center/Instructional Technology Center

6. **Faculty development.**
    a. Workshop and conference participation.
    b. Faculty training and follow up so that faculty make and use web pages
    c. Unit release time to develop resources.
    d. Dissemination of examples of effective use of technology in teaching.
    e. Partnership and consortial agreements for collaboration and sharing of information technology services among campus providers and among peer institutions (NITLE)

7. **Staff development.**
    a. Define levels of specialization (e.g., "a specialist who is experienced in both commercial and open source software.").
    b. Training opportunities.
    c. Access to appropriate hardware and software resources to remain contemporary.