

LMAC Minutes Nov 16, 2004

Present: Bill Barry, Randy Bentson, Sigrun Bodine, Karen Fischer, John Hanson, Rob Hutchinson, Norman Imamshah, Michael Nanfito, Lotus Perry, Geoff Proehl, Matt Warning

Warning called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.

There were no announcements. After a short discussion, the minutes from the November 2, 2004 meeting were approved with minor modifications in form of newly attached footnotes.

Warning explained the need for developing a Strategic Plan for Instructional Technology (IT), establishing a productive, forward-looking, and structured environment to give LMAC (as a representative of the faculty) the opportunity to express faculty interests, needs, and priorities for IT. Barry emphasized the importance of such a strategic plan also as a guide for the future, preserving the continuity and direction of the work of LMAC despite routinely changing committee members. Also, as TPG is working out a plan for the future direction of IT, the input of faculty on the issue is crucial. Nanfito said that he is preparing a presentation on

- (i) The current state of the technology in a digestive format
- (ii) The sketch a desired state of technology, as seen by OIS
- (iii) A roadmap on how to get there.

Bentson suggested that LMAC brainstorms ideas on IT and then analyzes them to see if they could be categorized. Fischer suggested concentrating on goals and capabilities and not on particular pieces of hardware since hardware components will inevitably change with time. Hanson expressed his concern that UPS does not have an expert in IT amongst the faculty: an expert might, for example, avoid a situation of trying out technological features that have already been shown to be unsuccessful in the classroom. A brief discussion followed on the feasibility to bring in an academician specializing in IT as a consultant. Barry said that he would be afraid that consulting only one expert might lead to a skewed view on things. Nanfito suggested a balance between outside input and existing knowledge in OIS, and said he would be happy to share publications on IT with LMAC.

Warning invited suggestions on how to move forward with the development of a strategic plan. Imamshah reminded the committee that Nanfito would give a presentation on the currently available technology and staffing resources. Bentson suggested informal interviews with colleagues to identify what is done and what should be done. As LMAC does not have a representative from Wyatt Hall, Bentson volunteered to talk with the colleagues there to find out about their technological preferences. Proehl suggested interviewing colleagues now informally but to wait with the brainstorming within the committee until after Nanfito's presentation. After some ongoing discussion on how to proceed, the committee agreed on the following:

- (i) Each faculty member of LMAC submits a technological "wish list" on or before Nov 24, 2004 to the chair of LMAC
- (ii) LMAC will meet on November 30 for Nanfito's presentation of technology resources on campus and to brainstorm thoughts on goals and organization of the strategic plan
- (iii) LMAC will meet again on Dec 7 to hopefully bring structure into ideas and priorities

Perry suggested using the remaining time of the meeting to begin the brainstorming, and started by calling for more thoughts on how to structure the use of resources. For example, are electronic classrooms still as important today as in the past with more than 50% of students possessing laptops? She also raised the issue of availability and reliability of staff support for technology. Hanson said that UPS does have support to install instructional software, but it is lacking support to develop instructional software, e.g. java applets. Perry agreed that development is important and emphasized

that software has been developed in some instances by student helpers. Imamshah pointed to the problem of sustainability of skills since students graduate and leave. Bentson reminded LMAC of his suggestions sent out earlier via e-mail with regard to wireless hotspots, digital signatures, video-on-demand, bandwidth issues, network configuration, and electronic classrooms. Proehl praised the support faculty has received from OIS and stated the need for another electronic classroom. Warning said that he is excited about the possibilities of wireless network and that he wants to see more of it. Perry emphasized the importance of streaming servers to deliver information, and that UPS needs more of them. Barry stated that there is not much flexibility with the timely purchase of software and that a fund for software would provide more agility for the acquisition of software. Bentson stressed the frequent availability of share-ware, i.e. software with no licensing fees. Although share-ware sometimes requires additional work; it might still be cheaper to fund staff to do this additional work than to pay for commercial software. Warning spoke in favor of making on-line schedules/calendars available, whereas Perry replied that 50% of the faculty would not want them. Imamshah concluded the discussion by stressing the need of OIS to learn about faculty's technological wants and desires.

We adjourned at 4:59 pm.

Sigrun Bodine,  
Scribe of the day