1. **Review of Committee Activities.** Gates reviewed the activities of this committee since the February meeting. Three educational technology vendors have made campus visits and presentations to demonstrate projectors, specifically projectors that can meet the high lumen requirements for the Bondurant auditorium. Kathy Gates, Michael Metcalf and Teresa McCarver visited Rhodes College to see several classrooms that are equipped with multimedia lecterns there. The consensus by the Bondurant building department chairs is that, due to the high cost of equipping the large auditorium, we will delay that project and instead equip the largest of the other classrooms and also set up a rolling multimedia cart to share between the other classrooms. We will go ahead and install any wiring or brackets that will be required to add multimedia presentation capabilities in the future. We have contracted a Memphis consultant, Technology Support Systems, to assist with bid specs for two scenarios: a permanently installed multimedia lectern and a portable cart. Gates distribute a draft copy of the bid document.

2. **Technology Support Issues.** The group discussed some of the issues with support of the proposed multimedia presentation equipment. For example, in rooms that are shared by multiple departments, who will take ownership of the equipment? What about training faculty to use the equipment? What about bulb replacement, repair costs, upgrades, maintenance of the computers that are part of the lecterns, etc.?

3. **Department Chair Survey.** Gates distributed the results from the department chair survey (see [http://www.olemiss.edu/committees/insttech/survey.html](http://www.olemiss.edu/committees/insttech/survey.html)). Penny Rice had compiled the responses and had created a classroom “candidate” list.

4. **Classroom Technology Priorities & Functional Requirements.** Daigle noted some of the difficulties in using the Business School lecterns. Specifically, she found it difficult to get the document camera out from underneath the lectern. The sliding drawer proposed in the newer specs may help with access issues. Reithel advocated keeping the systems as simple and as flexible as possible. He noted that we may want to consider installing fewer complete lecterns and instead installing more projector-only systems as projectors seem to be the most in-demand component. The group discussed the trade-offs of projector-only vs. complete lecterns. With a projector-only scenario, more rooms could be outfitted. Issues to consider include the following: how many faculty have access to laptop computers, how much time are faculty willing to spend setting up this equipment, some faculty may value the VCR and document camera more than the computer, etc. Threlkeld suggested that we may want to give some departments “on-loan” projectors for a year. The consensus was that we ought to consider four options: complete lectern & ceiling mounted projector, complete portable cart, ceiling-mounted projector and portable projector. Wilkins noted that this is an optimization problem and that we needed more data in order to make the best decision. Gates agreed to have her group collect the following data on each classroom: photos of the classrooms and courses.
taught during the past year together with hours, enrollment, and instructor. She would also conduct a survey of the faculty who teach in those classes to find out what components would be of most value and whether they would use the equipment if it were available.

5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.
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