MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY STANDING COMMITTEE

12:00 pm, Thursday, 10/19/2000 in the First Floor Conference Room of Powers Hall

PRESENT: M. Eftink, K. Gates, S. Larson, B. Scott, S. Threlkeld, T. Wascom, D. Wilkins

ABSENT: K. Daigle, B. Reithel, B. Taylor

1. **Approval of the 10/3 Minutes**

   Gates distributed the minutes from the 10/3 meeting and asked for comments/changes. No changes were suggested. Threlkeld moved that the minutes be approved.

2. **Presentation of EDUCAUSE Videos**

   Wascom played two videos that had been developed in support of a daylong tutorial presented by Eric Aitala, Kathy Gates, Jason Hale, and Tracy Wascom and titled, "Designing and Implementing Champion Web Projects: A Guide for IT Managers," at EDUCAUSE the previous week. These videos were developed by IT staff members (edited/produced by Wascom) to illustrate some of the challenges of developing web projects in academic settings. The videos focused mainly on the communication issues.

   Other EDUCAUSE presentations by UM included a panel discussion on TACIT and TACIT-like projects with UM (Gates and Wascom), Virginia Tech, UNC, and Mount Holyoke, a poster session focusing on Threlkeld's Estuaries project, and a presentation on SAP implementations by Buster Hale.

   Apple representative, Gary Dauphin, was in town at the time of the meeting and stopped by to visit this committee.

3. **Discussion on developing a policy for the allocation of the instructional technology fund.**

   Gates distributed a draft copy of the policy for the allocation of the instructional technology fund. Eftink suggested that the name "Educational Technology Fund" might have a broader connotation as this program will applicable to faculty and also service units that support instruction. The group agreed to make this name change. Wilkins asked what kind of activities would not be appropriate for this fund, e.g., research – other venues are available. Threlkeld suggested that some kinds of outreach from research might be appropriate. Should the fund be limited to currently enrolled students? Eftink gave an example of a potential case that did not apply to currently enrolled students. Gates suggested that projects like MathEd should be included. Since it is unknown whether this program will continue, Wilkins suggested that a better name might be the Educational Technology Grant Program.

   The following editing changes were suggested. Remove the second sentence (Threlkeld). Strike "similarly" and "that is" (Threlkeld). Make the narrative length limit three double-spaced pages instead of five (Threlkeld). Include the relevance of

the specified technology (Wilkins). Remove the vita requirement (Threlkeld). Accept Word, WP or PDF formats (Threlkeld). Don't require chair signature, but rather give the chair an opportunity to provide input (Larson and Eftink). Change the requirement of making a presentation to a possibility (Wilkins).

Gates will incorporate these comments and will repost to the group.

4. **Managing Classroom Technology Resources**

Eftink noted that this group needs to consider how we can make sure that faculty who need access to classroom technology get assigned to rooms with these capabilities. Allocation needs to be by need rather than by default assignments from previous years. Gates reported that she had discussed this with Mary Harrington, and that at a minimum, SAP/CM will have the capability of storing information on the technology capabilities of each classroom. Any scheduling algorithm will be necessarily complicated. This group will take up these issues in future meetings.

5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 pm. There will not be a meeting next week.

_____
Kathryn F. Gates, Chair   Date

APPROVED:

_____
Robert C. Khayat, Chancellor   Date