MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY STANDING COMMITTEE

1:30 pm, Thursday, 9/28/2000 in the First Floor Conference Room of Powers Hall

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

ABSENT: K. Daigle, B. Reithel

1. **Blackboard.** Gates and Wascom gave an update on Blackboard. Blackboard representatives were on campus last week to present information on levels 2 and 3 of the product. Level 2 includes a system architecture that is designed to yield better performance, especially in terms of simultaneous accesses. Specifically, the software is split across two hardware platforms – one for the application server and one for the database. This important given the recent performance problems on cedar with Blackboard and UM Web residing on the same hardware platform. Level 1 only supports the public domain database, mysql, whereas Level 2 supports Oracle. Level 2 also includes customization options for various constituencies. Level 3 includes an interface to the campus student information system. Per the request of Buster Hale, Gates is developing a 5-year funding proposal for eventually migrating to levels 2 and 3. Wascom and Gates will gather more information at the upcoming EDUCAUSE conference on competitor products.

2. **Classroom Technology.** The three ceiling-mounted units have been installed in Shoemaker, Anderson and Peabody. The portable units have been delivered to Modern Languages and Music. Technical Support Systems (TSS) has conducted training for the faculty who will be using these systems. The full lecterns are scheduled to be installed in Turner and Bondurant during the weekend of 10/14. Eftink noted the need for smart scheduling to make sure that faculty who need the technology are placed in the classrooms that possess the technology. We need to aim for full utilization. Gates noted that SAP Campus Management may include some support for managing classroom facilities. This would be a good question for individuals on that project. Threlkeld reported on a misuse case with regard to the Shoemaker projector. The committee discussed the need for an ongoing support policy. Wilkins, Scott and Wascom agreed to draft a policy for the committee to review. The policy should clearly outline departmental and Information Technology (IT) responsibilities. Departments should sign off on the policy at the time that they are notified of the decision to install the equipment in their buildings. The committee noted that it would be helpful to have a representative from the Teleproductions Resource Center (TRC) on this committee. Gates volunteered to forward this comment to the Faculty Senate.

3. **TACIT.** Eftink reported on TACIT progress. The Provost's Office has gathered input from faculty by way of application forms (http://www.olemiss.edu/tacit/TACIT2000.pdf). A small committee chaired by Eftink met last week to review applications. Most were accepted. A total of 70-80 computers will be ordered this year. Eftink will notify department chairs soon. A cut-off of 200 mhz processors and below was used this year. IT is exploring the possibility of pre-imaging these computers. Wascom reported on plans for attendant training. IT is working with Purchasing and Property Control to improve the delivery

process. Eftink reported that we will be able to recycle a portion of the computers that are being replaced.

4. **Galtney.** Gates reported on a very productive meeting that was held the previous day with the Weir Hall architects and representatives from IT, the Computer Science Department, and the Physical Plant Department. The next step is to develop detailed design drawings and then to go out for bids. Construction is scheduled to begin on February 1, 2001. This project is being bundled with the Lott Leadership project.

5. **Technology Enhancements to the Curriculum**. Gates distributed a memo from Provost Staton stating her request that this committee develop guidelines for allocating $30,000 to support technology enhancements to the curriculum. The deadline for having these guidelines in place is 10/31/2000. Wilkins noted that we will need to define what kinds of activities will be considered for funding. Threlkeld noted that we should "cast broadly" for maximum flexibility and reach. The first year of the program will be regarded as a pilot; we will need to make appropriate adjustments as we gain experience. Several noted the need for a better understanding of the related copyright issues. Eftink commented that the default position is that the faculty member owns the copyright. Exceptions include cases in which there is a substantial use for university resources or an employee is assigned to perform the work. Options exist for joint copyright. Another issue is developing course materials that rely on copyrighted materials. McDonald reminded the committee that there will be a Human Resources-sponsored workshop on copyright next week. Threlkeld stated several of his experiences as a publisher of an online journal. Wilkins suggested that we might start by defining what it means to "put a course online." "Online courses" can support synchronous or asynchronous delivery. Both are valid. There are a number of other issues with on-line learning including the potential for abuse. Scott noted that authentication is an issue, i.e., how to know that the student is who he says. This discussion will continue at the next meeting.

6. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm. The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, October 3rd at 10:30 am.

_____

_____
Kathryn F. Gates, Chair   Date

APPROVED:

_____
Robert C. Khayat, Chancellor   Date