

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

3:00 P.M.- 4:30 P.M., Thursday, March 14, 2002

MEETING MINUTES

Present: Robert Burger, Scott Bradbury, James Callahan, Robert Davis, Eric Loehr, Herb Nickles, Samuel Intrator, Thomas Rohlich, Charles Staelin, and Greg White

Guest: Eric Brewer

Approval of Minutes

The committee approved the minutes of the February 21, 2002 meeting.

Long-Range Planning subcommittees- reports

Scott reported that his subcommittee had not met but they agreed to meet at 2:00 PM on February 28th before the next CET meeting. Greg did not have a report for the committee today on the progress of his subcommittee.

CET committee vacancies for 2002-2003

Bob gave the committee a handout with a list of members to be replaced on CET for next year and asked the committee to bring two names for each division with them to the next meeting. He also asked that someone volunteer to count ballots at the election.

"SRIS" alternatives

Robert said that a faculty member working in New York had inquired about what provisions were being made for remote access to accommodate faculty working off campus. The committee discussed the possibility of CFCD managing an account that faculty to request funds from to assist them in the cost of remote access necessary to their work. Scott said that he was on CFCD last year and that such a plan would require more administration than they were equipped to handle. Sam suggested a voucher system whereby faculty might be able to purchase a set amount of computer-related products from the computer store each year. The suggestion was also made that perhaps all faculty salaries should be increased by a designated amount to cover some of the expense of remote access. Herb suggested that the savings from having discontinued Crocker Communications contract should be put toward increasing bandwidth to the campus since that would benefit faculty and staff. Sam said that the cost of remote access was more of a burden on assistant professors and that perhaps there should be a technology subsidy for junior faculty.

USA – presentation to the faculty

Bob had sent the committee a draft of a document on USA that could be circulated to faculty for discussion prior to their next meeting. He said that CET would be given about twenty minutes to inform the faculty about the USA program and asked the committee for their input on how best to make the presentation. He said that the faculty must be prepared in advance for an initiative such as USA; they should have workshops, stipends for their training time, access to wireless technology, and that additional staff may have to be hired to train the faculty in teaching with technology. His feeling was that this might require a two-year effort to prepare the campus infrastructure

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

3:00 P.M.- 4:30 P.M., Thursday, March 14,2002

and the faculty in order to make this program successful once students were given universal access.

Robert said that there is already a model in place on campus for faculty learning with the technology fellows program and the interactive network classroom. Eric Brewer said that it is be important to get laptops in the hands of the faculty so that they can begin to see the benefits, especially when the campus has wireless access. Sam spoke to the committee about his experience at the UMass technology fair recently; he felt that the faculty should be exposed to the possibilities for teaching with multimedia.

Herb said that Wake Forest instituted universal student access, provided laptops by increasing tuitions, and that they had done a mass faculty training program. He did not have much feedback from schools using USA as to successes and failures with their programs and felt that it may just be too soon to get such information.

The student representatives on ITCC are proposing a "technology intensive" designation, similar to the current " writing intensive" designation; this would not necessarily become a requirement but might encourage the introduction of technology into some classes in a sustained way.

Scott felt that when addressing the faculty, Bob should speak about technology initiatives already in process like the technology teaching fellows and also speak about the preparation of faculty for teaching with technology while carefully avoiding leaving the impression that all faculty would be expected to participate. Robert said that someone in the Art department, Library, or Science Center might speak about new technologies being used in their areas that would be enhanced by USA.

As the meeting drawing to a close, Bob suggested that each committee member write a page of concerns and aspirations for the laptop program and forward them to him to consolidate for the next meeting.

There being no further business to discuss on the agenda in the time allotted, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M. The next meeting for C.E.T. is March 28th at 3:00 PM in Stoddard Hall G4.

Respectfully submitted,

Constance McGinn, recorder