

Minutes from the Eighth Meeting of the Task Force on Instructional Technology  
 Friday, June 4, 2004; 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.  
 Chancellors Board Room, 370 Whitmore

Agenda from the Eighth Meeting

1. Welcome and May 21<sup>st</sup> minutes: <http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/meetings.html>
2. see: <http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/subcommittees.htm> for the latest in subcommittee reports.
3. Organization and Funding Subcommittee Report
4. Hardware Subcommittee Final Report
5. A summary, including “how much money will we need”
6. General Discussion. What’s next?
7. Thanks to all—it was an incredible effort by 20 wonderful, dedicated people.

There is NO Next Meeting!

Instructional Technology Task Force					
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Building</b>	<b>Campus Phone</b>	<b>email</b>
	1 Beatrice Botch	Chemistry	Lederle GR Tower	5-0442	<a href="mailto:bbotch@chem.umass.edu">bbotch@chem.umass.edu</a>
	2 Bob Feldman (ec)	Psychology	Tobin Hall	5-0130	<a href="mailto:feldman@psych.umass.edu">feldman@psych.umass.edu</a>
zzz	Copper Giloth	Academic Computing	Lederle GRC	5-4833	<a href="mailto:giloth@oit.umass.edu">giloth@oit.umass.edu</a>
	4 David Hart	CCBIT	Computer Science Building	5-3278	<a href="mailto:dhart@cs.umass.edu">dhart@cs.umass.edu</a>
	5 Donna Zucker	Nursing/Online	Arnold House	5-1343	<a href="mailto:donna@acad.umass.edu">donna@acad.umass.edu</a>
	6 Gino Sorcinelli	Accounting and Information System	Isenberg School of Management	5-5636	<a href="mailto:gino@som.umass.edu">gino@som.umass.edu</a>
	7 Glenn Caffery	IT and Resource Economics	Stockbridge Hall	5-2554	<a href="mailto:caffery@resecon.umass.edu">caffery@resecon.umass.edu</a>
	8 Jose Mestre	Physics	Lederle GR Tower	5-2040	<a href="mailto:mestre@physics.umass.edu">mestre@physics.umass.edu</a>
x	Laetitia Amelia La Follette	ArthHistory	Bartlett Hall	5-0634	<a href="mailto:laelaf@arthist.umass.edu">laelaf@arthist.umass.edu</a>
	10 Lee Osterweil (ec)	Dean, NSM	B715 Lederle; 722	5-1785	<a href="mailto:ljo@cs.umass.edu">ljo@cs.umass.edu</a>
	11 Linda Lowery	OnLine/Continuing Ed	358 N. Pleasant Street	5-2111	<a href="mailto:lloery@contined.umass.edu">lloery@contined.umass.edu</a>
	12 Linda Slakey (ec)	Dean, Commonwealth College	504 Goodell	577-3902	<a href="mailto:lslakey@comcol.umass.edu">lslakey@comcol.umass.edu</a>
	13 Lori Mestre	Library	W.E.B. DuBois Library	5-6851	<a href="mailto:lori.mestre@library.umass.edu">lori.mestre@library.umass.edu</a>
	14 Mary L. McCulloch	Professional Education for Engineeri	113 Marcus Hall	545-0063	<a href="mailto:mcculloch@ecs.umass.edu">mcculloch@ecs.umass.edu</a>
	15 Mei-Yau Shih (ec)	Center for Teaching	Goodell Building	5-1225	<a href="mailto:mshih@acad.umass.edu">mshih@acad.umass.edu</a>
	16 Richard Rogers (chair)	Faculty Advisor to the Provost	372 Whitmore	5-2554	<a href="mailto:rogers@provost.umass.edu">rogers@provost.umass.edu</a>
	17 Rick Adrion	Computer Science	Computer Science Building	5-2475	<a href="mailto:adrion@cs.umass.edu">adrion@cs.umass.edu</a>
	18 Robert Maloy	School of Ed			<a href="mailto:rwm@educ.umass.edu">rwm@educ.umass.edu</a>
x	Steve Goodwin	Associate Dean, NRE	Stockbridge Hall		<a href="mailto:sgoodwin@nre.umass.edu">sgoodwin@nre.umass.edu</a>
	20 Steve Pielock	AIMS	Goodell Building	5-5768	<a href="mailto:pielock@acad.umass.edu">pielock@acad.umass.edu</a>
	(ec) : executive committee				

x: absent

zzz: Kate Hudson sat in for Copper.  
 John Dubach was an invited guest.

Richard opened the meeting and said the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting minutes were on the Web Site.  
 See: <http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/meetings.html>

He quickly updated the group as to what had taken place since the last full task force meeting where the group had proposed two recommendations for the Organization and Funding Subcommittee to consider. Richard said he combined that subcommittee with the Executive Committee and invited four guests to attend a meeting on May 26<sup>th</sup> to take up these recommendations. At that combined meeting, the group abandoned those proposed recommendations and offered this one [for the full report see: <http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/orgfundrpt0504.pdf>]:

We recommend that the functions presently performed by CCBIT and the key people involved be moved (administratively speaking but not necessarily physically) to the Provost Office to serve the entire campus. This new unit will be called the “Center for Educational Software Development (CESD)”, or other suitable name, and would report to the Faculty Advisor to the Provost for Undergraduate Education. The current group known as CCBIT would become part of the new CESD and would maintain research links with faculty and research associates across the campus.

OIT, especially Academic Computing, will determine what support functions can be transferred from the former CCBIT to Academic Computing to support the use of OWL (CCBIT’s most developed product to date for **Online Web-based Learning**). Academic Computing will need an increase in staff to handle this new duty and will receive somewhere between 1 and 1.5 additional FTEs to handle the new work. OIT would then pay a license fee (amount to be determined) to the CESD for the use OWL across the campus.

CESD, relieved of deployment and support burdens, will focus on extension of the former CCBIT technologies with new features and for new markets to maintain “best-in-class” status for OWL and to develop innovative software applications as part of the overall campus plan to support instructional technology. CESD will also be involved in coordination and integration of new educational technologies into the campus environment as they work with counterparts in the Center for Teaching and OIT Academic Computing. These technologies will include those developed or piloted by campus faculty. The Provost will commit to backstop a level of secure base funding of \$220,000 per year to CESD.

The Provost will form an Educational Technology Steering Committee to make formal recommendations regarding directions and goals for educational technology on our campus. The exact nature of the Steering Committee needs further thought, but several examples from other Universities exist for us to consider. The committee would likely include the Faculty Advisor to the Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Director of the Center for Teaching and/or the Coordinator of Teaching Technologies of the Center for Teaching, the Director of Academic Computing, the Director of the new CESD, the Chair of the Information Technology Program, and four to six faculty members representing the entire curriculum.

In summary, the Educational Technology Steering Committee, supported by CESD, OIT Academic Computing, and the Center For Teaching will evaluate, recommend, and assess new educational technologies. CESD will focus on developing and preparing innovative technologies for deployment, which will then be managed by OIT Academic Computing and other units as appropriate.

This arrangement should be reviewed by the Educational Technology Steering Committee and the Provost one year after it is approved.

The group discussed the recommendation. There was concern that the base level of support was insufficient as Dave Hart’s critical mass report showed that they need over twice that amount, but that they have always managed to generate the additional revenue through grants and fees. After much discussion about the pros and cons of raising the base level of funding, it was decided that the recommendation has a one year review provision and hence the funding issue could be revisited then. The proposal was voted on it with all but one person present favoring the recommendation as written.

The group then turned to the Hardware subcommittee’s final report where they recommend a mobile computing device (the Tablet PC was the preferred device, unless price and uncertainties remain too high, and then a more conventional laptop with wireless features and other minimum specifications was the next preference; for their full report see <http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/hardwarerpt0604.pdf> ).

The group was divided over the merits of the Tablet PC with some saying it was critical to improved classroom teaching and learning due to its perfect size (not too big, not too small), wireless features, and inking technologies. Others found it an unproven technology and too restrictive since it forces us

to use Microsoft's operating system. We voted first on the timing of any requirement (Tablet PC or laptop) and agreed unanimously to a start date of Fall 2006 to require all new first year students to buy such a device. We avoided forcing a choice between the Tablet PC and a laptop by agreeing that students should be required to purchase a mobile computing device for entry in Fall 2006 and we will continue to debate what the minimal requirements should be for such a device. For example, will support of inking technology be a requirement? This approach allows us to hear from vendors as to what types of packages they could provide us with and at what price. As we draw closer to the date when we must have a clear recommendation of the minimum requirements, we should know more about the state of the computing world to allow a more informed decision as to what the minimal requirements should be. Several Universities have such requirements for laptops and we will benefit from their efforts.

We modified the recommendation for supplying faculty with mobile computing devices from saying they would be Tablet PCs to saying they must be mobile computers with some minimal requirements. Also modified was the procedure for choosing which 300 instructors get a device first. Instructors will submit a one-page proposal by the end of January 2005 as to how they will use their computer in teaching and 300 will be chosen by the Educational Technology Steering Committee to receive a device by the end of May 2005 for use in courses in the Fall of 2005. It is expected some instructors will choose a Tablet PC and thus we will gain additional insights into the merits of that tool to compare to others who seek a more conventional laptop with wireless features.

Richard summarized our Task Force's recommendations by using this table:

Friday, June 04, 2004

**Report from the Instructional Technology Task Force  
New Funding Needs to Implement Recommendations**

Vision/Goal	New Funding Needs by Year				
	year 1	year 2	year 3	Three Year Total	
Classrooms	\$2,078,180	\$1,406,060	\$1,151,240	\$4,635,480	see classroom report; <a href="http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/classrpt0404">http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/classrpt0404</a> .
Computers--Faculty	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$1,800,000	see Hardware report ; <a href="http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/hardware rpt">http://www.umass.edu/provost/initiatives/it/hardware rpt</a>
Computers--Students	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000	to create support for requirement
Personal Response Systems	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000	continual wiring, support
Training and Implementation	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000	see Training and Implementation Report
Organizational changes	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$360,000	\$60,000 to backstop CESD and \$60,000 for new position in Acad Com.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,938,180</b>	<b>\$2,266,060</b>	<b>\$2,011,240</b>	<b>\$7,215,480</b>	

He then thanked all for making this task force a successful and productive effort. He will write up a draft report and circulate it to the members of the task force before sending it on to Charlena.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m..