FETC Regular Meeting

2017-04-19  10:00-11:00 AM   Beatty Center Room 301

Present: Adem Ali, William Bares, Alem Teklu, David Desplaces, Zach Hartje (ex officio), Deana Caveny-Noecker (ex officio - Associate Provost), Chris Boucher,

Not present: Mark Staples (CIO), David Parisi, Gary Jackson

1. Minutes of Last Meeting

Approved

2. IT Minute (given by Zach in place of Mark Staples)

Zach – We sent out communication that we will migrate off OAKS on May 11th. We extended the outage window to 24-hours to allow for testing. We have started testing differentials between original OAKS data and new cloud-hosted copy. We previously tried to do this but had to pull out due to data center issues. They created a new data center. All testing has been successful.

Alem – Will this affect faculty?

Zach – Outage only. We are just moving location of where data is stored.

In our previous meeting we discussed bringing in an external consultation to evaluate our classroom utilization. This effort has been pushed to next fiscal year. We will be writing an RFP. Review – are we scheduling appropriately? Is technology being used at ideally a 70 – 75% utilization rate.

Adem – Will this involve faculty?

Zach – Not yet determined. Yes, we will absolutely involve at least this group.

Deanna – Who is on that group?

Zach – Deanna, you are on it. Staples, Zach,

Invites Alem to join group.

Adem – How would this team conduct their evaluation?

Zach – Work with registrar to get room data and walk to view classrooms. Collect data and run evaluation software.

Adem and Chris – What type of room usage data collection do we have?
Zach – We don’t track how often faculty use Crestron, Elmo. Can track bulb usage. Each classroom has a motion sensor so we can track when rooms are in use.

We have known issues with shortages of certain sizes of classrooms. This project will provide data for future capital expenses.

Adem Ali – We know of some rooms having been outfitted with technology, but not used.

Teklu – We also have some spaces being used as storage rather than teaching.

Zach – We are planning to revise computer replacement policy, which is currently first-in, first-out. The biggest issue is that the cycle is 6-7 years and we want to reduce this time. We are also likely invite a consultant team to take a campus-wide inventory of technology. We will aim for a 4-5 year cycle. We are trying to move away from schools and departments purchasing computers. We would prefer to have all purchases done centrally through IT.

Deanna – what about equipment purchased by grants? Would department-purchased equipment be not eligible for

William – Will centralized purchasing permit specialized equipment beyond stock Dell/Apple configurations? What about upgrades and peripheral purchases?

Zach – peripherals would be department level. IT would be able to order specialized equipment. Standard machine price is $1,200.

Chris – What is the rationale for this?

Zach – To have a better track of our inventory. P-card purchases don’t post to our inventory unless department tells us.

Teklu – IT does not show us the replacement list so departments tend to take it into their own hands to replace computers.

Zach – New IT strategic initiative may create new areas one being to maintain operating systems and application software.

Zach – shared powerpoint from Mark Staples – “Digital Transformation at the College of Charleston”. Four strategic principles – personalization, automation, integration, reporting/outcomes. We will organize projects according to six broad portfolio categories such as scalability, security, among others. Our purpose is to have digital literate graduates. We will share this presentation and will engage this committee.

David D – Where are we on VOIP?

Zach – Roll out is delayed. Not this summer.

3. Faculty Technology Needs Survey (Qualtrics)

David D – We are preparing survey form in Qualtrics on IT, TLT.
In discussion with Zach, we decided to modify form so everyone gets a chance to offer suggestions even if they answer they are happy in previous question.

Decided to send one survey that asks to report separately on each class taught to avoid issue of having to fill-out and merge separate surveys by class.

We estimate time to complete the survey is five minutes. We know that Tuesday morning is the best time to send an invite to survey. We may be better to wait until third or fourth week of the fall.

I want to work with institutional research to confirm that the exported data will be in the right format.

William – Can we ask for time during department meetings?

David D- We will request departments to give us time during a faculty meeting to allow completion of the survey.


Teklu – Is this different from SharePoint

Deanna – DigArc is the vendor of catalog software (Acculog). They took all of our curriculum forms and created a workflow and forms in their Curriculog system. Changes to course descriptions, pre-reqs, etc. will automatically propagate to the catalog. Gave example of issue where corrected version of form gets mixed up as it goes to Faculty Curriculum Committee.

I think SharePoint has just been used as a repository for various committees. SharePoint is not a workflow.

5. Others

Zach – The wireless network on campus

We have three SSIDs, eduroam, cofcguest, cofcsecure. Eduroam allows you to use your CofC login to use wireless network at other participating schools. We are third behind Clemson and USC for adopting. Eduroam and CofC secure are identical. We will decommission CofcSecure over the year. This month we are promoting use of Eduroam. Eduroam logins require your full username@cofc user name.

We have installed AppleTV in two rooms so far to wirelessly project from devices to projectors.

Adjourned

10:52 AM
FETC Regular Meeting

2017-03-01  10:00-11:00 AM  Beatty Center Room 220

Present: William Bares, Chris Boucher, Gary Jackson, Alem Teklu, David Desplaces, David Parisi, Zach Hartje (ex officio), Mark Staples (CIO)

Not present: Deana Caveny-Noecker (ex officio - Associate Provost), Adem Ali

1. Minutes of Last Meeting
Approved

2. IT Minute

Mark – VOIP is off the ground. Vendor selected before last summer (end of 2015), started running into technical issues of concern. We started looking at Skype for Business that integrates with Office 365. The state contract does not allow this option. We will need to stay with one of the three vendors on state contract. So, we are continuing to move forward with the original vendor as they had worked to address issue. We received extension from state until Dec. 31st (was June 30). In phase 1 we will replace phones with handsets so things will appear to work same way. In phase 2 we will add unified messaging tying messaging to mobile devices. With VOIP your office number will follow you where you go, even overseas, provided you have access to wireless internet. Roll out time is currently 1.5 hours per phone line. We have not produced a rollout schedule. We will be sending postcards in campus mail to inform faculty and staff. Our plan is to rollout for faculty in May (end of spring), or wait for winter break – still to be determined.

David Parisi – Is there a possibility for outages?

If there is a power outage longer than twenty minutes, VOIP phone will be unavailable.

Greg – Wifi or 4G LTE?

Mark – Clients will operate on either form of communication. First rollout will be to a VOIP handset in offices. Second phase will introduce VOIP on mobile devices.

David Desplaces – Does this help with adjuncts being able to have phones? SACS cited us for not providing offices and office phones for adjuncts.

Mark – This may be an area for improvement. We can give adjuncts a CofC number that will ring their personal devices.

David Parisi – Will this create an expectation of unlimited availability?
Mark – This would only be an issue if you elect to receive calls on a personal device. Your voice mail can be routed to your e-mail. There are 2,000 phones.

David Desplaces – Involve this membership in testing.

Zach – We are rolling out a new service ticketing system and will be seeking faculty input, including FETC membership.

Mark – I have an approval to bring in an outside company to assess our classroom utilization in consultation with faculty, registrar, and academic affairs. Our goal is to have acceptable classrooms and identifying a minimum standard for technology. We will change the nomenclature from gold, silver, etc. to be type 1, type 2, type 3 (higher numbers indicate more features). We are also investigating to identify some space on campus for a prototype classroom open for faculty to evaluate new technology.

Alem – What is the status of current classroom upgrades (Mark clarified these are renovations – capital projects)?

Mark – On the current schedule, these to-be updated rooms would not be refreshed again until 2030. We want to separate refresh of technology for renovation. We would like to be able to do a three-year refresh cycle. Newer laser projectors should have a longer life and refresh cycle.

David Parisi – My freshman are saying that they still prefer print material to content on devices. We cannot simply assume that they will want more devices and paperless delivery.

David Desplaces – We can expect to need to continue to offer diverse options for receiving content.

Mark – Providing multiple options is appropriate since learning and teaching styles differ.

David Parisi – What is our current update cycle?

Mark – It appears to be a six- or seven-year cycle from what I can see. Faculty technology needs differ between fields. Buying faster hardware will last longer. We are currently assessing the cycle.

David Parisi – Can IT help with routine maintenance of computers?

Mark – Yes, we have been replacing mechanical drives with solid state drives and more memory, which has resulted in speedups for many users.

10:46 AM

2. Chairs and TLT survey draft

David Desplaces – Let’s look at the draft survey. We need to format the questions so that it can be entered into Qualtrix. Survey will expand optional questions (if you answered yes, then you see related options to select).

Gary and Chris – Good. Seeing all available options may inspire further thoughts.
3. Task force to develop new general studies major

Zach – The task force is moving forward to identify a way to deliver a bachelor’s degree in general studies.

Alem – Some of the course work may be online.

Zach – Some general education requirements may not permit a fully online version.

Adjourned

10:56 AM

Saved for later

4. Update on undergraduate / graduate catalog
FETC Regular Meeting

2017-02-02  2:00-3:00 PM Tate Center Room 202

Present: Adem Ali, William Bares, Gary Jackson, Alem Teklu, David Desplaces, Zach Hartje (ex officio), Deana Caveny-Noecker (ex officio - Associate Provost), Mark Staples (CIO)

Not present: Chris Boucher, David Parisi

1. Minutes of last meeting
Alem - Motion to approve.  Adem – second.

2. IT Minute (deferred to wait for Mark’s arrival – See item below)

3. Chairs and TLT survey
David – What is the status of the annual IT survey?
Zach – Solicit chairs to talk to their faculty to provide input of lab needs.
David – Where is this raw data on room recommendations? Not all faculty feel like they are consulted.
Deanna – Classroom upgrades are different from software upgrades.
Zach – OK.
Deanna – Three different situations of service OAKS software (TLT), facilitates, classroom upgrades (TLT), and lab software (IT)
Zach – In 2013 had funds to do all requested updates. Most recently, did only 10. We are currently identifying rooms from prior year list that were not upgraded. That is why no solicitation went out this year.
David – We should communicate this status to whole faculty.
Zach – We have a tentative prioritized list based on ticket requests and prior year rooms.
David – There are 3 classes that are undergoing work during the spring semester. Some faculty were unaware.
Zach – Mark and I have been listening individually to deans. In the last round of meetings, we pitched a new concept to centralize the budgeting and scheduling of all classrooms. This would make it easier to manage and understand room utilization.

Deana – We are at almost 80% utilization of classrooms.

Mark – No one has complete visibility of all this data so we have an estimate.

Mark – Would like to have some rooms that serve specific needs (higher end). This coordination would make it easier to fulfill requests such as a specialized music classroom for CSC and Music. We can deliver better.

Ali – Centralizing would mean specialized spaces become shared? What if a specialized department lab is already heavily utilized?

Mark – The idea is to enhance what we can currently do. We have 33 classrooms with no technology. 55 rooms have very old technology. Currently each department takes care of classrooms in their respective buildings.

Zach – These 88 rooms represent about 30%

Ali – Why?

Mark – Budget constraints.

Alem – Was this discussed with chairs?

Mark – Not yet, but upcoming.

Deana – Some issues in policy of deciding who gets a room. It’s not necessarily FCFS.

Mark – It is possible to allocate based on an objective priority, resources needed, proximity.

Deana – Additional constraints make it harder to find a feasible schedule.

Mark – It appears to be a utilization / scheduling issue.

Alem – Some lab rooms in physics are used for storage.

Mark – We need to do a systemic analysis.

Deana – We have done some analyses, but did some for certain buildings.

Mark – Should we do an analysis campus-wide?

Deana – We can look at existing information and conduct a new analysis. However, decision must be made at the academic level and will required time from academic administrators.

David – Involving deans and chairs does not always mean information is relayed to faculty.

Deana – IT and TLT have authority and responsibility to engage with chairs.

David – Where is the raw survey data from past years?
Mark – In carrying forward, we need discussion and buy-in from deans and chairs and I want to use FETC to be a part.

IT Minute

Mark – Regrading the 88 sub-standard rooms, we need to do better with budgeting to get these rooms ready. The 33 no-tech rooms would only be useful for classes that don’t need any tech.

Alem – What feedback has IT received on these rooms? Can we get this feedback?

Mark – What is a standard tech classroom?

Deana – Other than classroom upgrades, we don’t have a definition. What must a faculty need to do in class to justify getting a tech room for the whole semester?

Mark – There are 259 classrooms on campus. What is the refresh cycle? For projectors / PCs? Can we aim for all PCs being no older than 2 or 3 years? I agree that we want to provide best environment for student learning.

David – Share data on room usage and needs of teaching. When is the decision made?

Deana – Usage data is not ideal since it says what has been done, but not what is wanted. For example, we have heard a desire for more medium-sized classrooms.

4. Matlab campus-wide license

Zach – College bought site-wide license before holidays. We are now working with users to ensure that we have all needed toolkits. Will announce this news later in this month.

Alem – Can we install Matlab now? Work with Godfrey Davis.

Ali – Can we distribute license through OAKS login so we don’t need to request a license?

Zach – We will need to look into this.

Deana – Place license link under faculty tab.

Mark – Goal is to offer a consistent experience from any campus computer. With Matlab students can install on their own computers.

Zach – We have a prototype for self-service app to download and install campus-wide apps.

David – What is the status of OAKS? Will it be changed?

Zach – Unable to move OAKS to cloud due to vendor issue. Started to internally discuss moving to another LMS. If we move forward, we will involve the entire community.
5. Wireless presentations

Zach – Evaluating tools in room. Alem and David tried them out. AppleTV had the best quality and was least expensive. Installed in beat 212 and HW 209 for in-class tests.

3:15 pm Adjourned
FETC Regular Meeting

2016-11-11  3:00-4:00 PM Beatty Center Room 301

Present: Adem Ali, William Bares, Gary Jackson, David Parisi, Alem Teklu, David Desplaces

1. Review of 2015-2016 Annual FETC Report

Alem Teklu – We will discuss review of the 2015-16 FETC annual report and consider how we can gather input on technology from chairs and deans.

David Desplaces – Meeting time allocated to IT minute should be limited. We can have separate venues for extended interactions with IT.

David Parisi – One example issue is that the mobile technology carts in Mayback are not easy to use. We need to ensure that we always do usability testing before rollouts.

David Desplaces – This committee in the past has relied on surveying chairs on technology needs from their departments, but the responses are not always completed. Seven years ago IT had test centers in the Bell Building and had people rotate through to participate in testing.

David Desplaces – This committee should soon have access to survey responses from the chairs since October 15th was the deadline for chairs to respond to IT’s technology needs survey. This committee should ask CIO Mark Staples for a copy of the feedback received.

William Bares – Does this committee participate in designing the survey that IT sends to chairs?

David Desplaces – No, this has not been the case recently. This committee can bring this question to new CIO Mark Staples.

Adem Ali – If we design a survey, it should balance faculty teaching needs versus IT’s priorities.

Gary Jackson – We could consider different survey formats tailored to best solicit feedback from the different departments.

David Parisi – Comments on issues with Deep Freeze lab management software cleaning out software that had been installed for class use.

David Desplaces – Previously the CIO’s focus had been on measurable such as the number of technology-equipped classrooms. This committee should focus on a broader perspective. Reports are available that detail which rooms are in line for updates and this committee should request them.

Alem Teklu – This committee should be proactive in finding ways to gather input on technology.

Gary Jackson – What about wireless video?
David Parisi – Commented that there is value in being able to use an iPad to wirelessly play video to a class, but we must consider the cost of bringing in this technology.

David Desplaces – Suggested possible questions to ask in soliciting input could include what technology do you use and what are your unmet needs?

David Parisi – Commented that it is important for this committee to be able to have input into survey questions.

David Parisi – Suggests that IT could actively check with departments for technology needs.

David also suggested connecting a TLT staff member with IT and that TLT staffer’s specific school.

Alem Teklu – What are the open issues with distance education?

David Desplaces – The College may drop D2L and contract for cloud services. Faculty who teach distance education courses would like to control access to their distance education content so that they can know when their materials are being evaluated.

David Parisi – Commented that it is possible to evaluate distance education courses before they go live to the students since they are prepared well in advance of the start of classes.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.
1. Introduction of Mark Staples, our new Chief Information Officer (CIO).

Mark Staples – What is the charge of the Faculty Education Technology Committee (FETC)?

David Desplaces – Provide advice to CIO, review policy, recommendations

David Parisi – Talk about examples of things done in recent past

David Parisi – Reviewed distance ed, some reports 3-4 pages, issues of feedback from new technology releases (Yammer, online eval), process for equipment upgrades, funding, Google mail. Anyone can bring an issue to this committee. Still need to develop a way to capture unmet needs.

Deana – One challenge is how to be more strategic versus responding to individual complaints while keeping in mind that some individual complaints represent broader issues.

Alem – We can have a planning meeting of FETC members only to think of how to gather input on issues so we broadly represent our respective Schools within the College.

Deana – The Faculty Senate can change the charge of FETC, if you find it helpful to do so.

Mark Staples – This post is my 7th college in 32 years including Indiana U, Northeastern (four years), prior to Wentworth Institute. Worked as IT head (similar to Zach Hartje) at three different schools. I have been an adjunct faculty member at Northeastern U. In my CofC interview I observed there is a perception that our IT shop is not as tuned to academics as it should. I reviewed faculty minutes, information from IT Strategic Advisory Committee (ITSAC), from Battery, etc. trying to understand their respective roles. I will closely link with the Provost, libraries, IT to enable functional connections. In my view, the ‘I’ in CIO stands for advancing the institution. 90+% of our revenue is from tuition. For example, how can we make it easier for faculty to enter grades? We (IT) want to put ourselves in your place. I also heard faculty senates at other places say that faculty feel technology is imposed on them by IT.

Alem – When did you begin?

Mark Staples - Friday Sept. 30. I plan to meet with Deans twice a semester since each School has its own needs and direction, issues. Some of this gets lost. How many members on ITSAC?

Zach – 25
Mark Staples – We will have lots of information on what each School needs. Let’s bring these needs into our governance process for setting priorities.

Adem Ali – Will you review how things work now – have weekly meeting with units in IT, and functional units out of IT. Plan to have ways to meet with individual departments.

Adem Ali – How would you prioritize?

Mark Staples – Issue is in governance, (Ali – pleased to hear this attention to faculty/teaching). We currently don’t do well at informing the community of what issues are being worked on. It would be great if we can better communicate what is being worked on and offer a timetable for work in progress. This year we have $900,000 approved for classroom technology upgrades, but only ten rooms can get an upgrade due to coordination issues. I see as a goal to take us to a digital university considering the impact on administration and teaching. This area is the topic of my Ph.D. dissertation. This issue crossroads with financial aid and student debt. Our future students may not have touched a book, but use devices instead. Are we ready for true digital native. What if – grades could be entered into D2L, then into Banner – wouldn’t that be easy.

David Parisi – We have been down these roads and have seen some pushback from faculty. The digital native may be a myth. I am not so sure that changes to respond to digital natives will be as drastic as some may think.

Mark Staples – I think we are 7 – 10 years away from seeing this phenomenon. In our world, we should be thinking of it. Higher Education teaching is still using the same methods as in day of Socrates. Faculty have a full load of teaching, research, service, and must keep up their expertise and pedagogy. I understand that it is not a short path to reach the goal of a digital university. I see the issue being enabling everyone to do what they need.

David Parisi – The myth of the digital native may push us to rush to fads like Second Life in classroom.

William – How do you see us testing new technologies on small scale before they are introduced into the classrooms?

Mark Staples – At Northeastern, we created a tech lab where people could try out technology - an Innovation center. In a past post at an academic medical center, we had 10 smart classes (1 of every 10 rooms), but 70% of classes in those rooms didn’t use the technology. Explore new ways, work with registrars so we schedule classes that best use the tech. We know that art history class, may need high end projector.

2. Minutes of last meeting

Minutes are approved as posted to the FETC web site.

3. IT Minute

David Desplaces – Think of how time is spent on trouble shooting versus strategic ideas. Literally had an IT minute. I suggest that every 6 months, we invite all faculty to talk to Mark.
Mark Staples – I expect to have open forum with faculty and I am happy to do this.

Deana – Committee duties – service, support, appropriate uses, education of those uses, consider and plan long range use, discuss suggestions, advice provost on educational technology use, advise CIO. ITSAC was created by IT to serve the CIO. CIO partners with FETC to connect with faculty/forum.

4. Undergraduate / graduate catalog

Alem – This agenda item came from a question from faculty. The undergrad/grad catalog is a PDF file. This year format has changed. Why?

Deana – The previous vendor is no longer available. We needed a new, more robust solution. We did an RPF and selected a new product which integrates tracking of curriculum changes with the generated catalog.

Alem – This new software requires more steps to click.

Mark Staples – Which software?

Andrew – Accalog

Deana – CurriculLog is the curriculum management counterpart.

David Desplaces – classroom upgrades some during semester, some timing issues of when changes happen. Sometimes management misses on informing and explaining changes.

Alem – Can new vendor generate a PDF?

Deana – We can check on whether it can generate a PDF.

Mark Staples – PDF is cumbersome on mobile devices.

David Parisi – It would be awesome to have both mobile friendly and PDF for desktop access.

Mark Staples / Deana – Agree. We can look into this.

5. Office 365 Update

Andrew – We have migrated over 4000 e-mail accounts. Next steps are to reconfigure mail flow so it runs entirely in the cloud and implementing hosting services to aid authentication so that you can login if College has issues locally. Try going into portal.office.com Login with CofC Id. There are planning tools, etc.

Ali – When I make an appointment, the location is sometimes shown as in some other place.

David Desplaces – For example search “liberty”, but Office 365 searches for other places not located at CofC.

Deana – This is the same problem on a device with e-mail.

Andrew – Office 365 is just doing a literal word match.
Deana – The old outlook applied frequency to estimate the most likely matches.
Deana – on catalog – provides a search window. Can select courses, programs, print.

6. Wireless presentations in classrooms
Zach – We have a solution for wireless presentation from mobile device to classroom projector/smartboard/TV. The network infrastructure limits make it harder to try web-based solutions. Ready for FETC to beta test. Try in “burn in room” in Bell building.
Alem – Time is running short. We will follow up by e-mail on remaining item –

7. TLT conferences (will communicate via e-mail)

8. MATLAB campus-wide licenses
Mark – The cost for a site license is not much more expensive than what we pay now for three different licenses. Can go to site license for not much more. Part of me says if available it would be used. Cost difference?
Alem – I heard the cost is $9k to $16k/year.
Mark – We might be able to negotiate price down.
Ali – My project may pay another $5k for more licenses.
Mark – Then it sounds like we should just go to site license.
Alem – Let’s do survey to see how much interest there is in having a site license.

9. Other issues
David Desplaces – Moving the tenure/promotion and post-tenure review site access on Society to only from on-campus, means that we cannot access from off campus during hurricane.
Deanna – Let’s talk more about this after the meeting.
Alem – We are adjourned. (3 PM)
FETC Regular Meeting
2016-08-31  3:00 PM Tate Center Room 202

I. Welcome

As outgoing chair, David Desplaces introduced the makeup and role of the committee. The FETC includes 7 faculty as voting members and 3 ex-officio members, which are the TLT Director, CIO representative, and provost office representative.

II. Introductions


Each person listed as present is briefly introduced.

III. Chair and Secretary Election

David Desplaces: called for nominations for chair and secretary.

Alem Teklu was nominated for chair and William Bares was nominated for secretary.

Both were accepted by acclamation. Alem deferred to David to continue leading the meeting.

IV. Agenda for the Year

a. Review of committee charge

David Desplaces: pointed out that he is also on the Strategic Advisory Committee for Technology which had been appointed to advise the College’s Chief Information Officer (CIO), previously Bob Cape.

David Desplaces: read the by-laws of the FETC.

David Desplaces described the FETC’s purpose as being to gather feedback for the benefit of the entire community. How can we be most inclusive in soliciting feedback from the campus community?

b. Review of Annual Reports

David Desplaces: identified several key issues for the new committee to consider including:

1. What type of mechanism should we have for the community to direct issues to this committee? We might be able to add one question to the existing IT survey.

2. What equipment should go into technology-equipped classrooms?

3. Which classes are selected to be scheduled in technology-equipped classrooms?

4. Which classes get selected for technology replacements or new installations?

Recent budget cuts have reduced the number of rooms that can be updated each year. In the past, we ideally have updated 30 – 35 rooms per year.
Zach: added that in FY 2017, only 10 rooms could be updated at a cost of between $28k - $35k per room. Typically rooms are updated every 5 – 7 years. The College has updated about 130 rooms since FY 2012. The campus has about 230 classrooms. We now anticipate an every 8-10 year update cycle.

David Desplaces: asked where can we find a report listing the status of technology rooms and updates?

Zach: said the campus IT web page has a page that lists an inventory of available rooms and their level of technology installed.

The campus is planning to phase-in a new phone system using Voice over IP digital technology, which would make it possible to receive phone calls and voice to text on mobile devices. The FETC can serve as early adoption testers to help identify and fix issues in the same way that FETC members helped to test the recently released Yammer information feed.

Zach: spoke about the upcoming technology rollout of a new service desk application which would replace the current e-mail to helpdesk AT cofc system. IT anticipates have a beta version in several months and the FETC is invited to participate in testing. The new system will allow users to view the progress and status of support requests.

David Desplaces: asked if we know the name of the new CIO?

Zach: said that Mark Staples will be announced as the new CIO. Mark Staples, currently at Wentworth Institute of Technology, will join the College on October 3rd.

David Desplaces: asked about the reasoning behind the move to Voice over IP.

Zach: said that all state of South Carolina agencies will switch to Voice over IP so consequently, the College will switch. The service will require installation of new phone equipment. IT plans to replace faculty phones in May after the end of the spring semester.

Gary: How will the equipment be swapped?

Zach: said that there will be one Ethernet cable that will split to your office computer and the other to the new phone equipment. IT anticipates completing about 40 phone replacements per day. Spirit will act as the service provider.

Adem: Will the costs of the new phones be billed to departments?

Zach: said that yes, departments are currently billed for phone service. In fact some departments have disconnected unused lines to reduce their costs.

David Parisi: What will be the cost per line?

Zach: said that Voice over IP will cost $12 - $22 per month per line with a phone rental fee of $2 per month per phone.

David Parisi: When I was at Rutgers, we did away with our phone system to save money.

Gary: Some faculty in English have opted out to save money.

David Parisi: My department pays $200 per year for a phone I used about four times.
David Desplaces: said that even if we all did away with phones, that we should not expect money saved to flow back to the departments that gave up their phones.

David Parisi: It would be possible for a staff member could answer a single department line and route callers to personal faculty phones.

Alem: asked if it would be possible for faculty to receive Voice over IP earlier than May.

Zach: said that it would be best to wait until after the semester so that as much as possible all faculty are running the same system. There were some problems with the Office 365 rollout that went beyond its planned completion date prior to start of fall so some faculty were experiencing issues communicating over two versions of the College’s e-mail system.

David Desplaces: suggested a Voice over IP rollout in summer II, which tends to be less busy.

David Desplaces: also asked if faculty need to be present for the phone replacements?

Zach: said no.

Zach: added that the IT quality of service survey was skipped this year due to the change in CIO. We might also consider using an app that integrates with Yammer to solicit input on technology concerns.

David Desplaces: added that from his sitting on the Strategic Advisory Committee for Technology appointed by the CIO, he sees more open issues related to distance education (DE).

Zach: added that the College has been moving gradually toward cloud-based services, which offers backup in case of natural disaster. The incoming CIO said that he plans to continue this advisory board.

David Parisi: pointed out that in past discussions of distance education in the Distance Education Steering Committee, faculty are concerned with who owns content that they create for their online courses.

David Desplaces: said that the College can take your content and pass it along to another faculty member if you are unavailable to teach that course again.

David Parisi: this type of policy on ownership of faculty-created course content is fairly standard.

David Desplaces: clarified that the College retains ownership of faculty-created content for one year. The motivation is for continuity.

David Desplaces: discussed evaluation of the quality of distance education courses as another open area which the FETC may consider. There are questions of rising numbers of students in distance education courses due to increases in course enrollment caps. Faculty time is also a concern since an online student may demand more faculty time in answering e-mails. What type of access should chairs have in reviewing your online course materials? Can chairs drop in anytime or do faculty know when a chair might browse their online course?

David Parisi: It would be worth being part of these discussions. The distance education steering committee reports to FETC.
Christopher: asked David Desplaces about how his enrollments in distance education courses have looked.

David Desplaces: said that his classes have started with about 26 then reduced to 18 after four weeks.

Gary: Which of our courses are chosen to be evaluated? Will an administrator choose to evaluate a DE version of a class that is sometimes taught on-campus by the same faculty?

David Desplaces: ended by saying that FETC should plan to meet once per month except December for the balance of the fall 2016 semester.

Meeting is adjourned at 4:15 PM.