TLT Preliminary Minutes
February 10, 2015, 1403 GITC 1:00-2:30pm

Attendees
Voting Members: Ron Rockland, Bill Reynolds (co-chair), Dave Ullman, Ellen Wisner, Haidong Huang, Hsin-Neng Hsieh, Andrzej Zarzycki, Taro Narahara, Marvin Nakayama, Serhiy Levkov, Elizabeth Petrick, Yvette Wohn, Paul Ranky, Brian Callahan, Andres Jerez
Non-voting Members: Richard Sweeney, Blake Haggerty, Rob Arms, Jenna Walther, Michael Koskinen, Joe Bonchi, Nafiza Akter
Other: Ryan Mass (attending in Gale Spak’s place)

Approval of the minutes of the November TLT meeting
Approved unanimously

TLT/CITLAR Committee progress reports:

- Technology Plan update – Dave Ullman
  - No comments received from first draft; will be updated to align better with the strategic plan and 2020 Vision that was recently approved
  - Convergence will be added to the technology plan
  - By the next meeting, there will be a recycled draft of this plan

- Converged class model – Blake Haggerty
  - A number of presentations have been made on converged learning; Dave presented at the recently Rutgers Online and Hybrid Conference in January
  - We have a number of courses running this semester, with student employees working as CoPilots
  - Hope to have a meeting this month to discuss things further
  - Next challenge is to get more rooms equipped with the technology required
  - Question: How do we get faculty to be more aware of converged learning?
    - Possibly doing a short presentation at the faculty senate, and there was discussion about also doing a video

- Emerging Educational Methods & Assessment – Ron Rockland
  - Four types of methods: Just in time learning, learning in chunks, adaptive learning and individualized learning
  - Next meeting: will try to put together a few tools like TopHat and PollEverywhere. iClicker is coming out with something called Reef that we might need to explore.
    - Yvette mentions that colleagues in Michigan have been using TopHat for a few years now, and students did not like having to pay for the app; especially because the app is only good for a semester
    - She mentions that she has been using Twitter hashtags to get student questions and comments and that has been successful
  - Ron has found that creating videos have been successful, and found that students will look at videos more than once

- Undergraduate Computing Requirements – Elizabeth Petrick
  - On a university level: recommend what we have now, which is what IST recommends for hardware
  - Individual schools should be able to choose specific criteria for students, and this should continue
  - Similar policies and policy structures are shared by our peer institutions
  - The only change would be to remove the word “minimal” from the recommendation because things like DVD drives are listed there, which do not seem necessary for all students
How do we accommodate this policy with *Bring Your Own Device*? The current policy states “Access to a device”--so this is broad and can refer to access to a lab computer or personal computer.

How do we accommodate to changing needs? It’s important for individual schools to have specific requirements or recommendations for students, as each one may need students to have access to specific software applications.

- For example, Architecture students will require a better graphics card than Electrical Engineering.
- A proposed solution is to have a lab where students can join via VPN to access the softwares that we need them to use; for example, some international students do not get back to the US until February, but they should be able to access the class remotely if needed.
- From a budgeting standpoint: if we create a computer lab with 100-computers, then we have to maintain and replace those devices every few years.
- The TSC is going to be implementing LabStats, which will give us metrics on how the PC Mall lab is being used, the frequency of visits, and the use of software. It will correlate usage with location.

We should have a professional development opportunity where we highlight how we can leverage student devices to optimize instruction.

Software Library Policies – **Rich Sweeney** and **Rob Arms**

- Committee met and looked at software as a whole; looking at it from ground up: what software is out there. Currently, this committee is at a exploratory stage, not ready to make any solidified recommendations.
- Looking to use what the TSC finds from the Lab usage statistics to enhance and solidify the finalized policy.
- Will call another meeting to discuss further finalizing this policy; *preliminary policies added as addendum*.
- Question: What other kinds of software, not associated with a specific department, may benefit the university/students as a whole; for example:
  - Language learning (we are getting Rosetta Stone, and that will give us some statistics) and office suite.
  - Camtasia Relay and WebEx have previously been financed by DL fees and have traditionally been free and available to students.
- How do we raise awareness amongst newer or transfer students about the software we have available for free to them?
  - TSC does an orientation that goes over this for all international, new, and transfer students.

**Physical and Virtual Learning Spaces** – **Joe Bonchi**

- Have not had much responses in Moodle to questions; looking to arrange a meeting soon to meet and discuss.

**Research Computing Infrastructure** – **David Perel**

- Will be discussed as a part of CITLAR.

**Update on teaching and learning spaces designs** – **Joe Bonchi**

- Fenster
  - Fenster 2nd Floor is being completed.
  - NJII is moving into the 5th floor of Fenster. Telecom is also moving.
  - Generally, there will be a lot of relocating of offices.
Central King Building status
- The fourth floor has a room with a 80” display screen
- The third floor is mostly done: one of the issues was that the podiums did not have lockable wheels; as a result, people moved podiums and disconnected the cables that are at the podium
- Chuck Brooks is teaching a converged class in CKB 303, so we are working out the quirks for that specific room
- Blake and Joe are on a subcommittee that works with the learning space builders, and they are working on the rest of the building. Some things that are being worked on are: finalizing classroom spaces, an emporium space, and open spaces. Some things will be finalized by the end of this month and will have more to report by TLT’s next meeting
- Originally the 2nd floor was supposed to be closed after the 3rd floor was opened; however, we don’t have enough teaching spaces so we will keep both floors as classrooms. 2nd floor will be enhanced to look a bit more aesthetically pleasing
  - We focused on some of the non-technology things to nurture active learning amongst students
  - We have lots of issues with physical classrooms: like lights and desks that are inflexible
  - Ron mentions that he was switched to a very different room, and he notes that if he knew about the room ahead of time--he would have restructured his instruction to best suit that room

Discussion on prior DL Fee Budget - Dave Ullman
- The University has restructured fees, and there is no longer a DL fee. The University’s budgeting process does not necessary tie revenues to expenses; we have a flat budget and have to make due with the money allocated to us or request additional funds
  - Previously, there were many detailed fees; these were consolidated into one larger fee, and a new major event fee (this fee is aimed to make campus life more engaging to students)
  - Due to lack of funds for the January Faculty Institute, faculty were encouraged to attend the RU Online and Hybrid Conference and reimbursed for registration
- Question for Marvin Nakayama: DL fees used to pay for Proctoring services, what happens with that?
- Ryan Mass, filling in for Gale Spak, mentions that proctors are coming out of CPE’s budget and hope to provide that in the future
  - CPE is providing proctoring on a needs basis, and only offering it for graduate students
  - Proposing: The university should provide proctoring services, whether the course is delivered online, hybrid, converged, or face-to-face, and students should not have to pay extra for proctoring services

Report on Technology Support Center – Blake Haggerty
- Deferred to next meeting

Continuing report on the continuing Converged course pilot - Nafiza Akter & Bill Reynolds
- Deferred to next meeting

Status update of Pearson-Embanet initiative – Gale Spak
- Deferred to next meeting

Next meeting
- March 10th, 2015
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- Moodle section for discussion and adding resources
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Addendum

TLT and CITLAR Sub-Committee on Software Library Policies  
December 3, 2014 Report

Members: Rob Arms (TLT), Joe Bonchi (TLT), Janice Daniel (CITLAR), Ann Hoang (chair, CITLAR/TLT), Norman Loney (TLT), Jolanta Soltis (TLT), Dave Ullman (CITLAR/TLT)

Charge: Develop a process to solicit and prioritize new academic software title requests for inclusion in the budgeting cycle for a new academic year. The process should include a review of existing academic software titles for possible removal as well.

Questions/Issues to Explore:

• Are we investing resources into software titles that are being used by students, faculty, and staff?
• Recommend a process might be similar to or run parallel with similar processes used by the library for management of databases and electronic journal subscriptions.

Meeting: November 19, 2014

The sub-committee met on Wednesday November 19, 2014. Only three members (Rob Arms, Janice Daniel, and Ann Hoang) attended the meeting.

Discussion/Recommendations

1. Need to collect software usage statistics to understand how these titles are being used. This will help to prioritize resources/funding.
   a. Rob mentioned LABSTATS software was recently installed on the workstations in the IST managed computer lab to track usage.
   b. IST currently collects software download statistics with UCID login. But it does inform how these software titles are being use.
   c. Janice asked about collecting how online students use of software titles. Can it be done?

2. Create a data dictionary to define key definitions for software to help determine purchasing priority. It should also be shared with purchasing department to ensure adherence to the process. For example:
   a. Software license – purchasing of a software license allows usage for a set amount of time
   b. Software – purchase of a software allows usage indefinitely with no access to upgrade
   c. Etc...

3. Prioritize software purchase into categories with definition of each category.
   a. University-wide software license – enterprise level with perpetual use and/or personal use paid for by IST budget and install on all computer labs manage by IST staff. This includes faculty and staff workstations (office and home).
      i. Establish a funding line for university-software license with set-a-side amount for exceptions. Exceptions must be approved by designated personnel.
   b. Departmental/Instructional (Academic) software license – purchase and install by department on departmental-specific computer labs. This includes all software use for instructional/academic programs that may also be installed on IST managed computer lab.
      i. Establish a funding line for departmental software license with cost threshold. Must be approved by designated personnel.

   1. Cost consideration: enterprise-level vs. per license
      a. Single department request with how many license/seats
      b. Multiple department request with how many license/seats

4. Reviewed IST software webpage to identify:
   a. A list of university-wide software
   b. A list of departmental software
   c. A list of no longer being supported by IST – IRIS and Solaris
It was concluded that many on the list are no longer being supported university-wide and can be removed. Also, an IST staff can easily create an excel workbook to accurately produce this information.

5. Review existing “Request for New Instructional Software” webpage. Revision is needed to tighten up several areas, e.g. the “Software Request Preparation Document Form”

6. Establish a funding line to purchase university-wide software license/software with a Provost set-a-side for exceptions. Exceptions must be approved by designated personnel.

7. Establish a zero-based budgeting for the coming fiscal year

8. We concluded that more information was needed from the other members particularly Dave Ullman and Jolanta Soltis who could provide detail information and history of current policy.

9. Another meeting will be schedule in January 2015.

Review of Existing Sources and Policies


1. **Current databases**: During the February meeting of the current fiscal year, each CITLAR department representative gets 50 points to distribute among the subscribed database list for renewal or cancellation. The usage data will help guide the voting process. Any databases that fall below the established funding line will be targeted for cancellation. Each database voted on must be retained for a 3-years subscription to ensure accurate assessment of its value to the university community before being targeted for cancellation.

2. **Unfunded databases**: If the library receives a budget increase that exceeds the inflationary cost of subscribing to existing resources, new database(s) will be considered after a trial is completed each fall semester. Another round of funding will be completed to determine which databases, if any, will be purchased. Purchases will be made in July of the new fiscal year.

B. Most colleges and universities have only general recommendations or departmental-specific recommendation for software purchase. Only Loyola University Chicago posted their software purchase policy online.

3. Loyola University Chicago, http://www.luc.edu/its/policy_hw_sw_acquisition.shtml. According to the policy each department is responsible for purchasing their own software and must comply with information technology services (ITS) review process to ensure that all software purchased is compatible with the university’s environment, and to enhance cost efficiency of the university overall. To ensure compliance with the review policy, the purchasing department will verify that the acquisition form has been reviewed and approved by ITS.


7. University of Georgia, https://eits.uga.edu/hardware_and_software/software

**Conclusion**
Further discussion is needed. Some great ideas were generated in the discussion section to draft recommendations.

**Action**

- Identify an IST to complete #4 – Rob Arms / Jolanta Soltis / Joe Bonchi / Dave Ullman
  - Feedback from all members, especially those that were not at the meeting: Rob Arms, Joe Bonchi, Janice Daniel, Ann Hoang, Norman Loney, Jolanta Soltis, Dave Ullman
- Further discussion to finalize the recommendations
- Schedule a meeting for early January preferably before the next TLT meeting.