

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