

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**LUTC NOVEMBER 17, 2005**  
**9:30 – 11:00 A.M.**  
**MEMORIAL HALL**

ATTENDEES: Gina Roesner, Curtis Creagh, Larry Ross, Theresa Rogers, Leon Steven, Mara Aruguete, Jim Rooney, Ed Hutson, Mary Masi, Gourang Saha, Arlene Broecker, Joe Simmons, Karen Thompson, Constance Williams, Turu Negash

✚ The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Curtis E. Creagh

✚ Agenda's and handouts were passed out by Gina Roesner.

✚ Opening Remarks –

- ✓ Mr. Creagh welcomed everyone this morning.
- ✓ Mr. Creagh announced that an Open Forum was held on Wednesday to introduce the campus on managing technology efforts on campus.

✚ LUTC Subcommittees

- ✓ LUTC Subcommittees will report at each meeting. Some of the Chairs were not available to submit reports
  - **Datatel Student User Group** ~ Theresa Rogers reported for this group.
    - Theresa discussed the recent institutional database cleanup.
    - This sub-group is looking at 4 top issues where web-browser was insufficient. Theresa forwarded these issues to Datatel to request that Datatel develop enhanced Web Advisor (WA) screens that address Lincoln's concerns. Some of the requested WA screen enhancements are documented in Answernet as requested by other institutions. Datatel responded to Lincoln's four requests with the response that none of our four screen enhancements would be scheduled any time soon but that custom programming was available at an hourly fee of \$200 per hour.
    - Discussion was held regarding customized programs. OIT reported that, to address the faculty's expressed concerns with WA, they collaborated with Collegis resources at Seattle University to develop two screens. OIT has requested a small group of faculty test the mid-term grades screen; to date Dr. Rooney is the only faculty who has responded. The second screen displaying transfer credit notation is still being tested in OIT but will be made available for faculty testing soon. Once faculty have tested and given approval, the screens will be made available for view in the LIVE production environment.

- Dr. Rooney initiated a lengthy discussion regarding degree audit and there needs to be an additional entry and be able to print both columns. Dr. Simmons explained that LU is open to litigation for developmental courses. **The suggestion of accepting Datatel as is and using customized Excel spreadsheets or other tools for reporting methods or for viewing data.**
- Dr. Rooney asked the question regarding the OIT contract and the issues of customized programming. Theresa answered customized programming is not part of their contract. There are implications of customized programming in terms of ongoing support and compatibility of customized changes with vendor upgrades. However, in response to Lincoln's request as a priority during implementation, Theresa responded that Collegis has customized several of the key outputs in Datatel including transcripts, payroll checks, student invoices, purchase orders and others. She said that customization of software is resource dependent and any software can be customized to any extent if resources are made available to do that.
- Discussion took place regarding developmental course credits and how they are used to make students **participant-eligible** for athletics or financial aid. Dr. Simmons will raise this discussion with Mohammed.
- Dr. Simmons shared a recent example of transcript problems. A student printed out a transcript in landscape format. Upon reading the transcript, it looked like a course was taken in Spring of 05 (as an upper division). Upon closer examination, the course was taken in 2002 as a lower division class. The student is one credit hour short of graduating.
- Discussion was held again regarding degree auditing. Dr. Simmons was asked if he had considered the summer recommendation to appoint a Degree Audit committee and assign responsibility for the maintenance of Degree Audit. It was decided that, rather than have this committee be part of the Datatel User Group structure, an ongoing Degree Audit subcommittee be established to focus 100% on academic issues. Currently nobody has responsibility for managing Degree Audit. Dr. Simmons was charged to submit names to serve on this Degree Audit Subcommittee.
- **Education** ~ Dr. Saha was available to report on the progress of this committee.
  - Dr. Saha reported on the survey that was recently distributed. To date, only 3 campus surveys have been returned.
  - Dr. Saha reported that the survey will be sent out again, this time through Department Heads and ask for their help in distributing. There seemed to be some confusion with the survey because one participant requested 25 laptops.

- Dr. Saha explained that this survey is looking at knowledge and skills assessment.
- It was suggested that the survey also be introduced in the next campus forum and explain what information is needed. The form may be confusing and the group will re-assess before redistribution.
- **Web:** ~ the web subcommittee will be reconvening in the near future. The refresh of the web has been completed. The web subcommittee will continue to enhance this project.
  - In addition, site-builder training has been completed. If others are identified, James will do one-on-one training.
- **Instructional Technology** ~ Mary Masi provided LUTC with today's report.
  - Mary Masi introduced the recommendations for a Student Technology Fee as well as the recommendation for a Classroom Technology Maintenance and Support Technician. A lengthy discussion followed.
  - Dr. Simmons asked is there was reasoning behind a \$10/hour fee vs. a flat technology fee. Dr. Rooney explained the committees reasoning for the hourly vs. flat fee technology fee which included not generating revenue from part-time students.
  - Dr. Simmons asked if the technology fees would be part of the Financial Aid package. Turu later confirmed that it would be part of the F/A package.
  - Research on technology fees is in progress. It was reported that 68% of Universities charge technology fees to help support the growing need for technology.
  - Theresa Rogers discussed technology fees as it was addressed in a recent Educause article. Theresa will share the article with committee members.
  - Dr. Rooney initiated a discussion regarding what/where/how these technology fees would be managed as well as used. Several issues surfaced, which included accountability. Dr. Rooney shared the breakdown from Louisiana as an estimate of how other Universities spend their technology dollars.
  - Theresa Rogers clarified that students currently do NOT have a limit on copies they print in the labs.
  - Theresa Rogers stated that she had issues regarding the title as well as offered alternate titles. A lengthy discussion took place regarding the title of the Classroom Technology Maintenance and Support Technician. It was also suggested that this position be moved within another department for accountability. Leon Stevens suggested it be left general and not departmental.
  - The motion to send Recommendation #1 to Cabinet was offered by Dr. Simmons, Seconded by Hutson, and passed unanimously.

Recommendation 1: Student Technology Fee

- Lincoln University will assess a \$10 per credit hour technology fee, beginning no later than Fall 2006, allocated to fund a specific budget account designated for technology costs only, including but not limited to the following: Infrastructure Support (campus: wireless, email, computing, etc.); Instructional Support/Multimedia Classroom Support (paper for classroom printing, maintain current equipment, equip classrooms not currently equipped, etc.); Student/Library Support (Laptop checkout, 500 copies prepaid student printing, additional copying and printing services in Page Library, etc.).
- The motion to send Recommendation #2 to Cabinet was moved by Dr. Stevens and seconded by Dr. Ross with the motion that the name be changed. The motion passed unanimously.

Recommendation 2: Classroom Technology Support Technician

No later than Fall 2006, Lincoln University will employ a permanent, fulltime Classroom Support Technician, within a department whose budget is supplemented by the Student Technology Fee to support both the salary of that technician and the equipment maintenance costs for multimedia classroom equipment, including but not limited to: projector bulbs, wires and peripherals, service calls, equipment repair shipping charges, replacement of outdated or broken equipment, purchase and installation of new and upgraded classroom equipment, etc. This technician will also establish and monitor a regular cycle of equipment maintenance, upgrade and replacement, along with a continuous training program to keep faculty current in the use of existing and new multimedia technologies.

✚ Information Update – VOIP vs. Traditional

- ✓ Sheila Gassner was not present, but it was announced that LU is currently contracting with an outside vendor to write an RFP for the VOIP vs. Traditional telephone switch. Sheila will report on this progress at the next LUTC meeting.

✚ LUTC Technology Request – Keesoo Lee

- ✓ Discussion was held regarding the submittal of a Technology Project & Major purchase Request Form by Keesoo Lee. The form was incomplete with very little information. It was mentioned when she called OIT that this was for a lab, but the form is not reflective of that information.

- ✓ Dr. Simmons moved to disapprove her request. Ed Hutson seconded. Motion passed to not accept and send back to Keesoo Lee.

#### Other

- ✓ Dr. Simmons inquired about the progress of the wireless solution for campus. Mr. Creagh explained that going wireless is hand-in-hand with the telephony solution that is currently in progress.
- ✓ Dr. Rooney inquired about his request that he handed out at the last LUTC meeting regarding his Major Purchase Request form for the DOD Suicide Prevention Program. No one had read the recommendation and it will be tabled until the next LUTC Meeting. Dr. Rooney did inform the committee that the space has already been approved as well as the needed electrical changes.
- ✓ A conversation was initiated regarding students having mandatory LU e-mail accounts. An extensive discussion followed regarding the pros of students having these accounts. It was explained that all students have accounts, but do not check them, therefore, messages bounce back.
  - Mary Masi explained that she tells her students that all correspondence must come from an official LU address. If not, she ignores the e-mail.
  - It was suggested that this be discussed at the next Senate Meeting.
  - The following recommendation would be part of the next release of the Student Handbook.
  - Dr. Stevens' recommendation: Create a policy that all student, faculty, and staff official communication be conducted through an LU e-mail account. All other e-mail accounts are null & void. In addition, e-mail accounts may not be changed in Blackboard. This change should be implemented by Fall, 2006. **Seconded – Simmons**
    - **Friendly amendment made by Mary Masi** to implement by Spring 2006. Rooney seconded the motion.
    -
- ✓ **NEXT LUTC MEETING SCHEDULED FOR December 15, 2005**

#### Adjournment

- ✓ The meeting was adjourned at 10:50