Academic Technology Committee -DRAFT

MINUTES OF MEETING:  05/01/09          APPROVED BY COMMITTEE:  10/02/09
Submitted Exec. Committee:_________  Approved by Exec. Committee:  _________
Submitted Academic Senate:_________  Approved by Academic Senate: _________

Members Present:  Ardavan Asef-Vaziri, Hilary Baker, Barry Cleveland, Kimberly Embleton, Ellis Godard (chair), David Levin, Sheena Malhotra, Gloria Melara, Jacek Polewczak, Magdy Rizk, Ashley Skylar, and Jeff Wiegley.

Excused: Wei Cao, Andrew Collard, and Nicole Umali.


Minutes: Jennifer De Iuliis

1) Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the 04/03/09 meeting were approved.

2) Announcements – Godard was not re-elected to serve on ATC next year.

3) Previous Meeting Action Item Review
   a. Baker – WAPs in ECS Boeing Lab (Raised by Wiegley)
      Emil Henry and IT staff reviewed and discovered there was some equipment in the room, which was competing with the wireless signal; adjustments were made and the signal was improved. IT provided this update to Wiegley who agreed to check that it is improved.

   b. Levin – Movie Noise & Room Setup (Raised by Polewczak)
      The media services representatives discovered that if the volume is turned up loud enough in Sierra Hall 209, it can be heard in room 207. The speakers in room 209 do not have an enclosure around them as others have due to the type of ceiling tiles that are in the room. The tiles are not accessible without breaking them. Over the summer, IT Media Services will complete a test by turning off the speaker located next to 207. If this does not help, then PPM will need to be engaged to review any other options.

   c. Levin - Smart Classroom Setup (Raised by Skylar)
      A review is currently underway to determine the options available to change the setup in four classrooms in the Education building. The rooms are constructed with many windows resulting in the equipment located in the back of the room which is not practical for teaching. The cost to replace the smart board would be approximately $3,000-5,000. At a lesser cost, the option of using a podium for the black box equipment is being discussed, with wires to the back of the room under a cover that would meet accessibility standards.
d. Godard - Election of 2009-2010 committee chair
   Godard noted that there are two nominees, Ashley Skylar and Jeff Wiegley. He asked
   members if there were any other nominees. None were submitted. Polewczak declared
   his support for Wiegley as the new chair. Godard asked whether the committee wanted to
   vote by either show of hands or written ballot. The members requested written ballots.
   Godard explained the election process would be completed the same way as Faculty
   Senate: written ballots are tallied, the chair is told the winner, and the vote count would
   remain private. Godard requested De Iuliis to collect the written ballots from each voting
   member, tally them during the meeting and then provide him with the name of the
   winner. This process was followed. Godard announced that the new chair for the 2009-
   2010 year will be Ashley Skylar.

4) Chair’s Report
   a. Annual Reports
      Godard will be preparing an annual report for the current year and will share both this
      report along with the previous year report with the committee.
   b. ATC/ERC Minutes
      Members approved the minutes from the joint meeting held on 02/11/09.

5) ACAT Report
   a. Neither Godard nor Skylar were able to attend the April meeting. Baker and Levin noted
      that the primary discussion topic at the meeting was faculty email.

6) CIO’s Report
   a. IT Survey – The survey was sent out last week to half of the faculty. The other half of the
      faculty received the library survey.
   b. Wireless – A large portion of the wireless access point work is expected to be completed
      in June and July. Baker encouraged members to please continue to notify IT of areas that
      they and others are experiencing issues with wireless connectivity.
   c. IT Planning – Over the past two semesters Baker, along with Levin and the Provost met
      with the Deans and administrative council members to discuss planning for the next few
      years. Baker asked whether members had any specific areas they would like IT to focus
      on. No areas were identified by members.
   d. Web Environment (Chris Xanthos)
      Handout titled – New Campus Web Infrastructure May 1, 2009
      Handout titled – Dear CSUN Web Application Owner (email example)
      Handout titled – Dear CSUN Web Page Owner (email example)
      Xanthos provided an update on the new infrastructure to host CSUN web services. The
      testing period from May 4th – 22nd will allow web content owners to check their web sites
      in a test environment and fix any issues that are found. Xanthos noted that most pages
      are expected to display in the new environment without any problems. He explained that
      students will not need to perform any testing because their content will be moved over
      between semesters. Xanthos shared two email messages to be sent: one to all web page
      owners (approximately 950) and one to all web application owners (approximately 135).
The communication announcement has links to pages that contain detailed instructions. Additional reminder email messages will be sent prior to May 22. Xanthos noted that a dedicated Help Desk team has been created, which includes students hired to assist with PHP and Perl. The team is located in OV30 and calls received by the IT Help Desk are being routed to this team. Xanthos shared that some volunteers assisted with early testing and he expressed his thanks for their participation. Polewczak noted he was invited to participate in the testing; however, he was frustrated that his access was not available and he was unable to provide input.

Wiegley questioned how UNIX users will be mapped, Xanthos agreed to add these details to the website. Polewczak asked whether the process with SSH system mounts would be the same; Xanthos said yes. Polewczak asked about MIME type files and per Xanthos they will also be addressed in the new environment. Polewczak requested Xanthos to send the configuration details to him via email for review.

7) Department/College Issues
   a. Roundtable – nothing raised by members.

8) Discussion Topics
   a. Faculty Email (Provost Hellenbrand)
      Handout titled – FINAL – Faculty Email Technical Assessment Prepared by IT for Provost

Hellenbrand said the members could review the assessment document on their own. He noted that the University can’t make an argument for either product (Exchange or Google) and that the real issue is around the legal aspect both nationally and for the CSU. He shared that his preference would be to move to Google but that there are legal issues standing in the way. Hellenbrand noted that students are being moved across the US onto Google, however moving faculty and staff to an external platform has only been done at Notre Dame (a private, religious school). Legal aspects include litigation issues if the need to extract data from Google arises and the information is stored offshore and privacy issues and commercialization (working with partnerships, etc.). The CSU recently requested that any proposal to move faculty and staff email to an offsite service, such as Google, will need to be reviewed by their legal department. Due to these legal issues, the campus has been road-blocked regarding its choices. He noted that other campuses which are similar to our system that are looking to move or have moved student email are SUNY, Indiana, Florida and Georgia. Hellenbrand believes that over the next few years the CSU will be looking into the options for moving faculty and staff email again.

Hellenbrand noted that faculty email will be transitioned to Exchange (currently used by staff) in fall 2009, after the census (fourth week of class) and before Thanksgiving. Baker explained that contract negotiations were taking place with Mirapoint to renew for only a six-month period. She added that the student move to Google is also planned for fall 2009.

Polewczak inquired about the other universities mentioned, specifically what other options have they considered. Hellenbrand explained they are all over the map, Georgia is reviewing options as a system and Florida is reviewing per campus. Polewczak asked if “Matador” was still being considered for use in the student Gmail domain. Hellenbrand explained that due to the response from various groups and individuals
on campus, this name was not going to be used; however, he did not know what other choices were being considered at this time.

Hellenbrand shared that he is currently on a system-wide LMS committee and he is pleased with the type of information the group has been gathering. He offered to share some of this data in June to any members that express interest on an individual basis, since the data is not available publicly due to confidentiality.

9) **Second Life Demonstration** (Ashley Skylar)

*Handout titled – A Case Study of Second Life as an Alternate to the Traditional Classroom in an Introductory Special Education Class*

Skylar became interested in Second Life last January when she attended the EDUCAUSE conference in San Antonio where she saw a demonstration. She began research funded by a grant. This semester she has been using Second Life in a course she is teaching. The course meets bi-weekly on campus and off campus. After each session she requests feedback from the students and has compiled the data using a Likert scale. Skylar noted the consultant she has been working with is Rick Shaw (former CSUN staff member) and his input is very helpful as she has created the course environment. This summer she is looking into joining discussion groups on Second Life to further enhance her knowledge.

Skylar said she is receiving feedback that students are excited about learning in this new environment. Malhotra asked how responsive the students were and what the learning curve was compared to using Elluminate. Skylar shared that she begins the sessions in a lab setting and then offers some individual assistance to students. She noted the importance of having the organization and structure set up from the beginning which makes everything much easier.

Polewczak and Wiegley questioned how the students are learning differently using Second Life technology. Skylar explained that looking into the future, to keep up with FTE’s, this type of classroom setting needs to be explored and many students felt very encouraged learning about Second Life (her students are preparing to be educators). In the fall Skylar will be comparing the course with one she has taught in Elluminate. Melara inquired about accessibility issues and Skylar noted she has spoken with Sue Cullen who has expressed interest in Second Life.

Hellenbrand noted that the concept of using avatars is not new, just the format is new. All communication is done with rhetoric, which either makes it more or less honest. He explained this is a classic issue which has been going on for centuries.

Skylar will keep the committee informed on the level of interest from faculty and students and if the campus is funded for an island in Second Life.

10) **Classroom Technology Survey** (Steve Fitzgerald and Diane Stephens)

*Handout titled – Report of Classroom Technology Survey Conducted in February 2009
Handout titled – Classroom Technology Survey Winter 2009*

The Classroom Technology Committee conducted a survey in February to get a better understanding of the current use of classroom technology and the faculty’s outstanding
needs. Stephens noted the handouts are a high level summary and the full details of the findings are on the Academic Technology web page. Fitzgerald highlighted three main areas of focus from the survey results. Faculty want a stable/reliable environment, to simplify existing technology and to receive specialized support. He noted that the committee has listed 14 recommendations in the report, which would help to address these points. Stephens shared that several of the items listed in the recommendations are already current projects or are connected to ongoing projects, such as the thin client testing. The same report will be presented to ACAT.

11) Policy
   None

12) New Business
   Cleveland made an acknowledgement and expressed thanks to Godard for his service as committee chair.

13) Next Meeting (09/04/09)

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.