

## ITAC Minutes for January 23, 2009

1. The meeting began with a detailed report from Royce Hackett on the expenditures from the Student Technology Fee. There is approximately \$14,000 left in the fund, not including approximately \$7,000 set aside for paper and toner used in the computer labs.

Jarrett Hartsfield presented a proposal to purchase software for Fine Arts 209, five computers for the Academic Skills lab, a projector and computer for Roney 100 and two computers for Biology. The total amount was \$14,181. A motion was made to accept this proposal. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Hackett suggested that the committee will need to be aggressive about purchasing as much as possible in the early fall of the next academic year.

2. The minutes from the last meeting (October 17, 2008) were discussed. Hackett said that the plan to implement a cap on printing in the computer labs was in progress and would be working later this spring. This agrees with the description of this project in the minutes.

A motion was made to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved. Copies of the minutes will be sent to the library and Thays Franca for posting on the GSW web site.

3. Technology Fee: In past meetings, concern was raised about whether the technology fee expenditures were following the guidelines from the Board of Regents. After reviewing the BOR guidelines (see: <http://www.usg.edu/acit/library/docs/techfeeguidelines.pdf>), the consensus was that we are following the intent of the guidelines.

The committee also reviewed GSW's policy on the technology fee (see: <http://www.gsw.edu/~oiit/computerpolicy.shtml>, section 8). Hackett stated that we have a student subcommittee that reviews all proposals, which meets the need to have student input on the technology fee expenditures. He added that he had significant input on "over 90%" of the technology decisions.

Gary Fisk asked whether a particular percentage of the technology fee needed to be spent on computer lab hardware every year. This issue was raised at a past meeting. Hartsfield said that we have about 600 lab computers. We need to replace about 100 per year in order to replace them every six years. We are not currently replacing the computers at this rate, so we are falling behind on maintaining these labs. Tom Weiland suggested that it should be easy to calculate the amount that needed to be set aside for maintaining the labs. If we replace 100 PCs per year, we would need about \$100,000 to 120,000 per year to replace each lab PC on a six year rotation cycle.

Hackett raised an issue about bulbs for the classroom computer projectors. These bulbs, which cost about \$400, are sometimes replaced by the department and sometimes are replaced by OIIT from the technology fee. He felt that a policy was needed on the replacement of these bulbs. After discussion, Weiland proposed that departments should replace their bulbs from their own budgets if possible due to limited funds in the Student Technology Fee. The motion was seconded and passed with a unanimous vote.

4. The charge of the ITAC was reviewed. Hackett was asked if we had a formal technology policy to review. Hackett replied that there is no formal plan at the moment, but we do have a list of pressing technology needs that constitutes our plan. These needs include replacing the firewall and core router,

adding centralized tape backup and adding shared network drives.

The charge also calls for ITAC to review faculty training and online/distance education technology. The committee has not examined these areas for a while. The discussion brought up some concerns that faculty training and resources for online teaching are currently inadequate. Hackett stated that the new president of Columbus State is making this area a priority. We risk falling behind our sister institutions if we do not invest in technology. Fisk added that traditional face-to-face courses could probably be making greater use of online resources. An example would be posting syllabi online rather than distributing them as a printed handout. More training will be needed to help faculty members effectively use online technology.

Fisk made a motion to review and update plans for faculty training and online instruction at the next meeting. This motion was seconded and approved. Hackett agreed to prepare a brief report about the current state of faculty training and the use of WebCT at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM.

Attendance: Tom Weiland, Jarrett Hartsfield, Royce Hackett, Marlene Allen, Anna-Kay Sterling, Gary Fisk