Instructional Technology Committee Meeting Minutes  
Friday, April 25, 2014  
OIT Conference Room, Morgan Hall  
11:00 A.M.  

Present: Simon Baev, Gavin M. Bernstein, Gary Fisk, Becky Gee, Mandi Goodsett, Chadwick Gugg, Royce Hackett, Jarrett Hartsfield, Svilen Kostov, Anthony Lasiter, Bob Slenker  

Agenda Items:  

- **Minutes of 2/12/2014 meeting are adopted:** Gavin motions, Becky seconds.  

- **Working Group progress report on online supplemental technology:**  
  Bob and Gary summarize. The Working Group task force has conducted a student technology survey, gathered feedback from faculty and staff, and conducted discussions with companies about prospective online supplemental technology options, costs, and capabilities.  

  The online student technology survey had approximately 190 participants. A summary of the results was provided to ITAC members prior to the meeting. It is noted that more than half of the respondents expressed interest in online lectures, videos, whiteboards, and power point slides, particularly when these allowed access to the notes/presentations at any time. Synchronous instruction, face-to-face chats, or other options that would require students to log on at a specific time or invest in video/recording options received less favorable responses. Thus, technology such as Lecture Capture is of interest.  

  Some faculty have expressed interest in Lecture Capture and virtual meetings. The School of Business has been doing lecture capture and high-end video teleconferencing. The School of Nursing has used WebX. Apps for Blackboard Collaborate and GoToMeeting are also discussed. A quote of approximately $5500/year is given for Blackboard Collaborate. Bob indicates that he has documents available from the discussions with companies. Working Group information will be presented to the Dean’s Council, Academic Affairs and Administration.  

  Gary feels that the task force has accomplished its charge of gathering information on technologies available and what is wanted or needed at GSW. Decisions now need to be made regarding how to proceed and with what. It is noted that synchronous technology will probably not be used for larger classes, but rather small classes such as those in the Graduate Nursing program. If we adopt a particular technology, Gary stresses that we must get the word out to faculty.
Simon asks how faculty will get a license if we make a purchase. Bob and Gary indicate that IT would determine how to deploy technologies based on faculty needs. Gavin inquires on whether ITAC should recommend a specific package. Bob states that faculty should always provide feedback on what they are interested in; a particular technology is not yet chosen. Svilen asks whether freeware (such as Skype) is sufficient. It is noted that most freeware is not robust enough for an academic setting – Conferencing may be limited to pairs only or sharing of files/data may be restricted. Gary notes that additional needs such as multiple video streams and screen sharing can often be added for a fee.

Gavin motions that the committee support the purchase of a supplemental technology package. Simon seconds. The motion passes.

- **Update on Cloud Storage:**
  Royce reports that there is Board of Regents policy on encryption, but we are not in line. Royce does not have all the tools needed in hand. Free encryption is available but comes with a learning curve. Learning curve issues include, for example, that one can accidentally encrypt the wrong part of the computer such as the boot sector of the hard drive.

  Royce explains that we will invest in LANDesk security, which will have an encryption component. Progress on encryption will have to wait until this is implemented.

  The Chair therefore tables this agenda item.

- **Proposed Student Tech fee purchases for 2014-2015:**
  Jarrett reports. Budget approval is sought now so that purchases and planning can be made for the start of Fall, 2014.

  Jackson Hall 205-208 and the piano lab are a top priority, with machines over 10 years old, and about 21 pc’s to be added.
  Education 235 – 22 pc’s to be added.
  Testing Center, Sanford 310 – 21 pc’s
  Library – 8 pc’s,
  CWH 102 – 23 pc’s
  Dorms – 24 pc’s

  Approximate costs are given. There is the possibility of repurposing current testing center and CWH 102 computers for the dorms. It is noted that large screen computers such as those in Nursing are problematic for repurposing into classrooms, as the large screens make cheating easy and can obscure more easily students taking tests from the view of proctors. Nova stations are discussed, especially in the context of test taking and reducing cheating. It is noted that that Nova stations require costly cabinets in addition to the computer itself. Random test questions are proposed as one possible, cheaper alternative to deter cheating in testing rooms.
Royce notes that policy requires the input of the ITAC Student Subcommittee as part of the student tech fee budget approval process. He will call a meeting. Reading Day on Thursday, May 1, is decided upon for the date.

Royce adds that the subcommittee meetings have been useful with, for example, the print management taskforce providing valuable feedback on student needs and successful implementation of student printing restrictions. Royce also reports that additional data drops and furniture has already been installed in the library.

Gavin motions that we accept the student tech fee budget expenditure proposal. Svilen seconds. The motion passes.

- **IT Budget Review:**
  Royce reports. Tech fee budget monies roll over. A small amount is left for repairs, printers, etc. In May, some small tech fee purchases may be made on an as-needed basis, but the intention is to let most of it carry over for big purchases in July.

- **Need for closed captioning in online course videos:**
  In an email Gary provided for us the following:

  From a recent Dean's Council Minutes: "ADA Complaint for on-line courses- Dr. Tate reported to the council the issue of ADA compliance was raised at the recent RACAA meeting. The point was emphasized that all videos for online classes have to be close captioned. When putting together a course for online classes, faculty cannot wait until a need arises and then create a compliant video, but must do so from the beginning."

  Dr. Tate has brought the issue to the attention of ITAC. Gary indicates that members of the Dean's Council feel that close captioning all online videos is too expensive and labor intensive for our current resources.

  Gary asks for opinions. Royce asks whether the claim of requirement of close captioning is legally true. Bob and Royce indicate that there is wide margin for interpretation of federal law. Royce further states that he is not aware of any University System of Georgia compliance standard of this nature. He feels that USG needs a dedicated compliance office. We have some policy, but no clear procedures, standards, or support. Does policy say in writing that close captioning is required, or is this interpretation? There is an upcoming CIO meeting. Royce speculates that further direction regarding Section 508 requirements may be offered there.
Mandi has provided for the committee a link to Portland Community College’s online tutorial on Accessibility for Online Course Content. Gary had commented in an email prior to this meeting that his take on this site is that it is a nice resource. They suggest using Camtasia or YouTube for closed captioning. For Blackboard Collaborate videos they apparently use a person from Disability Services to help with closed captioning.

Gary offers further thoughts: Are power point slides with the video sufficient? He indicates that the Dean’s Council had wondered whether faculty would be responsible for closed captioning. The technical nature and time commitment may make faculty responsibility for closed captioning an unrealistic expectation.

Royce adds that, rather than a grassroots or ITAC level decision, this needs to start with USG legal, as this is really a legal issue above Academic Affairs.

Gavin explains that in special education we do as needed, not before needed. This is counter to the thinking from the minutes excerpt from the Dean’s Council. Gavin further adds that, in special education, it is recognized that additions such as closed captioning may actually serve as distractions to the majority, and as such impart unequal advantages to certain students. This reinforces the idea of implementing such methods on an as-needed basis only.

Royce adds to Gavin’s remarks by indicating that we may lose functionality for larger groups of people to meet the proposed expectations. He emphasizes that a balance must be achieved for students and for faculty workloads. A set of standards is needed with joint input from the Office of Disability and IT. He notes that sometimes an Office of Disability may ask to anticipate possible needs with a comprehensive approach that exceeds available resources; again, he stresses that a practical balance is required in any implementation.

Svilen observes that, in his opinion, about 5% of academic institution videos, even from larger institutions, are currently closed captioned. It is suggested that we put this on the back burner for the moment in terms of implementation, as there are not sufficient resources or direction.

Gary tells Royce that that he can bring to the CIO meeting that we are currently studying the issue.

It is noted that our webpages are currently partly ADA compliant, as one can tab through text links. Simon asks whether this is true of D2L. Gary states that it is partly true -- There are tags for images.

Gary and Gavin note that potential needs are almost unlimited. We can proceed if directed to by USG.
• **Additional Business:**
Royce explains that Mike Rogers, Associate Vice Chancellor at BOR is in charge of a task force to look at D2L online learning in USG, current learning management systems, what can partner with D2L, how long we may use this system, strategic development and documentation for USG guidelines, and other technologies available. The task force will have five meetings, with four virtual and one in-person.

Mike Rogers is seeking students to participate on the task force. Royce nominated Stephanie Dunbar, an accomplished IT technician and GSW student. She has been accepted for the task force.

Becky would like to speak at the task force meeting. Royce responds that she could be Stephanie’s guest. Becky explains that D2L analytics software for test item analysis is too big for their purposes, covering, for example, statistics for financial aid outside the scope of the School of Nursing use. This, along with the $50,000 cost for it, is what Becky would like to address to the task force. Royce states that he will send Becky meeting information.

• **Meeting Adjourns:** 11:56 A.M.