Instructional Technology Meeting Minutes  
October 3, 2013  
OIT Conference Room, Morgan Hall  
5:00 P.M.

**Present:** Simon Baev, Jan Boesten, Gary Fisk, Brian Flynn, Becky Gee, Mandi Goodsett, Chadwick Gugg, Royce Hackett, Svilen Kostov, Boris Peltsverger (guest)

**Agenda Items:**

- **Minutes of 8/22/2013 meeting are adopted:** Chadwick Gugg motions. Becky Gee seconds.

- **Report from Student Subcommittee of 9/5/2013:** Royce Hackett and Gary Fisk report. Royce presents a summary of proposed technology expenditures including the upcoming completion of Residence Hall wireless upgrades and 39 PC’s in Crawford Wheatley Hall that require upgrading. He also discusses printing and print management on campus.

  Nursing students have been used to unlimited printing and have complained about print limitations. Gary has met with Dr. Sandra Daniel, Dean of Nursing on this. Dr. Daniel will bring up the need to encourage students to print multiple pages/power point slides on a single sheet at a future nursing faculty meeting.

- **Proctor U:** Discussion ensues regarding whether GSW needs to support Proctor U in computer labs or have a dedicated Proctor U testing center. Issues that would have to be addressed or overcome include:
  1) Students using Proctor U must be alone, necessitating private rooms within a testing center/lab.
  2) Proctor U controls a camera through the computer to monitor the student. GSW would thus have to relinquish control of the camera to an outside entity. A separate connection to the firewall would be needed.
  3) Administrative approval at the level of the president would be needed for a dedicated lab to be established.

  Discussion follows. Gary notes that ITAC advises administration, but does not set policy on whether to have Proctor U. It is noted that an on-campus testing facility is located on the third floor of Sanford Hall. Brian states that Business students do not need Proctor U on campus – Business students on campus take exams with their instructor. Residence Halls are not currently set up for Proctor U. Students living on campus wishing to use Proctor U must seek an off-campus facility. Jan asks why Business students use Proctor U. Brian explains that it is the best option for online students to take exams while maintaining some form of control over the exam environment and who takes the exam. He believes that Proctor U is working as currently implemented, aside from certain technical issues. Royce notes that the Residence Hall infrastructure work is being done with an eye towards being able to use Proctor U in the Residence Halls in the future.
Dr. Boris Peltsverger, Dean of the School of Computing and Mathematics, had been invited by Gary Fisk to join the discussion. Boris reports that graduate computing science students living at least 35 miles from campus use testing centers. Dr. Arvind Shah, Chair of Computer Science, personally contacts testing centers and proctors to set up PIN codes and testing conditions. This currently involves 16 graduate students. This method is necessary with students studying in China and India.

Gary notes that the overall consensus of the committee is that there is not an immediate need for an on-campus Proctor U lab.

- **Dropbox use**: Is there a need to encrypt student grades and similar sensitive information? Gary asks whether (personal) devices such as USB drives that carry back-ups of student records need to be encrypted. Also, what happens to spreadsheets and records in the cloud or in dropboxes?

Royce notes that IT is looking at investing in an endpoint system including encryption and a password management system, but work in this direction will have to wait at least until Spring. He states that TrueCrypt is a free and IT-recommended standard. It is Royce’s responsibility to put this on people’s radar.

Simon notes that, from the standpoint of security, home computers are generally the weakest links. Brian asks whether faculty can store information on GeorgiaView? It is indicated that there is a locker. Royce indicates that if we use due diligence in storing data, we should meet FERPA requirements. The Board of Regents is currently developing policy for GSW equipment, but not personally owned data storage devices.

- **Future plans for this year**: Gary reviews for the committee ITAC responsibilities according to the Faculty Handbook and works with the committee to set future agenda. Royce is working on a new IT Strategic Planning Committee with Dr. Blanchard. It will be charged with IT security (including dropbox) and developing an IT strategic plan. New security guidelines to work with will be forthcoming from the Board of Regents.

Gary notes that the Instructional Technology plan has not been updated since about 2005. A campus-wide annual assessment of instructional technology should be done. This is done insofar as Royce works with the campus community to meet IT needs and reports this information to ITAC, but no formal survey goes out to the campus. Gary asks whether some responsibilities of ITAC have been absorbed by Academic Affairs; for example, should ITAC review and advise on technology-oriented Faculty Instructional Grants for the Vice President of Academic Affairs?

- **Future Meeting Dates**: The 5:00 Thursday time conflicts with Student Government schedules. An alternative meeting time is required in order that SGA student representatives may attend. Royce indicates that one more November meeting should be sufficient for the Fall term. A poll will be taken to determine the next meeting time.

- **Open/Other Business**: Svilen notes that GSW has experienced many learning platform changes in recent years. Royce explains the transition from WebCT to Blackboard to D2L. Svilen suggests staying with D2L and only incrementally changing for a while.

- **Meeting Adjourns**: 6:02 P.M.