



## LTR Meeting Minutes, 10/10/2002

### Members present

- Present: Greg Bednar, Frank Birmingham, Don Descy, Jan Eimers, Scott Fee, Dave Gjerde, Melissa Holmberg, Mark Johnson, Kent Kalm, Joan Klanderud, Tim Kochery, Judy Kuster, Henry Morris, Joan Roca, Warren Sandmann,
- Absent: John Frey, Brian Groh, Catherine Hughes, Joel Jensen, Nancy Mackenzie, John Parham, Ian Radtke, Tim Scott, Pat Sexton, Gary Urban, Steve Vassar, Robert Zelin

### Old Business

- Greetings and Introduction of New Members  
Joan Roca welcomed the group. There were no new members present so introductions were bypassed.
- Minutes of Last Meeting - Additions to Agenda  
An addition to the agenda is an update from Joan Klanderud regarding South Central Technical College's LTR.
- The agenda order will be changed as Warren Sandmann will be late and some of the items are directed toward answering his questions.
- The minutes of the September 19th meeting of LTR were reviewed and approved with no changes.
- It was mentioned that the last minutes of Spring Semester were not distributed. Melissa

Holmberg will check with John's secretary to get a copy to post to the website to keep it up-to-date.

## New Business

- 

There will be a new section on the agenda. This section will include reminders and future topics for discussion. The future topics will be items that are important but can be dealt with as time permits. These items include reports from conferences and demonstrations. It was also mentioned that if you have an agenda item that includes handouts, to pass them out in advance of the meeting. That way, committee members will have time to review the document thus providing more time for discussion during the meeting.

- 

Technology Update (Mark Johnson/Tim Kochery)  
This topic was delayed until later in the meeting.

- 

Update from Joan Klanderud regarding SCTC  
This topic was an additional item that was added to the agenda.

- 

Joan Klanderud reported that The Learning and Technology Roundtable (TLTR) of South Central Technical College has been dissolved. This has happened due to the change in administration and focus on strategic action teams. The Department of Instructional Technology oversees issues that the TLTR used to handle. The overall plan was written by the employees and the Dean of Instructional Technology. Because SCTC is much smaller than MSU, the responsibilities of technology planning fall directly onto many individuals such as the Dean of Instructional Technology, employees of I.T., Library Media, and ITV as well as the webmaster.

- 

SCTC now has technology enhanced carts available to faculty. These carts include a DVD, VCR, document camera, and a flat-screen computer. The rooms have had projectors and speakers mounted in them. There a few rooms left to complete on the Mankato campus and Faribault is yet to be done. The staff seems to be pleased and

excited about the new carts.

## Discussion of Dr. Boubel's Charge

- The group reviewed the document presented by Dr. Boubel at the first meeting. A discussion of the LTR's charge followed.
- Mark Johnson stated that we must review the MnSCU Technology Master Plan and recognize where we fit in. MnSCU is requesting an inventory of technology. We feel that this request is geared toward smaller institutions.

- 

The first Technology Plan for MSU was developed by LTR approximately five years ago. A new plan for technology is needed. MnSCU requires that the technology plan be projected for five years. The rapid rate of change for technology forces us to be broad in our speculations. We need to identify a planning process that we are comfortable with. The previous plan will be of great value as we integrate plans to move in the same direction. Planning will include where we want to be in the next five years. Technology plans are too difficult to project for five years from now. A one to three year timeframe would be ideal for technology planning, however it is a good process and it is time to get moving with the new plan.

- 

A subgroup consisting of 4 -5 people will be identified to begin reviewing the plan. Volunteers include Greg Bednar, Mark Johnson, Tim Kochery, and Henry Morris. We are still in need of another faculty representative to serve on this subgroup.

- 

The first bullet in Dr. Boubel's letter discusses the charge to "develop an institution technology profile and a new Technology Master Plan per MnSCU requirements." The Learning and Technology Roundtable oversees technology issues for the entire university. Discussion in the past has taken on mainly the academic issues although the view from administrative computing users is needed as well. Action teams can be created to deal with the different views towards technology issues. Instructional Technology supports the entire campus with focus on the academic core. All areas need to work together to accomplish a successful goal.

-

The second bulleted item from Dr. Boubel's letter states "to create a campus vision for integrated use of technologies". We need to check the future vision and see how this will tie in with the Campus Master Plan. We need to identify a general direction of what we expect for technology. This should be more student-centered. This item can be combined with bulleted item number 1 and merge the vision as part of the plan.

- 

The third bullet charges the group to "examine, identify, and address technology issues related to distance learning and online education". There are many different ways to identify needs for distance education and online education. We will need to view the Presidential goals and objectives before we can supply feedback on academic issues. There are policies that are not mentioned here but advice from the LTR may be beneficial. There are also non-technology issues and we may not have solutions for them. Dr. Boubel asked specifically at our first meeting that we should address distance learning and online education and maybe a subgroup can spin off to get started in the topic. We'll revisit this at our next meeting.

- 

Bullet number 4 addresses the creation of action teams to achieve essential short-term goals as deemed necessary. Mark Johnson has identified issues that teams will be able to address after formation. This group is not supposed to be a problem solving group. Its active role is to propose visions and the issues that are brought forth will be dealt with by writing recommendations and movement through the subgroups.

- 

Dr. Boubel also mentioned that a year-end report with general recommendations be submitted. These reports are extremely helpful and should be completed this year.

### **Technology Update (Mark Johnson/Tim Kochery)**

- 

Mark Johnson explained the terms of the Microsoft Agreement for Graduate students. This agreement does not allow installation of the software on their personal computers. He has been working on a change to the policy that would allow graduate students to check out the software, however, a disclaimer is needed in advance. A high level of risk is involved and if the distribution of software got out of hand, the university would suffer.

-

The MavDISK issues that were presented at the last meeting have been solved. There are still problems with a small percentage of students not being recognized in the system but these are being dealt with on a case by case basis. If you have trouble, please submit the necessary information to Mark Johnson and he will direct it to the appropriate staff member.

•

The Global Learning Lab upgrade is moving forward. Some enhancements include a digital lab. This is expensive but a very good project in collaboration by ITS, the Library, and the College of Arts and Humanities.

•

Mark Johnson mentioned that he is working with MnSCU to identify imaging software for archival and storage use. This software is needed by those offices that accumulate a lot of paper records and have minimal storage space. With this new archiving method there would be direct access to many pieces of information and retrieval would be easy. Mark is receiving quotes on this software. It will make an impact on the whole institution.

•

New public domain (listserv) software is being reviewed. The new software would allow groups to post information to their web pages for review. It would help with organization of area minutes and informational postings. We currently use majordomo software and it was a good implementation at the time, however, now there are better choices available. New software will enable us to review and manage University lists much easier.

•

Tim Kochery reported that they have tried to address the problems with U-Compass Educator. OIT has addressed most of the issues involved with student enrollment and Ucompass/Educator. There were problems with the Integrated Student Record System (ISRS) interface, not with the platform. There were problems with the interface that made data fields change, security change, and caused firewall conflicts. There were several layers created with the interface. They have been resolved for the most part, but still there was unhappiness and embarrassment because of the unawareness of the problems it presented. Tim stated that a Faculty Advisory Board has been assembled to discuss these types of issues. The Faculty Advisory Board will be meeting on October 28, 2002.

Two open house forums were held to hear concerns related to Educator. Over three hours of meetings were held. Many conflicts were heard and feedback was not voiced. However, there was only one faculty member who attended these sessions and they were not a Ucompass user. Therefore, very little feedback was heard, thus making it difficult to determine if there are other faculty concerns with this platform.) OIT now realizes that they can use campus-wide e-mail protocols for faculty that were uncertain before. We now realize that we can use e-mail protocols that were uncertain before. Communication concerns were addressed. Please keep Tim Kochery and Jeff apprised of issues and conflicts.

- 

Tim Kochery was apologetic about the timing and testing of U-Compass. He addressed the problem of dropped students not being removed from the roster. Issues regarding registration and enrollment changes were addressed. Items such as name changes, and duplications are happening because of the ISRS data. Some control has been lost. Faculty are asking for things that we cannot perform. There is an issue if a student is actually registered for a class or auditing. There is a monetary concern regarding auditing students.

- 

There are approximately 700 classes using U-Compass. There are 350 faculty accounts. About half of the faculty and over 8,000 students are using this. The problem when students drop a class but are still actually enrolled is a concern, but it is due to some lag time between processing information by the MSU Registrar and having this file updated to the ISRS data.

- 

Warren Sandmann reported that the U-Compass survey is ready to be distributed. He will send it to the LTR electronically for review. The LTR group is encouraged to view it and send comments to Warren by the end of next week. There was discussion on how to publicize this survey. This issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

## **Copyright Issues**

This topic will be delayed until next meeting.

## **Distance Education - Online Education**

This topic will be delayed until next meeting.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

## Reminders and Future Topics

- Reports from EDUCAUSE - Next meeting.
- Reports to LTR: request that they be submitted in advance.
- Demo of video over IP

**Next meeting** - THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2002 2pm - 3pm in CSU 256

Respectfully submitted by: Julie Dornack

[Return to Top](#)

---

Back to the [Learning and Technology Roundtable](#) home page or to [Previous Meeting Minutes](#)

---

URL: <http://www.lib.mnsu.edu/ltr/1002.html>

Updated 10/16/02

This page resides in the [MSU, Mankato Library](#) web server

Send comments about this page to: [webmaster](#)