

Report of the Academic Computing Oversight Committee of the Faculty Council, 2005-6

The committee for AY 2005-2006 was composed of the following membership:

- Eleanor Kutz (term 06-09)
- Celia Moore (term 06-09)
- Mary Oleskiewicz (term 06-09)
- Gonzalo Bacigalupe (term 05-08)
- Jean-Pierre Kuilboer (term 05-08)
- Fred Johnson (term 05-08)
- Patrick Clarkin (term 05-08)
- Atreya Chakraborty (term 06-09)
- Eugene Gallagher (term 06-09)
- William Hagar (term 06-09)

Ex Officio

- Richard Antonak (provost designee)
- Kenneth Campbell
- Martyne Hallgren (CIO)
- Mark Schlesinger (Umass President's Office)

The committee met seven times during the course of the 2005-6 academic year:

A meeting was convened by Professor Gonzalo Bacigalupe for September 19th at the request of the executive committee of the Faculty Council. The meeting was set as an initial venue to meet members of the committee and discuss the initial charge of the committee as stipulated by the Faculty Council. The prospective members of the committee were Gonzalo Bacigalupe, Fred Johnson, Patrick Clarkin, Celia Moore, Mary A Oleskiewicz, Eleanor Kutz, William Hagar, Eugene Gallagher, Atreya Chakraborty, Robert Chen, Robert Stevenson, and Jean-Pierre Kuilboer.

The charge of the committee was initially:

1. makes recommendations on hardware and software acquisitions intended for Campus-wide academic use,
2. formulates plans for expansion and improvement of academic computing facilities,
3. recommends policies, based on curricular considerations, for determining distribution of, and access to, Campus-wide academic computing resources,
4. reviews all requests to acquire academic computing facilities, except those that are funded by external grants to provide dedicated computing facilities for sponsored research.
5. works closely with the Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education for the development and quality assurance of online programs, and
6. helps understand and meet the requirements of the UMass Boston

community for the use of technology

At the September 19th meeting the charges were discussed but no new proposal were made to modify or change them. A committee did not have a quorum and also no elected chair. The campus CIO, Martyne Hallgren represented the administration at the initial meeting.

A second meeting occurred on October 19th. The agenda included studying the previous year IT division report: [Report http://www.umb.edu/it/cio/documents/2005_ITDivison_Report_001.PDF](http://www.umb.edu/it/cio/documents/2005_ITDivison_Report_001.PDF) and starting the process of electing a chair for the committee. The report is divided into the following sections:

- Division of information technology
- Department of educational technology and learning commons
- Client services
- Enterprise computing
- Communication and infrastructure services department
- Business services
- Focus for ay05-06 (new student information system, ISIS, web-based finance system and grant management, new wiring initiative, managed wireless spectrum, network storage services, upgrade to the e-mail system, and fine tuning to the service model.

Goal for Spring was established to collect information about technology on the Boston Campus and come-up with the range of issues that need to be addressed. The ACOC committee has not been active for the past two-three years and most of its institutional memory is non existent. The last consultation on file to determine technology usage and needs of faculty and staff seem to date back to December 2001 survey (its results apparently are also missing). In contrast to academic program decisions and financial resources little information about campus IT and its governance has made its way to the faculty council. There is a clear need to understand the technology strategy plan as IT activities are clearly important to academic endeavors.

The last meeting in the Fall of 2005 occurred on November 21. A listserv was set by computing services for distribution of material to the committee and election of chair resulted in electing Dr. Kuilboer and Dr. Gallagher as co-chair of the committee. Some points of discussion for Spring meeting were discussed. For example questions were raised about support for WEBCT and its deployment. Technical issues of concern by faculty included communication (platform supported, e-mail, mailbox, IM) as well as collaboration (WEB portal project, WEBCT). Smart classroom and the need to extend their deployment were also discussed.

The REPLACE program for computing is to be discussed in Spring. The trend seems to be a move toward notebook, tablet for faculty instead of desktops. More information needs to be collected about the proposed deployment timeline.

Increased dependency on e-mail for communication with students raises the issue of security with adjacent concern with spam and spyware.

For our March 7th meeting, Ms. Hallgren presented the governance overview structure of IT (see attached). Other issues were discussed as follows:

1. The management of transition from Prometheus and the need for training of faculty on WebCT
2. The role of WEBCT for web assisted courses and online courses.
3. The feasibility of video conferencing – technical challenges of getting some of our classes on the web in streaming video.
4. The proper channel of processing faculty needs.
5. e-mail for student and faculty
5. The mandate of the ACOC committee.

The last point will be the focus of discussion for the next meeting. ACOC needs to rewrite a charter of deliverable that leverages the experience and the knowledge of the faculty and potentially set sub-sets of members to address issues and report to the committee. It was felt that part of the current mandate needed to be rewritten.

Next meeting was on April 12. Given the complexity of coordinating attendance from a large committee, Ms De Palma from the Provost office coordinated the meeting schedule.

Last meeting of the semester was on May 10th. A number of issues were discussed and the possible participation of the committee members in a number of computing projects and subsequent reporting of their impact will be reported to the Faculty Council.

1. 2nd Generation Classroom Technology (ex - wireless in classroom, tablet computers, video of lectures – publishing to the web)
2. Technology to mitigate Substructure Construction/Pandemic Impact
3. Examination/Impact of Student 1-1 Computing
4. Advise/consultation on a 10 year IT Capital Plan
5. Conduit to SAT Subcommittee activity
6. IT/Library Partnership
7. Participation in Web/Portal Advisory Committee
8. Support model of LMS/faculty technology and porting of courses to online format.
9. Participation in the elaboration of University web portal.

Post end-of-semester

Issues were raised after the end of the AY and should be addressed as soon as the committee reconvenes in the fall of 2006.

1. providing e-mail account to alumni. Effect of alumni perception should be considered balanced with the complexity and cost of offering permanent e-mail account (forwarding only being an option).