

TSPC Initial Meeting Notes

2/24/2005

2:40 PM

West Conference Room

Meeting called by:	Dr. Allen Henderson	Type of meeting:	Technology Strategic Planning
Facilitator:	Marcus Kerr	Note taker:	Alma Kleckner

Attendees:	Senior Management Allen Henderson, Provost- Absent	Internal constituents John Gonzalez, Student-Absent Earl Martin, School of Law-Absent Betsy Alexander, School of Arts and Sciences Sameer Vaidya, School of Business Carlos Martinez, School of Education-Absent Debbie Roark, Staff	Key decision makers/support personnel Bill Bleibdrey, C. Financial Officer-Absent Chuck Hollingsworth, CIO and Alumnus Marcus Kerr, Academic Technology and Web Services Cindy Swigger, University Librarian
-------------------	---	---	--

----- Agenda Topics -----	
Stakeholder Meeting Updates	Earl Martin, School of Law; Betsy Alexander, School of Arts and Sciences; Sameer Vaidya, School of Business; Carlos Martinez, School of Education
Technology Mission Development	All
Data Presentation	Chuck Hollingsworth
Data Review and Interpretation	All
Questions and Concerns	Open Floor
Agenda for Second Meeting	Marcus Kerr

Stakeholder Meeting Updates

Mr. Kerr initiated the meeting by requesting the Stakeholders for their updates. Ms. Alexander advised that she had a school meeting with the Chairs of all the departments. At this meeting Ms. Alexander asked the Chairs, how they would like to use technology, what they are doing with it, and how would they use it generally in their disciplines. Ms. Alexander gathered from the Chairs' responses the concern of working with what we have rather than adding to, to which all Chairs agree. They also suggested improving what the School already has such as having classrooms with computer/Internet access and overhead projection across the board.

Chuck asked if there was one specific group requesting the computer/Internet access and the response from Ms. Alexander was that all had the same concern. Chuck did confirm that all classrooms in the school were wired for Internet access. Ms. Alexander had another request from the Chairs-that any new classrooms be Internet connected with projection systems to be more available, because it is complicated to remember to request the systems from the Library. It would be much more convenient to have the media dedicated to the classroom.

Another suggestion was the ability to burn CD's or have CD burners because they are not available in the offices and also to establish a budget for updating equipment continually recommended by the School of Arts. A second recommendation was to spend the Student Technology Fee for technology instead of Datatel. Chuck confirmed that none of that budget was being spent for Datatel.

It was suggested to charge raise the technology fee. Mr. Kerr gave examples of other universities charging up to \$600 per semester on their technology fee and other state institutions have separate fees, one for instructional and another flat fee, while our University is only charging 1/6th of that. Mr. Kerr mentioned that Tarrollton University views technology to be central to the University.

Ms. Alexander recommended that the technology fee be sufficient to fund the technology we need. Mr. Kerr and Mr. Hollingsworth agreed. Students need to see where the funds are going and how they are being used. Ms. Alexander said that it was very important to update the labs, because they get heavy use. Students have old machines at home; therefore, they use it here in campus. She reiterated that it was important we have good computers. Mr. Hollingsworth suggested using metrics instead of using just words such as “heavy use.” We need to base our decisions on real metrics.

Cindy Swigger-Stakeholder for the Library advised that the Library should be central that things are done better when joined with ICT.

Sameer Vaidya-Stakeholder for the School of Business agreed with all the recommendations of the School of Arts and Sciences.

Technology Mission Development

Marcus Kerr distributed examples of the Technology Mission statements and sent an email earlier to the committee members. All present reviewed the examples and came to the agreement that the following statement best described our Mission:

“Texas Wesleyan University is committed to developing curriculum and applying instructional methods enriched with technology, providing the support and motivation necessary to ensure appropriate application of technology, and embracing the central role of technology in support of the university mission.”

Data Presentation

Mr. Hollingsworth presented the surveys’ results and graphs to the committee members and also advised them to look at the share drive for Educause Benchmarks. The Educause Benchmarks have data and reports from other universities to compare with what we have here at Wesleyan. He advised that there are no specific schools’ names mentioned in these reports.

Data Review and Interpretation

Mr. Kerr passed out copies of the surveys’ results and these were reviewed by all present. All members reviewed the surveys and commented on the needs and concerns of each group.

Questions and Concerns

Mr. Kerr went on to state that now that we had worked on our Mission statement, the next step was to work on our Vision statement. He stated the Vision statement had to do with what we do and believe. He suggested reviewing the handout “General Issues to Address.”

Ms. Alexander mentioned that in order to encourage the faculty and students to use more Technology online, we need more servers.

Agenda for Second Meeting (March 8th, West Conference Room, 2:40 P.M.)

- Work on our own Vision.
- Review handout “General Issues to Address.”