Central Student Technology Committee (CSTC)
Meeting: Wednesday February 28, 2006
Location: Union 002

Attendees: Jesse Ballard, Maggie Deming, Christy Boggs, Phyllis Brecher, Tami Browning, Charles Christensen, Glen Cox, Cheryl Hilman, Warrie Means, Paul Medina, Graham Mitchell, John Nutter, Mark Sunderman, and Renee Tihen

Maggie introduced Kevin Fontana from Health Sciences. He will be attending the meetings with Phyllis and will become the HS rep in the Fall 2006.

1. **Instructional Screen sharing technology**

   Charles Christensen voiced a concern about the use of the technology to force a particular use of the computers on students or limit the student use of the computer.

   Kevin Fontana explained that it is a control issue and there are legitimate reasons to prevent computer usage. This technology can be used to prevent computer usage during test taking or limit what students have access to. Kevin also commented that the use of IM in classes is a high tech way of passing notes.

   Mark Sunderman questioned that if the technology was funded who would train the faculty on the use of the software. Maggie explained that Information Technology is looking at providing training for classroom technology. Information Technology is currently in charge of classroom technology but the issues is being examined by the University administration.

   Mark Sunderman stated that he had seen this type of technology used effectively at Stanford. Mark explained that it showed the cooperative effort between students and the faculty and can be used as a good teaching tool.

   Glen Cox stated that this type of technology is in the Coe Library's classroom. The big benefit is to be able to directly show the student how a particular product works. Glen did express a concern about a student's screen being force shared or blanked out without permission.

   Warrie asked that the committee give the instructors the benefit of the doubt. Warrie can see how the program would be beneficial and a lot of it would depend on how the instructors would use it.

   Charles stated that when he has classes in these labs he uses the computers to take notes. He is concerned that if an instructor has control of what a student can do that this ability and other functions may no longer be an option.

Cheryl Hilman commented that she would like to know ECTL's position on the technology. Cheryl feels that ECTL needs to feel comfortable teaching the use of this technology to faculty.

Christy Boggs commented that she was on the user end of the software and it was used in the wrong way. Christy felt that the use of the technology forced students to stay at the same pace as the slowest user in the class. In Education, the solution to share student screens was to use wireless connecting to the wireless projector.

Paul Medina moved to implement the technology in one or two labs as a pilot with an evaluation by faculty, students and ECTL at the end of the Academic year 06-07. The implementation cost should not exceed $4000.

Christy Boggs seconded the motion

Discussion took place regarding placement of the technology and which labs should pilot the screen sharing. Jesse recommended that EN 2111 be the first candidate because the requesting faculty member uses that lab. Mark recommended that the second lab be one that has open hours in the evening so faculty members interested in testing the software would have access.

Charles Christensen moved to progress to vote

Approved: Phyllis Brecher, Christy Boggs, Graham Mitchell, Renee Tihen, Paul Medina, Tami Browning and Warrie Means

Opposed: Cheryl Hilman, John Nutter, Glen Cox, Charles Christensen and Mark Sunderman,
Abstain: None

Motion passed with a vote of 7 to 5.

2. **Web Cameras for security purposes**

Jesse explained that from a management perspective he no longer felt comfortable offering the expanded option that could support upwards of 64 cameras. Jesse explained that he felt the focus of the request was becoming too broad and requested that the committee only consider the smaller implementation and focus on the use of the cameras in CSTC labs.

Graham Mitchell voiced concerns about the cameras being a form of big-brother.

Warrie stated that he felt it is not this committee's responsibility to provide security.

Cheryl commented that engineering's interest in this solution had passed. She has decided to go with a smaller more localized solution to replace their camera system.

Charles Christensen moved to approve the web camera solution under cost structure 1 minus the email kiosks.
Tami Browning seconded

Approved: None
Opposed: all but two
Abstain: Glen Cox and Cheryl Hilman

Maggie adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm