

**APPROVED 3/27/2006**

**OSU Student University Technology  
Services Fee Committee**

February 27, 2006

211 Student Union

Meeting Minutes

**Present:** Timm Bliss, David Bosserman, Gina Causin, Karalyn Eyster, Becca Farr, Courtney Hentges, Darlene Hightower, Tom Jordan, Angel Kymes, Nicholas Materer, Kevin Murphy, Douglas Needham, Robin Leech (alternate for Anne Prestamo), Ryan Royse

**Absent:** Jerry Bowen, Alex Kolpakov, Jim Lish, Jeff Price, Luke Simmering, Marlene Strathe, Mitch Zaloudek

The meeting of the OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee was called to order by Chair Karalyn Eyster at 5:03 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes. A copy of the 10/3/05 minutes was included in the handouts for the meeting. No changes were noted. **Minutes from the October 3, 2005 meeting were approved as submitted by a motion, second and a show of hands.**
2. Course Management System (CMS) Task Force Update. Ron Payne from ITLE provided an update on the activities of the Course Management System Task Force. He provided two handouts for the committee's information. The first handout was a print out from the website set up to review what has been accomplished by the Task Force so far (<http://fp.okstate.edu/fsc/cms>). The Task Force was established in late November. The Deans were asked to appoint members to study what we needed to do at OSU. The Task Force brainstormed and defined approximately 150 features they would like to see in a CMS. The Task Force also polled faculty and students for ideas (218 faculty and 523 students took part). The issues/features were studied by the Task Force and they then defined five pieces of software (course tools) they felt would meet those standards. One of the vendors (Educator) decided to pull out of the process because the vendor felt they could not comply with some of the features. Educator was picked initially because Northeastern A&M used and loved it and therefore the Task Force thought it might be an option for the rest of the system. The other four vendors were Blackboard, WebCT, Desire2Learn, and Angel. Angel was started by a faculty member at IUPUI and Desire2Learn is a relatively new company. All four systems have large universities going to it. Desire2Learn and Angel are growing quite rapidly. Penn State has adopted Angel. Ohio State has adopted Desire2Learn. The entire states of Wisconsin and

Minnesota have dropped WebCT and Blackboard and gone to Desire2Learn. As a result of the meetings and the demonstrations that were held, the Task Force decided they would like to have Desire2Learn and Angel come back for two more in-depth sessions, which begin tomorrow. The second handout is an email outlining these sessions. All the systems have strengths and potential weaknesses. The Task Force decided that Desire2Learn and Angel are currently the top two systems. Another reason that Desire2Learn was considered is that OU dropped Blackboard for Desire2Learn. Ron asked for questions. The question was asked when this process was expected to be complete. Ron reported that if everything goes wonderfully, they would like to start it this summer, and be fully integrated by fall. The last thing the Task Force wants is to have three systems. The question was asked regarding the expected reaction from the faculty. Ron asked Brecca Farr to respond. Brecca indicated that the Task Force has tried to be attentive to elements of the system that would facilitate as smooth a transition as possible, such as how easy it is to import coursework out of Blackboard or WebCT into a new system. They have looked at user interface because of the number of users, both on the student side and the faculty side. It is anticipated that regardless of the decision made, there will be concern expressed and that is part of the reason for inviting the two vendors back. It is a way for IT to get in depth information about how that transition can be eased technologically. The Task Force has also been working toward the ability to set up communities, so that we are not tied to a course structure. David Bosserman asked Tom Jordan if the Faculty Council should be briefed. Tom indicated that he has been updating the Executive Council as the study has been progressing. Tom indicated it would be a good idea to brief the Faculty Council.

3. FY06 Budget Status Update -- Darlene Hightower reported that as it stands now we are in very good shape. We budgeted approximately \$2,713,000. As of today, revenue deposited is \$2,789,000. So we are \$76,000 to the good. The Spring Semester is not over yet, plus if you look at last summer's hours, we will have approximately another \$150,000 that we will be able to carry forward into FY07. The revenue is looking good.

4. FY07 Project Requests -- Last year these meetings tended to be very lengthy and we met two or three times to get the budget approved. What is proposed is that this week, the Deans and VPs would be notified that their requests for UTSF funding are due by a certain date. We want to get the bulk of the projects to the committee to review and consider prior to the next meeting.

5. Dates to Establish FY 07 Budget -- It was suggested that we schedule two meetings, two hours in length. The second meeting may not be needed, but it would be good to go ahead and schedule two meetings in case the extra time is needed. After discussion, it was decided the deadline for submissions will be set for March 21 by 5:00 pm. Electronic copies will be forwarded to the committee members on March 22. The first meeting will be held on March 27 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm. A second meeting is set for April 10, if needed.

5. Follow-up from previous meetings – What is the progress of the Virtual Lab project, and has it been established what programs would be included? Darlene reported that Gina has met with the student groups twice. We have purchased SPSS and are looking at including SAS. We are working with the reps to get the metering that we need for the licensing for that to occur. The question of including AutoCAD was brought up. There is not an easy student version that the students can purchase or download. Darlene asked for more info, such as specific version.

6. Questions/Comments.

- a) Have we considered Adobe Premium Suite products available through the labs via a volume licensing agreement similar to what we have with Microsoft? Some of the programs that would be useful are: Photo Shop, PageMaker, Illustrator, and Adobe Pro.
  
- b) Gina suggested that the graduate students could use access to PDF Writer.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Joyce Hise