

Meeting Date: April 19, 2001

Approved: 5/03/01

**PRESENT:** A. Bloom, D. Cardoza, J. Faust, D. Frankl, B. Krilowicz, J. Lister, V. Seaman, W. Sternal, J. Wiebe, F. Wu

**EXCUSED:** E. Forde

**GUEST:** C. Kaufman

1. Announcements

- The CMS/PeopleSoft update will be presented on May 17 with an adjusted meeting time. P. Quan has requested a noon start time.
- S. Cash has agreed to attend the May 3 meeting to discuss the Computer/Technology Competency issue.
- J. Woosley will be asked to the May 3 meeting to discuss GET.

2. Intent to Raise Questions

None.

3. Approval of the Agenda

It was m/s/p to approve the agenda.

4. Approval of the Minutes

It was m/s/p to approve the March 1, 2001 minutes.

5. Liaison Reports

- J. Faust announced that the Executive Committee would like a report on the positive or negative impact of the conversion to the semester system on technology and recommendations for possible solutions.
- J. Lister distributed postcards announcing the ASI General Elections, April 30 – May 2, 2001.

6. ATS User Services Web/Video Streaming

C. Kaufman, Manager of ATS User Services, demonstrated media streaming production and the tools available for faculty use in order to produce a streaming video. Additional information can be obtained at <[www.calstatela.edu/ats/user/streaming](http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/user/streaming)>. The Real Media Development Site with information on teaching with Real Media is located at <[www.calstatela.edu/ats/real](http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/real)>.

7. Software/WebCT Issues

S. Pollard provided a written response to a question raised by B. Krilowicz. (See attached)

The minutes respectfully submitted by  
Desdemona Cardoza, Vice President  
Information Resources Management

The following was sent to Stephen Pollard, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Information Services via Alan Bloom, Chair AIRC from Professor Beverly L. Krilowicz:

The CETL folks (Andy Winnick, Melva Irvin, Gayle Burns and I) were meeting today and an interesting question came up that appears to be appropriately directed to AIRC. We understand that ATS is developing software to potentially replace among others, WebCT, and wonder by whom and how decisions are made regarding 1) the software being used on campus, and 2) the minimal criteria/requirements of the software? For example, Gayle is very concerned that certain desirable features of WebCT will not be mirrored in the campus developed product (which I believe is Instructional 1?). We use the example of WebCT, but apparently the same could apply to other software, such as the catalog software.

ATS Response:

First, let me state that we in ATS are not developing any software to replace WebCT. We continue to administrate WebCT and provide the licensing for WebCT. We have set up an additional server to provide beta testing for new versions of WebCT by FITSC and faculty. We are continuing to seek ways to improve the performance of the WebCT product. ATS sponsored the LA WebCT Expo last year as well to encourage the use of the latest version of WebCT (version 3.0) on campus.

In addition to WebCT, we in ATS have provided server space for those faculty who wish to post course material on the web, but who do not wish to use WebCT. The campus, through the CSU Microsoft Enterprise Agreement, is the beneficiary of a variety of Microsoft Products that make it easy for faculty to publish and establish online courses via MS Office 2000 products. The use of these products is "free" to campus users. We have introduced this, though, it is still in a pilot phase to assist faculty who don't want/need to use WebCT. The cost to ATS has been minimal (cost of a server) to do this. We also plan to migrate those faculty not using WebCT to this new server as well so that the current curriculum server can be used solely for WebCT.

Regarding software choice, this is determined in a cooperative way between faculty, Academic Affairs and IRM and is based on what ATS can support with both fiscal and human resources, faculty need and support by FITSC. ATS continually looks for low cost ways to both provide access as well as to meet growing needs from faculty.

With respect to the faculty desktop, most, if not all, of the software on the desktop is the result of: the campus baseline plan (which has representation from all campus groups, including Academic Affairs, AIRC and faculty) and/or tools that FITSC and/or the faculty require to make effective instructional material using technology. Again, support and cost considerations determine vendor and specific products. However, our goal is to provide faculty with tools they need to accomplish a particular task. Software on faculty desktops can be viewed at:

[http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/desktop/winsupport/dss\\_fac.htm](http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/desktop/winsupport/dss_fac.htm) It should be noted as well, that faculty are free to install any software that they have a license for on their campus workstation.

With respect to the student desktop, most, if not all, of the software deployed comes from the campus baseline plan and/or requests by faculty to include software titles that are necessary for students in specific courses. Again, issues of cost and support in conjunction with the faculty goals insure that most, if not all, faculty needs are met. Software in the open access labs and electronic classrooms can be viewed at: [http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/desktop/winsupport/dss\\_stud.htm](http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/desktop/winsupport/dss_stud.htm) ATS software policy and requests for new titles can be seen at:

[http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/acct\\_admin/soft1.htm](http://www.calstatela.edu/ats/acct_admin/soft1.htm)