

TAB meeting, January 26, 2011

Attending: Brandon Remmert, Burton Peake, Michael Wirth, Scott Studham, Robert Fuller, David Ratledge (replacing Theresa Walker, per Linda Phillips's request), Gina Phipps, Joanne Logan, Jonee Lindstrom (for Chris Cimino), Tim Rogers, Sally McMillan, Stan Pinkleton, Louis Davis.

Banner update (Scott Studham)

- Gina Phipps will be ACIO for Student Services (interim, 6 months); Stan going to OIT Business Office.
- Banner – good things, mis-steps, current focus
 - About a decade long, \$10M project to replace all student information systems. Mainframe going away, using commercial rather than home-grown. Going on across all campuses. For a project this size, going remarkably well. Registration was phenomenal; start of semester was hard (5-6 speedbumps).
 - Most impact was days fees were due and being closed for snow first day. Had 10,000 concurrent logins and that didn't work. Have bought additional server, so won't run into that specific problem.
 - Change in wait-listing. Known, but could have been better communication. Used to be if 25 spaces, and 26 signed up, then one dropped, 26 automatically added. Now, 26 gets an email and 24 hours to respond, or goes to 27. Compounded by shut down of wait lists.
 - Fees. Historically, all fees were queued and sent out at once (e.g., for drops and adds). New system, each change led to an email with new fee statement. Lesson learned.
 - Field in student records (C or Y). Needed to be "C" to get financial aid to post; caused dismay when students thought they'd been dropped from their classes.
 - Still have a lot of work to do, inside IT, Registrar, Finance, to pull semester together and get off the mainframe. Doubled size of student information system group; mostly not student-facing.
 - Peake: Has been a request to change the class schedule printout format; students want a nice weekly schedule that's easy to find and similar to the old format.
 - Peake: Waitlisting. Some classes would say there were waitlist slots open but wouldn't allow anyone to actually register for them. Only happened to some sections and some courses. Ended up not being a big deal, but was a strange issue.
 - McMillan: Waitlisting. Faculty complained that once classes started, the waitlists went away. Logan says could get copies; Studham says that didn't go away, turned over to faculty decision. Logan said that "they" took snapshots and sent them by email. Rogers said that students were told that by faculty, that the waitlists were gone. Churchill said that in some cases, the display showed one open seat, but when tried to register, found on waitlist not in class. Studham thinks that's related to the 24-hour hold for a waitlisted person. Registrar considering the usefulness of a 24-hour hold per person.
 - McMillan: Policy question? Are students allowed to waitlist more than one section of a class. Studham says don't know, will investigate.
 - Remmert: when log into CPO, would give key dates; Banner doesn't do that. Studham: going to fix that.
 - Wirth: "Phantom" section of a Journalism class created somehow; had to cancel and move students into another section.
 - Logan: Faculty who need people to "jump" the waitlist have to go through Registrar. McMillan thinks is security issue, why not releasing timetable to departments.
 - Fuller: Banner / Blackboard interface, losing students, adding some back. Students very concerned about being "dropped" from their classes. Logan said adding was fine, dropping was less of a problem, all fixed over the weekend. Miles noted was also issue with snapshot.
 - Remmert: Would get email confirmation of dropping classes; would like with Banner in case need proof of dropping something (e.g., to contest a grade for a class that was dropped in time).
 - Peake: When searching for classes, the scroll box is tiny (only displays three lines); any way to have more items displayed at a time? Davis asks if front end site can be customized? Studham says can't modify the form without a lot of work and cost, but will ask Sungard if have a template we can work with.
 - Remmert: Any way to default to Knoxville campus classes? Under "Campus" it lists all.
 - Logan says that administrative interface and Ad Astra were great, and being able to get to them easily was very helpful.
 - Churchill: How is logging out working? Concern is security; has found times when he thought he was logged out and wasn't. Studham: Only way to log out is to log out of the machine. Also, will time out. If logged in and Portal passes to another site, remain logged in to Portal. Churchill: Also, if log in to another computer, should log out of first one. McMillan: If advisor allows student to log in to Banner on advisor's computer, only way to log student out is to completely shut down the machine. Studham says that's technically not possible, for the browser to maintain state across reboots. Churchill: Even if log out, and get "you are logged out" message, if close Safari and open Safari, still logged in. Peake says that didn't happen to him. Studham: Did you save tabs? Did you shut down or just close window? Browsers don't save state.
 - Pinkleton: Phase II portal, single sign on from MyUTK to Blackboard. Students seem to be satisfied.

- o Logan: Did Blackboard win the contract? Pinkleton: Yes. Don't know status of announcement. Phipps: Brown bag tomorrow will mention, and Feb. 7 Faculty eNews letter.

Tech Fee awards (Stan Pinkleton)

- In past, called for RFPs in November. Had letters and proposals back in December. Trying to make target date of about budget time, so departments knew what they were or weren't getting. Used to be done later, moved up at college requests.
- Target allocations set last year for college. Proposal still had to meet Tech Fee qualifications. March time frame was experimental.
- What has been an issue – we awarded early in the year, faculty got all their proposals for all their equipment, and none of them were valid by end of fiscal year when ordering. Had to go back to faculty for all proposals; some items had been discontinued; many things came back at higher prices.
- This year, want to try moving the awards process closer to the July end of the fiscal year so that prices will still be good.
 - o February 3 – email to deans requesting proposal and telling allocation
 - o March 15 – submission deadline
 - o March 25 – ranking due to OIT
 - o April 13 – TAB meet to approve
 - o April 20 – send award letters
 - o Shortly thereafter – start ordering
- Number of proposals has been declining
- Wirth: Doesn't make sense to base things on "fantasy" prices. Makes sense to do it this way. This way, amount of money in Tech Fee would be fully known. Pinkleton: Not really an issue; student headcounts pretty stable.
- Pinkleton: If this doesn't work, we can try something else next year.

Proposal for Enhancements to OIT Faculty Services (Robby Churchill)

- Proposed Faculty Technology Guidelines bill – this is one aspect of that bill. Brought to Faculty Senate Library / IT committee; that committee consulted with ITC
 - o Proposed: Meet with 500 faculty members per year, cost estimate \$48,000/year, and may not be able to meet with that many people. Dropped from this proposal.
 - o Reach out to new faculty to consult on technology uses in teaching, to meet with ITC and explore options – no cost.
 - o Reach out to approximately 50 departments a year with departmental presentations, cost estimate \$19,000/year.
 - o Create and distribute a short video outlining ways OIT can help faculty, cost estimate \$4500 one time.
- Suggests this should come out of Tech Fee.
- Would need to find a way to measure effect on faculty of spending this money. If it's working well, look at the higher cost option (meeting with 500 faculty / year).
- McMillan: Have you thought about TNTLC, Dave Schumann's group? He's very interested in helping faculty use technology better as part of an overall approach. Churchill wonders what kind of resources he'd get there. McMillan states that TNTLC is not solely technology, but very interested in using technology as part of their teaching. Logan: TNTLC focuses on pedagogy, not just bells and whistles. Pinkleton states ITC has working relationship with TNTLC. Phipps states ITC did a big workshop with TNTLC last summer, and working on one this month on engagement in large lecture classes. Logan states that this proposal needs to reach out, not just teach to the people who already come to workshops. Pinkleton notes this is a more proactive approach. Wirth: How to get faculty to take seriously? Logan: Have to tie into annual reviews. Looking at things like "How many students went to internships? How many teaching workshops did you attend?" Churchill: States that faculty don't know they aren't using technology effectively; they are very committed to their students and want to do well just don't know a better way. Students feel that UT isn't as advanced in technology as it really is, because teachers don't use the technology in classes.
- Churchill wants to quantify effects of spending the money
- McMillan likes idea of student-led initiative.
- Wirth asks, would the video teach how to use technology? Pinkleton: we were thinking more of a promotional video about ITC. McMillan states can't focus too tightly on technology, because it changes. Pinkleton: Could be ITC and TNTLC. We haven't really started planning content of this video, would ask for input. Wirth: Would department presentations be the same sort of thing, what ITC can do for faculty? Churchill: That's what we had in mind for the department presentations. As to instructional video, faculty have so many needs, really need a one-to-one consultation. Phipps: Concern about preaching to the choir. We have a loyal customer base, we get some new faculty, we get a lot who don't know we exist. Part of this is to make it easier for faculty to know about and meet with someone who can help. We need to meet people where they are. We do some departmental presentations (e.g., English faculty using technology presenting to their colleagues).
- McMillan: If going to do a video, need to be very creative and clever (e.g., video of students sleeping in class from another school). Use that kind of tone, "we're your students and you're not getting through to us".
- Logan: Thought about doing a video on new instructional classrooms; how do you download the software, how do you use

the equipment, that sort of thing. Also some of the pedagogy of using the technology to engage the students. Churchill: This is a different set of videos? Logan: Yes, some kind of repository of how-to videos for classroom tech. Churchill: That could be helpful. Still thinks the most important thing is sitting down one-to-one with someone who knows all the ins and outs of what works for different class sizes, different subject matter. If they don't come in to ITC, we won't reach them.

- Studham: So your proposal is for TAB to fund this, to have some kind of entertaining video that will encourage faculty to contact ITC, and also to have 50 appointments with departments. Pinkleton: Jean Derco thinks should do video first, get interest from departments.
- Studham to Wirth: Could your department help? Wirth: Bob Legg might be able to help, but would need a budget, hire a student worker, etc. Studham: Leave it up to students to be creative, have Bob mentor the student.
- Wirth: Whether ITC comes to department or department shows the video and individual faculty members get the idea, that's what you're really trying to achieve, to get the faculty member aware enough to call ITC or TNTLC, and make changes that will lead to better student outcomes. Pinkleton: Advantage to video is wide distribution. McMillan: Just run a viral campaign, make it cool.
- Pinkleton: No-cost item, "reach out to new faculty", incorporated in Faculty Computer Upgrade Program, every 3-4 years faculty member gets new computer and is contacted by someone in OIT about it. Repurposing this program to also talk about using OIT for technology support.
- Studham: proposal is to fund one-time cost of \$4,500 for video, and one year of \$19,000 pending development of metrics. Pinkleton: There is money available in the Tech Fee this year to do this. Studham: This would be at TAB discretion under student-funded projects. Suggests green light for one year, with understanding that ITC will have to demonstrate effectiveness to continue a second year.