Deans’ Group Minutes 02/28/01

In attendance: Ahmed Abdelal, Roy Bahl, Reid Christenberry, Ron Colarusso, Tim Crimmins, Sid Harris, Charlene Hurt, Steve Kaminshine, Susan Kelley. Ron Henry chaired.

Also in attendance: Bill Paraska, Faye Borthick.

I. Minutes of January 31, 2001 were approved.

II. Technology Security Issues
A summary of security incidents concerning computer security issues was presented. 22 incidents occurred on internal equipment, 5 on external equipment. 8 incidents of mail abuse have been detected. 2 incidents could not be investigated because those departments did not respond. 4 incidents with viruses occurred on machines which had no virus detection or out-dated products. Unix boxes seem to be the most unprotected.

The Information Technology Security Committee is moving forward to develop computer security policies, but certain issues have not been completed due to lack of response from some committee members. Tim Crimmins applauded successful efforts to eliminate viruses from GroupWise. The license for Norton anti-virus products will allow the university to share these products with students and the managed version will be available to faculty. These materials will be available on disc from the library as well as from a web site.

III. Strategic Plan for On-line Courses
Faye Borthick presented a strategic plan for on-line courses. She discussed some current problems. For example, in foreign language free web sites with engines which have given students poor translations. She suggested that faculty could use these problems as opportunities for educating students on the differences in foreign language grammar. She also pointed out that educationally the response to technology might be different between disciplines. In addition, she pointed out technology may offer so many new opportunities, that the choices may be overwhelming.

Charlene Hurt stated one common assumption is that technology is “inhuman.” Ron Henry indicated some individuals inaccurately assume that the use of technology permits education to be provided to more students for fewer resources. Ron Colarusso pointed out that learning outcomes for the translation of virtual experiences into actual experiences have not been proven.

Faye Borthick contends that in order to allow the use of technology the institution must provide support. This support would be in the form of training to learn the tools as well as for instructional design. In addition the institution should provide the appropriate equipment and its upkeep. She suggested a team approach to making educational decisions concerning technology might be helpful. This team could have separate, but integrated, components to develop goals, curriculum, technological applications and assessment of outcomes.

Ron Colarusso indicated that doctoral students informed the COE that they preferred that less than 30% of course time being dedicated to on-line interaction. Tim Crimmins suggested Web CT be used more frequently as a supplement in core courses to enhance writing skills. Charlene Hurt suggested some of the structure of the eCore courses is remarkable and could be used as models. Ron Henry pointed out that when implementing technology learning outcomes need to be established before the courses are designed. Steve Kaminshine discussed that some faculty may perceive that technology does not actually aid in the facilitation of achieving educational outcomes, rather it just glamorizes the material. He suggested that faculty need to discuss the improvement in learning outcomes that may result from the use of technology.
Ahmed Abdelal asked why it is so important that learning outcomes when using technology may be different than without. Faye Borthick indicated this is needed because immediate feedback from students is not available for the instructor to be flexible. Ron Colarusso stated that using technology requires more advanced planning, but that outcomes are not necessarily altered. Tim Crimmins suggested that the changes in learning outcomes (stated or not) will be incremental as technology is added. Reid Christenberry pointed out that as technology is added to any discipline such as business, structure has been added to facilitate its use. He also indicated it is difficult to anticipate extemporaneous, but necessary probes. Charlene Hurt stressed that this is shows the importance of information literacy.

Susan Kelley asked what type of tangible support should be offered. She suggested that faculty be initially referred to IS&T and distance learning to learn Web CT. She further indicated that designing educational outcomes is not available on campus for large numbers of faculty. Ron Henry asked if the Center of Teaching and Learning might be the site for such support. Steve Kaminshine suggested discussions with faculty who have been successful in enhancing their courses might be helpful in encouraging faculty to begin adding technology. Faye Borthick also indicated students are interested in interfacing most routine interactions with campus entities with technology.

IV. Budget Item
Ron Henry explained the legislature has approved $24 M for the supplemental budget. There is concern that we will not receive the $18 M to cover the semester conversion in the Big budget. $34 M for the Georgia Research Alliance was also approved in the supplemental budget.

V. University Policy on Recruitment and Retention of Ethnic Minority Tenure-Track Faculty
Ron Henry presented the Faculty Affairs report for discussion. Ahmed Abdelal felt it was a reasonable report. Roy Bahl suggested the primary problem with recruiting and retaining ethnic minority faculty lies in the fact that the supply is very limited and may be very limited in certain discipline. He indicated that larger funds need to be made available and that specific strategies need to be developed for the successful implementation of the action plan.

Ahmed Abdelal suggested strategies should be added to the action to develop the pipeline of student progress through disciplines and HBCU faculty exchanges may aid in retention. Charlene Hurt asked if reports would be produced for non-tenure track faculty also. The group suggested this document should be known as a “report” rather than a “policy.” In addition, item 4, adding funding to recruitment based on ethnicity is not legal. It is recommended that item 5 be eliminated. Roy Bahl asked if “target of opportunity” funding could be made available for the recruitment of senior faculty who could also serve as mentors for junior faculty.

VI. Non-tenure Track
Tim Crimmins circulated a print out of non-tenure track faculty numbers on campus.

Next meeting: Wednesday, March 14, 2001, 9 to 11:00 am, Golden Key Board Room, Room 200, Student Center.

Submitted by Lisa Beck 02/28/01