

**UNIVERSITY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TEACHING & LEARNING PORTFOLIO  
MEETING SUMMARY  
DATE: 7.31.2013  
TIME: 1:00 – 2:00pm  
LOCATION: Marriott Library 5201**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Fernando Rubio	Linda Ralston	Catherine Soehner	Rick Ash	Cory Stokes
Martha Bradley	Patrick Tripeny	Patrick Panos	Pam Hardin	Wayne Samuelson

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Rebekah Grow, Josh Wall, Aspen Perry

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Kirsten Butcher	Jean Shipman	Nalini Nadkarni	Eric Denna
-----------------	--------------	-----------------	------------

**Welcome/Minutes approval**

**Update on OITC (Operational Information Technology Committee) Action Regarding Classroom Technology Services.**

OITC agreed that classroom technology is a common resource, there are still 3 areas up for debate: Course Development Services, Course Delivery Systems, & Media Publishing Services. The funding model will begin being developed, once the criteria of *What a Common Resource Is* has been established.

Discussed foundation classroom configuration to decide what the foundation of each classroom should contain. Despite the additional cost of this foundation vs. what we are currently installing, the real cost essentially would be not having these technologies available. Question re: Blue Ray being necessary, despite low cost. Having those in the room helps to the University policy-compliant – plus many faculty still utilize the technology. Second question raised: Will this require new FTE's? No, actually this could be done with student apprentices.

MOTION: Is this the spec you would like to go with? Additionally, would you like to begin 10 classrooms refurbished on the foundation model this year? – Unanimously approved.

**Should TLT Provide Online Course Building Services**

College of Social Work has agreed to spearhead this project, looking mostly at rural and indigenous people, including refugee camps outside of the U.S. High quality course design/development typically runs \$30,000 – which can be compensated by revenue made. Has the potential to bring an additional \$3M in revenue from students who otherwise would not have access. Request would be made that additional revenue be recycled back into maintaining this service. Concerns over content and quality of online courses. Assumed that our objective remains teaching & meeting standards and not turn into collecting money without meeting standards. This will lead to a future discussion, should we continue putting \$200k into current online course structure or should it be moved to a more central plan.

Being clear that it would come as a program that would be built, not courses here and there.

MOTION: Does Governance want TLT to continue to explore this concept further? – Unanimously approved

ACTION ITEM: Next governance meeting Cory will bring back a service plan for this potential service.