

Minutes of the Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee

Tuesday, October 3, 1995 - Library 134

Present: Mott Greene, John Hanson (presiding), Chuck Hommel, Mary Rose Lamb, Marilyn Mitchell, Gary Peterson, Marta Robertson, Don Share, Raney Ellis (recording).

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M.

The minutes of the meeting of September 19, 1995, were accepted with the following corrections. Marta Robertson was present, but not recorded as such. The third group in the reorganized Office of Information Systems is Central Database Services, not Central Database Support.

Peterson reported for the subcommittee on a faculty technology survey. Hommel and Woodward sent him some suggestions for items. Ellis has obtained copies of the 1994 USC survey of faculty technology use. Hanson suggested that in the final survey, there be ample opportunity for written comment. Peterson invited input from everyone.

Hanson invited discussion of the 1994/95 report, with a view to putting priorities on items for the year's deliberations.

Share suggested that in the matter of faculty training and development, there is a concern that new computers get installed and the faculty don't know how to deal with a new system. This comment led to a discussion of training and use problems confronting faculty, to wit:

1. Some old software doesn't work on the new system, and then the liaison has to schedule a time to come solve the problem, while the faculty member can't use the system.
2. Having to confront such software as Windows and Eudora, without prior experience and training.
3. Bundled software is removed from the hard disk prior to installation, without telling the faculty member, who is then confused because the documentation refers to the removed software.
4. Not having master disks and manuals left with the computer.
5. When lab computers are upgraded, faculty who have their students use the labs are not sufficiently warned of possible conflicts between old instructional software and the new systems. If upgrades to the software are required, who pays?

6. Installers of systems check that programs boot, but don't always check on the way in which applications are used, which may cause problems for the faculty member.
7. On the Macintosh, extensions may cause lockups with new systems, and the time required to find the conflict may be substantial. Could there be work-study students trained to do this work?
8. Some faculty are still not using the systems they have available, which interferes with efforts to use the campus network and electronic means to share information and communicate widely.

Some suggestions were offered to help deal with these problems:

1. Could the department secretary or assistant be trained to be more of a specialist, supporting basic computer use? If so, this person should be provided the current standard system, not a hand-me-down.
2. Could training be done on a department-wide basis, to focus on common needs and get everyone to the training at the same time?
3. Perhaps training could be coordinated with Human Resources, both for new faculty as well as for others already here.
4. Word Perfect users still need help in the changeover to Word.
5. Self-instruction materials might be useful to some faculty.

Greene said that with the greater availability of CeDRIC, he would like some attention given to providing software that would download material in specific bibliographic format(s).

Hanson called the committee's attention to item 6, budgeting. For example, how is instructional software purchased and paid for? What is the library's, OIS's, and the departmental responsibility? We need guidelines. Mitchell and Ellis both agreed that guidelines are desirable.

There was some concern expressed about the expectations and protocols for email use. For example, there is now a need to configure Eudora to have a folder for attachments.

Hanson will suggest some priorities and key areas at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 A.M.