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Tuesday, April 25, 4:30 pm, TRLC

Attendees: C. Eisele (PROS), M. Gallantino (PROS), A. Mastrangelo (PROS), J. McCarthy (CMPS), P. McGinnis (PROS), D. Pinto (Library), A. Vedantham (Office Provost), D. Weiss (NAMS) and W. White (ARHU).

Comments received:
- Faculty currently face a difficult tension between dedicating program funds for student benefit versus buying updated computers for faculty and staff use. The concept of regular upgrade and replacement of faculty computers (with a special budget set-aside for this purpose) was welcomed.
- The plan may want to define a dollar amount threshold so that small items are not purchased from the Capital Equipment Fund.
- Some of the goals and evaluation criteria in the plan may need to be made more specific.
- Faculty asked if this document would be the appropriate place to think creatively about research labs and new ideas for the Physical Therapy program.
- Planning for faculty computers to be on a regular replacement cycle similar to the structure in place in NAMS currently was discussed.

Wednesday, April 26, 2:30 pm, TRLC

Attendees: G. Baldwin (Library), D. Carr (Provost), C. Farina (ARHU), L. Feeney (CMPS), B. Heinrich (CMPS), B. Kathrins (PROS), A. Latourette (PROS), M. Neifaroshan (PROS), C. O’Shea (ARHU), A. Vedantham (Office Provost) and M. Vito (PROS).

Comments received:
- The document should reflect the current plans for a proposed Division of Business. In general the Business Program needs greater representation in the document.
- The CEF Stakeholder Committee listed in the document has overlap with the recently-proposed Assembly Planning Committee. Clarification is needed on the roles and scope of the two committees. Faculty from all programs should be considered for the CEF Stakeholder Committee, not just the programs that already use technology intensively.
- Timing questions were raised about when the document would become finalized and the Provost indicated that this would not happen before early in the fall term.
- Faculty asked how they could submit language changes to the document, and they were asked to use the web submission form or send email.
Thursday, April 27, 4:30 pm, WQ103

Attendees: M. Hozik (NAMS), R. Tinsley (PROS) and A. Vedantham (Office Provost).

Comments received:
- The document has more detailed information from some divisions and units than it does from others. Some divisions have had faculty input earlier in the planning process that others.
- The TEAC accreditation process will benefit from this planning document because it shows a long-term plan for equipment.
- The document should make clear where new initiatives such as the Honors Program fit in to the larger structure.

Next Stakeholder Session: Thursday, May 11, 1:30 pm, TRLC

Attendees: D. Burdick (SOBL), V. deThy (EDUC), D. Emmons (SOBL), P. Forbes-Igharo (GENS), D. Gallaro (Office Provost), A. Herath (PROS), C. Kaus (SOBL), J. Loefflad (CMPS), M. Lowenstein (PROS), N. Messina (ARHU), L. Nutt (SOBL), Y. Sharon (NAMS), R. Simlot (SOBL), L. Stiles (NAMS), A. Vedantham (Office Provost), K. York (NAMS) and J. White (SOBL).

Comments received:
- Several faculty asked questions about the history of the planning process, and how input was solicited for the draft document. A. Vedantham and M. Lowenstein described the planning process for the FY07 budget hearings and the subsequent notification from Fiscal Affairs about the new CEF funding. Several faculty noted that they were glad to hear that the planning process would continue through fall term. Discussion ensued about the differences between this planning document and the decision-making on allocations of funds.
- It was pointed out that CEF funds roll over and do not face the same “spend or lose” dilemma of operating funds.
- Faculty asked what criteria would be used for allocation decisions, and what purchases fall within the scope of the CEF funds and what purchases do not. The concept of having a dollar-amount threshold, and the idea of not using CEF funds for consumables such as paper and toner were discussed.
- The role of different funding sources for items in the plan (construction budget for the Unified Science Center, set-aside budget for Computer Services projects, F-wing overbuild and Holocaust Center renovation budgets, etc.) was discussed at some length. L. Stiles emphasized that sometimes equipment is considered part of the construction budget and then shortchanged at the last minute due to façade improvements.
- Instructional technology needs were discussed including electronic classrooms, pilot programs for wireless laptops and new technology.
- Several Criminal Justice faculty presented a proposal for a Forensic Lab to provide students with hands-on exposure to fingerprinting, computer crime, deductive exercises and experimental activities. They described the enrollment growth in the Criminal Justice program and explained that such as lab would require about $200,000. The urgent issues would be space and maintaining Stockton’s competitiveness. The potential for a multi-use
lab space with other programs was discussed, and other lab proposals from Nursing, Psychology and Physical Therapy were also mentioned.

- Faculty mentioned the need to remind coordinators to include equipment plan suggestions in their annual reports to their Deans. It was suggested that guidelines be given for input so all divisions have similar processes when responding to the equipment plan drafts.

**Web Suggestion Box Submissions to Date**

*Please separate Occupational and Physical Therapy throughout the document. They are separate programs. Physical Therapy is a DPT, it has issues of replacement furniture & equipment since it is an older program, different accreditation pressures, heavy electrical equipment teaching and research needs. Occupational Therapy has their own unique needs.*

– Bess Kathrins

*Teacher Education does not appear to be represented well in the CEF draft. I think that any program with 400-500 students and 11 faculty members deserves more consideration as a stakeholder in this process. We have no designated technology facilities and no access to science labs. Please allow us into the discussion.*

Stockton Teacher Education students deserve to have dedicated computer hardware and access to basic school workroom equipment and technology for use in developing teaching materials. Stockton Teacher Education students further deserve to have dedicated science lab facilities for learning and practicing the art of teaching science.

*For our upcoming accreditation we have to document parity or the lack thereof with other Stockton programs. Stockton Teacher Education has nothing--especially in comparison to SPAD, PT, any of the sciences, etc., who have dedicated space and equipment spread across the campus. The CEF offers all of us a way to show that we are working in a positive direction. Nobody expects instant parity, but a plan to work toward some balance would be respected.*

– Ron Tinsley

*Electronic or paper distribution of capital request forms to all constituents, with instructions to prioritize requests as "urgent", "essential", or "enhancement" so allocations can be made rationally. Distribution to ALL constituents avoids the "penalty" of ineffective coordinators.*

*Stakeholder committee should not be limited to faculty members of "intensive users" as this sends the message that other faculty requests will be treated as inconsequential. In fact, this committee should either be a part of the "Strategic Planning Committee" or should not exist except as contributors to the overall capital 'wish list'.*

*New Initiatives: Laptops for all faculty, in lieu of desktop computers, with peripherals for offices (monitors, keyboards, etc.) so faculty can have their computer 'travel with them', especially so that wireless capabilities can be utilized. Links in the classrooms would make it simpler to use the laptops consistently without worry about leaving instructor CDs around.*
Major initiatives that are already known should be part of the planning document, at least in a broad framework that acknowledges the focus from Academic Affairs on those initiatives.

- Marilyn Vito

New Initiatives/Ideas - I think it would alleviate the crunch for computer labs if Stockton invested in some laptop carts for use in regular classrooms. This would allow a professor who simply needs students to access a spreadsheet or some websites to use a normal classroom, freeing the labs up for more complex or specialized needs. I would also suggest looking to start deploying interactive whiteboards in some rooms, especially for the education-oriented classes. More and more K-12 schools are using this technology, and it would be best if we model their use and expose students to them as a tool.

- Doug Harvey

Suggestion from a disinterested party (I'm transitioned to retirement.): If you want input, you might consider asking the kind of SPECIFIC questions that faculty can UNDERSTAND and respond to, such as asking them to choose between mutually incompatible options.
- E.g. should priority for faculty office computers go to research needs or teaching needs? Should we be permitted to opt for lap-tops rather than desk-tops?
- Should faculty receive office printers or be forced to use Divisional printers?
- Should "retired" computers be offered for faculty home use?
- Should the basis for NAMS lab equipment be for instruments and equipment for lower division courses or upper division (or research)?
- Should the replacement interval for computers be 4, 5, or 6 years, always with the COSTS and BENEFITS of each option made clear.
- On what basis should expensive software licenses be issued?

- Dick Colby

As of May 11, 2006, the New Jersey State Board of Nursing officially approved the new four-year nursing program at RSC. The program will begin in Fall 2006, with 36 students. Our recent visit from the Board revealed by 2 Board visitors an estimated cost of $250,000 to set up a nursing lab. While the lab does not need to be fully functional in Academic Year 2006-2007, a lab does have to be equipped with a variety of equipment and supplies. The Board of Nursing has mandated we send them photos of the lab in a reasonable time frame. Our first group of students will need to use the nursing lab in the Spring of 2007, albeit on a somewhat limited basis. As I read the document I noted language that says "as the Nursing Program makes progress toward development of its nursing program", This has become a reality and this lab now becomes an urgent need. Thank you.

- Linda Aaronson

I. As a faculty member there has not been a regular process for providing me with suitable computing to support either my research or my use of computers in the classroom. I might be wrong but, I don't think the college has purchased a new computer for my use in eight or more years. The computers in my office have come from labs that are being upgraded. In fact the last two computers I have are from a lab that first gets it computers as hand me downs from another lab. So these computers in my office have had about six years of student use before they land on
my desk. I think this happens because it is known that I will spend my own money to buy the technology that I need for research and teaching.

2. We have new faculty member joining the arts program in the sculpture area. Computer Services has already indicated that they will not be able to upgrade the sculpture studio into an electronic classroom. I hope that the funding can be allocated for this especially because this new faculty comes to Stockton with lots of teaching skills that utilize technology in the classroom.

3. I would like to see the return of technology based initiatives to support faculty projects in research and teaching.

4. Along with the initiative above, there still needs to be better support for the faculty that are lagging in the use of technology. I would like to see more staff time dedicated to working with faculty that are having problems using new technologies.

I was very pleased to attend the first public session regarding the planning documents. It is great to see such an open process.

- Wendel White