Resolution 97.4.1 dated 4/28/97

San Diego Mesa College
Computer Steering Committee

Computers and Computing in Labs

Whereas students, staff, faculty and administration have recognized many different needs and uses for computers and computing on campus,

Whereas computing is likely to be eventually necessary for all departments, areas and individuals,

Whereas the purchasing, training, installation, maintenance, repair and upgrades of computers, related technology and facilities will likely always be a high load on human resources as well as financially taxing,

Whereas one of our goals toward computers and computing is to maximize efficient utilization, and creating aggregates of machines we call "Labs" is one way to achieve this,

Be it resolved that we adopt the following model and language in pursuit of improving computing facilities. Furthermore, be it resolved that such a plan be pursued in such a way that all types and categories of computing be equitably funded and maintained to our best ability by way of some annual budgeting formula that does not favor one type of computing or computer over another:

i) Open Labs: Central Generalized Computing (examples and models include the faculty lab at the old ILC, the proposed lab for the new LRC that replaces the old ILC)
- open to all students and faculty on an individual basis (not a classroom lab) for general use related to course work from any and all disciplines (assignments and research),
- staffed by technicians, accessible from adjoining technicians' offices,
- centralized and accessible in spacious facilities with long operating hours,
- platform-integrated lab to consist of numerous technological and discipline diverse machines and applications with diverse operating platforms (i.e. should include some Macintosh machines and perhaps Sun machines if needed — Power PC would be an excellent choice for some of these computers — a large bank of Datel clones may be ideal for a majority of the systems),
- diversity of platforms and implemented software must be curriculum-driven,
- balance in maintaining and upgrading the different systems is dependent on the success of related curriculum, but never to the exclusion of any discipline with a legitimate use,
- conform to a pre-established criteria for a "Computer Lab" and "workstation" that must be defined and agreed upon.

ii) Open Entry/Exit Labs: Central Computing for Self-Paced Learning (example is the new curriculum for OIS)
- open to faculty and enrolled students on an individual basis (not a classroom lab) for use related to this Open Entry/Exit model — i.e. students enroll and then complete their course work on the computer at any time throughout the calender year,
- it is a shared lab for any and all disciplines that share this Open Entry/Exit model (it does not belong to any specific department),
- possibly ideal venue for a general computer literacy requirement,
- staffed by certificated instructors to help with the discipline-specific materials as well as at least one technician (excellent fall-back assignments for adjunct faculty whose original assignments have been canceled),
- centralized and accessible in spacious facilities with long operating hours,
- platform-integrated lab to consist of numerous technological and discipline diverse machines with diverse operating platforms,
- diversity of platforms and implemented software must be curriculum-driven,
- balance in maintaining and upgrading the different systems is dependent on the success of related curriculum, but never to the exclusion of any discipline with a legitimate use,
- conform to a generic definition and criteria of a "Computer Lab" and "workstation" that must be defined and agreed upon.

iii) Other Mediated Labs: Central Computing for Supplemental Instruction and Testing (examples and models include the DSPS lab, the proposed language lab slated for the refurbished ILC space)
- open to faculty and enrolled students on an individual basis for use related to supplemental instruction, tutoring and testing, as well as on a restricted group basis (for example, a single class demo on a specialized CD-ROM application,

a demonstration of Internet research techniques, etc.),

- it is a shared lab for any and all disciplines that share this supplemental instruction, tutoring and testing model (it does not belong to any specific department),
- staffed by certificated instructors to help with the discipline-specific materials as well as at least one technician (excellent fall-back assignments for adjunct faculty whose original assignments have been canceled),
- may be centralized and accessible in spacious-to-less spacious facilities with standard operating hours; perhaps these are more regional labs related to schools, perhaps not,
- platform-integrated lab to consist of numerous technological and discipline diverse machines with diverse operating platforms,
- diversity of platforms and implemented software must be curriculum-driven,
- balance in maintaining and upgrading the different systems is dependent on the success of related curriculum, but never to the exclusion of any discipline with a legitimate use,
- conform to a generic definition and criteria of a "Computer Lab" and "workstation" that must be defined and agreed upon.

iv) Discipline "Labs": Decentralized Discipline Specific Computing (examples and models include the Electronic Music Studio within the Music Department, the recent acquisition of computers for the Biology program, the proposed Computer Art Studio)

- open only to faculty and enrolled students of specific courses where the computing applications are highly specialized, where computers are necessary, but not necessarily the only tools, in the industry and/or where computers are generally needed in the classroom,
- it is a "lab", studio or classroom where the words "lab" and "workstation" are not generic and are not usually meant in the same way as above; it is specifically designed for a discipline and intended for a specific academic program (it does belong to a specific department),
- staffed by faculty, who are experts in the field, to teach the discipline,
- located in or near areas related to the discipline of the department,
- platform and software appropriate and specific to the discipline and relative industry standards, and must be curriculum-driven.

Date:

March 16, 1997

Submitted by:

Igor Korneitchouk, Co-Chair of the Computing Steering Committee
Dwayne Gergens, Chair of the Mesa Academic Computing Committee

A: I think we should be teaching every day. We would be served well to offer courses Monday through Saturday for room utilization, justifying expanded facilities, parking problems, student demand, etc.

Q: Is Critical Thinking mandated by the state?

A: CSU and IGETC not only require a course in critical thinking but UC requires critical thinking to be part of the content of all courses. Title V, in the area of course approval, states that critical thinking has to be included in every course that is AA/Transfer level.

There was some discussion about how people learn how to teach these concepts. Locke stated that it may again be time to get some flex day hours spent on this issue. There was further discussion about critical thinking in relation to four-year schools.

Chancellor Gallego closed by saying that he tries to get around to all the colleges and appreciates the good work and support that he and President Carroll have been given.

OLD BUSINESS: Resolution 97.4.1 - Computers and Computing in Labs.

Be it resolved that we adopt the following model and language in pursuit of improving computing facilities. Furthermore, be it resolved that such a plan be pursued in such a way that all types and categories of computing be equitably funded and maintained to our best ability by way of some annual budgeting formula that does not favor one type of computing or computer over another. (ENTIRE RESOLUTION AVAILABLE IN ACADEMIC SENATE FILES)

Dwayne Gergens, one of the makers of this resolution (Igor Korneitchouk was not in attendance) stated the goal is to create a model and language that is common to all of us in the pursuit to achieve many and varied labs on campus.

There was discussion regarding:
...having space for facilities and the matter of accessibility/ergonomics. A friendly amendment by Gail Conrad to change the language was accepted.

...dropping a statement regarding the generation of FTES. A friendly amendment by Charles Collins was accepted.

...combining some areas so as not to impact the existing mission of the ILC to serve all disciplines. A friendly amendment was made by Robert Michaels and accepted to change the language to this extent.

Senator Michaels spoke 'for' the resolution.

No one spoke 'against' the resolution.

After further discussions a

motion was made to accept resolution 97.4.1 as amended. It passed unanimously.

This resolution will go to Presidents Cabinet on April 29th.

REPORTS:

Senator-at-Large Diane Barbolla addressed the draft of District Contract Faculty Hiring