Committee on Academic Technology

Minutes – December 9, 2011

In attendance: Bruce Boyden, Michael Class, S.J., Steven Crane, Scott D’Urso, Kathy Lang, Shaun Longstreet, Laura Matthew, Barrett McCormick, Gary Meyer, Michelle Mynlieff, George Corliss, Jon Pray, Heidi Schweizer, Janice Welburn
Excused: Lesley Boaz, Steven DeLonge, Tom Wirtz
Not in attendance: Charles Beckwirth, Patrick Loftis

I. Call to Order
Reflection: Michael Class, S.J.

Minutes from 10/28/11 unanimously approved (November meeting was canceled).

II. Computer Vendor Selection

The committee was joined by Laura Boikus, project manager for CRP (computer replacement program) selection process. It is time to select a new preferred vendor. A questionnaire will be sent to vendors prior to inviting vendors to campus. The selection process will include vendor demonstrations for faculty and staff. The target date to choose a new preferred vendor is March 12, 2012.

Janice Welburn asked how can we make it more affordable? If we could reduce the cost, we would be able to replace more often. This is particularly problematic with laptops in particular. More people are asking for laptops now but they cost more so that it is prohibitive.

The vendors will be asked to demonstrate desktops, laptops, and convertibles.

Printers will not be included in the vendor selection process since they are not part of the CRP. Purchasing would like to eliminate individual printers. ITS members were not included in the discussions with individual departments when purchasing was working on the new printer contract. Technology must funnel through IT but not necessarily part of the CRP.

Both the Political Science department and Communications have had problems getting new computers for new faculty. It is thought that the Tsunami or flooding issues have had an effect on hard drive production.

III. Discussion – 2010/11 CAT Survey

Chris Stockdale forwarded the survey results. The data from 2006 are not filled in the table but this is likely due to the fact that some of the questions are different. Although some of the information is in the report, it needs to be filled in. The level of satisfaction with teaching support is high (question #2; satisfied or very satisfied, ~65%). On research support there is also a high percentage of satisfied/very satisfied. There is a strong preference for laptops (2 to one over desktops). Currently the average computer replacement cost is $700 since they do not include the monitors. Monitors are not typically replaced unless they die, are the older style, or the smaller size. Laptops are $1000-1200. Each unit must figure out how to fund if over the $700 budget.

Janice mentioned that vendors are pushing the efficiency of using dual monitors. However, there is no budget for that. CRP has 4 year warranty built into the budget and drives the 4 year replacement cycle.
The units for the University are business class, which come at a higher cost but with more consistency of parts.

Could we disaggregate the satisfaction questions based on college or academic area? Barry McCormick and Laura Matthew stated that science researchers might have different needs and different levels of satisfactions. Chris should have all the data. Laura suggested that maybe we could get the data for specific questions that we are interested in rather than the entire document. It might also be informative to cross tabulate by college. Mike suggested that science folks would ask less support but may need more technology.

Gary Mayer suggested that we all look through the report independently to determine if there are data we would like to see disaggregated. Kathy Lang has been asked to speak at a conference on faculty surveys on technology. She is not sure what she is going to present. Laura (McBride?) in Institutional research could do some of the analysis for the committee. The 2006 data needs to be added so that we can get a sense of how things have changed, if they have changed.

George Corliss asked if there was a design as to how it would be analyzed.

Barry suggested we identify areas where the faculty are most satisfied and least satisfied. This could be broken down into different faculty types and compared between 2006 and 2010. From this we would be able to determine where there was the most and least improvement.

Could we use it for resource allocation? Where people are dissatisfied, we could allocate resources.

Shaun Longstreet looked over all questions quickly. Lots of questions were based on where is there a demand. The handout really doesn’t include lots of information from the original survey, but there still is useful information in the summary. For example D2L training was needed and the CTL has already instituted a lot of new training in D2L.

What is the significance of neutral? On a likert scale, the middle is not necessarily mean neutral.

2006 was very different.

Raw data can be found at https://sp.mu.edu/sites/coat/Facsurvey/default.aspx

IV. Clickers and academic integrity.

In Poli Sci students are signing in for each other at the door.

Should computers be in the classroom? At UWM there was an article about not distracting other students around them. George explained that he often sits in the back of the room when outside speakers come into class. He will flip down lids of the computers of students using facebook/games, etc. and this seems to discourage the students from continuing with this behavior.

Faculty should keep their ears open about use of clickers and cheating. Jon Pray said there was a modest swing to the iclicker device over other classroom response systems.

Janice said students want to know why the library doesn’t check out clickers. Jon suggested that maybe the library could check out a clicker pack (for use in a workshop or a temporary thing). The union could have it for meetings/senate/conferences.
V. Subcommittee Reports:

Etext Book Subcommittee - The subcommittee met on a phone conference with the Follet regional sales rep. Their solution is a glorified PDF reader with some mark up capabilities. The University is bound to Follet until 2014. They will give Jon a list of which books are available in the Follet application. Individual text books have their own etext products. The next step is to pilot some of the etexts in classes. Coursesmart is another vendor that takes the publishers pdf and incorporates it into their reader. Charles Beckwirth thinks that students would be interested. High schools are using them a lot but research suggests that the students don’t retain as much as with printed media. Janice does have a lot of books that they are getting electronically. Jon wants to explore whether we could get Follet to offer us the ability to access the publishers mark up version which usually has more bells and whistles. Follet is probably trying to get faculty to build customized course packs.

Hardware/software Subcommittee – The subcommittee met last month and discussed organizing focus groups of students from various colleges. The committee asked Gary to provide some money for pizza and he agreed. We would like to acquire best practices on use of technology in the classroom. Gary says it might be available and will look for it. Jon said that a report was given to the Board of Trustees. He should have it and will send it to the subcommittee. The plan is to have the focus groups in February or early March. Shaun is going to get some service learning students to run the groups for us.

Janice says survey will go out in the spring on faculty use of data storage.

Cloud Subcommittee – The subcommittee has not met. It is still in search of a mission and George will talk to his students.

Scott said that Communications is looking at Itunes U. Kathy said that there is a digital asset management request but it hasn’t gone anywhere due to lack of funding. Storage demands are going to be a big issue.

Adjourned 3:07

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Mynlieff