Guests: Dr Jeremy Fyke, asst. professor, Diederich College of Communications and his students: Alex Lahr, Meghan O'Leary, Morgan Rossi, Arica VanBoxtel, Mike DiGilio, Alexa Porter, Emily Larson.

Called to order at 1:35

Recorder Jon Pray

The reflection was shared by Thomas Lenoir who told a story of a boy who had to choose between an ice cream sundae or a simple bowl of ice cream – the latter allowing the boy to leave a tip to an impatient waitress. It was a nice story of compassion and generosity.

Dr. Chris Stockdale moved to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 16, 2012. Fr. Michael Class seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

1. Dr. Jeremy Fyke – assistant prof, Diederich College of Communication - and a group of his students presented on a class research project. Several student focus groups gathered observations on the faculty awareness and the communications strategies of the Center for Teaching and Learning. About 200 students participated in these focus groups (labeled as “convenient, but broad” samples). Participants came from a variety of disciplines and included several members of the faculty.

Some of the highlights:

- Students are frustrated with having to go outside of D2L to access multiple resources (ARES, other sites and publisher resources). The complaints focused on too many log-ins, too many different locations for content and too many open windows on their computer desktops.

- Students were frustrated with technological inconsistency among professors ranging from classroom presentations to the use of online resources. There was a suggestion to try and confine as many instructional assets to D2L.

- There was a concern among members of the faculty the about the pressure to “use technology for its own sake.” Professors also expressed a need for more time to learn D2L and master technology in general.
• Students find D2L use by members of the faculty to be inconsistent, ranging from those who use it with some depth to those who do not use it at all. One student committee recommends more online training materials perhaps including an FAQ. Make it more efficient and easy for members of the faculty to get answers to simple questions.

• Students observed that we might be trying to homogenize technology across the curriculum. There’s a sense that there needs to be more tailored technology for each course.

• Faculty members participating in the focus groups seemed about 50/50 on D2L – some love it, some believe it enables/encourages fewer students to skip class. Students generally like it are enthusiastic about ongoing access to course material. However, students don’t like busy work (quizzes, discussions, reflections). There was a tangent about D2L quizzing and quizzing in general being repetitive from previous semesters/years. One student suggested that “Respondus 4.0” was a tool that would enable faculty members to make new and better tests.

• The conversation moved to eBooks and tablets in the classroom. Faculty members are split on having them in class. iPads are generally liked better and smartphones are less popular among faculty. Students prefer tablets for reading eBooks and expressed a growing acceptance for eBooks. Students believe we should encourage faculty to allow students to use a variety of personal devices in class.

• CTL workshops – there should be specific emails from the CTL (vs. News Briefs distribution). Some faculty participants in the focus groups indicated they were not aware of what was going on with CTL and awareness is a recurring theme. The students recommend more of a SPAM approach toward communicating with the faculty with multiple announcements through a variety of channels.

• Online courses - Students still want the connection of an MU education, physical, personal, dialectic, and reflective. Participants in the focus groups recognize the place for online delivery, but they do not want to lose the MU/Jesuit interpersonal connection.

A Q&A followed – regarding D2L, ebooks, testing. Students are cautious, but hopeful about electronic texts. The ability to not retain the book seems to be less of an issue. There was some give-and-take on Aplia – a text/eText supplement being used primarily in business. The students express frustration at it being yet another outside-of-D2L application and an additional expense.
2. Kathy Lang, Marquette CIO - provided a presentation on Marquette Technology Budget.

Ms. Lang provided an overview of capital, operating and staff. She also included some comparative data from the “campus computing project” and Educause. These sources also provided some of the headings for the various tech/resource categories cited in the presentation.

- Staff, capital, operating, and contract maintenance (which is generally increasing) are the primary categories
- 90% of budget is for staff and contract maintenance
- 6% of total costs is for “academic technology/research” –
- $936,235 dollars is the rough estimate of academic support dollars. This figure does not include the rest of the services/systems in support of the academic enterprise (network, bandwidth, servers, etc.)
- $381,000 was spent last year in capital (primarily presentation classrooms)
- $390,000 went toward contract maintenance of programs such as D2L, SPSS Matlab, etc.
- Academic expenditures are trending downward, particularly capital allocations are going down (classrooms, and computer replacement)
- Kathy gave some comparative data from our leader, competitors, peer schools – MU’s position varies but we are generally in the middle of the pack
- Our infrastructure is good, the staff is small and Marquette works with a smaller budget.

There was a discussion of the budget process and how to move education technology requests higher up the long list of priorities. The current strategic planning process was noted and there should be points of emphasis for academic technology in that document.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 3:03pm