Committee on Academic Technology  
September 24, 2010  
Meeting Minutes

Recorder: Bruce Boyden

Call to Order at 1:36 pm

Members present: Christopher Stockdale (chair), Gary Meyer (co-chair), Bruce Boyden, Marilyn Bratt, David Buckholdt, Steven Crane, Scott D’Urso, Kathy Lang, Barrett McCormick, Lars Olson, Jon Pray, Jame Schaefer, Heidi Schweizer.

Members excused: Mike Class, Janice Welburn.

Invocation by Chris Stockdale

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the April 23, 2010 meeting were not available to be voted on. It was agreed that members would try to reconstruct the minutes from their notes.

Continuing Business

Faculty Technology Survey. The proposed 2010 Academic Technology Survey was discussed. It was observed that there is a tight schedule for getting it on the schedule for approval by the Survey Subcommittee this semester. It was noted that there is nothing in the survey about the best pedagogical uses of technology, and what survey-takers would be interested in learning on that topic. Heidi Schweizer offered to craft a question.

The time to complete the survey was discussed. It was noted that it would take less time than it appears since some sections would likely be skipped. The survey should take no more than 20-25 minutes.

Chris Stockdale proposed a deadline of Wednesday of next week to return comments on the survey.
Various suggestions were made as to ways to boost the completion rate among those less familiar with technology. Prize give-aways were discussed. It was also suggested that statistical manipulation could compensation for under-reporting by some groups.

A suggestion was made to add a question or re-work Question 6 to focus on the amount the survey-taker uses technology, rather than mere level of comfort with technology.

**Clicker Policy.** There was discussion of a draft proposal to institute some sort of university policy regarding mandatory student purchase of clickers in classes. The burden on students of purchasing multiple clickers with largely similar functionality was discussed, although it was noted that the cost of the clickers is much less than a textbook. There was discussion of the best way to reduce this burden while not unnecessarily limiting flexibility to adopt alternative technologies. There was general agreement that the committee not be inundated with requests for approval of new technologies.

An amendment to the third paragraph of the draft proposal was discussed, with the exact language to be emailed to committee members with voting options prior to the next meeting.

**New Business**

**Vice-Chair.** There was discussion of the need for a Vice Chair to fill in when the Chair is absent. Chris Stockdale noted that he will be on leave in Spring 2011. If anyone is interested, please let Chris know. There was also discussion of how long the term for the Chair of the committee should be. There was general consensus that it be for one year, extending to the end of the academic year.

**Copyright and D2L.** Members of the committee are needed to act as an ad hoc subcommittee and liaison to a university task force being formed to deal with educating faculty members on copyright and electronic materials. The university received a cease and desist letter from publishers a few years ago with respect to materials being made available electronically. An agreement was reportedly entered into under which the university agreed to regularly inform the faculty about copyright and fair use. The task force would look into ways of implementing this.
It was suggested that the task force could also look into the issue of copyright in materials that professors create. Concern was expressed that any materials the university creates for educating faculty members not merely transmit a copyright-owner perspective. Questions were raised as to the exact content of the cease and desist letter and the agreement entered into by the university.

Email Chris Stockdale if you would like to volunteer for the subcommittee.

**Strategic Planning.** A new strategic planning process may begin soon, and the importance of this committee having input on technology projects as part of that plan was discussed. A suggestion was made that there be university-level “sandbox” funds available for small projects using new academic technology. It was also suggested that the committee should be proactive in finding technologies the university should buy. It was noted that no strategic planning process is likely to commence this academic year, until after the new President has been installed.