Committee on Academic Technology  
September 25, 2015  
Meeting Minutes

Attending: Scott D’Urso (recorder), Lisa Hanson, Mark Johnson, Adam Kouhel, Kathy Lang, Patrick Loftis, Shaun Longstreet, Richard Marklin, Gary Meyer, John Pray, Kevin Rich, Erika Tucker

Meeting commenced at 1:36p with a reflection by Richard Marklin. Introductions of all present committee members followed the reflection. The minutes of the April 24, 2015 meeting were reviewed, corrected, and approved by the committee.

New Business
I. Discussion on the Lessons Learned from the Recent Faculty Technology Day

A. The committee discussed the successes and challenges of the inaugural event. Successes included the keynote presentation and the various presenters. Most significant challenge was the poor attendance and lack of significant marketing for the event. There were also concerns about the time of the year that the event was held. Suggestions included moving the event to a Friday (Marklin & Tucker) though Longstreet noted that Mondays and Fridays have proven to be bad days to do events like this, and having a clearer schedule (Tucker) with more discreet events so that faculty could feel free to attend events when they were available. Additionally, better marketing/advertising (much earlier next time), personal invitations (requiring RSVPs), and opening it up beyond campus to showcase University (Rich) and to students (both grad and undergrad). Marklin wondered if a better name might also help. Johnson recognized that some of the event was hard to package.

B. Longstreet did note that the CTL is moving towards more departmental level programing rather than university-wide events. He suggested partnering with the Library in the future.

C. Lang noted that Pray and Meyer said that we can use some of the material presented (videos captured) as part of the strategy to promote an event next year. Next year’s event is scheduled (or reserved) for September 20, 2016.

D. Meyer asked if committee members were willing to take on this event again. Lang suggested a subcommittee be created again to take on this task. Committee concurred this was a good idea. Rich will put out a call for membership on the subcommittee.

II. Topics for Upcoming Year

A. Rich noted that few suggestions had been made thus far. He suggested that we select 2-3 issues to work on this year. Meyer asked if the Academic Senate had given the committee a charge for the year. Rich indicated that he had not received anything from Academic Senate regarding a charge for the year.

B. Johnson proposed that we examine how we use D2L on campus. Kouhel agreed that this was important to students as it is their main way to access course information (syllabi, course documents, and grades). Students seem dissatisfied with faculty use of D2L. Hanson noted that there are no minimum competencies regarding faculty
use of technology on campus. She argues that D2L helps with student management in class and online. She asked if we can set minimum requirements for faculty (beyond current requirement of posting syllabi)? Tucker inquired about availability of D2L training for faculty. Longstreet noted that there are frequent sessions available on many aspects of D2L usage (general, grade book, discussions, etc.) for faculty to attend. Tucker asked if there are more ways we could get that information out to faculty (flyers, bulletin boards, etc.). Longstreet indicated that this is done. Rich indicated that faculty also have some responsibility to keep up and it is not all the responsibility of the CTL. Longstreet also noted that attendance at these sessions are growing annually.

C. The key issue was defined as Making D2L more Visible to Faculty.

D. Meyer suggested that the topics should be more visionary in nature. Lang agreed, but also noted that current issues are also relevant.

E. Rich called for the committee to submit additional ideas.

**Old Business**

I. Investigation into integrating D2L Gradebook with CheckMarq

A. D'Urso presented an update regarding his meeting with ITS about the technical side of the issue

   I. Meeting held with Ken Daily, Eric Benjamin, and Jan Judziewicz regarding the technical issues associated with attempting the integration of the two grade functions.

   II. Key Issues Discussed:

      a. Mid-Term vs Final Grade Entry

      b. How to handle Audit Students and Withdrawals and other uniques situations

      c. Standardized Grading System

      d. Final Approval of Mid-Term and Final Grades

      e. Synchronous vs. Asynchronous integration of systems

      f. Identifying other universities who are doing this already (data/info forthcoming).

   III. From ITS perspective, there are three options:

      a. Utilize a D2L custom tool to export data to CheckMarq (costs are associated with this option)

      b. Purchase similar product from Oracle (PeopleSoft). (Significant higher cost associated with this option) NOTE - UW Madison tried this and the project failed - Unreliable.

      c. In-house development - no progress on this option, but there are some theories on how to make it happen. Until this reaches a formal project level, nothing more will be done.

IV. Of these options, the D2L solution would be the quickest route. It would only offer nightly interactions between the two systems (similar to how students are added/dropped from D2L courses right now). It would require that D2L create/export a grade file that would match up with the standard Marquette
grading system recognized by CheckMarq. It could take either the Final Grade or Final Adjusted Grade to use the exported value. Faculty would still need to log on to Checkmarq to give final approval and to address unique issues such as incomplete or failures (which require entry of last date attended).

V. While these solutions appear to solve most issues, there are still some potential pitfalls from each of the major parties involved:

VI. Registrar - would prefer synchronous updates because of quick turnaround needed at the end of the term. Key data still needs to be entered manually in some cases. Creation of a Mid-Term value still needs to be addressed.

VII. ITS - Data exported from D2L needs to be standardized to insure correct transfer, cost issues associated with D2L option vs in-house (though this too presents resource/time issues)

VIII. Faculty - change in culture - would require faculty to use D2L grade book, use the official Marquette grading scheme (values could be standardized or faculty would need to learn how to define them on their own).

IX. Summary: - There are both technical issues, logistical/practical issues, as well as organizational cultural issues within the faculty and administration that would all need to be addressed before moving forward. None are insurmountable, but are going to require some compromises on all sides to make this work.

B. Next step is to meet with Registrar to evaluate their concerns and work to address them. Goal is to come up with a mutually acceptable solution that streamlines the process and is attractive to faculty to encourage D2L Gradebook use and that meets the needs of the registrar and does not place any additional burdens on them.

II. Meeting Adjourned at 3:01p

Respectfully Submitted by Scott C. D'Urso