Annual Report
Committee on Academic Technology
Academic Year 2013-2014

Committee Description: The Committee on Academic Technology (CAT) is a standing committee that reports jointly to the Provost and the University Academic Senate. It is concerned with the use of technology as regards the academic mission of the university. Its membership consists of representatives of each of the colleges of the university, the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Director of Information Technology Services, The Associate Vice Provost for Educational Technology, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs and Teaching. Two subcommittees functioned during the 2012-13 academic year: Hardware/Software Infrastructure and e-Textbooks; chaired by Tom Wirtz and Jon Pray respectively.

Committee Membership: Bruce Boyden, Lesley Boaz, Margaret Cinto (GSO), Patricia Healy (USO), Michael Class, S.J., Steven Crane, Scott D’Urso, Kathy Lang, Patrick Loftis (co-chair), Shaun Longstreet, Laura Matthew, Gary Meyer (Co-Chair), Jon Pray, Heidi Schweizer, Christopher Stockdale, Janice Welburn, Tom Wirtz, Jenn Fishman and Kyuil Kim


University Academic Senate Charge: No charge assigned.

Committee Work and Accomplishments: The CAT committee addressed multiple topics concerning the use of academic technology here at the University as well as examining academic technology elsewhere. Key areas of work throughout the year included:

- Discussion of information obtained from the “SWOT Analysis: Online @ Marquette University” that was conducted in May of 2013. Breakout groups at that session were asked to respond to a variety of questions regarding online and blended learning at Marquette, including the potential use of MOOCs.

- A large-scale Marquette University Academic Technology Day discussion was begun. This idea emerged from an event held by the CAT committee during the previous spring called Campus Conversation on Technology. The discussion resulted in the planning the first Academic Technology Day that is planned for September 16, 2014. A subcommittee continues to meet monthly for planning. Similar events held in the past at other Universities were discussed. Our event is to include campus tours, a keynote speaker, breakout sessions as well as TedX talks all centered around the use of academic technology in teaching and research. These continued discussions took a large portion of committee time throughout the year.

- We The Committee on Academic Technology addressed several concerns brought to the CAT by the MUSG. These included
Students would like D2L sites to remain open longer than the last day of finals week, which is currently the default practice.

Students would like more faculty to use the gradebook function within D2L.

Students thought that integrating the D2L Gradebook with Peoplesoft and the final grade submission process would be an inducement to get faculty to make more use of the gradebook.

As a result of these concerns, the committee took several actions. In regards to the D2L closing date, Georgia McRae, University Registrar was invited and attended a CAT meeting to hear and discuss this concern. Joe Terrian, Assistant Dean, College of Business and Chair, Committee on Academic Procedures also attended to express potential faculty concerns. Based on this meeting and student concerns, the D2L closing dates was adjusted. The idea of integrating the D2L gradebook with Peoplesoft was also explored, but was felt to be cost prohibitive at this time.

• Given the budget constraints evident at the Marquette University, the idea of a technology fee for students was discussed. We explored what is being done across other universities in this regard. Many Jesuit universities do charge students an academic technology fee. This fee is applied in a variety of ways. No action was taken on this issue, but it may be explored further in the future.

• The MU Alumni Association was surveyed by the CTL regarding their potential interest in online learning opportunities provided by Marquette. These results were discussed in our committee. The idea proved to be quite popular among alumni, and topics of interest varied widely. It was felt that this might be an opportunity to facilitate alumni in maintaining or reestablishing contact with the university.

• With the summer, 2014 D2L upgrade, the ability to purge and/or archive or purge course material after a given amount of time was discussed. The potential pros and cons or this were discussed at length including intellectual property, ownership, access, etc. This discussion will be continued, with the committee making a recommendation for or against this in the future.

Subcommittees: Two subcommittees were established and met throughout the year. Reports from the Hardware/Software subcommittee and the E-Textbooks subcommittee are attached to this reports as appendices.

Committee Recommendations:
The CAT recommends that the University keep academic technology at the forefront of discussions on the future of Marquette University. We feel that in order to remain cutting edge and desirable amongst potential students, the university must be a leader in adaptation and utilization of academic technology.

The CAT requests that a formal charge be issued by the UAS for this committee. Although we strive to keep abreast of technological advancements and are committed to the betterment of the university, a formal charge would give the committee much needed direction in its quest to serve.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patrick J. Loftis, PA-C, MPAS, RN, Co-chair
Gary Meyer, PhD, Co-chair
Appendix A

Committee on Academic Technology, Subcommittee on Electronic Textbooks

Annual Subcommittee Report, 2013-2014

Subcommittee Description:

The eTextbook subcommittee will work to ensure that Marquette University is ready to meet the rapid changes by textbook publishing companies toward electronic media. Its members will investigate the various platforms and policies that are beginning to emerge and how we can ensure student and faculty have wide access to and/or ownership of electronic media.

Subcommittee Membership:

Bruce Boyden
Laura Matthew
Michael Class, S.J.
Heidi Schweizer
Steve Crane
Janice Welburn
Gary Meyer
Jon Pray

Activities:

This was the third year of existence for the eTextbook subcommittee which met six times during the academic year. We began the year with a review of the Internet2/Educause joint, large-scale eTextbook pilot. Member universities could buy-in at several levels of participation with several vendor/provider options. In particular, we monitored the University of Wisconsin where their CIO embraced the pilot with a high level of participation. The most recent news is that there was some push-back from members of the faculty.

The subcommittee began the year with the target of producing a website that would give faculty members some aggregated resources on the subject. We also met with several publishers, course-pack creators, and representatives of Follett/BookMarq. Among them were Cengage,
Xanedu, and CourseSmart. There were also two eTeaching workshops on the subject presented in the Center for Teaching and Learning. These occurred in the fall and spring semesters. The website remains a work-in-progress.

The subcommittee spent a good deal of time with Follett/BookMarq representatives to discuss their contract renewal and changing institutional needs. Follett was the only vendor to respond to Marquette’s RFP this year. General Counsel is finalizing the contract at this writing. Interestingly, there’s been some leveling of enthusiasm on the part of publishers who see electronic distribution as a market segment rather than a complete immediate future.

The Tumblr page that chronicles recent articles on the subject continued to be updated: http://muetextbook.tumblr.com/ in its third year. It now contains nearly 90 articles on the subject.
Appendix B

Committee on Academic Technology, Subcommittee on Hardware / Software

Annual Subcommittee Report, 2013-2014

Subcommittee Description:
This subcommittee reviews and addresses issues related to hardware and software for academic technology.

Subcommittee Membership:
Boaz, Lesley
Loftis, Patrick
Stockdale, Christopher
D’Urso, Scott
Longstreet, Christopher (Shaun)
Wirtz, Thomas, chair

Committee Work and Accomplishments:
Two items were identified as unfinished from the previous year.

- D2L Survey
- Group buying/licensing of software across the university

At the first meeting, we reviewed the unfinished work and determined that additional action on the D2L survey was not needed at this time. We recognized that group buying/licensing of software was still an open item, but we did not have an immediate plan how to address the issue.

We identified some additional issues for the year

- Consider how the committee can express concern and support for funding for technology, including the Computer Replacement Program.
- Review automatic posting of grades from D2L to Checkmarq
- Group buying/licensing of software across the university
We set support for technology funding as the first item to address. Over several months we refined a letter detailing the concerns and advocating for increased funding. But since the university sought financial reductions from most areas; we decided it was best to table the proposal this year.

The issue of review automatic posting of grades from D2L to Checkmarq was addressed by the full committee in the December meeting during a discussion with Georgia McRae, University Registrar. We discovered that the Registrar was not opposed to the concept. It is technically possible to accomplish. Cost is the major obstacle of implementation at this time. Beyond cost, the next major item to address would be the system controls necessary to ensure that the course director can initiate a process that accurately post the grades in Checkmarq. The subcommittee continues to work on group buying/licensing of software. We decided to extract information from ITS’ technology database of university computers (SCCM). By reviewing the applications installed throughout the university, we might identify common applications. To this point, Kathy Lang has coordinated collection of the information. We are in the process of reviewing it. We might complete the review this term. Otherwise the review can continue into next term.