



FACULTY SENATE

Educational & Research Technologies Committee
Minutes
327 Waterman
November 9, 2016

Present: David Feurzeig, Marc Law, Helen Read, Lyman Ross, Tim Tourville, Christina Wassel

Absent: David Brandt, Hung Do, Elise Hotaling, Omar Oyarzabal, Mark Starrett, Regina Toolin, Brian Voight, Cathy Paris

Guests: Andrew Horvat, Mara Saule, Keith Williams, Naima Dennis, Becky Clark, Veronika Carter

Chair David Feurzeig called the meeting to order at 8:32 am in the Faculty Senate Conference Room Waterman.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the October 19, 2016 were approved as written.

2. New degree audit tool – Becky Clark, Assistant Registrar for Transfer Affairs presented an overview of the Degree Works system. CEMS went live with the system on October 24th. The goal is to roll-out the system for all users by the summer 2017. Degree Works is a more robust system and is very transparent. There are very clear indications regarding what is completed, in progress, or outstanding. Transfer and exception information is now more detailed. Feedback has been received from CEMS regarding issues discovered in the system. Noted was that errors have been discovered in the catalog during degree audits. The most common error was that the catalog list includes courses that are no longer offered. The Registrar's Office is working with an implementation committee for training and roll-out of Degree Works. The committee includes faculty and students, including members of Faculty Senate and Student Government leadership.

3. Expanded Section Descriptions proposal: report out from Associate Deans' meeting (David)

David Feurzig discussed the updated draft of the Expanded Course Descriptions (ECD) proposal. Minor updates had been made including the addition of "Lab" as a mode of instruction in the

checklist. David reported that he had presented the draft to the Associate Deans meeting on Nov 8th for their thoughts and input. Feedback and comments included a suggestion to use an open-ended box for the prompt for course content/learning objectives. Concerns were expressed around utilization of the ECD by students. Do students know that ECDs exist and where to find them? Keith Williams will look at which courses are currently utilizing ECDs. The ECD is designed to help students choose their courses, and has separate sections for course content and materials. Listing course materials may be one reason that some faculty are not utilizing the ECD. Students want the information early, and the law requires that it is provided at the time the course is listed. Some faculty find this inhibiting, because the ECD is binding. Faculty may be delaying the creation of the ECD until they have solidified their materials, and then forgetting to create the ECD. Portal reminders could be generated to those missing. David asked how the ERTC would like to proceed. Should there be a resolution to the Senate? Discussion continued toward a solution that would be less burdensome for faculty. Completing the ECD may seem like additional work for faculty, and the timing when the course information is required is always difficult. One suggestion was to allow faculty to just upload their syllabus. Keith Williams stated that the same problems would occur with ECD and creating a syllabus database. The information will need to be reviewed and updated each time the course is offered. David Feurzig, Keith Williams and Lyman Ross will continue to discuss the technology of syllabus storage and utilization.

4. TIF procedures: discussion of Mara Saule's report. David Feurzig opened a discussion around the question, "should we request that the Provost and Maura set aside a certain amount of the student technology fee funds each year for open proposals?" Maura provided some historical background and knowledge gained from the experience of three rounds of proposals in the past. The proposal process was different in each of the three rounds, and each provided some lessons learned. The first-round proposals received were interesting, although some were not technically feasible. Many proposals had not checked with college or IT. One of the most successful proposal from a student was to develop an app that tracked the campus buses to minimize time students spent standing outside. That was a worthwhile and innovative proposal. However, the intent of the technology fee is to cover general purpose classroom upgrades to a certain level of technology, and expanding wireless. That intent needed to be made more clear in the call for proposals. Some of the proposals funded were not completed, possibly because there wasn't enough administrative involvement. In round two, the call for proposals went to deans and department chairs to share with their faculty. In the third-round, the innovation factor was minimized.

Maura stated that she supports having a proposal process, and suggested forming a small group to determine the conditions and criteria that should be included in the proposal guidelines. Suggestions included: Level of funding? Who can apply? How to encourage students to apply? Under what conditions can a student apply? What types of sponsors do student applicants need? Pre-Approval requirements? Do Deans or IT need to sign off? Clear guidelines for what will not be funded, for example, wireless, equipment replacement, and staffing. Maura will develop a first draft and then a small group would meet. Having a student on the committee would also be important.

5. Update on Scantron situation? (Grossman reps). Representatives from the Grossman School were not in attendance and the issue was not taken up at this meeting.

6. New Business.

A question was raised about the future of document cameras in the classrooms. There is only one remaining manufacturer. All of the others are no longer making or supporting them. The one remaining vendor creates a very expensive model. It is difficult to make an investment decision because we also do not know the level of use of the cameras in the classrooms. David suggested a survey of faculty on use of document cameras.

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m.