To: Faculty Senate

From: Scott Chapman, Presiding Faculty Co-Chair and Julie Mersiowsky (DEC), Staff Co-Chair, Academic Technology Advisory Committee

Cc: Ann Bailey Yoelin, Gretchen Braun, Francisco Javier Fernandez Urenda, Jennifer Beach, Mary Lehman (Senator), Scott McElfresh, Surma Mukhopadhyay, Ling Yang, Kim Redford (IT)

Subject: Annual report of the Committee

Date: April 24, 2017

Dear Faculty Senate Executive Committee,

Below is a report on the work that the Academic Technology Advisory Committee completed during the 2016-2017 academic year:

I. Function of the Committee: According to the FPPM, page 176, the committee's purpose/ goal is as follows:
1. Purpose and Duties: The responsibility of this committee is to serve as an advisory committee on technology issues that impact the institution: a. explore major shifts in technology; b. continuously assess and suggest revisions to the technology vision of the institution; c. assist in proposing and crafting policy and procedures about academic uses of technology; d. facilitate open communication among faculty, staff and students about academic uses of technology; e. provide strategic plan support for academic use of instructional technology; f. suggest standards for the acquisition of campus technology that support teaching and learning.

II. Meetings/ Accomplishments: The committee met once in November to elect a Chair, discuss the functions and goals of the committee, and give updates from IT and the DEC. We decided to meet on the second Tuesday of each month at 3:30pm (later adjusted to 3:45pm). During the Spring 2017 semester, the committee met monthly. Below are bullet point accomplishments from our meetings:
- Discussed the ETF refresh updates happening across campus to Dell Optiplex 780 and 790 computers, labs, and the upgrade to Microsoft Windows 10.
- Discussed the impact of Apple's Macbook Pro line discontinuing the network port.
- Discussed Canvas updates, and changes within the DEC.
- Discussed the importance of the committee being driven by the faculty and not just reports from IT and the DEC.
- Unanimously voted to keep the Committee Chair as an elected position, as opposed to a Faculty Senate appointed position. The current Committee Chair would call the first meeting in September and put together an agenda, as opposed to November as it was this academic year. The committee would then either re-elect the Chair or elect a new Chair at that time.
- Considerable time was devoted to discussing Scantron and Scantron replacement options. The committee was charged with looking at the current Scantron system, and some statistics we were given were that 80 faculty members and 920 instances of Scantron were used during the spring and fall 2016 semesters. There currently is one Scantron machine that IT operates. There is great concern that one machine for the whole campus is taxing on the IT department, inconvenient for faculty, does not give the statistical reporting that faculty would like, and if it breaks, there is no secondary option in place. The committee met with Mark Kendrick in January to discuss this issue. Brandon Jackson came to our February meeting to present his Python3-based option to the committee. The program exports to csv file for Microsoft Excel, gives a pdf of marked copies with missing and wrong answers, runs 20 scans in less than 10 seconds, no #2 pencil is needed, has custom answer sheets, can e-mail the graded answer sheet to the student, and uses a scan key and answer sheets in either .jpg (better) or .pdf format. It only needs a scanner and the cross-platform, open-source software to run. The committee was impressed by this option, but there was concern over FERPA and e-mailing the graded answer sheet. Susan Hines was contacted regarding this concern and I reported back to the committee her response. The committee decided we needed to survey the faculty so we could move forward recommending options to the Faculty Senate. Scott McElfresh created a survey that was presented to the committee for feedback and adjusted. This Google form survey, once complete will me sent through the appropriate channels to the faculty for feedback by the end of the Spring 2017 Semester.
- We discussed CANVAS and the options it presents to help with our Scantron discussion.
- We discussed the use of Endnote as a citation software, used in research publications, and there is great interest among the faculty, especially in HARK and among newer faculty. The cost for the entire university is $10,900 annually, or $219 per user/ per year for 5-19 users, or $181.50 per user/ per year for 20-34 users. We also discussed Zotero as another option, but the departments reported back to us that Endnote is the preferred program.
- We discussed the lack of a Graphic and Animation Design Lab and the concern over keeping software up to date in computer labs on campus.

- We discussed Read-Aloud software for test taking. This discussion was tabled and will be added to a Fall 2017 meeting agenda.
- Each committee member was asked to bring to the final meeting, agenda items (from their departments) for future meetings. Below are the items we discussed for the future, as well as committee recommendations to the senate:
    1. Concern over Smart Podiums being phased out and whether a replacement is in place or being considered that allows writing on PowerPoint Presentations. **Item to be added to the first Fall 2017 semester meeting**
    2. Concern over DVD players across campus not working and what can IT do to help.
    3. Software for faculty personal computers, specifically Windows 10. **Kim will report on this at our next meeting.**
    4. Discussing e-books and hand held devices in classrooms. What can the university do to help/ promote the use of e-books and improve campus Wi-Fi? There was great student interest in this topic as well.
    5. Encryption software with USB devices. **Kim will ask Jennifer Patterson to come to a fall semester meeting to discuss this with the committee.**
    6. Restricting the use of cell phones while on campus tours. Is there a way for us to do this?
    7. Training on Instructional Technology and more specific training for faculty on the software they use.
    8. Instructional Design & Disability Services with online/ hybrid courses.
    9. Scantron and the future of it at Longwood is still a major topic for the committee.
    10. IT does not currently have a technology-training program. There is concern that there are training needs, specifically for software in use across campus (Microsoft, Adobe, etc.), that are not being met. IT is looking into options. Kim Redford will report back to the committee next cycle.
    11. iPads have a short checkout period in both the Library and the DEC. What could be done to give greater university support for those devices for students and faculty so the checkout periods could be longer?
    12. Revisit the citation software discussion (Endnote and Zotero).
    13. Concern over long-range plans for upgrading the audio/ visual in classrooms. We do not have HDMI capabilities across campus, which is a difficulty for faculty.
    14. Some concern was presented about CANVAS and if we could discuss other options.
    15. There was concern at the lack of keeping software the students need to learn and use up-to date, and if there are funds for faculty to get the software they need for their office computers in order to teach students the current programs they will use professionally, outside of departmental funds. If we need it to do our jobs, and keep students current in technology trends, could the university provide more support to the faculty?
    16. The concern was presented of the lack of cameras in Art classrooms. **Kim said to refer the faculty members to her.**

III. Summary: The committee met numerous times over the semester, and had very meaningful discussions. We, as a committee are working on being more faculty driven than in the past. We are exploring Scantron replacement options and have presented a number of concerns/ future agenda items in this report. We've voted to keep the Committee Chair elected and have a plan in place for the first meeting in the fall. We have had a successful year, but have a lot more work to do for the future.

Sincerely,

Scott C Chapman

Scott C Chapman
Assistant Professor of Theatre
Chair; Academic Technology Advisory Committee