

**The University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology**

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met Tuesday, **October 17, 2000** at 10:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair William Zoller presided.

Present: *Professors* DeYoung, Diaz, Leggott and Zoller. *Ex Officio* *Jordan, Schmitt and Szatmary. *Regular Guests* Tom Lewis. *Special Guest* Scott Macklin.

Absent: *Professors* Aldea, Mizokawa, Porter, Riley and Sarikaya. *Ex Officio* Bjorkstam and *Beach (*with vote).

Introductions

The Chair welcomed FCET members and thanked them for serving on the council. Members introduced themselves and gave a brief description of their fields of expertise and areas of research.

Minutes from June 8, 2000 were approved as written.

Faculty Technology Use Survey

The Chair opened the discussion by informing new members that FCET has been planning to do a survey to find out what types of technology faculty at the UW are using. He added that he has had great success using Microsoft PowerPoint software in his chemistry classes and on the lecture tours he has done. DeYoung commented that faculty do not have the incentive to use technology in their classrooms. Diaz noted that Uwired is an underused resource on campus and that more faculty need to be made aware of the services Uwired has to offer--such as training classes in PowerPoint and other software. In his opinion, FCET has to increase its presence and the faculty technology survey is the key to empowering FCET. With the data from the survey, FCET can go to the administration and work with them, Uwired, and Computing and Communications to implement the infrastructure that faculty need in order to use technology in the classroom.

Macklin agreed that the key to getting faculty to use technology in teaching is to reduce the barriers to technology use. He pointed out that the use of Catalyst Tools was growing rapidly and that the UW is a leader in many areas of classroom technology use. DeYoung mentioned the "Tools for Transformation" grant that allows faculty to get paid for attending technology workshops; these types of initiatives energize faculty and the University needs to capitalize on this enthusiasm. It is fine to teach faculty new skills, but how do they implement them in the classroom? DeYoung admitted that it took her two trips to Uwired before she began to see the benefit of the programs they were offering. Since then, she has been able to use the skills she learned to teach her colleagues in Morocco how to use technology to enhance their teaching.

Diaz asserted that it is the graduate students and new faculty who know how to use this technology while the older faculty do not. DeYoung agreed that older faculty members are less likely to see the benefit of using their time to learn new technology; they believe their time is better spent on publication and research, not learning new technology.

Macklin informed the council that the Program on Educational Transfer with Technology (PETT) at the UW has obtained permission from the University of Michigan to use a faculty technology survey it designed. Macklin is working with Nana Lowell from the Office of Educational Assessment and Geri Bunker-Ingram from the UW libraries to develop a UW survey, based on the U of M model. The PETT has funding and administrative support and Macklin said he wanted

to make sure PETT and FCET were not duplicating one another's efforts. Diaz commented that the library survey traditionally has the best response rate of any University survey; faculty will respond to this survey because they know that the libraries will use the data to make specific changes to its policies. Jordan agreed that the library uses the survey to shape its programs and faculty see direct results from their responses.

Diaz wondered if the PETT survey would be too long to allow FCET to attach some of its own questions to it. However, he stressed that he did not want to overburden the survey, or jeopardize its response rate. Macklin submitted that he would like to see the surveys coupled if possible. Szatmary agreed that, if there is a perceived outcome to the survey, the faculty will respond but, if there is the perception that there is no money to implement the suggested changes, the faculty will not respond. He felt it would be in FCET's best interest to join with PETT's survey. Zoller agreed that FCET should pull together with PETT and create one survey. Diaz noted that the first decision will be the library's: whether or not they want FCET attaching questions to its survey.

Macklin informed the council that the U of M survey received a 75% response rate, which is almost unheard of. They accomplished this by doing intensive follow ups via phone, email, advertising in the school papers and by personal visits to faculty. UW has the resources to do the same. DeYoung said that Humanities faculty would like to use more technology and are just looking for the University to make it easier for them to implement it in the classroom; the survey would be an effective way to find out what faculty see as barriers to classroom use of technology. Macklin agreed and noted that the survey would address "social barriers" as well, such as what level of comfort and what types of learning and instructional environments faculty need to learn and use technology.

DeYoung mentioned that many faculty do not use Uwired's services because of its hours of operation. They are open from 9 to 5 and this is often inconvenient for most faculty. Diaz remarked that, with the survey data, FCET could urge the administration to expand Uwired's hours and encourage them to conduct more departmental visits. Chair Zoller asked how much money there was in the current UW budget for technology in teaching. Diaz responded that (Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education) George Bridges would be able to answer that question; he also noted that there are only a few people involved in the distribution of these funds: Ron Johnson (C&C), Steven Olswang (Vice Provost) and Ed Lazowska (Chair, Computer Science & Engineering), and that there needs to be more faculty involvement in how these funds are distributed.

Diaz suggested that the Chair send a letter to Lee Huntsman recommending that an FCET representative be placed on the technology funds distribution committee. The Chair agreed that faculty feel shut out of the decision making process and that FCET should push for more faculty involvement; *he agreed to write the letter to Huntsman.*

Jordan asked about the level of desktop support on campus: how many departments have viable tech support? Not enough. Diaz said that classrooms need to have "red phones" in place so that instructors can call for tech support when they need it. The Chair added that Classroom Support Staff need better training as well and he submitted that FCET needs to begin drafting possible questions to include on PETT's survey--CSS and infrastructure questions should make up the bulk of those questions. DeYoung noted that the UW does not support Unix and Mac nearly as well as it does PC's.

Diaz asked if there had been any progress with getting DSL lines for faculty at a discount. The Chair recalled that, at one of last year's FCET meetings, Ron Johnson said C&C had tried to

establish a relationship with one of the high-speed providers but none were willing to provide DSL or cable access at a discount. The problem seems to be that all the providers are having trouble keeping up with their current subscribers and are not in a position to take on several thousand new users all at once. Leggott also recalled that the question of coverage was an issue: faculty, staff and students are spread over such a wide area that it would take the cooperative efforts of several providers (or a wireless service) to cover the UW population. Szatmary observed that the State Ethics law (use of state resources for private purposes, i.e., state-supported internet connections in UW employees' homes) was also a stumbling block.

Leggott revealed that her department provides salary adjustments for certain faculty DSL connections: the faculty members make the arrangements to have the service installed and pay the monthly fees, and the department adjusts their salaries accordingly. Szatmary also noted that AT&T is offering DSL service for \$19.99 a month and this may be relieving the need for a discounted service for faculty, staff and students. Macklin said that the survey will ask faculty about DSL use--why their work requires high-speed internet capabilities--then the University could apply resources to support the data.

The Chair made a motion that FCET should coordinate with PETT to implement a faculty technology-use survey. He asked the recorder to send copies of the Michigan survey to all FCET members. The Chair also asked the recorder to email FCET members and find out their opinions on doing a coordinate survey with PETT. Diaz asked if it were possible to hold a vote by proxy and the recorder said he would ask the Secretary of the Faculty. The Chair asked Macklin how the survey would be administered--by web or paper. Macklin said it would go out in both forms with aggressive follow up via email, letter, phone calls and personal visits. The Chair suggested putting articles in The Weekly and The Daily and emailing the entire faculty about the importance of the survey.

Diaz asked who the survey would be sent to: lecturers, adjuncts, graduate students? The Chair responded that he would like to see the survey go out to faculty, lecturers, research faculty, retired faculty and part time faculty who teach at least two quarters a year or one quarter a year for three years. Diaz noted that departments would have to provide lists of all instructors who meet this requirement. Macklin agreed with this and added that FCET's role in the survey would be to provide the necessary social "buy-in" with faculty.

The Chair asked about future money being allocated for classroom technology. Szatmary replied that there are provisions in the current budget for classroom technology but cautioned that there will be no increase in these funds for at least the next biennium and possibly the next two, due to recent initiatives like I-695. He urged FCET to focus on educating faculty on current resources like Uwired and Catalyst.

Chair Zoller asked Diaz to help him draft the letter to Huntsman regarding increasing faculty involvement in distributing technology funds. Diaz agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. Minutes by Todd Reid, Recorder.