

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

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met Wednesday, May 14, 2003, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding. Chair Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges convened the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

PRESENT: *Professors* Gillis-Bridges, Goldberg, Kitts, Leggott, Rojas
 Ex officio Albrecht, Lewis

ABSENT: *Professors* Aldea, DeYoung, Mizokawa, Prakash, Roth, Sinanan, Zivot
 Ex officio Jordan, Macklin, Hurley, Szatmary.

Guests: Kurt Kors, Kimberly Gustafson

Synopsis

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. Discuss key findings of PETTT survey of student technology use and goals
4. Discuss and work on FCET report, with particular attention to presentation venue.
5. Propose agenda items for joint meeting with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach.

The agenda, the March minutes, and the April minutes were approved.

PETTT survey of student technology use and goals

Gillis-Bridges introduced Kurt Kors and Kimberly Gustafson, to provide background and data on the PETTT survey of student technology use and goals. How can this data be integrated into the FCET report to the Faculty Senate?

The survey used both written surveys and focus groups to discover how students use technology in support of their coursework and research. There was a 33% response to the survey, with 1880 faculty and 900 students, representing a cross-section of schools and colleges from all three UW campuses, responding. About 200 people participated in the focus groups.

Results indicated that students expect their technology abilities to increase significantly as a result of their attending the UW. They expect that technology training will be provided by the UW, and they expect to learn about that technology in the classroom. By graduation, students expect a great increase in their ability to use technology.

Faculty, on the other hand, report that time and resource barriers prevent them from providing technology training in the classroom. Faculty members also say they lack the skills and incentive to provide the technology training students expect.

Other results:

- Students expect faculty to have course Websites.
- Faculty need training in technology
- Student and faculty disagree significantly on the students' information literacy skills (ability to evaluate information found on the Web, for example).
- Faculty said they'd use online discussion groups if they had support to do so.
- 83% of faculty and students use email daily for coursework and research
- 33% of students use Instant Messaging daily for coursework and research.
- Students want to use Instant Messaging for peer contact, but not for contact with faculty.

Albrecht said he feels that these skills should be learned in high school, and UW faculty should not have to teach them. Goldberg agreed – students should be able to use, for example, PowerPoint but should not have to learn it in the classroom. Especially returning students seem to have some catching up to do.

Perhaps a blanket technology class could be held for incoming students. At a minimum, course syllabi should indicate what technologies students are required to know to participate in the class. It will be difficult to test for technology proficiency, just as it is for writing – at present, the University does not test for either one. Expectations should be made clear in both areas.

Faculty buy-in will be more easily achieved if they be helped to see how technology aids learning. This is not now being done. It is also important to apply a simple test to the use of technology: How does it improve teaching and learning? Technology shouldn't be used just for the "gee whiz" factor.

Gillis-Bridges commented that she originally expected technology to be a time-saver, but is still waiting for that time-saving day to arrive.

Albrecht commented that the PETTT survey focuses primarily on software – educational technology is, and increasingly will be, much more than software. For example, technology in the classroom can allow students at the UW to perform experiments in remote locations while never leaving the UW. Medical technology allows student surgeons to diagnose, treat, and operate on a lifelike robot "patient" that reacts to different kinds of treatment, including drug therapies. Working nuclear reactors are being operated by 100 and 200 level students on campuses around the country at this time. Albrecht sees all these kinds of things as "educational technology."

Albrecht believes the survey's definition and vision of educational technology is far too limited. Student focus groups may have defined educational technology in terms of course Websites, word processing, and PowerPoint, but that's because students don't know enough yet to define technology. He quoted President Odegaard as saying "the principle of the University is that some people know more than others; faculty know more than students. That's why students come here."

Kors agreed in principle, but asserted that many faculty acknowledge that they have only rudimentary skills in software basics and want help before they can even begin to think about more advanced technology.

Rojas said that his discipline, Construction Management, is a small community that has been aided by the use of sophisticated remote technology that widely-separated faculty members on far-flung university campuses would never have been able to benefit from individually.

Albrecht added that visionary ideas are not part of the dialogue in the Ed Tech committee. What is represented is the student viewpoint, from their experience of their home computers.

Tom Lewis applauded the idea of making a series of recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and pointed out to Albrecht that there is some original thinking going on, but this needs to be supported by the faculty. In order to do this, faculty first need to know the kinds of innovative thinking that are going on. Goldberg added that the realities of internal funding priorities drive some of the choices between what is done and what is not done. Leggott said it is important to make some recommendations about the technologies that should be spotlighted and developed – one of the questions is how best to do that.

Albrecht said it is not the job of the faculty to worry about money, but to create the vision. Where can we go with technology? What are its limits? Ed Tech should be working on the vision, not thinking about the money or lack of it.

Kors made a distinction between software packages and other kinds of technologies such as video conferencing in the PETTT survey. Goldberg wanted to know not what is being used, but what is being accomplished. Usage, he said, is not the same as learning.

Gillis-Bridges would like to forget about specific technologies at the outset, and just sit down with faculty and ask "What do you want students to be able to do?" "What educational goals are you trying to reach?" Then technologies can be identified that will help achieve the learning goals. At present, she does not see many places at the department or University level to have that discussion.

Lewis reported that faculty members have responded very negatively at Catalyst workshops to having pedagogy mentioned or included in the curriculum. The attitude seems to be "Don't tell me how to teach, just show me how to use the software."

Leggott said it would be helpful to have someone in each department who is the expert on the educational technologies that are available. These technologies seem to be passed on in an almost tribal way.

Kors said the University needs to intervene in some way to dispel the gaps that exist between faculty and students in their attitudes toward technology – as the PETTT survey showed, the problem is real and it is not going away.

Goldberg said there is an online service called "Element K" that provides tutorials for common software programs such as PowerPoint. This would be ideal for student and faculty, since the tutorial can be done independently as needed.

FCEO Meeting Items

General discussion revealed the following items for discussion at the joint FCEO/FCET meeting May 22:

1. What are the boundaries between the groups?
2. Communicate FCET deliberations to FCEO.
3. FCEO is a money-making group – can they be innovators vis a vis technologies?
4. Need to clarify the mandates between FCET and FCEO.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*