

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology
January 9, 2009
36 Gerberding Hall**

Meeting Synopsis

1. Approve Agenda
2. Approve minutes from December 12, 2008
3. Chair's Announcements
4. Open Announcements
5. Old Business
 - Preliminary results on learning technology survey (Tom Lewis)
 - News on data retention (Anjanette Young)
 - News on questionnaire on plagiarism tools (Bayta Maring)
6. New Business
 - Plagiarism C-class legislation "Brain Storming"

Chair Kaminsky called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

1. Approve Agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Approve minutes from the December 12, 2008 meeting.

The Council approved the minutes for the December 12, 2008 meeting.

3. Chair's announcements.

Chair Kaminsky welcomed the new president's designee Tom Lewis. He announced that Sandy Moy retired at the end of last year and he is looking forward to having Lewis act as the new designee. Kaminsky also announced that a new ASUW representative, Ryan Schmidt, has been appointed however was absent due to illness. Kaminsky also noted that member Bayta Maring was also absent due to illness. The Chair announced that he had submitted the Proposal for Webcam Use to the SEC agenda for Monday's meeting. He will report back to the FCET the results of the proposal at the next meeting.

4. Open Announcements.

There were no open announcements.

5. Old Business.

Preliminary results on learning technology survey (Tom Lewis)

Chair Kaminsky stated that the FCET is still trying to get money to fund learning technology. The council wishes for the UW to look as students expect it to look in terms of educational technology with regard to size and strength of the University. On that note, the Chair introduced the guest speaker, President's Designee Tom Lewis with an update of the results of the learning technology survey.

Tom Lewis, Director of Online Technology, stated that the purpose of his report was to put the information in front of the FCET so that they could begin to think about the results. He found similarities between reports which indicate that faculty members are unaware that certain technologies exist and are available to them. He noted that this report was preliminary and not all data had been collected. Once the final reports are received he will be sure to get the data to the FCET.

With regards to the learning technology survey, faculty, TAs and students are happy with what currently exists at the UW. However, the priorities are different at higher levels. Lewis noted the highest priorities moving forward are those technologies available in classrooms as well as wireless capability campus-wide. Lewis pointed out that the obstacles appear to be the knowledge of faculty to use the technologies and equally the support available to faculty who are using the tools.

Kaminsky noted that the results of the survey point out that faculty do not know what is available or possible. He stated students are pleased as long as they can go to computers and work. Kaminsky identified two reasons for tenure track faculty to use technology: 1) students have more fun and pay attention in class and 2) it creates less work for the instructor. The idea is to sell the technology and use these two perspectives in doing so. Educational technology should be treated as a commercial product. Kaminsky added that to get faculty to ask for money to fund technology, first FCET has to sell the idea to the faculty so that they will support it.

Roxanne Hudson noted that many classrooms do not even have projectors for her to connect her laptop to while teaching. Stephanie Andrews inquired with regard to budget and allocation in the upcoming year, if there were any global areas that need technical attention, versus specific asks from specific departments or programs. She thought that perhaps the best approach would be to look at a "global" technology need. She gave computer and technology equipment for every classroom versus chemistry lab equipment for the chemistry department as an example.

Lewis asked council members to think about other questions they might have with regard to the survey results and to bring those questions to the next meeting.

Masuda asked if either Lewis or Kaminsky could define "support." Would support be in reference to a technology item that is broken or rather faculty who need training? Kaminsky offered that FCET could support perhaps a mandatory class for faculty learning teaching technology. He noted that faculty will gain experience with the tools available to them and at the same time would be able to meet support staff so that they would know who they needed to contact when support was needed. Kaminsky thought they could call it a "faculty orientation for teaching technology."

Lewis pointed out that all new faculty members currently attend a very short technology workshop before they begin teaching. Kaminsky thought instead of making it mandatory, the Council could instead "advise" the faculty to attend or even make a special invitation and provide some refreshments to drive up attendance. He decided to put the topic on the agenda for the February meeting to give council members some time to think on the subject.

Martin-Morris made a request to Lewis to gain access to the old survey so that she would be able to get a better idea of what was asked. Lewis stated that he would look into getting the council members access to view the old survey.

Kaminsky noted that with regard to asking anything of the University in the upcoming biennium, budget could be a hindrance. Lewis pointed out that with regard to fiscal allocation there will be one process in place to govern all budgetary issues, so it may not be as difficult as it seems. Lewis also identified a

couple of additions to educational technology available to faculty in the near future: 1) student rosters will now come with photos of the students, and 2) online grades will be available by the end of Winter Quarter. Both items were well-received by council members.

Hollman stated that as a faculty member he was offered and orientation and took advantage of it, which, he noted was helpful. He identified support beyond the orientation as the major issue he sees with regard to learning technology. He stated that he is often unsure where to go for assistance on a given technical issue. He identified communication as a key factor in this scenario; there is not one link established for help. He also thought that maybe one shop could have dedicated personnel to make "house calls" at times when troubleshooting by other methods is not working.

Kaminsky agreed. He thought UW could establish a shop; people with technical troubles could call in and make an appointment to see the "computer doctor." Then faculty could bring the "sick" computer in to be fixed. They could charge a fee for this type of service. Lewis noted that the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) came up with a similar proposal a few years ago, however it was quickly dismissed. He believes that the need still exists and this issue could be explored again.

DeShazo pointed out that some of the confusion lies in the fact that there are different service level agreements across departments. Lewis acknowledged that some universities have a central system to hire and train staff in a local department; however that is not the case with the UW. Kaminsky noted that the need is there which is evident in the results of the survey. He also identified technology department understaffing as a main contributor to the lack of level of service at the University. Anjanette Young identified communication as a key factor evident in the survey results. She noted that she was not sure how to remedy the issue, but it remains a problem at the faculty level.

Kaminsky summarized that the Council had identified two items for February's meeting. He asked members to consider "computer medics" and faculty training as issues to be discussed in February.

News on Data Retention (Anjanette Young)

Young stated that she would check in with Yock and Lundberg to see if there were any updates with regards to Data Retention. She asked the council what they thought the content of her message should entail and said that it would be nice to have a specific question for them to answer. Kaminsky answered that she could ask them if anything has been done since the meeting in December. He said she could also ask when a good time would be to submit an official request to look into the matter and furthermore, do they need anything in terms of support from FCET.

News on Questionnaire on Plagiarism Tools (Bayta Maring)

Chair Kaminsky noted that although Maring was absent due to illness, she had emailed the link to the council members. He stated that he was pleased with the questionnaire but was unsure how FCET could get people to go to the survey. Lewis stated that he could put the link on UW Tech News newsletter as well as putting it on all of the start-up screens on the computers in the computer labs. Kaminsky approved of the idea and added that links to the plagiarism detection services should be put at the top of the survey so that the students would be sure to try the services.

DeShazo volunteered to help in securing web survey information from Maring. He will then be able to add Kaminsky so that Kaminsky will have access to the survey.

6. New Business.

Plagiarism Class C Legislation Brain Storming

