

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

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met Thursday, December 9, at 10:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding. Co-chair James Kitts was called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Synopsis:

1. Agenda, announcements, minutes, co-chair issue
2. Wi-fi policy (Oren Sreebney, Director, Client Services & Learn Tech)
3. New FCET Web page (Cara Lane)
4. Progress reports by task groups (subcommittees)
5. Presentation by Arnie Berger: "Worthington Technology Grant: Videotaped Short-Talks by Experts in Computer Architecture"

Approve agenda, announcements, minutes, new co-chair

The agenda was approved, the minutes were approved. Corrections were made to the subcommittee memberships.

Kitts announced that the FCET Webpage is now up, providing an online space to post actionable documents, discuss subcommittee business, and organize subcommittee meetings.

After discussion, it was determined that Kitts will invite FCET member Thomas Gravlee to be FCET's new co-chair.

Wi-fi Policy Presentation - Oren Sreebney

Oren Sreebney, Computing and Communications' Director of Client Services and Learning Technologies, described the funding and implementation of the campus-wide wi-fi initiative to install wireless technology in almost all University buildings.

Sreebney said that ATACS, the Academic Technology Advisory Committee, met in 2004 to determine priorities for the spaces that would be fitted with 802.11 wireless. This information can be found on the ATAC Website:

<http://www.washington.edu/president/tacs/atac/meetings/index.html>

Priorities established for wi-fi installation were:

1. Large common gathering spaces
2. Libraries
3. Classrooms and conference rooms

Sreebney said that ATACS found it easy to establish these priorities, but not so easy to identify funding sources. The University Technical Advisory Committee (UTAC), which advises the Provost and Ron Johnson (VP of Computing and Communications), devised a three-point model for wireless funding, submitted it to the Board of Deans and the University Budget Committee, and received approval. UTAC determined that:

- Initial installations would be funded with individual department monies or the student technology fee
- Maintenance would be funded by a tax on telephone rates

When asked whether the wi-fi initiative has progressed so far that the faculty, through FCET, cannot have any effect on it. Sreebney said the initiative is a "done deal." ATACS will be talking to the students tomorrow about using the technology fee, but student Rory McCloud is on UTAC and Sreebney assumed McCloud has talked to his constituents and this meeting will be a formality. McCloud is chair of the Student Tech Fee Committee.

Sreebney said that ATAC had concerns about wi-fi in classroom use and believed that policies to govern student use would be needed. ATACS appointed a subcommittee that met once and produced two outputs. The subcommittee recognized that wireless policy does not just affect computers, but wireless connectivity to many devices – phones, PDA's, etc.

Sreebney said the ATAC subcommittee reviewed UW Bothell's wireless policy for the classroom and recommended that the UW Seattle campus adopt this policy as a joint resolution with UW Bothell. Arnie Berger, UW Bothell, said that the policy has not worked at Bothell.

Sreebney responded that the ATACS subcommittee also realized that the subcommittee could discuss such a resolution, but could not make classroom policy. The subcommittee concluded that could only be done by the faculty, and should be "in the lap of the Faculty Senate."

The subcommittee did refer the proposed joint resolution to the Informatics Undergraduate Association (IUGA), who rejected the resolution. These students do not want a classroom policy because they say all of this is covered by the State of Washington Administrative Code (WAC), and because it would be an infringement on their rights. Sreebney provided FCET members with an email response to this effect from Charles Burrell dated December 8, 2004. A student survey of IUGA's position, conducted by IUGA, confirmed that other students felt the same way.

In response to questions, Sreebney confirmed that faculty would have no control over wi-fi in the classroom; i.e., it could not be shut off or blocked out during exams or at any other time unless each classroom had an IP address that could be switched off. This is impractical. But even if it could be done, there would still be bleed-through from other classrooms. Sreebney asserted that changing this would require a complete re-engineering of the way electronic networking is done at the UW.

Berger said that wi-fi was implemented at Bothell without consulting the faculty. After the implementation, faculty told students they were not allowed to surf the Web during class time, but these rules were ignored. Only then did the faculty learn that wi-fi could not be turned off in their classrooms – unfortunately, the technology was implemented before the policy was considered.

Sreebney said he would be glad to act as a resource for FCET, and would return if needed.

Demo FCET Webpage

Cara Lane provided a handout of instructions for FCET members to use in logging on and using the FCET Webpage, and answered questions about using the page.

Kitts asked members to use their subcommittee names, or topic names, in subject titles. Example: Use subject title "Wi-fi policy," not "Hey, I have an idea!" It is also important to open a thread and reply to the messages within it. The "Config preferences" menu leads the user to an option that will send email notification of new messages. Users can add articles or other information through "esubmit" instead of in the body of a message. Documents can be co-authored by using a Word attachment to an email – groupware is on the horizon but is not yet a reality.

Progress reports by task groups (subcommittees)

Kitts said that subcommittees that have not met should meet, and should feel free to contact Tom Lewis or others to meet with them as resource persons. Kitts will tackle the plagiarism check, and will report back early next year.

Kitts commented that an alternative proposal for wi-fi funding doesn't look fruitful. Kalpana Kanal said that UTAC has sent their recommendation to the UW Budget Committee and that the funding is on track for the President's approval. Perhaps FCET should ask Gary Quarfoth, Office of Planning and Budgeting, to come and talk to FCET.

Bob Albrecht said he would work on this wi-fi subcommittee if creative proposals were accepted. Albrecht proposed an alternative funding method involving the Husky football games: For a \$30 fee, football fans could vote via cell phone on what plays would be run. Looking for funds from the inside is not a good idea – funds should come from outside.

Shawn Brixey objected strenuously to the proposed tax on telephone lines, which is planned to fund wi-fi maintenance. This tax hits programs hard – his own program (Digital Arts and Experimental Media) makes heavy use of phone lines and this tax would be a real hardship, for something they would not use very much.

Nancy McMurrer raised an even more fundamental issue – this initiative was cleared by the Board of Deans, but do the Deans speak for the faculty? Why weren't the faculty consulted? Kitts will give Ross Heath, Faculty Senate Chair, a heads-up about the issue.

Berger and Brixey volunteered to draft a position paper on the wi-fi issue, to present to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the Faculty Senate, including the information that wi-fi is being implemented, that it has direct implications for faculty, and that faculty need to take a stand.

Sean Brixey is obtaining copies of performance contracts so they can be talked about, and will bring copies of these kinds of agreements from other universities so FCET can participate in affecting what the UW performance contract ultimately says. Changing just a few words can make all the difference in the outcome. Cara Lane will help in this drafting.

Worthington Technology Grant - Berger

Arnie Berger described his experience with creating a video archive of interviews with experts in computer architecture, under a Worthington Technology grant he applied for.

Berger used a simple camcorder to videotape eight renowned professionals in computer architecture. He has shown the archive and has received excellent feedback on it. Berger said that a \$300 camcorder and about \$100 worth of software produced a good result. Berger was gratified to see that the people who are working in these fields find joy in sharing what they know. One of the participants was Seymour Cray, whose name is synonymous with high performance computing. Berger sees this archive of videotapes as living history for Computer Science. He is going to re-do them using Produce software and put them on the Web.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Present: Berger, Brixey, Kaminsky, Kanal, Kitts, Leggott, McMurrer, Lane, Pilcher, Albrecht

Absent: Gravlee, Rojas, Roth, Sinanan, Lewis, Szatmary

Guests: Oren Sreebney, Elizabeth Campbell