

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Thursday, December 09, 2010
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Petersen Room, Allen Library

Meeting Synopsis

1. Approval of minutes from November 4, 2010
 2. Review of the agenda survey outcomes
 3. Center on Teaching and Learning update – Beth Kalikoff
 4. Initial discussions about faculty development for technology use
 5. Adjournment
-

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:32 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes from November 4, 2010 meeting

The minutes were approved without changes.

2. Review of agenda survey outcomes.

Chair Carline presented the agenda survey outcomes, with which the council concurred. The top vote getters were faculty development for use of technology in teaching and meeting the UW's increasing demand for providing courses in the face of decreasing resources.

3. Center on Teaching and Learning – Beth Kalikoff

Beth Kalikoff, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, gave an overview of the Center, which is a partnership cosponsored by the Graduate School, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, and the Libraries. The charge of the Center is to enhance and increase collaborative work on faculty development and work on teaching and learning across campus. They are still writing a mission statement and vision, but among the elements will be an emphasis on collaborative partnerships, collaboration on teaching and learning, increasing emphasis of technologies for teaching and learning, and working with diverse populations of students, staff, and faculty. They're also working on ways to identify expertise among faculty and staff.

Elkhafaifi asked about support to video and critique TAs, which the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) had provided in the past. Kalikoff said they'd like to continue to do that microteaching. Right now they have two CIDR consultants, so they have expertise but a small staff. With a changing model, they are investigating the national best practices of faculty learning communities.

Nelson asked about the resource base for the Center. Kalikoff said that CIDR was traditionally state supported, with an occasional grant, but part of her charge is to work with Advancement to identify new revenue streams for Teaching and Learning. They have money for salaries and some ability beyond that.

Funding currently comes from the Graduate School, with Undergraduate Academic Affairs and the Libraries providing nonmonetary help. Sahr added that the Teaching Academy side has money for some of its programs, and they are continuing to do large class collegiums, planning an institute for technology, and coordinating Distinguished Teaching awards. They are facing the fiscal reality but intending to keep successful and effective programs going. Nelson said that with no natural constituency to protect the Teaching Academy, the FCTL could have a role as its proponent.

The council also discussed ways to reach faculty who should be changing their teaching but don't seek out or want help. Kalikoff said that it's an assessment challenge, but their Center is going out to programs. She also said that students may be the ones pushing the faculty. Sahr added that reminding chairs and deans to help the Center identify people that could benefit from their services is important, and that the Office of Educational Assessment sends out course evaluation results to all deans, which provides an opportunity to at least identify people with lower course evaluations.

Sahr and Kalikoff said they would provide to the council a list of various groups around campus working on issues of teaching and learning, and a document of findings that provides the rationale for the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning. Kalikoff also said she'd send highlights of the advisory report to the council.

4. Initial discussions about faculty development for technology use (see Supports and Obstacles Related to Technology Use attachment from Tom Lewis)

Carline said it would be useful for the council to know what is already known about faculty needs for technology use, and introduced Cara Lane from Learning & Scholarly Technologies. Lane referred to a document titled Supports and Obstacles Related to Technology Use [**Attached – Appendix A**], containing excerpts from a 2008 report on surveys. Lane said that people with less self-rated technology expertise were more likely to seek out other people and people with more expertise were more likely to seek out online help. An obstacle was knowing how to use technology to meet a particular instructional goal.

Campion said that these findings point to the fact that faculty are looking for support to be local and contextualized, which is the biggest challenge in terms of funding. As a council, FCTL can try to envision other ways of meeting that need and identify faculty who are doing innovative things and can be a resource.

Szatmary added that the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) finding was that students want more and more technology. A few schools have some resources to do that, but not Arts & Sciences. Previously, the Faculty Council on Educational Technology submitted a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee that they pursue the ATAC recommendations.

Suggestions on the topic from the council included training for faculty (or staff to work with faculty) on building tools like websites; creating simpler tools; consistent support of Classroom Support Services (CSS) to ensure classroom technology is both present and working properly; notifying CSS when things *are* broken; utilizing templates for economies of scale (like having class websites be similar); and increasing integration between technology tools and platforms.

2. Adjournment

The meeting ended at 11:58 p.m.

Minutes by Craig Bosman
Faculty Council Support Analyst
cbosman@uw.edu

Present: Faculty: Carline (Chair), Kyes, Martin-Morris, Salehi-Esfahani, Elkhafaifi, Nelson, Olavarria, Merati, Zierler

Ex-Officio Reps: Hornby

Guests: Szatmary, Sahr, Lowell, Sugatan, Kalikoff, Lane, Campion

Absent: Faculty: Masuda, Harrison, Yeh, Wilkes

Ex-Officio Reps: Calissi-Corral

President's Designee: Taylor

Supports and Obstacles Related to Technology Use

Excerpts from *Learning and Scholarly Technologies at the University of Washington: Report on the 2008 Faculty, Teaching Assistant, and Student Surveys*

Available at: http://www.uw.edu/lst/research_development/papers/2009/2008SurveysReport.pdf

See pages 33-44 for a full discussion of survey findings related to supports and obstacles.

Key Points

- In general, all populations found knowledgeable peers (i.e., “classmates,” “colleagues,” and “departmental tech support”) to be the most useful sources of technical support.
- The most significant obstacles to using technology involved lack of time and lack of knowledge, rather than infrastructure problems, technology access issues, or technical concerns.
- Individuals with self-rated expertise in the expert range were significantly more likely to find trial-and-error and online help more useful than were those at the beginner level.
- Faculty and TAs with self-rated expertise at the beginner level rated several obstacles significantly more severe than they were rated by experts. These included items relating to lack of time, lack of knowledge, and lack of motivation, but did not include items related to infrastructure or access.

Recommendation for Point-of-Need Support

Respondents’ ratings of the helpfulness of several sources of technical support indicated a strong need for support at the point of need. Faculty, TAs, and students, all turned to knowledgeable peers for support (e.g., “colleagues,” “classmates,” or “departmental support staff”). These sources of support were among the most consistently used by all respondents and the sources rated as the most helpful. Faculty, TAs, and students also frequently used online materials to support their technology use, which could also be accessed at the point of need. While all populations tended to rate online materials as helpful, most found them somewhat less helpful than knowledgeable peers. The pattern of relying on people at the point of need was particularly true for respondents who rated themselves as beginners on our technology-expertise scale; also of note, expert users found online resources more helpful than beginners.

While infrastructure was the largest priority for all populations, obstacles related to lack of time (whether to learn how to use technology or to maintain and monitor it once implemented) topped the list of obstacles to using technology by all populations. Also of note, lack of knowledge on how to use technology to achieve instructional goals was a significant obstacle for faculty, particularly for those with lower expertise. When we look at the diversity of instructors, contexts, and goals across disciplines at the UW it follows that this knowledge may vary significantly by discipline. Support structures may need to reflect this diversity to be effective. The 2006 report by the ATAC subcommittee that looked at faculty’s future educational technology needs also presented a similar conclusion about the importance of local support. Overall, our data demonstrate the importance of recognizing a range of expertise within all populations and of offering support that helps individuals of varying skill levels. For the survey partners, and other central units, this pattern highlights the importance of connecting with the formal and informal local support networks that currently exist at the UW.

JCHE Article on Supports and Obstacles Data from the 2008 Surveys

Additional analysis of survey data and discussion on this topic is included in the following publication:

Lane, C.A., & Lyle, H.F. (2010). Obstacles and supports related to the use of educational technologies: The role of technological expertise, gender, and age. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*.

Available online at: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/u6l33253218l3722/>

Abstract: In order for institutions of higher education to provide essential technology resources and encourage the adoption of educational technologies, it is vital to gather information about the barriers their users encounter and the supports they find most helpful. The purpose of this study is to better understand how differences in user traits (e.g., age, gender, and technological expertise) may be impacting the use of technologies to support instruction. In this study, we report data from a university-wide survey of faculty at the University of Washington (N = 547). Study results indicate that individuals with technical expertise at the "beginner" level rely on different sources of support and encounter different barriers than do individuals at the "expert" level, even after controlling for gender and age. Our data demonstrate the importance of recognizing the range of expertise that exist among users when assessing barriers and implementing programs to support faculty in the adoption of educational technologies.

Findings of the 2006 ATAC Courseware Subcommittee

The subcommittee findings focused on the need for local support. Excerpts from the report are reproduced below.

Report to ATAC about the Educational Technology Needs of UW Faculty, Courseware Subcommittee, September 2006, <http://www.washington.edu/president/tacs/atac/meetings/2006-07/materials/11.01.courseware.task.force.subcommittee.report.pdf>

Main Finding

More than anything else, the faculty seemed to demand the appropriate and immediate support in the use of simple technology tools. Pressed by their core requirement to perform research and provide teaching, faculty has little time to learn, or much less master, technology tools which support teaching. In essence, faculty has been asked to do more under the same time constraints and generally receive very little direct support for the use of educational technology tools. They find themselves trapped between the desire to enhance their teaching and their responsibilities in research and basic teaching in the classroom, which in the recent past has been performed well without technology.

Details

Faculty wanted technical support to help them learn and then troubleshoot problems with their educational technology tools. Though some seemed aware of the centralized training support of Catalyst, they seemed to want more immediate, departmentally centered technical resources for fast response to their problems. One faculty member suggested "having IT support in every department. People can help every person. 2-3 people in each department, then it is accessible. That one person should not be responsible for 50 [faculty]. That is a resource for where to start. Don't need to take time out of the faculty day to learn program. Really need to go to departmental level to provide that support. University as it is now doesn't help."