University Council Technology Standing Committee

MINUTES   JULY 24, 2012   3:30 PM

MEETING CALLED BY	Laura Spray, Chair
TYPE OF MEETING	Monthly Meeting
FACILITATOR	Laura Spray, Chair
NOTE TAKER	Margaret Canzonetta
ATTENDEES	Members Present: Aimee DeChambeau, Mary Hardin, E. Stewart Moritz, Eric Mundy, Kellen Curtis Reusser, Jim Sage, Laura Spray, Yingcai Xiao Guests: Margaret Canzonetta (recording secretary), John Savery Absent with notice: Mark Shermis, Trevor Engelsman(excused thru summer – lives in Michigan) Absent without notice: Alvaro Rodriquez

Agenda topics

CALL TO ORDER

DISCUSSION	Laura Spray called the meeting to order. The May 31, 2012 meeting minutes were approved with no changes. The minutes have been posted on the UC Sharepoint site.

STANDING COMMITTEE GOALS & TACTICS

DISCUSSION	Jim asked for further input on the goals of the Committee: • Eric was concerned with the goal "Ensure the spending on information technology remains at or below benchmark levels for comparable institutions." He indicated that IT has the goal of being a leader in IT. Eric understood the need to be concerned with spending but felt that spending should be at or above benchmark levels. Jim appreciated Eric's comments but he needs to maximize the University's financial goals as well. UA is spending $750 per student. The challenge is the range of the benchmark which is $650-$4,500 per student. UA may want to be go further up the range but not likely at the mid-point. It was suggested to change the goal to "Ensure the spending on information technology remains at a level to continue to be a leader." Jim will make the change to the document. • Tom reported that his department would need additional support to keep running new kinds of classes and also the research being done. • Stewart questioned whether the department does metrics of success. Are we over performing for $750 per student? Jim reported that Educause has raw data on the matter. We need measures of success or value.

- Mary felt that we really do not have anything to measure our success. She suggested a comparison from semester to semester might be tangible items to measure success. Jim suggested that we should trend all the metrics and sought input from the Committee on what specific metrics we should be using and what we want to measure. It was noted that the cost per student does not factor in all the costs. Also, should the list include the events planned? The Committee should look at Educause to get baseline data to compare from beginning of the semester to the end. Eric suggested that maybe this task should be funneled out to the committee's work groups and report back at the next meeting.
- Aimee suggested that the data should be tied back to UA's 2020 goals. Jim indicated that it is the expectation that the goals should be tied to 2020. Jim suggested that the Committee look at 2020 again to develop new goals that achieve the goals of 2020. He would like the IT department to work from the perspective of enabling technology instead of leading.
- Jim questioned "Does the Committee want to raise awareness of IT and education or lead with new technologies?" Stewart indicated that we may be more positioned to enable than to come up with customer relations. John felt we were enabling but not leadership to go out to the faculty. Eric and others are doing this. Aimee felt the technology is here and we should enable it. Jim suggested that we add language that "We will make ourselves available to help departments achieve 2020 goals." We can weave 2020 into the goals. Mary suggested looking at terminology and get rid of practices that no longer make sense.
- In looking at the tactics as part of the goals, Kellen suggested adding that if faculty or students know how to use the technology, how do they measure the effectiveness of the technology. This could possibly be included with the course evaluations or posted on Springboard at the end of the semester. Jim indicated that we could make this recommendation to the Steering Committee about using technology for the course evaluations.

PLANS TO CREATE DIGITAL STRATEGY

DISCUSSION	John Savery distributed a handout "Digital Strategy for University of Akron" which outlined recent announcements and initiatives by Ohio State University. John indicated we could probably get the same deal with Apple (12% discount) but UA is doing a lot of the same things as Kent. We are optimizing wireless and have classroom technology. OSU has faculty incentives that UA has not done. The fellowship program is extensive. Jim felt it was a good model for a faculty energy technology team and a component for the student team.
	Jim questioned whether you align with a vendor like Apple or do you support whatever the students bring to campus (Droid, Microsoft). UA lets you bring your own device and IT drop loads sets on their technology. Jim suggested researching this issue and a recommendation should be made on whether we dictate what the students should use. Stewart suggested working with a content company like Amazon and not a hardware company. Jim agreed that we shouldn't force the use of a certain product. Aimee suggested that we could get data on what students are bringing to campus. The committee could develop standards and

	recommendations based on what students are bringing to campus. John reported that a prototype survey has been developed about utilization and the experience with technology students have had at UA. The Committee wasn't sure how the faculty would react to this. Questions such as "does our technology, meet your needs," "which technology has been good for you" could be incorporated. It was suggested to survey the population at large and relate it to IT and not faculty. Jim indicated that we could make this recommendation to the Steering Committee

PLANS TO ENGAGE FACULTY

DISCUSSION	Eric discussed the September event. Laura suggested that the group meet off line to discuss the plans.

MEETING DATES AND SUMMER SCHEDULE

DISCUSSION	The next meeting of the Committee will be August 21 at 3:30 pm in the McCollester Room.