

**SLA Technical Services Committee 2009-2010**  
**Meeting Minutes – September 24, 2009 (LH)**  
**Approved – October 29, 2009**

**Present:** David Bivin (Economics, AC rep), Jennifer Cochran (Communication Studies), David Ford (Associate Dean), Philip Goff (new Associate Dean), Linda Haas (Sociology), Kimmaree Murday (special guest, WLAC, past committee chair), Mike Scott (Tech Services), Bill Stuckey (Tech Services), Beverly Teach (UITS), Jing Wang (WLAC).

**Topics covered:**

**1) Constitution of the committee**

**a. Chairing the committee this year** - Jennifer Cochran and Linda Haas agreed to co-chair the committee this semester. Jennifer will chair the committee in the spring, since Linda hopes to be on leave in the spring. Linda will find out whom to contact in terms of recruiting a faculty replacement. Guidelines indicate that the committee should consist of five faculty members.

**b. Recruiting a student to serve on the committee** – Linda Haas volunteered to contact Amy Jones about obtaining a volunteer through the Liberal Arts Student Council. The Council represents undergraduate majors as well as graduate students in SLA.

**c. Representing UITs** – Beverly Teach was introduced and will serve as the representative of UITs on this committee.

**2) Transitioning to SLA's new relationship with UITs**

**a. Collaborating with UITs to meet Liberal Arts' students' technology needs** – Kim Murday discussed the concerns of last year's committee, that SLA staff and SLA classrooms would be negatively impacted by the transfer of all undergraduate student tech fees (\$700,000) to UITs. Kim said that UITs has kept paying the tech staff, but there is concern that a lab that is specifically tied to SLA might not be supported (such as the language lab) by UITs. We would have to collect a separate fee for that purpose. Mike Scott reported on the first memo of understanding that has been developed and a second one that will be developed shortly in regard to space, fees, etc. He asked for a faculty member to represent the committee at an upcoming tech meeting with SLA deans to develop the second memo about the transition. Jennifer Cochran agreed to attend this meeting.

**b. Retaining SLA space** - David Ford said that UITs decided that the spaces now used as technology labs should become UITs property. Since the need for student tech centers is likely to diminish rather than increase as students rely increasingly on laptops and wireless connections to the internet. SLA might be giving up space to UITs.

**c. Supporting software** – Mike Scott reported that this year UITs will continue to support the same software in labs as before (e.g., SPSS). Next year, UITs will be running "the key server." So departments will need to raise funds to provide licenses for some software that faculty use (e.g., STATA).

**d. Developing and administering a "scorecard" to assess how well Liberal Arts' students' technology needs are met** – A February 2009 memo from Chancellor Bantz indicated that "IUPUI and UITs would work together to be reviewed on an annual basis

with a scorecard developed in partnership between IUPUI and UITS.” David Ford recommended that SLA develop and administer its own survey to students at the end of both the fall and spring semesters to find out how well students’ technology needs are being met. The committee decided that this evaluation would be administered at the same time as the student evaluations, using a paper form. Jennifer Cochrane and Linda Haas volunteered to draft this instrument for the committee to consider. Bill Stuckey urged us to do this as soon as possible because it takes time to get these printed. Bill also mentioned that it might be possible to have the Survey Research Lab interview students on this matter.

When asked what areas the survey should concentrate on, when considering how well technology is suiting students’ needs, David Ford suggested we could be looking at the February memo from Chancellor Bantz; the first memo of understanding between SLA and UITS; and items from UITS’ regular user surveys (perhaps available on the UITS website). Mike Scott said he doesn’t know if other schools are working on developing a scorecard; we could try to find out if this work is being done in some of the bigger schools, e.g, science, education, nursing, and business.

### **3) Providing advice for renovation of the computer lab in BS3001**

Stacy Morrone, chairing the IUPUI Learning Technology Committee, has been in touch with this committee to seek feedback in the planned renovation of BS3001 (a computer lab once administered by SLA, in UITS inventory). She has developed and submitted a set of several alternative layouts for the lab to Dean Blomqvist, which we have been asked to comment on. Since the departments of Economics and Sociology seem to be SLA users of this lab, David Bivin and Linda Haas agreed to solicit feedback from their departments. Such a lab needs to meet the needs of instructors who want students to be able to focus on the front of the room as well as the needs of instructors who want students to be able to work collaboratively on projects.

**4) increasing students’ access to computers** – Mike Scott announced that new computers were installed in the social science computer lab in CA436 and that the old ones will be installed in the basement of CA. He said that students are increasingly using the basement for printing.

### **5) Living with Oncourse**

**a) registering complaints** - Jennifer Cochrane expressed concern that she has had difficulty registering problems with Oncourse through the Help phone line. While we feel that we benefit from the occasional emails on Oncourse sent by John Gosney, we need a way to reach staff above the level of the student workers who answer the help line. We need a way to get to expert help, not wait for 20 minutes on the phone while the student reads a manual. As a technology committee we could seek a solution to this; e.g., a specific person to talk to for SLA or a special number. Mike Scott and Beverly Teach talked about the difficulties communicating about problems with computers in the classrooms. Beverly manages classroom technology for the system and said that she is developing a better system for spring 2010, which we all look forward to. We were reminded in this meeting

that Bill Stuckey is the Oncourse administrator for SLA, and he is willing to help if the Help desk can't help. Kimmaree Murday announced that she serves on the all-university Learning Technology steering committee that is supposed to provide advice for Oncourse, a committee that appears to have been established after widespread complaints when Oncourse CL was first rolled out with a lack of faculty input. The committee has not yet been convened. Kim was willing to keep SLA in touch with the work of this committee.

**b) known glitch in testing tool** - We discussed a known glitch in Oncourse that can allow students to disable Java and therefore exceed test-taking time, thereby cheating on tests. Bill Stuckey said he has not heard of this. David Ford agreed to distribute information to faculty about this potential problem and its solution.

**6) following other technological developments** – Three classrooms now scan SLA students' ID for attendance as a pilot project using Tutor Track software. This is a project that involves Kate Thedwall, the director of gateway courses. Beverly Teach explained this system to us, and expressed concerns about how it will scale to classrooms. Mike Scott indicated that the SLA tech staff needs to be kept informed about such developments.

**7) considering the committee's charge** – We looked over the description of this committee, which included “to inform and give advice to the faculty, the students, and the Dean on the uses of technology in the School of Liberal Arts. Its function will include the drafting and updating a Technology Plan for the School;” it will also “provide a mechanism for making recommendations concerning the use and distribution of technology in the School.” We discussed how difficult it is to develop a Technology Plan under changing economic circumstances.

Bill Stuckey mentioned that we could look at the IUPUI Strategic Plan 2.0 because it has important implications for technology. Mike Scott mentioned that one component is the establishment of “data stewards,” who will manage all type of information across IU. Data can include library holdings, faculty's research data, information from students.

Linda Haas suggested that we need to look at our school's most recent strategic plan, and consider where we might want it to change in the new upcoming plan that is being developed for 2010.

**8) setting up future meetings** – it appears that Thursdays at 1:30 is a good time for most faculty, so we will set up another meeting for late October.