ITCO minutes 5-10-07

Wednesday, February 28, 2007
4:09 PM

Next meeting: June 13, 1 pm Place TBA

Present at the discussion:
- Lee Peitzman, Gail Rathbun, Jeff Nowak, Judith Garrison, Sue Mau, Steve Carr

Not present: Richard Strong, Brandon Smits, Eric Vitz, Stuart Blythe

- Gail reviewed the charge of ITCO, the principles of the Strategic Plan for Instructional Technology (SPIT), and the assignment from the Information Technology Policy Committee (ITPC).

ITCO’s charge: “responsibility to develop and implement plans for the use, support, and evaluation of instructional technologies at IPFW…”

Specific assignment from Walt Branson and Susan Hannah: Report at least once each semester. “Perhaps this first report could include an inventory of current instructional technologies, a list of pilots and explorations of new technologies and emerging issues for further discussion and resolution.”

The principles that will guide ITCO’s work (from SPIT) include:

- Promotion of reliability, accessibility, flexibility, and security as critical measures at every level of operation, maintaining a balance among them.

- Provision of multiple avenues for continuous input into the visioning and planning process and for the exchange and dissemination of innovative uses of instructional technologies in teaching and learning.

- Establishing faculty-defined needs, economies of scale, and sustainability as criteria for adopting new instructional technologies, and implement their use in planning.

- Continuous evaluation of instructional technologies.

-Data gathering update
Omissions of KT 123 (Math has outfitted this classroom with teacher workstation and projector) and KT 227 in our technology inventory were noted. Also noted was the omission of the general classrooms with installed technology in the basement of the Science Building.

Joseph was not able to get a tour of the Visual Arts Building facilities. Sue Mau intends to visit on Friday, May 11.
We were not able to get info from Business or Music. We did not yet investigate any Gates instructional technologies.

- Review of institution-wide pilot projects/instructional technology initiatives
  - IM Library Reference Service (planned for summer 2007)
  - Mobile Teaching Environment program
  - LEAD grant program, which aims to foster the exploration of innovative instructional technologies
    - Podcasting (Library and CELT)
    - Streaming video server (CELT offices)
    - Studio M
    - Adobe Connect (CELT, ITS, Library)
    - e-Instruction (clickers)
    - Blogs/Wikis
    - Classroom technologies
    - Digitizing media
    - Turnitin
    - Media site live (located in KT 227)
    - Apreso
    - Learning commons
    - IPFW Share server (Jeff Nowak’s) LEAD Project

New
  - Should we include the Institutional Assessment software project, since the use of the software depends on the articulation of learning objectives/outcomes at the course level (which impacts instruction)?
    - ePortfolios (inside WebCT, inside the Inst. Assessment software, TaskStream, the general idea of and how we would want to support this assessment tool?)
    - test scoring technology
    - re-consideration of the technologies facilitating student evaluation (both on paper and online)

- How to organize the report?
  - Should we organize the report around the issues that seem to “bubble up” from the data we have collected so far?
    - Example - We discussed several software products that appear to have the same function, that of recording things that happen on your desktop monitor: Apreso, Media Site Live, Adobe, and Screenrecorder. In fact, they do share some common features, but the essential purpose of each one is different. How do we make the differences clear? How can we better support people in the use of each? How do we know that we have spent our resources wisely?
      - Example - We have no process for maturation and evaluation on instructional technology innovations.
      - Example – Inconsistent technology environments across campus
      - Example – Too little cross-fertilization of idea among faculty; too many “accidental conversations” that uncover information that ought to be widely known.
Example – the commuter campus dimension (Students are working from home late at night after the kids are asleep; commute for an hour to campus; live in areas where there is only dial-up) (Students call the Helpdesk and are told that no help can be provided for the problem that they are having with their home computers)

Example - Science Building labs not accessible on weekend and breaks (a general perception that technology is not accessible when needed

Example – hearing from students on an ongoing basis about their technology needs, woes, etc. should be facilitated, perhaps by a persistent online survey

○ Steve suggests a framework:
  1. Infrastructure (hardware and software currently on campus)
  2. Usability on campus
  3. Applicability to the workplace that the students currently and in the future will encounter (Should the selection of instructional technology be connected to what students are expected to use in the workplace?) (Are we cutting edge, and should we be cutting edge?)

The group agreed to go ahead with presenting a report about the infrastructure, with more details to follow. Gail said she would assemble the report and have the committee look at it before May 17.