

**University Council for Academic Technologies (UCAT)**  
**October 25, 2010, 3:30-4:30 pm**  
**ITC, Room 226**  
**Meeting MINUTES**

**Members:**

Lance Askildson - A&L, Ed Bensman – Engineering, Casey Cockerham – UG Student, Steve Corcelli—Science, Mark Dehmlow – Library, Rob Easley – MCoB, Ed Edmonds – Law School, Patrick Flynn – Engineering, Mike Hildreth – Science, Michael Kirsch – Law School, Bill McDonald – MCoB, Kevin Mueller – Grad Student,

**Members Absent:**

Alan DeFrees—Architecture, Ted Mandell – A&L

**Ex-Officio Members:**

Kevin Barry – Kaneb Ctr., Ron Kraemer—Chair & CIO, Peggy Rowland—OIT, Mark Stadherr—Engineering, Paul Turner – OIT

**Guests:** Todd Hill--OIT

**1. Welcome and welcome to new members**

CIO Ron Kraemer welcomed members to the first meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year. New members were introduced and welcomed.

Kraemer briefly spoke about priorities for OIT. He noted that the fundamental function of OIT is to support the teaching/learning/research tasks of the faculty and students. There has been campus wide improvement in this area in the past year, and OIT will continue to prioritize this focus. Campus organizations such as UCAT are a key component in this process.

Kraemer noted that he welcomes feedback, both positive and negative, from all campus stakeholders. OIT needs to know what it is doing well and what needs improvement. He invited calls and emails.

Kraemer spoke briefly about the role of UCAT, indicating that he will seek active partnership from members to help define UCAT. Meetings have been scheduled for one hour; he invited feedback on that change. In addition to formal meetings, he encouraged the use of alternate collaborative communication tools to open up and maintain effective communication among members and between members and himself. Kraemer’s blogs are ‘going live’ in one week; the blogs could potentially be one tool for an ongoing exchange of ideas among UCAT members.

An important area for improvement is communication. UCAT needs to help identify and develop effective communication tools for intra-committee communication and for communication from the committee out to constituencies on the campus.

Kraemer invited members to provide ongoing agenda items as a further way of strengthening the utility of UCAT for faculty. Kraemer noted that member engagement is critical for UCAT to serve as a meaningful method for campus organizations to provide input to OIT about technology needs. He encouraged all members to actively reach out to their organizations to facilitate two way communications between unit and the OIT; he will do so as well.

### **3. The role of UCAT—Kraemer**

Kraemer invited members to name key issues which need to be addressed by UCAT and OIT.

#### **1. Easier procedures to provide access to software:**

Prof. Askildson noted that implementation of software cannot lag a year behind because of the necessity to pass all purchases through the General Counsel. Ed Bensman concurred, noting that faculty want to be honest citizens, so they need a clear pathway; he proposed a grace period to test a product before subjecting it to the formal review process. Members agreed that this would be helpful. Prof. Pat Flynn said that open source software presents a specific problem. Widely known and established software ought to be absolved of the detailed review process every time a new version is made available.

#### **2. Improved communication:**

Kevin Barry noted that both the quality of communication from OIT to UCAT and the timing of that communication needs improvement. Members agreed they would like to be ‘in the loop’ sooner than in previous years about decisions being made by OIT.

#### **3. Finding a viable use for academic development of software:**

Prof. Easley said that classroom projects are being developed that could be viable outside of the classroom; however, there is no pathway for moving this kind of development forward. Prof. Flynn’s mobile apps class has faced a similar difficulty. Easley noted that this is a hardware issue: where to put web programs to enable them to go into production.

#### **4. New technological tools to be used for teaching and learning:**

Kraemer noted that he has heard support of this issue in many one-on-one conversations with faculty. Clearly this is a key issue for UCAT.

#### **5. Funds for aged-out equipment:**

Kevin Barry gave the example of a Tablet pilot project, in which the tablets were used in the teaching and learning environment. For those users who continued to make use of the equipment after the pilot, they are now facing aged equipment for which there is no clear line of replacement funding. Advice to use the campus workstation budget overlooks the necessity of those funds needed for workstations; what is needed is additional funding to support another set of tech tools. This kind of financial assistance would show clear direction and reinforcement for experimentation and innovation. Members agreed that implementing pilots projects receives a lot of support; the mechanism for turning the pilot into a fully formed program is missing.

#### **6. For A&L faculty and others with interest but limited technology knowledge, personnel who**

can introduce and support new tech ideas to be implemented in teaching and research: Prof. Askildson noted that A&L faculty often express great interest in new technologies and strong success in implementing them in the academic arena. However, they are reluctant to initiate this kind of project, in part because they simply do not know what possibilities exist which might be of value to them. Askildson said that a team to present and support this kind of tool would be immensely valued and great for the OIT brand. This would be different from the kind of support already offered to administration projects; rather, this would be directed at instructional programs.

#### 7. Budget reviews:

Kraemer noted that organizations naturally adhere to the way things are being done. UCAT could provide review assistance to question budgets, to define new ways of redirecting monies, as well as service. He observed that a truism is that it is hard to stop supporting services in OIT.

#### 8. Review the relationship with Google:

Prof. Flynn observed that it has been one and a half years since ND went Google. Noting that he has no problem with Google, he said that a procedure for an approved transition of faculty to some of Google's services could be a wise decision. FERPA is a crucial issue here; has Google gotten educated in this area to facilitate a transition for faculty? Kraemer, noting that he done a lot of work with Google, said that at AAU institutions, more transparency is being accepted. General Counsels across these institutions are all dealing with similar issues, so ND will not have to forge this path alone. Barry noted that 'asking permission' for Google-facilitated collaboration can be a prohibitive step for faculty. All agreed that student use of Google while the faculty make use of Exchange complicates communication.

#### 9. Cross institutional research tools:

Prof. Stadherr noted that UCAT could investigate better institutional support of cross institutional research tools.

#### 10. Redesign of the UCAT subcommittee structure:

Prof. Easley described the subcommittees as 'opaque' and a bit serendipitous. Some issues have risen to command a high level of attention; however, there are many other topics and projects which could benefit from this level of attention as well. The rationale of this distribution is unclear.

#### 11. Clarify the structure of communication:

Prof. McDonald noted that the shortened meeting, which he approves, will limit itemized and nuanced discussions. Historically, communication has come from UCAT to the faculty, but faculty perception is that this is an ineffective communication channel. What can be done to improve this, and are there other channels of communication that can be utilized? Prof. McDonald asked about ways of representing his organization in the communication structure. Kraemer said that he had delayed the first UCAT meeting while he worked on developing an understanding of the culture of ND. While this is still a work in progress, he stated that he hopes to make use of collaborative communication tools, such as his soon-to-be operative blog. These efforts will be carefully monitored to determine what tools people do use and how people can be drawn into the collaborative communication. He cautioned that experience has taught him this

kind of structural change takes time and effort.

Kraemer thanked members for these suggestions and asked if there are any ‘quick wins’ that might be implemented soon. Suggestions included showcasing some very new technologies which might be used in the academy but which would not interfere with current workflows; addressing the policy of funding for cell phones used for work purposes; funding of equipment for projects which have graduated from the pilot stage to be fully implemented, and for aged out equipment in these programs.

Prof. Flynn asked Kraemer for his thoughts on effective quick wins. Kraemer described his perception of the campus as highly decentralized with a surface allegiance to centralization. Noting that while there are numerous centralized administrative services, he observed that many decisions get made at the school/college level. This has instantiated a significant amount of work flow that can create blocks to efficiency. To shift this institutional culture, core infrastructure which can be centralized needs to be identified. Kraemer suggested that some of the following might be quick wins: security, content management methods, better identity and access management, efficient provision of technology devices. He stressed that the workflow structures are creating barriers, and that change will not come instantaneously. He also stressed that UCAT could and should have a role in making this shift effective and beneficial.

Kevin Barry agreed with Kraemer’s description, noting that the current system happened gradually over time, as different organizations sought support they were not getting from a centralized structure. Kraemer stated that in instituting change, transparency will be key. He is seeking to create a strong sense of trust, and he noted again that it will take time and effort to progressively improve.

#### **4. Committee reports**

##### Course Management Systems, Rob Easley, chair

Prof. Easley reported that the committee, with new member Patti Ogden, Law School and new student representative Casey Cockerham, has been meeting to begin the evaluation process for the decision on a new course management system. He provided a rough time frame for the process: the committee will make a recommendation to UCAT by May, 2011 with a goal of implementing the new system in May, 2012. Four candidates are under consideration: Blackboard and Desire2Learn--proprietary; Sakai and Moodle—open source. Renewal with Blackboard comes up in Spring, 2011, so it will be functional through Spring, 2012. It may be worth considering extending that until Spring, 2013.

Currently, peers seem to be favoring Sakai, which impacts ND’s choice. There is a significant timing issue with Sakai, however, as the company is transitioning to a new and completely reengineered version. The committee is investigating this transition process, as it is reluctant to engage in a ‘bumpy’ transition for the ND campus. It would be unfortunate and problematic to implement one version and then switch to another shortly thereafter. The evaluation process is being tightly controlled; the committee is not interested in salesmen pitches but instead is getting

'behind the scenes' at these companies to get the fullest understanding of both the software and the company's approach to support and service.

Kevin Barry reported that currently there are four to five ePortfolio pilot projects on campus which is beginning to present challenges. One problem is that the pilots are using Google sites and may find it difficult to switch over after the pilot phase. Kraemer agreed that users can become invested in the systems that are familiar. Paul Turner noted that FYS is looking to make ePortfolios a part of their long term system; unfortunately, there has not been coordination with other on-campus technology tools to insure connectivity. He noted that there is no campus 'road map' for the various developing technology tools, such as CMS, mobile tools, ePortfolios. Turner noted that the Eportfolio projects are fast becoming unscalable, with little planning on how to integrate them with Banner, a concern of Associate Provost Jacobs. Members briefly discussed the need for OIT and UCAT to address the role of Google for faculty on campus. Kraemer noted that in 2011 Google will announce its entry into the course management services business, which could make a significant impact.

#### Learning Spaces, Lance Askildson, chair

Prof. Askildson noted that he has stepped down as chair of the Learning Spaces committee. Peggy Rowland complimented the committee's work in the last two years, as they developed the concept of an enhanced technology learning classroom and opened the Active Learning classroom in the basement of DeBartolo Hall this Fall. Kevin Barry volunteered to assume the chair, if it is permitted that an *ex officio* member fill a chair position. Rowland and Kraemer will confirm that this is permitted in the charter.

#### Software Acquisition and Distribution, Olaf Wiest, chair

Prof. Wiest has rotated off the chairmanship of this committee; the committee is in search of a new chair. Peggy Rowland reported that the ChemDraw software will be funded by the College of Science for the short term. This presents an opportunity to overhaul the policy of funding when software is used for discipline specific use.

#### CRC Faculty Advisory Committee, Mark Stadherr, chair

Prof. Stadherr briefly described the committee, noting that it is composed of three members from each of the colleges, Arts and Letters, Science, Engineering and Business, and meets once a month. The main issue currently is a resource allocation policy with a cost recovery model. A new iteration of this policy has been recently implemented and is being tracked; there have been no complaints thus far. A huge benefit is that core services from CRC are free; this represents a generous access to high level computing services. Additionally, CRC maintains the research clusters as long as they are available for use by other users (when not needed by the researcher). If not, there is a cost recovery process which bills for services. Kraemer noted that in this area of shared technological resources, ND is a leader. Prof. Stadherr reported that new faculty have been consistently cooperative about this program, which is extending its functionality.

## **5. Student updates**

### Graduate students—Kevin Mueller

Kevin Mueller reported no news from the graduate students. In response to an earlier discussion about cell phone usage, he noted that student research is hampered by the poor cell phone coverage on campus since the student hard phone lines are not provided with long distance coverage. Thus students must use their cell phones for long distance, which often cannot be used in buildings, necessitating the student go outdoors, often with laptop, to be able to complete a research-related phone call. Kraemer took note of this particular perspective on the cell phone coverage problem.

Ms. Rowland noted two ongoing issues her group is collaborating with the graduate students on:

1. Relocating the graduate student library cluster from the 11<sup>th</sup> floor of Hesburgh Library;
2. Adding printers in the three graduate residence halls.

### Undergraduate students—Casey Cockerham

As Mr. Cockerham had to leave, Ms. Rowland reported on items of interest to the undergraduates:

1. difficulties printing pdf files to ResHall printers
2. Student functionality to be added to the mobile site such as the ability to see meal balances and student schedules
3. Work closely with the Registrar to make the Enhanced Class search process more accessible
4. Promoting the new university calendar, especially to student groups/clubs
5. Input from student government to the DeBartolo Hall Lounge and Lab redesign.

Ms. Rowland also read Mr. Cockerham written comment: “Students love Google; faculty would too.”

Ed Bensman asked for more information about the lounge redesign. Kraemer explained that a student group recently spoke directly with John Affleck-Graves about refurbishing the lounge in DeBartolo Hall. The plan is for OIT to meet with the campus architect, Academic Space Management, and the UCAT Learning Spaces subcommittee to look at the space and devise a staged plan for refurbishing. Students would like additional cluster space as well as new furniture, carpeting, etc. Ms. Rowland noted that student needs and technology requirements change quickly but added that the plan created just a few years ago can be leveraged and updated. The staged plan will identify potential immediate changes and create a long term process for refurbishment.

## **6. Faculty Technology Survey—Paul Turner**

Paul Turner presented a brief overview of the Faculty technology survey, which has been in development for six months and is now awaiting permission for a push out. The purpose of this survey is to fill a data hole. Data on faculty use of Concourse is available; however, many faculty are using other course management tools. Some of those in use include: mobile tools, open source tools, publisher online course tools. OIT would like to learn what is being used,

how it works, what kind of support is available with these tools, and why these other tools are chosen over Concourse.

Turner described the survey, which includes 37 questions. 15-20% participation would be satisfactory; ideally, survey takers would be randomly distributed among users. Prof. McDonald noted that the very users in his college who would be most informative are those who have the least time to spend on a survey. Incentivizing faculty to participate is a key issue; members are invited to suggest effective incentives.

Turner asked members to take a sample survey and provide him with feedback about the content and design of the survey. Kevin Barry noted that the experts at the Center for Social Research could review the survey design for any biases.

Kraemer concluded the meeting by noting that he will send an email to members reminding them to compile a list of the top five issues UCAT should take up. Mr. Barry offered a final comment: he is newly elected to the UCWFS (University Committee on Women Faculty and Students) which has renewed his commitment to addressing campus gender concerns. He encouraged members to make gender equality part of their approach as they take up this year's work.

Kraemer thanked members for their willingness to serve on UCAT and reiterated his pleasure in joining the ND community.

As time had expired, the meeting was adjourned. Next meeting: November 18, 2010.