

## COEPS Technology Committee

April 22, 2013, 1:00-2:00

Present: Karen Barak, Wade Tillett, Scott Bradley, Todd Loushine, Stan Smoniewski, Katrina Liu, Ellie Dickmann, Dave Van Doren, Eileen Schroeder, Beth King

Absent: Nomsa Gwalla-Ogisi

1. Ellie Dickmann described the purpose of committee and relationship to department committees, campus plan and future technology planning (see charge)
  - a. Advisory to Katy
  - b. Look at facilities and college needs (early fall 2013)
2. Looked at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to technology in the college
3. Gather for next meeting:
  - a. Facts and current status in the college and the university (e.g., level of standardization, support)
  - b. Department level information already gathered and individual / department needs related to technology
  - c. Where technology is going in each field
  - d. College priorities (Katy)
  - e. Urgent needs
  - f. What we don't know (additional data needed)
4. Next meeting: **August 29** after college retreat (**2:00-4:00**)
5. Send out Doodle to determine best time to meet in the fall
6. Develop site for committee sharing of resources between meetings

### Strengths:

- Student skills (basic computer literacy, elementary and special education students take LIBMEDIA 201)
- Faculty skills and expertise in technology uses in teaching and learning
  - Use of technology for one's self
  - Use of technology appropriately in lesson plans for the most part
  - Recognition that personal interaction needs to be part of training
  - Individual interests, specific areas of expertise and application
- Support for innovation (college and department levels)
  - Faculty innovation
  - Willingness to embrace new technology
  - Openness to explore online or hybrid possibilities
  - Faculty focus on capacity building
- Support services
  - Faculty engaged with WITRC
  - College tech support services
  - University tech support services
  - Training available
  - Just in time approach
- Facilities and technology

- WiFi
- Labs
- Lab equipment and computer specialization
- Classroom technology
- WebEx for meetings and classes
- Lecture capture (COBE tech recording studio)
- D2L
- Smartboards, doc cameras, projectors
- ACL, co-labs
- Networked printers, drives, sharing
- Rotation for new computers to update hardware and programs
- Custom-based websites to facilitate teaching
- Electronic submission of grad materials (2014)
- Cross department collaboration and communication
- Global education campus initiative
- Uses for supervision
  - EMS, supervision through EMS (Counselor Ed)

### **Opportunities**

- Faculty / student knowledge and use divide to be leveraged
- Staff enthusiasm, knowledge and current work
- Lab modernization process, DE funds
- Decentralization
- Administration support (mindset and financial)
- Partnerships
- Connections with the schools
- BYOD

### **Weaknesses**

- Data on usage lacking
- Ongoing information on what is being used in the real world needed
  - Technology to and from local schools
  - Need for view / information on current and future trends
- Technology access
  - Access to equipment at needed level and capabilities / compatibility across equipment and platforms
  - Over-standardization / lack of flexibility
- Indecision on how to implement BYOD, 2.0 technology, P2P for students
- Students' habits of not bringing equipment to class
- Support issues
  - Just in time support
  - Lack of on-the-spot assistance when things don't work or are broken
  - College Technology Support Services – one person plus students to cover everything
  - University Technology Support Services – knowledge, response time, Help Desk

- Limited ICIT support for agile process → over-standardization, lack of acknowledgement of quickly changing needs
- Facilities
  - Specific problem areas (certain classrooms, limited technology access by cadet command, no thumb drives on computers, Roseman gym, viewing issues in classroom)
  - Not using what we have
  - Access to needed software (SPSS, NVivo, Camtasia)
  - Ease of student access to ipads for whole class
  - Wifi access – support for multiple devices, access in all classrooms
  - Facilities compatibility
  - Smartboard won't connect to laptops
  - Lack of student connection to Smartboards and projectors through own devices
  - Little desks in classroom too small for balancing laptops
  - Too much email
  - Incompatibilities with Mac
- Need for more partnerships (public / private, funding) (e.g, WTI/ Cisco)
- Leveraging other campus resources
- Faculty skills
  - Need for just-in-time training and support vs. taking a course
  - Lack of communication among faculty and staff
  - Smartboard use skills uneven
- Faculty time to learn, use, think about uses
- Different levels of faculty interest in technology – some see no use at all
  - Match with current student interests, needs, skills?
- Support of innovation
  - Difficulty of communication across faculty and staff – time, mechanism
  - Limited support of innovation and risk taking
  - Lack of clear policy to support innovation and risk taking
  - Time to innovate and experiment
  - Consumed with other demands (e.g., edTPA, LEAP) and don't see tie to technology
- Knowledge of how to best use technology
  - How to use technology to support different pedagogies
  - How to use BYOD in the classroom
  - How to use web 2.0/ social networking by students – social aspect of technology
- Lack of instructional design support
- Student skills
  - No concerted development of technology skills across the programs or levels

### **Threats**

- Faculty / student divide
- Over standardization – need to meet needs in the field
- Support capabilities (ICIT)

- Equity with BYOD
- Mutually beneficial partnerships
- Locked down computers
- Over blown curriculum process inhibits innovation
- Following vs. leading in the field
- Rapid change / keeping up
- Budgets / financial support
- Top down mandates
- Lack of need-based decision making
- Need for more staff