

## **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING**

**November 21, 2005**

**Rowe Conference Room, Knight Library**

### **Present:**

Andrew Bonamici, Herb Chereck, Deborah Exton, Kelsea Feola, Hilary Gerdes, Peter Gilkey, Dave Hubin, Steven Pologe, Kathy Roberts, Ron Severson, Karen Sprague, Mark Thoma, Mary Ann Beecher, Kate Wagle, Malcolm Wilson, Heiner Linke, Wendy Mitchell, and Glenda Utsey

### **Absent:**

Julie Newton, Anne Laskaya, Martha Pitts, Margarita Smith, Paul Engelking, Wendy Mitchell

### **Guest:**

Don Harris, CIO University of Oregon; Terri Warpinski, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; Deborah Carver, University Librarian and Co-Chair Educational Technology Committee

### **Minutes:**

The minutes of the November 7 meeting were proposed for acceptance.

**Motion was made by Mark Thoma to accept the minutes.**

**Motion was seconded by Ron Severson.**

**The minutes were accepted by acclamation.**

### **Announcements:**

The Chair distributed materials for the third Provost Candidate. Members of the Council were encouraged to attend the public presentation and the open Academic Forum with the candidate.

## **Agenda**

(See also: [Grade Inflation Report](#))

### **Educational Technology**

Andrew Bonamici opened the Council's discussion of the role of Educational Technology by stating that technology is pervasive in everyone's life, professionally and socially. The UO communication systems and information management is founded on technology and a great infrastructure. Andrew introduced the guests (Don Harris, Terri Warpinski, and Deb Carver), who will present three aspects of the Educational Technology service at UO:

1. Educational Technology Funding
2. Classrooms and technology infrastructure
3. Technology and Teaching/Learning

#### *1. Educational Technology Funding*

Deb Carver, Co-Chair of the Ed Tech Committee, presented an overview of funding. The Committee has heard from faculty that high-end needs are being funded without addressing basic needs. There is a proposal being developed to restructure Ed Tech funding among various constituencies:

- an allocation to Deans;
- an allocation to classroom support (in conjunction with "Certificates of Participation" (COP) funds for cost-sharing);
- an allocation to new large scale infrastructure support to schools and colleges;
- an allocation to curriculum development

The goal is to target significant amounts of Ed Tech funding to meet strategic needs.

Terri Warpinski, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, explained that the oversight of Educational Technology lies with the Sr. Vice President and Provost of the University (HO #1). The Educational Technology Committee functions primarily in an advisory capacity. Originally, the Committee provided technical expertise, primarily. Now, the Committee serves to vet projects and technological enhancement of teaching and learning (HO #2).

- **Discussion**

Council members raised two questions re. technology funding:

- In the past, significant funding went to recurring costs; are funds now moving away from those costs?

Answer: Eventually, other funding will be looked for to support recurring costs. Equipment replacement costs are not automatically supported by Ed Tech funds. These costs should be covered under the Deans allocation. There is also a move to manage licenses centrally through the CIO office rather than individually, within discrete departments.

- Has the possibility that more money should be allocated to basic needs been carefully examined? Faculty and students should be consulted to identify and prioritize what those basic needs are.

## *2. Classrooms and Technology Infrastructure*

Members of the Council questioned the responsiveness of Media Services to requests for support by faculty members. There is currently a perception among faculty that Ed Tech is not an effective service to provide help. Is there a mechanism in place for faculty to direct classroom/equipment problems that will receive a timely response? Terri Warpinski, the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, said that at the present time, faculty should contact Media Services, Facilities or Academic Affairs. Currently, an intensive classroom space inventory is being made, including analysis of the equipment and technology infrastructure in each classroom and lecture hall (HO #3). The survey is expected to be completed by the end of the Winter Term. Educational Technology is

trying to develop a maintenance and replacement schedule for classroom/lecture room equipment.

- **Discussion**

- There needs to be some clarification of the information flow for problems or questions connected with classroom technology: faculty → office manager → room scheduler → where?
- Is there a mechanism to alert all the faculty who teach in the same classroom when there is an equipment breakdown that can't be immediately corrected?
- A communication portal between technology and faculty needs to be established, perhaps on Web.
- Continuing classroom technology problems should be directed to the Classroom Committee.
- Maybe there are low tech solutions that can improve high tech function, e.g. utilizing the cadre of student classroom interns more efficiently.
- There was a general discussion of acceptable and unacceptable response times for assistance from Media Services.

### *3. Technology and Teaching/Learning*

Deb Carver, the Co-Chair of the Ed Tech Committee, stated that efforts were underway to understand faculty teaching needs. She and Andrew Bonamici will meet with CAS department heads beginning in February 2006. Andrew and Dale Smith had attended the Frye Institute and, as Frye Fellows, will develop and use a faculty survey to determine current technology usage and learn where faculty think UO should be going. It would also study Blackboard – how it is being used and how it can be improved.

Currently, much of the library's support for educational technology is through Blackboard and the Center for Educational Technology. The library is working with the Yamada Language Center to develop an audio-discussion function in Blackboard. Interactive media is used to develop major projects with faculty. The Center for Educational Technology will also begin making "office calls" to faculty for consultation on technology use in teaching.

Don Harris, CIO, said that his initial effort at UO has been to gather information on the technology services available on campus. He is also studying areas where campus IT needs to improve, e.g. expanding beyond a Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm service availability. He acknowledged the necessity of examining the present alignment of resources with need. Technology and infrastructure should be considered from an institutional perspective, and he sees that his primary task is to discover the needs of the university community.

- **Discussion**

Members of the Council acknowledged that Blackboard is useful, but also pointed out that the lack of reliable and consistent wireless access on the campus is a source of frustration for both students and faculty. The CIO said he would investigate the issue.

**Action Item:**

Deb Carver will return to the Undergraduate Council with updates on the Educational Technology Committee's activities at the end of Winter Term 2006.

**Miscellaneous:**

The Chair briefly outlined a schedule for submitting the Grade-Inflation report with recommendations to the Academic Senate in February.

The meeting adjourned.

**The next Undergraduate Council meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 28, 2005, in the Rowe Conference Room of the Knight Library.**