Council for Instructional Technology

March 1, 2010

8:15 – 9:45 AM

Horrabin Hall Room 60

Meeting Minutes

1. The Meeting began at 8:15 AM.

Members Present: Chair: Hoyet Hemphill, Kishor Kapale, Bree McEwan, Jeff Matlak, Sam Edsall, , Bob Quesal, Chandra Amaravadi, Charles Weiss, Bruce Harris, and Debbie Lee via CODEC.

Guests Present: Roger Runquist (CITR) and Robert Intrieri (Psychology, CITR Survey Manager).

Kishor Kapale was the secretary for this meeting.

1. Guests Roger Runquist and Robert Intrieri were present to discuss the current version of the planned CITR 2010 survey to compare notes and discuss possibilities of cohesion on items of interest in support of the charge for CIT (given here for review):
   1. What are the faculty needs for their courses
   2. What are the technological needs of the faculty
   3. What are the technological competencies of the student body
2. The Council members considered the CITR survey questions and suggested revisions on the basis of guidelines developed by the Chair Hoyet Hemphill on three major categories (More details in the Meeting Agenda):
3. Course Management System
4. Faculty Technology Needs
5. Student Technology Competencies.
6. **Course Management System (CMS) Survey Questions:**

The Council found that most of the items in question 13 (in the circulated version of the CITR survey) were appropriate for getting the data on CMS that is of interest to the CIT. The Council recommended seeking further feedback on the following items by adding elements to question 13.

* 1. The Issue of integration of external curricular material.
  2. The ease of transfer of existing materials to new system.
  3. The customization of navigation, fonts or layout.

1. **Faculty Technology Needs:**

Desktop Applications: Through discussions a strategy of dividing this question in two parts was The Council recommended division of the question on Desktop Applications into two parts (i) Technology for Teaching and (ii) Technology Needs for Research. Further the council suggested addition of an open response question so faculty can provide input on software they have purchased themselves and use extensively. This will be useful to obtain data on software widely used on campus but still individually purchased. In future this information could be used for suggesting purchase of site-license.

The council agreed with the guest Roger Intrieri’s suggestion to publish the results of the survey on a public website with link on the Faculty Senate website so the participating faculty get a meaningful feedback on the survey they fill.

1. **Follow-up Survey to Sense Faculty Perception of Handling of Technology Issues:**

It was agreed on by the guests and the council members that probing the faculty perception about the handling of the technology issues and selection of appropriate everyday technologies on campus is better handled by a separate survey as it relates to a unique charge of CIT and would not be appropriate for CITR to seek answers to those questions. This would be one of the agenda items for the next meeting in April and the meantime the members can have an ongoing discussions through the council wiki on PBworks.

1. **Student Technology Competencies**

The council is waiting to hear from Richard Chamberlain and his findings from Educause and faculty responses on the CITR before proceeding with this charge. The Council thinks that the Educause survey would give a baseline to compare WIU students with the national competencies. The idea would be to ask individual departments to gauge the existence of discipline-specific internal or national standards. One of the guests, Roger Intrieri, plans to share national level technology competency tests that he has come across as a starting point to address this charge.

1. Next Meeting is scheduled on April 1, 2010 at 8:15AM in Horrabin room 60. Council members agreed on reviewing and commenting on the updated version of the CITR survey in the meantime.
2. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 AM.