

IT Members

Mingchu Zhang <mzhang3@alaska.edu>,  
Orion Lawlor <[lawlor@alaska.edu](mailto:lawlor@alaska.edu)>, computer  
Katherine Arndt <[klarndt@alaska.edu](mailto:klarndt@alaska.edu)>, library  
Jody Drew <jldrew@alaska.edu>,  
Go Iwahana <giwahana@alaska.edu>,  
Julie McIntyre <[jpmcintyre@alaska.edu](mailto:jpmcintyre@alaska.edu)>, math and statistics  
Sandra Wildfeuer <sjwildfeuer@alaska.edu>,  
Bradley Moran <[sbmoran@alaska.edu](mailto:sbmoran@alaska.edu)>, fisheries  
Ex officio - Kelly Gitter <[klgitter@alaska.edu](mailto:klgitter@alaska.edu)> smart classrooms

Members in attendance:

Mingchu Zhang, Orion Lawlor, Katherine Arndt, Julie McIntyre, Sandra Wildfeuer, Bradley Moran, Kelly Gitter

1. Committee discussed selecting a new Chair and what that would entail for an academic year.
  - a. Job for committee chair
    - Committee meeting
    - Set the agenda
    - Attend AdComm meetings
    - Take minutes
  - b. Decided to wait to choose the Chair until the next meeting. This meeting, just talk.
2. Committee reviewed items that the 2018-2019 IT committee discussed.
  - Faculty 180
  - Blue Explorance evaluations
  - Bandwidth, gaming
  - Smart classrooms

OIT and Blue are from the provost office. Ecampus is different.

- a. Blue Explorance: There is a need to increase the response rate of Blue Evaluations.
  - A different Faculty Senate committee is looking at Blue Explorance evaluations, and they did discuss issues last year, and have tried to get some improvement on it-- finishing our contract with Blue, then create our own form? Create an evaluation form with what we want.
  - Discussion about student evaluations-- students like the paper, the Old way produced better response rates...
  - Could we reach out to other university that uses Blue to find out how they increased response rates

- b. Faculty 180: Faculty reviewed and chose Faculty 180, even though issues today. Faculty 180 to benefit administrators to help them get an overview, but not always easier
    - i. A systematic problem, buying a specific tool, we get what they want to do, help a student that is not doing well.. But there are cases where we see, when we buy a single purpose tool, faculty 180 is worse than a general purpose tool. General can be used to handle the special cases, higher quality, support, cheaper.
    - ii. Faculty 180 now integrates with UAonline info
  - c. Other software the university invests include:
    - Concur Travel software, limits our time, takes our time
    - Nanook Navigator was purchased by statewide
3. What can this committee do?
- a. We can advise, we can be a platform
  - b. What are mechanisms to have faculty input on when software works? Promises don't always match with reality, with software.
  - c. This committee can give feedback, even if we are not part of a decision. It is a process to help the decision making process
  - d. Changes to smart classrooms will be run by our committee.
    - i. Kelly will be conduit with OIT, grievances, complaints, other stuff, need details
4. Working plan for academic year
- a. We need good Synchronous data for developing schedules and to accurately represent the numbers teaching synchronously.
    - i. Have different sections for face to face and for distance to keep track, Coding issue - inventory of synchronous education
    - ii. Perhaps we need a survey or way to account for how we teach
  - b. Best practices, tools for distance teaching. What are the worst practices?
    - i. We have never had any change in our workloads, even though increased students in online courses
    - ii. Increase in workload, how to deal with exams, other issues with distance delivery
  - c. Too many solutions without clear goals, hangouts, zoom, collaborate, not clear
    - 1. Increase a section, the workload of the faculty increases -- faculty need to be recognized for this extra effort
    - 2. Increase in enrollment is administration issue
    - 3. technology issue