

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGES FOR 2016-2017  
Report of Progress on Charges

Shannon McGillivray, Chair  
Fred Chiou, Liaison

**ACADEMIC RESOURCES AND COMPUTING (ARCC)**

**A. Below please find information addressing the charges and list of accomplishment of the committee during the last academic year.**

**1. Allocate ARCC resources (Fall and Spring), including Dee Family Technology Grant funds, using consistent, objective, fair and reasonable criteria.**

This year we were able to fund all 14 ARCC grants submitted totaling \$113,550.63, and all 4 Dee Grants totaling \$18,225. Statistical analyses of the ranking of the applications for both funding sources indicated that all rankings were statistically similar between the members of the group. Analyses entailed converting raw rating scores each person on the committee provided to rank order scores, and then calculating average deviation scores from the average rank score (i.e., z-scores). Per standards, z-scores that fell within 2 deviation units (i.e., 2 z-scores) of one another were considered statistically similar. For the overall scores, 100% were statistically similar, indicating there is consistency in the evaluation of the grants among the 12 committee members.

The following ARCC grants were funded.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Director</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Automotive Online Collaboration Project	Scott Hadzik	Automotive Technology	\$7500
Audio Visual Equipment for Classroom and Recital Hall	Mark Henderson	Performing Arts	\$12,481.25
Using Busuu in the Foreign Language Classroom: Lower Division Pilot Program	Electra Gamon Fielding	Foreign Languages	\$900
Expanding and Maintaining Course Availability and Outreach Opportunities in Computer Science	Brian Rague	School of Computing	\$22993
Advanced Electrical Presentation Hardware	Scott Hadzik	Automotive Technology	\$2200
Biomechanics Lab Force Plate Replacement	Matt Denning	HHPH	\$15677.5
Isadora: The Creativity Server	Amanda Sowerby	Performing Arts and Dance	\$4875
Laptop Request for Student Research	Aaron Ashley	Psychology	\$7670.82
“Living Rock” Interdisciplinary Research & Education Display	Carie Frantz	Geosciences	\$6161
Updating Instructions for Online Math Courses	Sandra Fital-Akelbek	Mathematics	\$1,687.59
Production Cameras for Communication Students	Drew Tyler	Communication	\$18,000
Qlab for Theatrical Sound and Projection Design	Jessica Greenberg	Performing Arts	\$3,227
SMART Board 6075 Interactive Flat Panel with iQ and SMART Learning Suite Software	Rex Christensen	Radiologic Sciences	\$7500
Virtual Machine Server Upgrade	Jeffrey Clements	Business Administration	\$2677.47

The following Dee Family Technology grants were funded.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Director</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Verification of Mie Resonance Based Effective Medium Theory and Simulation of RFID Wireless Telemetry System for Medical Implants	Spencer Petersen & Chris Trampel	Electrical Technology & Engineering	\$1,050
GraphPad Prism Software for Neuroscience and Biological Psychology Research and Seminar Courses	Todd Hillhouse	Psychology	\$1,375
Test and Measurement of Radio Frequency (RF) Components for RF Engineering Classes and Faculty Research	Suketu Naik	Engineering	\$5800
Solar Charging Station for Electric Vehicle	Scott Hadzik	Automotive & Engineering Technology	\$10000

**2. Review funding criteria and procedures for ARCC and Dee Family Technology for possible revision or clarification.**

Last year we reviewed and slightly amended the ARCC proposal guidelines. Specifically, after much discussion it was agreed that “necessity” was a valuable aspect to consider when evaluating the grants. Previously, there was the category of points designated for “innovation.” Through discussion, the group acknowledged that sometimes a technology might not be particularly innovative, but is exceedingly necessary for faculty and students to meet or maintain basic standards within their field. Thus, some of the points originally slotted under innovation were moved to the new “necessity” scoring field. In the fall, we also updated the rubric, proposal guidelines, and proposal form for the Dee grants in order to create a greater degree of consistency between the proposal guidelines, form, and the rubric used to score those grants.

Next year ARCC plans to update the ARCC proposal form itself to better clarify the elements of evaluation for the grants, and to make certain criteria and guidelines clearer for the applicant and evaluator. Copies of all of the ARCC guidelines and documents can be found at [www.weber.edu/ARCC](http://www.weber.edu/ARCC)

**3. Assess faculty and possibly student computer needs, solicit faculty input and lobby for faculty computer-related interests.**

This will be a continuing effort of the ARCC committee. We have made some progress towards getting a better sense of what software and hardware faculty are using, and have plans to further investigate software needs of the campus. Using the ARCC members as a focus group, a survey was created to assess the extent to which faculty are aware of and using currently available IT managed software and hardware. See following pages 5-10 for the survey results. This upcoming year I would like to gather information from all department chairs regarding whether they have department-purchased software. In doing so, I hope to identify whether there are multiple departments purchasing the same software, and thus creating an avenue that could allow these departments to either pool their resources, saving money, or work with university IT purchasing to meet the demands.

In addition to these efforts, I have been coordinating with IT to reinstate town hall meetings. I created a survey that was distributed to ITGC and ARCC members in order to solicit input on how to structure these town hall meetings. The results of the survey are on pages 11-14. Overall, after discussion with ITGC and ARCC we plan on holding a university-wide town hall meeting early in the Fall semester of 2017. At the last ARCC meeting we discussed potential topics which included: security (including DUO), CANVAS training and information, explanation of available support for online learning and student success, and demonstrations of currently available software. I will work with ITGC and ARCC to coordinate which topics are ultimately put on the agenda at the upcoming town hall meeting.

4. **Maintain close communication with other IT related entities on campus (for example, WSU Online and the IT governance council) in order to:**

- Examine product implementation in computer labs and assess faculty input to determine if some products could be used on a campus-wide basis.

Ty Naylor came to our last ARCC meeting to discuss the rollout of DUO. In this discussion some concerns were brought up. Specifically, there was a concern about the impact on faculty productivity and potential for discouragement from the use of CANVAS. Ty stressed the importance of training and making sure colleges will have meetings where DUO information can be discussed. In regards to training, it was suggested that a short video be made and distributed that could help clarify how to use DUO.

The concern of always having to have your phone was also discussed, and Ty explained that there are free tokens available at IT central for anyone interested. These tokens do not require Wi-Fi and will allow you to log in without your phone. Ty also explained that unless you log into and new computer, or restart your computer, you do not need to sign in again. That is, if your computer is only “sleeping” you should remain logged into the system. It was pointed out that after a few weeks it becomes easier to predict the log in cycles.

In regards to soliciting faculty input for the potential for campus-wide adoption of software see information from previous section.

- Review (with computing support) and assess faculty concerns regarding standards and policies for hardware and software purchases.

It is the hope that the upcoming town hall can serve as a place where faculty are better able to understand the policies regarding software and hardware purchases. In the past, without an avenue for dialogue between IT and faculty there does seem to be a lack of understanding on what, exactly, these IT policies are. In the upcoming years, I would like to invite various representatives from IT to give short presentations at ARCC meetings in order to help convey and inform regarding this matter.

- Provide the faculty point of view in regard to the review, discuss and communication campus wide, of the security policies, procedures, and practices to protect student, faculty, and staff data.

ARCC has reviewed the revised Acceptable Use Policy. There was some discussion regarding concern of the wording surrounding remote access only for authorized users. The concern was about students who use VPN to do assignments and homework. We wanted to clarify that “authorized users” included students. This concern was conveyed and was addressed by Andrea Glover. Overall, the committee thought the more streamlined document was a positive step.

5. **Create a structure that allows ongoing collaboration between ARCC and the IT Governance Council.**

As ARCC chair, I have attended and participated in all ITGC meetings and have solicited input and advice from ITGC. In addition, there is always at least one, if not more, ITGC members at ARCC meetings. I have also met with Bret Ellis, Shelly Belflower, and Heidi Munk individually to discuss collaborative endeavors such as the town hall meetings.

6. **In collaboration with RSPG, consider the creation of a master web page for faculty funding and grant resources, including an outline of criteria for all funding opportunities.**

With leadership from Fred Chiou, we worked to develop a simple page that can better serve to inform and direct people to various funding sources. The link to this new page is:

[http://weber.edu/facultysenate/Funding\\_Sources.html](http://weber.edu/facultysenate/Funding_Sources.html)

7. **Work with the IT governance council and appropriate faculty survey data to follow up on the recommendation from the Provost to develop of a 5-year Strategic Plan for IT that would address the following components:**

- Duplication with computer support systems/personnel (ex, we have central support in Lampros and also IT support in some Colleges)
- Coordination of resources so that faculty know what is available and who to go to for what issue
  - Example: I have an issue with my office computer – do I call x7777 or contact my College IT person?
  - Example: who do I call for immediate support if there is an issue with a classroom computer?

For the above 2 points, last year Dave Ferro worked extensively on these and submitted a report to Faculty Senate in August. Overall, there does not seem to be a one-stop-shop for IT related problems at this point. He compiled a document with information regarding IT resources on campus. I have included it again in this report (pages 15-23).

- Work towards making computer set-up the same in every classroom at the University so that faculty can feel comfortable/confident in their ability to give a presentation in any classroom if necessary (Executive Committee recognizes this is difficult because the Colleges are responsible for their own classroom technology budgets, and in some cases the University funds classroom technology)

Last year, working with Dave Ferro, I created a survey to assess the needs and desire to have universal computer configurations in classrooms. The results of this report were shared last year, and are included again in this report (pages 24-27).

**B. Number of committee meetings held since August 2016**

We have held 2 in-person full committee meetings, one in the fall, and one in the spring. In addition, information and questions have been distributed to the full committee via email as needed.

**C. Attendance of committee members**

All committee members, or a suitable replacement, attended all meetings.

**D. Names of exceptionally outstanding members who provided significant service**

All members were helpful and contributed to ARCC. I would like to make specific mention of Daniel Hubler and Miland Palmer who volunteered for additional committee work (see point below).

**E. Subcommittee or special assignments**

A subcommittee consisting of Daniel Hubler, Miland Palmer, Kristy Baron, and myself met to review and draft changes to the Dee Technology Grant guidelines and proposal form.

**F. Suggestions regarding new directions the committee may pursue and ways in which the committee can increase its effectiveness**

Many of the charges I feel will require an ongoing process. For example, ARCC will continue to assess faculty and possibly student computer needs, solicit faculty input and lobby for faculty computer-related interests and maintain close communication with other IT related entities on campus. In addition to funding ARCC and Dee grants using objective criteria, next year ARCC plans to update the ARCC proposal form itself to better clarify the elements of evaluation for the grants, and to make certain criteria and guidelines clearer for the applicant and evaluator. Information and input from the upcoming Town Hall meeting should also serve to better inform ARCC of the needs and IT-related concerns of faculty and staff at WSU.