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.

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

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

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 remained login 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 and 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.
WSU Software & Hardware Usage
SURVEY RESULTS

Participant Characteristics
- 8 respondents
- All ARCC faculty members
- Pilot focus group

Hardware Usage - Computer
- Computer provided in the classroom
  - All but 1 indicated they use it all the time (i.e., at least once a week or more)
  - The other response was “rarely” – (i.e., less than once a year)

Hardware Usage – Speaker System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Software – Microsoft Office

- All the time: 8
- A few times: 2
- About once a month: 1
- A few times a year: 0
- Less than once a year: 0
- Never: 0
- I didn't know we had it, but will use it: 0

Software – Minitab Statistical Software

- All the time: 7
- A few times: 3
- About once a month: 2
- A few times a year: 0
- Less than once a year: 0
- Never: 0
- I didn't know we had it, but will use it: 0

*No one indicated they had used Minitab Quality Trainer

Software – Mathematica

- All the time: 3
- A few times: 3
- About once a month: 2
- A few times a year: 0
- Less than once a year: 0
- Never: 0
- I didn't know we had it, but will use it: 0

Software – SPSS

- All the time: 3
- A few times: 3
- About once a month: 2
- A few times a year: 0
- Less than once a year: 0
- Never: 0
- I didn't know we had it, but will use it: 0
How often will you use it now?

- Rarely = 0
- Sometimes = 1
- Often = 2

Software – SPSS/Amos

Software – GoReact

Software – Kaltura

Software – CANVAS
About once a month

Less than once a year

Never

But I don’t wanna use DUO (in a whiny voice)

4 responses

- 2 – smartboards in all classrooms
- 2 Qualtrics
- 1 Sigmaplot

Software – DUO

Software/Hardware Wishlist
IT Town Hall Survey Results

I would like to have IT Town Hall Meetings

Place for Faculty to Voice Needs vs IT to communicate info.

College-specific vs. University-wide
Other information

- 80% agreed that there should be a panel and/or presenters at the meetings, 8% disagreed (12% felt neutral)

- Only <4% felt that students SHOULD NOT attend these meetings; 80% felt they SHOULD be invited to attend.

Suggestions for encouraging attendance

- The purpose of these should be communicated as to how it will influence their work, teaching, etc. Most care about how technology affects their process.
- A few people said food.
- Holding them virtually?
- A topic would help target those interested in the topic; possibly some publicity regarding the purpose (email, announcements, flyers).
- I suggested that you hold a yearly town hall in faculty senate (with senators prepped with relevant material. You could present survey results for example). That is one way to guarantee attendance and get relevant feedback.
- Let those who are interested attend.
- Have them in the college.

Suggestions for encouraging attendance

- Allow them to submit their questions ahead of time and pick topics around them. Feed them and they will come.
- I believe that specific-issue town halls have generated the most interest; especially when the specific issue is important to faculty or students. Having an expectation of a ‘voice’ is also helpful.
- Perhaps have attendees be eligible to be early adopters or testers of new features, software upgrades, security features, etc
- I think by holding them at each college, the focus will be to have the faculty, staff from that college to attend and anyone else that is interested. Marketing efforts could be focused on that individual college.
- Presented as a learning opportunity for faculty AND as a chance for IT to hear how it can better promote faculty and student success

Suggestions for Encouraging “Collaborative” Discussions

- "We understand not everyone is happy, but this is how we can make our current portfolio work for you." Best practices on how IT and the programs IT services makes their lives easier.
- Food
- Post Rules of Engagement first. For example, people will be cut off if need be.
- Come with a list of prepared questions to lead the discussion should no one have suggestions. Have a good facilitator who can lead the meeting - steering away from topics that incite divisive tendencies.
- State this as a primary goal at the very beginning of the meeting, and also include this in advertising for the event.
- Topics would enable conversation that is focused. Having an open forum for venting would be good occasionally as well.
- Having an agenda to share information and then open it to questions and concerns usually manages this. Focusing on a particular topic will typically do this too.
Suggestions for Encouraging “Collaborative” Discussions

- Having an agenda to share information and then open it to questions and concerns usually manages this. Focusing on a particular topic will typically do this too.
- Have people there who can briefly talk to the ‘why’ things work the way they do.
- Have an agenda; have a specific focus for each meeting.
- Questions need to be submitted ahead of time.
- Good facilitator and/or providing opportunity for input prior to the meeting so that presenters can focus the meeting on immediate needs.
- If you focus the topic, could ask for feedback tailored to specific topic and/or needs
- Have surveys taken beforehand that can be filtered and vetted to give time to the panel or presenters to respond to the questions or concerns versus responding to an angry individual. Also, allow for individual questions to be asked after the town hall.
- Present best and innovative practices around IT.

Additional Comments

- I think having college-level meetings twice a year (meaning smaller meetings in each college ~6months) would be ideal. Then the faculty and staff know they have a venue for talking with someone about what’s most important to them. If you have a month where you try to hold one in each college during that month, the info and topic might be timely & you’d get relevant responses.
- How frequently we decide to offer Town Halls, if we decide to do so, will impact what we are trying to accomplish with each town hall. What is the real purpose of the town hall? Does IT need feedback in terms of direction? Does IT need buy in from campus? Does campus need an outlet to share ideas, concerns, frustrations, etc.? If we determine the purpose of the town hall, other decisions can be made about timing, audience, frequency, etc.
- Maybe try them a bunch of different ways over a year or 1.5 years and see what works best.
- I think the portfolio themed town hall meetings could have some challenges, as some portfolios will have little or no interest to campus audiences, while others will have extensive interest but limited IT resources may impede ability to adopt, incorporate changes in a meaningful time frame. Could foster frustration and/or unrealistic expectations.
STATE OF TECHNOLOGY REPORT from the Academic Resources and Computing Committee (ARCC) of the Faculty Senate of Weber State University
Collated by David Ferro, Dean, College of Engineering, Applied Science & Technology

CONTENTS

- Introduction
- Survey Overviews (2015, 2016)
- Technology Resources, CTCs – compiled by Ty Naylor
- Technology Resources, IT division – from conversation with Ron Jensen, etc.
- Technology Resources, Continuing Education ELearning – compiled by Andrea Jensen
- Technology Resources, Student Services – compiled by Clayton Oyler, Carl Porter
- Technology Resources, Committees related to IT and Portfolios – Ty Naylor
- 2016 Survey Report
- 2016 Survey Details
- 2015 Survey Report
- 2015 Survey Details

Introduction
In the 2016, the provost had requested of the Executive Committee a report from ARCC on the state of information technology at WSU specifically looking into the needs of uniformity in assistance (or access to assistance) and classroom technology. I offered to bring this together. This report benefits from the 2015 survey and focus group effort looking at numerous issues including level of satisfaction in computing support and classroom/lab needs and a 2016 Survey looking further into classroom/lab/personal technology needs. The conclusion - general satisfaction with technology assistance and some interest in technological consistency in classroom/labs (more likely within departments and equal or greater concern over local needs) - was discussed at Academic Portfolio. The action item arrived at was create a web page (available for x7777) that creates direction for user needs related to information technology but not necessarily maintained by the IT division. We will work with Alison Knowlton to create this. We are collecting information from Student Services (Clayton Oyler), Continuing Education (Andrea Jensen), and Information Technology (Ty Naylor, Ron Jensen, Peter Waite, Shelly Belflower, Jonathan Karras, Mark Green, etc.). Expect additions to that addendum to this report in the future; one potential landing page: http://www.weber.edu/academictechnology/
--David Ferro

ARCC 2015 Survey
Gail Niklason, et. al.

This was both a survey and some focus groups. Most interestingly (especially compared to the survey of ten years ago) faculty, for the most part, are satisfied with the service they have. However, a number faculty don't know who to call. [See attached.]

ARCC 2016 Survey
Shannon McGillivray & David Ferro

The point of this survey was to understand how people were using technology in classrooms and labs. It tried to refine the question of classroom and lab compatibility by looking at department, college, and university-wide
requirements. In addition, it tried to refine our understanding of how much faculty have used their own purchased equipment and potentially could use support. This came about from looking at the 2015 survey but not having a more refined understanding of localized needs in classroom, lab, and personal technology.

Shannon did an excellent job putting this survey together and her analysis is spot on. As noted, the surveyors of the survey mostly strove to understand how important to faculty is universal technology within department, colleges, and at the university level, and, separately, 'plug-ability' in classrooms and labs. They also wished to understand to what extent they were financially supported with technology - principally desktops and laptops - and how much of their own technology they brought to their job and into the classroom.

The results regarding universal classrooms/labs were mostly aligned with our expectations. Some comments even addressed a perceived intent of the survey to universalize technology across campus and noted the importance of local needs and technology that works over having university-level universal technology (the same switchbox in every classroom). One surprise was the comparative lack of interest for universal plug-ability across campus - although it was still greater than interest in universal technology. Perhaps the ability to plug in a laptop is already universal enough to be a perceived as a non-issue. Or, perhaps, the number of faculty who would plug in or teach outside their building is too small to make that any more of a distinguishing question than the universal technology question.

There was definitely interest in being supported for purchasing technology and keeping that up-to-date. Faculty expressed interest in University, College, and Department support for purchasing and keeping up-to-date technology. In fact, faculty needs go beyond traditional support. Over 50% of faculty use their own equipment (laptops) strictly for instruction at least 45% of the time. While there was no mention of that in any of the comments it does speak to a potential need for supporting portable computing in our instructional community.

There were several comments about making sure that the technology in classrooms or labs was working. While this question wasn't the intent of this study and the previous study mostly indicated a fair level of satisfaction with technology - it reminds us that not every experience is the same and there are still those unsatisfied by the current state. We decided it would be interesting to dive a little deeper into those and see if they can be addressed at a singular level and so Shannon created a report with only those comments and the associated college and department. We then shared these results with Ty Naylor to share with CTCs and other support personnel. One future direction that ARCC could take would be to conduct a very short yearly survey that only looks for technological concerns to send to support.

Finally, while not everyone is represented in this survey - in fact, a few departments are not represented at all - it does represent academic affairs pretty well college to college. I would argue that the survey results give us a fair picture of the campus for the survey's intent. [See attached.]
## TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES:

CTCs – compiled by Ty Naylor – found at https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1CMiFnPbJOUHw9vWm72FfVJv6Ra_wFJzPjxzYrJTyk8/edit #gid=0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>Jennilyn Stoffers</td>
<td>(801) 626-8825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jstoffers@weber.edu">jstoffers@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>Tyler Cahoon</td>
<td>(801) 626-8825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tylercahoon@weber.edu">tylercahoon@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology Services</td>
<td>Matthew Cain</td>
<td>(801) 626-7020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mattcain@weber.edu">mattcain@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology Services</td>
<td>Russell Paige</td>
<td>(801) 395-3527</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rpaige@weber.edu">rpaige@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology Services</td>
<td>Scott Peterson</td>
<td>(801) 395-3526</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scottpeterson2@weber.edu">scottpeterson2@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology Services (Davis Campus)</td>
<td>Sean Graham</td>
<td>(801) 626-7039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seangraham@weber.edu">seangraham@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology Services (Davis Campus)</td>
<td>Christopher Sawaya</td>
<td>801-395-3578</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christophersawaya@weber.edu">christophersawaya@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business and Economics</td>
<td>Gregory Brighton</td>
<td>801-626-7388</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbrighton@weber.edu">gbrighton@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Paul Dykman</td>
<td>(801) 626-7610</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pauldykman@weber.edu">pauldykman@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions</td>
<td>Eric Bennick</td>
<td>801-626-7371</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ebennick@weber.edu">ebennick@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions</td>
<td>Patrick Leavitt</td>
<td>(801) 626-7215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patleavitt@weber.edu">patleavitt@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>Tyler Hardy</td>
<td>(801) 626-7061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tylerhardy@weber.edu">tylerhardy@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Social Science</td>
<td>Ryan Stephens</td>
<td>(801) 626-6593</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryanstephens@weber.edu">ryanstephens@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>Christian Maughan</td>
<td>801-626-7147</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christianmaughan@weber.edu">christianmaughan@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>Jacob Cain</td>
<td>(801) 626-3311</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacobcain@weber.edu">jacobcain@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>Jacob Matson</td>
<td>(801) 626-7351</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacobmatson@weber.edu">jacobmatson@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>Lanny Ellis</td>
<td>801-626-6609</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lellis1@weber.edu">lellis1@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Business Services</td>
<td>Ty Naylor</td>
<td>801-626-6266</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tynaylor@weber.edu">tynaylor@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Business Services</td>
<td>Shelly Belflower</td>
<td>(801) 626-8610</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbelflower@weber.edu">sbelflower@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Network Engineer</td>
<td>Jonathan Karras</td>
<td>(801) 626-7529</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathankarras@weber.edu">jonathankarras@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Network Engineer</td>
<td>Luke Jenkins</td>
<td>(801) 626-7669</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljenkins@weber.edu">ljenkins@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Network Engineer</td>
<td>Tristan Rhodes</td>
<td>(801) 626-8549</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tristanrhodes@weber.edu">tristanrhodes@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service Desk</td>
<td>Quinton Dixon</td>
<td>(801) 626-8084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:quintondixon@weber.edu">quintondixon@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service Desk</td>
<td>Stephen Cain</td>
<td>(801) 626-6666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephencain@weber.edu">stephencain@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service Desk</td>
<td>Kirk Barlow</td>
<td>(801) 626-6666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kirkbarlow@weber.edu">kirkbarlow@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service Desk (Accounts Admin)</td>
<td>Cindy Sorensen</td>
<td>801-626-7777</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cindysorensen@weber.edu">cindysorensen@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Edd Ramer</td>
<td>801-626-7843</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eramer@weber.edu">eramer@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Mark Buxton</td>
<td>(801) 626-8645</td>
<td><a href="mailto:markbuxton@weber.edu">markbuxton@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Gursharan Bakshi</td>
<td>(801) 626-8533</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gsingh@weber.edu">gsingh@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Klint Holmes</td>
<td>(801) 626-8159</td>
<td><a href="mailto:klintholmes@weber.edu">klintholmes@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>David Clements</td>
<td>801-626-6860</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcllements@weber.edu">dcllements@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Ludwig Possie</td>
<td>(801) 626-8093</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ludwigpossie@weber.edu">ludwigpossie@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>Mark Maxson</td>
<td>(801) 626-7802</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmaxson@weber.edu">mmaxson@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>Patrick Beck</td>
<td>(801) 626-6522</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patrickbeck@weber.edu">patrickbeck@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Technology</td>
<td>Clayton Oyler</td>
<td>801-626-7415</td>
<td><a href="mailto:coyler@weber.edu">coyler@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Technology</td>
<td>Dave Taylor</td>
<td>801-626-6737</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dtaylor@weber.edu">dtaylor@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Technology</td>
<td>Spencer Coleman</td>
<td>(801) 626-7485</td>
<td><a href="mailto:spencercoleman@weber.edu">spencercoleman@weber.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Admin Development Services – Ron Jensen - Alumni, Advancement, HR, Finance

Continuing Education Web Applications – Kevin Goodrich - Concurrent Enrollment, Boys and Girls State, Early College

Database Services – Mark Green – Database Changes, Reports

Student Development Services – Denise Taylor – Admissions, Orientation, Registration, Advising

Web Development Services – Peter Waite – eWeber, SiteManager, Weber.edu

In addition,

Networking is Jonathan Karras

Servers is Mark Buxton

IT ORGANIZATION:

http://weber.edu/itdivision

### eLearning Team Services

Centen for Instructional and Institutional Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design</th>
<th>Contact: <a href="mailto:instructionaldesign@weber.edu">instructionaldesign@weber.edu</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Checkup:</td>
<td>Quick check of course for course navigation, functionality, videos, files, and hyperlinks to make sure all function properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices Course Review:</td>
<td>Faculty and ID review course independently. Then they meet to discuss possible revisions to course based on evidence-based best practices. Reviews available to all faculty for all courses. Professors receive a $250 stipend for first completion of successful course review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Course Design/Redesign:</td>
<td>Semester-long process involving faculty member and ID based on evidence-based best practices. Improvements may address: content, flow/navigation, course/student objectives, assessment techniques, engagement, etc. Course can be online, hybrid, blended, flipped, or face-to-face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Development:</td>
<td>Creation of custom banners for Canvas courses. On a limited basis, can create interactive learning tools for use in Canvas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas Templates:</td>
<td>Canvas course templates available to quickly add a nice touch of design to a Canvas course. Custom designs available upon request with advanced notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOC Development:</td>
<td>On special request, design and development of massive open online courses (MOOCs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Technologies System Administration

Contact: wsuonline@weber.edu OR 801-626-6499

- Manage course creation, faculty and student enrollment in the university Learning Management System (LMS) Canvas.
- Troubleshoot Canvas issues.
- Identify creative solutions to course access issues.
- Administration of Developmental Math System.

### Technical Support

Contact: wsuonline@weber.edu OR 801-626-6499

- Canvas technical support (phone, walk-in, email, ticketing system).
Support for integration of publisher content in Canvas.

Support for LTI integrations between Canvas and third party tools.

Provide Canvas sections for faculty completing rank and tenure review electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training &amp; Professional Development</th>
<th>Contact: 801-626-6499</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical:</strong></td>
<td>Online Canvas Training for Instructors (general introduction to Canvas for teaching).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face Canvas Training before each semester begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical:</strong></td>
<td>Online ID Series Workshops (accessible anytime online).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eLearning Certificate Program (Semester-based professional development program; requires application). Formerly called Master Online Certification Program (MOTC) or Blended Learning Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Events:</strong></td>
<td>Training sessions provided at the New Faculty Retreat, Adjunct Faculty Retreat, and Wildcat Tech Expo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Services – compiled by Clayton Oyler, Carl Porter

Testing Services/Chi Tester
Tracey Smith
Testing Services, Director
801-626-7663
http://weber.edu/TestingCenter/contact.html

Student Computer Labs/Computer Classroom:
Carey Anson
Academic Technologies, Coordinator
801-626-7018
&
Sarah Mackay
Lab Supervisor
801-626-7063
http://weber.edu/ComputerLabs/contact.html
http://weber.edu/ComputerLabs/classroom.html

Student Affairs Technology
Clayton Oyler
Director
801-626-7415
http://www.weber.edu/sat/contact.html (includes org chart)
Committee membership
• Computer Technology Coordinators (CTC)
• Student Portfolio
• Web Management Portfolio
• ISTF
• Information Technology Government Council (ITGC)

Academic Support Centers and Programs
Carl Porter
Executive Director
801-626-6872
http://www.weber.edu/ASCP/
Committee Membership
• Academic Portfolio
• Student Portfolio
Technology Resources, Committees related to IT and Portfolios (Committees where IT is discussed and/or there is IT representation) – Ty Naylor

ITGC (Information Technology Governance Council)
Administrative Portfolio
Student Portfolio
Academic Portfolio
Directors Council
Information Security Task Force
SCCM/Group Policy Task Force
CTC (Campus Technology Coordinators)
CPP (Change, Problem, Project)
IT EOC
ITPC (Information Technology Planning Council)
SAC (Staff Advisory Committee)
Lynx
Provisioning
Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity
Crystal Crest
Mobile Steering Committee
Web Management Portfolio
IT Finance Committee
General Person
Data Warehouse Committee
FM/IT Planning
Data Governance Executive Council
ARCC (Academic Resources and Computing Committee)
UTTC
UPC (University Planning Council)
Professional Development Committee
Athletic Event Management Committee
Customer Service Committee
Data Security Stewards
Enterprise Storage Committee
Risk Control Committee
Google Apps for Education
Davis Campus Council
IS&S
Wellness Committee
• 223 respondents

**PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS**

- **Colleges Represented**
- **Job Title**
- **DID YOUR DEPARTMENT PROVIDE YOU WITH A LAPTOP?**
  - Yes - Desktop
  - Yes - Laptop
  - BOTH a desktop & laptop

- 13 respondents indicated they did not receive a computer.
- All were adjuncts.
- 8 from EAST
- 2 from A&H
- 1 from science
- 2 from SBS
- All purchased their own - average amount spent = $1413

Could they pick if they received a laptop or desktop?
- Yes = 57%
- No = 30%
- 12% could not recall
USE OF PERSONAL COMPUTER

• 53% of ALL respondents indicated they use their own self-purchased laptop/desktop computer for job-related work.

• Of those respondents that indicated they do use their own computer, they indicated they use it for 45.4% of their job-related work. *This did not vary significantly between colleges.

DOES A LAPTOP/DESKTOP MEET YOUR TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS?

HAS YOUR TECHNOLOGY BEEN SUBSIDIZED?

STANDARD TECHNOLOGY IN LECTURE CLASSROOMS

Respondents were asked:

“How important is it to YOU that all of the lecture (lab/performance-based) classrooms in your DEPARTMENT (COLLEGE/BUILDING) (UNIVERSITY) all have the same technological capabilities built into them?”

1 = Not at all Important
2 = Slightly Important
3 = Moderately Important
4 = Very Important
5 = Extremely Important
RESULTS: LECTURE-BASED CLASSROOMS

- Percentage distribution by department, college/building, and university for lecture-based classrooms.

RESULTS: LAB/PERFORMANCE-BASED CLASSROOMS

- Percentage distribution by department, college/building, and university for lab/performance-based classrooms.

RESULTS – COMPARING LECTURE & LAB-BASED CLASSES

- Bar charts comparing lecture and lab-based classrooms.

ADAPTABLE TECHNOLOGY CLASSROOM INTERFACES

Respondents were asked:

“How important is it to YOU that all of the lecture (lab/performance-based) classrooms in your DEPARTMENT (COLLEGE/BUILDING) (UNIVERSITY) are capable of accepting/operating technology you want to bring in?”

1 = Not at all Important
2 = Slightly Important
3 = Moderately Important
4 = Very Important
5 = Extremely Important

Overall, respondents found it significantly more important for standardization within departments and buildings, less so at the university level, and this trend was even stronger for lab-based classrooms.
RESULTS: LECTURE-BASED CLASSROOMS

RESULTS: LAB/PERFORMANCE-BASED CLASSROOMS

RESULTS – COMPARING LECTURE & LAB-BASED CLASSES

SELECTED COMMENTS

- My computer (purchased by my college) is 5+ years old. My laptop (purchased by me) is 5 years old. Faculty need to be kept up to date with newer computers and technology, and we shouldn't have to buy it on our own!
- We need stronger Wi-Fi connections.
- Just like an airline (interchangeability is a good thing).
- We need more classrooms that have high-quality and high programs quality.
- If it is not fast enough, it hinders the technology there. If it also needs to work ALL the time for the classroom.
- I love the technology works rather than if they are all the same.
- When it comes to technology, it is important for the classroom to work well, and it is not essential for all departments to have the same technology, as long as they are capable of accepting their technology and have a consistent technology.
- The technology that is available in the classrooms is the most important in the education college, and it is a waste of funds.
- The survey seems to be very important for it to have very similar or identical technology in all classrooms. For me, if that is possible instead of just doing one, it is not essential for all departments to have the same technology, as long as they are capable of accepting their technology and have a consistent technology.
- Providing adequate technology in the classroom should be among the university’s highest priorities. In the past, I think that it has not been, as computing support on campus continues to lag that of other universities that I am familiar with.
- The current classrooms meet my needs well. I do not think that in the best room.
- If this survey is about standardizing computers and technology on campus, I don’t think that is the best move.
- The survey seems to be very important for it to have very similar or identical technology in all classrooms. For me, it is not essential for all departments to have the same technology, as long as they are capable of accepting their technology and have a consistent technology.