Academic Resources and Computing Committee Annual Report 2022-2023

Chair: Lixuan Zhang

1. **Accomplishments of the committee and objectives yet to be addressed. Please comment specifically on all assigned charges as well as any additional work done by the committee.**

   Charge 1: Allocate ARCC resources, including Dee Family Technology Grant funds, using consistent, objective, fair and reasonable criteria.

Grant	Year/Semester	Number of Accepted Proposals	Total $$ Awarded	Total Residual Money
ARCC	2022 - Fall	10	$64,105.83	$1,426.25
ARCC	2023 – Spring	10	$118,090.92	
Dee	2022 – Fall	4	$16,399.00	$19,123.60
Dee	2023- Spring	1	$1,675.00	

   Excel formulas were revised to improve the consistency of the ratings

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

   - *Made it mandatory to send the proposals to IT three weeks before the due dates.*
   - *Proposal forms are revised to include links of software risk assessment and Canvas integration application.*
   - *The IT signature on the ARCC application forms was moved to the second signature after the applicant's signature.*
   - *The follow-up report for Dee award recipients are required. In the application form, the applicants were asked if they had received Dee awards in the past two years and if they had submitted a follow-up report.*
   - *A template for Dee follow-up report was created and uploaded on the website.*
   - *A two-year deadline was set for applicants to spend the awarded money*

   Charge 3: Assess faculty and possibly student computer needs, solicit faculty input and lobby for faculty computer-related interests.
   a. Update college/departmental WSU software usage & needs document and disseminate this information to chairs and deans.
   b. Coordinate with student senate and Student Affairs Technology to assess student IT-related needs and promote knowledge of software access.

   Grace Zhang attended the IT governance council and communicate to the council about campus technology issues.

   Charge 4: Maintain close communication with WSU Online, Student Affairs Technology, the IT Governance Council, and other IT, computing, and digital-related

entities on campus.

Shelly Belflower (IT), Oliver Snow (WSU online), and Nick Lambert (IT) attended committee meetings. They provided feedback on the ARCC website and on the proposal forms. Shelly signs on every proposal.

Charge 5: Create a structure that allows ongoing collaboration between ARCC and IT

ARCC members have participated in these ongoing committees:
- *CTC member committee*
- *Academic Portfolio Committee*
- *UITC committee*
- *IT advisory board committee*
- *Liaison between CTC board committee and ARCC*

Charge 6: Ensure that the language of generated policies is inclusive. This includes tracking demographic data for grant applications. Discuss revising the rubric to foster more equitable and inclusive classrooms.

The committee collected demographic information on grant recipients and compared them to the overall faculty profile (Thanks to Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Office). Diversity criteria is added in both proposal forms and rubric.

	WSU	Fall 2022 recipients	Spring 2023 recipients
% of male	55.5% (tenure track only); 52.2% (including instructors)	65.2%	68.2%
% of Caucasian	86.4% (tenure track only); 87.5% (including instructors)	78.3%	86.4%

Charge 7: Ensure that the language of new or updated documents are inclusive. Review those documents to see how they may inadvertently impact particular communities in an adverse manner. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance

N/A

Charge 8: Create fillable PDF forms for grant applications.

The forms are created

2. **Number of committee meetings held since August 2022**

   The ARCC held four meetings on the following dates:

   September 9, 2022
   November 8, 2022
   January 20, 2023
   April 21, 2022

3. **Attendance of committee members**

   See attached spreadsheet

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

   - Janice Thomas served on the IT advisory council in both semesters.
   - Dan Hubler served on Academic Portfolio committees in both semesters
   - Shawn Broderick served on the CTC member committee in both semesters and acted as liaison between ARCC and CTC board committee.
   - Shannon McGillvray created the Dee follow-up report template.

5. **Subcommittee or special assignments**

   - Janice Thomas served on the UITC committee in both semesters.
   - Dan Hubler served on Academic Portfolio committees in both semesters
   - Shawn Broderick served on the CTC member committee in both semesters and acted as liaison between ARCC and CTC board committee.
   - Lixuan Zhang served on the UITC committee in both semesters.

6. **Charges from this year that should carry forward to next year.**

   Charges:

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

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

3. Assess faculty and possibly student computer needs, solicit faculty input and lobby for faculty computer-related interests.
   a. Update college/departmental WSU software usage & needs document and disseminate this information to chairs and deans.
   b. Coordinate with student senate and Student Affairs Technology to assess student IT-related needs and promote knowledge of software access.(*Ongoing*)

4. Maintain close communication with WSU Online, Student Affairs Technology, the IT Governance Council, and other IT, computing, and digital-related entities on campus in order to:
   a. Examine product implementation in computer labs and assess faculty input to determine if some products could be used on a campus-wide basis.
   b. Review (with computing support) and assess faculty concerns regarding standards and policies for hardware and software purchases.
   c. 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.
   d. Provide faculty input regarding new software implementation for research purpose and third party software integration into Canvas. (*Ongoing*)

5. Create a structure that allows ongoing collaboration between ARCC and IT. (*Ongoing*)

6. Ensure that the language of generated policies is inclusive. This includes tracking demographic data for grant applications. Discuss revising the rubric to foster more equitable and inclusive classrooms. (*Ongoing*)

7. Ensure that the language of new or updated documents are inclusive. Review those documents to see how they may inadvertently impact particular communities in an adverse manner. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance. (*Ongoing*)

7. **Recommendations for new charges.**

   - N/A

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

   - Need a good filing system to track past proposals and follow-up reports. I added the proposals and the follow-up report in the google drive of the email address arccbudgetmaster@weber.edu.

- More consideration on innovativeness vs. necessity in the funding rubric. The current rubric emphasizes the innovativeness of the projects and the committee needs to consider whether projects such as hardware replacement are valuable.
- Add the statements about software ongoing costs on the proposal forms.
- In Spring 2023, the applicants were required to send proposals to IT three weeks before the deadline. It did not work well. Here are the two reasons: 1). Faculty questioned the legitimacy of this rule, arguing that some proposals such as hardware replacement did not need the central IT to review when each department already has dedicated IT support. In addition, some proposals could be reviewed quickly by IT, prompting the faculty to expect reasonable exceptions to the rule. 2). IT expressed concerns that a late proposal may be critical for the students in the coming semester so they were reluctant to reject it. In the end, all three late proposals were accepted and the proposal review meeting date was extended for an additional week. The new committee needs to find a reasonable method for implementing this mandatory three-week rule.

Meeting Minutes: attached