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.

- Nancy Jarvis from IT Policy, Planning, and Assessment presented two policies that WSU is going to incorporate in the PPM. She wanted the ARCCs input regarding these policies.

- The ARCC worked with IT to ensure that textbooks that have the LMS software attached may or may not be integrated into Canvas. Canvas developed a system to ensure that faculty give IT enough advanced notification to implement this software into Canvas before the semester starts (see minutes 4/9/21).

- The ARCC looked for new ways the committee can increase its effectiveness due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The ARCC worked more closely with WSU online and TLF to ensure that our goals are in alignment.

- The ARCC ensured that the language of generated policies is inclusive. The committee reviewed the ARCC and Dee grant application rubric to foster more equitable and inclusive language.

- ARCC and Dee Grant Proposal Award Monies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Year/Semester</th>
<th>Total Budgeted $$</th>
<th>Number of Accepted Proposals</th>
<th>Total $$ Awarded</th>
<th>Total Residual Money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCC</td>
<td>2020 - Fall</td>
<td>$75,374.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$43,968.55</td>
<td>$31,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>2020 – Fall</td>
<td>$23,902.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,285.12</td>
<td>$14,616.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCC</td>
<td>2021 – Spring</td>
<td>$147,985.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$109,372.83</td>
<td>$38,612.17 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>2021- Spring</td>
<td>$59,500.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$46,953.40</td>
<td>$12,546.60 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rolls over to fall semester 2022

2. Number of committee meetings held since August 2020

The ARCC held four meetings on the following dates:
- September 11, 2020
- November 6, 2020
- January 22, 2021
- April 9, 2021

3. Attendance of committee members

See meeting minutes for attendance of committee members.
4. Names of exceptionally outstanding members who provided significant service
   - Aminda O’Hare created a survey regarding the faculty use of Kaltura. The results of this survey was sent to Shelly Bellflower.
   - Linda DuHadway worked with Peter Waite to provide suggestions on the Faculty dashboard changes.

5. Subcommittee or special assignments
   - Linda DuHadway worked with Peter Waite to provide suggestions on the Faculty dashboard changes.
   - Rex Christensen worked with the Chitester committee to review changes to testing. The testing system will be moved from Chitester to Canvas by Fall Semester of 2022.
   - Rex Christensen attended the Academic Portfolio committee meetings representing the ARCC

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 to assess student IT-related needs and promote knowledge of software access. *(Ongoing)*

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

   5. Create a structure that allows ongoing collaboration between ARCC and the IT Governance Council. *(Ongoing)*
6. Investigate the possibility of creating a new training funding line under ARCC. (Ongoing)

7. Work with IT to ensure that textbooks that have the LMS software attached may or may not be integrated into Canvas. Develop a system to ensure that faculty gives IT enough advanced notification to implement this software into Canvas before the semester starts. (Ongoing)

8. 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. Recommendations for new charges.

- Under the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Chair (Tim Herzog) the ARCC will take an active role in the decision making process for university software purchases. The ARCC will take a more active role in IT subcommittees to provide faculty representation on technical concerns at the university level (i.e. Canvas, Chitester, etc.).

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

- Clearer instructions on the ARCC and Dee grant application forms.
- Make specific deadlines for signatures on the application: chair, dean, IT, Canvas, etc.
- Put on the application that there will be no institutional software approval.
- Feedback mechanism for accepted proposals (per Bret Ellis)
- IT review from each college to determine innovative projects (Bret Ellis) who should this be?
- Should we move to an electronic application form?

Meeting Minutes: attached
Academic Resources and Computing Committee (ARCC)

09/11/2020 11:00 AM

Present: Abdulmalek Al-Gahmi, Aminda O’Hare, Brian Strecklein, Dan Hubler, Daniel Clark, Rex Christensen, Hugo Valle, Jamie Weeks, Jessica Greenburg, Linda DuHadway, Lixuan (Grace) Zhang, Nancy Jarvis, Ryan Cain, Shannon McGillivray, Janice Thomas

Next meeting: Friday, November 6th, 11:00 AM, via Zoom

1. Announcements
   Greeting and Introductions.

2. Discussion
   a. Nancy Jarvis from IT Policy, Planning, and Assessment presented two policies that WSU is going to incorporate in the PPM. She is looking for the ARCCs input regarding these policies. This is a great opportunity for us as faculty to provide input in this policy making process. Please review them in the google drive and provide suggestions/changes to Rex before Friday, September 18.
      a. PPM 10-8, Institutional Data Management
      b. PPM 10-10, Institutional Business Communications
   b. ARCC charges for the year 2020 – 2021. We discussed ongoing charges and new charges for the 20-21 year. The LMS statement was moved under section 4, which is the section regarding communications with IT related entities.
   c. Brian Stecklein talked about the challenges of incorporating textbooks into the LMS. There needs to be more time for setup and vetting of different textbook software. He would like feedback on this process from faculty.
   d. ARCC grant scoring rubric. We need to add inclusive language into our scoring rubric. Please go to the google drive and review the rubric and add language that is inclusive. We need to decide on this before we score the proposals.
   e. ARCC and Dee left-over money: ARCC = $75,374 Dee = $23,902 (fall semester round)
   f. ARCC and Dee money for the 20-21 academic year: ARCC = $116,000 Dee = $28,575 (spring semester round)
   g. Because we have left-over monies from last year (ARCC = $75,374 Dee = $23,902) we will do a fall semester round of proposals.
      a. Fall semester proposals are due by Friday, October 23 @ midnight.
b. We need to update the rubric ASAP before the due date.

c. Rex will update the website with the new rubric and due dates.

d. Rex will send the committee an email template regarding the fall semester proposal to all ARCC committee members.

e. We will meet (via Zoom) on Friday, November 6th to vote for the acceptance of the proposals.

Adjourned: 12:15 PM
3. Discussion

h. ARCC and Dee proposals were reviewed and set to a vote.

   a. ARCC proposals: There was a concern with the project entitled: “Using Mursion to Enhance Student Learning Outcomes in Teacher Education, Early Childhood Education, Communication, and Other Departments.” The concern was regarding whether the applicants had done their due diligence regarding the need for IT support and other special IT considerations. It was suggested that the committee approve the proposal under the contingency that the applicant(s) provide IT support documentation. The committee approved this suggestion.

      Linda DuHadway motioned to approve all ARRC proposals and Dan Hubler second the motion. The committee voted, and the vote was unanimous.

   b. Dee proposals: There was a concern with the project entitled; “360-degree virtual reality story telling.” The concern was regarding a line item of “Misc operational costs” totaling $264.87. Since there was no explanation regarding this expense the committee decide to pull this expense form the proposal. This changed the amount from $4,999.99 to $4735.12.

      Dan Hubler motioned to approve all Dee proposals and Linda DuHadway second the motion. The committee voted, and the vote was unanimous.

   c. There was discussion to change the ARCC application to clarify the “diversity” section. There was very little discussion regarding diversity in the submitted proposals. Also, the “Innovation” section in the ARCC rubric needs to be changed to be reworded for clarity. The ARCC and Dee applications need to be changed under the “WSU Online Representative” from Andrea Jensen to RC Callahan. Rex will make
the changes to applications. The committee needs to come to an agreement on how the “Innovation” section of the rubric needs to be changed.

i. There was some discussion regarding the Kaltura survey. Aminda O’Hare created a survey regarding the faculty use of Kaltura. Aminda had to leave to teach so there was no further discussion. The results of this survey was sent to Shelly Belflower.

j. Shelly Belflower suggested that she and Matt Cain be included in the review of the ARCC and Dee proposals for spring semester. She also mentioned that the YuJa software is under review and may be replaced by GoReact. She would like an ARCC committee member to be a part of this evaluation. Rex encouraged committee members to contact Shelly and participate in the process.

k. There was discussion regarding textbook and LMS integration. Brian Stecklein, RC Callahan, and Patrick Thomas discussed the many challenges of this process. They want more involvement from the ARCC in this process. The ARRC will have additional meetings to review the textbook adoption using a white list paper approach. RC Callahan has a worksheet that lists the challenges and lists the proposals. Rex will send the worksheet to the committee members.

l. Lixuan (Grace) Zhang was awarded Dee money last year to attend a conference. Due to Covid she had to attend a virtual conference. She has extra money due to this change. She asked the ARCC if she could use the excess money to attend another virtual conference. There was no objections from committee members.

Adjourn: 12:30 PM
Academic Resources and Computing Committee (ARCC)

01/22/2021 11:00 AM

Present: Abdulmalek Al-Gahmi, Aminda O’Hare, Brian Stecklein, Mahalingam Subbiah, Dan Hubler, Rex Christensen, Hugo Valle, Jamie Weeks, Jessica Greenburg, Linda DuHadway, Lixuan (Grace) Zhang, Ryan Cain, Janice Thomas, Shelly Belflower, RC Callahan, Peter Waite

Next meeting: Friday, April 9 (Time TBT)

Video Link: https://weberstate.box.com/s/08ngkz85hj16kep43l4fwce5uwfo5lfj

Welcome

1. New charges for ARCC based on the following email:

Dec 1, 2020
Hi Rex and Hugo

I was in a meeting the other day with Casey Bullock and Bruce Bowen where we discussed the role that faculty should play in decisions regarding institutional software. Software decisions can often drive policy since it enables some actions and prohibits others so I have advocated for more oversight from faculty senate when the administration makes decisions about important software. Examples of such decisions that are very impactful include the adoption and implementation of Starfish and Banner, among others.

I proposed that the ARCC committee could be a place where issues like this could be brought by people like Bruce and Casey when they are making decisions about software. The path in the past has been to ask a few random faculty members, but I really want the link to faculty senate to be present for both representation and communication reasons.

So, would the ARCC be willing to take an active role in processes like this where administration is considering adopting software related to all kinds of different administrative issues that directly affect faculty and students? It is a bit different than the “Academic Computing” part of the ARCC mission, but I feel like it is still relevant.

The other question is would the ARCC committee or a subset of ARCC be willing to be available to weigh in on issues in the summer as they arise?

Anyway, we don’t have to decide this immediately, but I’d like to hear more about your thoughts on these ideas.

Tim Herzog (Faculty Senate Chair)

Discussion:
Try it out for a year and see how it works. If the demand continues to increase we may have to spin it off to another committee (maybe a sub-committee of the ARCC). ARCC serves as a liaison to communicate to faculty about software purchase, changes, upgrades, etc. Training in specific areas that are not within our skill set. Provide feedback as to how it affects teaching. Administration is asking for help from faculty to help prioritize software needs and provide input. Understanding the process of how new software is implemented so expectations are realistic.

2. Scoring rubric to evaluate LTI (RC Callahan)

Discussion:
Understanding the process of how new software is implemented so expectations are realistic. The ARCC would communicate the results to the faculty in their respective colleges. RC said they are looking at “feature based” connections/integrations LTI requests (small group of faculty). Funding issues? Who pays for it? The student, or the department? What are the concerns? What are the advantages/disadvantages of dealing directly with people requesting the LTI rather than going through the ARCC? Tim wants more faculty input by going through the ARCC. They need help telling people yes/no and they need support from ARCC to doing this. It is important that we have specific deadlines for the application process and communicate that to the faculty.

Feedback to RC: Develop a process with timelines using the rubric that we can communicate to the faculty in our respective colleges.

3. Faculty dashboard changes (Peter Waite/Linda DuHadway)

Peter:
Migrating from Banner 8 to Banner 9. One of the last areas in the migration is the faculty dashboard. They are making changes to screens such as: class role, teaching schedule, input final grades, etc. Looking for faculty input to these changes. Linda DuHadway provided feedback on the new screens. They will be providing training on the new changes. Changes should begin the middle of summer semester.

4. F/U on canvas integrations/textbooks (Brian Stecklein)

Brian met with the bookstore. When do book orders have to be in? There will be an ad hoc committee for the bookstore.

Action item: Creating a process for book adoption early before the semester begins.

Deadline for the ARCC and Dee

5. ARCC and Dee proposals and deadlines

Discussion:
The Provost has agreed to roll over the residual funds from the ARCC and Dee budget to this year’s budget.
Friday, April 2nd will be the ARCC and Dee proposal deadline. The ARCC will vote on the proposals on Friday, April 9th. Rex will send out a template for the ARCC members to use to email to the faculty in their college.

6. ARCC website changes?

Rex will change the dates on the website. Also, change the application errors on the website.

List when the funds will be released. Put on the website that we have additional funds.

Adjourn: 10:40 AM
Academic Resources and Computing Committee (ARCC)

04/09/2021 11:00 AM

Present: Abdulmalek Al-Gahmi, Aminda O’Hare, Brian Stecklein, Mahalingam Subbiah, Dan Hubler, Rex Christensen, Hugo Valle, Jessica Greenburg, Linda DuHadway, Lixuan (Grace) Zhang, Ryan Cain, Janice Thomas, Shelly Belflower, RC Callahan, Mike Fowles

Welcome - Rex

7. CTC needs a faculty member representative from ARCC. The ARCC faculty member will attend the monthly CTC general meeting and CTC board meeting.
   **Action Item:** Rex asked for a volunteer from the ARCC members.

8. Third Party integrations in Canvas (RC Callahan & Mike Fowles)

   Mike Fowles discussed the new process and rubric for third party integration into Canvas. This is a follow-up assignment to RC Callahan from our previous meeting. The process and rubric was well received by the ARCC members. The following email template was provided to ARCC members to distribute to their respective colleges.

   ******

   WSU Online is working on a process to ensure that product integrations in Canvas are accessible, secure, supported, and FERPA compliant

   Towards this effort, they have developed a Canvas Integration Request Form which will soon be available on their website. This request form will ask a few basic questions about the integration you are looking to use in your Canvas course and includes a link to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and a Scoring Rubric.

   The MOU will need to be signed for new integrations and includes several University policies that are relevant to Canvas integrations.

   The scoring rubric will be filled out by WSU Online based on documentation provided by the integration’s vendor and is meant to guide next steps. In some cases, Purchasing or the Wildcat Bookstore will need to be involved before the integration is enabled.

   For tools not currently in Canvas courses, the request form needs to be submitted 4-6 weeks prior to the start of the semester. Integrations that are already listed under the "Apps" tab in Canvas, or that other
faculty members are using, only need to be requested 1-2 weeks out from the start of the semester.

Questions about this process can be directed to LMSadmin@weber.edu.

******

**Action Item:**

ARCC members email your faculty in your respective colleges using this template.

9. **ARCC and Dee Proposals**

All ARCC and Dee proposals were approved. Please see the ARCC Google drive for proposal amounts and residual funds from each account.

The following proposals had stipulations to their approval:

a. Jim Hutchins, (ARCC Proposal) “Canvas Integration of EdPuzzle Software” - The ARCC board did not approve institutional licensure for this proposal. The ARCC board does not know the unanticipated administrative costs for this software integration with Canvas. Therefore, the funds can be used for the EdPuzzle software as long as it does not utilize the integration with Canvas.

b. Frances McConaughy, (ARCC Proposal) “Portable Dental Manikins for OSCE and Zoom/Internet Instruction” The ARCC board did not award the full amount because there were no matching funds from her department or college. The ARCC board did not approve the previous purchase of the dental manikins as matching funds for this proposal.

10. **Suggestions for improvements in the application process.**

**Action Items:**

a. Clearer instructions on the proposal application forms.

b. Deadlines for specific people on the application: chair, dean IT, etc.

c. Update the Dee scoring excel spreadsheet with correct formulas (this has been added to the Google drive).

Adjourn: 12:15 PM