

Academic Technology and Online Education Committee Minutes

December 11, 2012

HUB 109

3:30-5:00

Present: Christian Roberson (Chair), Marylynn Cote, Hridaya Hall, Jong-Yoon Kim, Meagan Shedd, David Zehr

Unable to attend: Cheryl Baker, Daniel Bramer, Denise Burchsted, Pam Childs, Zach Dziura, Rich Grossman, Kristine Levan, Liesl Lindley, Scott Robison, Eun-Ho Yeo

Scribe: Christian Roberson

Acceptance of October 2012 minutes

Discussion: Clickers and PSU Policy

Christian asked Justin to provide some background on the clicker item brought by LTOE. Justin talked about the history of clickers and equipment on campus. A professor wanted to have students buy clickers, but the administration didn't want the students to purchase them. JoAnn pointed out each clicker costs between 40 and 50 dollars. Justin pointed out some other required expenses like Netflix accounts, cameras, accounts for software, etc. LTOE is looking for help with some sort of policy related to these items. David pointed out that this seems like a mixed message where technology should be used in the classroom, but at the same time it is discouraged if there is a cost associated with it. Nancy commented on a NEASC conference session that she attended where clickers were used. The value of the instruction and discussion was the driving factor. We have more sets now, but they cost about \$1,200 for a 30 seat set. There is additional issue of clickers being taken by students and replacement costs. Justin said there is definitely value added by these. Jong-Yoon asked if there are apps available. Jo-Ann pointed out Turning Point does provide one, but the cost for a site-license would be quite high for PSU. Justin asked should we be shifting costs to the students to support these technologies? On the flip side Jo-Ann points out that if the student owns a clicker, they can use it in any class. Hridaya asked what percentage of classes use clickers. Justin mentioned about a dozen faculty use it regularly at present. Justin also asked the question about what happens if PSU adopts one and faculty want to use different ones? Nancy asked about rentals but Justin mentioned previously rentals were not an option allowed to be considered. Marylynn had some concern about buying something like a clicker versus something like a Netflix account. Meagan talked about potential low-tech alternatives and how from her perspective how it is the difference between a tool and the content. Does requiring a clicker prevent a student who forgets it from participating effectively in the class? Justin cited the provost's prior edict and asked if this should still be enforced. Hridaya mentioned that in some graduate programs a camera is required and this was justified and put in the course description. Nancy feels that perhaps a case could be made that if a course had no textbook but wanted a clicker as an integral part of the course's design that it would be ok. Jo-Ann points out that faculty wanting to adopt or purchase a technology there is a point to have a conversation with ITS. David wonders if it would make sense to have a conversation with Julie regarding an update to this prior decision. Pam asked if certain faculty or departments wanted them could they purchase. Jo-Ann pointed out that most departments don't have the funds for this type of purchase. Perhaps LTOE should encourage faculty in these situations to run these types of fees/costs up the academic chain through the dean to the provost's office.

Discussion: Turnitin Pilot Program

David provided from context for the original Turnitin pilot from 2006. There was a poll and there was a split of opinion. At the time the decision was to not pursue it. What is driving the need? Justin pointed out that one big concern is that previously the software would keep a copy of all the submissions in their repository, but this is now an option rather than required. Justin mentioned a new grammar check feature in the software. Justin provided some information about the graduate studies desire to use it and purchase a CoGS-only copy. Jo-Ann mentioned that there is some interest in system-level purchase which could cut down the cost. Scott has been trying to get one adopted here on campus. Nancy asked about the pilot so far. LTOE would like to have a campus-wide forum over the next six months. Hridaya recalled some level of granularity for the repository. Justin pointed out some concern over the user agreement. Meagan asked if there was any concern about the length of time to scan the document. There is a delay in the report time. Jo-Ann points out how this could help with fixing grammar. Meagan asked if the writing center has been involved in discussions about the pilot. Hridaya does feel it can be helpful. Jo-Ann also talks about the potential for basic support for online students who don't have regular access to the writing center. Justin also pointed out a concern from English faculty about the correctness of the grammar tool. Meagan asked if there is any empirical evidence to support that it is doing a good job. Meagan would also like to see us address the concerns and provide some evidence if we are doing to adopt this technology. David talked about machine and automated tools and previous discussions with Elliot and how tools really are just one way to assess these skills. This is a tool and it can be used for good or bad. There is also an interest in peer marking. Meagan would like to know more information about how many and which faculty are using which pieces of the tool. Christian raised the concern about students knowing or having a choice in their work going into the repository.

Next meeting: February 12, 2013, 3:30, HUB 123

Meeting adjourned at 4:45