

Faculty Senate IT Use Committee
Thursday, January 28, 2016
2:00 – 3:00
Zimmerman Library, Herzstein Reading Room

Present: Elisha Allen, Aaron Baca, Stephen Burd, Deborah Fort, Aeron Haynie, Brian Mackie-Mason, David Sanchez, Peter Vorobieff, Jonathan Wheeler

Agenda:

1. Greetings and announcements.
2. Approval of 12-03-2015 minutes.
 - a. A recap of previous discussion about the upcoming faculty IT survey was provided for Campus IT representatives in attendance.
 - b. Minutes will be redistributed for approval via email.
3. Campus IT Updates
 - a. Wireless:
 - i. Wireless infrastructure has been upgraded for Dane Smith Hall, Mitchell Hall, and the College of Education building. IT is considering upgrades to the Ortega building as well.
 - ii. Individual classrooms were also upgraded, including 101 Clark Hall and an AV refresh in 101 Woodward Hall. An upgrade is pending for Bandelier 105 which should be completed by summer term.
 - iii. Some changes have impacted instruction due to software availability and hardware support.
 - b. IT Security Day will be February 10-11 in the SUB atrium.
 - c. Lobo Brain Bars (student IT support) will be available from locations in Dane Smith Hall and the bookstore.
 - d. LEARN has been recently updated. Upgrade to the October 2015 release of Blackboard is planned for May.
 - i. Blackboard has a new CEO – feature enhancements currently only available to their hosted instances may become available to self-hosting institutions like UNM.
 - e. Blackboard alternatives are being informally considered. A more formal investigation would not begin until summer 2016 at the earliest.
4. EvaluationKIT update
 - a. Response rates and ways of improving them
 - i. Response rates vary by college and within departments. The response rate during the final year of IDEA was roughly 69%, which is the benchmark for EvaluationKIT. Actual response rates have been lower.
 - ii. Improving response rates is a matter of motivating instructors as well as students.
 - iii. How do instructors communicate the importance of the evaluations to students? What incentives do they use?

1. A future faculty IT survey may provide an opportunity to investigate how faculty communicate about/encourage students to complete evaluations.
 - iv. Additional discussion touched on issues of how best to include student evaluations within the instructor evaluation process, and the variation in response rates due to differing approaches to evaluation and communication across departments.
 - b. Pending plans to enable faculty-added questions
 - i. Feature to enable instructors to add custom questions will be available this spring.
 1. Training resources will be available online.
 2. Campus IT and Academic Technologies will be interested in knowing how many instructors use the feature, as well as what kinds of problems they run into.
 - c. Designated faculty advisor(s) to IT on this project?
 - i. The EvaluationKIT steering committee has nearly completed its work. Looking forward, what role is there for a committee to provide information and feedback to Academic Technologies and/or Campus IT? A new, standing committee may be created, or could the role be fulfilled by the ITUC or the Teaching Enhancement Committee?
5. Committee activity
 - a. Data governance policy
 - i. Draft not currently submitted for approval
 1. Lacking new information on the policy, we consider it tabled for now.
 - b. Email policy