



University Technology Fee Advisory Board
Agenda – April 11, 2017 / 4:00PM
Library Room 203

2016-2017 Officers:

Adam Lynch, Chair

Blaire MacNeill, Vice Chair

Krissy Wegen, Secretary

Attendance: Adam Lynch, Chair, CNS; Casey Franklin, WCNR; Nicole Ramo, GSC; Chris Schaumbert, GSC; Cody Hernandez, ULC; Edgar Cedillo, ULC; Blaire MacNeill, Vice Chair, CVMBS; McKenzie Fulcer, CVMBS; Krissy Wegen, Secretary, ASCSU; Pat Burns, VPIT, Advisor; Scott Baily, ACNS; Jason Huitt, ACNS

- I. Call to Order & Introductions
- II. Approval of Minutes from March 28, 2017 Meeting
Approval of Minutes from April 4, 2017 Meeting
 - a. Both minutes approved by unanimous consent
- III. Presentations
 - a. Online Course Survey Supplemental Request (\$20,000)
 - i. Gwen Gorzelsky, Executive Director, TILT
 - ii. Matt Hickey, Professor, Dept. of Health and Exercise Science
 1. History
 - a. Student course section survey begun a number of years ago, at the specific request of ASCSU
 - b. ASCSU contributed to funding for over a decade
 - c. Paper forms
 - i. VERY labor-intensive to administer
 - ii. Very labor-intensive post-process
 - iii. Cause delay in reporting
 - d. Increasingly, comments from students: “Why isn’t this online?”
 2. CSU Course Survey Improvement Goals
 - a. Appropriate use:
 - i. Student feedback helps instructors to revise course design, instructional materials, and teaching approaches
 - ii. Students learn how peers see the learning environment created by specific a instructor in a particular course using an accessible tool
 - b. Expert design for intended uses
 - i. Questions suited to intended purpose; feedback aimed at improving the learning environment
 - c. Design based on feedback from all stakeholder groups

- d. Contributes to a culture of continuous improvement in learning and teaching
- e. Green survey: digital delivery
- 3. CSU Initiative
 - a. Institutional aim: excellence in teaching and learning
 - b. Task force on teaching effectiveness (TILT & UDTs)
 - i. Year-long process: analyzed existing research on diverse approaches
 - c. Student course survey redesign (CoTL)
 - i. Year-long process: Aim is to beta test this summer, most likely will be next fall – prime time will be spring 2018
 - ii. Want to suit the surveys to the school/college specific
 - iii. Analysis of research on student evaluation of teaching
 - iv. Analysis of statistical use (and misuse) of data
 - v. Continual input from CoTL & ASCSU
 - vi. Charge from FC:
 - 1. Phase 1: common “core” questions
 - 2. Phase 2: adaptable database of context-specific questions
- 4. Course Survey Shift in focus: from assessing instructor to improving the learning environment
 - a. Questions designed to obtain crucial perspectives available only from student feedback
 - i. EX: did this learning environment provide consistent and useful feedback to get a sense of my behaviors and if there is need for improvement?
 - b. Questions tailored to help instructors improve course design, instructional materials, and teaching approaches
 - i. EX: Was the course designed more for understanding rather than memorizing?
 - c. Questions designed to encourage formative rather than summative uses of survey responses
 - i. EX: how effectively did the instructor construct the sequence of assignments?
 - d. Intent to administer selectively, with faculty participation, multiple times during the semester, to improve the learning environment
- 5. In search of a platform: The Process
 - a. Review several tools used internally
 - b. Followed email threats on the EDUCAUSE CIO listserv
 - c. Reviewed tools used by peer institutions
 - d. Narrowed down to two products

- i. WEFIS (New company, Unizin)
 - ii. Qualtrics (established, used widely at CSU)
- 6. AEFIS vs. Qualtrics
 - a. AEIFS as a company in general is better
 - b. Qualtrics as a tools, reporting, data, cost – overall much better
 - i. Cost is about 25K lower than AEFIS
- 7. Usage
 - a. About 220,000 course surveys submitted per year
 - b. Submitted by > 70% of CSU course sections
 - c. Used in every T&P documents
 - i. Used in every annual review – by every faculty member
 - d. Goal for a revised course survey is to work with ASCSU is to increase student access – ASCSU’s Director of Academics will work closely with them
- 8. Budget Proposal
 - a. UTFAB funding request
 - i. \$15K/yr. licensing for FY18
 - ii. \$5K one-time implementation and configuration
 - iii. Total UTFAB funding request: \$20K total
- 9. UTFAB Funding Criteria
 - a. Follows all required criteria that is outside of UTFAB decisions
 - b. Co-sponsorship from ASCSU and other administrative sponsorship
 - c. Found the most cost-effective solution

Q&A

Question: what program is the 220,00 course surveys? *Answer:* that is the paper surveys. We have a room full of old surveys.

Question: it’s \$20K not \$30K right? *Answer:* correct.

Question: do you know how you are going to get students to fill out the surveys? *Answer:* we would like to make sure the survey can be completed on any device, that way we can continue what professors do right now and have them do it in class.

Question: is it ethical to have students do it while the professor is there? *Answer:* the professor could step out and have a student get them when they are done.

Question: assuming central funding doesn’t provide, what’s the plan? *Answer:* come back to UTFAB.

Question: what are the other funding sources funding if we cover this \$20K. *Answer:* there are a lot of other factors needed to fund this, it’s going to take central IT \$50K of staff funding to complete this.

Question: what is the status of questions? *Answer:* we have a database of several hundreds questions right now, but we’re thinking it’ll be 10-20 questions.

Question: on the paper surveys that we have right now, there is the option to remain anonymous, will that be continue with the online? *Answer:* yes, it will all be anonymous.

Question: But it does tie into your student account? *Answer:* a staff member in ACNS will/could get access to the EID of a student, but that is not going to happen with out a subpoena.

Question: what if a student does poorly? Or a different student demographic answers similarly? *Answer:* it's important, we won't know the individual but we could track patterns to demographics.

Question: do you know what the total cost of the project will be? *Answer:* we don't know exactly, we're thinking it's over \$100K.

Question: do we know how it's going to be brought out to the student body? *Answer:* our rollout committee will most likely take care of that. (RamWeb or Canvas) – collaborative with those platforms, and then emphasized with the instructors to have it in their syllabus.

IV. Old Business

- a. Legitimacy Votes
 - i. Online Course Survey Supplemental
 - 1. Online Course Survey Supplemental proposal voted as legitimate
- b. Bylaws Amendments – Final Vote (2/3rds majority required)
 - i. Bylaws Amendments revision passed unanimously
- c. Final Votes on Supplemental Proposals
 - i. CS130/425 \$13,631
 - ii. BSB 457/459 \$22,600
 - iii. Online Course Surveys \$30,000
 - iv. CSS Supplemental (Mics) \$ 8,750
 - v. Scott 101 & 231 Lecture Cap \$ 4,025

V. New Business

- a. PSFAC Update (Pat), Daniella - ASCSU
 - i. Switch discussion that it will continue to come up next year
 - ii. Feedback from all the fee areas for what worked and what didn't work

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday April 18, 2017 @ 4:00PM, Library Room 203

- a. Supplemental Proposals Final Votes
- b. FY18 Fee Package Discussion and Final Vote
- c. 2017-2018 Officer Elections

VII. Adjourn

Spring 2017 Upcoming Meetings (4PM Tuesdays, Library 203):

4-11 – Course Surveys Supplemental / Bylaws Amendments

4-18 – Final Votes / Officer Elections

4-25 - End of Year Celebration