

---

# **ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**Preliminary Report**

**May 2008**

# ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

## PRELIMINARY REPORT

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Academic Technology Needs Assessment questionnaire.....	3
Number of survey responses.....	3
Summary of survey findings, by question.....	4
Faculty focus groups.....	9
Focus groups discussion themes.....	9
Next steps.....	10
Appendix A: Academic Technology Needs Assessment questionnaire.....	11
Appendix B: Questionnaire complete results [available from Library Administration]	
Appendix C: Faculty focus groups discussion themes.....	14
Appendix D: Benchmark campuses academic technology services [available from Library Administration]	
Appendix E: Excerpts from program reviews and discipline technology needs [available from Library Administration]	

## **BACKGROUND**

In late 2007, the Provost suggested to the Academic Council that a case be made to address concerns about inadequacies in academic technology at Sonoma State. It was proposed that the library might shepherd a process for assessing these expressed needs by gathering perspectives from the academic side. This preliminary report seeks to convey a “sense” of the issues related to technology in teaching, learning and research success.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Beginning in the spring 2008 semester, a project was initiated to gather the perspectives of faculty regarding academic technology needs using focus groups and a web-based survey. The focus groups were scheduled as a parallel process rather than a follow-up to the survey. The information gathering process could be described as a “best attempt” in a short time frame to understand major concerns and experiences of the faculty related to academic technology – that is, to ascertain the magnitude and consistency of issues. This should not be interpreted as a scientific approach, but rather an anecdotal compilation based largely on feedback from faculty who have an investment in technology.

## **ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

A web-based questionnaire, modeled on a number of assessment surveys used at other institutions, was developed using Snap Pro software. An online approach was considered to be the most effective method for reaching as many faculty as possible as well as others identified by the school deans. The survey was open during a two week period, April 4 through April 18, 2008. It was announced to faculty by the provost using the faculty email distribution list and by the school deans as a redistributed email announcement. Several reminders were sent during the two week open period. *Note: the terms questionnaire and survey are used interchangeably in this report.*

The survey consisted of 10 questions intended to be easy and quick to answer. Questions 1 through 6 addressed specifics of academic technology infrastructure, support, and training using check boxes for responses and an open comment query at the end of each question. Open comments were solicited for Questions 7 – 9. The last question consisted of a pull-down list of School affiliation.

See Appendix A for the Academic Technology Needs Assessment survey questions.

## **NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONSES**

138 surveys were completed with a total of 417 open text comments provided for questions 1 through 9 of the survey. Respondent affiliation (question 10) was reported as follows:

School of Arts and Humanities	32
School of Social Sciences	27
School of Science and Technology	24
School of Education	19
School of Business and Economics	16
University Library	7
School of Extended Education	3
Unaffiliated	11
TOTAL survey respondents	138

As a footnote, there appeared to be a formatting issue for some respondents in the questionnaire display at the user’s end. Because it is a web-based instrument, the display was dependent on the user’s local web browser settings and in some cases, required the browser to

be reset to display properly. If this was not understood, the survey format may have been difficult to navigate.

Appendix B, attached in a separate document because of length, provides complete survey results with check boxes ranked by number of responses and open text comments reported for each question.

## **SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS**

All open text responses (417 total) were coded by theme. For each question, significant themes based on multiple repetitive comments are identified. The following section summarizes significant themes in order of greatest responses with representative comments. Complete responses can be found in Appendix B.

### **Q1**

#### **How would you describe your use of technology in teaching, in or outside of the classroom? (34 responses)**

Course Enrichment: Uses technology to support or enhance teaching of course content (32%)

*The visuals for my course are online. I require students to be present in class, so do not put my lectures on line. The visuals are complete and in order for students to study anywhere, anytime, and to establish group efforts to master the visual material.*

Course Content: Uses technology to communicate course content (29%)

*Provide access to material (hand-outs, quizzes, texts, questionnaires, etc. that otherwise would cost my department a lot money in photocopying.*

Research: Uses technology for research purposes (personally or on behalf of students) (9%)

*I have research projects that entirely use Web data bases.*

### **Q2**

#### **What do you perceive or experience as barriers to the use of academic technology in your teaching? (38 responses)**

Inadequate Support: Level or prioritization of technology support at SSU is perceived as a barrier (29%)

*Overall I find that IT is not focus on the mission of the University rather the mission of A and F. The priorities are in the wrong domain. In meetings with IT folks oftentimes I feel like Academics are a nuisance rather than core mission.*

Inadequate Smart Classrooms: Access to or configuration of current smart classrooms at SSU is perceived as a barrier (24%)

*I have great difficulty securing needed technology in my class. For example, I teach in a classroom that has a piano but is not "smart." It doesn't even have a clock! I ordered a computer from multimedia services and didn't have Internet access. It also rejected my login. Not having access to a smart classroom is a source of frustration for me and my students and limits my effectiveness as a teacher.*

Inadequate Equipment: Current computing offerings or lack of access to necessary equipment is perceived as a barrier (13%)

*Network access or the Mac in Stev. 1002 is so slow that my attempts to show instructional youtube videos have resembled low-resolution slide shows. I now download the videos in advance and play them on my personal laptop. I pay for my own server to get around space limits and copyright concerns. The emac in my office is so slow and dogged by a malfunctioning Macafee virus system which I am not authorized to disable that I now just plug its ethernet cable into my laptop. I no longer even turn the emac on. I find no way to send sound output from my laptop to the speakers in Stev. 1002, so I bring in my own amplified speakers.*

Lack of Time: Lack of time for training or self-discovery with new technology is perceived as a barrier (13%)

*I believe the first option here is misleading. I do not find the amount of time it takes to learn about technology to be a barrier. The barrier is the lack of time I have to devote to learning new ANYTHING given my teaching and service load.*

### Q3

**Imagine a classroom that is ideal, from a technological standpoint, for your teaching. Which of the following would this ideal classroom contain? (24 responses)**

Classroom Control: Classrooms would include technologies that would allow the instructor to manage student computer/network usage and learning environment (29%)

*Some classes need to be in a "computer classroom" with workstations w. network access for the full semester. For others, I would love the ability to eliminate wireless or network access. It is an ongoing battle to monitor inappropriate student use of computers due to wireless access. In large courses, I have even experimented with banning computer use entirely.*

New Technology: Classrooms would contain specific technologies not currently available at SSU (17%)

*A low-tech request, now used at SDSU - an ELMO OBJECT presenter. Can show small objects, documents, pages from book*

### Q4

**If you use WebCT, do you use it for . . . ? If not, why not? (38 responses)**

Uses Other Technology: Respondent uses other technologies or no technology to manage their class (39%)

*More comfortable designing and customizing my content with standard HTML; I also like to be able to share materials outside of SSU.*

Concerns About Stability: Respondent indicates lack of faith in WebCT's stability or ability to work properly (18%)

*So many of my students have had trouble with accessing WebCt this semester that I am not going to use it next fall. One of the problems seems to be browser issues, but there have been other problems too. I ended up having to send things out through e-mail and*

*changing assignments after receiving tons of calls and e-mails. It hasn't been worth the hassle this term. I didn't have as many problems with WebCt before but I have also tried to make much more use of it this term. That is a summary of my experience with technology at SSU. I can get by if I only use technology at a minimum level.*

Lack of Time: Respondent indicates lack of time for training in the use of WebCT (13%)

*the learning curve is steep--I tried this semester but did not have time to learn the system.*

## **Q5**

**If you had a block of time to set aside to learn about academic technology, what topics would you most like to learn about? (22 responses)**

Specific Applications: Would like to learn about specific technologies/applications. (41%)

*Online submission of papers (outside of web CT, if possible) and automated plagiarism scanning against both web sources and locally archived papers*

Training: Would like more training opportunities. (18%)

*In administrative roles (chair) I have found that I am expected to know how to use EXCEL, yet there has never been any training on how to use it. I don't think it is a particularly intuitive program and training would help with this.*

New Technologies: Would like to learn about new technologies or applications (14%)

*Surveys of digital image databases to determine where images can be found easily beyond ArtSTOR. We need a comprehensive campus digital image base by discipline.*

## **Q6**

**What method works best for you to learn about new technology? (14 responses)**

Select comments:

*Experimenting on my own at my work and home computers, after a basic workshop/consultation. I sometimes need to figure out how to work the technology so that I can use visual accessibility aids, to compensate for my own visual issues. Sometimes something as simple as enlarging font is apparently impossible (case in point, PeopleSoft) and that is very frustrating. So it would be helpful to have a techie who could help when I cannot fix these technical issues on my own (e.g., WebCT 4 screens were sometimes really hard to read when I enlarged the font sufficiently to see it without eyestrain. Hopefully will have better experience with WebCT 6)*

*Working groups to support each other. Like the transforming course design group*

*We need an Academic IT expert (or more than one--each school needs its own) to troubleshoot and help with new technology. It is a crisis area at SSU.*

*I just need a lot of hand-holding and idiot proof steps, along with clear, non-cluttered, documentation.*

## Q7

**Please describe academic technology needs specific to your field of study as you perceive them. (75 responses)**

Basic Computing: Needs expressed relate to commonly available and/or baseline technology (53%)

*I am not sure that my field's requirements are different from others. We need technology for: in-class presentation, including visuals and sound; playing videos in a variety of formats, including online; occasionally projecting objects such as casts of fossils; individual student response systems (quizzes, votes, tallying outcomes of in-class exercises, etc.) in class would be great.*

Specialized Software: Needs expressed relate to discipline-specific software (19%)

*Transcription systems for making and analyzing linguistic audiovisual recordings. E.g. ELAN, and sound spectrogram software.*

## Q8

**What do you think the highest priorities should be for academic technology at SSU? (95 responses)**

Update technology: Need to provide up-to-date computing resources, software, or teaching environments (58%)

*Need for full-time IT educational specialist (remember Jay Field?) to act as liaison between individual faculty, academic depts, IT and Brett Christie's office. More basic software available beyond MS Office (eg Dreamweaver, Adobe product line, FileMaker, etc.); funding for specialized academic applications to support faculty and student research; mobile technologies; upgrade of infrastructure to support online work (web mail) large bandwidth (streaming); more reasonable refreshment cycle for hardware and software (it's been over 5 yrs since my laptop has been refreshed, come on!); more smart classrooms (our classroom renovation budget is pitifully inadequate).*

Better Support: Need to provide better technical, training or fiscal support for instructors (28%)

*Support for faculty--by support I mean there are enough IT people employed by SSU to help faculty use technology. There is funding available to provide incentives for faculty to learn new technology. There is equipment that works. Support for students--students should have easy access to help with tech. problems. There should be ongoing, numerous "how-to" workshops available for students who come to campus in the afternoons and on weekends.*

## Q9

**Do you have further comments, including your level of satisfaction, regarding academic technology at SSU? (77 responses)**

Select comments:

*From an institutional perspective, it seems that the "business" side of the house typically has sufficient money to have current technology, and the academic side is left sorely wanting. If a comparable amount of resources had been/would be allocated to*

*academics as has been allocated to PeopleSoft/CMS (including both initial implementation and ongoing use/support), then we would see evidence that the CSU and SSU value pedagogy.*

*As one student asked last night, why aren't seminar rooms provided with smart technology? And are all of our freshmen given instruction in, for example, how to search library databases? (In an ideal world, college-bound students would already know this.) As with some other sectors on campus, it often seems as if information technology has too many administrators and not enough enablers (foot soldiers?)*

*I teach completely online and when things are working it is awesome, when the server breaks and there are not the resources to rectify this in a timely manner, it is very unprofessional and sends a negative message to the students.*

*There seems to be no alignment between resources and academic mission when it comes to technology. Current focus is disproportionately on network infrastructure, security and other non-instructional issues.*

*I am extremely dissatisfied. I am a very hard working teacher and truly concerned with providing a top notch educational experience for our students. I feel completely unsupported in the area of academic technology and continually disappointed in the misalignment of our financial resources with our educational mission.*

*As a new faculty I have been very disappointed in the technology in classrooms and the support of one person (who is wonderful but only one!) to come and help. I arrive to class an hour ahead of time, if I can get in, to start the computer! The equipment is not only slow but not available in most classrooms. I believe SSU is quite behind the rest of the other CSU system including the smaller ones such as HSU and Chico.*

*In the past 5-7 years, academic technology has had little if any support. I have not been satisfied with SSU in this regard in comparison with other CSU campuses of similar size. At CSU professional meetings, at times, this has been a source of professional embarrassment.*

## **FACULTY FOCUS GROUPS**

As a supplement to the questionnaire, discussions were held with a small number of faculty from each School over the course of several months. Faculty attended at the suggestion of the school deans and were joined by a few additional faculty who learned of the meetings and wished to participate. All schools were represented although not at an equal level. The total number of faculty was approximately 36.

Because the groups were small, conversations were informal and tended to reflect personal experience. Discussions were candid and typically focused on a single issue or a few major themes, colored largely and predictably by the disciplines represented. The library acted as scribe, collecting commentary that was prompted, or at least, initiated by a list of questions distributed in advance.

Comments from these meetings are consolidated in Appendix C, coded by general theme. The themes correlate closely with the comments expressed in the survey.

## **FOCUS GROUPS DISCUSSION THEMES**

The themes that surfaced as major concerns in the focus group discussions revolved around infrastructure, technical support, and training or professional development. There were a number of comments about organizational structure, service models, and planning but the focus was primarily on immediate baseline needs.

The gap between expectations of what IT should provide for the academic mission and the reality of daily experience was articulated by many. Several faculty observed a decline in the past ten years in provision of technology. All participants noted inadequate funding exists to address the issues perceived.

Specific concerns centered on the insufficient number of smart classrooms, outmoded classroom configuration, and scheduling challenges. Other infrastructure issues had to do with network slowness, server space limitations, inadequate level of technical support as needed, including after hours support, and a slow workstation refresh program. Observations about the need for timely communication and a better understanding of who might help with technology issues were widely shared.

A number of comments addressed issues directly related to the viability of academic programs such as distance course delivery, grants sign-off, convoluted or inflexible PeopleSoft processes, and specific needs for technology-dependent disciplines.

Appreciation for the limitations of lean staffing in support services was expressed with the recognition that staff may be doing the best they can.

Several observations were made about the need for high-level academic technology planning in a consistent, proactive approach if the academic program at SSU is to move forward. This included strong concerns about the inability to keep up or be competitive with progress in academic fields. A number of faculty described program reviews that called out weaknesses based on inadequate technology infrastructure. There was general consensus that educating students for the digital age requires programs and faculty to be up-to-speed with technology applications in teaching and learning.

Faculty focus group comments can be found in Appendix C.

## **OBSERVATIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

### **Priorities**

- Develop an academic technology plan
- Create an Academic Technology Council to address issues broadly

### **Some issues to address**

- Planning
- Leadership
- Organizational fragmentation
- Resource allocation
- Communication and outreach
- Management of expectations
- Service models
- Training vs professional development

This assessment exercise revealed an enormous gap between faculty expectations for an adequate technology baseline to support academic success and the reality of the current infrastructure and service delivery at Sonoma State. The gap may suggest a growing confidence issue that could impact faculty and student recruitment and retention. With technology in teaching and learning evolving rapidly everywhere, there is a clear need to examine priorities for academic planning and resource alignment. As with most surveys, more questions were raised than answered, providing plenty of opportunities for follow-up analysis.

Submitted by Barbara Butler with the assistance of Brandon Dudley, University Library  
May 18, 2008

**Appendix A:****Academic Technology Needs Assessment questionnaire with number of responses by question**

(Note: survey introduction is at the end of this tabulation)

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How would you describe your use of technology in teaching, in or outside of the classroom? (check all that apply)</b>	
	I do not use technology in teaching	6
	Create course webpage	66
	Use WebCT	73
	Keep students informed electronically (eg., email, class list email)	115
	Use data projectors to display screen contents in class	106
	Provide access to online resources (eg., links to websites, PowerPoint presentations, lecture notes, readings)	116
	Use presentation software (eg., PowerPoint)	96
	Promote student discussion (eg., online discussion board)	43
	Classroom response system (eg., clickers)	17
	Provide skill building exercises (eg., online quizzes)	33
	Help students work collaboratively (eg., blogs, online chat, class wiki)	35
	Reach new students who can't come to campus (eg., distance or remote learning)	32
	Create video or audio files for use on the web (eg., streaming video/audio)	33
	Offer my course completely online	11
	Other (please specify)	34

<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you perceive or experience as barriers to the use of academic technology in your teaching? (check all that apply)</b>	
	Amount of time required to learn about technology	65
	Amount of time required to use technology for teaching	55
	Network/internet connection slowness or downtime	69
	Server file space limitations	38
	Technical problems with your office and/or lab computer	63
	Lack of current hardware and/or software	76
	Classroom projection problems	66
	Inadequate technical support	72
	Lack of access to technology-enhanced classrooms or labs	77
	Smart classroom configuration limitations	60
	Inadequate student access to technology	26
	Lack of after-hours support	48
	Lack of money to fund initial course development costs	77
	Lack of necessary technical skills	60
	Lack of teaching skills specific to a technology-enhanced environment	33
	Lack of models/examples of effective uses of technology	42
	Lack of incentives (eg., formal recognition in RTP of academic technology use)	46
	Doubts about technology's usefulness in teaching your courses	20
	Uncertainty about how to get started	18
	Disciplinary content unsuited to delivery via technology	17
	Student resistance to technology	20
	Difficulty keeping up with changes in technology	36
	Other (please specify)	38

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Imagine a classroom that is ideal, from a technological standpoint, for your teaching. Which of the following would this ideal classroom contain? (check all that apply)</b>	
	Network access for instructors	116
	Network access for students	82
	Wireless network access	96
	Computers for instructors	117
	Computers for students	74
	Expanded software offerings	69
	Flexibility of classroom furniture and room configuration	107
	Amplification system	66
	Digital projector	115
	Student response/voting system ('clickers')	55
	Document projection camera	77
	Ability to record the class for distribution (eg., podcasts/vodcasts)	47
	Other (please specify)	24

<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you use WebCT, do you use it for...(check all that apply)</b>	
	Class management (eg., manage grades, email)	57
	Syllabus	66
	Course discussion (eg., discussion boards)	43
	Web links	53
	Course content (eg., assigned reading, exercises)	63
	Assessment (eg., quizzes)	22
	I don't use WebCT	24
	If you don't use WebCT, why not? (please specify)	38

<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you had a block of time to set aside to learn about academic technology, what topics would you most like to learn about? (Select three to five)</b>	
	Pedagogy of technology-enhanced learning	56
	Evaluation of technology-enhanced learning	33
	Course Management tools (eg., WebCT)	48
	Information design (how to design, organize and present information, usability)	62
	Colleagues' uses of academic technology (eg., case studies)	47
	Copyright/intellectual property issues	30
	Accessibility issues in designing and/or selecting course materials	32
	Funding opportunities for academic technology projects	46
	HTML/web page authoring (eg., Dreamweaver)	56
	Online communication tools (eg., blogs, chat, IM)	33
	Online collaboration tools (eg., wikis)	38
	Assessment software (eg., Snap Pro, SurveyMonkey)	42
	Electronic presentations (eg., PowerPoint)	30
	Managing and using digital images (eg., iPhoto, Adobe PhotoManager)	43
	Imaging editing software (eg., Photoshop)	39
	Digital video or audio editing software (eg., iMovie, Audacity)	42
	Spreadsheet software (eg., Excel)	23
	Database software (eg., FileMaker, Access)	20
	Animation/modeling software (eg., Flash)	32
	Desktop publishing tools (eg., Adobe Acrobat, PageMaker, InDesign)	35
	Online library resources (eg., databases)	32
	Other (please specify)	22

<b>Q6</b>	<b>What methods work best for you to learn about new technology? (check all that apply)</b>	
	Online tutorials	59
	Workshops, face-to-face	103
	Drop-in consultation	73
	Appointment-based consultation	86
	Reading books or manuals	38
	Talking with colleagues	56
	Experimenting on your own	76
	Calling technical support/helpdesk	42
	Other (please specify)	14

**Q7** Please describe academic technology needs specific to your field of study as you perceive them.

75 responses

**Q8** What do you think the highest priorities should be for academic technology at SSU?

95 responses

**Q9** Do you have further comments, including your level of satisfaction, regarding academic technology at SSU?

77 responses

**Q10** In which School do you perform your primary teaching responsibility? (Select from pull-down list)

School of Arts and Humanities	32
School of Business and Economics	16
School of Education	19
School of Extended Education	3
School of Science and Technology	24
School of Social Sciences	27
University Library	7
Unaffiliated	11
Total responses	138

-----  
[survey introduction]

**SSU DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS  
ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assess experiences with and perceptions of academic technology that directly impact teaching and research at SSU. Data collected will assist in establishing priorities for planning. All responses are confidential and will be reported only in the aggregate. These 10 questions should take about 10 minutes to complete. Your feedback is very important!

Please think about technology as broadly as possible in answering the following questions

**Appendix C:  
Academic Technology Needs Assessment  
School Faculty Focus Groups  
Spring 2008**

[Note: comments are verbatim from faculty discussions]

<b>Infrastructure: general</b>	Inadequate infrastructure; equipment and classroom/lab environment old and outdated; undependable; does not build confidence for teaching; students are aware—one student characterized SSU as a “technology ghetto”; reflective of an impoverished environment
	Infrastructure symptomatic of poor support for teaching; affects interest in pursuing some of the professional development offerings – why bother when the infrastructure doesn’t exist to utilize new learning?
	Inadequate infrastructure forces faculty to do workarounds for which they have little time, eg., arrive well in advance to set up and check operations; bring personal laptop as a back-up.
	Support not offered at the point of need; no support after hours although evenings may be prime teaching times; also the case for off-site programs or distance programs.
	General comment that there is a huge infrastructure issue, eg. in 06-07, WebCT was unstable, causing a lack of access; in 07-08 (this year) the server (web-streaming) went down. These conditions do not support the academic mission. There is no redundancy in people or equipment. Not enough support on the line; not service-oriented. Both WebCT and web support are far too lean.
	SSU is way behind; progress cannot be made without a reasonable support level. If the faculty are to be competitive, requires a more robust support structure. We are below maintenance level. School operating costs have to be covered by limited resources. Sense of impoverishment, “ghetto” – affects perception of SSU.
	SSU culture values small classes but the reality is that the campus is moving to larger classes, yet the infrastructure needs for this shift are not acknowledged.
	Observation of an obvious decline in classroom infrastructure. For example, we now have larger classes yet there are no labs big enough for these classes. Scheduling is an issue, particularly for large classes. Scheduling is first-come, first-served which doesn’t work if you are expected to teach a technology heavy course.
	Academic technology is crippled.
	We may be progressing with technology but only a small subset. Discouragement easily bred with local conditions.
	Observation that students are changing and growing up in a different way than most of the faculty. Academics is slow to change and the obvious concern is that faculty are not evolving to meet the needs of new students. We are a generation apart for the students. This is a time of transition. Students are capable in using technology and faculty know the content but the two are not intersecting in an environment such as ours. The value system is splitting and creating a divide. Students need preparation for the workplace and that is not happening where faculty aren’t evolving with the technology.
	Gap created by expectation of IT that they have an understanding of the academic mission but this is not the current status. Comment that there appears to be no interest in the world of academic technology. Discipline needs are not understood. Expressions to IT appear not to be received. For example, no communication around migration to new WebCT version. New version is counter-intuitive – should explore other course management systems. WebCT support not competent at the level needed by faculty trying to realize the LMS potential. Inopportune crash of our primary teaching tool – shows poor planning.

	Baseline has declined.
	SSU is behind in preparing students for life in a digital world. We feel like a “leaky ship” Has impact on recruitment and retention of students.
	Feels the technology support and infrastructure at SSU is like a dinosaur; we’re in the dark ages and we’re not evolving even though most academic institutions are fast adapting all kinds of technology pedagogy and tools
	Multimedia authoring and technical writing are basic expectations for students in our digital world – we are still teaching a print basis – we’re not moving forward – poor preparation for students
	Many faculty feel frustrated because we aren’t moving forward; no progress in teaching because these days requires a level of technology support that SSU does not have.
	Infrastructure, support and professional development limitations on the technology side. Not keeping up, in fact, slipping further behind and our faculty are no longer competitive. Affects new faculty and student recruitment because these days an acceptable level of support is so fundamental.
<b>Infrastructure: systems</b>	Issues around CMS/PeopleSoft – need a go-to person regarding academic applications that either don’t work or are needed. Have no idea where to submit those needs.
	Department paperwork requires systems adaptability yet inflexibility in the PeopleSoft system – one example is scheduling if you have a lab as part of the course, one cannot make the system work. Enormously inefficient.
<b>Infrastructure: workstations</b>	Workstation refresh program is poor
	Another issue is the slow refresh rate of workstations
	Refresh cycles are inadequate. Disconnect in this program.
	Get a basic workstation and that’s it – you need to pay for any add-ons yet you often aren’t allowed to enrich your equipment
	Workstation refresh too slow to allow faculty capability to progress with evolving technology.
<b>Infrastructure: Classrooms</b>	Smart classrooms don’t seem to be maintained; equipment often doesn’t work
	Scheduling is a major issue – can’t get the right spaces
	Not enough smart classrooms
	Smart classrooms appear to have been designed without academic consultation; do not reflect academic teaching needs or patterns, some very basic oversights. Examples: Media cabinets sometimes inaccessible; “squatting” to manage the controls; cabinet keys that don’t work; cords that don’t reach...Lack of flexibility in configuration; downtime.
	Biggest issue is scheduling labs – computer labs often don’t have enough capacity = class size restrictions. Labs are scheduled first-come, first served which can be a problem for some courses. Scheduling needs more intervention, matching rights spaces to the right courses. There is a range of needs.
	There should be consistency across labs with standardized software, eg. excel (downloadable) not always available in open lab – students can’t get their work done when configuration isn’t consistent.
	Teaching infrastructure is unbelievably frustrating – eg., one small example, the cabinets in the “smart” classrooms are not well planned.
	How do we add sound, video and other multimedia in a class that does not offer the appropriate infrastructure? Even students asked to present back to the class are challenged in this situation – certainly not a good learning environment and doesn’t square with the goal of providing digital skills for the 21 <sup>st</sup> century. Very, very challenging.
	Classrooms are non-standardized so students do not have same level of instructional experience – different platforms, physical configuration should not be a barrier. Inefficiencies in infrastructure cause huge time spent on workarounds = poor productivity.
	Classroom renovation needs to be accelerated.

	Next layer is classrooms/labs – there are improvements coming. But labs are not designated to support academic needs - open labs are not scheduled for learning they are just open spaces. Scheduling suggests there is a need for categorizing curriculum – or courses – based on technology – may need a designated class/lab for some classes – eg., communications, digital art needs.
	Is there faculty involvement in classroom design?
	Need projection capability for documents, eg., to have students working together on a written piece but in an online mode
<b>Infrastructure: technical support</b>	Need support for equipment, eg., laptops bought with grant monies, ordered to IT's specifications and purchased through them but no service support supplied
	Smart classrooms aren't smart (eg., Darwin 38) – do not know how to find out whether a classroom is up and running. Typically lose 15-20 minutes trying to get up; cabinet keys are an issue; processes are confusing. For example, first day of class in Fall 07, nothing worked all day in 2010. This is so critical because for nursing this is the class that is held in person to orient students – WebCT was down; had scheduled a guest speaker. Devastating credibility mess. Also can't do orientation because there is no way to get past PeopleSoft records. Also the WebCT support staff person is well-intended but not knowledgeable enough – need more advanced assistance.
	Re the nursing server bought with nursing grant dollars – department feels they gave IT enough time to implement but this did not progress as expected.
	Faculty interested in some of the technology tools but often can't use the modules in which the CSU has invested – doesn't make sense. For instance, teaching modules on Merlot - have been unable to actually use the application because there is no local support for such application use.
	There would be better use of WebCT if there were visible and more capable support
	WebCT experience has varied
<b>Infrastructure: service policies</b>	Convoluting processes in the IT arena and no interpreter. For instance, would not load up the laptops that were going out to another site for teaching. Hugely discouraged because the workload is great anyway, cannot afford to bump into constant obstacles.
	No help when needed, especially early classes or late classes
	Seem to rely on student assistants who may not be an optimal workforce; not paid well, often not trained well; perhaps not managed well
	Perception of technology support as reactive with a sometimes patronizing attitude; not always knowledgeable, attitude of just do my job and go home; real service-oriented approach missing; have to work at a personal relationship in order to get response – what about the faculty who don't have time to do that?
	Other issues -- server limitations; IT class web list useful but IT will not add outside addresses which does not address reality.
	Workstation program – IT follows one size fits all – can't accommodate academic needs, eg. publishers' "test banks" – entails a different level of access – many layers to get through, why can't IT be more proactive, it's perhaps the fact that you have to ask about everything to get an explanation. Adds unnecessary steps. Probably the help desk staffing is too lean. If only there could be better outreach by IT.
	IT service removed, disengaged, doesn't respond to special needs.
<b>Infrastructure: Distance education</b>	Support for distance delivery or hybrid curriculum should be a priority, and certainly is for particular programs such as Education & Nursing
	Online education cannot be successful without appropriate infrastructure and support; nursing cannot go forward if this situation is not improved
	Side note: Nursing will not respond this year to the online education survey done by US New & World report because we have slipped too far behind. In fact, nursing department is assessing whether to continue the online program given the difficulty of sustaining it and the credibility factor. Where did the nursing dollars (from the system) go?

<b>Infrastructure: network</b>	Server response, boot-up are far too slow. Is the zeal for security outweighing academic effectiveness? Drivers appear to be central, risk averse initiatives, one size fits all – where is the academic voice?
	Email and network seem unstable which is unacceptable. Wireless access is spotty. Eg. Warren does not have wireless access. Terribly inefficient and hopeless for multimedia capabilities.
	Equipment too slow to boot up. Need analysis and solutions to overcome awkward, slipshod environment.
	Email slow.
	Wireless network not very secure, can log in as guest and appear to have full access – don't need to use authentication process.
<b>Infrastructure: server admin</b>	Limitations on server space, eg., an entire preparation done in Dreamweaver and couldn't save it because of file size limits; lost productivity = frustration
	Server file storage is limited; allocation is not enough for some academic programs. If a number of people are not using their allocation, why not have a process to reallocate to the heavy users. Is this a by-product of the "one size fits all" approach in IT?
	Unreliable server; server administration very restricted. Need levels of security – high for open machines, less restricted for faculty and lab machines and even less on personal machines.
	IT takes bureaucratic, one size fits all approach. Limited server access. No attempt to ascertain real needs let alone to meet some of them.
	Storage problem with video
<b>Training and prof development</b>	Necessary academic software, eg., Snap Pro, video capture, e-portfolios, require training and support yet none offered
	Need development money for online education – this is where the world is going. Nursing, eg., had to buy a server out of grant money to deliver its program online.
	There is a real and serious need for faculty development support to move the programs forward. Incentives would help and they could be small, simple. The CTPD workshops are helpful but schedule is limited. Incentives may motivate attendance.
	Things that have gone away – funding dollars (\$) that faculty used to be able to compete for and that could be used for software on equipment that was instructionally related – no longer exists.
	Need to reward faculty past tenure for continual professional development, especially when it pertains to technology. This is a morale issue.
	Structural impediments to effectiveness of CTPD workshops – scheduling conflicts, not targeted – could they be done on a local level? Work directly with departments – identify who needs workshops, how, when and where? Also, workshops only for supported software, eg. Dreamweaver, yet there is a cost to faculty to have Dreamweaver license.
	Would be great if there could be an informal meeting, orientation, one on one, with new faculty
	WebCT – can't use because it's too much trouble to start up. Should have intensive WebCT training at the department level if wider, better utilization is desired. Offer release time, stipends, or other incentives to participate in training. Part-time faculty really can't invest the time without an incentives model
	No opportunity for follow-up after workshops which are just overviews and this defeats motivation
	Need training at the department level. Work with the School. Could use stipends because of the time commitment.
	Need support for faculty development, eg., web design. Re web design, there should be more standardization with instructional web sites so that students can navigate.
	Would benefit from experts with best practices – show and tell – expositions
	We need teaching models, good technology support – our outside review

	illuminates the faculty development need and lack of support. Our potential is unrealized – this is a disservice to students
<b>Organizational structure and processes</b>	There is a lack of understanding of the role that IT should play, who they report to, and policies that are all over the map. Very fragmented. 3 aspects of technology piece – support (funding), technical proficiency, and policy making. Primary – basic infrastructure – network, web, and email should not be a concern for the academic side.
	Need a go-to person who can understand and convey potential implications of technology decisions.
	IT service removed, disengaged, doesn't respond to special needs.
	Need proactive support – it's just not there. Feels as if everything is so difficult. Organizational structure exhibits no interest in positive outreach. Individuals seem inflexible – do not have a positive service feel
	Poor communication, eg., no communiqués about a lab or classroom that is upgraded – when available, what enhancements and how to use
	No incentive to work with the situation on campus – in fact, disincentives – goes off campus for email, server space, and dependable uptime.
	Creates ambience that academic program is not highly valued; feeling that faculty are not trusted
	No roadmaps provided, eg., at new faculty orientation, nothing about IT organizational structure, who to go to, what services are available. In Fall 07, only technology related item was about accessibility and it caused immediate anxiety, emphasis conveyed but no indication of how faculty could be helped to meet the initiative
	Additional issues are communication and priorities. Grants sign-off often doesn't address the academic implications; need someone in the process who is knowledgeable about what grants mean to academics.
	Organizational issue – really should bring Academic Technology under the Provost; need a plan that is forward-thinking and addresses the support needs.
	Convoluting processes
	There should be an official with authority and expertise directing academic support and the Provost should have direct authority over that individual; accountability.
	Calling the IT helpline – there should be a dedicated line for faculty help particularly because there no understanding of academic needs.
	IT lack of understanding interferes with pace of academic program progress
	Badly need active academic technology leadership.
	Perception that whenever a proposal is made to IT, they come back with a fee – why isn't IT providing the academic side with the infrastructure needed to progress? “can't do” response inhibits academic activity. Convoluting processes and charge-backs.
	Need a visionary technology leader who really understands the academic mission. Need a true academic technology officer and much improved training and support.
	IT is responsive but understaffed. Unclear the division of labor between IT and the library.
	Library and IT person should attend school meetings, also department meetings, at the beginning of the semester – so hard to keep up with changes, need to know.
<b>Discipline – specific issues</b>	Psychology program review illuminated major issues. The need to teach research methods in Psychology to small special classes cannot be met. Principles of egalitarian culture do not lead to success in upper division courses which often are data driven.
	Grants typically need to be met by a campus commitment yet can't rely on that commitment here.
	Digital art/image repository storage and retrieval would provide a campus-wide benefit – images not only for art history/ art studio but use by other disciplines
	Perception that we may be overestimating students' technology abilities – there

	is actually a huge variability, wide variation in basic skills – should we do something about that? Eg., need for assessment of student computing skills at the beginning of class – could be helpful when planning course
	Example – there is a CSU mandate to move to hybrid or online delivery of composition courses which are often remedial or at least partly – yet we are unable to do this. For English Education, SSU program did not pass because of insufficient and inadequate technology base and will sunset in 2009 without improvements.
	In language teaching, have been unable to keep up with teaching innovations because the lab is out of date. Language teaching and phonetics are technology heavy but situation at SSU is very frustrating.
	Language Education – training future teachers - used to be able to offer a significant technology component but no longer able to do that – inadequate technology infrastructure has a huge impact on teaching and learning capability.
	Language lab was state of the art but that was 1989! Lab has aged and no capacity for moving to new applications and techniques. This was noted in the program review.
	Nursing used Media Site (sp?) as an online course delivery system for a year on a one-time basis, it provided an outsourcing solution and worked well, but was not sustained by IT.
<b>Planning</b>	Staffing limitations are obvious but where should the priorities be? Need a better refresh cycle. Need to do an analysis from the bottom up and the top down. Are we thinking about green computing? Are we looking ahead?
	Although have had good experience with IT, it is clear there should be better planning, eg. workshop offerings may conflict with teaching, affects training progress
	WebCT is adequate but are there alternatives? Need to be thinking about the pedagogy of using technology.
<b>Other</b>	Need clarification about just what we can ask students to bring to the table – are there legal implications? Also, need clarification about campus stance on intellectual property. – faculty ownership of output? Clarification about expectations around accessibility.
	Concern about privacy – files stored centrally and also what about the software that tracks plagiarism such as turnitin.com – are they legitimate?
	A possible perspective is that technology may be driving a curriculum which is not good.
	Should be thinking about integrating technology into teaching and learning activities, eg., GIS activities – this should be part of literacy.