

ASSETT Spring 2018 Board Meeting Minutes

April 27th
10:30 am to noon
Technology Learning Center, Room 215

Board members: Anthony Pidanick, Lakshmi Lalchandani, Carew Boulding, Laura Osterman, Beth Osnes, Jennifer Lewon, Andrew Martin, Mark Werner, Janet Cassagrand, Jennifer Nebergall, Amy Lavens

Introduction of new staff

The meeting began by introducing Joy Adams, our newest Teaching and Learning Consultant. Joy wasn't present, but we distributed a biography of her.

Approval of minutes

Next the board voted to approve the minutes from last meeting. Beth Osnes offered the motion and the voting members present voted in favor of it.

FY 18-19 budget review

Next Jenn Nebergall and Mark Werner reviewed the ASSETT Budget for FY 18-19.

For Fiscal Year 2017-18, Jenn walked through the categories in the budget and explained what they referred to. Then Jenn walked through Fiscal Year 2018-19 projections and described what they referred to.

Some notable changes are:

- Hourly and GRA, which includes two new GRAs
- Professional development increases, which includes accounting for two new full-time employees.
- Development & Analytics
 - Increase due to the configuration coding that will be needed for the VIP GORP tool being adopted from UC Davis.

- Outreach
 - Declined due to lower printing
- Domain of One's Own
 - Increase due to supporting this project, with library
- Video development
 - Increase to allow for professional development of videos showing activities like Faculty Fellows' final projects on ASSETT web site.
- Class media site and A/V support
 - This accounts for providing improvements to A&S classrooms in their A/V equipment and increasing the number of classrooms that have Mediasite Live in them.
- A&S Projects
 - Budget goes to zero. We will be adding a new proposal for ongoing funding for faculty to propose innovations in teaching and learning with technology.

Laura asked why the A&S projects line went down to zero. Mark answered that the full funding proposal hasn't been submitted yet. Laura expressed that she liked the idea of funding A&S faculty projects.

Laura asked about Kyle leaving and what is going to happen to that position. Amy Lavens described that the position will be changing and the parts of his job that dealt with the Academic Advising Center will be handled in the short term by Jennifer McDuffy. ASSETT won't report to Jennifer. Jennifer will be focused on better collaboration between the advising center and Mary Kraus' office.

Update from ASSETT Faculty Advisor

Next we switched to Andy's update.

Andy explained that for the ARPAC report, the CSL, FTEP, ASSETT, and GTP underwent a modified ARPAC review. Usually, in an ARPAC, there is a self-evaluation and it is given to a committee that the Provost puts together. There was no interview process this time, but normally there would be. There was no external review. Given these changes, the ARPAC report should be called an internal review.

Some of the criticisms of ASSETT in the ARPAC response were unwarranted and not reflective of the mission of the units. The report suggested ASSETT wasn't doing a good job in showing that it's work was translated into student gains. But ASSETT's mission is not to do that. It's extremely difficult to do. It's a valid criticism of any professional development program, but if they want ASSETT to do that, they should give them that charge and the resources to do it.

The idea that we are asking faculty to work on teaching and learning is important. Andy felt like the panel was providing a function that was more of a critic than an

advocate. Andy mentioned they collected data in the ARPAC report, but it is not clear how they came up with their recommendations.

Anthony Pidanick mentioned that students aren't aware that ASSETT is behind student success activities, but it is.

Jen Lewon mentioned that there is confusion generally between OIT and ASSETT

Laura Olson wondered if students need to be aware than ASSETT is doing what it's doing? She also wondered how the criticisms of ASSETT compared to the criticisms of FTEP in the ARPAC response. She asked, how does FTEP measure success? Is it anything different than what ASSETT does?

Beth Osnes suggested there's an opportunity to have faculty collaborate with ASSETT to measure the impact of their teaching with technology. Beth had an ASSETT fellow (Austin Chau) help her class. If they added in a measurement of the effect of teaching with technology on the ASSETT collaboration.

Amy Lavens brought up issues with the report that she saw. The report suggests that the mandatory fee won't continue, but it is going to continue. The report mentions that ASSETT reports to Kelly Fox (not true). ASSETT is managed by OIT, but it has a robust system of governance from A&S including an Associate Dean, a Faculty Advisor, and the Advisory Board.

Andy suggested that the messaging around ARPAC should be redone because it is basing its assumptions on faulty claims.

Laura suggested that ARPAC should rewrite their report.

Amy mentioned that the ABAC meeting on Monday will review the ARPAC report and that at that meeting there's a potential movement to grab the funding and ASSETT.

Andy suggested it might be worthwhile for people on the advisory board to read the report.

Amy said that Physics Prof John Cumlout knows of this and he is a member of ABAC.

Beth asked whether there might be a Is there a desire to have ASSETT be a campus good?

Amy said, yes, we've asked for bridge funding to do that a few years ago, but we couldn't get traction from the other colleges.

Andy would like to advocate for ASSETT.

Andy described the position he is championing this year. He wants to have a grad student who would like to develop their C.V. by being able to do research in curriculum and technology. In the past, he hired someone from Nancy Emory's group. This position is a way for grad students to benefit from scholarship in this area, which also benefits the college. Andy would like to set this up and have a good faculty mentor. Andy will work with the Faculty Fellows to realize this.

General announcements and discussion

Mark discussed the updates that have happened on the ASSETT web site.

Mark then described the ASSETT offerings this summer. He asked how the board could help get the word out about the offerings. Beth suggested the summer schedule of Boulder Valley School District be considered when setting up the schedule.

Jen asked that Mark send the summer flyer to the departments.

Mark mentioned that this year's Tech Camp's focus is about helping students be producers.

Jen asked if she could have a more detailed schedule

Laura asked if participants receive an honorarium for the Tech Camp. Mark said no. Mark mentioned the course design workshops provide an honorarium.

Mark reminded the group that there is an email distribution list for the Board (oit-dl-asset-board@colorado.edu).

Jen suggested ASSETT staff put phrases about active learning and more relevant language about learning in the fliers. She suggested we emphasize learner outcomes.

Jen asked that ASSETT do more to advertise and promote individual consultations. She thinks faculty think they can't get consultations from ASSETT any longer.

One person suggested that perhaps a certification from ASSETT be given for each offering.

Jen urged us to ensure we use language in our advertisements that are relevant to the initiatives the faculty are conducting. Mark asked how we might know that. Jen said actually they sometimes become aware of teaching strategies to adopt based on what ASSETT is teaching (i.e. active learning).

Beth commented that she really likes Canvas.

Jen mentioned that she sees Canvas as imposing huge costs on faculty members when grading free response questions. She also suggested that assign partial credit is difficult in Canvas.

Mark acknowledged that Canvas was selected for the vast majority of faculty, but that for edge cases, like more complex grading activities, D2L is actually better.

Mark then asked the group if they had advice for driving more attendance to the Teaching with Technology Symposium. There were only about 40 to 50 attendees this year. Suggestions for changing it included:

Co-partner with another college or even a department. Have a department propose a speaker and ASSETT could fund it.

Beth mentioned considering having the event in the fall. Which could be good because people are focused on the year ahead.

Jen mentioned her department urges her to network, and so if we can build into the Symposium more ability for faculty to network, that would be good.

Someone suggested we talk to department chairs to ask for advice and to emphasize that networking is a good outcome of the Symposium.