

**Subject:** Report of the CAS Committee on Technology Policy (CTP)  
**From:** Tom Dietz, Roy Rosenzweig, Suzanne Slayden, Patrick Story,  
Stanley Zoltek (Chair)  
**Date:** April 26, 1999

---

The CTP was created on December 14. The gist of the committee charge is that

Members will proactively consult with the Vice President for Information Technology and other administrators concerning investments in and development of potential uses of computer-based technologies that impact educational techniques and practices in CAS . . . and report to the faculty.

Since notification on March 16 of our election we have met once together and once with Joy Hughes, VP for Information Technology, and her staff members Anne Agee, Director, DoIIIT [Department of Instructional Improvement and Technologies]; Keith Segerson, Director, UCIS [University Computing and Information Systems]; and John Zenelis, University Librarian.

At our meeting with administrators the main topic of discussion was communication between the various IT units and faculty. Each unit communicates its messages to faculty (and others) via a web site and printed material. The web sites have been recently overhauled. The printed material, especially from the library (*Full Text*) and DoIIIT (*Contexts*), is timely and informative.

Each unit has established a different method of direct communication with faculty to solicit opinions:

- *VP for Information Technology:* This year Joy Hughes distributed money directly to the CAS Dean's office for Technology Across the Curriculum (TAC). (In the fall we will make an inventory of programs and activities within CAS.)
- *Library:* Continues its long-established practice of designating library liaisons to departments. This model has yielded good two-way communication.
- *UCIS:* Holds faculty-staff focus groups on topics selected by UCIS to help them determine preferences. These provide useful discussion of specific problems, but involve only selected faculty and take place at irregular intervals.
- *DoIIIT:* The appointed directors of IRC [Instructional Resource Center] and STAR [Student Technology Assistance and Resource] are currently CAS faculty members. DoIIIT has a 16-member Advisory Board divided about equally between staff and faculty, with representation from each of the colleges and campuses. Two members are from CAS, but reportedly neither can attend meetings because of teaching conflicts. In November 1998 the Advisory Board announced they would be conducting a faculty needs assessment.

At present, DoIIIT, UCIS, and the Library use some type of "Senatorial" model of faculty representation. The previous model of faculty representation, the Academic Computing Advisory Committee, included faculty members and exercised review of the budget. Given our size relative to other units, CAS would benefit more from a "House of Representatives" model for two-way communication between faculty and administrators, with representation roughly proportional to student seat count.

In conclusion, our Committee is encouraged by the Provost's recent concern about faculty development, including information technology, as summed up in his University Initiative memo of April 12:

The dispersion of [faculty development] efforts among three central administrative units diffuses our investment unless coordination is vigilant. We risk sending mixed signals, or defining agendas for which faculty are unwilling to take ownership . . . The three vice presidents [Hughes, Rosenblum, Potter] now supporting faculty development should review this situation, based on an inventory of current programs and activities. (pp. 15-16)

The Committee on Technology Policy will continue to make an inventory of current programs and activities that provide technologies impacting educational techniques and practices in CAS. Next fall, along with continuing our inventory, particularly within CAS, we will also make recommendations.