Summary of Activities for Instructional Infrastructure Committee: 2017-2018

Since electing a new chair at the first meeting of the 2017-2018 year, the Instructional Infrastructure Committee (IIC) has met with several other committee chairpersons and head of departments to obtain a summary (or briefing) of the current projects happening around the University of Las Vegas Nevada (UNLV) main campus. We have also discussed prospective projects and charges according to the needs of different departments and new technologies around campus.

IIC met with Dr. Carl Reiber, Senior Vice Provost, and Dr. Rainier Spencer, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, to learn about the D/F/W program and their efforts to identify and assist students struggling with STEM courses. Later, it was decided that the D/F/W committee would be reduced to a smaller subset of individuals intended to monitor these student numbers.

Dr. Laurel M. Pritchard, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, gave us an overview of Campus Connect and Early Alert programs which are tools designed to help the D/F/W with monitoring student progress across departments.

One conclusion drawn from these meetings was that there is a need for increased staffing. The D/F/W committee was reduced and made to only monitor because they realized that the task was too great for a single committee to take on. Much of the results from Dr. Pritchard’s programs comes to the conclusion that more support was needed, whether to support the faculty to help the students, or give help more directly to the students themselves with counseling or services to assist them. However, the student also needs to take the initiative to respond when UNLV is reaching out to them.

The IIC meeting with Lori Temple and Darrell Lutey resulted in a number of different avenues the committee could investigate further. Among these, a new attendance app program seemed the be an area where it was new enough and in the preliminary stages that IIC may be able to help obtain more feedback for other department’s thoughts and implementation for such an app.

One of the committee members was a part of the pilot for Canvas. He expressed many various frustrations and issues with the program. While implementation is already going forward, IIC may be able to assist with the aftermath as the system goes live throughout campuses.

This concludes the summary for the 2017-2018 year for the IIC. Please do not hesitate to contact us should any new ideas or charges come to mind where we may be of assistance.

Eve Chung, MS, DMD
IIC Chairperson 2017-2018
Called to order: 1:00pm

Points Discussed

1. **Discussed the mission/charge of the committee – Robinson**
   a. The purpose of the committee is not for faculty development, but to investigate and review and/or report new tools and ideas for the advancement and improved effectiveness of higher level education.

2. **Discussed preliminary ideas for campus wide evaluation of student responses to current methods of learning – All**
   a. Establishing a single question to be added in all teaching evaluations as a standardized marker for student responses.
   b. Explore ideas for educational research, reviewing previously done research articles or thinking of new topics to explore and research as a committee.

3. **Discussed contacting 3 main areas of interest for student learning and improvement**
   a. D/F/W Committee – Rainer Spencer (Associate Vice Provost), Carl Reiber (Senior Vice Provost)
   b. OIT Master Plan process and technological upgrades in classrooms – Daryl Lutey (Classroom tech and student labs), Lauri Temple (Head of OIT/Masterplan)
   c. Distance learning – Advising, suggestions, online education

4. **Campus-wide Wifi Access**

5. **Elected a New Chair – All**
   i. Eve Chung from UNLV SDM will act as the new chair of the committee for the remainder of the 2017-2018 year before another election is conducted for 2017-2018 no later than May 15, 2018.

Future Agenda

1. **Contact representatives**
a. A meeting with Senior Vice Provost Carl Reiber will be planned for the next meeting agenda. Main topics for the agenda will be to gather more information about the D/F/W committee and to see how we might be able to work together or what they might need help with from the infrastructure committee.

2. Review and revise committee bylaws

Meeting Adjourned 1:25pm

Notetaker: Eve Chung
UNLV Instructional Infrastructure Committee Agenda

November 17, 2017
FDH 316
2:00PM – Call To Order

- Approval of the minutes: September 29, 2017
  - Informal majority yes.

- Informational Item: D/F/W committee and Faculty Center
  Dr. Carl Reiber, Senior Vice Provost
  Dr. Rainier Spencer, Vice Provost for Academic Programs
  - committee focus placed on 2 main courses; ENG 101 and MATH 124
  - groups focused on instruction; background data/analytics/achievement
  - top courses on DFW list (gen ed, high enrollment)
    - BIO 189 196
    - COM 101
    - FAB 101
    - GEO 103
    - HIS 101
    - MATH 95 96 129 124 126 127 181
  - current process is to observe courses, collect data, instrument with card swipe and other data feeds & ways of checking resource access
  - EN: Interest in these data; curious about role of II committee re: support or other initiatives re: DFW
    - CR: design of Faculty Center is of primary interest; need to determine priorities for this center to have maximum impact.
    - EN: how does this trickle down from faculty center to actual effect on instructors in individual sections (including PTI & GA).
    - CR: Ngai has distributed a high level survey of faculty priorities (broad).
    - Many: discussion of student and course level variables that may provide insight as they correlate to DFW rates

- Informational Item: Campus Connect and Early Alert
  Dr. Laurel M. Pritchard, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education
  - Campus Connect - analytics, intervention & advising platform from Education Advisory Board
    - replaces an earlier version of the platform adopted a few years ago
    - used primarily by academic advisors + ASC (academic success coaches, supplemental instruction, tutoring)
    - identifies students at risk of not completing degree
    - identifies courses that are important predictors of who will graduate
    - identifies patterns that provide opportunity for engagement with student to propose a change of major
    - includes outreach tools; selection of many students to launch interventions; e.g., early alert
      - early alert used in first year seminars; rest of campus used a qualtrics form
within Campus Connect, instructor has 1-click access to pull up roster and
- flag student as at risk
- label why: based on performance, attendance, behavior, etc;
- label their action toward student
- ticketing system, student can be referred to academic support, assign to resource (tutoring, counseling, etc); instructor alerted when case is closed (successful or 3x contact but nonresponse).

Q: How are students responding to the pilot of campus connect?

LP: Categories (by frequency)
- nonresponse (often appear from data as unlikely to retain)
- appreciative
- marginal (cranky “stop bugging me”)

CR: in the future is to reach out to students (rather than invite them in)

EC: When does this happen?

LP: Early Alert meant to be by week 3 (not rolled out until week 4 in F17 pilot); Qualtrics version is more of an ongoing effort (and admittedly more onerous on faculty & assessment office side)

CR: Intentions also include working with faculty to figure out how to best approach early alert, grading, etc.

RS: Midterm grades will not go away; are a peoplesoft asset used by advisors and ASC. End goal is to collapse it into a single system.
- Some faculty see no value in midterm grades; CREA (Rosser, Marchand) are working on a report to show the causal effect of midterm grades on course performance

EN: How can II Committee help convince faculty to use solutions within their normal workload to achieve assessment needs without encumbering new time costs (e.g., midterm grades).

CR: in agreement with sentiment; unclear if integration between products (PeopleSoft, Canvas, Campus Connect) can be made to limit faculty effort

LP: Typical message from OIT and ESS when a PeopleSoft dependent system request is made, “what is the institutional priority?” It would be useful if, out of II Committee a statement could be made to prioritize this kind of integration (so it can be taken on by OIT).

CR: top tier initiative isn’t the same as becoming an R1; community pushback shifted to “top tier.” II committee plays a central role to ensuring the quality of the teaching side of that dual push of scholarship and teaching, which is the reason it’s called top tier.

Update on how Early Alert/Campus Connect is working with the D/F/W program
Dr. Laurel M. Pritchard, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education
- EC: you’ve both been piloting and doing research; how do these initiatives relate?
- SEE HANDOUT BY PETE RINTO (APPENDIX)
- RS: Marchand & Rosser group reports math and science are generally reporting.

Update on current goals/initiatives of the D/F/W and Early Alert
Dr. Carl Reiber, Senior Vice Provost
Dr. Rainer Spencer, Vice Provost for Academic Programs

- Identify areas in need of improvement
  - TR: Communication from Administration re: tools like Early Alert are sometimes not understood, on radar, or well-received.
    - XX: need to consider ways to get these into faculty meetings to promote awareness
  - EN: need to hit programs, not faculty; only way to get to instructor-base, inclusive of PTI & GA. Need to make an infrastructure to support these kinds of assessment and reporting activities.
    - KEY PIECES
      1. RM: need better staffing for (& communication to faculty from) student success
      2. ?: need to work on ways to motivate students to use resources
      3. EN: need to clarify for faculty the value of their teaching (intrinsic, but more explicitly, clarify extrinsic reasons in terms of role of teaching for PTIs, PhD students, Tenure Track faculty).
      4. PF: Role of II unclear; do we advocate for early alert or tune it to work for faculty to embrace it. Seems the latter
      5. EC EN: Integration across systems related to assessment (Early alert, SIS, LMS, etc).
      6. TR: Also need to know from Darrell Lutey re: Lecture capture and other systems
      7. ACTION (EVE) -

- Define the jurisdiction of the IIC and discuss specifics and tasks for how the committee can help

Adjourn

Notetaker: Matthew Bernacki
UNLV Instructional Infrastructure Committee Meeting Minutes  
January 12, 2018  
FDH 218

**Attendees:** Eve Chung, Matt Bernacki, Ed Nagelhout, Pramen Shrestha, Maziar Majzoob, Richard Miller, Jay Nietling, Priscilla Finley, Han-fen Hu, Lori Temple, Darrell Lutey  

**Excused:** Toni Repetti

**Meeting Called:** Eve Chung  
**Notetaker:** Han-fen Hu

Called To Order at 2:02 PM

**Item:** Approval of the minutes: November 17th, 2017  
Motion made by E.N.; 2nd by H.H.; Vote: Unanimously approved.

**Item:** Approval of the bylaw  
Motion made by E.N.; 2nd by P.S.; Unanimously approved.

**Item:** OIT Master Plan Overview  
**Presenter:** Dr. Lori Temple, Vice Provost for Information Technology

Lori went over the IT master plan: [https://www.it.unlv.edu/it-master-plan](https://www.it.unlv.edu/it-master-plan)

1. Planning process: The IT master plan will be adjusted continuously to match the UNLV master plan and taking the campus’ input into account.

2. The plan: It includes 14 initiatives in 4 sections.  
   **Discussion:** If new suggestions for student success are made, it will be incorporated into the master plan as an action item under an initiative.

3. Top Tier: It shows how the initiatives align with the Top Tier goals. The action items under each initiative with timelines can be found under the Action Plan section.

4. Progress: the Annual report will also be made available to the UNLV community.

5. Other items: A new IT website (not a website for OIT) is also under construction, focusing on providing a unified IT service catalog across campus. It will replace the OIT website.

**Item:** Classroom Tech - Current vs Future  
**Presenter:** Dr. Darrell Lutey, Assistant Director, Office of Information Technology

Darrel presented the updates on the classroom technologies.

1. Almost all systems around campus have been recently updated.

   (1) All the general purpose classrooms will be updated by the Fall.
(2) Technology updates include switching system, supporting the latest laptops and resolutions, projectors, etc.

(3) After the updates, OIT can remotely support and troubleshoot for instructors.

(4) OIT is also planning on providing the floor plans and 365-views for all classrooms.

2. Canvas

(1) The landing page of WebCampus now has both Blackboard and Canvas listed. 
   https://www.it.unlv.edu/webcampus

(2) The pilot group (Urban Affairs and Nursing school) moves to the new WebCampus on Canvas this Spring.

(3) OIT will help transit the content on Blackboard to Canvas.

(4) Support will be offered, including help desk, training sessions, and videos.

(5) In February, the new Canvas will be open to the entire campus to prepare for the full migration in Fall 2018.

3. Lecture capturing

(1) On the final stage of RFP; the system by Panopto is likely to be chosen.

(2) The lecture capturing system offers the function of text recognition; the lecture content, including the text on the slides and the speech, will be searchable in the system.

(3) The system is integrated with Canvas.

(4) **Discussion**: If the instructors use the chalkboard, the content will also be recorded as long as the chalkboard is within the range of the camera. The instructors are also encouraged to use the document camera to ensure the content is also fully captured.

(5) **Discussion**: The lecture capturing system may not be set up for every classroom, but will accommodate the faculty’s needs.
6. **Discussion:** The instructor can use the system outside of the classroom as well. No special equipment needed; even just the webcam on laptop computers would work.

7. Support will be offered: OIT now is in the process of hiring designated personnel for supporting the use of lecture capturing system and the web conferencing system.

4. Web conferencing

   1. The system will fulfill a long-time requirement for the students and faculty to meet online.
   2. RFP is ongoing and down to two vendors.
   3. The system will be adopted mainly for teaching purposes but it can be used for administrative purposes as well.
   4. The system will be integrated with Canvas.

5. Attendance System/App

   1. The system can help the faculty to take attendance. The vendor of the system offers free piloting and testing.
   2. **Discussion:** Is this system something the OIT should introduce for the campus?
      - As compared to iClicker that costs students a fee, this system only requires a mobile phone.
      - Not every student has a mobile phone (or the phone runs out of battery), but faculty can make manual adjustments/corrections.
      - Concerns about privacy, security, and data ownership issues on the student data, geolocation information, and others.
      - The possible adoption rate is unknown. While it will help large classes to take attendance, not all other classes require attendance. A more important consideration is how to attract students to attend, and have the needed infrastructure to facilitate this goal.
- If the system is only needed for the Law school and a few others, it should not be implemented with an enterprise license.

- Need data from the vendor or the literature to verify whether the adoption of the system can improve attendance and student performance.

- Concerns for undocumented students. Need to have adjustment/alternative for them.

(3) **Action items:**

- OIT need to check the service terms and conditions, and/or have the university lawyers to verify and add the needed terms. (Canvas also shares the same concerns. OIT will check the terms and conditions.)

- OIT can design a survey targeting at the faculty to identify the interests and the possible usage of the system. This committee should help distribute the survey and encourage responses.

**Item:** OIT and Student Progress Monitoring  
**Presenter:** Dr. Lori Temple, Vice Provost for Information Technology

Lori discussed OIT’s role in Early Warning, Stem courses, ALEKS – Math Placement Test.

1. OIT supports but not act as the main leader in these initiatives.

2. The Provost office is now having different plans of tracking student success. For example, data on the student performance will be collected for the high enrollment classes in the Spring. OIT will help the data collection and provide information for decision support.

3. OIT is open to initiatives requested by faculty to support learning and teaching. This committee can suggest initiatives to OIT and initiate the discussion.

**Item:** Questions, Ideas for Implementation

Eve asked Lori and Darrell to offer their insights on important teaching infrastructures they would suggest this committee look into.

1. Darrell suggested establishing a testing center on campus. Current online classes use ProctorU for the exams and some departments use their own staff/faculty to proctor exams outside of the class time. The testing center can benefit the students and faculty by preventing cheating and saving time and resources.

2. Darrel also suggested that hybrid courses can be encouraged and promoted; having hybrid courses can free up classroom spaces and does not require the same level of resources as pure online courses. However, they should not be categorized as online courses, so that the students would not be charged more for taking hybrid courses.
3. Lori suggested update the policies to keep up with the technologies, such as intellectual property concerns, privacy concerns, etc.

4. Lori recommended having a technology sandbox for the faculty to play and test new technologies. It is an infrastructure that would encourage innovation.

5. Lori also suggested organizing user groups and facilitating the discussion among users to find innovative ways to teach and use technologies.

Adjourned at 3:25
Instructional Infrastructure Committee Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2018 2:00pm
Bldg FDH, Rm 218
Attendees:
Maziar Majzoob
Han-Fen Hu
Matthew Bernacki
Pramen Shrestha
Richard Miller
Eve Chung
Toni Repetti
Edwin Nagelhout
Priscilla Finley
Jay Nietling
Karu Hangawatte

Called to order: 2:09pm

Points Discussed
1. Discussed a software some departments on campus have started using for course evaluations called Blue.
   a. Preliminary feedback from Music school was negative.
   b. Preliminary feedback from Hospitality was potentially positive in limited use so far.
2. Discussed that the D/F/W committee has possibly been eliminated.
   a. This will be confirmed.
3. Discussed user faculty user experience and frustrations with recently implemented and currently
   being tested class management software Canvas. Because this system has already gone forward,
   there is little the committee can see doing to affect or change the system that is already being
   implemented across campus.
4. Discussed the potential charges for the IIC going forward.
   a. Discussed the options listed on the agenda.
      i. Main Campus Testing Center Proposal – The bulk of this work (calling other
         campuses, gathering statistics and data, obtaining feedback for the desire from
         faculty and students) was determined to be something beyond the scope of the
         committee.
      ii. Graduate & Professional Students Association Grading Guidelines – Must
          contact and connect with K. Espinoza.
      iii. How to help D/F/W students, Reaching Out vs. Inviting In – D/F/W
          committee has been disbanded into a smaller group of individuals to help
          monitor student progress. Helping the students themselves was determined to
          be outside of the IIC whose purpose is to be aiding faculty and all student
          resources are already available in the student center.
      iv. Updating policies to current technological standards – Too broad of a
          scope, would need to contact and work with OIT more exclusively.
      v. Technology sandbox, user groups. – Too broad.
b. Discussed if charges should be more faculty focused vs student focused. – Consensus is that IIC should be more faculty focused, but the only options currently available to gain feedback from faculty is making more surveys which most faculty do not seem to respond to.

5. Pursuing the Attendance App research and implementation with OIT while it is in its early stages may currently be one of the more solid directions for the committee to go towards in search of a charge.

Meeting Adjourned 3:00 pm

Notetaker: Maziar Majzoob  
Amended by: Eve Chung
UNLV Instructional Infrastructure Committee Minutes

May 11, 2018
FDH 218
2:00PM – Call To Order

Attendance:
Eve Chung <eve.chung@unlv.edu>
Matthew Bernacki <matt.bernacki@unlv.edu>
Toni Repetti <toni.repetti@unlv.edu>
Priscilla Finley <priscilla.finley@unlv.edu>
Han-Fen Hu <han-fen.hu@unlv.edu>,

Excused:
Maziar Majzoob <maziar.majzoob@unlv.edu>

I. Approval of the minutes: March 16, 2018
Motion to approve minutes: MB
1st HFH, 2nd PF

II. Elect a chair for 2019-2020

Because we did not have enough members of the committee present for a quorum according to our approved Bylaws, the members present decided to nominate via e-mail and vote online. Toni R. will help with making the survey form should more than two members be nominated for chair for the committee to vote on.

III. Additional discussion as desired

1. Canvas launches campus wide by this Fall 2018. Faculty/Staff may need IIC to help troubleshoot or find out what our departments need from IT as Karu H. had brought to our attention last meeting that there are many issues or difficulties with the program.

2. Our valuable committee member, Matt Bernacki, is leaving by the end of the month and needs a replacement on the committee from the College of Education. Point of contact: Jeff Gelfer - Senior Rep for College of Education

3. Next meeting will be in September 2018. Date TBD. Friday afternoons seems to work for most members.

Adjourn: 2:15pm

Notetaker: Eve Chung