**Council for Instructional Technology**

Minutes from February 15, 2012

1:00 – 2:00 PM

HH 60

Attending: Chandra Amaravadi, Virginia Diehl, Sam Edsall, Bruce Harris, Bree McEwan, , Bhavneet Walia, Mei Wen.

1. **CIT Administration**
	1. Minutes from previous meeting were approved by Bree and seconded by Bhavneet.
2. **Clickers**
	1. **Review of clickers information collected**
		1. Chandra will continue to collect data on clickers, both conventional and web-based models.
		2. The invitation to visit Eric Ribbens’ biology class remains open to those interested seeing clickers in action.
		3. Brochures were received by Chandra and posted on PBWorks.
		4. The committee first reviewed conventional clicker technologies using the clicker comparison worksheet printed from PBWorks.
		5. Popular brands for which information was collected was iClicker2, Turning Point, Smart technologies, Quizdom and iRespond.
		6. The importance of clickers with LCD displays was also discussed. Clicker with display has become common among all vendors. But only smart phones are capable of displaying text questions.
		7. CIT also considered if other criteria should be added to the PBWorks comparison worksheet. It was agreed to include ‘Dual-mode’ meaning whether or not the clicker technology could use a conventional clicker and a web-based version (smart phone/tablet app) at the same time. Such a criterion would prove to be beneficial to those who have mobile devices that could utilize click technology without the need to purchase a conventional device.
	2. **Recommendations**
		1. Chandra found a study by Northeastern done in May 2009 that had a list of criteria to be considered when purchasing clickers. All the items were noteworthy and parallel the criteria that the committee had used. Sam suggested that the committee evaluate the criteria items based on its level of importance before making a recommendation.
		2. Six clicker technology capabilities were deemed by the committee as most important:
			1. Dual-mode – The clicker technology can be used with conventional clickers and web-based (smart phone/tablet app) at the same time.
			2. Compatible/integration with Desire2Learn
			3. Cost
			4. Compatible/integration with PowerPoint
			5. Support for faculty and students
			6. Ability to import & export content
		3. Members of CIT are invited to try out various web versions including:
			1. eInstruction - <http://www.einstruction.com/>
			2. Polleverywhere - <http://www.einstruction.com/>
			3. iVoted - <http://www.ivoted.com/view/audience-response-system>
			4. UT Reponder - <http://www.utresponder.org/>
			5. Mobile Participation - <http://www.appbrain.com/app/mobile-participation-system/umich.apps.mps>
3. **Items from CIT action plan**
	1. **Faculty voice – web site design requirements (input form)**
		1. The committee is developing an input form for the CIT web site and discussed what should and should not be included on the form.
		2. The idea of a pop-up subject line was brought up, but the committee decided it would be best to have an open subject line entry where faculty could enter their own subject.
		3. The committee discussed the idea of the ability of sending anonymous forms to CIT. The committee decided against this.
		4. The committee also discussed the idea of the ability of adding attachments to the form. It was suggested that this could come in handy as a means to show examples of problems faculty are having. The committee decided that this was not necessary since that role would be more suitable for uTech rather than CIT.
		5. The committee agreed that accompanying the form would be information regarding the form’s purpose - to voice comments, concerns, considerations and recommendations regarding instructional technology.
		6. Also included in the purpose of the form would be a link to uTech for technical problems.
		7. Lastly, the committee looked into the need to archive all forms sent to CIT and it was agreed that this would be a good idea.
		8. Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager/Recording Secretary will work on including our suggestions for the CIT input form.
	2. **Mechanisms for communicating with campus bodies (College computing technology, CITR, Utech, University technology VP, QC)**
		1. The CIT committee looked into a means for communicating with other technology-related committees.
		2. It was decided that CIT would give a report to the uTAG (University Technology Advisory Group).
		3. uTAG meets every 3rd Friday of the month.
		4. CIT will include a policy item that it makes a monthly report to uTAG.
4. **Other:**
	1. **Dedicated Smart Classrooms**
		1. Bree brought up a problem of a shortage of department-level smart classrooms.
		2. Sam, who is also in COFAC, suggested she talk with her Dean on this issue. Broadcasting does have a smart classroom with 16 iMacs and an instructor station. All machines can run Mac or PC.
		3. This classroom was funded with Dean monies and should be available to any department within COFAC. This room is occasionally shared with Music faculty.
		4. It became clear that better communication on smart classroom facilities within the college to all faculty would be beneficial.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Edsall