

Notebook University Implementation Committee

Interim Report

April 3, 2006

Respectfully Submitted by:

The Notebook University Implementation Committee  
Dr. Susan M. Powers, Chair

The January 2006 Implementation Plan submitted by the Notebook Initiative, the Notebook University Implementation Committee (NUIC) provided our recommended committee structure to address the charges that were not already resolved prior to committee formation in October, 2005. This report will provide the current status and recommendations that have come forward to NUIC from the subcommittees.

The results contained within this interim report are the results of approximately 8 NUIC committee meetings since the development of the Implementation Plan at the beginning of January, 2006, and numerous subcommittee meetings. Representation on the subcommittee extends well beyond NUIC members. Additionally, NUIC had an opportunity for an extended meeting with representatives from IBM Lenovo to address questions and concerns with regard to implementation of the Laptop Initiative.

## **Faculty Development**

A professional development subcommittee was formed to address issues related to faculty preparation and training. The focus of this group not only addresses care and feeding issues related to the notebook, but also the important issues of using the notebook in the classroom, helping faculty design courses that make best use of the technology and appropriate syllabus language for faculty. The subcommittee is working with the staff of the Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology Services (and is chaired by the Director of CIRTSS) to take best advantage of the resources of that organization. The faculty development subcommittee will also need to address the issue of data security (research data, student grades, etc.) on machines that leave campus and are more susceptible to theft and damage. The subcommittee report is available in Appendix A.

The syllabus language provided in the subcommittee report will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on April 3, 2006 as an information item.

NUIC will take action on the recommendations of the Faculty Development Subcommittee during its regularly scheduled meetings in April. Results from those actions will be provided in the next interim report.

## **Wireless**

This subcommittee interfaces with the Network group from OIT to address issues related to wireless access on campus. These issues include ubiquitous access, ensuring that classrooms have sufficient access so that all students can get on the network, and the breadth of how far the wireless should extend. The subcommittee provided the following information:

- OIT is rescanning wireless learning spaces under new assumptions of higher student density of the laptop university.
- Cisco enterprise wireless management software is planned. It automatically adjusts wireless access point power under varying demand conditions.

- The committee has determined it is not possible to turn off wireless coverage in a single classroom without affecting other learning spaces.
- There is an examination of wireless coverage desirability in non-public areas of residential halls. Residence Life has representation on this committee.
- Longer Ethernet cables in residential rooms are needed if no wireless coverage is made available.
- The committee is looking into the desirability of wired access in some classes. We would add ports to certain classrooms in this case.
- OIT has been pursuing its own wireless implementation plan and expects to complete efforts for Fall 2007 when the laptop initiative becomes a requirement.

It was recognized by NUIC that the subcommittee is reporting on OIT's progress and no action is required by NUIC.

### **OIT Support**

This subcommittee works with OIT User Services to ensure that adequate levels of support are available for faculty and students. Support includes the important aspect of notebook repair, as well as the assistance of the help desk.

Although it has been stated on several occasions, one issue that seems to persist is the idea of battery cafés. When the university adopted the notion of laptop ownership over leases, the possibility of battery cafés (where a dead battery could be swapped for a fully charged one) was eliminated. In order to clarify this issue and other areas of misunderstanding, NUIC has extended an offer to the ISU AAUP officers to participate in an AAUP forum early Fall 2006 regarding the latest information on the Laptop Initiative.

The subcommittee has provided initial information about plans for the computer store, purchase options, and the computer repair center that will be available starting Fall 2006. Their report is available in Appendix B.

NUIC will be acting on the subcommittee's work in April.

### **Money Issues**

This subcommittee was formed to deal with a number of issues that all have a relation to the investment in the notebook computer. These issues center on planning for insurance/loss/damage and how to provide options for insurance plans for students.

This subcommittee has engaged Risk Management to determine what the insurance, loss, and theft needs might be. Information is being gathered to inform students and families about what insurance might be required beyond the accidental damage coverage and key information about the differences between these two forms of coverage. In particular, they are working to modify our current insurance that requires notification every time equipment is taken off campus (not feasible when all faculty have laptops). Public Safety

is also part of this subcommittee, working to identify the issues that will be involved with faculty and student safety, and theft recovery.

The committee has been working to identify the total costs of ownership (i.e. cost of computer, insurance, etc.) and student purchase options (online through Lenovo, through the computer store, etc.). Finally, how to work with Lenovo to prevent fraud with purchases.

NUIC will be acting on the subcommittee's work in April.

### **Guidelines for Proper Use**

This area is of major concern to faculty. A subcommittee was formed to explore issues related to policies and procedures related to how students use the notebook computer in the classroom in a safe and ethical manner and conform to faculty rules. This subcommittee is drawing upon other work within the university on classroom civility and student code of conduct.

The report from this subcommittee is provided in Appendix C. NUIC will be acting on the subcommittee's work in April.

### **Evaluation**

To determine success and potential problems in the notebook initiative, an Evaluation Subcommittee was formed to identify the domains that need to be evaluated, identification, and if necessary, collection of baseline data to measure performance within the initiative.

This subcommittee has developed a collection of baseline and institutional data that can be collected as elements that can be used evaluate the effectiveness of the program in terms of institutional effectiveness, student use, and faculty use. The plans provided by this subcommittee to date are available in Appendix D.

NUIC will be acting on the subcommittee's work in April.

### **Marketing and Communication**

This subcommittee was formed to work with the University Marketing and Communications Group to ensure a consistent message and to manage the information flow to interested constituents. The group has developed an initial website for basic information and will continue to grow that site (<http://www.indstate.edu/laptop/>). Additionally, plans for materials that are necessary for students, parents, feeder schools,

faculty, and staff will be developed from this subcommittee. The communication plan that has been presented to NUIC to date is available in Appendix E.

Additionally, at a request from Admission, this subcommittee took a number of ideas generated by NUIC to develop the top 5 reasons why there is a laptop initiative. The consolidated ideas presented to NUIC are:

**The Indiana State Laptop Initiative makes our students more:**

1. **Marketable:** Coming from a laptop university, an Indiana State degree adds value to graduates in the competitive job market as it demonstrates a well-rounded, technologically savvy student who has already mastered the computer skills employers expect of new hires.
2. **Productive:** Laptops will allow students to become more efficient in their homework preparation, access to electronic resources, and other research endeavors. This will increase student productivity and lead to more active learning and better retention of course materials.
3. **Interactive:** Pervasive campus computing can increase faculty-student, student-student, and faculty-faculty communication, participation, and feedback which contribute to a greater sense of community and a more robust, active learning environment.
4. **Supported:** Technical support for hardware and software issues, including loaner systems, is available on-campus for program-purchased systems. With the entire campus more technologically savvy, students have more places to turn to for support.
5. **Empowered:** Mobile computing is available anytime, anywhere. The convenience and efficiency with which students can conduct academic, administrative, and personal activities is empowering.

NUIC will be acting on the subcommittee's work in April.

**Instructional Technology Facilities Committee (ITFC)**

NUIC decided that to address issues related to software that should rest on the notebooks and/or be accessible from the notebook, as well as preparation of classrooms to facilitate notebook use, we should utilize the expertise of an existing committee. ITFC is charged to consider instructor workstations and projection as well as software. NUIC asked ITFC to add representatives from Facilities, Registrar, and student representation. NUIC recruited these additional persons for ITFC.

Since ITFC is a standing committee of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), reports provided to NUIC from ITFC are informational only. ITFC's report is available in Appendix F.

### **Student Training**

The Faculty Development Subcommittee will begin in April to work on issues related to student training. CIRTS has been charged to conduct student focus group to learn from students what they see as the most pressing needs for student training. Additionally, representatives of NUIC will discuss with the General Education Coordinator and the Information Technology Literacy Oversight Committee (ITLOC) how the Notebook Initiative impacts the ITL requirement.

### **User Services**

There are some issues related to the Notebook Initiative that were not included in the original charge, and did not fit within the subcommittee structure, but were important recommendations from the 2004-05 NUIC. These issues include store that will exist as an auxiliary unit to provide notebook supplies, as well as a rental loaner pool for students not participating in the mandatory program. These issues have been delegated to User Services. Many of these same topics are being discussed by the OIT Support Subcommittee as well. When information is available, it will be provided to NUIC as information items.

## Appendix A

### **Indiana State University Faculty Development for One-to-One Mobile Computing March 29, 2006**

#### **Framing the Issues**

##### **Professional Development Imperative**

Students at Indiana State will soon have ubiquitous access to technology. This access to technology will allow an opportunity to transform the curriculum and learning environment. This move for Indiana State poses a challenge as to how to efficiently and effectively introduce 650 instructors on how to incorporate the various aspects of today's technology. While many pre-college students are knowledgeable about, and increasingly proficient with technology, many faculty members may not sufficiently familiar or comfortable with technology for it to become an integral part of their instruction delivery and communication with students outside the classroom. More importantly, faculty preparation has yet to fully address this paradigm shift.

Both current literature and experience of other institutions indicate, Indiana State University needs to respond to these challenges with an intensive, enhanced faculty development program utilizing a number of approaches. Literature does point to some issues that need to be addressed to make any laptop initiative successful for classroom instruction. First, faculty must perceive that there is an infrastructure in place that supports their use of technology in instruction, including hardware, appropriate software, and training (Groves & Zemel, 2000). This premise is echoed by Dusick and Yildirim, who assert that because faculty play a decisive role in how successful technology will be in education, investment in technology cannot be fully effective unless faculty receive the necessary training and support and are willing to become fully capable of using these technologies (2000).

Ali identifies one key but very common problem with existing information technology training for faculty: too often, training programs look at faculty under one big umbrella and with limited concern for the needs, abilities, and interests of individual faculty members (2003). A more successful training program for faculty would integrate the technological tools into the curriculum (Cole, 2000). Specifically, training would be more valuable if it could be provided in a context that directly parallels the discipline or uses subject matter that allows the individual to see and experience the use of technology specifically in his or her professional field (Dusick & Yildiim, 2000).

Individualized training is also a recommended training method for faculty members (Seels, Campbell, & Talsma, 2003). Ali reports on the success of one-on-one mentoring where faculty decided what and how to learn. Not only is this type of training attuned to each faculty member's individual needs and abilities, but it allays any fears and embarrassment that the faculty feels at looking incompetent in front of their peers (2003).

There are other elements to include that can make a training program for faculty a success. First, before training is offered, faculty should be able to see new technologies and their capabilities (Seels, Campbell, & Talsma, 2003). A “sandbox” where faculty can play with technology is one way of meeting this need. This would help to justify the suitability of the technology before it is implemented, as recommended by Ali (2003). Then, once training is offered, the sessions should be short, which recognizes a faculty member’s time constraints (Backer 2001). After training has concluded, support resources, such as manuals, should be made available (Seels, Campbell, & Talsma, 2003).

## **Project Plan**

In anticipation of the first year of the initiative, half of all regular, full-time faculty members will receive laptop computers in the spring 2006, along with preliminary training and assistance to familiarize them with operation of the equipment. A similar distribution will follow in the third quarter of 2006. Departments will offer “loaner” laptop computers for temporary instructors to use. Professional development for the laptop computer initiative will begin in summer of 2006 with instruction on basic techniques for classroom utilization of laptops but extends far beyond learning new skills. As it progresses, faculty will redefine learning goals and revise curriculum through the introduction of instructional technologies to enable greater student success. Both formal and informal experiences will contribute to new insights into best pedagogical practice. It is vital that faculty have support in their exploration of this new tool, not simply to overcome hesitation due to lack of experience or training with technology, but to guide their understanding of active learning strategies and advance their effective use of individualized, mobile computing and other supportive technologies to ensure student success. With professional development, faculty can expect to:

- Acquire techniques that lead to more effective instruction.
- Actively engage students in discovering knowledge and applying skills.
- Increase faculty-student, student-student, and faculty-faculty contact, participation, and feedback.
- Increase opportunities for student self-exploration.
- Increase time spent in class on high-level rather than low-level thinking skills and activities.
- Integrate lecture and lab activities previously delegated to specific physical spaces, so that learning activities are dictated by the educational objectives rather than physical location.
- Access more appropriate current information via the Web.
- Use class time more efficiently through use of electronic documents and anytime, anywhere resources and information.
- Significantly improve their information technology knowledge, skills, and confidence.
- Improve ability to utilize the full potential of ISU computing capabilities in their classes.

Professional development will be guided by best practices. Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected at several milestones, primarily using surveys, focus groups, and individual interviews to ensure that instructor needs are effectively met. In this way, formative assessment will guide the program and compiled data will contribute to summative evaluation which will contribute not only to the future of Indiana State but to other institutions nationwide as they consider and develop their own levels of technology integration. The evaluation of professional development will be part of a broader assessment of the laptop initiative conducted by an evaluation committee.

### Professional Development Program

Professional development will increase faculty awareness of effective strategies that incorporate ubiquitous computing. The following program has been designed to increase faculty knowledge and awareness of laptop computer use in the classroom.

- **Summer Institute** Each summer, a group of 24 faculty members (12 in each session) will begin a week-long (5-day) professional development program that will focus on best practices for using the laptop computer for instruction. A major emphasis of the first year will be on faculty who teach the 100 and 200-level courses that are attended most heavily by the freshman students who will be required to have laptops in fall 2007. Our goal is for faculty to become competent in the skills necessary to utilize technology ubiquitously rather than as a separate tool to be brought in only for special projects. The first two summer institutes have already been scheduled for the summer of 2006.

<b>Session 1:</b>	May 15, 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm	<b>Session 2:</b>	August 7, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
	May 16, 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm		August 8, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
	May 17, 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm		August 9, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
	May 18, 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm		August 10, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
	May 19, 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm		August 11, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

- **Faculty Learning Communities (FLC)** An FLC is a cross-disciplinary group of faculty (no more than 8 participants in each group) engaged in an active, collaborative, year-long program about enhancing teaching and learning in the context of the laptop initiative. The FLC will be structured to provide encouragement, support, and reflection for faculty who are committed to enhancing

the learning experience for students. The five FLC to be formed in the fall of 2006 will be as follows:

- Assessment and Engagement - This learning community is focused on understanding the current literature and best practices about assessment and engagement with students in a one-to-one computing environment. In addition, this learning community will provide leadership on new forms of evaluation and assessment that support one-to-one computing to the ISU community.
  - Classroom Environment Issues - This learning community is focused on classroom management issues related to all students having access to a laptop computer in the classroom. This can include developing faculty members' awareness of current software and techniques to maximize student learning.
  - Innovative Instruction with Laptop Computers - This learning community is focused on deepening faculty members understanding of cutting edge software and instruction in a one-to-one computing environment.
  - Laptop Support Issue - This learning community is focused on individual and classroom support issues related to the laptop initiative. This can include design of learning spaces to support the one-to-one computing as well as individual technical support issues.
  - Content Orientated Issues - This learning community is focused on how course content and/or curriculum can be enhanced or modified given a one-to-one computing environment.
- **Faculty Mentoring Program** (Grant Program – dependent on external funding) Faculty members will be selected from the faculty to assist in providing individualized assistance to other faculty. Peer-to-peer relationships have been shown to be very effective for training. Optimally, 24 mentors will be chosen to represent various departments, although smaller departments may not be individually represented. Mentors will be faculty who will receive one course reduction per term to lead other faculty in transforming their teaching style to optimize the mobility and immediacy of the laptops. Mentors will participate in a minimum five-day summer institute for structured, in-depth training ranging from general use to pedagogy and effective practices.
  - **Laptop Instructional Pilot Program (LIPP)** To explore technology in the classroom LIPP would allow faculty to work with students in an environment in which new instructional practices and technology could be tested. Coordinated by the Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology, this program will provide opportunities to “field test” technology in a simulated classroom setting.
  - **Workshops** ISU trainers and instructional designers will share how and why laptops are utilized, pedagogical aspects, and the most effective practices. Workshops will take place in various locations rather than in a stationary lab, exemplifying the mobile, flexible instructional methods being promoted. Faculty will be introduced in small groups to encourage synergy and exchange. Initial

experiences will be augmented with individual sessions as needed. Continued growth and exploration of new technologies will be supported through the Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology. A suggested list of courses includes:

- Shifting Pedagogical Approaches
  - Constructivism
  - Evaluation/Assessment
  - Infusion of Learning Objects
  - Universal Design
- **External Speaker Series** A series of speakers (up to two each semester) will be brought to campus to discuss the use of laptop computers in the classroom. Both discipline specific and general speakers will be found to broaden the conversation about laptop computer use on campus.
  - **Showcase of Successes** An annual laptop showcase event will be organized. At this event faculty will present how they are piloting or using laptop technology in the classroom. In addition, panels from each of the five faculty learning communities will discuss issues they have worked on over the past year.

Within all of these programs, ongoing evaluation will be conducted to ensure the best possible training.

### **Syllabus Language**

Another area charged to the faculty development committee was the development of syllabus language for faculty. Four categories of laptop use in the classroom have been developed.

#### *Laptop Required for Course: Regular Usage*

For the purposes of this course, it will be assumed that you are in compliance with the mandatory laptop policy of the university. You will be expected to bring your laptop and be ready to use it for every class period. Usage of the laptop must conform to the provisions of this course as laid out in this syllabus as well as the Code of Student Conduct.

#### *Laptop Required for Course: Irregular Usage*

For the purposes of this course it will be assumed that you are in compliance with the mandatory laptop policy of the university. You will be expected to bring your laptop and be ready to use it for those class periods noted (below/above). Usage of the laptop must conform to the provisions of this course as laid out in this syllabus as well as the Code of Student Conduct.

#### *Laptop Not Required for Course: Usage Permitted*

While there will be no assignments or examinations for which the laptop will be used, your use of a laptop is generally permitted as long as such usage remains within the bounds of the Code of Student Conduct and it conforms to the provisions of its use as laid

out in this syllabus. There may be occasions where laptop usage is forbidden and if that occurs, failure to comply with this direction will be viewed as a violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

### *Laptop Usage Forbidden*

While the university has chosen to require laptops of its students, the university also recognizes and respects the right of faculty to conduct their classes as they deem appropriate. In this course, no laptop may be used. Failure to comply with this direction is a violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

## **Conclusion**

Indiana State has made a public commitment to student success through active learning. The adoption of a mandatory ownership of a laptop computer by our students, the deployment of laptop computers to our faculty, and our focus on faculty professional development to enhance pedagogy all speak to this commitment. We are confident this project will place Indiana State at the forefront of higher education activities related to ubiquitous computing and better position our institution to leverage some of the emerging K-12 one-to-one technology initiatives.

## **References**

- Ali, A. (2003). Faculty adoption of technology: Training comes first. *Educational Technology*, 43 (2), 51.
- Backer, P. (2001). Models for faculty training in technology. <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU0157.pdf>.
- Cole, S. L. (2000). Technology has found its way into our schools...now what? *TechTrends*, 44(6), 23-27.
- Dusick, D. M. & Yildirim, S. (2000). Faculty computer use and training: Identifying distinct needs for different populations. *Community College Review*, 27(4), 33-47.
- Groves, M. & Zemel, P. C. (2000). Instructional technology adoption in higher education: An action research case study. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 27(1), 57-65.
- Seels, B., Campbell, S., & Talsma, V. (2003) Supporting excellence in technology through communities of learners. *Educational Technology, Research and Development*, 51(1), 91-104.

## **Notebook University Implementation Committee - Faculty Development**

**Subcommittee membership:** Kenneth Janz (chair), Jody Brucker, Robert Guell, Tim Mulkey, Robert Perrin, Susan Powers, Debra Runshe, Virgil Sheets, and Kelly Wilkinson.

## Appendix B

**OIT Support Subcommittee Meeting Minutes****Date: 4-2-06**

---

---

**Members:** Dave Bigney, Mark Ford, Justin Henderson, Paul Hightower, Ernie Kramer, David Malooley, Yancy Phillips

---

---

**Committee Charge:** Identify, discuss, and recommend solutions for all OIT Support involving the Notebook University initiative.

- **Self-Maintainer Program** - OIT is working with Lenovo to establish the Self-Maintainer program at ISU. OIT will become certified to work on the laptops by Lenovo and will also be training student workers to do repairs as well.
  - Since students are purchasing an issue might arise during accidental damage repair process. If there is a discrepancy as to whether something is covered under ThinkPad Protection (TPP) or not the vendor will be the final decision maker. This would scenario would only arise if a question arose as to whether some was accidental or not.
  - The mistreatment of laptops will likely not be an issue for faculty because of the lease – if this ever was an issue.
  - Hot spares will be available 2.5% percent of machines purchased. These will also become spare part laptops. There will be a limited number of spare laptops, but will likely not be a problem since turnaround on spares parts to repair a laptop is 24 hours in most cases.
  - The hot spares will be used for parts. However, in most cases repair parts are received within 24 hours.
  - Cosmetics are not covered under accidental damage or warranty unless it affects the operation. Cosmetic items are considered normal “wear and tear”. The lease agreement will not be affected by cosmetic damage.
  - Repair of alumnus laptops could be covered under the program, but at a lower priority than current students and faculty. This program has not been fully reviewed by the Committee and there is much discussion still needed.
  - SCC 126 and 127 will be closed at the end of spring 2006 semester. The Self-Maintainer program will be established in this room for a “one-stop” support center for students including a walk-in Help Desk, one-on-one assistance with problems, and repair of laptops (software and hardware).
  - Evaluation of spares for part-time students still needs to be discussed.
  
- **Accidental Damage Protection** - Students will need to be educated regarding accidental damage protection, warranty and insurance. Accidental damage protection will be available to the students at a charge of \$60.00 for a three-year

period. A suggestion was made to advertise that the protection would be available at an average cost of \$10.00 per semester to make it sound more appealing.

- **Asset Tracking** - Asset Tracking Property Tag Numbers will be done by Lenovo at the factory for all faculty laptops and then all pertinent information will be provided in a flat file with the asset tag number, MAC address, and serial number for tracking purposes. Student laptops can be checked at the Lenovo administrative site to determine whether the laptops was purchased through the ISU website so that repairs can be made and so that the laptop repair history can be reviewed. Student laptops will not be asset tagged.
- **Laptop Image** - The image for the faculty laptops has been created. The faculty image is dynamic and will change subtly from semester to semester especially between the first round of faculty procurement and the second round in the fall. The student laptop image is being created similarly to the faculty image, but will not include administrative tools such as Banner and NoliWeb. Microsoft is being asked for a waiver for installation of the Office products on the image.
- **Back up Image** - A separate back up image for the drive has been developed for the both students and faculty laptops. This will allow the students for faculty to restore the computer back to the ISU factory default image if an emergency arises. Network storage will be encouraged for both faculty and students so that data is protected especially if an image is restore is to be completed.
- **Encryption** - Any data stored on the laptop will be lost if the laptop is lost or stolen. Encryption is being considered, but has not been developed at this time.
- **Upgrades for Student Laptops** - Students will be able to upgrade some of the options when purchasing from the website. They will be able to purchase one of three different models; standard laptop, preferred laptop, and multi-media laptop.
- **Residence Hall Support** - A Resident Computing Consultant (RCC) will be located in each of the residence halls beginning in the fall. These students will be instrumental in assisting students with their information technology concerns including networking (wired and wireless), Cisco Clean Access (CCA) assistance, and Lenovo ThinkPad assistance. Each RCC will be issued a Lenovo ThinkPad at the beginning of their employment to become more familiar with the product that students will be purchasing.
- **Cisco Clean Access (CCA) on Faculty Laptops** - Cisco Clean Access updates is a major concern especially if the laptop is to be used for classroom instruction. The group suggested that all faculty laptops be placed in the exemption/exception list. This has already been established and prior to the laptops being disbursed all faculty laptops will be placed in the exception list.

- **Printing** - Researching printing options for the student printing is beginning. The need for wireless printing is an important factor for students. The final solution for printing from the laptops will be investigated and installed by fall 2007. An interim solution will be in place for fall 2006 which will likely consist of a student visiting a public lab and “hard-wiring” into a local printer. This will likely consist of a USB cable connection to a local printer in several labs.
- **Batteries** - Battery cafés will not be established because students will not be leasing computers. Students will be able to purchase additional batteries for \$99 through the Computer Store that will be established in fall 2006.
- **Care and Feeding** -

**Items still under discussion:**

- **Care and Feeding** - CIRT is creating much of this documentation as well as working with Lenovo to provide ISU with existing documentation.
  - Tips and Tricks
  - Some type of competition using laptops
- **How to:**
  - Apply MSCA software to schoolwork
  - Use software to get organized
  - Protect your laptop
  - Maximize battery life

## Appendix C

Report from the NUIC Sub-Committee on  
Guidelines for Proper Use

**Members:** Nick Swango (SGA), Chantelle Henry (Student Representative to the Student Affairs Committee), Rhonda Impink (Social Work), Robin Burden (Elementary, Early, and Special Education), Bonita McGee (Student Judicial Programs), David Wright (Student Affairs)

**Regulations:**

The committee reviewed regulations presently in force according to the **Code of Student Conduct**, Section C, **Offenses Detrimental to the Operation of the University** and determined that these regulations are adequate to the task of defining acceptable conduct in the classroom, including the appropriate use of technology. A copy of these regulations is available at <http://web.indstate.edu/sjp/code/code2004.pdf>. Additionally, the committee reviewed Section C of the proposed Academic Integrity policy which addresses “conduct which disrupts instruction.” This proposed regulation serves to reinforce the authority of faculty to address improper activity in the classroom.

**Assuring Appropriate Use:**

The committee has determined that the positive presence of Laptops in the classroom depends on two efforts:

- **Effectively Identifying Positive Outcomes.** Focusing only on activities we hope to prohibit or control will not make this initiative a success. The committee recommends a commitment to positive faculty development that provides different levels of support designed to address varied types of classroom uses as well as varied levels of instructor comfort and need. CIRTS should consider the provision of faculty support that is designed to help faculty use this technology to enhance teaching and learning as defined by the individual faculty member. Faculty development should not be presented in a manner that suggests that teaching without technology is no longer valid. The committee believes that faculty development should be offered at department levels, and should utilize faculty who are already technology users as “consultants” within their respective departments.
- **Guidelines for Proper Classroom Use of this Technology Abound at Other Laptop Institutions.** The committee spent considerable time reviewing some of these models, especially the “Suggestions for Addressing Computer Use in the Classroom” from Northern Michigan University. Based on this review, the following recommendations should inform the development of guidelines at ISU:
  1. Teaching faculty using technology in the classroom should be identified and used as consultants as to effective classroom management and teaching strategies. These colleagues are a resource that should be organized by CIRTS to assist in all aspects of this effort.
  2. Written examples outlining classroom expectations should be developed and provided to faculty for inclusion in syllabi and in introductory sessions to each

course. Expectations should make it clear that the instructor will determine when Laptops are open and when they should be closed.

3. Faculty development must include assistance in how to effectively confront a student whose conduct (technology based or not) is disrupting instruction. It is important to address the issues individually and privately as opposed to addressing the offending student publicly.
4. Proper use of laptop technology should be tied to positive class outcomes (for example, points given for classroom participation to encourage attentive behavior, points given for appropriate use of the laptop).
5. Issues beyond classroom management can complicate the use of laptop technology. Guidelines from other institutions often refer to the need to confront “offensive” or “inappropriate” screen images. Faculty development needs to help faculty work through the complexities of determining what images should be challenged and which are protected speech.
6. Mandating that a student have a laptop creates a difficult situation when an instructor tells the student he/she can no longer bring the notebook to the class. Guidelines must include consequences but those consequences must be applied within the context of this mandatory program.

As the university embarks on this initiative, it will be important to return to this topic and undertake an assessment of the effectiveness of faculty and student development in making this a positive learning initiative. This assessment should be conducted on an annual basis.

Appendix D

***Evaluating the Impact of the Laptop Initiative***

**Draft Report**

**NUIC Evaluation Subcommittee**

**March 30, 2006**

*Committee Members:*

Concetta DePaolo (Chair)

Terry Ishitani

Ken Janz

Susan Powers

Virgil Sheets

Nick Swango (student)

Kelly Waite (student)

## Evaluating Student Usage, Proficiency and Satisfaction

Below is a brief review of existing student survey data that could be used to evaluate the initiative's success in five different domains.

### ISU's Perception & Recruitment

Of course, the ultimate measure of the contribution of the laptop to ISU's recruitment efforts would be seen in increased recruitment and retention numbers. However, these are influenced by so many factors, more specific indices should also be examined.

Perhaps the most obvious place in which the impact of new initiatives on ISU's perception can be measured is in the SIQ that is given to almost all students at Sycamore advantage. We recommend adding two items to question #50 (which asks about the importance of various factors in students' decisions to come to ISU). Specifically, we suggest

**SIQ 50i. ISU's being a laptop university**

**SIQ 50j. The laptop scholarship program**

The SIQ also contains several background items that would indirectly assess students' perceptions of ISU (by virtue of assessing the students' background characteristics and collegiate expectations). These include **SIQ #8, #24f, #35h, #41j, and #42h**, which assess prior computer experience, usage, and collegiate expectations.

### ISU's Active Learning Goals

The contribution of the laptop to ISU's reputation for active and experiential learning can be assessed in numerous places, including the First-Year Experience survey, Senior Survey, SIRs (averages across multiple sections of courses and across the university), and OIT data. Note that some of these items simply assess use of computers for academic work, while others assess "active learning" independently of computers.

The First-Year Experience Survey (FYE) currently contains several questions relating to active and group learning **D4, D6, and D7**. In addition, the questionnaire includes items assessing "relationships with faculty members," **A3**, "use of technology" on campus, **A5**, and students' overall "academic experiences," **A8**, all of which may be affected by the laptop initiative.

The Senior Survey also contains questions about students' academic experience, and although few pertain directly to "active" learning issues, they might be affected by the laptop initiative. These questions (for which we have no identifying numbers) assess **satisfaction with classroom instruction (generally), with the teaching ability of faculty in the major, with opportunities to interact with faculty, and with feedback from instructors about academic progress**.

Similarly, the NSSE has four items pertaining to computer use (thought not necessarily for active learning). These items assess frequency of using a computer to discuss/complete an assignment, **#11**, using email to communicate with instructors, **1m**, using computers in academic work, **10g**, and using information technology, **11g**.

SIRs also assess the experience of various active learning strategies, including #22, engaging in small group discussions, #24, working on lab exercises, and #33, whether the course actively involved the student. In addition, SIRs ask for students' evaluations of the instructor's use of computer aids, #28.

Finally, the **OIT survey includes items (too numerous to identify individually)** that assess students' use of technology both in and outside of class, many of which we expect to be impacted by the laptop initiative (although they do not—in all cases—correspond to “active” learning strategies). This survey also contains a specific item to assess how much **faculty use of technology has impacted their learning**. OIT also holds data on frequency of blackboard use and network storage that should be impacted by the laptop as well.

Notably, many faculty have expressed a concern that the use of the laptop will increase off-task behavior in the classroom (thereby reducing active engagement in the class). *Unfortunately, none of the current instruments contain any measures relating to off-task behavior.* We would suggest that a new question be added to one or more of the above measures (or that a separate, self-report or observational measure be created) to measure **off-task behavior**. The ideal placement would be on SIRs, but since those are standardized instruments, it might be difficult to do so (unless we can request the inclusion of an additional item). In addition, we propose the administration of a survey of off-task behavior be administered to a large sample of undergraduates once prior to the implementation of the laptop initiative and (at least) once more after the initiative. A copy of the proposed instrument and methodology are attached.

### ISU's Computer Support for Students

The experience of computer support for students as a result of the laptop initiative can be assessed in multiple ways.

The FYE survey has a single item, **B3**, that assesses students' satisfaction with computer labs, which we recommend is changed to:

#### **B3 Laptop Support**

Similarly, the Senior Survey has an item (unknown number) that assesses students' overall satisfaction with ISU's computer labs. We recommend this item be changed to:

#### **SS#? Laptop Support (and/or laptop initiative).**

The OIT survey contains several items that assess **support from the IT Help-desk, from non-ISU vendors, and from on-site computer lab attendants**. We would recommend that the item assessing satisfaction with computer lab attendants be replaced with the TWO items below:

**OIT#? Laptop assistance & support.**

**OIT#? Access and support for printing**

### ISU's Students' Post-Graduate Success

Whereas the alumni survey has a fairly low response rate and does not directly address the issues of interest, the contribution of the laptop initiative to students' post-graduate success is hard to measure.

However, several items on the ISU senior survey assess students' perception of their post-graduate readiness in ways that might be affected by the laptop initiative. These include

items (whose numbers are not known) that address students' satisfaction with **the value of their education**, their **career preparation**, and their **preparation for employment received from courses in their major**.

In addition, the OIT survey has an item (number unknown) to assess how well ISU's technological services **have prepared them for the workplace**.

Other (non-academic matters)

Students at many laptop institutions have noted that the computers are frequently used outside of class as in class, and it would seem worthwhile to evaluate other aspects of students' lives that might be affected by the laptop (and that may also influence students' success).

The FYE survey contains several items, **D15, D16, & D17**, concerning use of the internet or computers (though not exclusively) for recreation and socialization. It also contains an item assessing students' satisfaction with their "social experience" at ISU, **A7**.

Similarly, the senior survey assesses students' satisfaction with the "**social climate**" at ISU that might be impacted by the laptop.

Finally, the OIT survey also contains items to assess students' use of **interactive services** and **group portals** that will likely be affected by the laptop.

## Evaluating Faculty Usage, Proficiency and Satisfaction

Most of faculty concerns about the laptop program can be addressed with institutional data as well as data on student satisfaction with the program. However, it is also important to examine the impact of the laptop on faculty's experience in teaching and of obtaining technical support for their laptops (that may be used for both teaching and research).

### ISU's Active Learning Goals

Numerous items on the OIT survey concern faculty use of the laptops in ways that assess students' active learning, including a question assessing students' **off-task behavior** in the classroom, students' **attendance**, and active **involvement** in class. Faculty also rate students' **understanding of technology** and students' **interest in learning**.

In addition to these items, we recommend the addition of several items after implementation begins:

**How able to implement active learning in the class?**

**How many times/semester do you assign homework requiring use of a computer?**

**How many times/semester do you require students bring their computer to class?**

**How satisfied are you with your laptop computer, if you have one?**

**How often do you use computers in class for:**

**Demonstrations**

**Individual or Group Activities**

**Polling or other Classroom Interaction**

**Administering Exams.**

### ISU's Computer Support for Faculty

The experience of computer support for faculty as a result of the laptop initiative can be assessed via multiple items on the OIT survey, including items that assess **satisfaction with technological services**, **usefulness of technological services**, and **sources and barriers to technological support** on campus.

### Evaluation Using Institutional Data

Below is a brief review of existing institutional sources of data that could be used to evaluate the initiative's success in five different domains.

#### ISU's Perception & Recruitment

Ideally, the laptop will positively impact ISU's attraction to high achieving students. Although not solely a result of the laptop initiative, changes in admissions data are a key source of information on success in this arena. These include data on: **number of inquiries, numbers of applications, and actual enrollments** before and after implementation of the initiative (Multiple time points should probably be examined to control for pre-existing trends). Other possible data include data on the types of students applying, e.g., **SAT scores**, and on the rate of **retention** from year-to-year.

In addition, any future marketing studies (like that recently completed by EMG) should be examined to identify whether significant changes in the perception of ISU have occurred (especially in the perception of ISU's academic rigor and quality of training).

#### ISU's Active Learning Goals

Numerous forms of institutional data can attest to the positive impact of the laptop on active and experiential learning at ISU.

First, data from faculty interest in and participation in **CIRTS workshops** related to new pedagogies (especially those involving technology) can be used to establish a change. Data should summarize the **number of workshops offered** related to engaging pedagogies and use of technology in the classroom, as well as a record of **attendance at these workshops (both in raw numbers as well as percentage of slots enrolled)** both before and after the implementation of the laptop.

Second, **OIT** also provides data pertaining to this domain. Specifically, the **percent of courses using blackboard** and the amount of **network storage devoted to courses**.

Finally, data from **room scheduling** regarding **requests for "smart classrooms"** and/or classrooms with other technological features (e.g., "clickers") should also be examined.

#### ISU's Computer Support for Students

A primary source of data on the impact of the laptop program on ISU's ability to provide computer support is data from OIT. Specifically, data on the **number of calls to the help desk (and the proportion of those calls that must be "turned down" because of unique machine issues)** should be examined before and after implementation of the laptop. In addition, data on the **average "response time" for computer repairs** should be collected after implementation (Note that although there is no baseline for repairs of student machines before implementation, comparisons could be made for post-implementation repairs for both students and faculty with pre-implementation repair times for faculty). Data on the **"down time" for servers** used by students and used for coursework (e.g., for online testing) should also be monitored before and after implementation.

#### ISU's Students' Post-Graduate Success

The primary source of institutional data pertaining to the impact of the laptop on students' post-graduate success would be the career center. The relevant data would include

**counts of the number of employers who interview/recruit students** through the career center as well as **percentages of students hired** prior to graduation. We would also recommend that the Career Center include a question about the benefit of ISU's laptop program on any questionnaires given to employers and/or graduates (Such a question might be added in two years that is before full implementation in order to get a baseline).

Other (non-academic matters)

Another source of institutional data pertaining to the laptop initiative would be data from the University police on the **number of computer and computer-related thefts**, both for departmental- and student-owned equipment.

**Appendix A: Student Grid**

	<b>Competitive Advantage (Student Attitudes)</b>	<b>Enhanced, Active Learning</b>	<b>Improved Technical Support</b>	<b>Post-Grad Impact</b>	<b>Other / Non-academic</b>
<b>SIQ</b>	<i>NEW - effects on choosing ISU of:</i> 50i - laptop program 50j. laptop scholarship <u>Computer usage, expectations</u> 8 - how long used comp at home 24f - amt. usage for rec in HS 35h - proficiency for school work 41j - expected use for rec coll 42h - coll should improve comp abil				
<b>FYE survey</b>		<u>Active/group learning questions</u> D4 D6 D7 <u>Other</u> A3 - relationships with faculty A5 - use of technology A8 - overall academic experience	<i>NEW - change question on labs to B3 - satis with laptop support</i>		<u>Use of computers outside class:</u> D15 D16 D17 A7 - satis with social experience
<b>Senior survey</b>		<u>Satisfaction with:</u> Classroom instruction Teaching ability of faculty in major Opportunity to interact w/ faculty Feedback from instructors	<i>NEW - change question on labs to Satisfact w/ LT Support/initiative</i>	<u>Questions assessing:</u> Value of their education Career preparation prep for employ - major courses	<u>Satisfaction with</u> Social climate
<b>NSSE</b>		<u>Computer usage questions:</u> 11-use computer complete assign 1m - use email commun w/ faculty 10g - use comp academic work 11g - using information technology			
<b>SIRs</b>		<u>Active learning/computer questions:</u> 22 - probs small grp discussions 24 - lab exercises 28 - instructor use computer aids 33 - course actively involved me			
<b>OIT surveys/data</b>		<u>OIT student survey</u> Many questions on use of tech Fac use of tech impacts learning Use of Blackboard Network storage	<u>Existing questions on:</u> support from the IT Help-desk non-ISU vendors <i>Change Q on-site lab attendants to: Satis w/ LT Support &amp; assistance</i> <i>Satis w/ access/support printing</i>	<u>OIT student survey -</u> tech services prep for workplace	<u>OIT student survey:</u> use of interactive services use of group portals
<b>New Data Collection</b>		<i>New questions or new survey on Off Task Behavior</i>			

**Appendix B: Faculty Grid**

	<b>Enhanced, Active Learning</b>	<b>Improved Technical Support</b>
<b>OIT surveys/data</b>	<p><u>Faculty survey - eval of students':</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>off-task behavior</li> <li>attendance</li> <li>active involvement in class</li> <li>understanding of technology</li> <li>interest in learning</li> </ul> <p><i>NEW questions on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>implementing active learning</i></li> <li><i>how often assign hw using computer</i></li> <li><i>how often require comp in class</i></li> <li><i>how satis with laptop</i></li> <li><i>how often use computers in class for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>demonstrations</i></li> <li><i>individual/group activities</i></li> <li><i>polling/classroom interaction</i></li> <li><i>administering exams</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>Faculty survey</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>how useful tech services are</li> <li>satisfaction with tech services</li> <li>sources of tech support, barriers</li> </ul>

**Appendix C: Institutional Grid**

	<b>Competitive Advantage (Student Attitudes)</b>	<b>Enhanced, Active Learning</b>	<b>Improved Technical Support</b>	<b>Post-Grad Impact</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Institutional data</b>	Admissions data: (before & after) interest/inquiries applications enrollment Types of students applying SAT scores Retention data	CIRTS data: faculty participants in workshops, etc. number of workshops attendance (# and % filled)  Room requests for smart classrooms, etc.		Career center data # employers who recruit placement rates	Admissions/Financial Aid data: Breakdown of # of students: laptop scholarship got financial aid for laptop had to buy themselves <u>Security issues</u> Police reports, thefts Insurance claims
<b>OIT data</b>		Percent of courses using Blackboard Network storage devoted to courses	Satisfaction with help desk Maintenance numbers # calls # turned down b/c unique machines average response time down time for servers	OIT student question - prepare for workplace	
<b>New Data Collection</b>	Marketing study on perception of  ISU esp. regarding academic rigor, quality of training			Career center New question on laptops on surveys given to graduates or employers	

**Appendix D: Off-Task Survey & Methodology**  
(Compiled by Taiwo Ande, CIRT)

OFF-TASK ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

1. College affiliation : (drop-down list of colleges)
  
2. Classification:  
Freshman                       Sophomore   
Junior                               Senior
  
3. When are most of your classes held?  
Morning                       Afternoon                       Evening
  
4. What is the average duration of your classes?  
Less than 1 hour                       1-2 hours                       More than 2 hours
  
5. Do you usually get a break during your class session?  
Yes                       No
  
6. What is the average size of your classes?  
Less than 10 students                       10-25 students   
26-50 students                       More than 50 students
  
7. Where do you usually sit in class?  
Front rows                       Middle rows                       Back rows
  
8. What is the classroom type for most of your courses?  
Online/Virtual classroom                       On-campus classroom                       Labs
  
9. What is the main teaching method used for most of your classes (*Select all that apply*)  
Lecture   
Lecture with audio-visual presentations   
Discussion and group activities   
Hands-on/experiential/demonstrations   
Blackboard/WebCT

10. What percentage of class time do you spend on the following off-task activities?

	0%	Less than 10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	More than 75%
Talking with friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dozing/Sleeping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Passing notes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cell phone use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Laptop use (for activities not related to class)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Listening to music	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Eating/Drinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spacing out	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Please list any other off-task activities you indulge in, apart from those mentioned above. Also indicate the percentage of class time you spend on each listed off-task activity.

12. How much of overall class time do you spend off-tasking?

- None       Less than 10%       11-25%   
 26-50%       51-75%       More than 75%

13. How does off-tasking impact your learning during class?

- Barrier to learning       No impact       Improves learning

14. Do you notice other students indulging in off task activities during class?

- No       Yes, a few       Yes, several

15. What are your main reasons for off-tasking? (Check up to three only).

- I don't off-task in class
- The class gets boring
- I am not interested in the class
- I need to attend to something urgently
- Off-tasking helps me learn better
- Other students instigate me to off-task
- My professor does not mind if I off-task

## CLASSROOM OFF-TASK BEHAVIOR EVALUATION

### Proposed Methodology

The following are suggestions for the implementation of the off-task behavior evaluation:

- **Personal Response System (PRS)**

#### *Method 1*

Various elements of off-task activities that are to be evaluated may be incorporated in form of questions on PRS-ready PowerPoint slides. The PRS will be set up in public areas around campus which are used by students from all colleges (e.g. Commons, library, public labs). Students will be invited to participate in the evaluation by clicking their answers into the PRS using the remotes provided. It would be especially useful to target groups of 5 or more students who enter the public area together. This would allow for the collection of multiple responses simultaneously, thereby maximizing time available for the evaluation.

#### *Advantages*

- Setting up PRS and using large screens in public areas to conduct the evaluation could attract attention and encourage participation. Students may be curious and interested in trying out a new technology.
- This method could publicize the PRS and make the campus community aware of the use of technology.

#### *Method 2*

The PRS slides may be set up as outlined in Method 1. However, the evaluation will be conducted in various classrooms across campus at the beginning of class sessions. The Principal Investigator (PI) will obtain permission from instructors of various courses to conduct the PRS evaluation during the first 15 minutes of one of their classes. In order to put students at ease, it would be ideal if the professor is not present in class during the evaluation. PI or his/her representative will demonstrate the use of the PRS, following which students can click in their answers.

#### *Advantages*

- If this method is used in enough classrooms across campus, a significant number of responses can be obtained since students are directly targeted in large groups.
- Students will have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the PRS. This would especially be useful if the technology is going to be incorporated as a campus-wide teaching tool.
- Setting up the PRS in different classrooms will allow for diverse responses based on classroom type, size, course, student classification, and college.

*Overall Disadvantages of Using PRS Methods*

- PRS leaves little room for open-ended responses. The number of questions asked should be limited in order for this evaluation to be feasible in terms of time and student participation.

- **Web Forms**

An off-task behavior questionnaire will be developed using Webforms, and approved as an instrument for this evaluation. The link to this online form will be sent to the MyISU e-mail addresses of all students as well as posted as a global announcement on the MyISU portal.

The form will be active for a specific time period or until an acceptable number of responses have been received.

*Advantages*

- Setting up the Webforms is relatively quick and convenient.
- An online questionnaire allows ample scope for open-ended responses and incorporation of more questions.
- Data collected can be easily exported for analysis.

*Disadvantages*

- In spite of mailing the link to all students on campus, getting an acceptable number of responses may be difficult. The form should be enabled for a fairly long period of time and regular reminders, announcements, and other promotional methods are required to encourage participation.
- Webforms have been widely used for many evaluation purposes, and are therefore not particularly unique, exciting, or innovative in terms of technology.

**Concluding Note**

Either of the above methods or a combination of methods can be used for evaluation of off-task behaviors. PRS Method 1 may not be suitable for the purpose of this evaluation due to various limitations. The following are the possible combinations of the recommended methods - PRS Method 2 and Web Forms:

- Both methods will be implemented simultaneously. Responses will be collected using PRS as well as Web Forms, independent of each other. The advantage of this combination is that more responses may be obtained using two evaluation methods. The disadvantage is that some responses may overlap, i.e. if a participant in the PRS evaluation also completes the online questionnaire.
- Webforms may be used as a complement to the PRS. Responses to basic questions will be collected during the in-class evaluation. Participants in the PRS sessions will be asked to complete the online questionnaire for the second phase of the evaluation. The Web form will incorporate questions that could not be included in the PRS and provide

scope for open-ended responses. The advantage of this method is that overlapping responses can be avoided, and a thorough evaluation is possible. The disadvantage is that only PRS participants can take the online questionnaire, and there is no guarantee that every student will complete it.

## Appendix E

## Laptop University Communications Plan

updated March 22, 2006

Audience	Communication/Event	Purpose	Date	Responsible
Prospective Students/Parents	Sycamore Advantage flier	Promote optional purchase option	Mar-06	Admissions
All	ISU laptop website	General information, direct to online purchase	1-Apr	OIT/CIRT
Prospective Students/Parents	Scholarship website	Promote laptop scholarship	Apr-06	Admissions
Current Students/Parents	General flier	Promote optional purchase option	Apr-06	CIRT
Laptop Award Recipients	T-shirt promotional mailing	Encourage confirmation/attendance	1-Apr	Admissions
Laptop Award Recipients	E-mail to students via Talisma	5/1 confirmation deadline	14-Apr	Admissions
All	Lenovo purchase website	online purchases	1-May	Lenovo/OIT
Current Students	MyISU portal announcements	Varies by need/topic	May-06	CIRT
Prospective Students	E-mail to students via Talisma	Promote optional purchase option	May-06	Admissions
Faculty	Letter via campus mail	Faculty/Students/Admin Rights and Responsibilities	May-06	NUIC/CIRT
Faculty	Provost's Leaflet newsletter	Promote Laptop Initiative/ purchase option	May-06	CIO/CIRT
Faculty/Staff	Sycamore.Net OIT newsletter	Promote Laptop Initiative/ purchase option	May-06	CIO/CIRT
Current Students	Posters	Promote optional purchase option	Jun-06	CIRT
Students/Parents	Infomercial Video	General information about program	Jun-06	CIRT
Faculty/Staff	Campus Connection	Promote Laptop Initiative/ purchase option	Jun-06	Katie Spanuello
Faculty/Staff	Presentation (with video, handouts)	General information about program	June 5-6, 06	NUIC/CIRT
Prospective Students/Parents	Sycamore Advantage table/pres. ?	Promote optional purchase option	Jun-06	OIT/CIRT
Current Students	Student Technology Guide	Promote optional purchase option	Jul-06	CIRT
Current Students	Laptop Infomercial videos	Promote Laptop Initiative/ purchase option	Jul-06	CIRT
Current Students	E-mail to students via Talisma	Promote optional purchase option	Aug-06	Admissions
Current Students	Move-in flier	Promote optional purchase option	15-Aug-06	OIT/CIRT
Current Students	Statesman ads	Promote optional purchase option	20-Aug-06	OIT/CIRT
Faculty/Staff	Global E-mails	Varies by need/topic	Ongoing	CIRT
Faculty/Staff	MyISU portal announcements	Varies by need/topic	Ongoing	CIRT
Alumni	Indiana State Magazine	General information, direct to online purchase	Aug-06	Marty Blank

## Appendix F

**ITFC Subcommittee Report****Date 4-2-06**

---

---

**Members:** Alma Mary Anderson, April Hay, Paul Hightower, Pei-Yi Hu, James Hughes, Julie Lockett, Bruce McLaren, Anita Moon, Yancy Phillips, Marvin Seger, Pat Teeters, Alan Ward, Ginny Whitkanack

---

---

**Classroom Classification** - The Committee is classifying each classroom based on the following:

*Differences between levels in **BOLD***

- **Level I** – Base Component Configuration
  - Overhead Transparency Projector
  - Screen
  - Lan Access
  
- **Level IIa** – Base Component Configuration
  - Custom Teaching Station or Equipment Cabinet
  - Ceiling Mounted LCD Projector
  - Projection Screen
  - Computer and Monitor
  - SVHS Video Cassette Recorder
  - DVD Player
  - Audio Amplifier and Speaker System
  - S-Video Switcher
  - Peripherals Interface – typically Altinex Wall Mount Analog Interface
  - VGA Autoswitch Distribution Amp
  - Rack Mount Power and Distribution Unit
  - **Campus Cable** and Lan Access
  
- **Level IIb** – Base Component Configuration
  - Custom Teaching Station or Equipment Cabinet
  - Ceiling Mounted LCD Projector
  - Projection Screen
  - Computer and Monitor
  - SVHS Video Cassette Recorder
  - DVD Player
  - Audio Amplifier and Speaker System
  - S-Video Switcher

- Peripherals Interface – typically Altinex Wall Mount Analog Interface
  - VGA Autoswitch Distribution Amp
  - Rack Mount Power and Distribution Unit
  - Campus Cable and Lan Access
  - **SMARTBoard**
- **Level III Classroom – Base Component Configuration (Large Venue)**
    - Custom Teaching Station or Equipment Cabinet
    - Ceiling Mounted LCD Projector
    - Projection Screen
    - Computer and Monitor
    - SVHS Video Cassette Recorder
    - DVD Player
    - Audio Amplifier and Speaker System
    - S-Video Switcher
    - Peripherals Interface – typically Altinex Wall Mount Analog Interface
    - VGA Autoswitch Distribution Amp
    - Rack Mount Power and Distribution Unit
    - Campus Cable and Lan Access
    - SMARTBoard
    - **Two-way Voice Amplification**

These levels will need to be adjusted as we move through the process of adding the laptops to the classrooms. As the laptop initiative proceeds additional features that will need to be considered are wireless/wired networking, power, furniture, lighting, etc. The need for wireless access to be added in a classroom should be based on special needs by faculty that is yet to be determined.

Rooms where the laptops will be used first will need to be determined. At other institutions with laptop programs Lenovo indicated that their experience has shown that faculty members prefer flexible seating arrangements in the classrooms. Although this has not been determined yet there seemed to be consensus from the Committee that this was true at ISU as well. The Committee looked at how the possibility of power and wired access will not be conducive to flexible seating.

**Learning Spaces Identification** - Discussions were held to identify as many learning spaces in the University as possible. Although this list may not be comprehensive or possibly overly comprehensive the Committee felt that the list should be provided for reference in future decisions.

The following areas were suggested as possible learning spaces:

- Classrooms
- Labs

- College of Business open areas
- Stalker Hall first floor
- College of Nursing lounges
- Conference rooms
- SCC front area
- Commons area
- Commuter lounge (two separate rooms)
- HMSU 6<sup>th</sup> floor (student organizations)
- College of Education lounge areas, study areas (study carrels), and department lounge areas
- Library
- DE rooms
- Residential Life
  - Every residence hall room
  - Every suite – Lincoln Quad
  - Every apartment – University Apartments
  - All floor lounges
  - All first floor lounges
  - Le Clubs work out space
  - Two newly renovated 7<sup>th</sup> floor lounges (possibly two other 7<sup>th</sup> floor lounges)
  - Several basement rooms in several of the halls (meeting and conference rooms used by the students)
  - Two mezzanines (Cromwell and Mills)
  - Dining rooms (Sycamore and Lincoln)
  - Reception desk areas
  - University Apartments (computer lab, community center, fitness center and party room areas)
- Outdoor areas
- Fountain area
- Brazil Field Campus
- College of Nursing skills lab
- Post Office
- Prudential Building
- Hulman Center
- Bus Terminal/Garage Parking
- Arena
- Fine Arts Building
- Athletic fields
- Bird/Gibson Center
- Michael Simmons Building

**Power in Classrooms** – It was suggested that one classroom in each of the academic buildings be set up with wired Ethernet and power outlets as a pilot. One of the larger classrooms could be used as many of the newer

rooms already have power and wired Ethernet installed. This is all contingent on budget to do so.

There are safety issues in the classrooms that need to be factored in due to extension cords, power strips, or the likely possibility of students “stringing” their AC adapters from the wall to their laptops. This will cause a serious tripping hazard. There were a few suggestions by the Committee to help alleviate this problem such as:

- Special electrical cords that are flat would allow for special covers to be placed over them so as not to interfere with foot traffic
- Running cables under carpeting
- Furniture arranged so that it is against the walls so that power is run through the desks
- Installation of electrical in classrooms especially if they are being remodeled

It is proposed that batteries could be made available for rent in academic buildings. OIT could provide the batteries for rent by those students that purchased the recommended laptop. Obviously money will have a determination on if this is possible including the staffing of the locations. The battery life with the Lenovo technology is superior to less expensive laptops, but a student’s battery may not last if the student has two or three classes in a row. Nothing additional has been discussed about this specific idea other than the statement that students can purchase additional batteries at the Computer Store so they would have additional capability if needed.

A prototype classroom should be created where feedback could be obtained from students and faculty.

**Classroom Scheduling** – Classroom scheduling appears to be a major concern of the Committee. The classroom levels need to be added to Banner to accurately reflect the technology in the classroom. Problems have occurred when using the present classroom scheduling process which has caused some faculty members to schedule classes at other locations outside of their building. It was also mentioned that it would be beneficial if department assistants would be able to view the schedules to assist in scheduling.

A suggestion was made to assign the laptop friendly classrooms to those that will use the rooms the most especially in the beginning stages of the laptop initiative. The Deans and Department Chairs could be consulted to identify appropriate classrooms and faculty. The first year will involve freshman and faculty teaching them should be given priority. Pilot projects could be identified and then priority given to them. It has been suggested that the prioritization could be determined by

discipline or by college. A concern was raised regarding the prioritization process being assigned to the colleges and is still under discussion.

---

---