

Notebook University Implementation Committee

Interim Report II

June 1, 2006

Respectfully Submitted by:

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

This report represents the second interim report of the Notebook University Implementation Committee and provides the current status and recommendations that have come forward to NUIC from the subcommittees and action taken by NUIC based on these subcommittee reports.

Beyond the subcommittee reports, NUIC also created a statement of rights and responsibilities to define roles of students, faculty, and administration within a mandatory laptop program. The generated statement is shown below:

- 1) Faculty
 - a) Rights
 - i) To conduct their class in a fashion consistent with their discipline.
 - ii) To require, encourage, or prohibit the use of laptops in their classrooms for assignments or examinations as they deem appropriate to course goals and pedagogy.
 - iii) To be offered sufficient faculty development to determine optimal laptop usage in their courses.
 - iv) To expect that the infrastructure of the classroom will support laptop usage when the faculty member has indicated to his/her chair an academic need for such.
 - b) Responsibilities
 - i) To place in their syllabus rules and expectations with regard to laptop usage.
 - ii) To place in their syllabus or clearly announce course-meeting, assignment-specific, or examination-specific laptop usage requirements.
 - iii) To deal with violations of rules and expectations in a fashion consistent with the Code of Student Conduct.
 - iv) To clearly communicate to their chair their intention to use laptops within their course so that a room assignment can be appropriately made.
- 2) Student
 - a) Rights
 - i) To receive clear instructions as to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of laptop usage in courses, for assignments, or for exams.
 - ii) To receive timely support for laptops purchased through the ISU-approved vendor.
 - iii) To expect that the infrastructure of their learning spaces will support laptop usage when there is an academic need for such.
 - b) Responsibilities
 - i) To comply with all laptop-relevant instructions from any ISU faculty or staff member.
 - ii) To attend class prepared for all assignments or examinations as they relate to the laptop. (Specifically, but not limited to, students have appropriate software and security updates as well as charged and spare batteries as necessary.)
 - iii) To use the laptop in a courteous fashion as it relates to their fellow students.

- iv) To comply with the Code of Student Conduct.
- 3) Administration
 - a) Rights
 - i) Expect that faculty will inform appropriate administrators of hardware/software/behavior problems that emerge as laptops are used in the class.
 - b) Responsibilities
 - i) With all due diligence provide sufficient hardware, software, technical, and bandwidth support for laptop usage.
 - ii) Provide sufficient faculty development to allow faculty to determine their optimal use of the laptop and appreciate the time required for faculty development.
 - iii) Facilitate the assignment of classrooms consistent with faculty needs for laptop uses in the classroom.

This statement has been forwarded to the Student Government Association (SGA), Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the President's Cabinet for comment and action.

NUIC was also asked by Dr. Ed Kinley to consider if tablet PCs would be an acceptable alternative. OIT had received several requests, but the tablets do not meet the minimum faculty specifications as provided by NUIC. On May 10, 2006, a motion was made to support the interest in mobile computing but acknowledge the lack of expertise of the committee and potential problems of servicing such a machine that the NUIC therefore does not intend on offering standard specifications for a tablet and encourages faculty to get a laptop as their primary academic unit but also encourages deans to discuss with faculty their needs and to provide computing support for those needs. It was pointed out that the tablet can be classified as a specialty machine and therefore specs for such a machine would be specific to each faculty member requesting one. NUIC recommends that tablets not be used as a primary computer but can be a useful secondary specialty computer if the funds are available through grants, departments, or colleges.

It is important to note that the interim reports provide a summary of action taken by the committee. Minutes that provide greater detail on the discussion related to all issues before the committee are available in Appendix A (minutes for 2005-06 meetings).

Faculty Development

The faculty development plan submitted by the subcommittee in March 2006 was approved and accepted by NUIC on April 12, 2006, 16-0-0.

The syllabus language presented in the April 3, 2006 report has been forwarded on to Faculty Senate Executive Committee for approval.

Wireless

No new information was presented to the subcommittee since the April 3, 2006 report.

OIT Support

It was determined that the information provided by the OIT support committee is provided to NUIC for information and discussion. No direct action is required.

Since the April 3, 2006 report, the OIT Support Committee has met to determine the priority that different levels of support will receive, how to manage the loaner pool and costs associated with it, and how long a customer will be in the support center before being supplied with a loaner.

The most recent information from this subcommittee is available in Appendix B. NUIC has not reviewed the information provided in Appendix B. The committee will address this information in Fall 2006.

Money Issues

NUIC has taken no action on information from this subcommittee. Since April 3, 2006, the subcommittee has met and Thomas Ratliff has created a process for students to request financial aid for the purchase of their laptop (i.e. with a laptop requirement, the cost of the equipment figures into the total cost of education for financial aid calculation). A web form has been created and linked from the laptop FAQ under "Cost Issues" at <http://www.indstate.edu/laptop/faq.html#cost>. The form is located at http://www.indstate.edu/finaid/Finaid/0607_forms/0607/2006-2007%20Computer%20Expense%20Form.pdf.

HF&C has been chosen as the insurance company. This company provides University approved coverage for residence halls students. Plans are underway to offer this option from the website.

Guidelines for Proper Use

NUIC spent a considerable amount of time discussing the work from this subcommittee, as presented in the April 3, 2006 report.

The following suggestions emerged from the discussion:

- Ask the President and Provost to provide a reminder about the guidelines in their fall addresses.
- Share the information with department chairs and in the various chairs councils in the colleges.
- Remind faculty to clearly state their policies regarding laptop use in their syllabus.
- Include the ethical issues and guidelines as part of faculty development and student orientation.

- The proposed guide for Academic Integrity should include information on managing technology and integrity issues in the classroom.
- Send to ITLOC a recommendation that the ITL courses address ethical guidelines and laptop use issues.
- The Guidelines for Proper Use should be forwarded to SGA.
- The Guidelines should be incorporated as a learning community issue.

It has been noted by the committee that the proposed Academic Integrity policy will support faculty regarding their choice of whether to allow students to use or not use laptops in the classroom.

Software applications to give faculty control over student use in the classroom is being explored and tested by CIRT.

Evaluation

The Evaluation Subcommittee provided a final report of its proposed evaluation plan to NUIC for approval (see Appendix C). Their plan provides a recommendation that any future generation of NUIC (such as a steering committee) coordinates the collection of evaluation data and provides the necessary reports.

The span of data collection and evaluation (from baseline to after full implementation) will be determined on the trends that are being observed and concerns or issues that might arise over time.

It was recognized that some of the data indicated in the report might not be possible to collect, such as that from the Career Center. It was noted that it will be important to collect feedback from the community and employers.

It was suggested that the college departments talk with their employers to gain information. A sentence could be added to the report to indicate that we further recommend that departments consider conducting focus groups with a small group of employers each year as this initiative progresses.

It was suggested that Public Safety be contacted regarding data that they may have available on the number of computer thefts as statistics gathered from police reports does not reflect what was stolen. Laptops may be stolen from a student when they are away from campus and Public Safety would not have this information. Additionally, the meaningfulness of this data was questioned.

It was suggested that the next NUIC report should include a statement indicating that the NUIC will be doing in-course corrections and will be gathering information that will help indicate the effectiveness of those corrections.

The evaluation report does not include direct evaluation of the faculty development activities.

Marketing and Communication

For the purposes of marketing and communication with parents and prospective students, the subcommittee forwarded a list of 5 reasons why there is a laptop requirement. These represent desired outcomes based on outcomes at other institutions which have successfully implemented laptop initiatives.

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 approved the reasons and the order in which they are presented 16-0-0 on April 12, 2006.

This subcommittee met on April 19, 2006. To date two Indiana Statesman ads, two iQ magazine ads, one Parent Handbook ad, and a flier for the Sycamore Advantage mailer have been disseminated. An optional purchase program letter from Dr. Ed Kinley was mailed to parents of Fall 2006 freshmen. The laptop website at <http://www.indstate.edu/laptop/> continues to be updated with information and additional FAQs and on May 1, links to the Lenovo Indiana State purchase website were made live. Filming for two informational videos was conducted in April which was coordinated by CIRT. One will be a general overview of the laptop initiative and the other includes care and feeding information for students. Laptop information is currently being added to this fall's editions of the Student Technology Guide and the Faculty and Staff Technology Guide.

An updated communications plan was provided by the subcommittee and is available in Appendix D.

Instructional Technology Facilities Committee (ITFC)

[A suggestion was made to share the plan from this subcommittee with SGA.](#)

Reed Kidder was invited to the April 26, 2006 meeting to discuss power issues in the HMSU Commons. Given that the commons is on a slab and has an open ceiling concept, it is difficult to run additional power to the Commons. It was noted that few students currently plug in while there.

To learn more about student use and needs for wireless and power, it was suggested that focus groups take place with the laptop scholarship students to identify problem areas. Since the laptop scholarship is not under the purview of NUIC, Yancy Phillips will refer this recommendation to the Laptop Scholarship Committee.

Student Training

Documentation for students regarding the proper use of laptops is currently being developed.

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 a 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.

The remodel of SCC room 109 for The Computer Store has been under construction during the month of May and is nearly complete. The store will operate as an auxiliary unit and will provide notebook supplies and peripherals for student, faculty, and staff to purchase. John Gorsuch, the RAM Store Manager from the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, visited ISU and provided two days of intense training on creating and opening a computer store on the ISU campus. His two day guidance proved to be invaluable.

Appendix A

NUIC Minutes

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
October 17, 2005**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Justin Henderson, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Michael Jarrell, David Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Grant Scharton, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

II. Introductions

The committee members of the Notebook University Implementation Committee introduced themselves.

Copies of the Feasibility Report were provided for the new members.

A public website will be developed by the end of October that will include all NUIC documents and minutes. The Blackboard site will be maintained for discussion and subcommittee reporting.

III. Establish Meeting Times

The possible meeting times were discussed. Weekly meetings will be scheduled on Wednesdays at 8:00 a.m.

IV. Computer Specs

A copy of the suggested laptop configuration was provided for the committee members. After discussion, the committee decided that the High-end Business Class Laptop Configuration should be used in the RFP for faculty laptops. Susan Powers noted that the faculty laptops should be similar to the student laptops. The faculty laptops would be leased with one half of the faculty receiving them the first year and the other half receiving them the second year. No laptops would be distributed the third year. They would also have the ability to operate as docking stations and would allow for use of dual monitors.

The following specifications were reviewed:

- **Intel® Pentium® M Processor 760 (2.00 GHz) 14.1 inch XGA, Intel GMA 900**

The committee felt that this range should be sufficient. A question was raised regarding the 14.1 inch XGA. It was explained that a larger size would cause additional weight and portability would become an issue.

- **Operating Systems: Microsoft® Windows® XP Professional, SP2, with media**

A suggestion was made to add a TiVo box to the operating system. It was stated that adding a TiVo box to a laptop would be expensive and would cause additional weight.

- **Memory: 1.0 GB DDR2 533 MHz SDRAM, 1 DIMM**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **Hard Drives: 80GB Hard Drive, 9.5MM, 5400RPM**

It was noted that the hard drive size would depend on the vendor options.

- **No Floppy Drive**

Departments would need to decide if external modems would be needed. Price lists should be provided.

- **Modem: Internal 56K Modem for Dell Latitude D-Family Notebooks, Factory Install**

Built in modems, Ethernet and wireless should be specified. No PC cards should be included.

- **AC Adapter: 90W A/C Adapter**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **Module Bay Devices: 24X CD-RW/DVD Combination Drive**

The committee recommended that the device be changed to read/write for the RFP.

- **Wireless Local Area Networking Options: Intel® PRO/Wireless 2200 802.11b/g WLAN**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **miniPCI Card**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **Batteries: 6 Cell Primary Battery**

A question was raised regarding the life of the battery and when the battery cafes would be available. It was noted that a student would need four hours of battery time during Sycamore Advantage for testing and registration. After discussion, it was decided to include the price of two batteries in the RFP. The purchase of two batteries could possibly be used as a replacement for the battery cafes.

Vendors have been contacted regarding appropriate battery charging procedures. There were no exact guidelines in the responses received.

Classroom structure and battery cafés will be discussed in a subcommittee.

- **Carrying Cases: Nylon Deluxe Carrying Case**

The carrying case will be included in the RFP as an option for the faculty.

A question was raised regarding whether the students would use a carrying case. It was felt that it was important to provide a carrying case for the students at Sycamore Advantage. ISU logo could possibly be used on the case and an ISU backpack could be used in place of the carrying case.

- **Hardware Support Services: Promo 3 Yr Limited Warranty plus 3 Yr NBD On-site**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **Service and CompleteCare (accidental damage protection)**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

- **File System: NTFS File System for all Operating Systems**

The committee felt that the recommendation was sufficient.

The price included a docking station, a keyboard and an external mouse. The committee felt that individual needs would need to be determined regarding monitors.

A question was raised regarding whether a video card should be included. Gaming and graphics capabilities were discussed. An option for a Radeon 64 MG DVR RAM will be included on the RFP.

A configuration will need to be developed for those faculty that request Mac PowerBooks. It was noted that the Mac specialty labs would be maintained for students.

The buyout of the laptops for use by adjuncts and graduate students should be considered. Yancy Phillips will investigate the buyout option for faculty laptops only.

Biometric security will also be included as an option.

V. Subcommittee Structure

The following suggestions were made for subcommittees of NUIC:

- Classroom Structure
- First-year Students
- Wireless Infrastructure and Expansion
- Faculty Development
- OIT Support
- Battery Café
- Money
- Risk Management
- Public Safety
- Buying Options
- Review Existing Policies as They Apply to the Laptop Program
- Ethical and Appropriate Use of Technology in the Classroom

The subcommittees will operate as an advisory to NUIC.

A suggestion was made to forward the topic of Student IT Literacy to the ITLOC committee for discussion.

A list of all members of NUIC with contact information will be forwarded to the committee members.

VI. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2005**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Justin Henderson, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Jeff Pohlen, Susan Powers, Grant Scharton, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango, Richard Toomey, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the October 17, 2005 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Blackboard Website Information

Susan Powers will create a Blackboard website for the committee members. Minutes, agendas and other materials will be posted. An area for subcommittee information will also be created.

IV. Approval of Subcommittees

- Computer Specs
- Classroom Structure
- First-year students – handouts, Sycamore Advantage, maximizing first-year pedagogical use
- Wireless infrastructure and expansion
- Faculty development
- OIT Support
 - Battery Café
 - Repair
- Money issues
 - Insurance (theft/accident)
 - Risk Management
 - Public Safety
 - Student Purchase options
- Guidelines for proper use
 - Downloading
 - Confirmation of existing policies to ensure they are robust enough
 - Use in class

- Student information/training
- Evaluation

A question was raised regarding whether there should be a subcommittee added for students beyond the first year. It was explained that the Faculty Development subcommittee should address these issues.

A suggestion was made to form a Marketing and Communications subcommittee to address the development of the public website. Student and parent FAQs would need to be included. The NUIC will discuss appropriate terminology.

With the implementation of the notebook initiative, the learning space of the University will need to be identified. A suggestion was made to include Learning Spaces as a part of the Classroom Structure subcommittee. Classroom Structure/Learning Spaces will be addressed by the NUIC and at this time no subcommittee will be identified.

It was noted that each subcommittee member assigned to convene a group would need to bring in the appropriate people.

The committee members approved the above subcommittees with the addition of the Marketing and Communications subcommittee and the addition of Learning Spaces to Classroom Structure.

V. *Subcommittee Charges and Timelines*

The following individuals were recommended for the subcommittees:

First-year Students

- Bob Guell - Chair
- Jeff Jacso
- Rich Toomey
- Susan Powers
- SGA Student – To be named
- Director of Freshman Affairs – Drew Loftus
- A.M. Anderson

Wireless Infrastructure and Expansion

- Bruce McLaren
- Bob Barley
- Grant Scharton

Faculty Development

- Ken Janz - Chair
- Deb Runshe
- Bob Guell
- Virgil Sheets
- Tim Mulkey
- David Langley
- Robert Perrin
- Jody Brucker
- Susan Powers
- Jim Buffington will recruit Kelly Wilkinson

A suggestion was made to provide laptops for graduate assistants and adjuncts teaching high occupancy classes. A pool of laptops could be made available to be loaned from the departments.

OIT Support

- Yancy Phillips - Chair
- Justin Henderson
- Dave Bigney
- Dave Malooley
- Paul Hightower

Money Issues

- Yancy Phillips - Chair
- Jeff Jacso
- Thomas Ratliff
- Sherry O'Neal
- Joe Newport
- Bob Guell
- Mary Ann Boose

Guidelines for Proper Use

- David Wright - Chair
- Nick Swango
- Bonita McGee
- Student Affairs subcommittee member – Jim Buffington will contact

Student Information/training

- Susan Boyd
- Heather Millick

Evaluation

- Virgil Sheets – Chair
- Terry Ishitani

- Irene Johnson
- Concetta De Paolo
- Susan Powers
- Nick Swango
- Kelly Waite – student
- Ken Janz

Marketing and Communications

- Susan Owen
- A.M. Anderson
- Jim Buffington will recruit someone from Marketing
- Rich Toomey

Susan Powers will summarize the subcommittee list and will post on the Blackboard website. An area will be made available to begin the discussion regarding the charge of the committees. The laptop configuration information will also be posted for review and comments.

VI. *Adjournment*

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
November 2, 2005**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Justin Henderson, Jeff Jacso, Michael Jarrell, Bruce McLaren, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Jeff Pohlen, Susan Powers, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the October 26, 2005 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Announcements

The Blackboard website has been developed, and the subcommittee group pages are available.

The individuals recommended for the subcommittees were confirmed by the committee members with one addition. Robbin Burden should be added to the list of members for the Guidelines for Proper Use subcommittee.

IV. Revisit to Laptop Configuration Recommendations

The recommended configuration for faculty notebooks was discussed with the CIO. Faculty and student notebooks should be similar. After discussion, it was felt that the recommended configuration was appropriate, with increased RAM, and would be mainstream for what would be needed in the configuration for the student notebooks to be purchased in 18 months.

Susan Powers explained the three-year lease process for faculty notebooks. Originally the faculty notebooks were to be leased with one half of the faculty receiving them the first year and the second half receiving them the second year. No notebooks were to be distributed the third year. After consideration, the third year will now be used to lease notebooks for new faculty. It was also noted that the leases would need to be renewed each year.

A question was raised regarding whether money will still be available for department computer purchases. It had been recommended by the 2004-05 NUIC that not all funds go to the notebooks.

It was noted that the docking stations would be replaced when the notebooks are replaced.

A question was raised regarding whether OIT would be prepared to do an operating system change. Yancy Phillips explained that beta testing is usually done before the change and the change should take place more quickly than in the past. Installation on notebooks will need to be considered.

Susan Powers announced that a discussion forum has been placed on the Blackboard site regarding the configuration.

A suggestion was made to involve University Advancement in the Notebook Initiative.

V. Subcommittee Charges and Timelines

First-year Students

The charge of this committee will be assigned following the November 11 administrative meeting and a decision is made regarding the distribution of the notebooks.

Faculty Development

The charge of this committee will be discussed at the next meeting due to the absence of the chair, Ken Janz.

Guidelines for Proper Use

David Wright will serve as the chair of the subcommittee.

The following suggestions were made regarding the charge of the committee.

- Develop guidelines for the student handbook
- Redraft of the code of student conduct
- Academic integrity should be addressed
- Modify the language in the Acceptable Use Policy

It was noted that a draft policy regarding student disruption will be going to the Board of Trustees, and this may influence the recommendations of the subcommittee.

It was also suggested that this subcommittee work with the OIT Support and Risk Management subcommittees regarding protection of the machines and fraud.

Students will need to be informed regarding their responsibilities.

Marketing and Communications

Susan Owens will serve as chair of the subcommittee.

The following suggestions were made regarding the charge of the committee.

- Develop NUIC website
- Work with Enrollment Services on marketing materials
- Update student and faculty tech guides to reflect changes for the Notebook Initiative

A suggestion was made to find a student and faculty member that are presently working together using technology and could be profiled.

Money Issues

Yancy Phillips will serve as the chair of the subcommittee.

The following suggestions were made regarding the charge of the committee.

- Develop a total cost of ownership to convince the students to purchase the recommended model.
- Explore allowing the students to finance through ISU for a lower interest rate.
- The value at the end of the lease for the faculty computers will need to be considered.
- Removal of ISU tagged equipment from campus is not permitted without appropriate registration. Arrangements will need to be made regarding the faculty notebooks.

OIT Support

Yancy Phillips will serve as chair the subcommittee.

A suggestion was made to ask the ITFC for a recommendation regarding software and key access for student computers.

The following suggestions were made regarding the charge of the committee.

- Computer Support Center planning
- Distribution of faculty Notebooks

Distribution of student computers will need to be addressed following a decision by Administration.

VI. Other

The November 23 meeting will be moved to 10:00 a.m.

VII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
November 9, 2005**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Justin Henderson, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Yancy Phillips, Jeff Pohlen, Susan Powers, Grant Scharton, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango, Richard Toomey, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the November 2, 2005 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Public Information Website

The public information website has been created. Comments should be sent to IRTS.

IV. Classroom Structure and Learning Spaces Discussion

The ITFC committee met and discussed notebook issues. Software for student laptops and the use of keyed software was considered. Committee charges to the ITFC should be forwarded to Yancy Phillips.

A suggestion was made to use tables in the classrooms instead of desks to allow for better use of the notebooks.

Some faculty members have raised a concern regarding whether wireless access could be turned off in the classrooms. It was explained that one sector could not be shut off without shutting off additional space in the building. As a possible solution, Cirond software could be used to monitor access points after the buildings were mapped, however, this would be very complex to use.

Dishonorable student behavior regarding notebook use was discussed. Improper use by the students could be handled through the Student Code of Conduct. The use of a testing center or testing software could also help with these issues.

A copy of the Higher Education Mobile Learning Handbook was provided for the committee members.

Deb Worley will be contacted to request her attendance at the next meeting to discuss her experience with the notebook initiative at Northern Michigan University. Susan Powers will also contact other universities participating in a notebook program.

The committee indicated that the Commons area should be made completely wireless regardless of the number of users. The lounge space located in the new Student Recreation Center should also be made wireless.

Wireless capability in the residence halls was discussed. Money and capacity issues have been considered previously. Bruce McLaren will discuss the technical issues regarding installing wireless in the residence halls with Tony Roberts. It was noted that the cords provided for the students are too short and do not allow the students to use their laptops away from their desk.

The possible dangers of using wireless access other than through the University was discussed. With the use of CCA, wireless is now being tracked by login.

A question was raised regarding ergonomic use of the notebooks. The learning spaces will need to be made safe and functional for the students. It was noted that desks with a table pivot were used at Northern Michigan University. Glare on the notebooks monitors was also considered.

Printing capabilities will be addressed by the OIT subcommittee. A suggestion was made to make printing available in the current lab areas. Printing could also be considered as a faculty development issue regarding whether papers are handed in as a hard copy or electronically. At Northern Michigan University, a paper is handed in electronically and the professor returns it by using Breeze or printing the paper themselves for comments.

As the notebook initiative progresses, students may develop their own learning spaces.

V. *Subcommittee Charges and Timelines*

First-year Students

The First-year Students committee meeting has not yet been scheduled pending the decision of the Laptop Scholarship Committee regarding distribution of the laptops.

Guidelines for Proper Use

Faculty members have been contacted regarding their schedules to set the first meeting.

Marketing and Communications

The subcommittee met, but due to the absence of Susan Owen, the update will be provided at the next meeting.

Evaluation

The first meeting has been scheduled for November 17.

VII. Other

A request was made to provide Admissions with the notebook specifications before March. Information will need to be made available regarding when the student should purchase the notebook. Vendors will need to decide whether a student can purchase a notebook without being an admitted student. Distribution issues will also need to be resolved.

The battery café will be revisited at the next meeting.

VII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
November 23, 2005**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Ken Janz, Jeff Jacso, David Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the November 9, 2005 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Announcements

Susan Powers shared a student booklet from another university regarding their laptop program.

Dr. Deb Worley will be attending the December 7 meeting to discuss her experiences at Northern Michigan University regarding their laptop program.

A schedule for possible meeting dates for next semester will be forwarded to the committee members.

The November 30 meeting will be canceled.

IV. Status of RFP

The RFP for the lease of faculty laptops will be ready to go on Monday, November 28 and will be reviewed with Ed Kinley. Prospective vendors will be meeting with ISU regarding the RFP on December 5.

A question was raised regarding whether approval from the Board of Trustees will be required. This will be clarified by Yancy Phillips.

V. UNC Visit

Yancy Phillips shared his experiences from his visit to UNC with the committee members. He discussed the following:

- The UNC program went into effect in 1998, and laptops are being provided for faculty for the first time this year.
- Tours of their laptop store, repair center, helpdesk and support areas were provided.
- Students are not provided with a specific recommendation for their laptop purchase.
- The staff at UNC commented that the wireless infrastructure was not adequate when their program was implemented, and suggested that this should be considered by ISU when implementing our program.

Copies of flyers that are provided to students at UNC were shared with the committee members. An article from the UNC student newspaper regarding their technology will be forwarded.

A suggestion was made that the University should consider a loan for students with low interest rates for the purchase of the laptops. It was noted that loans were available to UNC students through their Foundation. Jeff Jacso will talk with the ISU Foundation office regarding whether they would be willing to do a similar program for our students. It had also been suggested that one of our local banks design a package for low interest loans. This topic will be forwarded to the Financial subcommittee.

It was noted that warranty work is done on site at UNC, and the plans are for ISU to do their own warranty work.

VI. Subcommittee Charges and Timelines

Susan Powers will be contacting staff at other laptop universities working with first-year programs and orientation programs and will ask them to share their experiences.

A question was raised regarding whether the need for the First-year Students subcommittee is still needed following the decision to distribute the laptops through the vendor and during Knowing Sycamores for the scholarship computers. After discussion, it was felt that this topic should be moved to the Faculty Development subcommittee.

Evaluation Subcommittee

Virgil Sheets advised that the subcommittee met and outlined the type of evidence that they have regarding student computer use. Ideas will be generated from the base line data to evaluate successful changes and satisfaction.

Wireless Infrastructure and Expansion

Bob Barley will be contacting Dr. McLaren to set up their first meeting.

VII. Other

A question was raised regarding a situation where a student would receive a scholarship laptop and then drop out. This issue will be discussed at the Scholarship Committee meeting.

It was noted that on several occasions CCA has caused a login delay. A solution for the delay issue will need to be found to make wireless functional for everyone.

A discussion ensued regarding the mandatory laptop requirement and verification of ownership.

It was noted that the COMPAS software needs to be on an ISU tagged machine and labs will need to be maintained until mobile labs are available.

VIII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
December 7, 2005**

Present: Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Michael Jarrell, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Richard Toomey, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the November 23, 2005 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Announcements

Meeting times for the spring semester will be identified on Friday, and appointments will be sent to the committee members.

IV. Dr. Debra Worley

Dr. Debra Worley discussed her experience at Northern Michigan University regarding the laptop program in 1997. She shared the following:

- The program was a lease program and was mandatory for most students.
- Regular student desks were used and plugs were located on the floors.
- The campus was not wireless.
- Printing took place at several locations on campus.
- No specific training was provided for faculty.
- Laptops were not used often in the classroom, but were used more for portability.
- Laptops were not used for testing.
- Course delivery systems were not available.
- Faculty did not oppose the program.

Dr. Worley noted that she did not recall any significant problems regarding the implementation of the program. Parents were pleased to lease the laptop at that time because it was less expensive than purchasing a laptop.

V. Status of RFP

Yancy Phillips announced that the RFP has been sent to several committee members for review, and the process should be completed this week. Vendors will be visiting next week to address any questions. It will possibly be late January before the laptops are delivered and distribution is completed.

VI. Subcommittee Update

The Faculty Development Subcommittee met. Ed Kinley had sent a message to the deans requesting the number of faculty that would be receiving the laptops in January. He followed up with a message requesting identification of those faculty members. The Faculty Development Subcommittee felt that it would be best for faculty teaching freshman honors courses to receive the laptops. A pool of laptops for adjuncts and graduate assistants teaching freshman classes could be created. A suggestion was made that the NUIC forward a recommendation to the Provost to encourage the deans to choose faculty that primarily teach freshman classes. The committee members should forward the names of those faculty to Susan Powers.

A suggestion was made to set aside certain sections of freshman courses for laptop friendly classes. The committee felt that having a notebook section for courses would be beneficial and could act as a pilot for the program. It could be specified as a requirement for a certain section. It was also suggested that Math 102 be identified as one of the notebook sections to pilot.

Susan Powers will compose a memo to be sent to Provost Maynard regarding the committee's recommendations. The memo will be forwarded to the committee for comments and feedback prior to being sent.

VII. Other

Roles will need to be defined for students, faculty and administration regarding the laptop program. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Subcommittee reports and classroom structure will also be deferred to the next meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2006**

Present: Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Richard Toomey, and David Wright

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the January 12, 2006 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Subcommittee Reports*Evaluation*

The subcommittee met and will meet again tomorrow. Surveys have been reviewed and the group will assess whether changes have occurred as a result of the institution of the laptop initiative. Surveys from OIT, SIR and OSPIRE will be utilized.

Faculty Development

The subcommittee met once and has scheduled biweekly meetings. The group will need answers to general questions before they can begin. The decision regarding which faculty members will be receiving laptops will need to be made.

Guidelines for Proper Use

The first meeting was held earlier today and suggested guidelines from Northern Michigan University were shared. Weekly meetings have been scheduled. The group will discuss whether new regulations are needed in terms of faculty development.

Marketing and Communications

The group met once in early November and reviewed the website. As decisions are made information will be added to the website. Ideas should be forwarded to Susan Owen.

Money Issues

The subcommittee met before break and will be scheduling future meetings.

OIT Support

The subcommittee met before break and will be scheduling future meetings.

Wireless and Infrastructure Expansion

The subcommittee met and is working on problems that have been identified. Pam Dwenger has been asked to join the group to address issues regarding Residential Life.

After investigation, it was found that turning off wireless capability in a specific room would not be practical. The student code committee will need to develop an appropriate strategy to address issues.

Adequate coverage in large classrooms will need to be considered.

IV. Subcommittee for Learning Spaces

The NUIC had originally planned to discuss learning spaces during regular meetings, but due to time constraints, this has not occurred. A suggestion was made to add a subcommittee or forward the charge to the ITFC. After discussion, it was felt that the ITFC could fulfill the charge to address the learning spaces. It was also felt that a representative from the Library, Facilities Management, Residential Life and the Registrar's Office should be asked to participate. A motion was made to forward the charge regarding learning spaces to the ITFC. Motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Susan Powers called the question. The motion was approved unanimously. Dr. Powers will contact the appropriate designees.

V. Revisit of Charge*Ownership Options*

The University selected the lease option.

Procedures and Policies

Procedures and policies will be discussed at a later time.

Faculty Participation

Faculty members will not be forced to accept the laptops.

Faculty Preparation and Faculty Training

Faculty Development Subcommittee will address faculty preparation and faculty training.

On-going Support for Faculty and Students

OIT Support Subcommittee will address the on-going support for faculty and students.

Ubiquitous Access

The Wireless and Infrastructure Expansion Subcommittee and the ITFC will address ubiquitous access. This should include making the dorms wireless. Residential Life should be included in the discussions.

Hardware Standards

The hardware standards have been determined by the RFP. The requirements follow:

- 1.73 or above
- 40 GB
- 512 MG RAM
- 64 MG of dedicated video memory
- CDRWDVD combo
- 4 cell battery
- Under seven pounds

As soon as a vendor is chosen, the requirements can be posted on the website.

Software Standards

The software standards will be forwarded to the ITFC to address.

Insurance/Loss/Damage

The Money Issues Subcommittee will address insurance/loss/damage.

Program Assessment

The Evaluation Subcommittee will address program assessment.

Public Relations/Advertising

The Marketing and Communications Subcommittee will address public relations/advertising. The group may want to consider developing a university brochure describing the laptop initiative. It was noted that the vendor will assist with the brochure.

Notebook Repair

OIT Support will address notebook repair.

Acquisition and Distribution

User Services will be delivering the laptops to the faculty and will collect their old machines. The consultants will set up appointments in advance for the transition. The deans will specify additional options for the faculty members prior to distribution.

A question was raised regarding the removal of the laptops (University property) from campus. Ed Kinley is working with Risk Management to address the laptop portability issue.

The students will be receiving their laptops directly from the vendor.

Retirement/Recycling

User Services will be in charge of the collection and retirement of the laptops. It was noted that the RFP includes a buyout option. A question was raised regarding whether personal buyouts would be allowed. It was explained that tax issues would need to be considered.

Classroom Preparation

The ITFC will address classroom preparation.

Student Training

It was suggest that student training be added to the Faculty Development Subcommittee. Student focus groups should be conducted to address the different options for training. Students will have different skill levels.

It was noted that timing issues could occur regarding the wireless and the running of the updates. Schedules will be set up for the year.

Student Support

Student support will be covered as part of the ongoing support for faculty/students.

Laptop Recovery

Students will own the laptops and if stolen, they will need to work with law enforcement. Insurance will be made available.

Risk Assessment

This will be included as part of insurance/loss/damage.

Education for faculty will need to be provided regarding what type of data should be kept on the laptop. OIT is investigating technology that will encrypt data on the hard drive. This could be assigned to our technical committee to make a recommendation to ITAC. Susan Powers will discuss with Bob Barley and Ed Kinley.

Susan Powers will create a draft report and forward to the committee for comment. The final report should be completed by February 1.

VI. Other

OIT is working to set up the store in the Student Computing Complex. It will be operated as a retail establishment and people will be able to come in and look at machines, peripherals, laptops bags, etc.

The loaner pools were discussed. Part-time students should be able to rent laptops. User Services will develop a plan and forward a recommendation to the NUIC.

VII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2006**

Present: Katie Adkins, A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Nick Swango, Richard Toomey, and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the January 18, 2006 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Discussion and Approval of Implementation Plan

A question was raised regarding the decision to have the second release date of the faculty notebooks moved from July to October. Yancy Phillips explained that faculty have expressed that it would be difficult to change during the beginning or the end of the semester. Some faculty members do not arrive on campus until the day prior to the beginning of school.

Appointments will be made with the faculty by the consultants to make the transfer. A suggestion was made to offer the option of transferring their computers in mid-July or early August. It was also explained that some faculty have indicated that they do not want to use student workers due to confidentiality regarding tests, grades, etc. The use of students could also be provided as an option. A suggestion was made to give the faculty the option of taking care of the transfer themselves. It was explained that the old computers will need to be retrieved and some faculty may not have the time available for the transfer.

Yancy Phillips will investigate if transferring the computers in mid-July or early August and using student workers could be offered as options. Security for the notebooks will also need to be considered.

A motion was made to adopt the implementation plan. Motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Susan Powers called the question. The motion was approved unanimously. Dr. Powers will forward the plan.

IV. Subcommittee Reports

Guidelines for Proper Use

The subcommittee met and David Wright will have the recommended guidelines by the end of the week. Guidelines from Northern Michigan and Wisconsin and the ISU student code of conduct were used to formulate the list of guidelines. The information should be forwarded to Susan Powers to be shared with the committee.

Faculty Development

A decision was made at the last meeting to implement a summer institute for faculty. Debra Runshe is working to develop the content and the information will be reviewed at their next meeting. The programs used by learning communities are being modified to generate ideas regarding issues such as classroom management, assessment with the notebooks, and teaching and learning issues with the notebooks. The subcommittee will have information available within the next week regarding the care and feeding materials that are being developed for faculty.

A question was raised regarding the care and feeding information that will be provided for students. It was noted that it would be beneficial to include the information in the Sycamore Advantage mailing at the end of March. Information that should be included in the Sycamore Advantage mailing will be discussed at the next meeting. Ideas should be forwarded to Susan Owen prior to the meeting.

Money Matters

The group met and considered that informational sessions be held during the afternoons of Sycamore Advantage regarding the care and feeding policies of the notebooks. It was suggested that theft and insurance coverage be discussed during these sessions. The students could be provided with a top ten list of important issues.

There is presently a company on campus that provides insurance coverage for students. This information will need to be posted on the website where the students will be ordering the machines. Accidental damage protection and insurance information will need to be provided.

The university will be able to track Mac addresses when a notebook is stolen. This information will also be shared with the students.

Joe Newport from Public Safety will be contacting Northern Michigan University and the University of North Carolina to discuss security procedures regarding their notebook program. It was also suggested that

anyone bringing a notebook on campus should register the machine for security reasons.

Evaluation

The subcommittee will meet this afternoon.

V. Question: Should Notebook Use Classes be Designated?

A message was forwarded to the department chairs requesting the names of faculty members to consider for participation in a pilot program regarding the use of the notebooks in the classroom during the fall semester. The long name in Banner could be used to indicate that a notebook would be required.

It was noted that students would need to be notified well in advance and there might not be enough time before fall semester. Advisors will also need to be informed. Issues were discussed. A student, not having a notebook, might want a professor that is teaching a notebook specified class. A question was raised regarding notebook carts and whether they could be used for those students that did not have a notebook. The possibility of using the loaner pool was also considered. It was also noted that a pilot program would be helpful.

VI. Other

Yancy Phillips announced that a representative from the selected vendor would be visiting ISU on February 28 and March 1. They will assist in helping to ensure that everything is set up for the beginning of school. A lunch meeting will be scheduled for March 1 at 11:30 a.m.

VII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 8, 2006**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the February 2, 2006 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Sycamore Advantage Mailing

A sample flyer for the Sycamore Advantage mailing was provided for the committee members. It was explained that the April mailing should attempt to convince the students to attend Sycamore Advantage. The laptop flyer should be kept to a single page. The following items were suggested to be included.

- General information
- Links to websites
- Motivation to purchase the laptop
- The laptop display availability
- Required purchase date (including month)

Discussion ensued regarding whether the term “laptop” or “notebook” should be used. After discussion, it was felt that the term “laptop” would be better recognized by students and parents. “Notebook” could be defined in the FAQ section on the website.

Susan Owen will meet with the Marketing and Communications Subcommittee on February 15 and will work to create the flyer for the Sycamore Advantage mailing. A media kit has been requested from the vendor.

Comparisons of other laptop models regarding price and quality will be made available on the laptop website. The website could also include a link that would provide the specifications and the minimum requirements. The

website for the purchase of the laptop will be created by the vendor. Their link could also be available at that site.

A laptop display will need to be created and set up in HMSU for Sycamore Advantage during June. It was noted that the students should be able to commit to the purchase at Sycamore Advantage. A suggestion was made to have giveaways during the sessions such as printers, jump drives, etc.

A question was raised regarding whether technical support would be available if a student purchased a laptop during Sycamore Advantage. It was explained that the student would need to work with the vendor for repairs until the beginning of school. At that time, the University will be able to provide the needed support.

Communications and Marketing will be doing a series of press releases. The vendor has offered to contact high schools regarding advertisement.

A few laptops are being sent by the vendor and will be brought to the next NUIC meeting. It was suggested that the vendor representative meet with the SGA sometime during their visit. Yancy Phillips will schedule the meeting.

A question was raised regarding whether the vendor will require confirmation that the student making the purchase is enrolled at ISU. It was noted that it may be beneficial if parents would be able to purchase the laptop for a graduation gift. Students on the dual admission program with Ivy Tech may also be able to purchase the laptop.

A handout for the care and feeding of the laptops was also provided. This type of information will be made available during Knowing Sycamores.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2006**

Present: Katie Adkins, A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Robert Guell, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Michael Jarrell, Ed Kinley, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Jeff Pohlen, Susan Powers, Kris Rogers, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the February 8, 2006 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

Susan Owen noted that the minutes from the last meeting indicated that pricing and quality information would be made available on the website for comparable models. Information to help families compare the Lenovo/IBM model to other vendors' models will be made available on the laptop website, but pricing will not be listed. IBM will be contacted regarding whether the retail price could be listed for comparison.

III. Subcommittee Reports*Marketing and Communications*

The group met and revised the handout for the Sycamore Advantage mailing. Richard Toomey and Susan Owen will meet to finalize and will forward to the University Publications office for the layout. Meetings have been scheduled through the spring semester to address work on other projects as they arise.

The laptop initiative website was discussed. It was suggested that when the link to the purchase site becomes available, FAQ answers could be placed on the first page of the website to explain why students should buy now. Parents may want to purchase the laptop as a graduation gift. The website information will be discussed with IBM during their visit. Support for the laptop will not be available until fall, but can be obtained through the vendor. Discussions with the vendor will take place three times during the year to address pricing and quality. Susan Owen should be contacted regarding any suggestions for the website.

Guidelines for Proper Use

The group met and is working on the second draft of the report to the NUIC. The final should be available by the next meeting.

Faculty Development

A report has been prepared regarding the work that has been completed by the group, and the direction for the summer and fall will be discussed at the February 24 meeting.

ITFC

The group met and identified learning spaces. Power and seating needs were also discussed. The group will work to identify what needs to go into a classroom to make it laptop friendly.

A solution for printing will need to be developed for fall 2006. A meeting was held with Ikon and they will be researching possibilities. Location, support and supplies will need to be considered.

Money Matters

The group will be meeting later in the month.

OIT Support

The use of battery cafes is highly unlikely because the students will be purchasing their laptops and batteries. Repairs, parts, disk imaging, and asset tracking were discussed.

A question was raised regarding whether a device is available that could be used to check the charge of laptop batteries. It was explained that there was no load-testing device available, but batteries will be available for purchase in the computer store.

A question was raised regarding a possible software solution that may be available for instant messaging in the classroom. It would be beneficial for a faculty member to be able to see a question from a student in the middle of a presentation. It was explained that most of the software available allows for private send. Two computers might need to be used if the instructor did not want the other students to see the questions. The instructor could be driving the display from the laptop and the classroom computer could be logged into the instructor's account. There is also software available for the laptops to allow for immediate feedback.

Evaluation

The group is creating a grid of survey pieces that are presently available and can be utilized.

IV. Question: Should Notebook Use Classes be Designated?

The discussion from the February 2 meeting continued regarding participation by faculty members in a pilot program for the use of the notebooks in the classroom during the fall 2006 semester. The long name in Banner could be used to indicate that a notebook would be required.

Some faculty will be participating in training during the summer and this would provide a venue to try out the training that they have received. The laptop classes would need to be well advertised and labeled appropriately. The necessary classroom infrastructure may not be available at the beginning of the fall semester. Faculty will need to be made aware that the support may not be in place at that time. It was noted that this should not be tied to the laptop initiative and should not be the measure of success for the laptop program. The language used to identify the course will need to be carefully considered.

A suggestion was made to create notebook learning communities. Some faculty members are anxious to try the use of the laptops in the classroom and a few classes could be set up.

Decisions will need to be made by the end of March to organize the training plans for the summer.

Concern was shared regarding the risks involved.

The notebook use in the classroom discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
March 1, 2006

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Mary Bennett, Jim Buffington, Henjin Chi, Pam Dwenger, Sharon Gick, Justin Henderson, Paul Hightower, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Bob Jefferson, Ed Kinley, Becky Libler, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Thomas Ratliff, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango, Rich Toomey, Vicki Winn, David Wright, Guo Ping Zhang, and Karen Pennington. IBM/Lenovo representatives, Tim Coynesmith, Marc Seidband, Jerry Haan, and Jeanne Mau.

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

II. Discussion with IBM/Lenovo Representatives

Tim Coynesmith, Senior Project Manager and Marc Seidband, Lenovo Client Representative servicing ISU, introduced themselves and provided a brief overview. Mr. Coynesmith has been working with higher education institutions in setting up their laptop programs.

The critical success factors for a laptop program are as follows:

- Communication and expectation setting
- Students/parents/faculty satisfaction
- How are we going to incorporate technology into the curriculum
- Financial commitment

The project plan has been reviewed and adjustments have been made.

Questions were raised and explanations provided:

How have the other universities addressed the issue of faculty members giving up their desktop machines for a laptop?

Some of the schools did not require that the faculty members take the laptops. They had the option of choosing a desktop. It was noted that most of the faculty members changed their mind as the program progressed and requested the laptops.

The individual faculty member's needs should be considered and they may be addressed with the laptop.

How long will it take to deploy the laptops to the faculty?

The largest piece of the deployment is the data migration. The most successful implementations occurred when a person sits down and explains the features of the laptop to the faculty member.

Could you tell us how to maximize the lifetime of the battery?

The ThinkPads have a power management utility that allows you to set the utility at a certain specification to maximize the lifespan of the battery. A field tech will be sent to the university when the faculty receives their machines to discuss some of the value added features on the machines.

Assuming that they don't take advantage of the utility, when would you expect the batteries would need to be replaced?

After a two-to-three year timeframe, the batteries will need to be replaced. With the value added tool, we are adding six months to a year to the time when it might have to be replaced. It will be dependent on the individual user and what type of applications are running. Wireless or wired will also impact the lifespan.

Do you have any reports on how many hours a student will spend on their laptops?

The last data indicated that the students spend approximately 6 hours per day on their laptops.

Is there an easy way to do an exam?

A utility called Secure Exams could be used. When loaded, it will lock down the computer and you can't access any other applications as long as the exam is in progress.

What can be done to keep students from playing on their laptops during lectures?

A software could be used called Silicon Chalk. It has been purchased by Horizon Wimba and has been taken off the market until later in 2006. The software allows for PowerPoint presentations to be recorded on all of the student laptops and notes can be taken. It will allow you to control the applications and will let you know which students do not have Silicon Chalk running on their computers.

What can be done for students that have a problem with their laptops during exams?

The Support Center will have loaners available. The instructor would have the option of letting the student pick up the laptop and then add additional time to take the exam.

Where would it be appropriate to retain wired access for the students? How many schools are putting power and Ethernet in classrooms and in what environment?

Most schools are doing wireless in the classrooms. Faculty like flexible seating and it is more expensive to run cable to the seat.

Is there any way, without using the screen, to have students see the same PowerPoint presentations on their monitors and have the ability to make notes as the material is reviewed?

Silicon Chalk can do this. The pages are flipped on the student's machine at the same time. It also has polling capability.

How do you define the success of the laptop programs at the other universities?

Different schools have different criteria for success. The IT area may look at the average cost of computing and the total cost of ownership. The service levels that can be provided may also be considered. Students may look at success as their costs are down for the price of the laptop and the student experience has been increased. The university may use the student experience as publicity and could possibly see an increase in admissions.

The laptop is heavy and not aesthetically pleasing. Will another model be offered?

While this model is slightly heavier than some, it is about the same weight as some textbooks. This model is presently being used at Clemson University, UNC and Northern Michigan. There is discussion underway regarding a possible third choice, but no decision has been made. Durability, functionality and cost were considered.

Marc Seidband offered to return to campus and visit with the SGA to discuss what other universities are doing and why ISU can be successful.

These laptops will be delivered in stages. What will the consistency be in the product?

The same model will be built for 12 to 18 months. There will probably be another model for the fall 2007 class.

At what point will the laptops be available for voluntary student purchases?

It is anticipated that the information will be available from the website by the end of March. Information regarding the maintenance program, protection, etc. will need to be made available.

Will parents be able to purchase the laptops for graduation presents?

An email will be sent to accepted students and their parents and the website should be up and running by the end of March. It was noted that they would need the image from ISU prior to the laptop being shipped.

Will personal purchases be permitted?

Purchases for employees, alumni and Ivy Tech students are being considered. Marc Seidband will get back to the committee.

For those that use three monitors, will ports be available and at what cost and functionality?

Marc Seidband will investigate the difference between the full docking station and the port and will get back to the committee.

Will the external display resolution that was indicated in the specs support what was installed?

The resolution listed in the specs was incorrect. They will investigate and report back to the committee.

Have you seen a trend at the other universities where students use the laptops for research computing?

Mr. Coynesmith has not seen a trend.

What would be your recommendation for a student that has classes all day regarding their battery? Would an additional battery be recommended or should the battery café idea be revisited.

They did not feel that the battery café was a good idea. It would be an additional expense to the university.

Whether there were opportunities for the student to recharge would need to be considered. It may be an issue of convenience to purchase an additional battery.

Have any of the other universities developed a satisfaction survey for their laptop programs?

Focus groups were conducted and improvements were made from their experiences.

It was noted that 95% of students at NCU choose the student recommended machine. Eighty percent of the Help Desk calls, at the beginning of school, were for the non-recommended laptops.

What is the DOA rate for the ThinkPads?

The DOA rate is considered to be ship+90 days and is less than one percent. Annual failure rates are at 12% and that is for any type of failure that is tied to the serial number on the box, for example, mouse, etc.

What do students carry these computers in?

Laptop bags or sleeves may be available for purchase at the computer store. It is recommended that the students use a sleeve before they put the laptops into their regular backpacks. The bags can be customized, but it was found that students at other universities did not want their bags customized. They felt that this gave them a label. There was also a concern regarding theft.

What were the hours of the service centers at the other universities?

ISU will be providing the service and that will be their decision. The model that ISU is purchasing is a self-maintainer model. Pre-paid shipping boxes will be provided for the service center and turn around will be 72 hours. Students will not have to deal with the shipping.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
March 29, 2006**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Henjin Chi, Robert Guell, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Ed Kinley, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Richard Toomey, and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the March 8 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Reports from the Subcommittees

A draft copy of the NUIC interim report was provided for the committee members.

Faculty Development

Ken Janz shared the following recommendations from the subcommittee:

- A summer institute will be held for 24 faculty members. The institute is a professional development program focusing on best practices for using laptop computers for instruction and will take place over a week long period. Effort will be made to invite faculty in the 100 and 200 level courses.
- Five faculty learning communities will be formed in the fall of 2006 and will present a forum to discuss issues that they have worked on throughout the year. The five committees are as follows:
 - Assessment and Engagement
 - Classroom Environment Issues
 - Innovative Instruction with Laptop Computers
 - Laptop Support Issue
 - Content Orientated Issues
- A Faculty Mentoring Program will be created. The program will be dependent on external funding.

- The Laptop Instructional Pilot Program will allow faculty to explore classroom technologies and will allow faculty to work with students in an environment in which the new instructional practices of technologies can be tested.
- Workshops will be provided throughout the year.
- An external speaker series will be brought to the campus to discuss the use of laptop computers in the classroom.
- An annual event will be organized as a showcase of successes regarding the laptop program.
- The syllabus language for faculty was developed and the following categories were highlighted.
 - Laptop Required for Course: Regular Usage
 - Laptop Required for Course: Irregular Usage
 - Laptop Not Required for Course: Usage Permitted
 - Laptop Usage Forbidden

It was noted that the language in the Laptop Usage Forbidden category was confusing. It was explained that it should read, "In this course, no laptop may be used during class time," instead of "In the course, no laptop may be used".

The committee requested that the syllabus language be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as an informational item.

The report from the Faculty Development Subcommittee will be discussed at the next meeting. An electronic copy will be forwarded prior to discussion.

Wireless

Bruce McLaren discussed the following from the Wireless subcommittee:

- OIT plans are underway to conduct a wireless scan of the learning spaces identified by the ITFC. The scan will determine what capacity is needed.
- The subcommittee is examining the appropriate wireless coverage for Residential Life. Wireless areas in the lounges and on the floors may be desired.

- OIT is planning to purchase Cisco Enterprise Level Wireless Management software. The software changes the power according to demand.
- It has been determined that it is not technically possible to turn off wireless in a single classroom without affecting other classrooms. There may be software solutions available to resolve the problem.
- The subcommittee is looking into the desirability of wireless connections in certain rooms. It may be appropriate to put certain classes into rooms that have wired connections at each desk.

Bruce McLaren will forward the information to Susan Powers to include in the interim report.

OIT Support

Yancy Phillips discussed the following from the OIT Support subcommittee:

- Battery cafes are no longer being considered. Batteries will be available for purchase at the computer store and online through the website.
- The self-maintainer program will be up and running by fall. ISU will be certified as a repair center for Lenovo laptops. All repairs and warranty issues will go through the repair center.
- The group will address the following issues in the future:
 - Mistreatment of laptops
 - Maintaining fully equipped spares
 - Spare pools created by purchasing leased laptops
 - Evaluating the use of spares for part-time students
 - Maintaining spare parts
- It was noted that cosmetic damage is not covered under accidental damage protection or the warranty and will not affect the lease value.
- The base image has been created. Key server software will be put on as people request it.

A question was raised regarding whether the COMPASS tests would work on the laptops. Yancy Phillips has not yet tested, but will forward information to the committee when completed.

A question was raised regarding whether the OIT Support Subcommittee would be addressing printing. It was explained that a temporary solution will be in place for printing this fall, and a more permanent solution will be developed for the fall of 2007. Investigations are underway regarding the best method.

A suggestion was made to have AAUP offer a session on the laptop initiative for faculty.

Yancy Phillips will forward the information to Susan Powers to include in the interim report.

Money Matters

Yancy Phillips discussed the following from the Money Matters subcommittee:

- Sherry O'Neal and Tom Harding will be meeting to review possible insurance policy choices for students. Lenovo will allow the link to be put on their website. The difference between insurance, accidental damage protection and warranty will be explained.
- The policy to allow the laptops to be removed from campus will still need to be approved.
- Joe Newport, of Public Safety, had talked with other universities having laptop programs regarding theft issues. He found that theft has not been a problem for them.
- Laptop purchases will go through the website. Accessories can be purchased through the computer store. A website will also be available in the store to purchase laptops. Purchase patterns will be monitored. If problems are experienced, a more secure site may be needed.

The computer store manager from UNC will be visiting to discuss their process. IDs will be required for purchases in the store.

Yancy Phillips will forward the information to Susan Powers to include in the interim report.

Guidelines for Proper Use

A copy of the report from the Guidelines for Proper Use Subcommittee was forwarded to the group prior to the meeting.

Action will be taken at the next meeting.

Evaluation

Virgil Sheets reported the following from the Evaluation subcommittee:

The Evaluation Subcommittee will meet tomorrow to complete their work. They have identified existing sources of data that are already available on campus. Items were identified that can be used to address the questions and concerns that people have regarding whether the program was a success for the institution as a whole.

Action will be taken at the next meeting.

Marketing and Communications

The subcommittee received a number of ideas generated by the NUIC and developed the top five reasons why there is a laptop initiative. A suggestion was made to highlight one word in each of the reasons to emphasize the topic. Susan Owen will work with the subcommittee to identify the appropriate words.

Action will be taken at the next meeting.

Instructional Technology Facilities Committee (ITFC)

Yancy Phillips will forward the interim report to Susan Powers.

Student Training

The Faculty Development subcommittee will begin work on student training.

User Services

User Services was discussed under OIT Support.

IV. Other

Yancy Phillips announced that the faculty laptops should be received within three weeks. Faculty members will be contacted and given the choice of making an appointment for delivery of the laptop or they will be able to pick up the laptop at a scheduled event.

The laptops will be provided for the faculty and no signature form will be required.

V. *Adjournment*

Meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2006**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Robert Guell, Ken Janz, Michael Jarrell, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Richard Toomey, and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the March 29 meeting are available for review. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Definition of Roles (Student, Faculty, Administration)

Copies of the draft Rights and Responsibilities for Faculty, Student, and Administration were provided for the committee members. The draft syllabus language, which was also provided, was developed from the Rights and Responsibilities.

The Rights and Responsibilities will be included in the student catalog and in the notebook literature. These rights and responsibilities would establish, if adopted by the Faculty Senate, a basis to address possible confrontations.

The Rights and Responsibilities were reviewed by the committee.

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

The right of faculty to receive sufficient development to determine optimal laptop usage in their courses was discussed. The group felt that it would be more appropriate that sufficient development “be offered” as a right rather than “received”.

The infrastructure supporting laptop usage in the classrooms is presently available in only few classrooms. It was felt that it would be the responsibility of the chairs to schedule appropriately. It should be the faculty member’s responsibility to inform their chair of their academic needs for laptop usage. Classrooms will need to be identified regarding whether they are laptop friendly.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

It was stated that it should be the student's responsibility to arrive for class with their batteries charged and software updated. After discussion, a responsibility will be added to indicate that students should come prepared for all assignments, including but not limited to, having appropriate software and security updates, and having charged and spare batteries as necessary. It was suggested that this be included in the syllabus language. Possible issues were considered regarding laptop use during three-hour classes.

The right of students to download material in class was discussed. It was felt that the downloading of material would be acceptable if appropriate to the academic pursuit of the course.

The Student Code of Conduct provides language that directs students to comply with instructions from all university officials. Using the laptop in a courteous fashion should remain as a separate item as that behavior may not always be related to conduct violations.

The Sycamore Standards, which states that students are expected to accept certain personal responsibilities, was discussed. A question was raised regarding whether the Sycamore Standards should be included as part of the student responsibilities. It was noted that the standards have only been adopted by the SGA and not other university groups.

The Student Rights and Responsibilities will need to be approved by the Student Government Association.

Administration Rights and Responsibilities

It was noted that most classrooms do not currently have power available and Administration will not be able to provide sufficient electrical support for laptop usage. It was suggested that the statement should be changed reflect that the power is not currently available. Possible safety hazards where cords are placed on the floors of the classrooms should be considered. It was also noted that the size of the desks in the classrooms might be inappropriate for laptop use.

It was stated that faculty do not always notify the appropriate administrators of hardware/software/behavior problems in a timely manner. It should be the right of Administration to receive appropriate notification.

A suggestion was made to include that Administration should recognize the time that is required for faculty development.

Susan Powers will make the suggested changes to the Rights and Responsibilities and will forward to the group for discussion at the next meeting.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
April 20, 2006**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Robert Guell, Ken Janz, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Jeff Pohlen, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, David Wright and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the April 6 meeting are available for review. It was noted that "Marketable" should be changed to "Will make our students more Marketable" in the Top Five Reasons Why There is a Laptop Initiative. Corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Action on Subcommittee Reports in Interim Report, Continuing

Guidelines for Proper Use Subcommittee.

Ethical issues and guidelines should be provided as a part of faculty development and student orientation. It was noted that as a result of the Academic Integrity process, a faculty guide is being developed. The guide will address several concerns, including how to manage technology and integrity issues.

It was noted that the Academic Integrity policy would not be approved until fall 2006. As it presently exists, the code should support faculty regarding their choice of whether to allow students to use or not use the laptops in their classrooms.

The Faculty Development Subcommittee is developing documentation for students regarding the proper use of laptops. Students receive information regarding the Student Code of Conduct at Sycamore Advantage and Knowing Sycamores.

A concern was raised regarding the use of inappropriate screen images. The faculty member would need to make the decision regarding what is appropriate in the classroom.

Instant messenger systems were discussed. The faculty member could require that this feature be turned off. It was noted that Public Safety

should be notified regarding any harassment issues involving instant messaging.

A suggestion was made to send a recommendation to ITLOC to address ethical guidelines and use issues.

A question was raised regarding possible software solutions for use in the classroom. It was explained that Silicon Chalk has been taken off the market, but trial copies of two other similar software programs have been ordered. Paul Brown will be working with faculty to test the products.

A suggestion was made to forward the Guidelines for Proper Use to the Student Government Association for their review.

It was also suggested that the Guidelines be included as a learning community issue.

Susan Powers requested that the committee members review all suggestions regarding the Guidelines for Proper Use. Action will be taken at the next meeting.

The OIT Support subcommittee report and the report from the ITFC should be reviewed. Reed Kidder, from Residential Life, has been invited to attend the April 26 meeting to discuss learning spaces.

IV. *Plans for Future Meetings*

The next interim report is due on June 1, 2006 and there are three remaining meetings scheduled.

The interim report will go to the Faculty Senate today as an informational item. Ed Kinley will be present for possible questions. It was noted that the Rights and Responsibilities had not been included in the report.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviewed the interim report earlier this week. The Rights and Responsibilities were also presented as an informational item.

After discussion, the committee decided to work on finalizing recommendations from the subcommittees and not meet during the summer months. Monthly meetings will be scheduled next fall. The charge of the committee will continue. Issues will be addressed and progress will be reviewed. The next report is due January 2007.

V. Other

A question was forwarded from the PPARC meeting regarding whether international students were included in the laptop scholarship program. It was explained that the student requirements for the scholarship did not correlate and tax issues were problematic.

A question was raised regarding whether students outside of Indiana were included. It was found that several students from other states were offered the scholarship.

PPARC also questioned whether incoming international students would be required to purchase a laptop. It was explained that the program was set up so that all full-time freshmen will be required to purchase a laptop.

The Marketing and Communications subcommittee will be developing a plan to provide information to the students notifying them that the laptop is a requirement for fall 2007.

Yancy Phillips announced that the faculty laptops are on the way and should arrive on Monday.

A sample of the ISU t-shirts packaged in a laptop box was shared with the committee members. The t-shirts were sent to all of the students that qualified for the laptop scholarship.

VI. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
April 26, 2006**

Present: A. M. Anderson, Jim Buffington, Jeff Jacso, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, Nick Swango and David Wright. Reed Kidder and Karen Pennington also attended.

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the April 20 meeting are available for review. A change in Other Business regarding the international students and the laptop scholarship was requested. The statement “requirements for the scholarship did not correlate” will be changed to “requirements for the scholarship were too problematic”. Other corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Action on Subcommittee Reports in Interim Report, Continuing*ITFC*

Yancy Phillips provided an overview of the report from the ITFC. He highlighted the following:

- Classroom classifications with appropriate levels will be assigned based on equipment that they have currently. The classrooms will move to other levels as upgrades take place.
- Learning spaces were identified.
- The group had suggested that a specific room in each of the buildings be identified for power and wired access. Power cord hazards were also considered.
- Classroom scheduling issues were considered. Scheduling 25 will no longer be used and replacement software is being investigated.

A suggestion was made to share the plan with the SGA.

Reed Kidder was invited to attend the meeting to discuss the learning spaces in HMSU and the residence halls.

The areas having power in the Commons were discussed. It was noted that locating additional hookups in the Commons would be difficult.

Discussion ensued regarding the residence halls and whether the rooms should have additional wired hookups or wireless coverage. It was stated that most students would not need additional internet in their rooms to study with a group, but having additional power and wireless in the lounge areas on the floors may be helpful. Mr. Kidder explained that adding power and wireless to the floor lounges would not be difficult. The lounges on the first floor were previously used as computer labs and have a substantial amount of power available.

Protocol will be developed as the program progresses and areas of need will be identified by student use.

A question was raised regarding whether the laptop scholarship winners would be surveyed regarding their experiences. The ITFC had suggested that surveys be conducted with the group. A luncheon could be held to encourage students to participate. CIRT offered to help with the surveys. Yancy Phillips will take these suggestions to Enrollment Services.

A question was raised regarding how many semesters the award winners would need to stay enrolled in order to keep the laptop. It was explained that they would be allowed to keep the laptop at the point in the second semester when full tuition is due. This information will need to be communicated to the students.

Suggestions regarding learning space issues will be taken back to the ITFC.

Guidelines for Proper Use Subcommittee.

It was suggested that the Guidelines for Proper Use be forwarded to Ken Janz to include in faculty development.

A question was raised regarding what group is responsible for training faculty on the Code of Student Conduct. The laptop issues could be incorporated into this training. If the Academic Integrity policy remains as written and is approved by the Board of Trustees, the policy will support and affirm the Guidelines. The policy will need to be shared with the departments. Individuals that will be assigned to the responsibility of training the faculty have yet to be identified.

The committee decided that a recommendation could be included in the next report indicating that training for the Code of Student Conduct and the proposed Academic Integrity policy cover the issues as they relate to the

laptop initiative, but that NUIC also recognizes and recommends the importance of future training on the new policy to incorporate laptop and technology issues with faculty.

It was noted that several typos were found in the interim report by the Faculty Senate. The June report will be reviewed prior to forwarding to the group.

The Evaluation Subcommittee will be finalizing their report and will forward to Susan Powers to distribute to NUIC members.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
May 4, 2006**

Present: Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Justin Henderson, Jeff Jacso, Michael Jarrell, Ed Kinley, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, David Wright, and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the April 26 meeting are available for review. Other corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Action on Subcommittee Reports in Interim Report, Continuing

Evaluation Subcommittee

Copies of the final report from the Evaluation Subcommittee were forwarded to the committee members prior to the meeting. Virgil Sheets provided a brief overview of the report. Faculty Senate concerns were taken into consideration regarding the possible negative impact the laptop initiative might have as well as the possible positive impact. Several student data sources will be utilized.

The subcommittee organized around four areas.

- Perception of students wanting to attend ISU
- Impact of pedagogy in the classrooms
- Impact on student outcomes in preparation of their careers
- Impact on technical support

It was proposed that a subcommittee would collect the data on an annual basis and report what has changed in the different areas that might be attributable to the laptop.

The possibility of doing an off-task survey is being considered.

A question was raised regarding what is considered to be the transitional years. The optional year is 2006-2007 and the following three years could also be considered transitional. It was explained that the evaluator could determine the appropriate statistical procedure. It was also questioned

whether the plan should include one or two years after full implementation for evaluation. This will depend on what the pattern is and what the committee, as it exists at that point, determines.

A question was raised regarding the recommendation to survey whether employers found value in our students based on their experience. After discussing with Career Center personnel, it was noted that it might be difficult to accomplish this evaluation. It was explained that there is data that employers collect that may be useful, for example, technical skills. This could possibly indicate a positive or negative impact from the laptop initiative.

A question was raised regarding when the evaluation from employers would begin since it will be several years following the first required year before those students graduate. An impact could still be seen from the initiative because the laptop would become part of the campus environment and skills could develop.

It was noted that it would be important to obtain input from the community and from employers. It was suggested that the college departments talk with their employers to gain information. A sentence could be added to the report to indicate that the subcommittee further recommends that focus groups should be conducted with a small number of employers each year as the initiative progresses. Questions for the focus group could be developed by a steering committee using the data and analysis. Issues that arise would determine what the focus groups should be.

The student surveys regarding off-task behavior were discussed. It was commented that students do not always take time to fill out these surveys. Volunteers will be invited to participate in the focus group. It was noted that the students that are willing to participate would most likely be students that are not involved in off-task behavior.

Faculty experiences should also be considered. Evaluating the effectiveness of the Faculty Development program will also be valuable. Off-task behavior and how it should be handled is important to faculty.

It was also noted that Public Safety was contacted regarding data that they might have available on the number of computer thefts. Their data does not always indicate what was stolen. For example, laptops may be stolen from a student when they are away from campus and Public Safety would not have this information.

The Evaluation subcommittee will gather data, interpret data and forward the information to different areas. The NUIC will begin with the baseline data and will decide if changes are needed.

It was suggested that the next NUIC report include a statement indicating that the NUIC will be doing in-course corrections and will be gathering information that will help indicate the effectiveness of those corrections.

OIT Support

The OIT support report is informational. The group met and the priority of support was discussed. The loaner pool and cost associated with it was also considered. After the decisions are made, they will be brought to the committee for discussion.

Money Matters

Thomas Ratliff has created a process for students to request financial aid for the purchase of their laptop. A web form is being developed.

HF&C has been chosen as the insurance company. They have been the company that was offered to the students in the residence halls previously. Plans are underway to offer this option from the website.

A question was raised regarding whether the laptop scholarship students would be able to upgrade their laptops. It was explained that the laptops are purchased at a bulk cost and to upgrade would not be possible.

Marketing and Communications

Advertisements from different publications were shared with the committee. A question was raised regarding the pricing information and it was suggested that the savings should be made available.

It was commented that the connection to ISU was not obvious in the ads. The shirt in the add could have the ISU logo, more ISU blue could be used throughout, and something could appear on the screen of the open laptop.

A comment had been shared from a faculty member saying that the student in the ad was dressed inappropriately. It was explained that the advertisement had been shared with a group of male and female students, faculty and Publications and Marketing and no problems were found.

IV. Other

Ed Kinley announced that a budget request was submitted for one-time funding to retrofit a select number of classrooms for the laptop initiative.

Xythos is a file repository that provides a web based file access browser and does not require LAN-connection. It will soon be available. It serves both as a file repository as well as a file "drop-box" to allow users to exchange files (both on and off campus).

Requests have been received from faculty asking to consider using tablet computers. Tablets do not meet the minimum requirements. The committee will discuss at future meetings.

V. *Next Interim Report*

Suggestions from previous meetings will be discussed next week and decisions will be made regarding possible action that needs to be taken. The information will be forwarded to the committee prior to the meeting.

VI. *Adjournment*

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

**Notebook University Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2006**

Present: A.M. Anderson, Jody Brucker, Jim Buffington, Jeff Jacso, Ken Janz, Ed Kinley, Dave Malooley, Bruce McLaren, Tim Mulkey, Susan Owen, Yancy Phillips, Susan Powers, Virgil Sheets, David Wright, and Karen Pennington

I. Call to Order

Susan Powers called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the May 4 meeting are available for review. A correction was noted in the discussion regarding the ads for the laptops. It was stated that the ads were reviewed by "Publications and Marketing". The statement will be changed to read that they were reviewed by "the Marketing and Communications Subcommittee." It was noted that future ads should be sent to the Marketing and Communications department for review. Other corrections and changes should be forwarded to Karen Pennington.

III. Tablet Computer and Specifications

Requests from faculty members have been received regarding the purchase of tablet computers. The tablet power does not meet the minimum specifications that were set by the NUIC for the laptops. The NUIC has been asked to consider approval of the purchase of the tablets. The following comments were shared:

- The tablet computers are more expensive.
- The tablets do not have an internal writable driver, which will require the purchase of an external driver.
- Each college is allotted certain funds and if the faculty member wants a tablet, the college could pay the extra cost.
- The financial constraints on the university should be considered.
- A few of the tablets could be used on a limited basis for future reference.
- A small discount may be available.
- The tablets have no serviceable parts and will need to be shipped to the vendor for repair.
- The decision should be left to the deans.

A tablet computer was examined by the committee members.

It was stated that specifications were established by the NUIC for the notebook initiative and to set specifications for tablet computers would go beyond the scope of the committee.

If a faculty member needs a tablet for their specialized work or research, they could go through the regular channels. Discipline specific and academic needs were discussed. The focus should remain on the laptop computers.

A motion was made to support the interest in mobile computing but acknowledge the lack of expertise of the committee and potential problems of servicing such a machine that the NUIC therefore does not intend on offering standard specifications for a tablet and encourages faculty to get a laptop as their primary academic unit but also encourages deans to discuss with faculty their needs and to provide computing support for those needs. It was pointed out that the tablet can be classified as a specialty machine and therefore specs for such a machine would be specific to each faculty member requesting one. NUIC recommends that tablets not be used as a primary computer but can be a useful secondary specialty computer if the funds are available through grants, depts. or colleges. Discussion followed. Motion was seconded. S. Powers called the question. The motion was approved 11-0-0.

IV. Action on Subcommittee Reports in Interim Report, Continuing

Due to time constraints, the action on the subcommittee reports will be taken at the next meeting.

V. Next Interim Report

Susan Powers requested that the committee members review the draft report and provide comments.

VI. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Appendix B

**Laptop Service Priority Recommendations
5-18-2006**

A priority of service will be established based on the following general criteria:

PRIORITY LEVEL 1

- Greatest need (urgent, “End of the world”, system non-functional)
- Student with urgent pending work (affecting individual student)
- Faculty with urgent teaching needs (affects a classroom of students)
- Critical errors
- VIP customer
- Emergency loaner laptop may be available on a situational basis

PRIORITY LEVEL 2

- Intermediate need (urgent, not critical, “Not end of the world”, scheduled service, system mostly functional):
 - Virus, etc.
 - Various non-critical or ‘manageable’ errors
 - Cisco Clean Access assistance
- Emergency loaner laptop may be available on a situational basis

PRIORITY LEVEL 3

- Lower priority (no urgency, scheduled when convenient)
- Any of the above
- General updates/maintenance
- Loaner laptop would not be issued

CSC Service Matrix 5-18-06 Support Services provided >	Software	Help Desk Responses								
	MSCA	ANY Telephone support	ANY Walk-In support	ISU-OWNED Consultant On-site	ISU-OWNED ERS Support	ISU-OWNED Contracted Hardware Support	Leased Lenovo Laptops IBM Self Maintainer	Student-Owned IBM Self Maintainer	STUDENT-OWNED CSC Software Only	STUDENT-OWNED RCC Software Only
Customer Type (below)	MSCA	Telephone support	Walk-In support	Consultant On-site	ERS Support	Contracted Hardware Support	IBM Self Maintainer	IBM Self Maintainer	STUDENT-OWNED CSC Software Only	RCC Software Only
Students	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	n/a	Y	Y	Y
Distance Education Students	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	n/a	Y	Y	n/a
Faculty	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	N	n/a
Staff	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	N	n/a
Retirees	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	n/a	n/a	N	n/a
Alumni	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	n/a	Y	N	n/a
Non-ISU community	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	n/a
Guests	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a

Appendix C

A Guide to Evaluating the Laptop Initiative at ISU

**Report Submitted by the Evaluation Subcommittee
to the whole
NUIC (Notebook University Implementation Committee)**

May 2, 2006

Subcommittee Members:

Concetta DePaolo, Chair

Susan Powers

Virgil Sheets

Ken Janz

Terry Ishitani

Nick Swango

Kelly Waite

Table of Contents

Background Information	1
Recommended Evaluation Plan	2
Evaluating Marketing & Competitive Advantage	3
Evaluating Pedagogy & Enhanced Learning	4
Evaluating Student Outcomes & Post-Graduate Impact.....	6
Evaluating Improvements in Technical Support.....	7
Evaluating Other Aspects of the Initiative.....	8
Appendix 1: Data Sources - Marketing & Competitive Advantage	9
Appendix 2: Data Sources - Pedagogy & the Learning Environment	10
Appendix 3: Data Sources - Student Outcomes & Post-Graduate Impact.....	11
Appendix 4: Data Sources - Technical Support.....	12
Appendix 5: Data Sources – Other Aspects.....	13
Appendix 6: Off-Task Survey & Methodology	14
Appendix 7: OSPIRE Data Sources.....	18
Appendix 8: OIT Data Sources.....	19
Appendix 9 Other Data Sources	20

Background Information

When the Faculty Senate approved ISU's plan to become a Laptop Institution, it recommended the development of a process for evaluating the success of the initiative. Following this recommendation, NUIC charged a subgroup of its members and invited others to develop such a plan. The committee, consisting of faculty, administrative/professional staff, and students met biweekly from November 2005 through April of 2006. The following pages are the result of those discussions.

The first step in developing an evaluation plan is to determine what was to be assessed. To address this, the subcommittee began querying about the objectives underlying ISU's decision to become a laptop institution. It was quickly realized that there was no singular reason for ISU's decision, but rather, the decision to become a laptop institution was predicated on the understanding that other laptop-adopting institutions had experienced numerous positive benefits. However, presentations to campus groups (e.g., student government, faculty senate, etc.) seemed to emphasize four classes of outcomes (that resonated to different degrees within and among various groups of supporters). They were:

Marketing: It was expected that becoming a laptop institution would enhance ISU's goal of becoming *an institution of choice for high achieving students* in an increasingly competitive higher education marketplace.

Pedagogy: It was expected that becoming a laptop institution would enhance ISU's strategic objective of becoming *known for use of active/experiential pedagogies*.

Student Outcomes: It was expected that in becoming a laptop institution, ISU's students would be better *prepared to integrate and use technology in their careers* post-graduation.

Technical Support: It was expected that becoming a laptop institution would enhance ISU's *provision of computer (hardware) support* for students (with no diminution of services for faculty).

Thus, the recommended evaluation plan will consider the initiative's impact in all four of these areas.

Recommended Evaluation Plan

Bases of Evaluation: We strongly recommend using currently existing data for which collection is ongoing as the basis for evaluating the success of the laptop initiative in the four key areas: marketing, pedagogy, student outcomes, and technical support. In the pages that follow, we describe student, faculty, and institutional data sources relevant to evaluation in these domains. In addition, other relevant bases for evaluation (for which data are available) are also described, and additional data needs are specified. Appendices A through F provide data sources for each evaluation component. Additional appendices are organized by data source for ease of use.

Timeline: The initiative should be evaluated annually until implementation is complete. We recommend that AY 05-06 be treated as a baseline year (though this might be extended to AY 04-05 if the data are available) and that AY 06-07 be treated as a “transitional” year. Annual evaluations of the initiative should continue at least through AY 11-12, when full implementation is completed.

Responsibility: The Notebook University Implementation Committee (or its future derivation) holds primary responsibility for conducting the evaluations and for disseminating annual reports of its conclusions and recommendations. Although there may be other audiences, minimally, these reports should be sent to the CIO, the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Evaluating Marketing & Competitive Advantage

Both student and institutional data sources can be used to assess whether the laptop initiative is successful in making ISU more attractive to higher ability students and in improving ISU's reputation. (See Appendix 1)

Student Data Sources

ISU collects data from numerous student surveys that are relevant to evaluating the laptop's impact. The SIQ (Student Information Questionnaire), which is administered annually to incoming freshmen, can be used to help assess the impact of the laptop initiative on marketing and student attitudes.

The **SIQ** contains numerous questions that should be immediately responsive to changes in the student population with the implementation of the laptop requirement. In particular, we recommend tracking changes on items **#8, #24f, #35h, #41j, and #42h**, which assess students' background characteristics, prior computer experience, and college expectations.

In addition, we recommend adding two new items to question #50 (which asks about the importance of various factors in students' decisions to come to ISU):

- SIQ 50i. ISU's being a laptop university**
- SIQ 50j. The laptop scholarship program**

Institutional Data Sources

ISU also keeps numerous sources of operational data that would be relevant to assessing the impact of the laptop initiative on marketing and ISU's competitive advantage.

Data from the **admissions office** are key sources of information on ISU's success in marketing. These include: **number of inquiries, numbers of applications**, and **actual enrollments** as well as data on the types of students applying, e.g., **SAT scores**, and rates of **retention**.

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 areas of **academic rigor** and **quality of training**.

Evaluating Pedagogy & Enhanced Learning

In order to determine the effect of the laptop initiative on the learning environment, student, faculty, and institutional data sources should be utilized. (See Appendix 2.)

Student Data Sources

ISU collects data from students using the FYE (First Year Experience) questionnaire, the Senior Survey and the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement), which are administered biennially. Additionally, SIRs (Student Instructional Reports), are collected for each class and can be summarized at college and university-levels. All of these instruments and their results may be obtained from OSPIRE. Finally, OIT (Office of Institutional Technology) also conducts an annual survey of students (and faculty) that provides additional data relevant to this evaluation.

The **FYE** currently contains several questions to assess students' experiences with active and engaged pedagogies at ISU, including items **D4, D6, and D7**. Other items that might be affected by the laptop initiative include those assessing "relationships with faculty members" (**A2**), "use of technology" on campus (**A4**), and students' overall "academic experiences" (**A7**), all of which may be affected by the laptop initiative.

SIRs also assess the experience of various active learning strategies, including **#22** (engaging in small group discussions), **#24** (working on lab exercises), and **#33** (active engagement of the student). Students are also asked to evaluate the instructor's use of computer aids (**#28**). These results should only be examined in summary form at the college or university level.

The **OIT survey** also includes many items (**too numerous to mention**) that assess students' use of technology both in and outside of class, although they do not all measure "active" learning. However, the survey also contains a specific item to assess how much **faculty use of technology has impacted their learning** (unnumbered).

While the **Senior Survey** also contains questions about students' academic experience, including **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** (items unnumbered), it does not address the instructors' use of active pedagogies or computers in their instruction. On the other hand, the **NSSE** has four items pertaining to academic computer use though not necessarily within the classroom; they include 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**).

Faculty Data Sources

Although ISU faculty complete numerous annual reports and surveys, only the OIT survey directly addresses faculty experiences that should be impacted by the laptop initiative.

Numerous items on the **OIT survey** concern faculty's use of active classroom pedagogies, including questions on students' **off-task behavior, attendance, and involvement** in class. Faculty also rate students' **interest in learning** and **understanding of technology** (unnumbered). We also recommend the addition of several items after implementation begins:

- How able are you in implementing active learning in the classroom?**
- How many times/semester do you assign homework requiring use of a computer?**
- How many times/semester do you require students bring their computers 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**

Institutional Data Sources

ISU keeps numerous sources of operational data that would be relevant to assessing the impact of the laptop initiative on pedagogy and the learning environment.

Institutional data on changes in pedagogy at ISU might be reflected in faculty interest and participation in workshops at **CIRT**. Summaries of the **number of workshops offered** (particularly those relating to active pedagogy and use of technology) as well as **attendance** at these workshops (both in raw numbers as well as percentage of slots enrolled) should be tracked.

Related data from **OIT** might include the **percent of courses using Blackboard** and the amount of **network storage devoted to courses**.

In addition, **requests for technological or "smart" classrooms** should also be monitored throughout the laptop implementation period.

Evaluating Student Outcomes & Post-Graduate Impact

In order to determine if the laptop initiative is successful in improving the skills of ISU's graduating students, both student and institutional data sources should be used. (See Appendix 3.)

Student Data Sources

Because the alumni survey has a fairly low response rate, students' perception of the contribution of the laptop initiative to their success may prove difficult to measure.

However, several items on the **senior survey** address students' satisfaction with **the value of their education**, their **career preparation**, and their **preparation for employment received from courses in their major** (unnumbered).

In addition, the OIT survey has a single item (unnumbered) to assess students' perceptions that ISU's technological services **have prepared them for the workplace**.

Institutional Data Sources

Institutional data relating to the impact of the laptop initiative on student outcomes should come from the **Career Center** and include **counts of the number of employers who interview/recruit ISU students** through the career center as well as **percent of students hired** prior to graduation.

We 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.

Evaluating Improvements in Technical Support

The effectiveness of the technical support provided to students, faculty and staff should be evaluated using several student, faculty, and institutional data sources. (See Appendix 4)

Student Data Sources

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:

Laptop assistance and support
Access and support for printing

The **FYE** survey has a single item, **B3**, that assesses students' satisfaction with computer labs. With the advent of the laptop initiative, we recommend this be changed to:

B3 Laptop Support

Similarly, the **Senior Survey** has a single item (unnumbered) that assesses students' **overall satisfaction with ISU's computer labs**. We also recommend this item be changed to:

Laptop Support (and/or laptop initiative)

Faculty Data Sources

The computer support for faculty as it relates to 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.

Institutional Data Sources

To evaluate the impact of the laptop initiative on technical support, we recommend that the evaluation reports include 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)** as well as data on the **average "response time" for computer repairs**. Data on the **"down time" for servers** should also be monitored.

Evaluating Other Aspects of the Initiative

In addition to these four broad areas, the subcommittee also felt that the impact of the laptop initiative on other areas, including the transformation of the social experience of students, the prevalence of thefts of computers, and the extent of off-task behavior using laptops, should be assessed. These aspects of the initiative can be addressed using existing student and institutional data sources, and some new data collection. (See Appendix 5)

Student Data Sources

At many laptop institutions, computers are used as frequently outside of class as in class; thus, we also recommend that the evaluation consider the influence of the laptop on other (nonacademic) aspects of students' lives.

The **FYE** survey contains several items (**D16, D17 and D18**), 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 (**A6**).

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.

Institutional Data Sources

Data from the University police on the **number of computer and computer-related thefts**, both for departmental- and student-owned equipment, is also relevant to evaluating the success of the laptop initiative.

Special Data Collections

Many faculty have expressed a concern that the use of the laptop will increase off-task behavior in the classroom (and thus actually reduce students' active engagement with their coursework). Unfortunately, few of the current instruments regularly administered at ISU contain any measures relating to off-task behavior. We therefore recommend **the development of a survey of off-task behavior** that should be administered both before and after implementation of the laptop initiative. A copy of a proposed instrument and validation methodology are located in Appendix 6.

Finally, we further recommend that the Notebook University Implementation Committee consider supplementing the quantitative data described in this report with **qualitative data** from focus groups or in-depth interviews with subsets of ISU students and faculty.

Appendix 1: Data Sources - Marketing & Competitive Advantage

Student Data / SIQ	<p><i>NEW - effects on choosing ISU of:</i></p> <p>50i - laptop program 50j - laptop scholarship</p> <p><u>Computer usage, expectations</u></p> <p>8 - how long used comp at home 24f - amt. usage for recreation in HS 35h - proficiency for school work 41j - expected use for recreation college 42h - college should improve computer abilities</p>
Institutional data	<p><u>Admissions data: (before & after)</u></p> <p>Interest/inquiries Applications Enrollment</p> <p><u>Types of students applying</u></p> <p>SAT scores Retention data</p>
New Data Collection	<p><i>Marketing study on perception of ISU esp. regarding academic rigor, quality of training</i></p>

Appendix 2: Data Sources - Pedagogy & the Learning Environment

	Student Data	Faculty Data	Institutional Data
FYE Survey	<u>Active/group learning questions</u> D4, D6, D7 <u>Other</u> A2 - relationships with faculty A4 - use of technology A7 - overall academic experience		
Senior Survey	<u>Satisfaction with:</u> Classroom instruction Teaching ability of faculty in major Opportunity to interact w/ faculty Feedback from instructors		
NSSE	<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		
SIRs	<u>Active learning/computer questions:</u> 22 – probs. small grp. discussions 24 - lab exercises 28 - instructor use computer aids 33 - course actively involved me		
OIT Surveys/Data	<u>OIT student survey</u> Many questions on use of tech Faculty use of tech impacts learning	<u>OIT faculty survey – eval. of students:</u> Off-task behavior Attendance Active involvement in class Understanding of technology Interest in learning <i>NEW questions on:</i> <i>Implementing active learning</i> <i>How often assign hw using computer</i> <i>How often require comp in class</i> <i>How satisfied with laptop</i> <i>How often use computers in class for Demonstrations</i> <i>Individual/group activities</i> <i>Polling/classroom interaction</i> <i>Administering exams</i>	Percent of courses using Blackboard Network storage devoted to courses
Other	<i>New survey on Off Task Behavior</i>		<u>CIRT data:</u> Faculty participants in workshops Number of workshops Attendance (# and % filled) <u>Room requests for smart classrooms, etc.</u>

Appendix 3: Data Sources - Student Outcomes & Post-Graduate Impact

	Student Data	Institutional data
Senior survey	<u>Questions assessing:</u> Value of their education Career preparation Prep for employment - major courses	
OIT surveys/data	<u>OIT student survey -</u> Tech services prep for workplace	OIT student question - Prepare for workplace
Other		<u>Career Center data</u> # Employers who recruit Placement rates
New Data Collection		<u>Career Center</u> <i>New question on laptops on surveys given to graduates or employers</i>

Appendix 4: Data Sources - Technical Support

	Student Data	Faculty Data	Institutional Data
FYE survey	<i>NEW - change question on labs to B3 - satisfaction with laptop support</i>		
Senior survey	<i>NEW - change question on labs to Satisfaction w/ LT Support/initiative</i>		
OIT surveys/ data	<u>Existing questions on student survey:</u> Support from the IT Help-desk Non-ISU vendors <i>Change Q on-site lab attendants to:</i> <i>Satisfaction w/ LT Support, assistance</i> <i>Satisfaction w/ access/support printing</i>	<u>Faculty survey</u> How useful tech services are Satisfaction with tech services Sources of tech support, barriers	Satisfaction with help desk Maintenance numbers # Calls # Turned down b/c unique machines Average response time Down time for servers

Appendix 5: Data Sources – Other Aspects

	Student Data	Institutional Data
FYE survey	<u>Use of computers outside class:</u> D16 D17 D18 A6 - satisfaction with social experience	
Senior survey	<u>Satisfaction with</u> Social climate	
OIT surveys/data	<u>OIT student survey:</u> Use of interactive services Use of group portals	
Other		<u>Admissions/Financial Aid data:</u> Breakdown of # of students: Laptop scholarship Got financial aid for laptop Had to buy themselves <u>Security issues</u> Police reports, thefts Insurance claims

Appendix 6: 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 were 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 7: OSPIRE Data Sources

	Competitive Advantage (Student Attitudes)	Enhanced, Active Learning	Improved Technical Support	Post-Grad Impact	Other / Non-academic
SIQ	<p><i>NEW - effects on choosing ISU of:</i> 50i - laptop program 50j. laptop scholarship Computer usage, expectations 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</p>				
FYE survey		<p>Active/group learning questions D4 D6 D7 Other A2 - relationships with faculty A4 - use of technology A7 - overall academic experience</p>	<p><i>NEW - change question on labs to B3 - satis with laptop support</i></p>		<p>Use of computers outside class: D16 D17 D18 A6 - satis w/social exper</p>
Senior survey		<p>Satisfaction with: Classroom instruction Teaching ability of faculty in major Opportunity to interact w/ faculty Feedback from instructors</p>	<p><i>NEW - change question on labs to Satisfact w/ LT Support/initiative</i></p>	<p>Questions assessing: Value of their education Career preparation prep for employ- major courses</p>	<p>Satisfaction with Social climate</p>
NSSE		<p>Computer usage questions: 11-use computer complete assign 1m - use email commun w/ faculty 10g - use comp academic work 11g - using information technology</p>			

Appendix 8: OIT Data Sources

	Enhanced, Active Learning	Improved Technical Support	Post-Grad Impact	Other / Non-academic
Student Survey	<p><u>OIT student survey</u> Many questions on use of tech Fac use of tech impacts learning</p>	<p><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 & assistance Satis w/ access/support printing</i></p>	<p><u>OIT student survey -</u> tech services prep for workplace</p>	<p><u>OIT student survey:</u> use of interactive services use of group portals</p>
Faculty Survey	<p><u>Faculty survey - eval of students':</u> off-task behavior attendance active involvement in class understanding of technology interest in learning NEW questions on: implementing active learning how often assign hw using computer how often require comp in class how satis with laptop how often use computers in class for: demonstrations individual/group activities polling/classroom interaction administering exams</p>	<p><u>Faculty survey</u> how useful tech services are satisfaction with tech services sources of tech support, barriers</p>		
Other	<p>Percent of courses using Blackboard Network storage devoted to courses</p>	<p>Satisfaction with help desk Maintenance numbers # calls # turned down b/c unique machines average response time down time for servers</p>		

Appendix 9: Other Data Sources

	Competitive Advantage (Student Attitudes)	Enhanced, Active Learning	Post-Grad Impact	Other / Non-academic
SIRs		Active learning/computer questions: 22 - probs small grp discussions 24 - lab exercises 28 - instructor use computer aids 33 - course actively involved me		
Admissions/ Financial Aid	Admissions data: (before & after) interest/inquiries applications enrollment Types of students applying SAT scores Retention data			Admissions/Financial Aid data: Breakdown of # of students: laptop scholarship got financial aid for laptop had to buy themselves
CIRT		Faculty participants in workshops, etc. Number of workshops Attendance (# and % filled)		
Registrar		Room requests for smart classrooms, etc.		
Career Center			# employers who recruit Placement rates <i>New Data Collection:</i> <i>New question on laptops on surveys given to graduates or employers</i>	
Campus Security				Police reports, thefts Insurance claims
New Data Collection	Marketing study on perception of ISU esp. regarding academic rigor, quality of training	New questions or new survey on Off Task Behavior		

Appendix D

Laptop University Communications Plan
updated May 23, 2006

Audience	Communication/Event	Purpose	Date	Responsible	Done
Prospective Students/Parents	Sycamore Advantage flier	Promote optional purchase option	Mar-06	Admissions	X
All	ISU laptop website	General information, direct to online purchase	1-Apr	OIT/CIRT	X
Propective Students/Parents	Scholarship website	Promote laptop scholarship	Apr-06	Admissions	IP
Current Students/Parents	General flier	Promote optional purchase option	Apr-06	CIRT	X
Parents of Fall 2006 minus awardees	Goal Quest email	Inform of flier coming around May 1	Apr-06	Admissions	
Laptop Award Recipients	T-shirt promotional mailing	Encourage confirmation/attendance	1-Apr	Admissions	X
Laptop Award Recipients	E-mail to students via Talisma	5/1 confirmation deadline	14-Apr	Admissions	X
All	Lenovo purchase website	online purchases	1-May	Lenovo/OIT	X
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	X
Current Students	Posters	Promote optional purchase option	Jun-06	CIRT	
Students/Parents	Infomercial Video	General information about program	Jun-06	CIRT	IP
Faculty/Staff	Campus Connection	Promote Laptop Initiative/ purchase option	Jun-06	Katie Spanuello	
Prospective Students/Parents	Sycamore Advantage table (video)	Promote optional purchase option	Jun-06	OIT/CIRT	---
Current Students	Student Technology Guide	Promote optional purchase option	Jul-06	CIRT	IP
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	X
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	
Fall 2007 Students/Parents	Mailings ?	General required laptop program	Aug-06	CIRT/Admissions	

Deleted: /pres. ?