WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
October 27, 1998

PRESENT: Bareford, Bhat, Boroznoff, Chesney, Ciliberti, Coomes, Duffy, Dye, Edelstein, Garcia, Ghosh, Goldstein, Grier, Grodner, Hayden, Hirstein, Kim, Kim-Yoon, Maheshwari, McCallum, Murphy, Mwaura, Nack, Ndjatou, Overdorf, Parker, Pope, Din, Scala, Schubert, Sesay, Speert, Swanson, Tardi, Wagner, Weidenaar, Weltman, Wolf

ABSENT: McClean, Morganstern, Vardiman

GUESTS: Agard-Jones, Applebaum, Barrier, Bogdon, Bliss, Bolyai, Brown, Colon, Connolly, Curtis, Davis, DeLuca, DeYoung, Doot, Duncan, Fountoukidis, Gaboury, Gerardi, Grant, Harris, Harrison, Haver, Hendriquez, Hozalik, Hutchinson, Kloss, Link, Loisel, Malanga, Martinez, McNamara, Monteagudo, Nilsen, O'Donnell, Pandya, Pardi, Peterman, Phadia, Principe, Reiss, Risley, Rivela, Rodrigues, Rosenfeld, Roux, Rudnik, Schaeffer, Shapiro, Sheikh, Varron, Voos, Wahrman, Williams, Wolk, Zeman, Zurich [There were other individuals present who did not sign the attendance roster, and one signature was unintelligible. My apologies if I manhandled your name.]

PRELIMINARIES: Chairperson Overdorf called the special Faculty Senate Technology Panel meeting to order at 12:40 PM. The minutes of the October 13, 1998 meeting (moved by Boroznoff, seconded by Duffy) were accepted unanimously. Overdorf reminded all present that student outcomes should be part of all new programs and new courses. A. Ciliberti, Chair of the Elections Council, reminded the campus of the election for the Promotion Committee, and of the continuing need for pollwatchers.

TECHNOLOGY PANEL: Overdorf introduced M. Wahrman, Director of General Education, who moderated the "Technology Across the General Education Curriculum" panel discussion. The panelists were: J. Bliss (Teaching Learning Technology Roundtable), L. Bogdon (Information Systems), R. Harris (IRT), R. Kloss (Center for Teaching Excellence), G. Ndjatou (Computer Science), R.Pardi (General Education) and K. Wagner (Library). Discussion catalysts were: J.Coomes, J. Gaboury and J.Hutchison.

> Gaboury opened the session by asking, "What is computer competency? How do we measure it? What are our students' expectations?" Each panelist briefly responded. Harris introduced (and praised) the Student Technical Consultants in the audience. Bodgon spoke of making access to networks and information systems available so students could "do business" on them. Pardi emphasized the importance of seeing computer competency as similar to writing

across the curriculum: something all students need to know. Ndjatou held that the computer is a tool for solving problems, and he began to outline a multi-step model of the levels of competency students must move through. Kloss asked the campus to consider how we know that we are accomplishing our goals in teaching students. Bliss insisted that computers should be used only when they are the right strategy for the content being taught. She also called upon more technologically-literate faculty to mentor their faculty peers. Wagner noted that librarians act as teachers and intermediaries who take the students beyond basic technical competencies, and teach them critical, evaluative skills in the use of resources such as the Internet. Hutchison began the second round of questioning by asking each panelist how she or he sees technology fitting (and best implemented) into the curriculum? Harris noted that we are not starting from ground zero: we can integrate technology into existing programs and approaches (e.g., WAC). Bogdon stated that e-mail is, by far, the most widely-used application on campus. Pardi announced that the General Education Committee favors technology-intensive courses rather than separate computer literacy courses. Ndjatou reiterated that computers are not just tools for writing papers, but should be seen as ways of solving problems. Kloss emphasized that the important thing is to improve student learning, which may – or may not -- be facilitated by using computers. Bliss recommended a "minimum competency" exam, with remedial courses (a boot camp) for those who fail. She also emphasized the need for assessment. Wagner described the Library's combined approach (used in its user education classes), which he described as a model of integration.

Coomes kicked off the final round of questions by asking how should faculty be encouraged, helped and/or rewarded for attempting the implement technology across the curriculum? Harris stated that IRT exists to help faculty do just this. He suggested that the University recognize the effort involved (and online "publications") in tenure decisions. Bogdon's people, too, provide such assistance, and they encourage experimentation. Pardi reminded anyone contemplating this that it is very labor intensive, and that departmental support is vital. Ndjatou stated that computing is explaining, and that students should not only use technology, but "make" technology as well. Kloss concurred that there is heavy front-loading, and that progress may come only in small increments. Bliss agreed that technology doesn't really take less time, but emphasized the value added that may come from its use. Wagner urged that there be no division between the techies and the luddites; technology cannot take over from the educators, for they are the ones who will be creating and managing it. Wahrman opened the floor to questions from the audience. R. McCallum reminded those who have been around for a few years that fifteen years ago the GE Committee proposed the use of computers in

WAC. He also reported his own findings of decreased quality in student papers heavily reliant on Internet sources. Pardi countered that the late scribes probably felt the same way about books. Bliss emphasized the need for faculty to teach students to critically evaluate Internet sites. I. Nack hoped that the rush to use technology will not lessen what he considers the primary tasks of education: teaching thinking (and oral expression) skills. R. Weidenaar, echoing McCallum, suggested that just sitting in front of a computer may be an electronic sinkhole. Perhaps the incredible ease of production has contributed to the perceived lack of quality. A. Ghosh denied that computers are impersonal, and can be very helpful in teaching. S. Tardi complained that high enrollment caps hinder the growth of technology in some departments. Bliss responded that it is difficult to provide personal feedback when class sizes grow too large. She also cautioned administrators from seeking illusory savings by packing distance education classes with large enrollments. M. Boroznoff called for mandatory training for all faculty. Harris replied that it must be done in the departments to be most effective. Coomes asked the Registrar to help out by scheduling classes in rooms of appropriate size for the class enrollment and subject matter. S. Maheshwari noted that overall societal technological literacy is growing, and that we must look ahead to using technology as a learning, and not just a teaching, tool. M. Edelstein recalled that the old GE requirement in information literacy was abolished, and that the job is done better within each department. R. Grier suggested that if one has a very large class, it may be useful to break the students into groups. In response to F. Din's query about the absence of a panelist from the technology-heavy College of Education, Wahrman stated that M. Rodriguez had been invited, but was unable to attend. She emphasized that input is desired and needed from all sectors on campus.

STC F. Doot spoke of the cluster class he's in (taught by Harris) in which listservs and other things involve the students in using technology. Kloss questioned how the success of such an approach can be assessed. S. Collins wryly noted that she, too, had tried the listserv approach – but she was the only person contributing to it! Wahrman said that when she casually remarked that typical exam questions would be on her listserv, every student signed up. Harris said that participation – online and in class – represents 30% of the grade in his course, and that he feels that he has thoroughly integrated technology into the materials and requirements of that course. Collins voiced the frustration of many when she complained that sometimes half the computers in the Atrium aren't working. J. Voos declared that the crux of the issue is, quite simply: how much money is the University willing to invest to assure that all students have working access to the technology? N. Grant complimented students for

developing expertise in excess of his own.

Warhman addressed a final question to the panelists: If technology takes so much more time than traditional teaching, why do it? Harris: students are expected to know these things when they graduate. Pardi: It's a whole new world of teaching and learning, and there's no avoiding it. Bliss: It adds another dimension to teaching and learning. Ndjatou: It is the future: computers are a major part of our lives and will be part of our way of thinking. Wagner: We can't just hand students the keys to a new toy: faculty have the duty to nurture the inquisitive and critical aspects of using technology properly. Hutchison: Teaching will work more effectively when technology is integrated into the curriculum – and IRT will be there to help faculty in every way it can.

A. Ciliberti announced that the Library's departmental selectors will be contacting all faculty in the near future to demonstrate "The Library At Your Desktop" in departmental offices. There are may riches available on the University and Library Home Pages (to say nothing of departmental pages) that can be easily and profitably accessed and used by faculty and students.

ADJOURNMENT: Overdorf thanked all the participants and guests, and closed the meeting at 1:55. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday November 10, 1998, at 12:30 PM in Student Center 203-5.

Respectfully submitted,
Bill Duffy, Sometime Secretary

WPU Faculty Senate
William Paterson University