

Illinois State University  
Division of Academic Affairs

**FY18 Consolidated Planning Document**  
*for the*



**OFFICE OF ACADEMIC  
TECHNOLOGIES**  
*Illinois State University*

*Center for Teaching, Learning, & Technology*  
*Learning Spaces & Audio/Visual Technologies*  
*TechZone & Student Technologies*  
*Web & Interactive Communications*

**28 March 2017**



# FY18 Consolidated Planning Document

## Introduction

The Office of Academic Technologies (OAT) federates the activities of twelve units working together to provide academic technology services that support the goals of Educating Illinois, enhance teaching, learning, research and creative activity, and service outreach, and to help attract and retain great students, faculty, and staff. Three of the twelve units report directly to the Associate Vice President for Academic Technologies in the Office of the Provost. The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology (CTLT) co-reports to this AVP and the Associate Provost. The seven directors in the College Technology Support Team report to the deans of their respective colleges. The Associate Registrar leads IT staff support in Enrollment Management and Academic Services. These twelve units work together and with staff in Administrative Technologies and Student Affairs IT, to achieve a fiscally sustainable technology environment through collective research, planning, purchasing, and more.

This *FY18 Consolidated Planning Document* combines the Major Objectives and Funding Requests for three of the four directly-reporting units in OAT:

- Learning Spaces & Audio/Visual Technologies (LSAVT)
- TechZone & Student Technologies (TZ)
- Web & Interactive Communications (WEB)

The *FY18 Planning Document* for CTLT is submitted by the Associate Provost.

One of the overarching organizational goals of OAT is to strengthen the collective voice for academic technology needs of units in the Division of Academic Affairs. Toward that end, a report on the *FY18 Academic Technology Priorities* seeks to summarize and prioritize those needs. That report is submitted under separate cover.

## I. Major OAT Objectives for FY18

*Describe the unit's most important objectives for FY18. Outline how the objectives support the mission/goals of the Unit/Department/School, College, and Educating Illinois.*

All OAT units continually respond to four interrelated questions to assess whether we are working toward our collective objectives:

- ➔ Are we doing the right things?
  - ➔ Are we doing them the right way?
    - ➔ Are we getting them done well?
      - ➔ Are we getting the benefits expected?

To know if we are “doing the right things” we must show that what we do advances one or more of the Goals of the University as articulated in *Educating Illinois* and highlighted in the *IT Strategic Plan* (2015-2018). The ITSP is built directly on the four foundational Goals of *Educating Illinois*. Each of the Goals in the ITSP inform OAT staff about “the right things” to do. While the Goals listed below are from the ITSP, the Strategies are from *Educating Illinois*. Each directly-reporting, or co-reporting, unit in OAT as well as the members of the College IT Support Team have specific Objectives tied to one or more of these four overarching University Goals that relate to the services offered by that unit (shown in parenthesis).

1. **Support a student-centered educational experience with information assets and technologies that advance students' success**
  - Strategy 1B: Implement creative recruitment and enrollment initiatives (WEB, TZ, Colleges)
  - Strategy 3A: Increase professional development offerings designed to help faculty deliver high-quality educational experiences, especially in one-on-one or small group settings (WEB, CTLT)
  - Strategy 3B: Increase partnerships across campus and with other educational, civic, and corporate entities that support student learning and development (WEB, Colleges)
  - Strategy 4B: Increase offerings of online and hybrid/blended courses (CTLT, LSAVT, Colleges)
  
2. **Support rigorous, innovative, and high impact academic programs and facilitate University research with state-of-the-art information assets and technologies**
  - Strategy 1A: Increase the availability of state-of-the-art technology-enhanced courses and programs. (CTLT, LSAVT, Colleges)
  - Strategy 2A: Centralize support services for research that improve the efficiency and coordination of activities. (Colleges, AVP)
  - Strategy 2F: Enhance the University's commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning. (CTLT)
  - Strategy 3D: Enhance leadership and professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. (All)
  - Strategy 5D: Enhance administrative support, recognition, and professional development opportunities for faculty and staff involved in international programs and partnerships (CTLT, LSAVT, WEB)
  
3. **Support integration and collaboration regarding information assets and technologies throughout the University**
  - Strategy 1: Enhance cross-divisional and cross-departmental collaboration. (All)
  - Strategy 2: Increase pride, engagement, and sense of community among University stakeholders. (All)
  - Strategy 3: Develop partnerships with business, educational, and government entities that provide learning, financial, and mutually-beneficial opportunities. (All)
  - Strategy 4: Advance the University's reputation through initiatives that promote the mission of the institution. (All)
  
4. **Enhance the institutional effectiveness through the adoption of enterprise architectural principles**
  - Strategy 1B: Systematically review the University's support functions to ensure quality, efficiency, and consistency with the University's mission. (All)
  - Strategy 2: Build a modern IT infrastructure that supports the achievement of the University's mission and goals. (LSAVT, WEB, TZ, Colleges)
  - Strategy 3: Build a culture of philanthropy throughout the University community (WEB)
  - Strategy 4: Continue to promote university planning efforts and ensure all plans are integrated with Educating Illinois. (All)
  - Strategy 5: Promote a safe and environmentally sustainable campus. (All)

## II. Permanent Funding Requests for FY18

Several of the permanent funding requests made by the Office of Academic Technologies are also listed as priorities in the *FY18 Academic Technology Priorities* report. This list is in priority order.

1. *ReggieNet Hosting @ \$149,000/year* – Increasingly, students come to college with “significant expectations regarding the use of technology to support learning” (Roberts, EDUCAUSE, 2015) expecting to have immediate, 24/7 access to course materials and grades, and anticipating that they may be asked to complete some course work in online environments. Similarly, an increasing number of faculty at Illinois State are coming to appreciate the instructional conveniences and opportunities afforded by a robust learning management system. Usage of our Sakai Learning Management System has increased steadily, with over 90% of courses offered being published in “ReggieNet” as of the Spring semester 2017. These are listed in priority order.

Illinois State has moved to a hosted production environment for ReggieNet at Longsight. This has improved the timing of software updates and reduced the amount of AT staff time needed for such updates. Running ReggieNet in this “cloud” environment costs **\$149,000 per year**. There is no permanent funding allocated for this expense. The practice that has been followed every year for the last decade is to request a temporary transfer from the Provost’s Enhancement Fund for this recurring annual cost (which I have done again this year).

2. *Learning Spaces Hardware Maintenance @ \$33,400/year* — One of the Strategies in Educating Illinois 2013-2018 is to “Enhance technology infrastructure for classroom[s]...” as a way to support the Goal of improving institutional effectiveness by building a modern IT infrastructure (Goal 4, Strategy 2C). All instructors in the 310 learning spaces that are scheduled by the Registrar’s Office are now able to leverage the recently-installed technology to support their instruction. After the initial capital outlay, no new operating dollars were allocated to maintain this technology. This shortfall needs to be addressed lest the advantage of the general availability of technology for instruction goes wanting. The equipment in these learning spaces needs to be on rotation for replacement in either 4-year, 6-year, or 10-year intervals. On average, 50 projector bulbs need to be replaced each year.

The annualized cost of replacing the projector bulbs plus the core hardware every 4-10 years is \$208,400 (See Table 1 below). Learning Spaces & Audio/Visual Technologies currently allocates about \$175,000 out of its operating budget and personnel variance to keep the bulbs and core hardware current. Maintaining the instructional technology in the expanded number of learning spaces will require an additional **\$33,400 per year** in operating funds (See Table 2). This does not include the annual cost to replace the more long-lived special equipment that make up the instructional technology tools (i.e., Switcher, AMX, etc.).

Table 1: Annual Cost of Classroom Technology Maintenance

Item	Count	Unit Cost	Expected Lifespan (yrs)	Annual Replacement Cost
Count of technology-enabled 110 & 210 spaces	310			
Projector		\$ 2,100	6	\$ 108,500
Computer		\$ 700	4	\$ 54,250
Doc cam		\$ 700	10	\$ 21,700

Table 1: Annual Cost of Classroom Technology Maintenance

Monitor		\$ 200	10	\$ 6,200
<i>Replacement of Core Hardware</i>				\$ 190,650
<i>Replacement of Projector Lamps</i>	50	\$ 355		\$ 17,750
Core Equipment Subtotal				\$ 208,400
Switcher		\$ 1,200	12	\$ 31,000
AMX equipment		\$ 1,200	12	\$ 31,000
Amplifier		\$ 375	12	\$ 9,688
Speakers		\$ 250	12	\$ 6,458
Special Equipment Subtotal				\$ 78,146
Total				\$ 286,546

Table 2: Operating Budget Shortfall for Classroom Technology Maintenance

Estimated annual cost of Core Equipment maintenance	\$ 208,400
Current operating and variance dollars spent on maintenance	\$ 175,000
Shortfall in Operating Budget	\$ 33,400

- Koemei closed captioning @ \$40,00/year* — The accessibility of learning materials, regardless of disability, is a huge issue in online learning and an integral consideration when designing an online course. Not having a quick and convenient way to provide closed captioning or transcripts for videos used in online courses increases our legal risk. In early 2015, Harvard and M.I.T. were sued over lack of closed captions in videos on their edX online courses. The lawsuits, filed by the National Association of the Deaf, sought an injunction requiring that closed captioning be provided for all online materials. (Tamar Lewin, NYTimes, 13 Feb. 2015, p. A18)

An annual subscription to the Koemei service provides "online tools to transcribe, edit, caption and index the world's growing educational rich media content." Koemei offers automatic machine-captioning with a very high degree of accuracy. Without Koemei, CTLT staff estimate (based on experience and experimentation) that it will take professors and/or teaching assistants about 10 minutes of transcription time per minute of media time. Purchase of Koemei would result in a huge savings of time for faculty and CTLT staff developing course material, regardless of the delivery mode. This software will also be a valuable accessibility tool for the new Web Accessibility Coordinator to increase the accessibility of videos available from one or more ISU websites.

4. *Sakai Rubric @ \$10,000 /year* (est.) – Now that a permanent hosting environment is in place we need to turn our attention to expansion of tools available through this LMS to include frequently requested additional tools for rubrics, web-conferencing, and ePortfolios. One of the most requested software tools to use with ReggieNet is an assessment tool that lets faculty set up and score student mastery of rubrics created for their course or mandated as part of an accrediting body and have those scores recorded directly into the ReggieNet grade book. Right now CTLT provides a workaround to faculty who need to use rubrics for grade assignment using an Excel workbook. Longsight is working with the Sakai Community to develop a native rubrics tool for Sakai v12. Because of the importance of this tool to the faculty using ReggieNet, ISU agreed to contribute up to \$5,000 worth of the development hours for which our vendor, Longsight, was paid as part of our contract with them. The share of the cost of development to ISU is \$26,000 less than the expected cost of a campus license to iRubric, our previously sought-after alternative!

When the new Rubric tool is released as a part of the version 12 update to Sakai (we are now on version 11.3), the cost to ISU to use the software will increase. At this time Longsight is not providing an estimate of the amount. We do know that contributing to the development of the Rubric tool will make it available at a "lower" cost.

5. *TechTuition Funding @ \$82,000 /year* – The Associate Vice President for Academic Technologies administers a single fund available to units in AT, OAT, and the colleges to use in support of student access to technology. This "Tech Tuition" fund was created in FY96 after Illinois State students agreed to assess a 4.5% tuition increase for the purpose of providing student access to technology. In FY96, 2.5% of the tuition income, or \$600,000, was provided to the fund. In FY97, 3.5% of tuition, or \$1,000,000, was provided. In FY99, 3.5% of tuition, or \$1,100,000, was available. From FY99 to FY02 the Tech Tuition fund was fixed at \$1,100,000. In FY03, the budget was reduced to \$1,023,000 as a part of overall campus budget cuts. In FY12, that fund was increased by \$12,759 or 2% of the operating dollars allocated in FY11. In FY17 the Fund was reduced by nearly \$36,000 as a result of a drop in State funding, reducing the beginning balance to just under \$1,018,000.

A declining budget can support little, if any, growth in campus operations that support student computing activities. The only way colleges can receive additional Tech Tuition dollars is if other campus support units reduce the cost of their funded services. For example, a decline in the cost of uLabs operations since FY02 has saved nearly \$100,000. A decrease in the cost of the Passages program over that time period has saved over \$34,000. But these savings are offset by the increase in the cost of campus-licensed software, which has risen over \$100,000 during this time. All in all, the funding available for the Colleges is currently at nearly \$650,000 where it has remained since FY14. Because demand for specialized IT hardware and software available for student use is growing, software costs are rising (for those programs paid for, in whole or part, by Tech Tuition funds), and minimum wage increases raise the cost of student staff in the labs, it is important that this fund be permanently increased by nearly \$82,000 in order to restore funding to its original FY99 level of \$1,100,000.

Table 3 below lists the top five Requests for Permanent Funding to support the reporting units in the Office of Academic Technologies. This list is a subset of the items also found — in a different order — in the *FY18 Academic Technology Priorities* report.

Table 3: OAT Permanent Funding Requests

Priority	Software or Service	Expected Annual cost
1	ReggieNet Hosting	\$ 149,000
2	Learning Spaces Hardware Replacement	\$ 33,400
3	Koemei Closed Captioning	\$ 40,000
4	Sakai Rubric Add-in	\$ 10,000
5	TechTuition Funding	\$ 82,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 314,400</b>

### III. Strategic Budgeted Carryover Requests for FY18

1. *TechTuition Funds for Software* – OAT carry over **\$48,069.35** on behalf of the TechTuition fund. While the original \$84,022 was set aside to pay for additional software, that balance was used to reduce the impact on the Colleges and support units receiving those funds that came about because of the nearly \$36,000 reduction in the TechTuition Fund that occurred in FY16. The remaining balance of \$48K will be held to cover the FY16 reduction for one more year and to cover any additional reductions that may occur in FY17.
2. *WEB Offices Remodeling* – WEB will carry over **\$20,000** to FY18 to complete the office remodeling work started in FY15...

### IV. Provost Enhancement Requests for FY18

1. *Longsight Sakai Hosting Contract* – **\$149,000** to pay for third-party hosting of *ReggieNet* for FY18. (This was also submitted, with more detail, as a request for permanent funding in Section II.)
2. *Learning Spaces Hardware Maintenance* – **\$33,400** to support the operating expenses incurred in FY18 by Learning Spaces and A/V Technologies for routine maintenance of the technologies in the 310 classrooms they support. The operating budget of LSAVT was not increased after new equipment was installed in over 165 classrooms and the current balance of operating (and personnel variance) that can be allocated for maintenance is insufficient.

3. *Share of Annual Cost for Qualtrics* – **\$4,587.37** to pay for Provost’s Office share of the second “installment” (of four) on the three-year contract for access to Qualtrics web-based survey software.

#### V. New Personnel Requests for FY18

1. *None*

#### VI. Replacement Personnel Requests for FY18

1. *None*

#### VII. Facilities Requests for FY16

1. *None*