

Executive Summary:

Information Technology invited faculty to respond to our annual survey, providing feedback on their perceptions of services and support offered in the 2012/13 academic year. Our response rate was small, which we believe is due in large part to effects of Superstorm Sandy, which carved out a significant portion of the fall semester. Resulting delays in the survey launch and in the semester overall affected faculty availability.

Nevertheless, the information obtained is valuable to LIU's Department of Information Technology and to the institution's process for self-assessment. Key highlights that are detailed in the following include insight into why computer labs remain valued by faculty despite the ubiquitous nature of mobile device ownership among faculty and students. Results also indicate that faculty desire more training for understanding affordances of various technology tools and ways of incorporating that functionality in their teaching. Faculty have voiced that more training is desired both in the form of workshops, and also in the form of video tutorials. Faculty assessment of IT services and support systems are largely positive. Areas where improvement is desired include wireless connectivity and responsiveness from campus-based departments.

Results from two faculty surveys collected thus far reference actionable requests primarily in three areas: offsite access to within-network resources, improved responsiveness and requestor tracking of IT-related service requests, and extended wireless Internet access. In response, Information Technology has launched several new tools and a completely revised website. <http://IT.LIU.edu> was launched November, 2012, and now serves as a central resource for procedures, policies, instructions and help documentation. Microsoft's Sharepoint provides the LIU community with a cloud-based repository for communication and collaboration. Atlassian's JIRA is another new acquisition that will be used to track progress, issues and the development of IT projects. A new Web-based helpdesk system will be launched in the summer of 2013, by which performance of hardware and software resources may be monitored and through which individuals may submit and track service requests. IT is also negotiating with external providers for better saturation and signal strength of our wireless infrastructure, along with additional proposals to funding agencies for advancing access and Internet2 membership. These new directions are informed by faculty feedback and point to a greater reliance on technical resources supported by Information Technology.

Information Technology appreciates the considered feedback we have received. Just as the survey itself was improved by the informed evaluation of faculty technology committees, this year's assessment will also be used for the continued improvement of our support and services.

Respondents:

Roughly the same number of respondents completed the 2012 IT survey as did the 2011 survey: 136 and 133, respectively. For the 2012 respondents, 44% were from Brooklyn; 50% from Post and the remaining 6% from the regional campuses. Seventy-

four percent of respondents were full-time faculty and 26% adjunct. These respondents represent teaching in 7 fully online courses, 23 blended, 72 web-enhanced and 106 traditionally-taught courses over AY 2012-13.

Mobile Devices: Of their mobile device use, Apple is the big winner among faculty as a result of their iPhones or iPads for personal use. Forty-seven faculty say they use an iPad in their teaching; 36 in their research; and 62 for personal use. The iPad (or tablets, generally speaking) was the most ubiquitous device faculty incorporate into teaching and research.

Computer labs:

Particularly in light of LIU's investment in its iPad initiative and wireless Internet access, we wondered how these investments might be impacting the demand for desktop-enabled instructional labs. Anecdotally, we know that access to these instructional labs can be difficult because the demand is high. If the majority of students in each class has their own mobile device, what value do the labs hold for faculty? To answer this question, we asked faculty to rate the importance of instructional activities computer labs enable.

Overall, 47% of respondents report using an IT-supported instructional lab, comprised of 23 from Brooklyn (45% of Brooklyn respondents) and 28 from Post (48% of Post respondents). For teaching activities within the IT-supported instructional labs, the following table illustrates percentages of importance, ranging from not important to absolutely necessary. These ratings are displayed first for all lab users, then the higher ratings for Brooklyn and then for Post.

Important components in IT labs	LIU Overall				Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Absolutely Necessary	Important	Absolutely Necessary	Important	Absolutely Necessary
Special Software	28%	17%	26%	30%	21%	32%	28%	24%
Internet	9%	4%	13%	75%	16%	74%	4%	80%
Projection	13%	9%	23%	55%	21%	58%	28%	48%
Document Creation	36%	34%	9%	21%	5%	11%	12%	32%
Exams	43%	23%	21%	13%	26%	11%	20%	16%
Projects/HW	26%	23%	30%	21%	37%	11%	24%	28%
Collaborations	28%	26%	26%	21%	32%	16%	20%	24%

Among all faculty who use IT labs, faculty value Internet access for the entire class as the single most important aspect. Following closely in importance is presentation projection. Student access to an individual machine with Internet access and/or presentation projection are the primary reasons for teaching in a computer lab, and in terms of frequency of usage as well. It appears there is a fairly even spread across the

activities in which students are engaged. These are activities include: access to specialized software, collaborative activities and projects and homework. There are minimal differences when these ratings are viewed by campus.

Frequency of using lab components	LIU Overall				Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	1-3 times per semester	4-6 times per semester	Nearly every class	Every class	Nearly every class	Every class	Nearly every class	Every class
Special Software	32%	13%	4%	15%	5%	21%	4%	12%
Internet	13%	17%	32%	23%	32%	32%	28%	20%
Projection	19%	9%	19%	32%	21%	37%	16%	28%
Document Creation	21%	17%	4%	11%	5%	5%	4%	16%
Exams	32%	15%	2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	4%	n/a
Projects/HW	19%	15%	19%	11%	21%	11%	16%	12%
Collaborations	28%	23%	9%	9%	5%	11%	4%	8%

Other affordances of teaching in a computer lab mentioned by faculty relate to web resources like interactive forums, software, scholarly content, and practice within applications. Other physical components faculty view as important to teaching include audio capabilities, particularly for multimedia. Several fill in answers included speakers and VCR/DVD players.

For respondents who say they do not use an IT-supported computer lab, the capability to project content was rated as most important, followed by ratings for the importance of a whiteboard. Interestingly, the importance of a chalk board was rated more highly than the importance of an interactive whiteboard.

Important components to non-lab users	LIU Overall			
	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Absolutely Necessary
Interactive whiteboard	44%	24%	19%	13%
Whiteboard	19%	24%	23%	34%
Chalk board	41%	21%	19%	19%
Projecting content	6%	10%	19%	65%

Summary: These data suggest that despite a 1:1 (device to student) University-wide program, faculty still require computer labs for student access to the Internet. In-class activities that perhaps are not enabled by mobile devices include using specialized software, group collaborations and special projects or homework. Also, we did not ask about printing in the labs. To assess the extent to which faculty incorporate the iPad in their classroom, a future survey may include questions about those preferences. Do faculty prefer a computer lab for activities mobile devices are incapable of performing, or for reasons of convenience? Ascertaining the degree to which a single stationary

desktop with projection capability (only for the instructor) may help ease the demand for computer labs and provide easier access for those who truly require it.

Blackboard:

Another integral component—both in terms of institutional investment and teaching component—is our course management system. To assess its perceived utility among faculty respondents, we asked if Blackboard was in use this semester, if plans were underway to use it in Spring 2013, and if no, why not. Seventy-four respondents (54%) used Blackboard in the fall 2012; 27% ($n=37$) plan to use it for their spring courses and 20% ($n=27$) say they do not use Blackboard. Reasons for not using Blackboard are reviewed later in this section.

Using Blackboard	Yes – Fall 2012 (n)	Yes – Spring 2013 (n)	No (n)
Brooklyn	55% (34)	24% (15)	21% (13)
Post	52% (35)	28% (19)	19% (13)
Regionals	71% (5)	43% (3)	14% (1)

Of those using Blackboard, we were interested in the tools faculty prefer, as well as ascertaining areas of interest for learning about the tools. Tools of most frequent usage are assignments and the grade center, followed by tests/surveys and rubrics. Areas of training by campus are interesting in their differences. Brooklyn faculty note overall higher percentages of interest than Post. Brooklyn's highest areas of interest are in safe assign and tests/surveys, while Post's are grade center and rubrics.

Blackboard Tool Preferences	LIU Overall			Training desired - Brooklyn	Training desired - Post
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently		
Blog	77%	16%	7%	40%	36%
Discussion	49%	30%	21%	47%	32%
Journaling	81%	15%	4%	49%	28%
Wiki	88%	9%	3%	44%	34%
Assignments	32%	28%	39%	42%	30%
Safe Assign	78%	11%	11%	54%	34%
Tests/Surveys	50%	33%	17%	58%	38%
Grade Center	50%	16%	34%	49%	40%
Rubrics	60%	21%	19%	51%	40%

One out of every 5 respondents say they do not use Blackboard. Of the feedback offered, 10 comments identify more training is required; 7 say Blackboard is unreliable, difficult or cumbersome to use, 5 say it is not needed or they are too busy.

Summary: These frequencies suggest that faculty may be more interested in the utilitarian uses of Blackboard rather than tools that bring newer technology-infused activities like blogs, journaling and wikis. Both the expressly stated training requests and the infrequent usage of some tools hold suggestions for the ITRCs. One-third to nearly

half of faculty respondents tell us that with training, there is interest in employing some of the newer Blackboard tools in their courses. Additional training is suggested by comments for why faculty do not use Blackboard. Of those who find fault with Blackboard, it is possible that training may make the CMS less difficult and easier to use.

The IT Resource Centers:

Information Technology makes a substantial investment in the IT Resource Centers for individualized support and instruction for its faculty. We asked for ratings of satisfaction to requests on specific topics, factors that compelled workshop attendance, and areas of skill development not currently offered.

Faculty ratings of their satisfaction of how specific questions are resolved by the ITRCs were exceedingly positive. Percentages for response choices were aggregated into dissatisfied and satisfied. Differences between these percentages and 100% of responses represented are due to the “not applicable” choice.

ITRC Request Satisfaction	LIU Overall		Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied
Blackboard questions	10%	51%	13%	41%	6%	64%
Software questions	11%	56%	10%	59%	11%	57%
Hardware questions	9%	55%	8%	56%	9%	55%
Roster/grading questions	9%	25%	5%	28%	6%	30%
E-Mail questions	12%	42%	13%	46%	11%	40%

(Response choices were: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied, and not applicable.)

Overall, 37% of respondents reported attending a ITRC workshop this year (30% Brooklyn; 44% Post). Last year, we asked faculty to rate their satisfaction with workshop quality. Many faculty skipped these questions, and thus we focused this year on those aspects faculty identify as encouraging workshop attendance.

Important enablers of workshop attendance	LIU Overall				Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Absolutely Necessary	Important	Absolutely Necessary	Important	Absolutely Necessary
Topic relevant	13%	14%	46%	27%	52%	22%	44%	24%

to teaching								
Topic relevant to research	25%	32%	34%	9%	30%	7%	40%	4%
Scheduling of workshop	11%	7%	30%	52%	15%	63%	48%	36%
Workshop format, 1:1	43%	29%	21%	7%	26%	4%	16%	8%
Workshop format, small group	36%	30%	27%	7%	30%	7%	24%	4%

Forty-six percent reported they would be very likely to use video tutorials, and another 37% said they maybe likely to use them. We also asked about areas of skill development not currently offered. The most frequently cited category falls in tools associated with synchronous and asynchronous teaching tools (Adobe Connect, Camtasia, voiceover PPT). Ten suggestions noted are on topics already covered in both campus' workshop listings. Other single item skills mentioned: SPSS, Student Voice, and Twitter.

When asked what IT could do to help faculty teaching, answers center on two areas. In the classroom, faculty note they want easier access to working equipment or smart carts for every room, functioning equipment in each classroom and whiteboards over chalkboards. Training is also an area faculty want IT's expansion. Six individuals asked for varied scheduling and five more want more channels for training and support (e.g., by email, over the telephone, and online).

Summary: Overall, faculty want to keep learning and depend on the ITRCs for this skill development. Scheduling is the major prohibitive factor to attending, yet more than half are likely to avail themselves of pre-recorded video tutorials. Of those tools for which we currently do not offer training, faculty appear to be interested in asynchronous tools. Many asked for training on tools for which we do offer training, suggesting we can do a better job of publicizing workshop schedules.

IT:

Among the varied services and support Information Technology provides, we are interesting in knowing faculty perception of the network and other services. The following table demonstrates positive feedback. Differences among the aggregated percentages do not equal 100%, as responses that were not applicable (na) are not included.

Information Technology Service	LIU Overall		Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied

Satisfaction						
E-mail Overall	9%	86%	13%	84%	6%	86%
Internet/Web access	10%	80%	15%	77%	6%	83%
Wireless connectivity	21%	61%	36%	51%	11%	67%
Data Security	7%	71%	5%	28%	4%	68%
Software Support	18%	63%	21%	69%	15%	60%
Hardware Support	18%	66%	18%	69%	17%	64%
Helpdesk Support	18%	42%	21%	46%	6%	51%

(Response choices were: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied, and not applicable.)

E-mail: From the table above, it appears that faculty are generally satisfied with the overall e-mail service provided. Of those responding, most report they use their LIU e-mail account. 34% report using the application Outlook as a client; 38% use Outlook web access; and 40% report using a different client for accessing their email. 88% report some level of positive satisfaction with e-mail speed. This rate of satisfaction drops for e-mail storage, down to 69%; 27% expressed dissatisfaction. Calendaring garnered less than half of respondent interest in answering the prompt, but of those who did answer, all but 4% expressed positive satisfaction. 88% are satisfied with the ease of use and e-mail reliability.

Wifi: Overall, wireless connectivity ratings were less positive than other service offerings. Faculty ratings on the signal strength and quality of connection in their offices and classrooms differed slightly by campus. Brooklyn faculty reported higher dissatisfaction with wifi connections in their classrooms than Post faculty. Open-ended responses may provide some insight into this downturn. Three comments elsewhere note wifi issues with streaming and Skype-ing. Perhaps with greater numbers of mobile devices appearing on campus each semester that all rely on the same access points, the threshold for access is reached more quickly in the densely populated buildings on the Brooklyn campus. With a higher demand on more services and data types accessed via wifi, these two forces have affected faculty perception of wifi access.

Wireless Connectivity Satisfaction	Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied	Very to somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied to very satisfied

In my office	29%	58%	26%	55%
In my classroom(s)	45%	47%	21%	66%
Reliability	53%	42%	21%	66%
Availability	55%	40%	23%	64%

Telephone Services: For the first time this year, we asked faculty about their satisfaction with telephone services. Fewer faculty responded to these prompts. Of those who did, few faculty were dissatisfied with their telephone instrument or with voicemail. Of those who had experience with requesting telecommunications services, 31% reported some level of positive satisfaction (16% were dissatisfied to varying degrees), and 30% were satisfied with how a telecommunications problem had been resolved as opposed to 14% who were dissatisfied.

IT services overall: Faculty ratings are largely positive, yet some disagreement is reported with respect to departmental responsiveness and client-centered orientation. (not sure what else to say here!)

Information Technology Overall Ratings	LIU Overall		Brooklyn Only		Post Only	
	Strongly to somewhat disagree	Somewhat to strongly agree	Strongly to somewhat disagree	Somewhat to strongly agree	Strongly to somewhat disagree	Somewhat to strongly agree
IT keeps provided systems up and running.	8%	92%	11%	89%	4%	96%
My campus IT department is responsive and client-oriented.	24%	76%	24%	76%	20%	80%
My campus IT department delivers timely services.	17%	83%	16%	84%	15%	85%
IT provides services that are valuable.	11%	89%	8%	92%	11%	89%
IT helps me use technology effectively.	25%	75%	32%	68%	17%	83%

Lastly, when asked for feedback on the new IT website, only about 15% of all respondents provided their feelings. On content findability, helpful and intuitive navigation and an organized layout three-fourths of respondents were satisfied. Responses to the open-ended questions were much more enlightening. For additional resources we could be providing, faculty asked for additional how-to's, e-mail settings for other devices and various other tasks. Three faculty asked for updates and monthly

reminders and content spotlights. Faculty noted as positive, the site's ease of use, clarity of presentation and overall comprehensiveness. When asked what could be improved, faculty noted it could be organized somewhat better, asked for more video tutorials, links, and a newsletter.

Summary: Overall, Information Technology offers services that are largely appreciated and valued by faculty. While areas for improvement are noted, particularly in the areas of the dispersion of wireless Internet access and to a lesser extent, customer service, we are pleased that the majority of faculty who responded to this survey report we do a good job keeping systems up and running, providing valued services in a timely manner, and generally help most of our faculty colleagues use technology effectively.

While technology is not likely to ever be a domain in which teams may rest on their achievements, it is greatly satisfying to us to know that the hard work we contribute is noted and appreciated. We know our job is never done and are committed to improving LIU's learning environments, both physical and virtual, for the betterment of our students.