Results of the ACC Survey

The Academic Computing Committee Survey was distributed in Fall 2012. At the time this report was generated, there were 105 responses to the survey. All colleges were represented by at least 10 people, except Honors. Liberal Arts is the highest with 23 respondents. Business is the lowest with 10.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Applied Arts		13	13%
2	Business		10	10%
3	Education		14	13%
4	Fine Arts		11	11%
5	Health Professions		13	13%
6	Honors		1	1%
7	Liberal Arts		23	22%
8	Science		16	15%
9	Student Affairs		0	0%
10	Other		3	3%
	Total		104	100%

Most respondents were tenured or tenure-track faculty.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Lecturer		12	12%
2	Senior Lecturer		9	9%
3	Assistant Professor		20	19%
4	Associate Professor		28	27%
5	Full Professor		30	29%
6	Other		5	5%
	Total		104	100%

Most were from the main campus, although 6 indicated being at RRHEC and 3 indicated being primarily on-line or San Antonio (based on later comments, these appear to mainly be on-line faculty).

A little over half had little to no familiarity with the ACC RFP process.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	No familiarity: I have not heard about ACC Grants before now.		27	26%
2	Limited familiarity: I have seen or heard about the RFP, but do not know any specifics.		30	29%
3	Moderate familiarity: I know about the process, but I have not submitted a proposal.		19	18%
4	High familiarity: I have submitted a proposal to the ACC.		10	10%
5	Very high familiarity: I have submitted multiple proposals and/or served on the ACC.		18	17%
	Total		104	100%

The majority of respondents felt the timeline should stay the same, regardless of level of familiarity with the process. For those that did feel the timeline should change, most felt the issue came with the timing over the break.

#	Answer	No	Limited	Moderate	High	Very high
1	Remain the same.	23	26	17	9	10
2	Change	4	3	2	1	8
	Total	27	29	19	10	18

Issues noted with current timing: conflicts with final exams, holidays, representatives not being available (ie off-campus), and the start of the new semester.

Not surprisingly, the more familiar people were with the process the more likely they were to know who their representative is. For the vast majority of respondents, being required to meet with the representative would have no effect or a positive effect on their likelihood to submit a proposal.

Additional comments on the timeline are provided at the end of the report.

A web-based application for submitting requests seems to have support, though I think this is something for a later discussion and not for this year.

Results of what counts as “computing resources”

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Computer Systems (Windows, Mac, or Linux system including monitor)		102	98%
2	Internal Computer Components (e.g. memory, hard drives, etc.)		82	79%
3	External Computer Peripherals (plotters, printers, scanners, etc.)		83	80%
4	Computer Software and/or Software Licenses		84	81%
5	Tablet devices (e.g. iPad, Samsung Galaxy Tab, etc.)		60	58%
6	Other		13	13%

Text Responses for “Other” category
cloud capabilities; University servers
Any equipment that has processors and/or is controlled by computer systems that relates to our area of research
Smart Phone
data projectors
all IT infrastructure, including off-campus support and library data bases
assistance and support
smart phones
Wi-Fi support
Installation, Projection, etc - Resources that would provide the likelihood of successful implementation.
Online training programs
Assistive technology
network-resident devices
benchmark licenses (e.g., SPEC, PARSEC) specialized HW (e.g., Tesla GPU, specific Intel or AMD boards)

Faculty were split 42% to 58% on expanding the scope beyond simple replacement. Suggestions for ways in which the scope could be expanded are provided at the end of this report.

There appears to be strong support for including software in the process.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes, only computer hardware should be funded.		5	5%
2	Yes, hardware should be funded prior to software.		24	23%
3	No, both should be weighted equally.		69	66%
4	No, software should be given preference over hardware.		6	6%
	Total		104	100%

Faculty are split 45% (in favor) to 55% (against) about the obligation to continue funding for software after the license expires.

Some concern was expressed over criteria in terms of impact and department/college contribution. For impact, impression is that proposals that might have a major impact but only for a few students would not be ranked highly whereas low benefit but high number of students would be. Basically, the number of students is ranked as more important than size of impact. Departments are short on funds and often can't contribute very much, which is why they are requesting assistance. The lack of contribution does not indicate a lack of commitment from the department. Also unclear on what counts/doesn't count as contribution (for example staff salaries, supplies, etc.)

In response to whether all proposals should be approved if funding is available, over 80% felt that criteria should still be used. There was some split between whether criteria should be more flexible in this situation.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes, if the money is there it should be used.		12	12%
2	No, but proposals that might not normally be funded should be considered.		45	43%
3	No, only proposals that meet the requirements should be funded.		42	40%
4	Unsure		5	5%
	Total		104	100%

The following pages include responses to open ended questions related to ways that the scope could be expanded, suggestions for changes to the timeline, and additional comments and suggestions.

Ways that scope should be expanded
it should be used to expand existing resources (hardware and software) and include engaging students in research as the benefit for students.
There should be some fund raising for first time needs of equipment. It seems that the same people just keep getting money to replace equipment that may not be that old.
Create specialized labs -- for student use
Purchasing new equipment
Computerized or computer controlled equipment that is related to our area of research.
I think the ACC should consider proposals for new equipment if funds are available after funding replacements.
"Replace" and "upgrade" do not seem to include the extension of functionality, i.e., new kinds of devices, in order to perform new functions.
I would like to see software covered. You asked above whether the ACC should be obligated to continue funding that software when it needs renewal. I don't think ACC should be obligated; rather, when the software license needs to be renewed, the organization could ask for funds again.
New Resources; Software
Tablets
Creation of pilot "laboratories" for improved teaching effectiveness; software that enhances the teaching mission
outfitting new computer labs
Outfitting new computer resources.
tablets - class room sets.
unsure
Develop new resources....and, regarding the continued funding of software - i think the PI should be able to request renewal through the competition, but it should not be automatic.
inclusion of software
printers
acquire new computing resources
Incorporation of new technology due to changes in technologies needed for students to enter the job market
Should assist in the acquisition of new technology for programs that might otherwise not be accessible or grant opportunities to secure.
Basically I am in the middle on this question, but only choices are yes and no--i have had the need for certain software upgrades or those other than the standard ones offered in general to TX State faculty.
I think the goal should be expanded include upgrading the availability of computing resource on campus by funding new (non-replacement) computers where appropriate -- e.g., new computer labs or classroom computing resources.
Tablets, digital recording devices, etc. Change the name of the committee to Academic Technology Resources Committee

Instead of just replacement, we need to identify classrooms that have NO technology equipment! I've contacted your office before and requested equipment for rooms in the Music Building that are being used half of the day for classroom and half for rehearsal. There is no technology in these rooms and WE NEED IT!
Ipad
Online training for software should be given.
Online training programs for effective teaching and research methods should take place.
If we are going to mandate use of software that can only be used on one type of computer (e.g. MAC or PC), offices/labs should be equipped with both options.
Well, our program has grown extensively. We no longer have sufficient computing capability in our dedicated lab for the number of students we have. When I ask if we can expand it I'm consistently told NO.
new faculty hardware/software needs
new computer resources
Adding new computing resources
maintain/update the equipment after the faculty member receives it - technology becomes outdated so quickly now that even a 3.5 year old computer I am working on doesn't work effectively when the university upgrades the inernet system.
marketing for donations

Suggested changes to timeline by level of familiarity with the process.

No familiarity: I have not heard about ACC Grants before now.
Text Response
come out earlier than late November
That falls at the end of one semester and the beginning of another, with holidays in between. Seems too rushed.
More time to prepare the proposal.
Sent out in September

Limited familiarity: I have seen or heard about the RFP, but do not know any specifics.
Text Response
Not over winter break!
Summer
longer is better

Moderate familiarity: I know about the process, but I have not submitted a proposal.
Text Response
Middle of October 'til end of the semester -- current time frame means little ability of teaching faculty to contribute unless work is all done over the Christmas break.
RFP distributed monthly in Sept, Oct, Nov, Dec. Nov is too close to the end of the semester.

High familiarity: I have submitted a proposal to the ACC.
Text Response
Earlier in the Fall semester with the same deadline.

Very high familiarity: I have submitted multiple proposals and/or served on the ACC.
Text Response
Move up the date when the RFP is sent to faculty.
Send out request in October and have it due at the end of January to provide folks more time to work on it.
later in spring semester - mid to end of February
Send out the request in October to provide ample time to respond, especially with Thanksgiving, end-of-semester activities, and Winter break.
It is difficult to submit proposals at the end of January - often that is within the first 2 weeks of the semester which is already a very busy time.
mid-February with April 1 deadline
It goes out at the busiest time of the semester just before final exams. Faculty do not have time to deal with it. The holiday season starts. Sometimes the contact person has been unreachable due to the holiday season.
Request should go out earlier.

Other comments and suggestions
Provide helpful resources to faculty related to purchasing technologies that are not covered by the ACC, such as obtaining new equipment, iPads, software, memory, etc.
....
We need more funding for software..
There are many pieces of hardware that are in good working order so long as Windows 8 is not installed. If the University decides to move to the Windows 8 OS, these pieces of hardware will have to be replaced. A review of the inventory of current hardware noting purchase dates may be in order
The definition of funded items needs to be much broader.
Better coordination of approval, purchasing, installation, pickup of replaced equipment would help plan down-time and staffing in the facility where equipment is being replaced.
Consider advocating for funds for new computing resources; provide repository of resources to provide faculty guidance in seeking external funding for new computing resources
none
My main complaint has been the way in which we must submit proposals--we have to get signatures and then scan the documents and then email them. Any streamlining of that process would be greatly appreciated.
Change our rep. The process is rumored to be awarded on favoritism and friendship, not merit. If that is true, why bother?
None
Thank you for your commitment to this process.
I would like to see the campus upgrade its Windows platform across campus from XP to either 7 or 8, depending upon which of those can be effectively administered. Or, am I the only one who still has XP?
cloud backup space
None
none
none
ACC should recognize that replaced equipment is sometimes kept to replace even older equipment. I believe the fear is that older equipment might be used to establish new labs. I don't see a problem with this if the new labs are needed and justified.
I am not familiar enough with ACC to suggest changes.
n/a
I could not answer the previous question, because I don't know how the selection process distinguishes between "relevance, anticipated impact, and perceived benefit to targeted Texas State students" and "appropriateness of the requested resources." What criteria *other* than relevance, impact, and benefit are included under appropriateness? What would be inappropriate resources? I would appreciate clarification of the criteria, particularly if made available during the application process.
You should have better identified what the acronym ACC meant before beginning this survey. After reading further, I realized I had heard of your requests before. I'm very frustrated that we don't have technology (NO COMPUTERS OR PROJECTORS) in many of the Music Building classroom/rehearsal areas.

All music rooms need to be able to play CD's, DVD's, access the INTERNET EVERY DAY! Please help!!!!!
None
There is a major concern with students buying their homework (i.e., essays, projects, computer programs etc.) from online essay mills that custom design what the students want. Emphasis needs to be placed upon preventive measures. Additionally, tenure and tenure-track faculties members are buying their research from online essay mills as well, and in both cases ghost authorship, a form of illegitimate authorship, is taking place. So, more emphasis on lower level faculty members would be very wise, especially because this will give them motivation to refrain from becoming ghostwriters.
Please consider online distance learning and ways to improve this at TSU, such as training programs and special emphasis for those who submit proposals concerning ways to improve online education and to reduce cheating.
The Honors College has no representative, so answering the question about whether we would want to talk to our college representative before submitting a proposal didn't really make sense. The current system where we have no representative is working, but a revision to require a consultation would need to be thought out.
In the past having a computer lab be "open access" for at least part of the time was an important part of the proposal. If a department badly needs equipment that would be used by a large number of majors but do not have resources to provide an open access period, I don't believe that the open access should be given much weight.
Unsure, it is only my first week.