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Executive Summary

Educational Technology Services (ETS) was instrumental in furthering the mission of The University of Texas at Dallas during Academic Year 2016-2017. The department realized a 15% increase in blended/online course offerings over the previous year. 81% of all sections offered actively used the eLearning Learning Management System (LMS). ETS renovated and updated the audiovisual systems in 70 rooms, completed major repairs in 28 rooms, and supported 146,697 class/lab sessions and 1,730 events. Classroom media uptime was 99.46%. The number of help calls to Media Services decreased 43% over the previous year, despite a 9% increase in the number of class meetings. The department has reached an unprecedented level of institutional knowledge and stability.

Mission Statement

The mission of Educational Technology Services (ETS), a division of the Office of the Executive Vice President, is to provide the University's faculty, staff and students with educational technology resources and pedagogical instruction to facilitate the best possible learning experience. The focus of the team is to effectively integrate technology into online, hybrid and classroom-based courses.

Personnel

Educational Technology Services Staff under the direction of Dr. Darren Crone, Assistant Provost

- Maria Cubie, Administrative Assistant II
- Qin Fang, Associate Director
- Katrina Adams, eLearning Manager (Operations)
- Roopa Chandrasekhar, Manager (Training & Support)
- Dennis Nguyen, Instructional Designer II
- Sylena Measles, Instructional Designer II
- Irma Madrigal, Instructional Designer I
- Alan Safai Instructional Designer I
- Joo Haldeman, Instructional Technology Training Specialist
- Ryan Arnold, Media Services Supervisor
- Timothy Kennedy, Media Technology Specialist IV
- Joe Martinez, Media Technology Specialist III
- Brian Crockett, Media Technology Specialist III
- Kristopher Porter, Media Technology Specialist III
- Daniel Delgado, Media Technology Specialist III (Student Union)

- Oladele Adetokunbo, Media Technology Specialist III (Student Union)
- Adrian Chen, Media Technology Specialist II
- James Trammell, Media Technology Specialist II
- Kassiopia Jackson, Media Technology Specialist II
- Rane Peerson, Media Technology Specialist I
- Alexander Parry, Media Technology Specialist I
- Darrell Chambers, Video Services Supervisor
- Michael Snyder, Audio Visual Technician III
- Bart Sand, Assistant Media Coordinator
- Micheal Mitchell, Audiovisual Engineer
- Philip Johnston, Software Systems Specialist III
- 6 Student Workers (eLearning)
- 5 Student Workers (Media Services)
**eLearning Services**

**Courses/Organizations**
Each face-to-face section has a corresponding eLearning section created. There were 7,187 academic eLearning sections created, an 8% increase over AY 2015/16. 81% of these eLearning sections were actively used (figure 1).

Online/blended sections made up 7.7% of all course offerings. Online (6.79%) and blended (1.39%) credit hours accounted for 8.18% of total credit hours (figure 2). The department developed and supported 555 online/blended sections, an increase of 15% over AY 2015-16. Online/blended enrollments were 8.1% of all enrollments at UTD, up from 7.9% the previous year (figure 3). Blended offerings saw an increase from 84 to 137 (+63%) and fully online offerings increased from 397 to 418 (+5%) compared to AY 2015-16. Historical data are shown in figure 4.

![Sections Using eLearning](image)

**Figure 1**

![Total # credit hours sections](image)

**Figure 2**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># online/blended sections</td>
<td>325 (+7%)</td>
<td>391 (+20%)</td>
<td>467 (+19%)</td>
<td>481 (+4%)</td>
<td>555 (+15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous AY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># online sections</td>
<td>311 (+4%)</td>
<td>373 (+20%)</td>
<td>409 (+10%)</td>
<td>397 (-3%)</td>
<td>418 (+5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous AY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># blended sections</td>
<td>14 (+180%)</td>
<td>18 (+29%)</td>
<td>58 (+222%)</td>
<td>84 (+45%)</td>
<td>137 (+63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous AY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of ALL sections</td>
<td>5,206 (+10%)</td>
<td>5,670 (+9%)</td>
<td>6,186 (+9%)</td>
<td>6,639 (+7%)</td>
<td>7,187 (+8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percentage change over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous AY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online/blended sections as</strong></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a percent of all sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online sections as a percent</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of all sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended sections as a percent</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of all sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # credit hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>blended/online sections</strong></td>
<td>35,064</td>
<td>38,155</td>
<td>42,765</td>
<td>43,951</td>
<td>49,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # credit hours online</td>
<td>34,114</td>
<td>36,987</td>
<td>39,137</td>
<td>38,722</td>
<td>40,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # credit hours blended</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>8,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ALL credit hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online/blended credit hours as a percent of total credit</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online credit hours as a</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent of total credit hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended credit hours as a</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent of total credit hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>online/blended sections</strong></td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>13,373</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>15,675</td>
<td>17,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment online</td>
<td>11,904</td>
<td>12,957</td>
<td>13,949</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>14,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment blended</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment ALL sections</td>
<td>158,604</td>
<td>167,327</td>
<td>183,596</td>
<td>198,206</td>
<td>217,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Course Development**

The eLearning team developed 34 new online and blended sections in AY 2016-17.

- ACCT 6202.PS1
- ACCT 6301.OW1
- ACCT 6301.CW1
- ACN 6348.5H1/HCS 6348.5H1
- BPS 6310.CW1
- COMM 1315.0H1
- CLDP 3339.0H1/PSY 3339.0H1
- CRIM 3309.0W1
- GISC 7363.0W1
- HLTH 1301.0W1
- MBA Office Special Course Site
- MAIS 5335.5H1
- MECO 6312.0W1/ BUAN 6312.0W1
- MIS 6309.0W2/OPRE 6391.0W2
- MIS 6320.0W1/ACCT 6320.0W1
- MIS 6324.0W1/BUAN 6324.0W1
- MKT 6301.0W1/SYSM 6318.0W1
- MTHE 5326/SCI 5V06.5H1
- OPRE 6303.0W1
- OPRE 6V99.0W1
- PA 3380.0W1
- PA 6313.5H1
- PA 6344.0W1
- PA 6348.0W1
The team redeveloped six online and blended sections.

- CRIM 6332.0W1/GISC 6331.0W1
- CRIM 6381.0W1
- CS 3377.0W1/SE 3377.0W1
- EERF 7V89.0W1
- MIS 6345.0W1/BUAN 6345.0W1
- PSY 3331.0H1
- SOC 3325.0W1
- MIS 6364.0W1
- MIS 6380.0W1
- MKT 3300.0W1

The eLearning LMS is increasingly being used by non-academic groups. There were 314 eLearning Organizations created/supported, a 29% increase (243) over AY 2015/16. Large/significant organizations included:

- Writing Center Resources for Faculty and Students
- UTD eLearning Student Forum
- Registrar 101
- Information Security – Employees
- Information Security – Students
- JSOM Career Management Center – Student Resources
- PeopleSoft and Related Training
- BBS Information Center
- Internship Seminar
- Pre-Arrival Modules for International Students

Course Evaluations and GPA Comparisons (Online, Blended, & Face-to-Face)
In AY 2016-17, graduate and undergraduate students generally rated blended/online courses the same as face-to-face offerings (figure 5). The same generally held true for instructor rating (figure 6). GPA for blended courses was slightly higher than in online and face-to-face courses (figure 7). Generalizations with these data (particularly blended courses) should be made with caution as we have a small sample size, and not all types of courses are equally represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the course was excellent (Online UG)</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Blended UG)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (f2f UG)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Online Grad)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (Blended Grad)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the course was excellent (f2f Grad)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Online UG)</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Blended UG)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (f2f UG)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Online Grad)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (Blended Grad)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the instructor was excellent (f2f Grad)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (Online UG)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (Blended UG)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (f2f UG)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (Online Grad)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (Blended Grad)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (f2f Grad)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7**

**Training and Support**

Training/outreach was a major focus in AY 2016-17. The eLearning Team shifted to a more proactive approach, actively reaching out to faculty before they have issues. There were 145 training sessions offered (Group and One-on-one). 639 customers (non-unique) were trained (figure 8). Additionally, an Online Teaching Certification was developed and implemented.

Examples of the sessions include:

- Open Labs: 51 sessions
- Qualtrics: 12 sessions
- Turning Point Polling: 20 sessions
- Getting Started with eLearning: 19 sessions
- Student Engagement Tools: 8 sessions
- Assignments and Rubrics: 13 sessions
- Online Tests in eLearning: 15 sessions

Outreach initiatives included:

- New Student Orientations
- UT Dallas Trainer Alliance
- UTD Staff Appreciation Event
- Faculty Lunch & Learn – Kathy Zolton
- OIT Summit
- Cometville
Improved processes and increasingly stable technology resulted in a substantial reduction in eLearning Help Desk calls. The support team saw 32% less tickets, down from 2,284 to 1,547 (figure 8); despite an 8% increase in the number of eLearning sections. The number of customers served increased 4% even though general group training session offerings decreased 26% as the training team shifted focus to individualized training through expanded open lab hours. This resulted in greater efficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions Offered</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>136 (+27%)</td>
<td>195 (+43%)</td>
<td>145 (-26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Labs Offered</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48 (+153%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers Trained (non-unique)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>223 (+30%)</td>
<td>612 (+174%)</td>
<td>639 (+4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Total)</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>5,293 (+23%)</td>
<td>2,284 (-57%)</td>
<td>1,547 (-32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Faculty)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>538 (-12%)</td>
<td>396 (-26%)</td>
<td>346 (-13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Students)</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,417 (-19%)</td>
<td>1,676 (+18%)</td>
<td>1091 (-35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Tickets Closed (Unspecified) - When customer emails the Help Desk or a web form is submitted</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>3,338 (+73%)</td>
<td>212 (-94%)</td>
<td>110 (-48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty, staff, and students. There were 146 faculty/staff and 509 student respondents. Responses fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range for all items (Figure 9).

**Customer Survey Response:**

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of the eLearning training session(s) you attended? | 4.28/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of support you received from the eLearning 24/7 Helpdesk (when you call 866-588-3192)? | 4.02/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the quality of support you received from the eLearning 24/7 Helpdesk (when you call 866-588-3192)? | 4.28/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of support you received from on-site UT Dallas eLearning Staff (Instructional Designers and Trainers)? | 4.39/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the quality of support you received from on-site UT Dallas eLearning Staff (Instructional Designers and Trainers)? | 4.34/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate Media Services’ response time to help-calls in your class/es? | 4.36/5.0 |
| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate Media Services' ability to resolve issues with classroom technology during your class/es? | 4.26/5.0 |

**Figure 9**

**Technology:**
eLearning boasted a 99.9% uptime. 81% of all sections taught had an active eLearning section. This was down slightly from 82% in 2015-2016 (figure 10). In addition to eLearning, the following technologies were supported:
- Blackboard Collaborate
- Respondus
- Respondus LockDown Browser
- Camtasia/SnagIt
- Clickers (Turning Technologies)
- Turnitin/Peermark
- Qualtrics
- Echo360

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Uptime percentage (based on total outage time)</td>
<td>99.71%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.82%</td>
<td>99.86%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively used eLearning sections (total &amp; percentage)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,231/6,186 (84.56%)</td>
<td>5,670/6,883 (82.38%)</td>
<td>5,815/7,187 (80.91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10**

**Accomplishments:**
Online programs recognized in national rankings:

**Challenges:**
- Increased demand for the creation of online and blended sections
- Accommodating short turn-around course development/delivery needs
Future Direction:
- Increase blended/online offerings by 10% in AY 2017-18
- Incorporate student workers into course review process
- Extending instructional design consultation and support to enable faculty to become more self-sufficient in developing and delivering online/blended/technology enhanced courses
- Increase instructor/TA enrollment in Online Teaching Certification

Media Services
Media Services provided support for 146,697 class/lab sessions, in 143 classrooms and 36 conference rooms. Uptime for classroom media was 99.46% (improving from 98.96% in AY 2015/16). There was a 43% decrease in help calls answered by Media Techs despite an 8% increase in class/lab sessions over AY 2015/16 (figure 11). This was due primarily to 94% (134 out of 143) of all classrooms being updated in the past 5 years (figure 12). This year, new equipment was installed in 70 classrooms/labs/conference rooms/non-academic rooms, and major repairs were completed in 28 rooms. Media Techs conducted 215 one-on-one training sessions, which helped reduce user error. Classroom uptime and faculty satisfaction continues to improve.

Support
On-site media support for events is a major function of the department. The number of events supported saw virtually no change over AY 2015/16 (from 1,738 to 1,730). Media Services supported 742 academic events and 988 student events. Major Events included:
- Commencement
- Doctoral Hooding
- FACSS Mid-Autumn Festival
- Founders Day
- Alumni Gala
- Kusch Lecture
- Phi Kappa Phi Induction
- Celebration of Support
- State of the University
- Homecoming
- McDermott Scholar’s Finalists' Weekend
- International Talent Show
- Bangladesh Night
- ECS3 Groundbreaking
- Freshman Orientation
- OIT Summit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Calls</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,398 (-31%)</td>
<td>790 (-43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Meetings Supported</td>
<td>127,076</td>
<td>135,022 (+6%)</td>
<td>146,697 (+9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Uptime (Calls/Class Sessions)</td>
<td>98.4% (2,032/127,076)</td>
<td>98.96% (+.56%) (1,398/135,022)</td>
<td>99.46% (+.5%) (790/146,697)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Supported</td>
<td>1,645 (+81%)</td>
<td>1,738 (+6%)</td>
<td>1,730 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11

Classrooms with AV Updated in Last 5 Years

- Updated: 134, 94%
- Not updated: 9, 6%
New and completely renovated classrooms/labs: 50

- AD 3.104
- CB 1.102
- CB 1.106
- CB 1.202
- CB 1.206
- CB 1.260
- CB 1.210
- CB 1.214
- CB 1.218
- CB 1.222
- CB 1.223
- CB 1.102
- CB 1.104
- CB 1.106

- CB 1.204
- CB 2.104
- CB 2.106
- CD C140
- CD B108
- CD A101
- CD A229a
- CD J108
- CD J204
- CRA 12.110
- CRA 12.120
- ECSN 4.702
- ECSN 4.728
- ECSN 2.704
- ECSN 2.706
- ECSN 2.210

- ELSN 4.728
- MC 1.608
- RL 3.204
- RL 3.206
- RL 4.724
- ROC 2.103
- SL 2.202
- SL 2.302
- SL 2.304
- SL 2.306
- SL 2.303
- SL 1.204
- MC 1.608
- JO 4.122
- SSA 12.471
- SSA 14.250J
- SSA 14.270D
- SSA 14.467
- SSA 13.451A
- SSA 14.431C
- SSA 14.424A
- SSA 14.431E
- SSA 13.451L
- SSA 14.431G
- SSA 14.431R
- SSA 13.451G
- SSA 14.431G
- SSA 13.330
- SSA 14.120P
- SSA 14.250L
- SSA 14.510
- VCB 1.101B
- SSA 12.471
- SSA 14.250J
- SSA 14.270D
- SSA 14.467
- SSA 13.451A
- SSA 14.431C
- SSA 14.424A
- SSA 14.431E
- SSA 13.451L
- SSA 14.431G
- SSA 14.431R
- SSA 13.451G
- SSA 14.431G
- SSA 13.330
- SSA 14.120P
- SSA 14.250L
- SSA 14.510
- VCB 1.101B

Non-academic rooms: 20

- SSA 12.471
- SSA 14.250J
- SSA 14.270D
- SSA 14.467
- SSA 13.451A
- SSA 14.431C
- SSA 14.424A
- SSA 14.431E
- SSA 13.451L
- SSA 14.431G
- SSA 14.431R
- SSA 13.451G
- SSA 14.120P
- SSA 14.250L
- SSA 14.510
- VCB 1.101B

Rooms Repaired 28

- ATC 3.205
- CB 1.106
- CB 1.104
- CB 3.104
- CB 3.130
- CB 3.106
- CB 3.138

- CB 2.215
- CB 3.131 X3
- CB 1.108
- CRA 1.601 X2
- ECSN 2.210
- ECSS 2.214

- FN 2.203
- FN 2.216
- FN 2.306
- FN 2.102
- FO 2.715

- ML2 2.218
- SLC 1.201
- SLC 2.202
- SLC 2.303 X3
- GR 3.214

- JO 3.356
- ML2 2.218
- SLC 1.201
- SLC 2.202
- SLC 2.303 X3
- GR 3.214

Customer Survey Responses

A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty, staff, and students. There were 146 faculty/staff and 530 student respondents. Responses fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range for all items (figure 13).

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the reliability of the technology in your classroom/s? | 4.06/5.0 |
| Survey item (Students): How would you rate the reliability of the technology in your classrooms? | 4.08/5.0 |
Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the quality of training you received on classroom technology from a Media Services Tech?

4.15/5.0

Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How would you rate the audiovisual quality for event/s you have hosted?

4.21/5.0

Survey item (Students): How would you rate the audiovisual quality for events you have attended?

4.17/5.0

Figure 13

**Accomplishments**
- Media Technicians have increased their collective skillset, ranging from basic to expert installation/repair capabilities
- Integrated student workers into operations

**Challenges**
- Late release of funds resulted in delayed classroom media installations

**Future Direction**
- Renovation of 9 more classrooms (this will complete the 4 year AV classroom upgrade project)
- Institute 5-year AV refresh cycle for all supported rooms
- Refine training procedure for junior employees and student workers to learn office processes and troubleshooting under the supervision of upper-level specialists
- Institute a more efficient record-keeping system to track new install/repair requests, help-calls, and response times
- Implement RoomView classroom technology monitoring system in all new classroom installations
- Relaunch website

**Video Services**

**Productions**
Video Services recorded/distributed 149 videos, a 21% increase from AY 2015/16. 27 sessions were streamed (a 4% increase from AY 2015/16). There were 30,357 views (live and archived) by customers in the US, China, India, Korea, etc. The Echo 360 lecture capture system is now installed in 12 rooms. There were 872 recordings (a 3% increase over AY 2014) and 65,689 student views (a 79% increase over AY 2015/16).

High profile event recordings included:
- Commencement Ceremonies
- Hooding Ceremonies
- Alumni Awards Gala
- University Lecture Series
- Center for Brain Health Lecture Series
Customer Survey Response
A customer satisfaction survey was sent out to faculty and staff. There were 62 respondents. The response fell in the “Good” to “Excellent” range (figure 14).

| Survey item (Faculty/Staff): How satisfied were you with the video/s Video Services produced for you? | 4.11/5.0 |

Figure 14

Accomplishments
- Revamped infrastructure in Gymnasium, resulting in better quality audio and video for events
- Integrated YouTube as a secondary streaming solution (providing redundancy)

Challenges
- It has been difficult supporting off-site events with existing staff and equipment

Future Direction
- Expand services as the University’s needs evolve
- Archive all existing historical videos to Box

Expenditures
- Media Services/Video Services (Operating) expenditures: $176,303.63
- Media Services (Commercial Paper for AV Upgrade project) expenditures: $250,151.98
- eLearning Services (Operating) expenditures: $46,540.12
- Salaries: $1,197,000.69
- Total expenditures: $1,669,996.42