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>> Welcome, everyone, to today’s ELI Webinar: The I.T. Experiences of Faculty and Undergraduate Students: 2019 ECAR Findings. This is Christopher Brooks, Director of Research at EDUCAUSE, and I’ll be your moderator for today. EDUCAUSE is pleased to welcome today’s speakers: Joe Galanek, Senior Researcher at EDUCAUSE, and Dana C. Gierdowski, Researcher at EDUCAUSE. Before we begin, let me give a brief orientation on our session’s learning environment. The online room is subdivided into several windows. Our presenter’s slides are now showing in the presentation window, which is the largest portion of the screen. The tall window on the left is the chat window, serving as the open chat area for all of us. Feel free to use the chat space to submit comments, share resources, or to pose questions to our presenters. We will pause throughout the presentation for Q&A, so we encourage you to type your questions into the chat throughout the webinar. If you have any audio issues or other technical questions at any time, you can direct a private message to “Technical Help” for support. Click the top right corner of the chat window to open the drop-down menu, select “Start Chat With” and select “Hosts.” You can also click on the link in the lower left hand corner of the screen for quick technical troubleshooting steps. And now, let’s turn to today’s presentation.

Students and faculty are arguably the most important end users of the efforts of I.T. units to provide effective and reliable technologies. Today’s webinar will offer insights and recommendations for data-driven decisions to support the teaching and learning missions of higher ed institutions using data gleaned from over 55,000 students and 10,000 faculty. We are delighted to be joined by: Joe Galanek, Senior Researcher at EDUCAUSE. Joe has provided research and evaluation consultation, project management, and data analysis for federal, state, and local governments and private foundations, including the Centers for Disease Control, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, the Kellogg Foundation, the Oregon Department of Corrections, the City of Cleveland, the state of Ohio, and the Mayor’s Office of New York. His research has been published in Medical Anthropology Quarterly; Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry; Social Science & Medicine; Cancer Causes & Control and The Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice and Criminology. Joe received his Ph.D. in Anthropology and his Master of Public Health from Case Western Reserve University. Dana C. Gierdowski, Researcher at EDUCAUSE. Dana serves as a co-principal investigator and supports ECAR research initiatives, including the Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology,
the I.T. Workforce in Higher Education study, and the biannual Study of Faculty and Information Technology. Her work has been published in the journals Library Hi Tech and Computers and Composition, and in the edited collections Writing Studio Pedagogy: Space, Place, and Rhetoric in Collaborative Environments, Making Space: Writing Instruction, Infrastructure, and Multiliteracies, Sustainable Learning Spaces, and Cases on Higher Education Spaces. Dana received her Ph.D. in Communication, Rhetoric, and Digital Media from North Carolina State University. And with that, let’s begin..

>> Thanks a lot. Let’s get started, everyone. Really excited to have you here today. I want to briefly just mention, how many people participated in our student and faculty study. How about this, folks? 53,000 students, 160 institutions, seven countries, and 38 U.S. states. That was just published. They use servers’ results from 45,000 student responses, 118 U.S. institutions, and for the faculty study, total number of surveys, 10,000 fact participated in this, 127 institutions, six countries, 40 U.S. states. The cover on the right-hand side, we used about 195 fact student responses for our findings. Solely from 119 U.S. institutions. And these are the reported topics. So I think when you look at these reports, the pallet study should be reported towards the end of November. When you look at the reports you focus on these five areas, learning environment preferences, student success tools, technology experiences, technology use in the classroom, and accessibility. For today's presentation, Dana and I believe be focusing on the items in orange, learning environment preferences, what are students or faculty referring, technology in the classroom, what is being banned these days, what is being allowed in terms of Mobile technology. And then finally Dana will be wrapping it, it up with accessibility and understanding how students are using and rating support services. Also understanding fact experience with these services. We want to get everybody engaged. We have a few poll questions we'll be doing today. Let's get right to it. Your first poll question. You saw the numbers. Has your institution ever participated in a tracks survey? We want to understand anyone here today if they have done it. Looks like about -- almost even. 20%, 21% yes, and no. Since I'm doing the presentation, reach out to your colleagues and let them know what some kind of experience you have because our data and findings really again on you, our participants. So here is where we're at in the process. I just want to give you an opportunity to see where we're at. This is the time appeared to sign up. So before you spend the holidays, let's look at where we are in the process and sign up again, your responses, your insights are extra extremely valuable to our work. Please do sign up. Our work depends on your responses, your experiences actually at your institution. So we want to make sure that we hear your voice. It's so important to our work. So again, just a brief explanation of where we're at in our publishing process, as I said earlier, on the left-hand side the student information technology has dropped, and we have a hub for it. So there's other information that you can access at this hub, a very and important and exciting report, and we've really focused on streamlining these reports to make sure you're getting the information that you need for your institution. The pallet study, that will drop later this month. Again, the topic areas that I showed you earlier, those are going to be the ones that we cover, those five topic areas. Then we're going to go through learning and teaching environment preferences. The first, we're
going to look at fact. Before we do that I want to show you a picture. On the left-hand side we have the lone ranger student doing her online coursework I delegatey participating in a discussion board, downloading resources. She's got her laptop, she can go anywhere she wants on the campus to do her work, have a job in the morning. We know this is current with increasing online enrollment and offerings. On the right-hand side it looks like an instructor leveraging media. These represent two dichotomies. But we find this year that actually what people want overall is a combination of these two. Let me explain to you. When we ask pallet what Technigen merchant they prefer, 51% of pallet prefer a blended environment. Somewhere of solely face-to-face or solely online. They kind of want to leverage the system the way they can use both environments. When it comes to students it's very similar. 56% of students prefer blended. So very similar. About 5% difference. Now I want to just expand this a little more and think about it in a little more granular manner. When we ask them if you prefer face-to-face or mostly face-to-face, when we do this next level of analysis, we find that 73% of pallet prefer face-to-face or mostly face-to-face. When we ask students the same question, 70% of students prefer face-to-face or mostly face-to-face. So the take home message here is that kids and pallet are still desiring this face-to-face contact in the classroom. Now we're going to go another layer, a little more granular, and we're going to talk about the preferences based on activities and assignments. Dana, let's take a look at this poll question. What do people think people are referring?

>> Thank you, Joe. So we asked students about their learning environment preferences for their kind of activities and assignments they have in a typical course and we gave them choices based on the polls Joe was talking about. We want to see if you can predict what student said. The question, what activity did students tell us was the most preferred to have in a face-to-face environment. Here are your choices. Projects with piers, course related discussions, and labs and demonstrations. About half of you saying labs and demonstrations. Not as many for projects with peers. All right, looks like labs and demonstrations. Let's find out what students said been what we found was there preferences were really differing based on the learning task itself. The most preferred activity for completely faucet to face, you all were right. Labs and demonstrations came in top in terms of preference for completely face-to-face. You can see that here in the graphic at the bottom in the orange bar. The top three were labs and demonstrations, pallet student conferences and also lectures. We also found that the most preferred activities for completely online, and these also appear at the top of this bar graph in the far right in the Navy blue, homework, assignments, exams, tests, peer reviewing, peer grade the preferences for having labs and demonstrations, conferencing, lectures would be face-to-face environments made sense to us. There are more opportunities for conversation, for interaction, for immediate feedback, for peers, having feedback from instructor as well. And you also notice that these were rated at or near the bottom as the least preferred for completely online, so the data here is suggesting to us that having these particular experiences in person is valued by many students. And they're looking for opportunities to have engaging interactions during class. And we also found evidence that supports this from any of the open responses that students shared with us this
year particularly related to lectures. I wanted to share a few examples with you from those open responses. Students want more interactivity during class and they see technology as a way to do that and they were talking about in respect to this specifically to act Thursday. What is the one thing you would like to do with instructors to enhance your academic success. Notice a pattern here. Students wanted instructors to use technology, engage them, and these several examples that word "engagement" kept coming up. This first example the student is saying the instructors usually use technical for presentation only and they felt that was kind of a missed opportunity. This next example the student wants to be engaged with the course material during the lecture. They found it interesting that the students wanted a different kind of lecture to be involved in the learning process. This last student goes to far as to suggest some techniques for using technology, for example, interactive polling, so they can be more engaged, see more dynamic use of technology. These student responses suggest that thank you, sir they could very well be thinking about lectures in a different way than some faculty are this they don't see them as a one-way transmission of information, but something that they want to be engaged in and be involved in. They don't want to be spectators in their classrooms. I'm going to turn it now over to Joe and he is going to learn what -- share what we learned on the faculty side.

>> Thanks, Dana. As you can see, the open-ended responses we provided, we're going to provide today, really provide a depth of understanding with your responses. Let's look at the specific activities and assignments. The top half of this figure and bottom are divided into course management at the bottom, and at the top, faculty student and peer interaction. This is through factor analysis, seeing what items kind of hung together statistically. The course management functions, these are characterized as functional time savers. You can see a lot of the blended teach environments are used, course syllabus, and materials. A lot is done online through peer review and grading activity. The purple bar indicating all online. That is a huge portion. Then we go to the top of this, you see factual student peer reaction, human centered activities where the interaction between students and faculty between peers is very important we all know if you've been in the classroom these are foundational activities for teaching and learning, right? Giving people information and having students and faculty and students discuss it. Let's take a look at some of these preferences. For lecture, the third item on your left-hand side, top of the figure, the learning Ture, 49% of the faculty preferred face-to-face for lecture, but 45% preferred blended. So face-to-face really important still important for faculty for lecture. The blended component consists of a range 'mostly face-to-face, half and half mostly online. Going into the discussion, trying to understand what people get and what they don't for the questioning, right, understanding and really digging into the material face-to-face, 41% faculty prefer face-to-face for discussions. However, 53% reported that they preferred some type of blended activity for discussions. And I think that these findings show that faculty are attempting to leverage the learning management system at their institution in order to harness these tools in an appropriate way. Doing online discussions, materials to prepare for the lecture. I think these are important decisions to make in terms of how faculty are actually harnessing this technology. Now we did ask faculty similar to what Dana presented for the students, we asked the faculty what is the one
thing the institution can do with teaching technical to facilitate your control, look at the responses and you'll get a sense of what faculty thinks they needed to get more of a blended perspective or more of a blended approach to discussion. How about this. Faculty said workshops such as video/sound capital your the of lectures. If you're providing a-- that might boost that up, video capturing. Discussion best practices and discussion new ideas with comes. We're talking about -- colleagues. We're talking about learning communities here, discussing with colleagues, how they're harnessing it in classroom. This as praying particular perspective, give me more technology in my teach role. Between teaching, college service, other professional and development, people just don't have time. People need release time what is we're saying. That is something that only you can provide us by participating in our survey. We really appreciate having an opportunity to hear people's voices throughout the data. Based on this, I think Dana touched on this, really important, about using technical intelligence in class, increasing the activity and engaging in lecture and labs. Really not saying just hey, let's do this, but actually having the tools in your toolkits to be able to use this intelligence. And for faculty, promote benefits and strategies for engaging in online teaching and mentoring, professional development. It's so important. We'll talk a little bit about professional development later and also creating learning communities. There are no some low artists in this -- solo artists in this field. We need to be supporting each other to make sure people are getting the information and training and support that they need. All right, looks like we have some pending questions. Christopher will lead us through some of those. Christopher?

>> Thank you, Joe, and thank you, Dana. We had a few questions pop up in the chat space. The first was from mark. He said when you're describing blended learning merchant is that c time replaced with on time activities. If I can kind of summarize that, I think he is looked for sort of the way in which blended is operationalized from our data. So if either or both of you want to address that.

>> I can take that one.

>> I was just going to point out that the assignments really get at what people prefer. It is on a continuum. It's a scale that shows the range of activities. I don't believe that we have any kind of identification of like an either or in our survey questions. Like if you did this in our courtroom classroom, you did this online. Thank you, Dana.

>> Sure. I can also add to the way we have talked about blended learning or used that term in the last several years is based on anything between the polls. So any -- we don't define this in the survey instrument in terms of that question regarding C time. We don't ask students and faculty exactly how -- in terms of how this is defined at C time. We ask them like Joe said on that continuum, but that is how we have used the term blended, it falls between anything that is not exclusively online, and not exclusively face-to-face. Christopher, feel free to add anything there as well.
No, I think you've hit upon the highlights there. I think one of the reasons that we haven't defined it specifically within the scale is there's not sort of a universally send definition of what blended entails. I think my former colleague Jeffrey and I deferred to blended as being between the polls study a couple of years ago. Just for a little bit more context. We also have another question from Tracy from Harvard University's extension school. The question is, is there any data on which -- managing a classroom discussion in zoom, visualization of large numbers of students, et cetera, and is that any different than trying adobe connect, right? I think it's the way in which lms might be correlated to different answers there.

we didn't reported out on the numbers, and in the instrument itself we did not ask about specific elements of platforms. We asked in general and gave users and example so we had a greater sense of defining. -- [ indiscernible ] -- Joe, do you have anything to add there?

No. I'm trying to look through my notes to see if people identify their elements. I'm not finding that in the survey. With that said, even address' question about using zoom or adobe for conferences and things, I know specifically we didn't ask about -- we asked the things like blackboard canvas, things of that nature. Great question. I'd be curious what address found in her school, user experience for these platforms. Tracy please share later on if you feel. Thank you.

I have one last one that is combined of a combination. Someone from Boise state piped in, curious about student demographics, if there was a composite profile based on average or if they sliced the data by age or other demographics. David from the University of Kansas follows up with a question, he said he'd be interested in whether or not the survey sees differences in technology and teaching preferences in students with marginalized backgrounds. If you address those, then I think we can move on to the next section.

I can address the democratic section. We did not address those, we did cost tabs on student and demographics and we did see -- I think it was the other question about specific preferences for students from marginalized background and we do cover that in the larger report. I encourage you to read it and check out the sections, see if that's an interest, particularly in learning environment. We found in student demographics, particularly students who were married, students who were parents, who identified as independent with dependents and those are likely parents, students who worked more than 40 hours a week as well as students who identified as both offering a physical and learning disability were more likely to prefer mostly online. So please check that out if that's something that is of interest to you in relationship to your own institution. Then we'll go ahead and move on then for the sake of time. So I wanted to now talk a little bit about Texas nothing use in the classroom. Like I just mentioned before, we covered a lot in the report Negligence technology experiences of students and faculty on campus. I encourage you to
check it out. One area about technology use in the classroom itself, and most students perfect telling us that they agreed that their instructors use technology to engage them in the classroom. The top three where they disagreed or strongly disagreed, they said instructors were using technical to engage the minority processes Lansing learning with additional materials, and collaboration tools to communicate with their instructors and peers both inside and outside of class. That's depicted on this graphic with the largest bars here at the top of who agree, you see those in yellow and orange. But we also found that significant fewer said that they were encouraged to use their personal technology. Half of their instructors, they said, asked them to use their laptops and only a quarter reported they were encouraged to use their smart phones. What we're finding is these numbers really didn't move since last year, which is installing to us that those attitudes that faculty have about Mobile technical in the classroom are pretty slow to change. Joe is going to be sharing some of those physicians with you from the faculty study that support this before, but he does that we wanted to pause for another quick poll question, and this is related to the faculty side of the study. So the question is what do you think is the percentage of faculty who are discouraging or banning smart phones in class. Is it over 50% or under 50%? What do you think? And then Joe is going to give us the reveal in just a moment. It looks like we have over 50 is winning. getting higher. 69% of you. I'm going now to turn it over to Joe, so he can play the answer.

>> fantastic. Great poll, everybody. That is really interesting to see. 66% is what people are saying, over 50%. Let's look at it. Let's look at smartphone wearables. A little over 50%. Great work, everybody, in identifying this think we know this on or campus is faculty is saying don't bring a smartphone into my class. Wearable technology also getting up there close to 50% for banning or discouraging. I'm solely looking at the orange bars on the left-hand side. I think the wearables, I think people concerned about texting answers and those kinds of things, why professors and instructors want these banned. The laptops and tablet, the purple bar in the top right-hand side corner, from% require courage laptops. We'll talk later about technology and how this is important to people, so it's nice to see that at least 50% truckers are encouraged or require. However, we still have banning in tablets and equally discouraging for tablets as well. Considering the push to use technology and trying to leverage this as Dana mentioned earlier about the intelligence use of technology, these numbers may not be where we want them to be, so I guess the question would be how do we get people to actually leverage the technology that is in everyone's hands.

>> What Joe is talking about, those can impact students who need their devices in class. We certainly talked about that in these reports in previous years. One pattern we observed this year in their responses was their discussion of their use of digital textbooks. We include a few examples up front of the responses from students who say they're using these resources. Again, this is in response to the question what is the one thing you would like your instructors to do with technology to enhance your academic success. So this first example, the students said many of my professors do not allow technology in the classroom. Most of the books I need for class are
much cheaper to have a digital copy than if I need to bring the book to class. I should be allowed to utilize the technology I have access to. We're seeing for many students, this is one example, but highlights the idea that this is many times a financial decision that students are making. And the next one, I've had a few instructors who are strict on the use of Texas nothing during classroom. It was difficult to participate in class discussions about the proceedings because my notes were on a laptop. We're seeing participants issues. Students aren't able to participate in the class in ways they should be able to because they're using these sorts of resources. Finally, the last example, the student says many instructors oppose using laptops in class. This is very troublesome for me because most of my textbooks are digital. They effectively prohibit me from using my textbook in class. The policy is preventing them or at least how they see it, from using their textbook in class. Students are using their own devices for educational purposes now more than ever. More students like the first two who shared their experience of getting reduced costs, residential e-textbooks. More institutions are planning those, packaging those for students. We also have the digital first textbook movement. So these can be really problematic for students who are trying to do the right thing and use their textbooks in class and also to save money because for many students it's a financial issue. So what can be done about this? I'm going to turn it over to Joe talk about this from the faculty side.

>> fantastic. Thanks, Dana. Hey, everybody, I want to point out to you this top quote on this slide. I didn't write that. That came from a faculty open-ended response on what is the one thing your institution -- institution can do in technology teaching role. Require professional development. That came straight from the faculty member. I want to take a look at the professional development. I believe Christopher put in the chat box you can donate this graphic which is on there. One of the things I want to point out to you is we have three terrific nominations here. We didn't put wearables. If you look at the top blue letters, professional development on integrated technology in your classroom, if you're teaching, if you receive this professional development there's a 9% decrease in bans. Let's look at tablets. If you receive professional development there's an 11% decrease in bans. Let's look at smart phones, which is like the bane of teachers. We have some questions about why people are banning smart phones, right, but think about this. 14% decrease in smart phones ban, 14% decrease with professional department. That is an amazing finding. Faculty are hungry for professional development. When they actually receive it, it washes the argument in the classroom. That is really important, that we need to communicate on -- communicate to our faculty. Dana, what about the recommendations based on all of this. What are we finding and regional to people.

>> Right, so the idea that offering faculty alternatives to technical bans, there has been a few comments in the chat about raising awareness, yes, but also offering our faculty alternatives. We offer a number of suggestions in the reported, in the student study as well as touching upon this in the faculty study as well. One in particular is a study we reference that offers some interesting findings and an effective approaches with a split classroom approach where students can self-select into support of -- sort of a technical section of the room and non-technical section. We
have had some success. If that is something you want to fast on to your faculty. Also faculty professional development on integration into teaching. Not just technology for technology's sake, but something that is purposeful that is meeting goals and objectives of the course in engaging students and also demonstrating to faculty that more active learning practices can be built in through the purposeful use of technology. All right, so we're going to now pause again for some questions. Christopher will walk us through a few.

>> Okay. So Chris asks both of you why are so many faculty discouraging and banning technical. Do we have any good answers to that?

>> Yes.

>> That's a great question. Yeah, so I'll jump in as well. I would also encourage any of our attendees have idea, please let us know. We certainly know what we have been studying as well, but there is the idea that these are distractions. Is that what you were going to add, Joe?

>> I was going to reference the study about these technologies being distractions. Not just to themselves. The students recognize that.

>> And I think there's also Arizona lack of awareness. I saw a little discussion about that in the discussion box as well. A lack of awareness on how the technology can be really used to engage. There's also the issue of not feeling like this is something that instructors know how to use. So there's an intimidation factor there. So it's easier to ban outright or discourage the use of that. I think Joe is right, the biggest sort of pushback we've studied about that is the idea that the belief that these technologies are a distinction in class versus something that could be used as a learning tool.

>> Still on that topic, Chris had a follow-up question as well asking what are some alternatives to banning technology in the classroom?

>> Some of the ones we referenced -- go ahead, Joe, go ahead.

>> Well, again, I was going to -- Dana and I are completely in sync today just, so you know. I guarantee we're thinking about the same thing. It's basically using as Dana pointed out earlier and intelligence use of technology in the classroom Dana wasn't there a study we have seen about using a split classroom where people had the ability to split the classroom, where people on this side of the classroom could use a device, the other side could?

>> Yes. And we have cited it in both student and faculty studies, so if that is of interest, please check out the larger report. Giving folks, students, a choice, sort of split seating. Students can self-select. There has been some really interesting study about the effectiveness of that approach.
We also recommended in the student study as well as working with -- Ken urging faculty to work with students on their own technology devices and policies. Many students, faculty member, myself, my students I worked with were the first to admit they could be distracted by those so we could come up with policies ourselves and ways to use the devices so they weren't distracting to peers, but also that we're really leveraging what they had as a learning tool, so they could engage in the classrooms in purposeful ways.

>> Yeah and just really quickly, I'm conscience of time, my thinking about all this, the overall aspect of it, is take the argument and the debate and the power struggles in the classroom and just neutralize them by using it intelligence. Don't argue with students about what they're doing on their phones. Give them something to do. I think that is kind of the point of those studies and also in terms of what Dana suggested earlier, this intelligence use. It looks like Stephanie it from Rickster just posted something in our chat box about a book so thank you.

>> That is awesome she recommended that. The new book. Which we actually cite in the student study. Thank you for recommending that. We found it really useful, some great ideas from Derek as well.

>> One last question I'll offer up here. Carrie asks are we assuming that all students have a device? We didn't report on it this year, but I'm wondering if you could speak to device access ownership in a historical context.

>> Sure. we found, and these numbers have been pretty consistent the last couple years, we have pretty much reached the saturation point with students owning -- I think it's 99% of students report they own a smartphone and maybe a percentage sores two less say this they either own or have access to a laptop computer. We know that based on what they're telling us the past few years we have reached a pretty solid saturation point in ownership and access numbers.

>> I think so we should probably move on to the next topic if you're ready.

>> yeah. Wonderful. Great, thank you and thanks everyone for all the great questions. This last section covers data related to accessibility. On the student side we found that only half of those who identified is having a disability who made accessible accumulations rated their support as good or excellent and nearly a quarter said their support was poor or fair so not great. We also asked students to rate their awareness for needs of accessible technology. Before we share what they said about that awareness Joe is going to do one last poll question for us.

>> All right. Let's take a look here. Can we move the -- thank you. Sorry. What percentage of students with disabilities said that their institution was not at all wear of their accessible technical needs. What percentage of students said my school has no idea that I'm experiencing this. Who said that. How many said that got a few year. 31% or more is really leading here. People are
saying, wow, that institutions may not be wear. 61%. 59%. Okay. Great. So about more than half are saying -- a third or more students said their institution was not aware. Let's take a look and see. Dana?

>> Great. Thank you, everyone. All right, so the good news is it's not as much as our participants think. The bad news is it's still more than we want it to be. Students with disabilities rating their school's their needs for accessible technical. We found that half rated them as good or excellent, which is depicted in the purple bars in this graphic. About a quarter rated awareness as poor or fair. And 11% said their institution was not at all wear of their needs for accessible technology. So, you know, not as high as poor, fair, and we still want to see those numbers coming down, but this is suggesting to us, especially based on the outside research and review of scholarly work and disability studies that we did last year and this year, that many students are experiencing barriers to disclosing their disability to their institution. There are a number of barriers. I would like to invite you as well, if you had some experience with this, please upon them in the chat, but a number of the resources that we viewed for the student study this year and also cite, so check those out the that is of interest and concern to you on your campus is the stigma of disability as well as for students who also have invisible or non-apparent disability, the research is telling us there's some heavy negative experiences with instructors or peers, the need to feel like they have to defer their need for an accommodation, that is really difficult. It's one of the barriers that they have to overcome. Other barriers include lack of awareness, availability of support services on their campus. When we think about navigating an institutional system, a lot of students don't know how to do that. It requires a lot of strong advocacy. That can be problematic for students coming into a university setting for the first time, especially if they're coming from a K-12 environment where they received a lot of accommodation and received a lot of supported, whereas now, they're getting into the higher education system and don't quite know how to navigate those systems. We talk about the others in the report as well. If you can give us others that can help us understand this issue, please upon them in the text. We'd like to know about them. I'll hand this next one to Joe to tell us about if faculty side.

>> The thanks, Dana. Let's look at what faculty says. This presents faculty use of support services on making courses accessible. The top part here. We're slowly going to focus on these. I do want to point out a lot of faculty have used those services, but over 50% have used them. When you look at the faculty that have used these services, you can see on the right-hand side, purple and the dark blue there. 60% rated these services as good or excellent. Sometimes when we some a 60% number like that we can hopefully thinks about can this be better, just 60%. I think everybody wants to see through these services may be rated 70 or 80% is excellent, right? If anybody has experience with that, please put them in chat. As a benchmark, 60% for this year. I don't know, I'd like to see that a little bit higher. It's interesting, these findings can different over institution type. Ma and D.C. granting institutions much lower in using the services. However, associate branching institutions, aa institutions as we call them in our reports, 20% of aa faculty are not -- had not used the service. Overwhelming majority of AA faculty have used
these important kinds of services. Dana recently authored a report on community college, very important report. I strongly recommend you download this today and take a look at it. She is our community college expert. What does it say, overwhelming use of support services by AA faculty, what does that tell us about the changing landscape?

>>> We begin with the deep dive we went into this year with the community college dataset from the 2018 numbers, was telling us that students were rating -- students at AA institutions were relating their support as better on awareness, so as a result of trying to understand that we did a lot of reading and research to examine that population and we found that far more students who identify as having disabilities enroll in community colleges, so what we are seeing here could be that the experience of instructors who are working with these students, they simply serve more of those populations. Therefore, they may be using these technology services more to meet those students’ needs.

>>> Great. Thanks. That's an important shift, right, that we're seeing that. What are the recommendations saying?

>>> Our final recommendations for accessibility, we want to encourage institution to partner, I.T. units to partner to educate all students from the time they're enrolling from the type of technical available and especially how to navigate the system how to request those. Again, when students move into a setting like in higher education, when they have had support K through 12 it can be do you wanting. When we're educating all students from the time they enter, we have a greater chance of them reaching the students who may not be as willing to disclose. Also I think creationed awareness of faculty and student needs. Also, the difficulties they face trying to report their needs or the barriers that keep them from reporting those needs. What we found is there's a lot of underreporting here that not nearly as many will apply for their accommodations and get the things they need. If faculty know that, this is something that is an issue, that they can talks and address this in ways to all of their classes and create a more inclusive intent where they will feel more comfortable and requesting their needs and also faculty can help them navigate those systems and help point them in the right direction. I think this also reiterates the importance of universal design for learning. If faculty are getting training in professional development, on designing courses from the ground up to meet the needs of all students, ideally then some of these issues in reporting starting to away because those course materials technologies are going to be designed in ways that everyone is able to access the things that they need versus having to apply and get an accommodation. All right. so this is our last stop for questions. I'll turn it over to Christopher to help us with those.

>>> We have a couple of really short questions that are largely definitional. Tracy asked two things. Can you define accessible technology needs. Also define support services. Are these people or tools.
In the instruments themselves, I don't believe we had a set definition. So we left that up to the users to look at that. Accessible technologies, we worded the question -- first we asked students if they had a physical or learning disability that required some type of technology in order to do their coursework and then we sort of filtered down from there, so we didn't do a-- the only stipulation that we gave in the question was it a technology need that they needed in order to do their academic work.

okay. And the last one is a question I'm deriving from a couple comments. Chris wrist students have to support their needs, something similar, students have to go to disability students to get services as well. Dana can you comment very briefly on how students might be able to overcoming that as an obstacle or the ways in which self-reporting is an obstacle.

Right, right. And again, I encourage you to check this section in the study because it we go more into detail there based on the research we're reading. Yes, it is the it is on the own us of the student to request the accommodations. Some students may not have received a diagnosis by the time they get to their college level experience, so they may get farther along in their college education before they realize there is a problem opinion then they have to navigate through the student disability office and go through additional diagnosis and testing in order to -- and from some of the things we've also understood is that can also be kind of a lengthy process, so we also have time as an issue as well in working with students with disability. That is just one of many. So I Ken courage you to check those out the that is something of interested on your list.

Thank you, Dana, for that. You can check out the report right there, scan the QR code we provided you or visit the tiny URL. And if you want to sign up for ETRAC and get your students’ experiences on campus, we want you for ETRAC 2020. So sign up to run the student study in 2020 there. If you have questions about that, the benchmarking. A quick thank you to Joe and Dana.

On behalf of EDUCAUSE, thank you all for joining us today for an engaging session and conversation. Before you sign off today, please click on the session evaluation link which you will find in the chat window. Your comments are very important to us. The session’s recording and presentation slides will be posted to the website later today. Please feel free to share it with your colleagues. On behalf of EDUCAUSE, this is Christopher Brooks, thanks for joining us today.