
TURNING POINT AUDIENCE RESPONSE SYSTEM SITE LICENSE 2006-2007

The University of Washington entered into a 3-year contract with Thomson Higher Education in August 2005 for the purpose of establishing a site license to use Turning Technologies audience response system software and hardware. There is an annual exit clause in the contract that allows the UW to give 90 days notice that we do not wish to carry the contract over to the next year. Since we are now well into the month of December 2006 we are obligated to renew the contract for the 2006-2007 term and we do so willingly since the audience response trial program continues to be successful and continues to grow. For example, the original contact agreement was based upon an estimated 2000 students using the system over the course of each year. Following a fall quarter review we now find that we are approaching having 3500 UW students, faculty, and staff using the Turning Point audience response during any given quarter.

Our contract for a Turning Point site-license sets the value at \$8 per student on an annually recurring cycle. This resulted in a total 3 year contract value of \$48,000 that was to be paid in 3 annual payments of \$16,000 coming due at the start of each Fall Quarter. To support additional usage for the 2006-2007 school year we have an obligation to pay for an additional 1500 seats (\$12000) in addition to the \$16000 that has already been budgeted. A copy of the contract to be signed is attached at the end of this document. I am confident that this contract represents a fair, if not exceptional, value for the software and hardware provided under the terms of the contract and that both Thomson Higher Education and Turning Technologies have and will continue to meet or exceed any performance conditions specified by the contract. For example, I have personally visited many of our clients with representatives of each company and organized on-campus information and training sessions across campus with Turning Technologies representatives. So far so good, however if for any reason what so ever the University of Washington chooses to not continue with this contract past the current 2nd year term of August 20, 2006 through August 19, 2007 it must provide written notice to Thomson Higher Education no later than May 20, 2007. If the program continues to be such a success there are likely to be significant economic reasons for doing so and for exploring a perpetual licensing option instead.

As already stated, as of winter quarter we will have close to 3500 users of Turning Point who are using it in various capacities at the UW. We appear to be successfully bridging the traditional gap between early adopters and mainstream users. Bringing new technologies into the classroom environment is often a great challenge but to date the Turning Technologies audience response program at the UW can only be described as a success. This may be due the fact that individuals and departments across campus are free to implement its use in completely unique ways, according to their own needs and expectations. Though originally envisioned as a simple tool for bringing added value to the large lecture undergraduate learning environment, we have seen that there is no one way to use the technology. In fact, we are seeing the system being used by many different kinds of users, some very creatively, all across campus. This is one advantage of having a campus wide site license, in addition to the obvious advantage of reducing

burdens upon students who have been increasingly required to purchase a variety of clicker-responder devices from the bookstore from different manufacturers for each class that uses the technology. We have seen that providing a site license for a specific product of excellent quality, and a variety of support structures for using it, is an excellent way to promote standardization. In spite of the fact that we do very little to promotion use of this technology, as word of modern audience response technology and the Turning Point site license circulates around campus more rarely does a week go by that I am not contacted about using the technology, often for very unique and interesting uses.

Today's audience response systems are effective in the classroom because they are capable of creating highly active learning environments that leverage the creation of the elusive *teachable moment*. But beyond a host of academic benefits, the basic underlying assumption of the current Turning Point audience response program is that if we can clearly identify a system that meets a broad spectrum of instructional needs, has widespread departmental support, and can be effectively scaled out across the entire University of Washington environment, then we have ought to have a strong interest in establishing standards for use of that technology on campus. Following our fall training and information sessions, the Physics Astronomy department has volunteered to begin a trial use of the Turning Point audience response system in one of their classes winter quarter. This represents a monumental step towards making any kind of standardization determination. Currently, about 1,500 students in the Physics Astronomy undergraduate curriculum are using an older audience response system. If the Physics Astronomy department is satisfied that Turning Point performs to their needs and expectations then there will be an additional 1,500 students using Turning Point fall quarter 2007. If that comes to pass then we are likely to be at the point of saying we are ready to establish a campus standard for the technology. If and when the University of Washington is able to arrive at such a conclusion it would be my strong recommendation to *not* renew our current agreement and instead seek to take full advantage of whatever licensing benefits arise from being in such a position, such as changing to a one-time-fee perpetual license that maintains upgrade and support benefits. The long-term financial benefits would be enormous.

That said, deciding to *not* establish a campus standard for audience response technology certainly remains an option. This would substantially reduce my personal technology management burdens. However, we are involved in this because we found ourselves under considerable pressure to investigate the potential for providing a valuable new campus wide educational technology service and, as a result, established this investigative program in part to answer this need-for-standardization question. We are observing that the list of UW clients using audience response is growing and includes those listed on the following page with the current usage estimates, which trend upwards.

Report compiled by Randy Jackson, Classroom Support Services, 206-543-9900,
December 20, 2006 ranjack@u.washington.edu

Law School – 150 student users

Damien Koemans, Law School Director of Multimedia Services
206-543-0519, dkoemans@u.washington.edu

Christine Aker – 200 seat system for classroom use

Manager, Div of Classroom Services, HS Academic Services & Facilities
206-616-3260, caker@u.washington.edu

Randy Jackson – 160 seat system for classroom use

Assistant Director, Classroom Support Services
206-543-9900, ranjack@u.washington.edu

Physics/Astronomy – 1,500 students currently using HiTT system

Daryl Pedigo
Senior Lecturer, Physics
206-543-4983
pedigo@phys.washington.edu

Earth and Space Sciences - 700 students

Contact Liz Nesbit, 206-543-5949, lnesbit@u.washington.edu

Chemistry – multiple instructors - 815 students

Contact Bill Cusworth cusworth@chem.washington.edu

Biology – multiple instructors - 750 students

Contact Dave Hurley dhurl@u.washington.edu

Education - 40 students

Contact Richard Neel rickneel@u.washington.edu

Continuing Medical Education - 200 students

Contact Eric Tobiason, 206-616-8118, tobiason@u.washington.edu

College of Architecture & Urban Planning - 20 students

Contact Mark Baratta, 206-616-5273, baratta@u.washington.edu

Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences - 40 students using Qwizdom system

Contact Christopher Moore, 206-616-5273, camoore@u.washington.edu

In addition to these regular users we have had periodic users, including: Communications Department, Program on the Environment, President Emmert's office. There are likely to be additional isolated users of the technology on campus that we are as yet unaware of.