**Academic Technology and Online Education Committee**

April 14, 2015

3:30 pm in HUB 123

Minutes

In attendance: Daniel Bramer, Rich Grossman, Joann Guilmett, Brendon Hoch, Lynn Johnson, Gail Mears, Robyn Parker (chair), Scott Robison, Meagan Shedd, Zhizhang Shen, Mark Turski, David Zehr, Steve Taksar (guest).

Excused: Linda Carrier, Kathleen Norris, Christian Roberson, & Emma Wright

1. Old Business:
	1. March 24, 2015 meeting minutes – Approved without revision.
	2. Examine the classroom technology packages (Tier 1, 2, 3) initiative and explore mechanisms to facilitate communication and decision-making regarding academic technologies (Robyn Parker)

 Background*:* *The committee decided to invite Steve Taksar to this meeting to explore a mechanism for better communicating about initiatives involving significant changes to and investment in academic technology. Steve was in attendance.*

 Disposition: Steve presented on the classroom tier system, which came about due to a need to maintain inventory of technology and also a desire to improve support by identifying a set of technologies each classroom type would have and then developing staff to repair/support.

 There are 3 levels of mediation in PSU classrooms: Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3. Tier 1 classrooms have little or no technology beyond whiteboard/blackboard and possibly overhead projector. Tier 2 classrooms have computer & projection station/screen. Tier 3 classrooms (of which there are none now, but one is going into Hyde 116 over the summer) will have a projection cart, screen, cameras, and software that allows students to project work. Also, there is the ability to bring in virtual speakers and to broadcast out through NH Connects.

 The question was raised about how technology decisions get made, for instance in the case of Hyde 116. Steve said, if it’s in reconstructed space, meetings are held with users of that space to find out what they need, when do they need it, how will they use the space/technology.

 Committee recognizes that technology impacts pedagogy and input on technology planning like the standardized technology tiers in classrooms should be something that comes to ATOEC as a principle policy-making committee. The committee could also play a role in communicating changes to the faculty. It was suggested that the committee could develop protocols for approaches to planning technology—new construction, decommissioning (remove or stop supporting), refreshing classrooms.

 The question was also posed that there may be bigger things to be discussing such as shared spaces and needs assessment. Another question posed was what the expectation of faculty is to use the technology in a given space? Additionally, the committee believed it should have a role in at least recommending, if not joining in the decision making before the new Tier 3 classroom in Hyde becomes the standard Tier 3 offering.

 Steve asked the committee to determine what steps might be needed, beyond asking the academic leaders of those to use the renovated space, should be taken. Developing a process could put a protocol in place for future decisions (next AY).

 The committee decided to explore how faculty experience the technology decisions made on campus through some informal polling and invite Steve Taksar to attend the May meeting.

1. Revisit the question about funding models for software with multi-department subscriptions

 Background: *The committee agreed to table this discussion and revisit it during the next meeting when our IT members would present. ATOEC would like to better understand advocacy around software.*

 Disposition: Rich Grossman shared information about software packages and licensing on campus. Suggested reducing duplicate types of software would allow for better informed help desk and support staff. For instance, right now there are 6 different statistics packages on campus. Given the similarity of their functions, reducing would increase quality of support and decrease costs. He wondered if ATOEC could play a role in synthesizing faculty software needs.

 Rich also discussed license terms and length. He suggested some standards be created around popular toolsets such as Microsoft, Adobe, and SPSS. Discussion ensued about the mechanism for sharing information about software licensing and how associated costs are paid for. A question was posed about whether we had software inventories. The answer was yes and no. Another question was asked about whether ATOEC can/should develop a policy that could be used in determining which units should fund what packages—or if the licensing should be centralized.

 Finally, it was strongly suggested that this group should petition for more software funding. Without advocacy, funding drops off.

 No additional discussion or suggestions were made. Issue/questions were better understood, but no specific plans were made to address the policy question.

1. Revisit the discussion of the need for a data management system for assessment from last meeting.

 Background: *Members agreed to send their input to Gail to compile in order to explore and prepare a position statement about the need to be proactive in generating assessment data. Input should take the form of ideas about the need and, if available, data to support it.*

Disposition: With the last meeting just 2 weeks ago, members did not have time to collect input to send on. Gail will reach out to them and work on a statement to be brought back to the committee.

1. Revisit the plan for the GoReact pilot to determine when to meet with instructors in Educator Prep.

 Background: *Members agreed to run a pilot of the GoReact software next year, periodically collecting updates from users for the purpose of making a recommendation for pursuing this product for university-wide us. Annette Holba will pilot along with a couple of other faculty using the student license approach. We also planned to meet with the folks in Educator Prep to see if there was interest in trying the product. The Chair of that group can give us 15 minutes on the April agenda, but prefers to have us attend during their retreat on May 18th.*

 Disposition: Robyn Parker and Annette Holba will attend educator prep’s retreat on May 18th. They will coordinate with GoReact CEO Glen Thaxton, who will skype in.

1. New Business
	1. Proposal to add Google Hangouts (web conferencing) to the available Google tools. (Scott Robison)

 Background: *Faculty are asking about the availability of Google Hangouts. They’d like to have it as a tool available through their PSU account. It’s unclear why this feature is not part of our Google Education package.*

 Disposition: Rolled over to the agenda for the May 12th, 2015 meeting.

1. Announcements: none