**Academic Technology and Online Education Committee**

May 12, 2015

3:30 pm in HUB 123

Minutes

In attendance: Scott Robison, Rich Grossman, JoAnn Guilmet, Kathleen Norris, Dan Bramer, Christian Roberson, Meagan Shedd, David Zehr, Robyn Parker (chair)

Excused: Mark Turski, Linda Carrier, Gail Mears, Christian Roberson, Emma Wright

1. Old Business:
	1. April 14, 2015 minutes were delayed. They will be brought to ATOEC for approval at the first meeting in September 2015.
	2. Review of document provided by CFO Steve Taksar on the renovations of Hyde Hall and implications for classroom technology packages (Tier 1, 2, 3). This is in support of developing mechanisms to facilitate communication and decision-making regarding academic technologies begun at last meeting (Robyn Parker)

 Background*:* *Coming out of last meeting, the committee decided to examine the present levels of faculty input about technology decisions using a test case, this summer’s renovations of Hyde Hall, which will include a tier-3 classroom. CFO, Steve Taksar provided a description of that process (included at the end), for our consideration and response. We had hoped to collect perceptual data for the experience, but timing didn’t work out. We’ll review and explore next steps.*

 Disposition: Discussion of the steps in developing a protocol yielded a set of questions to be answered in a systematic order, although most are iterative.

 Step zero: Develop conceptual thinking around a process/policy/standard. Where are the hooks to get input on technology? At what point do things start to hook in?

 Step one: Presuming everything will follow a standard, how does the standard evolve/adapt?

 Step two: Establish a working group, which seems the logical place where the hook (see above) starts and continues through step three: design and development.

 Step three: Use information bridge to bring projects/issues/concerns back to ATOEC and to take ATOEC to projects/issues/concerns. Should help establish and adapt standards for technologies decisions that impact teaching and learning. CIO can play the role of Information Bridge and bring members from ATOEC to projects. CIO also bridge to physical plant & IT for information on academic areas that may be impacted by known construction projects.

 Additional bridges/functions: ATOEC’s rep to ESCIS can report on technology planning/decisions. ATOEC Chair is on the Faculty Steering Committee—can provide a report to faculty to allow faculty not on ATOEC have a voice in decisions that impact pedagogy. LTOE to share representative needs of the faculty, so practical solutions can be identified and be brought into any technology initiatives.

 Bridge reports made to ATOEC may provide some patterns of how things are happening that may allow for better information flow and greater transformation.

 Step four: Establish culture and mechanism for program, faculty members who are thinking about something they want to do that requires technology and are looking for resources or funding. Chairs and deans can/should use ATOEC when looking at how to run, grow, transform teaching and learning. Committee defined these terms in this way: run— doing what you’ve always done; grow—doing more of what we’ve done; transform—do something different than what were doing.

 Next steps: Revisit this initiative at the first meeting of the next AY.

* 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 prior to the April meeting. The idea was to compile it in order to explore and prepare a position statement about the need to be proactive in generating assessment data. Input should have taken the form of ideas about the need and, if available, data to support it.* (Gail Mears)

 Disposition: Gail could not attend, so committee reviewed the notes on the purpose of a system to explore the need further. A system was recommended by NEASC evaluators during their last visit to help in managing data that allows us to assess the effectiveness of our academic programs. NEASC stressed the need for academic assessment data. Presently we use a program called TrakDat that no one likes it. PSU put out an RFP and vendors showed demos of data management systems; everyone liked two. Task stream or TK-20. Funding, however, was a problem—ESCIS thought either were great tools, but didn’t know how to deal with cost.

 Once again, ATOEC committee members asked why this issue didn’t come through them, although they were pleased that Dean Mears had brought it to their attention now. A data management system for assessment data will influence pedagogy. We attend to what we measure, which impacts what we do.

 While no decisions were made related to the tool, one was made that the ATOEC needs to educate others that academic technology decisions should come through committee for input/faculty voice. This is a principal policy making committee. A recommendation was made that the committee communicate with faculty and others about what we do and how we can help and how it’s relevant to faculty.

 This discussion brought us full circle to where we started last fall, defining ATOEC’s charge. This meeting seem to set an agenda to develop the means by which to carry it out.

* 1. Update the committee on the plan for the GoReact pilot involving Educator Prep Instructors

 Background: *Members agreed that Annette Holba and Robyn Parker would meet with Educator Prep Instructors at their retreat on May 18th. Plans have changed slightly. This is just an update.*

 Glen Thaxton and Annette Holba will coordinate with Megan Birch and interested members of Educator Prep to recruit for the GoReact pilot. They will share back experience with ATOEC to determine whether further recommendations for investment are appropriate.

 (Update on project from over the summer. Meghan Birch, Chair of Educator Prep and a couple of others explored the GoReact tool. They decided it wasn’t rich enough for their purposes. Therefore, ATOEC decided this is a tool individual faculty may want to use, using individual student licensing, which was affordable. But, it didn’t appear to generalize well enough to warrant continuing it as an ATOEC project. Individual faculty can decide to use the tool as software for service; students buy licenses the way they might purchase an e-book. Academic freedom prevails.)

* 1. Consider proposal to add Google Hangouts (web conferencing) to the available Google tools; this rolled over from the previous month’s agenda. (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.*

 Diposition: Rich Grossman explained why Google Hangouts is not an option right now. Some portions of Google for Education are available ala carte. Other portions have “dependencies”. That is, if you use it, you must do something else. Google Hangouts requires using gmail and google calendar instead of Zimbra. PSU is looking at that, but it hasn’t yet decided.

 Some alternatives are a text based (not video) system. There’s also the option of the Connect NH video system: one virtual room is available. Must reserve it. There are other free web-conferencing tools. Mozilla; Hello (icon; smiley face). These can be good replacement for office hours and are like google hangouts, but are not good for presentations. There is no screen share. It’s a chat tool. In web conferencing the video quality is important.

 One driver of this question was that support for Big Blue Button, a web conferencing tool, was thought to be ending. However, it will be continued.

1. New Business:
2. Election of a Chair for ATOEC for AY 15-16

Disposition: We did not have enough returning members at the meeting to nominate and elect a chair. Therefore, Meagan Shedd agreed to put out a call for nominations by email and to call the first meeting of the new AY at which a new chair could be elected.

1. Announcements : none

*Scroll down for attachment.*

**Plymouth State University**

**Division of Finance and Administration**

**Summary of Construction/Renovation Process for Bid-Design Projects**

**Prepared by: S. Taksar**

**DRAFT - May 8, 2015**

**Overview**

The following summary outlines the general process used to ensure appropriate campus input and feedback is integrated into construction projects on campus. The goal is to seek broad input to define current and future needs to ensure that the structure or facility is meeting its intended purpose.

The assumption is that the project has been approved and the budget determined before these steps are followed.

**Key Steps**

1. Broad project scope is defined which identifies purpose, needs, and general goals of the project. This is called the **conceptual design phase** and forms the foundation of the design process. Technology is not specifically identified but rather generally assumed to meet university standards at this early stage without much definition.
2. Project steering committee (e.g., Physical Plant, ITS, Provost, Deans, Academic Representation, VPFA, etc.) is assembled which is the working group to review issues, priorities, and begin to clearly define the project beyond the conceptual stage. This is the group that would work through all the planning issues to ensure the project is meeting its intended goals and within budgeted resources. The typical outcome of this step is developing a **Program Statement**, which is a detailed summary of how all space will be used, who will occupy the space, timeline, technology needs, HVAC needs, etc. It allows the architects to develop a more refined project plan and cost estimates. Meetings typically occur with all stakeholders including: building occupants, Physical Plant, ITS staff, and appropriate campus leadership to ensure broadest range of input upfront. It is not uncommon to have multiple meetings with building occupants and department representatives who may not necessarily be on the steering committee but their input is critical.
3. Project steering committee and design consultants then begin reviewing plans, assumptions and budget to determine if scope can be met. Verification of assumptions, scope reductions and many adjustments occur in this phase as the team is trying to fit all their needs into the project. This is typically called the **design development phase** where many details are flushed out based on early assumptions. Do we have enough space? What are IT needs? What are alternative design strategies if cost estimates are too high? What reductions are necessary to move the project forward? What is missing that we didn’t include? The outcome of this step is a final set of design documents with all assumptions, specifications, and design details worked out. Changes after this point are discouraged as it results in revising documents and higher costs.
4. Production of final construction documents begins after final design has been reviewed and approved by campus leadership. These are the documents which are used to seek bids for real costs compared to estimated costs.
5. Once the project is bid and awarded, ongoing regular construction meetings begin once the project starts to meet with contractor and monitor progress. These meetings occur for the duration of the project until completed. Variations from the design are discouraged and only allowed if a critical issue was overlooked or the design assumption was inaccurate based on new field conditions on site.