

ATOEC

Tuesday, October 11, 2016
3:30-5:00 pm, HUB119
Minutes

1) Approve minutes: Minutes accepted

- a. Present today: Robyn Parker, Robin DeRosa, Christin Wixson, Liesl Lindley, Zhizhang Shen. Mary Beth Ray. Lynn Johnson, Kathy Patenaude, Rich Grossman
- b. Robin DeRosa will post previous minutes
- c. Mary Beth Ray taking meeting minutes

2) LJ welcomes everyone

3) Old Business:

a. **Open Lab “roll out” report:**

- i. Table because Joanne G. is out of town

b. **Update: Math Smartboard move request:**

- i. LJ: Screen can be moved for Math Dept. No need for us to be involved; ZS: department is all set, also
- ii. One proposal in for next meeting

4) New Business:

a. **Summer Institute Report:**

- i. Table because Joanne G. is out of town

b. **Possible sub-group charges:**

- i. **Committee Composition (Lynn):** Lourdes has task force; looking for each committee to come forward with recommendations for committee makeup; Do we want students? What is realistic for this considering the small number of students on student senate? TIP proposal coming from student technology fees > make sense for student involvement here. LJ: Will bring back information for next meeting to talk more of this

- ii. **Online Learning Policy Review (Josh, Joanne, Liesl, Kathy):**

Originally approved Oct 2010; In 2012 at Oct meeting there was talk of need to revise; Some faculty unaware of the existence of policy; Need to take course to teach online, Josh P. is overseeing now

LJ: We need to take time to look at this to make sure that the online learning course process is still in line;

RG: read through recently and agrees that it is dated and needs refreshing; Josh and Joanne could look to update, how can it meet current needs beyond just the LMS and incorporate connected learning LL volunteers to also join and look at the update: Concern is that flexibility needs to be built into the policy since tech changes so quickly;

RD: distance ed and online ed are dated terms, so we need to change the way we talk about online learning

KP: have we ever looked at quality matters and national standards about courses should be set up?

RD: Recognizes different opinions about quality matters and national standards

RP: Think about quality across the curriculum, not merely in online space

LL: do we have a specific reasoning to do this now that all our courses are so integrated?

LJ: some things seem unique to online learning and distance learning

RD: If we are moving to connected learning as noted > how can we think about those type of policies and incorporate them?

LJ: When can we expect this revision? Group will provide an update at the next meeting.

RP: Course observation for online versus face to face, is available on academic affairs website; under policies link

ZS: Appendix b, student evaluation piece?

RP: Melinda Barnsley should be able to provide that

c. **TIP proposal update:** The one proposal we received after the deadline we will review in Nov.

d. **ATOEC as PP making committee:**

i. LJ: Hesitant to disband as a PP committee; conversations surrounded connected learning, especially connected to clusters

RP: Two years chaired this committee and spent a lot of time discussing this; the one piece of that is the chair needs to sit on the steering committee; does that makes sense considering the role of the committee?

RD: In the past folks felt confused about the mission, but last year made some good steps about participating together the tag funds and prioritizing larger scale initiatives; Believe that tech planning and decision making would be best done by a coalition of involved stake holders; we do craft the new tech policy and participate and tech planning and do open labs; how can we do that? Is the new structure wanting that type of coalitional decision making

RG: Looking for a group to provide aggregated type of decision making RD is talking about; We need to know we are making appropriate tech choices for the university; That function of the group has to remain

ZS: Don't see an immediate need for policy making but important to leave that possibility open; What is the process for changing to a PPC or out of being a PPC?

RG: What are the requirements for being a PPC? Is there a make up, meeting frequency, etc?

RP: Policy making versus advocating for something?

RG: Last year we created two policy documents (drafted phishing policy...)

RD: Clarification? We don't make the policy we make recommendations

and take the policy to who can implement it;

LJ: Our motions go straight to the faculty as a PPC

LJ: Hold this conversation and move forward to the next point...

e. ATOEC role as Advocate for Academic Technology:

i. LJ: Connections across campus, Gen Ed, etc. Do we have a role to advocate for tech across the campus

ZS: Every department has their own TECO

RG: Tech is only going to be more and more integrated; if we don't have some sort of group doing coordination from a support standpoint that may be challenging; I think that's absolutely a role here

LL: CETL's role in this; How do we pick that up?

RD: Where are we specifically implementing connected learning in the university, how do we get there?

RG: Shared mission

ZS: We don't want to duplicate resources

LJ: Our connection to the Center for Transformation?

RP/RG: that would be beneficial/ Josh on so many other groups right now

RP: Policy feels static, is this more advisory?

RD: Two parts, what is our tech ideology/tech mission, what policies help us do that/accompany that?

RG: Examples, policy about resources sharing; policy around what tools we use for certain types of tasks; calendar, sharing documents, online communications, etc. Here are the standards, and wrap training around that; Addressing tools outside the LMS; Putting resources towards what we think are the best;

ZS: How does this compare to what we've done in the past; in terms of the impact of the committee as a whole?

LJ: Connect to earlier point ... reason to stay as a PPC...

RD: Power to affect change

RG: Policies can have flexibility to address types of needs the community has to accommodate folks who want to go in another direction;

CW: Three different policies heard today; that being so it would be very hard to support this group not being a PPC;

LJ: Talking of the responsibility of going to the steering committee; notes two PPC do not go to steering committee;

RD: Is everyone on board with being a PPC? Policies need to support the vision; How do we build policies to support the vision?

RP: What is the reach of our policy? How can we work to be the most effective? 365 change? This group could be a powerful advocate for how to use those tools.

LJ: Been reviewing the minutes to figure out past policies, where they are, what still exist and how can we refresh/update

LJ: Does anyone believe we shouldn't be a PPC? No.

f. Meeting adjourned at 4:37pm

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 8, 2016