School of Education Technology Committee
Meeting Minutes; Tuesday, November 13, 2012

Location: Guyton 211
Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2012; 2:30 pm
Committee Chair: Dr. John Holleman

Committee members in attendance:
- Mr. Andrew Abernathy
- Dr. Allan Bellman
- Dr. Qiang Cheng
- Dr. Katherine Hermann
- Dr. John Holleman
- Ms. Carol Hopkins
- Mr. Clay Pounds
- Ms. Smitty Horne Wood

Welcome
2:30 pm: Welcome (J. Holleman)
- General discussion of establishment of new committee.
- Current members discussed previous technology committee.
- Draft of bylaws submitted for consideration.

Open Discussion
Discussion of Goals, Objectives, and Overall Mission of Committee:
- Opened discussion with recommendation by J. Holleman that meeting should produce consensus on committee mission statement and goal(s).

Suggested mission statement for committee to consider:
*The Technology Committee implements, evaluates and improves the use of technology in the School of Education. The committee plans faculty, staff and student development programs related to technology, meets with product vendors, reviews software licensing agreements, as well as develops policy and implements plans for the use of instructional technology in lab spaces and classrooms.*

Committee members were urged to consider the acceptability of the suggested mission statement. Will determine acceptability by vote.

General discussion initiated by J. Holleman: Suggested one purpose of committee: To offer assistance to Mr. Pounds and Dean Rock with respect to technology standards and vendors (to participate in vendor presentations). Committee members discussed participation in vendor presentations to provide resources for faculty and students; finding ways to streamline the many resources to make it accessible and understandable to faculty, staff and students.

Discussion of Google Apps for Education:
Discussion by J. Holleman: The committee should consider using Google apps because the university already uses many features of the Google for education platform, Google syncs with the varied OS platforms.
- Mr. Pounds suggested the need to be focused on Google drive, Google docs and all Google for education apps.
• Questions about Google for education: Is there a different log-in you need for educational purposes: response: use go.oolemss.edu to access Google for education domain (UM administrators may enable or disable features that normal Google account holders cannot access), may connect current MS Exchange server account to UM Google account.

• Discussed features of UM Gmail and Google education accounts and benefits of using Google through UM; explored Google Apps at UM website through online demo.

• Mr. Pounds mentioned “Open Classroom”: in testing phase; has capability to tie into Google Apps for education and do some classroom management functions. Looks promising.

• J. Holleman suggested need for clarity on synchronous collaborative online platform. (i.e., reports of the phasing out of the WIMBA tool via Ole Miss Online). There exists need for synchronous collaborative tool to be used in online classes. Potential solutions may be Blackboard Collaborate, WebEx or Google+ Hangouts; using the Hangouts (presumably free) may be logical path.
  o Example: At one point, Teacher Education was looking at how to make electronic portfolios. Used Google apps.
  o Google sites: Examined special education program (sample portfolio) on SOE website.
  o Higher Ed program has previously considered options for online portfolios; Google apps may be useful path for e-portfolios.

Discussion of Student Technology Outcomes and Resources for Programs

• Dr. Hermann and Ms. Wood voiced concern about the gap between knowing what potential solutions exist and knowing the needs of the faculty/staff; i.e., many are unaware of what is available and the simplicity of use involved.

• J. Holleman stated the committee should place importance of being in contact with program coordinators and departmental chairs to keep in touch with respect to the needs of the respective programs and desired student technology outcomes regarding establishing technology competencies. J. Holleman stated that it will be necessary to consider desired student outcomes with respect to subsequently establishing technology requirements for undergraduate and graduate students.

Discussion of General SOE Technology Activity

• Mr. Abernathy commented on websites for different SOE programs/centers: differences exist and some are poorly done.
  o J. Holleman and Mr. Pounds confirmed Dean Rock wants centralization of website design and update through Clay Pounds. Mr. Pounds only makes changes to program sites he manages if request come from departmental chairs or Dean’s office.
    ▪ Mr. Pounds shared that several SOE centers contract with external website design yet others have internal personnel whom manage the sites.
    ▪ Issue raised by Mr. Abernathy: should this committee examine and confirm that SOE center websites are consistently updated?
- Dr. Hermann asked if committee could provide a standard format to the sites that are using separate website administrators.
- J. Holleman asked: Should tech committee be in a ‘policing’ role? It was suggested that policing may go beyond scope of committee in terms of resources/time.
- J. Holleman suggested being mindful of technology standards and requirements that could support SOE students (undergraduate & graduate).
- Questions raised by Dr. Hermann: As a committee, what do we need to do with respect to providing resources students and faculty? How do we help them learn to use technology to advance their studies? Should part of purpose be to bridge gaps between students and faculty and technology use?
- J. Holleman and Mr. Pounds resumed general discussion about Google apps: free software, accessible on multiple operating systems, ease of use, etc.
- Potential Objective of SOE Technology Committee: To support SOE technology initiatives and needs, advocate for technology, gather needs from faculty (i.e., how to assist incorporation of technology into classes), recommend technology options, bring awareness to resources already available (Google apps).

**Determination:** J. Holleman will examine the resources and workshops available through UM central IT, and Google for education opportunities.

- Committee should seek to advocate for the Google for education and associated apps.
  - Mr. Pounds added: Used in proper combination, Google for education can be a powerful alternative for Blackboard.

**Discussion Regarding the Committee Mission**

**Suggested mission statement for Committee:**

*The Technology Committee implements, evaluates and improves the use of technology in the School of Education. The committee plans faculty, staff and student development programs related to technology, meets with product vendors, reviews software licensing agreements, as well as develops policy and implements plans for the use of instructional technology in lab spaces and classrooms.*

- Motion to accept above stated suggested mission statement passed.
- Motion to accept draft of committee bylaws passed.

**Closing Remarks**

- Last remarks: Mr. Pounds is working on application where SOE committees can upload minutes; chair or any committee member could have access (will be tied into committee website).
- Question raised by Dr. Hermann: Will it be possible to have link connected to technology committee’s webpage that provides a resource list for technology? Mr. Pounds will work on this and put a link under the SOE faculty/staff resource link.
- Committee members advised to send additions to meeting notes to J. Holleman.
- Discussed plans to establish subsequent meeting in early February 2013.

**Meeting adjourned: 3:45 pm**