OSU Student University Technology
Services Fee Committee

April 16, 2013
Room 402 Classroom Building
Meeting Minutes

Present: Joel Billings, Mary Bryans, Sonia Crochik, Nik Dalal, Steven DeLoose, Brecca Farr, Emily Gardner, Andrew Gipson, Trevor Greer, Darlene Hightower, Joyce Hise, Angel Kymes, Kaitlin Lloyd, Robin Leech, Nicholas Materer, Maria Moccia-Wolff, Matt Rogers, Keith Teague, Denise Weaver

Absent: Andrew Dunn, Marc Krein, Mason Toole, Don Turton

The meeting of the OSU Student University Technology Services Fee Committee was called to order by the chair, Trevor Greer, at 3:01 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda. **A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote**.

2. Approval of Minutes. The 4/4/13 minutes were included in the handouts for the meeting. **It was moved to approve the 4/4/13 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

3. Project 14-001   Emergency Messaging – Darlene Hightower indicated that she was withdrawing this project request because the funding was being provided by 911 rates, which is billed through the telecom rates.

4. Project 14-002   Read & Write Gold SMA Cost – Darlene Hightower reported that more information was available regarding the licensing for this product. All OSU campuses will contribute. The tech fee will only pay for the student portion of the OSU-Stw cost, which is $1939.73. This is for ongoing maintenance, and it will be placed on the maintenance software spreadsheet for ongoing funding. **A motion was made to approve Project 14-002 for the revised amount of $1939.73. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

    Project 14-015   General University Classroom Upgrade & Maintenance – Chris Ormsbee from ITLE provided additional information regarding the Smart Board portion of this project. Last year the UTSF Committee provided funding for 10 Smart Boards. Nine of those have been installed; one of those rooms is in renovation and the Smart Board will be installed when that renovation is completed. On the handout, the ten rooms are identified. With those ten rooms, the implementation impacted 89 instructors, 95 courses and 193 sections. The process they followed was, over the summer, they met

with all the associate deans in the colleges to determine locations. The boards were then ordered and in August, work order requests were put in for Physical Plant to do the electrical work. Since the rooms are heavily used, the accessibility to install the Smart Boards was limited during the fall semester. The boards were installed in December. They also started offering training for instructors. Two face-to-face workshops and one-on-one support were offered, and a Smart Board club was formed. Now they would like to expand the Smart Board growth. The goal now is to continue with the training. Online resources will be developed, such as a webpage with tutorials, resources, and information. If the funding is approved for FY14 for fifteen more, they would get started right away and install the boards this summer and be ready to go in the fall. Chris mentioned that as she was going around, she noticed that one of the challenges is the room design. Sometimes the rooms meet the parameters (100 or less students), but are not designed to have a Smart Board permanently installed. In some cases, the Smart Boards will be placed on a stand, or they will install a symposium instead. A sweep of the rooms will be conducted so that the design of the room is taken into consideration. Comment was made that there has been at least one incidence of conflicting technology with the Smart Board and existing software in the room. Dr. Ormsbee commented that they would look at all the rooms and ensure that there is a clear toggling system so that a system can be turned off when not in use. During the upcoming campus classroom tour, special effort will be made to observe where the Smart Boards are placed to ensure they are placed in the best location. Regarding faculty response to the Smart Boards, Dr. Ormsbee commented that approximately 25 – 30 people come to the training offered. There are also other sources for Smart Board training, which instructors may have utilized.

Discussion was held on Project 14-015. Since there are two parts to the project request, it was proposed that they be voted on separately. **A motion was made to split the project into two requests. The motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.**

Motion was then made to approve the portion of Project 14-015 for the replacement and upgrade of aging multimedia equipment in the amount of $225,000. Motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

Further discussion was held on the Smart Board portion of Project 14-015. The question was asked as to what the committee would like to see in order to approve the amount requested for Smart Boards. Receive input from the instructors demonstrating their experience using the Smart Boards and how much that has affected the students. Suggest the committee meet in a room that has a Smart Board and have an instructor demonstrate the use of a Smart Board. Would like to hear, overall, where we are going in regards to technology in the classrooms. What is the progression-- are more Smart Board purchases anticipated in the future? If we fund this, should we look at directed installations where we are sure they will be used? Possibly look at the subject matter areas where there is more potential use of a Smart Board. It was noted that additional feedback will be needed if further purchases are expected.

A motion was made to approve the second portion of Project 14-015 for Smart multimedia interactive devices in the amount of $94,500. Motion was seconded and approved by a show of hands. Yes 8   No 7

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and approved by a voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Joyce Hise

Minutes approved by the UTSF Committee on 11/20/13.