

**Academic Services Committee
Monthly Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2013**

Committee Members Present: Sonit Bafna, Susan Wells Parham, Denise Johnson Marshall, Kristen Butler, Michelle Powell (Executive Board Liason), Carrie Shepler

Not present: Peter Hesketh, Amy D'Unger, Helena Mitchell, Arjun Meka

Sonit Bafna called the meeting to order at 12:08pm. New members who were present (Kristen and Michelle) were welcomed and introductions were made.

The *September meeting minutes* were presented. Denise Johnson Marshall motioned to approve them, and Susan Wells Parham seconded. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

Sonit Bafna reported on the campus IT master plan after meeting with Robert Gerhart (RG):

- RG stated that the goal was to centralize and co-ordinate IT investments over the entire campus (previously very segmented)
- RG's committee is associated with the Strategic Technology Investment Committee (STIC), which is housed under the Enterprise Product Management (EPM) organization. More information can be found at : **<http://epmo.gatech.edu/stic/>**
- RG's committee is currently reviewing items listed in the handout prepared by Sonit and Carrie (see end of meeting minutes). In summary:
 - Communication and IT support for research collaborations and teaching
 - Developments in teaching and classroom technology (RG seemed very enthusiastic about this item)
 - , Questions about needs for computer labs and clusters (future of?), and developments like “classrooms-without-walls” distributed learning
 - Resources for communications and information exchange at a personal level:
 - Many people at Tech have 2 profiles (Tech and social)—can they be merged/connected?
 - Additional, non-academic services
 - Accessibility issues
- Schedule
 - The committee still was doing community outreach (until the end of October)
 - Their goal is to draft a 40 page document by end of November when they will be looking for formal feedback

- RG will attend the November ASC meeting
- Their goal is to complete a full draft document by December/January

The discussion turned to issues in which the ASC committee would potentially be interested. Discussion points included:

- The relationship between Tech as consumers and Tech faculty as producers *and authors*—can in-house production of technology be leveraged in future investments?
 - Susan Wells Parham and Michelle Powell have already worked in this area. Susan prepared and submitted a STIC proposal to improve repository infrastructure for the management of research data, which will allow GT researchers to conform with federal agencies regulations regarding public access to research outcomes.
 - *Committee action item:* Raise the issue again to push prioritization and enhance value.
- Classroom technology
- Michelle Powell is concerned about RG's committee's lack of focus on specific IT needs of research faculty and research activities (as opposed to those of teaching activities)
 - *Sonit requested that Michelle and Susan make a list of concerns and issues to present to RG at the November meeting.*
- Michelle Powell suggested that the committee report systems that are lacking to the IT for Research Support (ITRS) committee which is geared toward research agenda (Michelle, Susan Wells Parham, and the former executive board liaison to the ASC, Raj Vachatu, are all active with this committee).
 - The Technology Experts Council, chaired by Ron Hutchins, vets things from ITRS and reports to STIC.
 - Items to mention:
 - Denise Johnson Marshall stated that the IRB system is not universally accessible, and that it may create legal issues
 - Denise also pointed out that it is easy to deal with new systems, but dealing with countless old ones is more problematic, thus there is need for systematic review of all systems.
 - Michelle Powell indicated that in addition, the problems should be addressed at the policy level—currently, they come to light only at the user end and often at a point where it is too late to address them
 - Denise stated that OIT had a policy (that they admittedly stopped enforcing) and the Board of Regents also had a system at one time.
 - CATEA involvement should be formalized and funded.
 - Denise is part of subcommittee on programs/services of the President's committee on accessibility chaired by Jeanne Singleton and will report back to ASC from her subcommittee;

The next agenda item discussion of accessibility issues for the Open Access Implementation committee. Discussion points included:

- There is a gap between policy and implementation
 - Some portions of the policy are unclear
- All new systems should be compliant (related to the master plan discussion above)
- The validation process for technology should be formalized
- Transparency is needed in implementation
- If done correctly, this is a good opportunity to reduce administrative burden on faculty
- *What is the committee role in this?* Do we just make recommendations or do more?
- *Action item:* We will devote part of the December meeting to making a list of accessibility issues on which to work

The next agenda item was the Standing Committee Survey. Those ASC members who have been chairs in the past, (Helena Mitchell and Amy D'Unger) have be requested to fill out individual surveys. It was decided that Sonit will compile one response for the committee that he will distribute for revisions and comments.

In relation to the standing committee survey, the group discussed the role of the Academic Services Committee. Discussion points included:

- The historic role of the committee has been collection and presentation of data.
- Because we are not a totally representative committee (for example, not all colleges are represented), any of the work associated with any formal recommendations we make falls on the committee members.
- The general feeling is that the principal role of the committee should remain as providing oversight and advice.

The final agenda item was other business, and Susan Wells Parham discussed the "Reimagining the library" project as she thinks it is a good project for the committee. We will discuss further at the December meeting.

Sonit Bafna adjourned the meeting at 1:00pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by,



Carrie Shepler
Secretary, Academic Services Committee

Georgia Tech Academic Services Committee
Notes on the Campus IT Master Plan; Meeting with Robert Gerhart on Oct 3, 2013.

Goal is to create IT master-plan for Georgia Tech, to manage and co-ordinate GA Tech future investments in IT. Plan co-ordinated by STIC, the campus Strategic Technology Investment Committee, under the Office of Enterprise Project Management [need to verify]

Areas of interest currently identified

1. Communication and IT support for research collaborations and teaching:
 - What IT systems will be needed to support teaching and research communication and collaboration (for instance, to replace t-square)
2. Developments in teaching and classroom technology:
 - What new classroom technologies might be required or desirable?
 - What kind of IT support would enable classrooms based on BYOD (bring your own device) technologies, if that is desired
 - Enabling “untethered instruction” or “wall-down” approach to instructional technology (the instruction is not tied to the classroom, but is possible outside it, due to supporting IT technology that allows information and visual resources to be accessed anywhere) / enabling remote access to resources
 - Resources or technology for addressing accessibility issues, particularly for people with disabilities
 - Will computer clusters and labs be still needed as existing, or will they take other forms?
3. Resources for communications and information exchange at a personal level:
 - Many people at Tech have 2 profiles (Tech and social)—can they be merged/connected?
4. Additional, non-academic services:
 - Bring efficiency to core-business procedures
 - Direct attention to functions that add value to business functions of GA Tech
 - Planning for ensuring security and privacy of personal information

Schedule

1. Community outreach till end of October (includes town-halls, focus groups, one-on-one meeting)
2. Then define goals (8 draft goals identified so far); prepare a 40 page draft of the master-plan
3. Meetings with faculty and other interest-groups beginning end of Nov to get feedback from master-plan

Concerns and issues that ASC might care to raise

- Relationship between Tech as consumers and Tech faculty as producers—can in-house production of technology be leveraged in future investments?
- What are the steps taken to assure universality of access to all users?
- Transparency of process / concerns about how decisions are made and transmitted up or down through the organizational hierarchy

Sonit Bafna / Carrie Shepler
presented before ASC, Oct 21, 2013