

**College of Education
Instructional Technology Plan**

March 21, 2008

College of Education Conceptual Framework

The College of Education prepares exemplary, reflective professionals to serve a diverse global community; it achieves that end through teaching, scholarship, outreach and partnership at local, national and international levels.

College of Education Strategic Technology Plan

The College of Education collaboratively developed a five year strategic technology plan. The planning process was shared and documented through the committee's web site <http://www.coe.uga.edu/techplan>.

COE Strategic Technology Goal

The College of Education will use technology to drive innovation through research, instruction, and service.

Instructional Objectives

- Increase programmatic technology and curriculum integration to prepare graduates for the 21st century
- Increase the access to and support of exemplary practice
- Increase the technology infrastructure to support off-campus programs
- Increase the college's ability to assess the technology skills of graduates
- Increase opportunities for information concerning legal and ethical considerations

Rationale

The College of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). "NCATE's standards expect accredited schools of education to provide adequate access to computers and other technologies, and expect faculty and candidates to be able to use technology effectively as a teaching tool." (<http://www.ncate.org/pubs/diff.pdf>)

The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) has developed the next generation of NETS standards that focus on skills and expertise necessary for students, teachers, and administrators to excel in our technology rich world. These standards cover six competency areas:

- Creativity and Innovation
- Communication and Collaboration
- Research and Information Fluency

- Critical thinking, Problem Solving, and Decision Making
- Digital Citizenship
- Technology Operations and Concepts

Colleges of education must provide the opportunity for pre-service and practicing teachers and administrators to learn these skills in a technologically rich environment so that students exceed in their technology competencies. (<http://www.iste.org>)

Process

In the fall, 2001, the COE Technology Advisory Council consisting of faculty, undergraduate, and graduate students developed strategies for instructional technology that would support the college mission and vision. The council recommended a tiered system for spending Student Technology Fees. The tiers represented strategies for:

- Allocating dollars to provide maximum impact to students
- Identification of technology for classrooms, labs, centralized check-out, infrastructure, departmental needs, and innovation
- Structure to distribute technology equitably at Aderhold, Ramsey and River's Crossing
 - Tier 1 - Basic Technology Infrastructure to support student needs (sufficient hardware for students to have timely and high speed connections to the Internet, items like classroom hubs, drops and switches)
 - Tier 2 - Computer Laboratories (instructional/open laboratories for student use) and classroom needs (equipment/technology needed to support student instruction and student presentations)
 - Tier 3 - Centralized/Common Use Equipment for student checkout (portable computers, digital cameras, etc.)
 - Tier 4 - Departmental Needs, Innovation, and Experimentation (Special Projects Requests)

This structure is the foundation for an instructional technology plan with a focus on lab technology, software compliance, classroom technology, centralized equipment technology, infrastructure, and innovation to improve student access and use of technology.

Instructional Technology Planning Events

Fall of 2002, OIT leadership developed a planning process for yearly Student Technology Fee Reports and special project requests. Each year, OIT staff inventory lab, classroom, and Media Services technology. Software licenses are reviewed and identified for upgrades when appropriate. Departmental requests for software are identified and added to lab configurations where appropriate. Strategies for hardware replacement are reviewed and adopted. Departmental requests

for consideration are collected each year in January for consideration as special projects.

On March 18, 2008 the Technology Advisory Council approved the FY 09 recommendations for the three-year plan and prioritized special project/program requests. The recommended COE Instructional Technology plan was presented to and approved by the Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Andy Horne. The COE Student Technology Fee Request was delivered to Dr. Barbara White, CIO and Associate Provost on March 21, 2008.

The estimate for implementing the 2008-2009 Tier 1-3 COE Instructional Technology Plan is \$407,175. Past experience with economy of scale in purchasing computers, peripherals, and software indicate that COE will be able to implement this plan with the allocated 2008-2009 funds of \$372,362. Tier 4 initiatives were submitted as Student Technology Fee Special Project/Program Requests.

COE is committed to sharing with students how the student technology fee is used. Stickers will be placed on equipment. Signs will be included in the entrance of labs and Media Services indicating what was purchased with tech fee dollars. Additionally, information will be published on the COE web site and included in the OIT newsletter.

COE Technology Plan 2008-2011

Nature of Initiative: Tier 1 – Basic Technology Infrastructure.

Location and Departmental Affiliation: COE

Infrastructure improvements will be located at River’s Crossing, Ramsey, and Aderhold. Replacement and backup equipment for the wireless network and for the instructional servers will be purchased as needed.

Number of students: 9 departments, 5,232 (2007 Fact Book)

Estimated Cost from Student Technology Fee:

Description	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Wireless Technology	\$0,000.00	\$21,000.00	\$21,000.00
Instructional Servers	\$5,000.00	\$500.00	\$5,500.00
Network/Security Upgrades	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$56,000.00
Tier 1 Total Estimate	\$55,000.00	\$121,500.00	\$82,500.00

Benefiting courses or activities: Adequate infrastructure is required to allow timely access to resources for students in classrooms, laboratories, and graduate student offices. Additionally, more of our students are using wireless laptops and other wireless devices to connect to resources.

Nature of Initiative: Tier 2 – Computer Laboratories (Instructional/Open Laboratories for Student Use).

Location and Departmental Affiliation: COE

Aderhold Computer Laboratories: 227, 228, 233, 616, 618

Ramsey Computer Laboratories: 214

River’s Crossing Laboratories: 135, 143, 156

Number of students: 9 departments, 5,232 (2007 Fact Book)

Estimated Cost from Student Technology Fee:

Description	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Computers for Labs	\$86,600.00	\$91,000.00	\$65,400.00
Projectors	\$0.00	\$25,200.00	\$0.00
Software	\$34,485.00	\$55,760.00	\$32,360.00
Printers & Scanners	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$2,700.00
Total Estimate	\$121,085.00	\$176,960.00	\$100,460.00

Benefiting courses or activities: The COE developed a systematic plan for rotating new hardware and software into our laboratories every three years. The three year old equipment and software, when relevant, is moved into other areas such as graduate student mini labs, graduate teaching assistant work areas, and other student work areas. This plan has created the opportunity to provide access for our students as they use technology for project development, communication, access to instructional resources, and collaboration. The labs provide the most cost effective way to provide these resources to the largest number of students.

The labs also provide a way for the college to create an instructional environment for our students to learn and practice integrating technology into instructional practice. Our graduates will be responsible for creating classroom activities where students learn academic knowledge and technical skills. This strategy also supports NCATE standards with a focus on technology and technology competency for teachers as identified by ISTE.

Nature of Initiative: Tier 2 – Classroom Technology.

Location and Departmental Affiliation: COE

Aderhold Classrooms: G5, 102, 112, 114/115, 116/117, 119, 213, 215, 220, 306, 317, 319, 401, 409, 411, 412, 417, 418, 430/432, 520, 531, 581, 601, 607, 625, 626, 627 631-IP Video

Ramsey Classrooms: 114, 202, 203/204, 205/206, 213, 224, 225

River’s Crossing Classrooms: G-62, G-63-IP Video, G-64, 113, 129, 135, 139

Number of students: 9 departments, 5,232 (2007 Fact Book)

Estimated Cost from Student Technology Fee:

Description	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Ramsey Classroom Technology Standard Including LCD Projector, Control Panel, Television, VCR, OHP, Screen, and Computer – Three Year Replacement	\$0.00	\$16,800.00	\$7,700.00
Aderhold Classroom Technology Standard Including LCD Projector, Control Panel, Television, VCR, OHP, Screen, and Computer – Three Year Replacement	\$133,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$26,400.00
River’s Crossing Classroom Technology Standard Including LCD Projector, Control Panel, Television, VCR, OHP, Screen, and Computer – Three Year Replacement	\$0.00	\$19,600.00	\$7,700.00
Total Estimate	\$133,000.00	\$111,400.00	\$41,800.00

Benefiting courses or activities: The COE developed a standard for classroom technology and a three year replacement plan. Students benefit from access to technology in the classrooms as they share information, collaborate on projects, demonstrate instructional strategies, and learn to integrate technology and curriculum.

A major project for the COE includes the upgrade of 42 classrooms with touch panels that provide the ability to incorporate multiple inputs. Annotation capability will be included in 6 of the classroom upgrades. A standard for these panels will be implemented and provide increased reliability and support of instructional technology. Ramsey and River's Crossing's classroom integration systems have been installed in all classrooms. During the 2008-09 fiscal year the remaining 16 classrooms in Aderhold Hall will be completed, including 112, 116/117, 119, 306, 401, 411, 412, 417, 430/432, 520, 531, 601, 607, 625, 626, and 631.

This strategy also supports NCATE standards with a focus on technology and technology competency for teachers as identified by ISTE.

Nature of Initiative: Tier 2 – Totals

Description	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Computer Laboratory Total	\$121,085.00	\$176,960.00	\$100,460.00
Classroom Technology Total	\$133,000.00	\$111,400.00	\$41,800.00
Tier 2 Total Estimate	\$254,085.00	\$288,360.00	\$142,260.00

Nature of Initiative: Tier 3 – Centralized Media Services/Common Use Equipment (Student Checkout)

Location and Departmental Affiliation: Aderhold Media Services (COE)

Number of students: 9 departments, 5,232 (2007 Fact Book)

Estimated Cost from Student Technology Fee:

Description	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Media Services Checkout Equipment such as Laptops, Camcorders, Storage Devices, Transcribers, Recorders, External Hard Drives, Digital Cameras, Interactive Boards, Projectors	\$73,090.00	\$36,800.00	\$63,298.00
Editing Suite – Digital Video Software Upgrade, Storage Devices	\$25,000.00	\$17,000.00	\$16,000.00
Tier 3 Total Estimate	\$98,090.00	\$53,800.00	\$79,298.00

Benefiting courses or activities: COE provides a centralized checkout of equipment for students. These items, such as laptops, digital cameras, external storage devices, and transcribers, etc., are used by the students for a variety of projects related to instruction. The process maximizes the impact of equipment because it is used when needed and is accessible to the entire COE student population. Technology fees provide the means to purchase and upgrade equipment.

The College of Education's editing suites are used by students to create video and multimedia presentations as part of their classroom participation. Additionally, students build portfolios that capture examples of teaching strategies that can be shared with classmates.

K-12 schools have identified communication skills and technology competencies required of students. Our pre-service and practicing teachers must have the experience creating and using video and multimedia elements in order to lead these efforts in their classrooms.

Special Project or Program Requests

Nature of Initiative: Tier 4 – Departmental Needs, Innovation, and Experimentation

Benefiting courses or activities: Departmental requests provide the means to address specialized needs or improvements that target disciplines, technology enhancements, or flexible delivery of instruction. COE requests for technology have exceeded the funding provided through the student technology fee allotment based on COE enrollment and credit hour production. Departmental and experimentation requests that could be served through classroom technology, labs, and Centralized Media Services/Common Use Equipment were incorporated into Tiers 1-3. Requests that focused on unique needs, benefited the university as a whole, or introduced new means to improve student access were collected and are presented as Student Technology Requests. Additional information on impact is included in project worksheets. The COE Technology Advisory Committee recommends consideration for funding these initiatives through the Student Technology Fee Project Request process.

See addendum for prioritized list of project or programs request and request worksheets.

Evaluation

OIT will evaluate the planning, implementation, and support for instructional technology. The method of evaluation will include:

- Timely and within budget purchasing, installation, and training required for hardware, software, and infrastructure
- Yearly report to COE Technology Advisory Council – published on the OIT web site (<http://www.coe.uga.edu/oit>)
- Evaluation of COE Technology Plan – March, 2009, COE Technology Advisory Council
- Capture data to support access, use and performance regarding technology (NCATE and PSC Reviews)
- Development of Student Technology Fee plan to support COE goals, January 2009

Addendum

2008-2009 Technology Advisory Council

Suneeti Nathani Iyer - Communication Sciences and Special Education

Michael O'Conner - Kinesiology

Linda DeGroff - Language and Literacy Education

Alan Stewart - Counseling and Human Development Services

Sandi Glass - OIT Facilitator (non-voting)

John Hoge - Elementary and Social Studies Education

Norm Thomson - Mathematics and Science Education

Gretchen Thomas - Educational Psychology & Instructional Technology

Barry Robinson - OIT

Roger Hill - Workforce Education, Leadership, and Social Foundations

Kristi Leonard - OIT

Janet Truluck - Lifelong Education, Administration and Policy

Peter Norris - OIT

Student Representatives

Betsy Alpert

Christie Cooper

Craig Shepherd

Michael Tsao

Addendum
2007-2008 Tech Fee Summary

The College of Education's 2007-08 student technology fee base allocation was \$381,724. In addition, all of our College's special projects were funded including: COE Classroom Technology Upgrades (\$40,000), Communication Sciences and Special Education Computer Lab (\$6,000), Mathematics and Science Education Visualization Project (\$7,995), COE Student Response System (\$10,087), and the Mathematics and Science Education Computers for 111 and 113 Aderhold Hall (\$10,292).

Total Allocation: \$456,098.00

Nature of Initiative: Tier 1 – Basic Technology Infrastructure.

Networking Maintenance and Upgrades: \$107,214

- Wireless Routers
- Access Points
- Cabling/Mounting/Etc.
- Lab Server
- Server Backup DLT Tapes
- Ramsey Center Network
- LCM Security
- Wireless Maintenance Program

Nature of Initiative: Tier 2 – Computer Laboratories and Classroom Technology

Classroom Technology: \$159,851

- Classroom Computers (Aderhold, Ramsey, River's Crossing - all classrooms)
- Classroom Technology Upgrades – Touch Pad Systems (102, 213, 215, 319, 409 Aderhold; 202, 203/204, 205/206, 213, 224, 225 Ramsey; G62, G63, G64, 113, 129, 135, 143 River's Crossing)

Computer Labs: \$54,715

- Lab Computers (616 Aderhold (Macs and PCs), 214 Ramsey)

Software: \$39,009

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| • SPSS Annual Fee | • VMWare |
| • SAS Annual Fee | • NVivo |
| • Adobe Creative Suite 3 | • MaxQDA |
| • HLM | • Softrack |
| • Remedy | • Media |
| • Hyperqual | |

Nature of Initiative: Tier 3 – Centralized Media Services/Common Use Equipment (Student Checkout)

Media Services Checkout Equipment: \$16,242

- Checkout Laptops
- Transcription Foot Pedals
- ELMO
- Digital Recorders
- Digital Camcorders
- Microphones
- Carrying Bags
- Batteries
- Digital Still Cameras

Nature of Initiative: Tier 4 – Departmental Requests and Tier 5 – Experimentation to Improve Student Access and Use of Technology

Special Project Funding: \$74,374 (opportunity funding)

- COE Classroom Technology Upgrades (\$40,000)
- Communication Sciences and Special Education Computer Lab (\$6,000)
- Mathematics and Science Education Visualization Project (\$7,995)
- COE Student Response System (\$10,087)
- Mathematics and Science Education Computers for 111 and 113 Aderhold Hall (\$10,292)

Miscellaneous \$4,693

- Bulbs, Cables, Projector Mounts, Batteries, Etc.

**Addendum
College of Education
Prioritized Project List and
Project Worksheets for
Student Technology Fee
Projects/Program Requests**

College of Education
Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009
Project or Program Requests

Project Name	Department	Amount Requested	COE Ranking
Windows to the World Field Production Kit	OIT	\$14,523.60	1
Windows to the World Portable Studio	OIT	\$16,489.35	2
CMSD 7140/CMSD 4000 Technology Upgrade	UGA Speech & Hearing Clinic, Communication Sciences and Disorders (in Communication Sciences and Special Education)	\$1,123.50	3
Upgrade Room 215 Aderhold	Science Education (in Mathematics and Science Education)	\$5,863.25	4
Speech and Hearing Clinic Computer Upgrades	Communication Sciences and Disorders (in Communication Sciences and Special Education)	\$2,000	5
Upgrade Rooms 102, 111 and 112 Aderhold	Mathematics Education (in Mathematics and Science Education)	\$51,091	6
Project Live Text	English Education (in Language and Literacy Education)	\$3,560	7

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Request Worksheet

1. Project or Program Name: Windows to the World Field Production Kit
2. Department, Program, or Unit Name: Office of Information Technology
3. Brief description of request:

The purpose of the Window to the World project is to increase cultural, environmental, and technical literacy through the creation of digital stories produced by students at the College of Education. The audio & video vignettes will capture the experiences of our students through global study programs and in authentic learning environments off campus. Funds from this grant will provide “field kits” to be taken on location as students study abroad or participate in a contextual learning experience away from campus.

The College of Education (COE) prepares teachers for 21st century classrooms. This preparation is based on the Framework for Accomplished Teaching and includes: (a) content and curriculum (b) technology integration (c) knowledge of learners (d) assessment, and (e) diversity. Additionally, the students in a 21st century classroom expect relevant, interactive, and media rich experiences (The CEO Forum, 2001). The Window to the World project provides COE students the opportunity to have hands-on practice with video-based technology while experiencing and sharing the unique and rich stories of cultures and locations from around the world. The outcomes of this project will be video vignettes produced for K-12 schools curricula. All lessons and materials will be associated with Georgia Performance Standards (see: <http://www.georgiastandards.org>).

Vignette topics will be produced in the context of the curriculum of K-12 schools while addressing the importance of cultural awareness in a world no longer separated by distance and connected via instant communication. Content will include elements of global culture that might include dress, language, education, environment, religion, music, art, etc. Another project will provide marine science & teacher education from a whale watching boat on the Stellwagen Bank off the coast of Massachusetts. Students and their Georgia teachers will view and interact with whale and environmental education lessons nearly in real-time. The prepackaged lessons and the supporting two to three minute video vignettes will be shared via the Teacher’s Corner (<http://www.coe.uga.edu/k12>). This web site features technology resources for teacher candidates and K-12 in-service teachers and students. Resources are organized under the broad topics of (a) technology integration (b) information literacy (c) 21st century schools, and (d) emerging technologies.

Training for effective use of the “field kits” will be provided by the Office of Information Technology (OIT) prior to participation in field-based learning environments. These training modules will focus on writing, digital capture, editing, and distribution of short vignettes. Included will be education and training on: (a) digital cameras, (b) audio techniques, (c) audio & digital storytelling, (d) interview techniques, and (e) field editing.

4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served:

The Window to the World project will provide centralized resources available to all COE students (Number of students: 9 departments, 5232 (2007 Fact Book)) and has the potential to open

authentic learning activities to over 1.6 million Georgia K-12 students and 107,000 Georgia public school teachers. All of these students and teachers will have access to these resources and will benefit from the outreach of the university.

5. Total cost: \$14,523.60

6. Detailed Budget – Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Windows to the World Field Kit (Includes: Video Camera, Still Camera, Digital Audio Recorder, Digital Media Player, Microphones, Adapters, Cables, and Carrying Case)	3	\$2,739.25	\$8,217.75
Apple 13inch Mac Book	3	\$2,101.95	\$6,305.85
Total		\$4,841.20	\$14,523.60

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any: None

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain. Yes

9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

The Window to the World project will be a new COE feature that provides student-produced stories. These video-based cultural experiences will be shared with local classrooms via the Internet and the Teacher’s Corner website. The project will provide the opportunity for our students to learn the technology skills identified by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Specific examples include the preparation of school library media specialists and instructional technologists along with classroom teachers fulfilling technology integration course requirements. Additionally, the media produced and distributed by our students will increase cultural awareness for our teacher candidates and the understanding of diversity in K-12 classrooms. Unique learning environments can be shared in classrooms locked in by walls, schedules, and textbooks. The vignettes, produced by teacher candidates for teachers and students, provide the window to the world through the College of Education web site.

Specifically, the College of Education would use the proposed technology to enhance the growing number of programs that rely on learning situated in authentic contexts and to support the technology and curriculum integration skills of COE students. Three examples illustrate how the equipment and training proposed in this application will be used. The first is the increasing number of study abroad opportunities for all students. Second is the Whale Class, which explores innovative instruction in authentic learning contexts. Third, is the integration of video technology as part of the school library media, instructional technology, and technology integration courses.

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Request Worksheet

1. Project or Program Name: Windows to the World Portable Studio
2. Department, Program, or Unit Name: Office of Information Technology
3. Brief description of request:

The purpose of the Window to the World project is to increase cultural, environmental, and technical literacy through the creation of digital stories produced by students at the College of Education. The audio & video vignettes will capture the experiences of our students through global study programs and in authentic learning environments off campus. Funds from this special project will provide a “studio kit” to be taken on location as students study abroad or participate in a contextual learning experience away from campus.

The College of Education (COE) prepares teachers for 21st century classrooms. This preparation is based on the Framework for Accomplished Teaching and includes: (a) content and curriculum (b) technology integration (c) knowledge of learners (d) assessment, and (e) diversity. Additionally, the students in a 21st century classroom expect relevant, interactive, and media rich experiences (The CEO Forum, 2001). The Window to the World project provides COE students the opportunity to have hands-on practice with video-based technology while experiencing and sharing the unique and rich stories of cultures and locations from around the world. The outcomes of this project will be video vignettes produced for K-12 schools curricula. All lessons and materials will be associated with Georgia Performance Standards (see: <http://www.georgiastandards.org>).

The Windows to the World Portable Studio includes the addition of portable studio equipment to provide opportunities to capture: (a) panel discussions (b) multi-camera shoots (c) formal interviews, and (d) live events for streaming. The equipment will include the ability to add (a) graphics (b) text, and (c) transitions during live recording. The portable studios can be moved to multiple locations for training of students and faculty. For example, the field kits and studios can be used to support instructional technology and school library media candidates in video production and studio production activities. These technical skills are in high demand by K-12 schools as districts increase the use of these technologies for (a) communication (b) technology integration, and (c) technical education programs.

Training for effective use of the “studio kit” will be provided by the Office of Information Technology (OIT) prior to participation in field-based learning environments. These training modules will focus on writing, digital capture, editing, and distribution of short vignettes. Included will be education and training on: (a) digital cameras, (b) audio techniques, (c) audio & digital storytelling, (d) interview techniques, and (e) field editing.

4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served:

The Window to the World project will provide centralized resources available to all COE students (Number of students: 9 departments, 5232 (2007 Fact Book)) and has the potential to open authentic learning activities to over 1.6 million Georgia K-12 students and 107,000 Georgia public school teachers. All of these students and teachers will have access to these resources and will benefit from the outreach of the university.

5. Total cost: \$16,489.35

6. Detailed Budget – Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
TriCaster ProFX Live Production Studio	1	\$11,494.85	\$11,494.85
Headsets and Microphones	1	\$1,059.50	\$1,059.50
Light Kit	1	\$2,214.70	\$2,214.70
Cables	1	\$370.35	\$370.35
Training and Support	1	\$1,349.95	\$1,349.95
Total			\$16,489.35

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any: None

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain. Yes

9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

The Window to the World project will be a new COE feature that provides student-produced stories. These video-based cultural experiences will be shared with local classrooms via the Internet and the Teacher’s Corner website. The project will provide the opportunity for our students to learn the technology skills identified by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Specific examples include the preparation of school library media specialists and instructional technologists along with classroom teachers fulfilling technology integration course requirements. Additionally, the media produced and distributed by our students will increase cultural awareness for our teacher candidates and the understanding of diversity in K-12 classrooms. Unique learning environments can be shared in classrooms locked in by walls, schedules, and textbooks. The vignettes, produced by teacher candidates for teachers and students, provide the window to the world through the College of Education web site.

Specifically, the College of Education would use the proposed technology to enhance the growing number of programs that rely on learning situated in authentic contexts and to support the technology and curriculum integration skills of COE students. Three examples illustrate how the equipment and training proposed in this application will be used. The first is the increasing number of study abroad opportunities for all students. Second is the Whale Class, which explores innovative instruction in authentic learning contexts. Third, is the integration of video technology as part of the school library media, instructional technology, and technology integration courses.

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Requests

1. Project or Program Name: CMSD 7140/CMSD 4000 Technology Upgrade

2. Department, Program, or Unit Name:
CSSE, CMSD, UGA Speech & Hearing Clinic

3. Brief description of request:

The University of Georgia Speech and Hearing Clinic provides a wide variety of diagnostic and therapeutic services to individuals in the University and local communities. The University Clinic is recognized throughout the state of Georgia for its expertise in the area of Auditory Processing Disorders (APD), an often misdiagnosed learning disability. UGA master's level students in speech-language pathology participate in the diagnosis and development of remediation plans for APD by their involvement in CMSD 7140 Audiology Clinic. Our department is required to provide experience in this area to maintain accreditation by the American Speech Language Hearing Association. UGA undergraduate students observe APD diagnostic evaluations in the clinic in independent study classes (CMSD 4000) to fulfill necessary observation requirements for national certification. In order to continue to provide this community service and maintain APD experiences as part of the graduate and undergraduate practicum in Audiology, the clinic's APD evaluation compact discs and compact disc player need to be replaced. The current discs are seven years old and the compact disc player is ten years old.

4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served:

20-30 Master's level students per year in CMSD 7140 (100% of graduate students enrolled)

5-7 Undergraduate students per year in CMSD 4000 (100% of undergraduate students with specific interest in Audiology and/or Aural Rehabilitation)

5. Total cost: \$1123.50 total cost; \$873.50 requested from Student Technology Fees (because of \$250 department contribution, see below)

6. Detailed Budget – Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Compact Disc Player-Recorder (5-disc CD player)	1	\$324.00	\$324.00
Auditory Processing Test Battery Compact Disc with test forms (Auditec Recording)	1	\$799.50	\$799.50
		Total	\$1123.50

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any: Department will contribute \$250.00 if Student Technology fees can be used to cover the balance

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain. Yes, this equipment would be accessible to students with disabilities.

9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Requests

1. Project or Program name: Upgrade Room 215 Aderhold

2. Department or Unit: Science Education, Aderhold Hall

3. Brief description of request:

1. Mimio "Interactive + Capture" portable SmartBoard unit; wireless

2.0 Upgrade Kit; carrying case

http://www.electronicwhiteboardswarehouse.com/mimio/mimio_xi_capture.htm

price \$787 + \$248 + \$55= \$1080

quantity: 1

2. Vernier LabQuest Environmental Science Deluxe Package

<http://www.vernier.com/pkgs/labquest/environmental.html>

price: \$1462

quantity: 13.

3. Nokia N810 internet touchpads

www.nokia.com/n800

price \$479.99 each

quantity: 5

4. Sony digital voice recorders

http://www.thenerds.net/SONY.Icdmx20_digital_voice_recorder

price: \$184.26 each

quantity: 5

5. Total cost \$5,863.25

6. Detailed Budget-Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Mimio "Interactive + Capture" portable SmartBoard	1	\$ 1080	\$ 1080
Vernier LabQuest Environmental Science Deluxe Package	1	\$ 1462	\$ 1462
Nokia N810 internet touchpads	5	\$ 479.99	\$2400
Sony digital voice recorders	5	\$ 184.26	\$921
TOTAL			\$5,863.25

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any:
No additional funds available at this time.

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain.
Yes, all rooms in Aderhold are accessible.
9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

We are requesting:

1. Mimio "Interactive + Capture" portable SmartBoard unit; wireless 2.0 Upgrade Kit; carrying case

http://www.electronicwhiteboardswarehouse.com/mimio/mimio_xi_capture.htm

Price \$787 + \$248 + \$55= \$1080

Quantity: 1

Justification: Many of the Science Education faculty have seen instances in local schools, in which we work on research and service projects and supervise students, of the unique usefulness of SmartBoard technology for several kinds of science teaching strategies at a variety of grade levels. In classrooms in Aderhold that already have permanent, fixed SmartBoards installed, however, we and many of our colleagues have experienced great awkwardness associated with the physical separation of the smartboard, conventional whiteboards, and, in some cases, physical equipment necessary for demonstrations. We also see practical problems with storing, maintaining, and securing small, "trans-portable" smartboards. We request a single unit of this truly portable (1.0 lbs., 9" length when folded) and less expensive device that is attached with rubber suction cups to standard dry-erase whiteboards. This allows smartboard capture functionality while being able to physically overlay captured writing, other computer-generated displays, and conventional whiteboard contents. Key teaching and learning functions for which this equipment would be most useful are whole-class compilation and subsequent analysis of low-tech lab data, and many applications involving interactive mapping web sites that are increasingly commonly available, including but hardly limited to such sites as GoogleEarth, the United States Geological Survey, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A systematic poll of ESCI faculty revealed that most of the faculty would be regular users if the technology were available. It is like that the most frequent "home" of this equipment would be Aderhold 215, our largest and most frequently used classroom, but this particular kind of smartboard technology could also readily be moved and temporarily installed in any of the other rooms customarily used for ESCI classes (213, 220, 216, in descending order of frequency), or for Mathematics Education faculty using classroom other than 214.

2. Vernier LabQuest Environmental Science Deluxe Package

<http://www.vernier.com/pkgs/labquest/environmental.html>

Price: \$1462

Quantity: 1

Justification: The Science Education Program is developing for the first time a "critical mass" of faculty and full-time doctoral students deeply interested in and committed to the teaching of Environmental issues as broadly defined in a sociocultural and ethical context, particularly with the arrival this year of Dr. Mike Mueller. The "probeware" equipment of which we own multiple sets is now 15 years old and the base units support use only with graphing calculators supported by relatively dated and awkward software. Many of the

probes, however, are still fully functional and could be used (due to Vernier's longtime commitment to "downward compatibility") with this newest, stand-alone data-gathering unit, from which the data can easily be imported to a computer for readily visible graphical analysis and display. The LabQuest unit is the latest development in the evolution of this technology. We ask for only a single unit for demonstration and evaluation purposes now, including several types of interchangeable probes which we do not currently own and which are especially useful for various kinds of field monitoring central to the scientific basis of environmental investigations. We already own single sets of the previous two generations of such base units, the Vernier LabPro and the Pasco PasPort (purchased several years ago in connection with Eisenhower/ITQ grants). This newest sample of this technology could allow us in both technology-focused courses such as ESCI 4480/6480 and in the context of planning and development of teacher education and research projects, to judge the relative costs and benefits of each system before potentially purchasing multiple units for more extensive student use in the lab (e.g., room 216) or field.

3. Nokia N810 internet touchpads

www.nokia.com/n800

Price \$479.99 each

Quantity: 5

Justification: We would like to use the Internet touchpads with students in the undergraduate (4420) science methods courses and with student teachers. Using the touchpad's web camera, recorder and microphone, and its ability to download files/applications, students, working in teams, will be able to create photoessay assignments and exchange environmental monitoring data.

4. Sony digital voice recorders

http://www.thenerds.net/SONY.Icdmx20_digital_voice_recorder

Price: \$184.26 each

Quantity: 5

Justification: As part of one of the projects Dr. Deborah Tippins uses for both undergraduate and graduate courses (i.e., 4420, 6420, 8010) students have to conduct interviews with community people about a science practice in the community. In addition, they conduct an "interview of instances" with a student about their understanding of a selected science concept. The digital voice recorders do not require cassette tapes and the quality of the sound is much better. These recorders would really be useful for these projects and other projects that require interviews.

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Requests

1. Project or Program Name: Speech and Hearing Clinic Computer Upgrades, Communication Sciences and Disorders

2. Department, Program, or Unit Name: Communication Sciences and Special Education

3. Brief description of request: Speech and Hearing Clinic computer lab addition and upgrade of equipment for clinical practicum equipment

4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served:

- a. All students in the CMSD master's program enroll in clinical practicum courses (CMSD 7041-7046) every semester during their 2-year program (currently 41 students). Each student sees at least one, and usually 3 or 4 clients per semester, with substantial required confidential paperwork for each client. All students must complete all patient documentation in the student computer lab in 528 Aderhold, which is a mandatory location by departmental policy to ensure compliance with HIPAA privacy and security rule requirements. Student tech fees funded purchase of 5 computers and monitors last year, which has improved computer availability and decreased problems related to the previous old systems. All 5 computers are typically in use all day and evening during a semester by our students, and many students are not able to access a computer when needed. With the move of our computer lab to a new location, we now have available space in our lab for another workstation; therefore, an additional computer/monitor is requested. This addition would improve student access to the computers and facilitate completion of required patient documentation.
- b. Students in CMSD 7041-7046 provide speech-language pathology services for assessment and treatment of clients with communication disorders to fulfill clinical practicum requirements. Computer-assisted treatment and assessment programs are a valuable adjunct to therapy and are necessary for students to experience during their clinical education, but the clinic is currently using an outdated computer system to run therapy and assessment software. A new computer and larger monitor are requested to run these programs adequately and to provide improved visibility for our pediatric and adult clients with special needs. This computer would be used by approximately 25-50% of CMSD master's students during any given semester; 100% of CMSD master's students will use it several times during their 2 years on campus.

5. Total cost: \$2345.00, of which \$2000 is requested from Student Technology Fees and \$345 will be contributed by department

6. Detailed Budget – Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Optiplex 755 Minitower and 17-inch flat panel monitor	1	1058.00	1058.00
Optiplex 755 Minitower and 20-inch flat panel monitor	1	1287.00	1287.00
Total cost			2345.00
Department contribution			-345.00
TOTAL REQUEST			2000.00

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any: The department has agreed to contribute \$345 in support of this project if \$2000 can be provided by Student Technology fees.

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? Yes. If not, please explain.

Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Requests

1. Project or Program name: Upgrade Rooms 102, 111 and 112 Aderhold

2. Department or Unit: Mathematics Education, Aderhold hall

3. Brief description of request:

A. The laptops in Room 102 are 500 MHz, G3 iBooks (White) obtained in 2002 and 2003 and need to be replaced. They have only 128 MB memory. As we have updated them to Mac OS10.3.7 and current Mathematics Education software, the operating speed and the memory have proved to be limiting. We are requesting these be replaced with MacBooks.

Projected Cost: 20 MacBooks with 2.2GHz Intel Core 2 Duo, 1GB memory, 120GB hard drive Double-layer SuperDrive

20 @ \$1299 is \$25,980

Cart: \$300.

Total: \$26,280

B. We are requesting SMART Board 600i interactive whiteboard systems to be installed in Rooms 111/102/112

Projected Cost: 3 SMART Board 600i interactive whiteboard systems.

3 @ \$5,599

Total: \$16,797

Installation @ \$1200 is \$3600

C. We are requesting a classroom set (25) of TI-Nspire CAS to be used in Rooms 102, 111 and 112.

Projected Cost: 25 TI-Nspire CAS

25 @ \$157.99

Total: \$3,949.75

D. We are requesting a Go! Link Teacher Pack (1) to be used in Rooms 102, 111 and 112.

Projected Cost: Go! Link Teacher Pack

1 @ \$464.00

Total: \$464.00

4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served:

Room 102 is used for mathematics education classes at the elementary, middle school, and secondary level. Courses that have made use of the computers in that room are EMAT 2000, EMAT 3400, EMAT 3410, EMAT 5280/7280, EMAT 5290/7290, and EMAT 5320.

Room 111/113 is the centerpiece of our current departmental technology facilities. It was created out of our work with the Georgia Research Alliance in the early 1990s, the NSF funded Project Radiate in the mid-1990s, and college support (replacing earlier facilities with Apple II, MS-DOS, and Macintosh equipment). The original state-of-the-art PowerPC 7100 computers from around 1995 were replaced by G3 computers, then G4 computers, and now some G5 computers. We have evolved a strategy of trying to replace 6 of the computers each year. Therefore, at the moment, Room 111/113 has 7 G4 computers from 2002, 6 G4 computers from 2003, and 6 G5 computers from 2004. The room is complemented by server hardware and software in the department that is state-of-the-art.

Room 112 is used for mathematics education classes at the elementary, middle school, and secondary level. Courses that have made use of the computers in that room are EMAT 2000, EMAT 3400, EMAT 3410, EMAT 5280/7280, Math 5020/7020, EMAT 5290/7290, MATH 5030/7030, EMAT 5320, MATH 7035, and STAT 6070.

5. Total cost \$50,626.75

6. Detailed Budget-Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
MacBooks	20	\$1,299	\$25,980
<u>Cart</u>	1	\$300	\$300
SMART Board 600i interactive whiteboard system	3	\$5,599	\$16,797
SMART Board 600i Installation	3	\$1,200	\$3,600
TI-Nspire CAS	25	\$157.99	\$3,950
Go! Link Teacher Pack	1	\$464	\$464
TOTAL			\$51,091

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any:

No additional funds available at this time.

8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain.

Yes, all rooms in Aderhold are accessible.

9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.

Mathematics Education Technology 2008 summary is attached.

Technology Enhancement Proposal
Department of Mathematics Education
February 12, 2008

Rationale

The first concern we have for our programs is that the students have excellent preparation in mathematics and excellent preparation for the teaching of mathematics. The appropriate use of technology serves these goals. Our objectives and requests for equipment center on quality of instruction and quality of learning for our students in mathematics education. Any objective for proficiency in learning about technology is to serve these aims. Our programs have had a technology component with this view since 1970.

We need to continue to build a better technology base for student instruction and student learning in the Mathematics Education program. Our technology plan has always had the integration of technology into student learning as its core. The plan has always been forward looking and built to incorporate new technology developments as they become available. So it is now.

The integration of technology into doing mathematics, communicating mathematics, teaching mathematics, and learning mathematics has become necessary. No longer is it sufficient to think of technology as a set of tools to be used occasionally. Rather, technology has permeated the way we think about mathematics and is changing the school mathematics curriculum. Thus students in mathematics education, at all levels, must become proficient with the technology to help them do their own mathematics investigations, understand technology as factor in the content of the mathematics curriculum, and become totally comfortable with the use of technology in mathematics teaching. This includes developing a sense of appropriate use of technology.

Our program supports the implementation of the principles and standards set forth in *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (NCTM, 2000). In particular, the Technology Principle states:

Technology is essential in teaching and learning mathematics; it influences the mathematics that is taught and enhances students' learning.

We have a responsibility to help our EMAT students understand, interpret, and implement this recommendation, along with the Equity Principle, the Curriculum Principle, the Teaching Principle, the Learning Principle, and all the Standards for K-12 mathematics. Our student need and deserve technology in all of their experiences (classes, field experiences, independent study, and personal development) within our program.

Our students must have access to technology that is forward looking. We must not equip our students to only use current or past technology. In a real sense we must be looking at generative ideas with technologies as well as remaining alert to technologies that are emerging or yet to come.

Background

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) has led the movement for mathematics education reform. Unlike the top-down education reform efforts of the 1960s, NCTM began a grassroots discussion of issues in the mid-1970s. Subsequently, *An Agenda for Action* (1980) reflected input from *all* parties interested and involved in mathematics education, and set in motion much-needed discussion and debate. NCTM later published a series of documents which, appropriately, set criteria for excellence rather than singular prescriptions for implementing "new best ways." They included the NCTM Curriculum and Evaluation Standards (1989), the NCTM Teaching Standards (1991), and the NCTM Assessment Standards (1995). Collectively, these standards advocate methods that emphasize mathematical power: conceptual understanding, problem solving, reasoning, connection building, communicating, and self-confidence developing. Efforts continue throughout mathematics education community as standards evolve and are revised. The Principles and Standards for School Mathematics (NCTM, 2000) are the latest implementation of this collective endeavor.

Our department has been involved in all of the principles and standards development efforts of NCTM. It is logical and important for us to be at the forefront of their implementation.

Technology can provide mechanisms to sustain assistance to mathematics teachers in their use of technology to implement mathematics education reforms in their classes. Technology enables mathematics education reform, but it is not reform per se (cf. Kaput, 1992). We must provide mathematics teachers extended opportunities to experience and do mathematics in an environment supported by diverse technologies (Dreyfus & Eisenberg, 1996). The heart of our approach is the development of mathematical power-- understanding, using, and appreciating mathematics. Our interest is in empowering teachers through the use of technology in mathematics exploration, open-ended problem solving, interpreting mathematics, developing understanding, and communicating about mathematics (see Bransford, et al, 1996; Schoenfeld, 1982, 1989, 1992; Silver, 1987).

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1. Promote innovative practices in the tool uses of technology in mathematics teaching and learning

- To use technology tools to model and demonstrate standards-referenced mathematics content and pedagogy.
- To enable mathematics teachers to experience and enhance school mathematics using various technology tools for exploring real world applications, engaging in problem solving and problem formulation, and communicating about mathematics investigations.
- To use technology to develop an appreciation of the distinction between demonstration and proof in mathematics and to emphasize the value of each in the understanding of mathematics.
- To use technology tools to engage in mathematics explorations, to form mathematics ideas, and to solve mathematics problems.
- To use technology tools to construct new ideas of mathematics for oneself.
- To engage in mathematical investigations using software applications.
- To use general tools such as word processing, paint programs, and spreadsheets.
- To facilitate mathematics investigations and communication about mathematics investigations.

Goal 2. Revitalize mathematics teaching and learning by modeling, then applying, innovative technology-enhanced approaches.

- To develop effective mathematics demonstrations using appropriate technology tools.
- To engage in some independent investigations of mathematics topics from the school curriculum or from mathematics appropriate for that level.
- To enable better communication of mathematics ideas that arise from technology enhanced investigations.

Goal 3. Support reform of mathematics teaching and learning mathematics classrooms.

- To enable mathematics teachers to develop and adapt materials and goals from standards based curriculum through the use of technology.
- To model and explore collaborative instructional strategies.
- To develop mechanisms and expectations of sharing instructional ideas, materials, and information among mathematics teachers.
- To disseminate information supporting comprehensive standards-based school mathematics curricula and the implementation of Quality Core Curriculum objectives.
- To realize the use of technology tools in the implementation of alternative assessment strategies.

Goal 4. Establish the human and technological infrastructure needed to sustain meaningful reform of mathematics instruction.

- To develop comfort and confidence in the use of technology by mathematics teachers. as they explore, practice, reflect, and become in technology-enhanced teaching and learning of mathematics.
- To enable and encourage mathematics teachers to collaborate by using technology support.
- To support professional development opportunities for mathematics teachers and other key personnel through a network of peer teachers.

Technology and Curriculum Refocusing

Mathematics content and pedagogy are enhanced through technology. It is important to recognize, however, that as technology tools become available and our insight in using them expands; the very nature of the workshops and what is emphasized will need to change. The technology impacts not just what we want to select from mathematics, but also fundamentally at the substance of the mathematics we teach.

Technology often provides convincing demonstrations of ideas, helps to generate hypotheses, and encourages exploration. Demonstration, however, does not replace the need for proof. Nor does constructing a proof rule out the use of technology. This contrast of demonstration and proof is essential to conceptualizing appropriate use of technology in our mathematics and mathematics education courses.

The TI-Nspire calculators will be used in several EMAT courses, including EMAT 4500/6500 and EMAT 4360/6360. Their geometry capabilities exceed those of earlier TI

calculators, such as the TI-92, making them more useful for EMAT courses in which geometry is a focus (such as EMAT 3500 or EMAT 5290). The TI-Nspires allow students to view multiple representations of the same mathematical object at the same time, and to "grab and move" parts of a graph, watching the equation change as they do so. With a TI-Nspire, students have the capability to save and edit their work, as well as transfer it to a computer. Instructors can also examine students' work and download problems and other information from a computer to several calculators at the same time. The TI-Nspire CAS would provide our students with the opportunity to interact with a handheld computer algebra system before going out into the classroom. To my knowledge, many of our students do not have this opportunity, even though using a CAS is a useful skill for any high school mathematics teacher. In short, the TI-Nspire has the potential to both improve our instruction in several courses and allow our students to develop useful technology skills for their future teaching.

The Go! Link enables us to use the Verier CBL probes with the Dynamic Data program, Fathom, for which we have a Campus-Wide user license. Incorporating lab experiments into our mathematics education and science education courses will enable us to integrate mathematics and science in exciting, motivating and meaningful ways. We currently use the CBL probes with Graphing Calculators; having the direct link to the computer and to the Fathom program will make these lab experiments much easier to conduct and will enable students to do statistical analyses of the collected data as soon as they have completed the experiment, thus cutting out the tedious job of transferring data from calculators to computers. We shall use the Go! Links with our classroom set of iBook computers and existing CBL probes. The one Teacher Pack of 8 Links will enable 24-32 students to work on 8 experiments in teams of 3 to 4 students.

The Mathematics Education faculty have seen instances in local schools, in which we work on research and service projects and supervise students, of the unique usefulness of SmartBoard technology for several kinds of teaching strategies at a variety of grade levels. We feel obliged to prepare our students for the classroom of today as well as classroom of the future. At the moment, we do not have any way of exposing our students to this wonderful technology.

Suggested Priorities 2008

- A. 20 MacBooks with 2.2GHz Intel Core 2 Duo, 1GB memory, 120GB hard drive Double-layer SuperDrive
1 Cart.
- B. SMART Board 600i interactive whiteboard system to be installed in Rooms 111/102/112
- C. Classroom set (25) of TI-Nspire CAS to be used in Rooms 102, 111 and 112.
- D. Go! Link Teacher Pack (1) to be used in Rooms 102, 111 and 112.

Bibliography

- Bransford, J. D., Zech, L., Schwartz, D., Barron, B., Vye, N., & The Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1996). Fostering mathematical thinking in middle school students: Lessons from research. In R. J. Sternberg & T. Ben-Zeev (Eds.). *The nature of mathematical thinking* (pp. 203-250). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dreyfus, T. & Eisenberg, T. (1996). On different facets of mathematical thinking. In R. J. Sternberg & T. Ben-Zeev (Eds.), *The nature of mathematical thinking* (pp. 253-284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisenhower Professional Staff Development (1995). *Needs Assessment for the State of Georgia*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.
- GCATT (1997). *The status of educational technology in the State of Georgia: A Report submitted to Board of Directors*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Center for Advanced telecommunications Technology,
- Georgia Department of Education. (1997). *Quality Core Curriculum (draft document)*. (<http://www.doe.k12.ga.us>)
- Georgia P-16 Initiative: First Year Progress Report (September, 1996). Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta GA.
- Hatfield, L. L. & Olive, J. (1997) *Leadership in Technology for Mathematics and its Uses in Society*. NSF-supported leadership training project. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.
- Kaput, J. (1992). Technology and mathematics education. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 515-556). New York: Macmillan.
- Means, B., & Olson, K. (1995). *Technology's role in education reform: Findings from a national study of innovating schools*. Washington, DC: OERI.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1983). *The third national mathematics assessment: Results, trends, and issues* (Report No. 13-MA-01). Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1980). *An Agenda for Action: Recommendations for School Mathematics in the 1980s*. Reston: VA: Author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1991). *Professional standards for teaching mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1995). *Assessment standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000) *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Research Council. (1989). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Office of Technology Services (1996). *State Educational Technology Plan Blueprint*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education.
- Pea, R. (1996). Learning and teaching with educational technologies. In H. Walberg & G.D. Haertel (Eds.), *Educational Psychology: Effective practices and policies*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (1997). *Report to the President on the use of technology to strengthen K-12 education in the United States*. (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OSTP/NSTC/PCAST/k-12.html>).
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1982). Some thoughts on problem-solving research and mathematics education. In F. K. Lester & J. Garofalo (Eds.), *Mathematical problem solving: Issues in research* (pp. 27-37). Philadelphia: Franklin Institute Press.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1989). Teaching mathematical thinking and problem solving. In L. Resnick (Ed.), *Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research* (pp. 83-103). ASCD Yearbook.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1992). Learning to think mathematically: Problem solving, metacognition, and sense making in mathematics. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 334-370). New York: Macmillan.
- Silver, E. A. (1987). Foundations of cognitive theory and research for mathematics problem-solving instruction. In A. H. Schoenfeld (Ed.), *Cognitive science and mathematics education: An overview* (pp. 33-60). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zimmermann, W., & Cunningham, S. (Eds.) (1991). *Visualization in teaching and learning mathematics*. Washington, D.C.: The Mathematical Association of America.

February 21, 2008

Dr. Sandra Glass, Executive Director
Office of Information Technology
College of Education
Athens, GA 30602

Members of the Committee for Academic and Instructional Technologies:

This letter supports the request by mathematics education faculty for interactive whiteboards for mathematics education classrooms. Students who graduate from our college must enter classrooms prepared to teach students 21st century skills. These skills include communication skills, visual literacy skills, problem solving skills, and systems thinking. The use of multi-media and interactive technology will improve the technology and curriculum integration skills of our graduates and thus improve their teaching methods.

The addition of these interactive whiteboards will also provide opportunities for our students to create and practice instructional and assessment strategies in their courses. This practice will be valuable as they begin their teaching careers.

Our neighboring schools districts such as Gwinnett County, Oconee County, and Clark County report that interactive whiteboards have been adopted in classrooms and some district-wide implementations. We support this request to provide opportunities to gain the experience our graduates will need with interactive technology as part of our teacher preparation. This special project will provide valuable information for the Office of Information Technology as we continue our development of standards for classrooms in the College of Education.

Sincerely,

Dr. Sandra Glass

Student Technology Fee for 2008-2009 Project or Program Requests

1. Project or Program Name: Project Live Text
2. Department, Program, or Unit Name: English Education (in Language and Literacy Education)
3. Brief description of request: We request that a technology fee be instituted for our students that will in turn directly fund the costs of LiveText, on which they are required to produce their electronic portfolios. LiveText has been offered for free on a trial basis, but from this point on, students will be charged
4. Evidence of student need, starting with number or percentage of students or courses served: Roughly 40 undergraduate and graduate students will be required to produce a LiveText e-portfolio annually.
5. Total cost: $\$89 \times 40 = \$3,560$

See http://college.livetext.com/purchasing/membership_student.html

6. Detailed Budget – Include all items required for this project or program:

Item requested	Number requested	Unit Cost	Total Cost
LiveText portfolio accounts	40	\$89	\$3,560

7. Briefly describe additional funds available for this project, if any: None
8. Will this project be accessible to students with disabilities? If not, please explain. Yes
9. Please attach any other supporting information regarding this request.