Technology for Teaching and Learning Committee (TTLC)
April 23, 2012
11:00
Distance Ed Room


Approval of Meeting Minutes: The minutes from March 26, 2012 were approved.

Additions to the Agenda: Possible BlackBoard Summer Upgrade

DE Subcommittee Report: The 2012-2015 GC DE Plan was discussed. Janet shared that the DE Subcommittee will look at incorporating the distant education subcommittee plan into the Tech Plan. Nancy questioned whether or not there will be timelines added to the plans. The committee agreed it would be useful, but given the current budgetary restrictions, implementing any changes in a timely manner may be difficult at best. This, in turn, could result in negative reactions when these published dates do not come to fruition. The DE Subcommittee will look at the plan annually to assess progression of each goal.

Another suggestion was to prioritize each project instead of assigning prospective completion dates. Kerry mentioned that the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) is the body that approves the projects/technology purchases. This does not mean, however, ICS or IS actually has it in their queue. This part of the process tends to be overlooked, and the funds may not be available. Joann would like to see the prioritization driven by the requirements for accreditation.

Janice would like a step in the process that also recognizes when a task/priority has been completed. She referred to page 6, Objective 1a of the DE Plan that says one of our goals is to “Promote the tools and techniques for online teaching and learning.” Janice, Deb, and Chris have worked on these tools, so we need to find a way to notate when goals/actions have been completed or are in progress. We need to keep this document “alive” and continue to update the document with comments that address: “how we’re doing it,” “when we did it” and “when we achieved the objective.” Janice requested that objective 3h listed on page 7 be changed from “Provide online counseling services” to “Enhance online . . .” as this service is currently in use.

Kerry said Chris Hill and those involved in the planning area are currently working on a new spreadsheet for planning and for reporting out. Kerry suggested we look at this document and develop something similar. Nancy suggested there be an area dedicated to exemplars so faculty and staff can share what they are currently using and works for them. Joann suggested that the DE Subcommittee and TTLC both discuss the current status of projects/goals each time they meet.

Janet discussed the Quality Matters (QM) program that many colleges are utilizing to evaluate the design of online courses. This program does not evaluate the instructor. Chris mentioned that QM utilizes a rubric that serves to enhance online courses. Many colleges currently require that all their online courses are evaluated by this rubric. Janet mentioned we could begin slowly by evaluating our intro courses first and then build from there. Janet reiterated the rubric evaluates the design of the course, not the quality of the teacher. Janet suggested we set up a conference call with a contact she made in Indiana.
Kerry said the QM proposal has been drafted and is currently in Barb Blanchard’s office waiting for input. The proposal suggests evaluating 2-4 courses the first go-round as the evaluation process for QM is very intensive and takes 20 weeks to complete. The best method for identifying the first courses to be peer-reviewed is via volunteer. Offering incentives such as iPads for faculty who volunteer to have their online courses go through the QM process was discussed. The basic QM subscription is approximately $1650 while the full subscription is approximately $3300. Kerry suggested that the proposal be updated with some of the suggestions garnered here and resubmit to Barb.

Chris discussed the GCCCD Online Success Website. He suggested that faculty include the website address in their syllabi: [www.gcccd.edu/online](http://www.gcccd.edu/online). Janice mentioned that we need to get this information to the students before they enroll in an online class. She suggested Chris put this link on the Grossmont homepage. Chris suggested committee members peruse the website, especially the student support site, and email him with any suggestions. He also encouraged faculty to guide their online students to this site as this will become the primary one-stop-shop for faculty and students utilizing any aspect of distance education. Janet asked Chris to present the Online Success Website at the next Chairs and Coordinators meeting, and he agreed.

Denise discussed the fact that Saddleback College offers a free, non-credit, four-hour class on a Saturday that introduces prospective online students to the tools they will need to succeed in an online class. Denise would like to follow up with Saddleback to see if this course added to their retention rates.

Chris and Debi discussed the possibility of upgrading our BlackBoard by purchasing a new service pack (SP). The district has been looking at installing SP 7, which introduces many new fixes as well as some new features we may like. The various fixes and possible glitches were discussed. Debi mentioned that each SP will come with their own glitches, and the debate over which SP is better could go on for quite a long time. SP 7, for example, does not save some graded test results. This is a big issue. Stan said that implementation of any new SP should be done in the summer to minimize the impact of the new glitches. Michael suggested that the district look at other options such as Moodle or Desire to Learn. Debi mentioned that Cuyamaca is leaning toward SP 7 for the summer. Stan suggested the committee discuss the pros and cons and submit a recommendation at the next ITAC meeting. Debi will draft a list of the pros and cons and send to TTLC members. Debi also mentioned the test server has SP 7 and can be looked at by the committee.

**Action:** Janet to change the verbiage in the 2012-2015 GC DE Plan, page 7, objective 3h from “Provide” to “Enhance.”

**Action:** Kerry to update QM proposal and resubmit to Barb.

**Action:** Committee to review GCCCD Online Success Website and send suggestions to Chris.

**Action:** Chris to put the Online Success link on the homepage.

**Action:** Chris to present the Online Success Website at the next Chairs and Coordinators meeting.

**Action:** Debi to draft a list of the pros and cons associated with SP 7 and send to TTLC members. Recommendations will be sent to ITAC.

**Tech Plan/Process Chart:** Kerry distributed and discussed the Annual Technology Planning Process Chart she drafted. This chart is meant to elucidate the GC annual tech planning process as it relates to the larger planning and budget cycle. Kerry would like to see this chart distributed to Chairs and Coordinators and faculty in general to communicate how faculty and staff procure new technology in their respective areas. One area that needs better communication is between the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) and the Learning and Technology Resource division (LTR). IRC approves new technology proposals, but these approvals are often
not communicated to the LTR division until implementation is expected. This glitch in the process proves difficult as many times the LTR division does not have the human resources available to support new technology. As such, the LTR division needs to be in on the planning process a lot earlier than has been the norm. One change Kerry would like to see is that the LTR Dean be provided a list of the activity proposals requesting new technology in December. Having the LTR division involved in Activity Proposals that request new technology would also allow the LTR division the ability to better plan for LTR division staffing, including the need for additional personnel. It was decided the process chart could use an additional step in August/September. This step would have the LTR division involved in Activity Proposals that involve new technology. Kerry will make these changes and email the updated document to the committee for their feedback. Kerry would also like to present the updated chart to IRC and other committees as appropriate for their input.

**Action:** Kerry to update the Annual Technology Planning Process Chart and send to TTLC members for their feedback.

**IS Report:** Stan discussed the status of current IS projects. The Decision Support System (DSS) contract has been signed. Demos are currently being scheduled with the curriculum committee regarding Curricunet. The first piece of the Degree Audit Registration System (DARS) has been uploaded to the system. The online advising and orientation is scheduled for December. The college website is in pre-proposal stages now. Whether or not to contract out the new website is being debated. As far as the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) project, IS would like to have a recommendation ready by May. Stan also mentioned that the district is now looking at supporting iPads. Mobile device management software is currently being evaluated as a tool to support iPads and other mobile devices. IS is also planning Grossmont College computer room upgrades (A/C, Backup Power, new APC racks/UPS). The plan is to take down these servers in December. Grades are due December 19, so faculty must be aware that the servers will not be available starting Dec 20.

**Proposed Meeting Schedule for Next Year:** Kerry put up the proposed TTLC schedule for the next fiscal year. She will email the schedule to the committee and ask for input.

**Action:** Kerry to email next year’s proposed TTLC meeting schedule to members for their input.

**Other Business:** Kerry mentioned that we need GC representation at ITAC which meets the third Thursday of each month at 1:00 pm. Kerry asked if Cary Willard would be willing to represent Grossmont at ITAC. Kerry asked Cary and any other volunteers to email her with their willingness to serve.