Minutes of March 7, 2005, meeting were approved after modifications.

**Faculty Survey for Technology Use** – Pam Mery of the office of Research, Planning, and Grants distributed photocopies of two research instruments: a new, proposed survey directed at counseling faculty and staff, and the last faculty technology survey. She also distributed an outline of related discussion points from the March meeting. There was general support for a new survey now. Bonnie asked for clarification about omitted items, Pam explained that items that result in 85% or greater majorities are not needed, e.g., a question such as “do you have email?” is unnecessary. Question #14: “how often do you use a computer for work?” had a similar level of saturation. These items are no longer informative. Completely new areas of technology usage warrant additional research, so there will be a separate survey of faculty input regarding Banner targeted at those who have accounts. Asking survey questions about software in use such as GroupWise may be moot points, because CCSF cannot rewrite the software. New discussion addressed various issues: (1) there was a suggestion that the GroupWise website might be used for faculty feedback on an on-going basis, rather than using the survey. (2) Using the icon rather than technical language to identify GroupWise may be necessary. (3) Bonnie asked what we will do with the responses and the statistics they generate. She pointed out that one value of a survey is to raise awareness; therefore, there is merit in using a paper form rather than an online form because it will reach those who are not using technology as much. Pamela says the hardcopy might have a different form than an online form. For example, the online survey could branch to follow-up questions than depend on responses. Tom suggested a possible question might ascertain what percent of faculty know that accessibility is required on our web sites in the context of State Code 508. Mamie suggests adding a question about “electronic materials provided by educational publishers.” It was noted that “very satisfied” may psychologically be the best first choice on a scale of ranging to “not satisfied.” The general results of previous surveys are posted on the ORPG page. Pamela noted that in previous surveys some faculty did not respond at all, and some did not respond to every item. Janet suggested revamping “INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY” to be “INSTRUCTIONAL” in general with technology embedded. Pamela stated that the edited survey would be deployed in September.

Discussion turned to the new survey specific to technology as used by or needed for counselors. A draft of items was distributed for discussion. Patricia suggests that this could be part of the overall survey in order to see how the statistics break down.
Master Plan - Nicholar Chang distributed photocopies of reports related to the Action Plan 2003-2004. The 7-31-2003 report on “Student Development Technology Planning” delineated priorities. However, it was noted that some items do not reflect new technologies, i.e., Ethernet versus wireless, or intranet versus Internet access. Mamie suggested that we would need variety rather than a single network solution. Nicholar also reported on various projects for (a) document imaging, (b) electronic transcripts, (c) transfer student tracking, both in and out of CCSF, etc. Category One priorities include new computer labs at John Adams and Downtown, and new computerized assessment testing. It was noted that online orientation is heavily used, 9000 students in the last year. Document imaging had to go to a second round of bids because the initial bid evaluation was compromised by a breakdown in funding and objectivity standards. Bar code can be used for many things but the existence of so many sites makes bar-code readers a problem. The Rosenberg Library uses bar code and the printed bar code has saved a great quantity of staff hours. The integration of “stand alone” software, such as SARS Grid that generates reports of usage, has not been completed. Currently, downloading from Banner to SARS is possible. Eventually, the program for uploading to Banner will be completed. Some stand-alone software and data like DSPS files and Medical Records may need to remain unconnected to Banner for confidentiality. Automated degree audit will provide very helpful reports for student. They will be able to get a diagnostic result based on options such as transfer to UC or CSU. The delay is the need to enter all the courses, scholastic programs and such into the database.

Nicholar will demonstrate the Electronic Educational Planning tool at the May meeting.

Strategic Objective 7.1 - Yevgeniya Malamud reported on IPTV. She distributed a handout that lists questions to be answered, and sites examples of this technology in use, e.g., Southeast Technical College, where it is used with their distance-learning program. Grants should be pursued as a need is identified. This technology has components that include expensive cameras and microphones, and specialized staffing for tech support and assisting at remote locations. The University of Wisconsin recommends a stable teaching situation and extensive training for the instructors. At present, the only interactive solution is found in online synchronous applications. One tool is called EZ-Engine Machine 1.0-Comweb. Mamie noted that IPTV would require a great deal of stable funding because it cannot be done on the fly. Francine underscored that we have done a lot of fact finding, including field trips. She stated that it is necessary to separate the technology from the pedagogy to make progress in defining objectives. Bonnie suggested that Pam might need to add a question about IPTV or similar technologies to the new faculty technology survey. Mamie noted that funding requests would be more compelling with fully developed examples of how students will benefit. John Odell defined the question in terms of student development: “What problems of student access to services does IPTV solve?” Francine mentioned CSU, Chico and CSU, Sacramento as sources of initial responses to this question.
**EATV, cable casting** - John Odell reported on interactive, live cable casting of classes. CCSF has 12 telecourses, but this is an entirely different technology. CCSF has three public education channels for which the mandate is to do educational programming. Except for the cost of telecourses, everything is sourced free; the Annenberg Foundation has a 24-hour, 7 days a week, free feed of educational programming. EATV was a partnership between SF Unified School District and CCSF, but Annenberg replaced them. Their programming targets K-12, parents, teachers and college students. The library of content and the live feed include events such as the City Arts and Lectures series, CCSF Board meetings, the international news programming on SCOLA (which is a feed from SFSU because it doesn’t have a channel), and student productions such as “A Mid Summer’s Night Dream.” Francine says steaming on the web would extend the channel beyond Comcast cable television users.

**Strategic Objective 7.1.E** was addressed by Janet briefly due to time constraints. There will be a relevant meeting on May 3 at 2:00 in Arts Extension X170; the committee is chaired by Tom Blair. Yet, TLTR should carry-the-ball about web casting, and Tim Ryan would be involved. Comparing the capture of content from feeds in order to create archives of programming to out-right purchases of content, Tom Hetherington pointed out that publishers may have web versions that broadcast better than conversions of digital video, and that copyright issues may apply. The EATV group will be focusing on more local programming.

**Training opportunities**, Carol distributed flyers for @One and other technology training.

The next TLTR meeting will be May 2, 2005 in R518 on Ocean Campus.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.