The meeting was called to order at 2:10 pm.

October minutes were approved without modification.

Old Business
Review and Discussion of Findings continued from prior meetings on the CCSF “Instructional Uses and Course Activities: Technology Survey Fall 2005” (Institutional Advancement, August 2006)

The fall 2005 survey was delivered by email only. Survey respondents were self selected. There was an assumption in TLTR that a high percentage those who answered the tech survey were likely to have an interest in technology. Of roughly 1,600 faculty, less than 300 answered the survey (292, or 18%).

The Committee discussed Graph 4, in particular the online courses, and the findings that could be viewed as a “general plateau in total faculty interest in using some of these instruction technologies”. However, of the 1,586 total instructional faculty, over 900 credit-teaching faculty did not answer the survey. * That’s a substantial pool which could be tapped for online or hybrid teaching, and there is no reason to believe that the overall interest in online teaching has plateaued.

There was discussion on the survey wording for question 4: “Please indicate your use of the following instructional resources and course activities”. The term “computer lab assignment” could include assignments for lecture courses or online (WebCT) courses or language lab activities using a computer. TLTR members were not sure what the results signified. The survey was constructed at a time when facilities, equipment, available Internet tools were very different from today.

There were suggestions on how to overcome the stated “barriers to use” (Table 3, Faculty who indicated why instructional technologies are not currently used):
Encourage (require?) all faculty to have a College email address, a personal web page, course web pages. (Some of these barriers will be overcome when/if the College adopts portal software.)
Give faculty more information about time involved for various applications; separate myth, fear, reality, benefits.
Require new hires to have a degree of technological savvy and skills. (Many departments already designate this as a desirable qualification. Teaching online is voluntary.)
Show how technology use can be structured to make the instructor’s life easier (e.g., no standing in line at the copy machine, stability of information to students).
Promote appropriate technology use at flex day workshops and departmental meetings.
Negotiate some AFT contract language on online office hours, release from presence on campus for each course taught online, etc.

The Committee discussed getting updated comparisons of course retention numbers, face-to-face courses compared to online and tech-enhanced. Stats are available for comparisons with online, but not with tech-enhanced, which is harder to analyze since it applies to a wide-range of tech use, both in types of equipment and software used and in extent. Furthermore, each course could vary widely semester-to-semester. Conditions would be difficult to control, and usefulness and accuracy of data would be questionable.

There was a suggestion that we cross-compare results from student surveys, faculty surveys, and RPG data.

Suggestions for the next survey in 2009:
Track the non-responses and publicize with DCC asking for their help in promoting responses to the survey.
Give prizes for participation (win an IPOD, etc.).
Send surveys in hard copy, not just by email, to get more responses.
Have faculty classify themselves using their highest level of tech use: Are you:
An online teacher
A hybrid online teacher
A tech-enhanced teacher (lecture with tech supplemental materials and/or assignments).
49% or less of course content delivered via technology.

Tom Hetherington raised the idea of how to discuss whether or not to approve online and hybrid courses in the Curriculum Committee (he is a member of that Committee). This is a discussion for that Committee.

New Business
Lani Battiste, the new ADA Compliance Director, spoke with the group. Lani will oversee ADA compliance for CCSF. She is an attorney and worked with the College on the facilities compliance lawsuit. She has worked mostly with facilities, but will also work with programs to see that they are programmaticall compliant. We will develop written policies for online courses, telecourses, library materials, etc. These policies need to come out of the law. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act covers this. Tom Hetherington noted that the College could be proactive instead of reactive and that polices should be developed with faculty buy-in to help protect us from lawsuits.

Digital Inclusion Strategy. Pierre Thiry had requested feedback via email on this city-wide program for WiFi. Comments from this Committee were that it would be good to include the project in our new educational technology master plan, that he could resend
his email request to the list, and that he talk with Wing Tsao about looking at the stem cell project as a model.

Revision of Ed Tech Master Plan

History
The last plan was approved in 1997. There was an interim update in the “CCSF Strategic Master Plan” in 2003 (Strategic Objective 7.1: “Strengthen and Expand Educational Technology Programs”). In spring 2004 there was a report and recommendations implementations of SO7.1 (“TLTR actions on CCSF Strategic Master Plan”)

There was discussion on keeping the three general goals stated in the 1997 plan and updating the objectives listed under each. Some comments: Goal 1: “accessible” has two major meanings but both need to be clarified by listed objectives. Goal 2 is good but leaves out how ed tech benefits students after college for work and vocational objectives, as well as educational and professional. Goal 3 seems to be about sustainability. Janet Willett will bring copies of the 1997 objectives to the next meeting for further discussion.

*292 (18%) faculty answered the survey (Table 2, 2005-2006, Respondent Demographics). 240 faculty (82%) of the survey respondents taught either only credit or a combination of credit/noncredit. Total faculty teaching at least one credit class within the past 5 years was 74% (1,174 faculty). Note that online courses are only developed for credit courses.