Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable (TLTR)
APPROVED Minutes of meeting: December 1, 2003
Ocean Campus, Rosenberg Library R518
Submitted by Edward Stering, Secretary


TLTR Co-chair Janet Willett called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

The minutes of the November 3, 2003, meeting at Evans Campus were approved with corrections.

New Business:

1. Plans were made for a memorial, termed a “remembrance,” to eulogize Steve Levinson, co-founder of TLTR, who passed away on November 23, 2003. The remembrance will be on December 11, 2003, following the College Council meeting. Janet Willett will represent TLTR with a recollection of Steve’s years of service to technological issues at City College. Other tentative plans were discussed. The Levinson family will be invited.

2. Edward Stering volunteered to be the minutes secretary for TLTR.

3. The Roundtable discussed academic policies that pertain to the appointment of chairpersons for shared governance committees. TLTR is currently an open committee with a faculty co-chair and an administrative co-chair, resulting in the following unresolved issues:
   a. There may be an academic policy rule that a 100% release-time faculty member cannot chair an open committee as the faculty representative. Members of the Academic Senate present at the TLTR said this was not the case.
   b. The Chancellor wants to avoid any conflict-of-interest issue in which an advisory committee is chaired by a member of college operation served by that committee.
   c. The online archive of minutes will be researched for commentary on who can serve as a chairperson.
   d. Membership is currently open but limited to 10 faculty, 4 administrative, 4 staff, and 2 student members. More individuals are willing to serve on the Roundtable than there are places.

If TLTR were to become an unlimited committee, a, b, and c, and d would all be resolved.

Whereas the TLTR does not have a budget, and whereas the TLTR is a consensus-based advisory committee, it was approved by all that TLTR seek the status of an unlimited committee.

The appropriate proposal will be made at the next meeting of the Academic Policy Committee.

4. Spring semester meetings were scheduled for February 2, March 8, April 12 and May 3, 2004. An invitation will be extended to the appropriate personnel at both Mission Campus and Chinatown Campus. These campuses will be asked to
present their technology issues for one hour each at the February 2, 2004, meeting and one at the March 8 meeting. Each of these campuses is in the process of designing a new facility and their technological issues are a pressing matter. Academic Senate regulations state that a faculty member who does not report to a department chair and who is on 100% release can act as a resource only for committees.

5. The spring conference of the League for Innovation was announced. City College and De Anza College co-host this conference, which is scheduled for February 29 to March 3, 2004. James Rogers at ETO is coordinating volunteers for conference service. Call 239-3711 to volunteer. Eight hours of service entitles the employee of City College to free registration. www.league.org/ccti is the website for the League, and http://www.league.org/i2004/glance.html is the “conference at a glance” website.

Old Business:

1. Update on Copyright Information/Policy Revision. There was no quorum in the Academic Policies Committee, so the matter was tabled for future discussion.
2. The Strategic Plan, Objective 7.1, a and d were discussed.
   a. Activity a reads “support the institutionalization of online learning classes, as appropriate, based upon evaluation of course effectiveness.” This activity is associated with four actions and a timetable.
      i. Currently, Technologically Mediated Instruction (TMI) has funding to develop 49 online units per year. The intent of item a is that these courses become part of the corresponding department’s assigned maximum of courses, i.e., that they be institutionalized.
      ii. It was noted that large departments are better able to absorb online courses without negative impact on their face-to-face course offerings. However, small departments often cannot give up any of their current face-to-face courses. The provost currently funds delivery of 49 online units that departments have not been able to absorb. And no new courses are developed for a department unable to absorb them immediately.
      iii. After discussion, it was noted that the current budget constraints and the current caps on the number of courses offered make it unlikely that the Fall 2004 timetable can be met.
      iv. The first action for this activity calls for a review of current online classes in order to determine levels of enrollment and student and faculty satisfaction. Besides compiling enrollment data, surveys will be written and administered to determine degrees of satisfaction.
      v. The third action calls for the recommendation of courses for institutionalization. The Roundtable discussed criteria for recommendations. A point-based system could include some or all of the following criteria:
         1. Transferability to other institutions of higher education
         2. Relevance to preparing a student for a career, i.e., basic skills and vocational education
         3. Four consecutive semesters of consistently high enrollment
4. High marks on a standard peer evaluation report
5. High levels of student satisfaction

vi. After further discussion it was recommended that a fifth action be associated with this activity. “Define institutionalization incentives which will encourage the college’s departments to give priority to online courses when new funding becomes available.”

vii. The Roundtable noted that more secure funding could be attained if the college could offer an A.A. degree program comprised of all online courses. By fall 2004, the online program will be one course short of having the necessary courses for a general education AA degree. After the addition of the Gay, Lesbian, Transgender course, only a math course will be lacking.

viii. It was noted that current funding constrains institutionalization within a zero-sum environment. When one department/program gets an increase in the number of courses it can offer, another department/program loses a course. Because of the inevitable competitiveness, the Roundtable considers the fall 2004 timetable unattainable.

b. Activity d reads “evaluate effectiveness of instructional technologies in contributing to student progress and success.” This activity is associated with three actions, the first of which is to “develop evaluation plan.”
   i. The Roundtable discussed student surveys that ask questions and call for comments regarding satisfaction and success. Students would be asked (1) if they would recommend the course to others, and (2) if they believe they learned more or better on-line than they would have in a traditional classroom setting.
   ii. A free online survey software program was discussed as a possible tool in the evaluation process. The software program is called Student Assessment Learning Gains (SALG), and it can be customized. Student input is anonymous, but the instructor would know who completed the survey.

3. TMI announced it does have funds to pay for release time for faculty who would develop a new online course. An online course is defined by state regulations as one in which at least 51% of the instruction is delivered via the Internet. It was also announced that TMI could also provide support to any instructor in the area of technological enhancement of their face-to-face courses.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.