TEACHING AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGY ROUNDTABLE (TLTR)
Approved Minutes of Meeting: December 4, 2006
Ocean Campus, Rosenberg Library, Room 518.
Submitted by Carol Reitan

12 Present: Christine Beard (Transitional Studies), Kristin Charles (Institutional Advancement), Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer (Library), Mamie How (ETO/ITS). John Kennedy (LAC), Pam Mery (Research and Grants), Francine Podenski (BEMA), Carol Reitan (TLC/Foreign Languages), Tim Ryan, (ITS), Janet Willett (TMI), Peter Wood (CNIT), Christina Yee (Language Center).

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

Minutes: The minutes of the November meeting were approved as amended.

Old Business:
1) The major findings of counseling tech report: Pam Mery
Pam Mery reported on the results of the Technology Survey. She reported that the “interest in technology” reported in the survey was malleable. That is, targeted publicity to those who did not even respond to the survey could change minds. The 900 individuals who did not even respond to the survey may become interested at a later time. She also reported that the survey shows that the number of online courses will slowly build not grow exponentially.

Additionally, Pam reported on attending the “Meeting of the Minds - National Adult Education Practitioner-Researcher Symposium” conference in Sacramento where she saw much interest in distance education (DE) indicated by the number of sessions and reports on research on its efficacy. National statistics present at the symposium indicate that around 70% of adult education/literacy students have access to technology.

Lindy McKnight and Patty Chong-Delon of the Counseling Department had added a counseling section to the Technology Survey. Pam distributed copies of the results. The survey, to which there was an excellent response rate, revealed that there is more use of technology by counselors than expected. The survey indicates that more counselors are using technology and that they want more training and follow-up. A follow-up survey will ask how counselors are using various applications and how frequently they are using them, not just if they’re using them.

John Kennedy asked if a survey had been made of student technology use. Pam stated that info about student use of technology is garnered with “embedded questions” in other surveys. Noncredit would be the first place a tech survey would be deployed if one were, as there is little information about that group at this time.

Pam Mery invited TLTR members to contact her for further information about or feedback concerning the Technology Survey.
New Business
2) Streaming Video for the College: Tim Ryan
Tim Ryan reported on the ongoing video project connected with the ICONS grant. He first spoke about the state of video technology in general, specifically about streaming files from a server. He then summarized some of the possible uses he sees of video technology at CCSF. These include:

- Distributing video of CCSF Board meetings
- Housing DVD on server so that more than one person can view it at a time (Video on demand)
- He asked the question, “When is it appropriate to have video rather than just audio?”

Tim proposes a server for this use at CCSF (files on a server) – roll of ITS to maintain server

- Potential uses? Working w/ Library Dean, Rita Jones to put library video materials online – language oriented materials
- Banner training- 70% of banner users want more training
- Student Services: Orientation for new students – registration process, financial aid, etc.
- Video of CCSF sports events

Tim mentioned the following challenges to this sort of deployment at CCSF:

- Creating clips
- Cataloguing (search) clips/indexing
- Don Griffin has asked the following questions concerning the project. “Where is ownership?” Is there one entity in charge? Or are several departments working together. What about staffing levels? Is this a new entity?

There was discussion on the various challenges that need to be met. Ownership across the college is one important issue. Who will be in charge of a campus video project? Who will maintain the servers, the websites, etc. involved with the project? Who will produce and process the video? Delivery via the internet, network capacity, standardization of the viewer, and copyright protection are issues must also be considered. Tim mentioned one way video could be delivered only to those who have permission to view it would be linking through Banner. He cited UCLA as one institution who is doing just that. WebCT was also mentioned as a possible point of authentication, but could not be used for noncredit, as the WebCT license does not include noncredit. Tim mentioned that another challenge would be making material available via the internet, not just the CCSF intranet.

Discussion also pointed out that there were actually two types of video being discussed. One was the compression and/or digitizing of existing content is currently owned by the library and other collections that could be formatted for delivery via an intranet or the internet. The second type of video is video that would be created by instructors. Both
types would require additional staffing somewhere on campus as video processing can be time consuming and requires specialized skills.

There would be two modes of delivery of the video as well. Some video would be designed to be viewed on a computer desktop screen. Other video would be designed for viewing in a classroom. The processing is different for both types.

John Kennedy mentioned that models for ownership exist currently for other campus-wide projects; the CCSF website and WebCT. There is centralized administration and localized ownership for the content in both.

A pilot (possibly 5 videos) was discussed. Tim Ryan mentioned that a method of in-take would need to be in place to set priority for projects. Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer suggested that classes with the highest enrollment who use video that does not change regularly might have priority. John Kennedy suggested rather than concentrating on which videos to process, it might be wise to ask the instructors to identify departments that rely heavily on video. Christina Yee noted that the Language Center has a collection of DVDs for which they already have publisher permission to distribute on the web, and that these would be a good candidate for the pilot project.

Francine Podenski noted that a pilot would demonstrate utility of such a service. It was concluded that after the pilot, more staffing would be necessary to continue the video project.

Given the constraints of staffing, etc, Phase I of the project could concentrate on existing content, get it on a server and make it accessible, in order to show the utility of the undertaking and get college support. The coding and indexing portions of the project could fit into existing job classes. Tim Ryan stated that at least $100,000 and two staff people would be necessary to carry out the entire project. Tim notes that the cost may go higher depending on how large the storage capacity becomes and what level of data backup CCSF needs to provide.

For the pilot, Janet Willett suggested that the work could be contracted out for the pilot project. Tim Ryan volunteered to provide links to the examples he’s already made to the TLTR mailing list.

Francine Podenski noted that Multimedia studies will offer a new class on digital video distribution. It was also noted that for online training, esp. of computer applications, Camtasia offered a good option.

It was decided that a subgroup should do a pilot and make a proposal: Possible departments to be involved are: ITS, Tim Ryan; ETO, Mamie How; Library, Dean Jones’ designate; BEMA, Francine Podenski. A possible pilot would include some high use video for classes, and one online training item.
Tim Ryan agreed to write a few paragraphs giving an overview of the project. The product being considered by Tim is “Video Furnace”, a video indexing and streaming tool. “Video Furnace” is in use at UCLA and has a relationship with Alcatel, the company that manufactures the phone system at CCSF.

3) Goals of the last master plan:

Janet Willett asked the membership to consider if the goals of the 1997 plan were appropriate for the 2007 plan? The goals of the 1997 plan were:

- **Goal 1**: physical infrastructure and technical support for academic use of technology.
- **Goal 2**: Increase and promote opportunities for faculty and students to use education technology.
- **Goal 3**: Maintain and improve a system for continued planning for, evaluation of, and ongoing funding for education technology.

For the next meeting, Janet asked the membership to take a look at the old master plan, strike portions that are outmoded, and add things to be considered as additions to the plan. A paragraph of achievements will be added to the new master plan.

4) Next semester meeting dates:  It was decided to continue the precedent of meeting on the first Monday of the month. The TLTR will meet next semester on the following dates.

- Feb 5, 2007, 2-4, R518
- March 5, 2007, 2-4, R518
- April 9, 2007, 2-4, R518
- May 7, 2007, 2-4, R518

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