The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm.

I. Approval of Minutes
   a. The minutes from the October 4, 2010 TLTR meeting were submitted and approved.

II. Announcements
   a. CCSF is upgrading to Banner 8. This new version allows for waitlists. Online classes have been using waitlists for many years now. (Dewar)
   b. TMI is using a new ticket system. The first phase has been rolled out this semester and involves faculty. The next phase for students will be rolled out at the beginning of the spring semester. (Dewar)
   c. TMI plans for training in the spring including tech-enhanced workshops and special topic workshops. (Dewar)
   d. The Distance Learning Advisory Committee will review applications to develop online courses in December. The application due date is Wednesday, December 1st. The link to the application is:
      http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/TMI/application_develop_online.pdf
   e. The next TLTR meeting will be held on Monday, December 6th at 2 pm in MU 388.

III. New Business
   i. Non-credit online courses
      1. Carmen will follow up with the new CTO regarding whether or not non-credit students have CCSF student mail accounts.
      2. Cynthia will look more into the logistics of adding non-credit courses to Insight.
   ii. New Education Technology Department
      1. The committee discussed the role of the new Education Technology Department that would fall under the Department Chair Council.
         a. The DCC President, Darlene Alioto, sent an email to all online and telecourse faculty asking their opinion on the creation of an Education Technology Department.
         b. Karen Saginor reported that the Academic Senate is most interested in TMI getting the support that it needs. The AS is in favor of this new department.
   iii. Support Needs for TMI
      1. The committee discussed the creation of the 80% re-assigned faculty position within TMI. Tom Boegel, Acting Dean of Educational Technology, re-iterated that a new faculty position would be created and a position would not be moved from classified.
      2. It was pointed out that there is a need to have both types of training at CCSF. One of the challenges is that there is an evaluative piece to the process of approving a class to be taught online. From an
evaluative stand point it is much better to have faculty evaluating faculty instead of administrator/classified serving in this role.

3. With the reorganization of IT in July, some of the decisions in the ETO are now being made by IT. A faculty member serving in such a position makes certain that academic decisions are remaining in Academic Affairs.

4. IT is moving away from a specific person being assigned to one unit and more to a group of people being assigned. A faculty member in this position directly serves online faculty.

5. It was agreed that faculty need support when developing online classes.

6. It was suggested that maybe this is more of a coordinator position.

7. Karen asked that a title other than Instructional Designer be considered for the position.

8. The position is not an IT job. The goal is the same no matter what the technology looks like.

9. At CCSF faculty work to design and develop their own courses and they retain intellectual property rights to the online course they developed.

10. Members discussed their concern that the faculty member serving in this position would not be available in the summer. Other members pointed out that most of the pedagogical support comes during the academic year and the technical support can still happen with the TMI staff during the summer.

11. It was agreed that this conversation would continue at the December meeting.

IV. Adjournment
   a. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm

Submitted by Cynthia Dewar