University of Alaska Southeast
Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable

October 27, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Call to order 10:33

Present:

Stefanie Ashley (student rep),	Marnie Chapman
Joe Sears, IT	Suzie Feero
Michael Ciri	Robbie Stell
Matt Heavner	Barney Norwick
Marsha Gladhart	John Bilderbeck
Anselm Stock	Jennifer Brown
Alice Terstig	Colleen McKenna
Wayne Houtcooper	

1.
    Minutes from sept 22, 2006
    correction: On page 2, the server was purchased using campus
    reallocation fees (not the tech fee as stated in the minutes)
    approved with correction
2. Cara Wicks-Ortega asked about using a service like Turnitin at UAS so plagarism
    added to agenda. Michael noted that there are many issues (intellectual property,
    implementation, usage policies) associated with turn it in or other
    plagiarism detection software
    --> if UAS is going to use any of it, we have to get the policy in place

    There is a campus plagiarism committee (Beth Mathews is the Natural
    Science rep) and they have explored this issue and may have a campus
    license for some plagiarism software. Marsha will contact plagiarmism committee
    and see what they've found.
3. Based on the minutes/discussion from last meeting, a clarification of
    the purpose of the TLTR and its relationship with the tech fee was
    discussed:
    a. Michael Ciri described that the tech fee was established to get
        technology infrastructure, and any leftovers could be used for special
        projects. A priority should be given to general instructional space.
    b. This year there is no money for special projects. However the TLTR
        should solicit special projects; TLTR will solicit innovative
        projects. The funding for these projects isn't necessarily the tech
        fee, but it is rather a call for ideas which we (and Michael and
        Robbie) will use to pursue multiple funding sources. This

project/call for ideas should not be confused with Chancellor or any other existing call for proposals.

c. Primarily, the purpose of the call for proposals should encourage thinking broadly. The TLTR setup a committee to define and produce the call for proposals. The volunteers for the committtee are: Matt Heavner, Stefanie Ashley, and Barney Norwick. Perhaps the proposal committee needs to come up with a new name (not the TLTR Special Project).

4. Next, Robbie Stell spoke to clarifying the mission of the TLTR

What is the mission? The UAS TLTR was based on Steve Gilbertson's original concept of a group of faculty, staff, and students who met to consider issues related to technology and learning. The UAS TLTR was formed and was given the tech fee as part of its responsibilities. We're trying to separate it out a bit so that the TLTR is not synonymous with managing the tech fee special projects, but instead is a forum for broader discussions about the use, implementation and future of technology in the university.

Currently, in the university budgeting process, there is often "last-minute" money available for academic equipment and needs have not been identified. If there is an ongoing discussion (in a regionally representative TLTR, for example) of where we would like to be going with technology in the classroom, UAS administration could respond to this "last-minute" situation in a better way. For example, this year there is an existing request for $1.5M (or is it $1.8M?) for academic equipment (this figure is statewide, and each MAU will be approached for proposals. If we have strong, prepared proposals, UAS has the opportunity for a significant investment from statewide in our identified academic equipment needs.

So how does TLTR initiate and facilitate these discussions? First, WCET webcasts to spur on discussions regionally. Robbie would like to see TLTR work with faculty development seminar to see how to make faculty more effective with students (using technology).

Brown bag lunches have been one of the most successful TLTR things in the past. Should we be archiving and webcasting the brown bags to include all three campuses. One important aspect of these brown bags is the social aspect.

Marsha agreed that sharing resources is very important. One of the Web casts that we have archived at this time addresses evaluating online instruction. This year winter convocation about assessment, perhaps it will tie in to evaluating online instructions. (A "heads up"). Marsha will contact the assessment committee about a shared panel on this topic to follow the archived Webcast.

The discussion moved to online evaluations and the use of student responses. IT feedback and "non-IT" feedback combined in course evaluations--part of assessment is getting that feedback to the right person. So non-IT feedback gets communicated out to TLTR, to faculty

Evaluating/assessing online vs face-to-face course is an issue

TLTR should be generating this type of discussion (on assessing courses) regionally.

Marnie: important to work as a region, can we use Elluminate to facilitate TLTR meetings?

Question posed to Robbie: Can we get a sense of organization of TLTR? Where does Ketch/Sit money go? One pot or not?

Robbie: Every campus has their own tech fee. Again, we want to get away from TLTR purpose as tech fee. At Ketchikan/Sitka the campus director decides on tech fee spending. Can it be spent on IT personnel? (Wayne--yes it is being used that way).

Marnie: Perhaps the TLTR agenda could reflect regional first for the main meeting and then we would split up into campuses to address any local issues (this is a successful model used by Nat'l Sci faculty meetings)

5. Brown bag lunches. WCET archives, second life demo, podcast training. What is the best venue to generate discussion?

   a. faculty development seminar is very effective (for demos), but brown bag lunch is social event, student technology use could use help, Barney is a great resource for faculty
   b. Michael put forth, "IT's job is to provide training". In the past it used to be safe to assume that "all students needed a general IT introduction", but now if 3-4 students need a specific topic, then IT will respond with ac-hoc training. External input on needed training would be great. And Michael specifically requested TLTR act on providing a list of needed training.
   c. One idea discussed was a "test course" for UASOnline -- for students (and faculty?) to use as a "sandbox" to test UASOnline.

      There are several classes being offered or developed to improve student technological literacy: one successful model from another university is "CS 1" which is offered in the dorms. Colleen is working on CIOS 101 (perhaps to become a GER?) Could this be a half semester courses?

Education 230 class – offered to students who need to learn basic skills for other classes

    d. What topics should be covered in whatever forum is developed for these discussions? Lots of topics--identify specifics

6. Marsha requested permission to pursue using WCET archives. It was asked what the cost is--it has already been paid. The group agreed that Marsha should go ahead and see about using the archive then.

One forum and topic identified is to have a faculty development seminar on helping students succeed in online courses. Definitely we should include some students on panel.

Several other ideas were discussed:
    a. Creating a repository of help topics for UAS specifics would be good (Do we want a question mark next to every button on UASOnline which will describe what that button does and how to use it?)
    b. A late starting 1 or 2 credit class would be good
    c. Cathy LeCompte did lots on "preparing to be an online student"
    d. ---update tech use guideline
    e. entrance test for technology (Marnie?) and Ketchikan

7. An instructional retreat was on the agenda but never really discussed.

Submitted by Matt Heavner