University of Alaska Southeast
Teaching, Learning, & Technology Roundtable (TLTR)
Minutes
–January 16, 2015

Chancellor's Conference Room
12:00-1:30 PM

1. Call to order – present:
   Lee Graham, Kimberly Schulte, Robin Gilchrest, Julie Hamilton, Bethany Wilkes, Maureen O'Halloran, Susie Feero, Jill Hanson, Marnie Chapman, Ann Spehar, Kathi Baldwin, Michael Ciri, Gabriel Wechter, Diana Collins, and Andrew McDonough.

2. Minutes from December 5th meeting
   Bethany moved to approve, seconded, and passed without changes.

3. Provost (Rick Caulfield)

   Rick supports this committee's work. About 49% of classes are online now at UAS. In a new McDowell Group survey of alumni, UAS gets the highest rating of overall academic experience. How can we maintain that? Faculty Senate wants more direct connection with TLTR Committee. Now TLTR is a shared governance committee. We need to think creatively and in innovative ways and bring those ideas forward.

   BOR and Shaping Alaska's Future – looking at efficiencies across all UA systems. We ARE 3 separately accredited institutions with different histories, which is okay. But alignment will continue. E.g. we should all be on the same LMS. We're currently looking into non-credit software that would track non-credit offerings – should it also include an instructional component? Statewide Academic Council (provosts, faculty, and research) is looking at these issues too – our committee discussions form what they might discuss. The Summit Team (chancellors, provosts, VP of academic affairs, president) is intended to make decisions from a management standpoint. They vet all information from committees, etc., and make decisions. TLTR has a very important role in formally recommending changes for best practices.

   Peer Review is an important tool. How do we communicate to the broader audience/stakeholders that we take it seriously? For marketing purposes, QM gives us a national standard to point to. Rick is not adamant that we must go to this specific tool, but is raising the question. How should we align with best practices?

4. Peer Review update and report (Kathi Baldwin)

   Kathi explained the history of peer review at UAS. The Sitka campus rubric looks similar to the old QM rubric. The biggest difference is our process. All reviewers are internal, and provide an abundance of feedback/suggestions. Our home-grown process is

a rigorous process to help improve courses – more than to provide a stamp of approval. Reviewers benefit and gain from the process as well.

Some of the negatives in marketing (i.e. with QM and KPC/Kodiak) are what does it really mean? KPC and Kodiak have done well by training many of their faculty in QM. In contrast, our untrained faculty have limited understanding, and there are not many who can be reviewers. We have 25 faculty trained. One reviewer on each team must be a content expert for the course being reviewed. We've been paying $500 stipends, but QM is closer to $150 for reviewers. But it's more a problem of time rather than money to get the reviews done.

The question has come up as to who can see the review results? Could results be held against a faculty member? Do all original review documents need to be relinquished to the faculty member? We don't know how QM deals with these issues. Some faculty don't like being mandated to be reviewed. But things seem to work okay when it's all voluntary. QM has points (scores) but Sitka has never used points in their process. KPC does some internal reviews prior to getting a course reviewed by QM (in order to help pass). Preparing for a peer review is where a course really improves. Chico State has done some excellent peer review work – almost used as often as QM's rubric by other schools.

Statewide has purchased a QM membership. Rick is going to look into this and let us know if this is true, and what this means to UAS costs for QM reviews. Sitka has been paying for a membership to QM. Their Title III grant runs through October – can we get some more faculty trained and pay for it while the grant is still in place? Reviewers must have taught an online course in the past two years. Michael believes that if you want to have it all be voluntary, can we really use the QM sticker with integrity (i.e. the bad courses aren't stepping up to get reviewed)? He worries that if we choose to do a peer review for online, but not face-to-face classes, does it imply that online courses are inherently inferior and therefore need some sort of stamp of approval? Ann believes we should have a consistent standard of quality across both online and in-person classes. There is a big difference, according to Kathi, between the two. Observing teaching is different from analyzing the setup of a course online. Peer review is all about organization, content, etc. – not about teaching quality. Review of actual teaching gets sketchy because you may then be open to union issues, etc.

Per Rick, it's really about fulfilling our mission which is quality student learning. Hopefully faculty sees that constructive review feedback can only be good. We need a process in place to do this – it should be voluntary. The fact that faculty would seek this out is only a plus in their review process. UAS as a whole needs to think sustainably – we can't rely on the Title III grant going forward. How can we sustain this conversation? Chico's rubric is very clear, so in communicating to our audience, we should explain our mechanisms on how we strive for continuous improvement. Make it more explicit and transparent – especially on our web site. We want everyone to support this initiative – not have it rammed down anyone's throat.

Lee explained that this committee's mandate is technology, so the quality review of in-person classes is the purview of Faculty Senate, not TLTR. We're just talking about review of the technological mediation of teaching/learning. On-line isn't inferior to in-person, it's just different.

The regional TLTRs will regroup and discuss this issue and bring back recommendations to TLTR. Hopefully we will have a concrete recommendation formed sometime this spring semester.

5. Blackboard and Web conferencing updates (Maureen)

We need to change the version of Collaborate that we're on. Support for our version ends in 2015. UAF and UAA have switched to the BB hosted version of Collaborate. Collaborate participants will now be able to join by telephone, and there's a better mobile version. The old Collaborate server will be decommissioned, and the old recordings (archives) will go away. Faculty COULD use Camtasia to record the webarchive – that's the only decent way to keep the recordings. If faculty is making recordings this semester, they won't automatically be around in future semesters. The timing for this conversion is not certain yet.

Upgrading BB in May. This will make the MyBlackboard functionality available. March-May the sandbox for this will be available.

6. Turnitin (Marnie Chapman) (= anti-plagiarism software)
Will be moved to next meeting's agenda

7. Upcoming agenda items
   - Quality Matters Review
   - Sloan-C – enough support for all our distance course (scorecard – looks at bigger realm than just class by class)
   - Draft discussion-Standardization Across MAUs

8. Adjourn

Next Meeting:
   - February 20th 1-2:30 pm