MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
— MINUTES —
Thursday, February 14, 2013

Approved

PRESENT: Richard Albistegui-DuBois, Michael Bartulis, Erin Hiro, Nirmala Kashyap, Lawrence Lawson, Kalyna Lesyna, Jackie Martin-Klement, Lillian Payn, Carlos Pedroza, Teresa Pelkie

ABSENT: Michael Arguello, Sherry Goldsmith, Chris Sinnott, Jonathan Smith

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the Chair Lillian Payn at 2:10 p.m. in Room LL 104.

MINUTES: The minutes were approved as read with one abstention.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. The committee members reviewed our goals for the academic year:

ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
— GOALS: SCHEDULED AND PRIORTIZED —
— 2012-2013 —

		OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	AP	MAY
GOAL		BB Student Training			Almost DONE				
		Contest	*Announce*		*Launch*		*Deadline (Ap1)*	*Judge*	*TEA*
		Policy: Exams, Proxy, Lab…..			DONE				
					DIL				
					POET -review -market -BB forum				

2. Regarding the request from the committee to see data about the digital divide at Palomar to project the computer needs in the new library regarding the future towers vs lending mobile units: Michelle Barton reported that Palomar College does not collect this kind of data.

INFORMATION:

1. State-wide satisfaction survey for online students. Follow-up: 39 colleges have agreed to participate and Palomar College will receive a summary report (per our request) with the individual college stats removed.

   The Work Groups presented their status reports.

2. Work Group Report: BB Student Training: almost finished with the final video.

3. Work Group Report: Contest: Lillian has been marketing the showcase to the deans, department chairs, division meetings, and other cross-campus groups. No entries have been submitted to date. Mike Bartulis suggested prizes such as iTunes cards to motivate submissions.

4. New Library Workgroup Report: (no meetings this year).

5. Work Group Report: Policy, Proxy, Security (completed)

6. GOAL: DIL
   Jackie Martin-Klements met with Lillian prior to our meeting. The PowerPoint presentation is in Blackboard Sandbox for review and will be presented at the 2/28 meeting.

7. GOAL: POET review
   Lillian distributed the survey results from POET v. 1 for the committee to review to determine what should be refined or changed. The workgroup for Policy, Proxy, Security agreed to spend more time on this review since they are finished with their tasks.

8. Terry Gray and the ATRC reports that the VOICE AUTHORING tool in Blackboard is not working. David must repair it frequently and it goes down randomly. It is of little value and is counter-productive, since students may not be able to access voice files submitted by the instructor. Therefore, ATRC has compared equivalent tools. They recommend TechSmith RELAY, which would have the same license fee as Voice Authoring (approximately $5500/year). It is more robust with better features, such as voice announcements, podcasts, and voice presentations, all of which can be submitted by the instructor to Blackboard. ATRC asks the Academic Committee for endorsement to cancel the Voice Authoring license and approval of a new license to TechSmith Relay.

9. . Terry Gray reports that a number of job tickets (regarding unresolved issues with Blackboard) to the developers have gone unaddressed. On occasion the Help Desk at Blackboard has stated they will address the issue next year. The specialists in ATRC find this unacceptable, so Terry Gray communicated the issues to Matt Lord (the rep who presented to our Committee Fall Semester). He was able to arrange a conference call with several of the higher execs and development managers on Feb 13 for about 45 minutes. They agreed to address the pending conflicts and issues.

10. The Senate asks the Academic Technology Committee to draft a policy on Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Lillian asked the committee to start looking at elements that should be included in such a document, in order to consider the academic advantages/disadvantages rather than our workload issues in order to craft a stronger position statement.

11. Vice President Cuaron asked Lillian to participate on the Accreditation Committee. The next meeting will be a training session on March 15 at Irvine Valley College. Lillian will also investigate the accreditation visit procedure for online classes in the next item #12.

12. Shannon Lienhart shared an alarming report of a separate process for visiting online classes by the AACJC:

    Feb 12, 2013, at 11:37 AM, Dean Mancina wrote:
    This may be old news, but I think we should keep a record of all the changes we discover about AACJC's accreditation process. The following is news to me.

    At one of our colleges, Orange Coast, the live accreditation visit is scheduled from March 18-20, 2013. However, online faculty were notified this past weekend (February 9) that effective that day, two new people are added to each of their online classes -- "Accreditation Student" and "Accreditation Instructor" so that the accreditation team has 24/7 access to online instructors' classes from February 9 - March 20. That's more than 5 weeks. Accreditation visit periods are apparently growing significantly longer.

    Dean Mancina, President, Coast Federation of Educators, AFT Local 1911
    Representing all Full-Time / 50-67% Part-Time Faculty in the Coast Community College District
    2701 Fairview Road, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
    714.432.5037 office, 714.432.5921 fax - http://www.cfe1911.org
    ----
    Also:
    From: Don Sparks <dsparks@aft1521.org>
    Date: February 12, 2013, 8:04:31 PM PST
    To: Dean Mancina <cfemancina@yahoo.com>

Cc: Don Sparks <dsparks@aft1521.org>, "ccc@cft.org" <ccc@cft.org>
Subject: Re: Accreditation Info

We have been told the same thing at Pierce College (LACCD) (due for its visit in March). How can they treat online differently than regular classes where they only have access during the days of the visit?

13. Online interpreters: with Blackboard being the delivery mode for online and f2f classes, issues have emerged regarding interpreter access. Denise Vanderstoel has expressed challenges getting interpreters enrolled in classes, and at least one instance this semester demonstrates the difficulty in getting access for 4 weeks. Lillian asked for a procedure that would permit establishing a technical account so interpreters can be routinely admitted the first day of classes, as needed. This is a technical issue, not an academic one.

MEETINGS: SCHEDULE (LL 104), 2:00 – 3:30 pm / 2nd, 4th Thursdays
2013
3/14
4/11, 4/25
5/9

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.