

---

# MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

## — MINUTES —

Thursday, January 24, 2013

---

*Approved*

PRESENT: Richard Albistegui-DuBois, Michael Arguello, Michael Bartulis, Sherry Goldsmith, Nirmala Kashyap, Lawrence Lawson, Kalyna Lesyna, Jackie Martin-Klement, Lillian Payn, Teresa Pelkie, Chris Sinnott, Jonathan Smith

ABSENT: Erin Hiro, Carlos Pedroza

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the Chair Lillian Payn at 2:13 p.m. in Room LL 111.

MINUTES: The minutes were approved as read.

ACTION ITEMS:

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

### ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

— GOALS: SCHEDULED AND PRIORITIZED —

— 2012-2013 —

	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FE B	MAR	AP	MAY
GOAL	BB Student Training			Almost DONE				
	Contest	<i>Annou nce</i>		<i>Launch</i>		<i>Deadlin e (Ap1)</i>	<i>Judge</i>	<i>TEA</i>
	Policy: Exams, Proxy, Lab.....			DONE				
				DIL				
				POET -review -market -BB forum				

2. The At Committee vetoed the recommendation for participation in the Online Class Satisfaction Survey. The reasons were that the committee 1) would have liked to have seen the questions first, to determine the information we would gain from the results; 2) was concerned with the statistical significance of the sample since historically we do not get a strong response rate; and 3) the profs are spread thin, and it would be an additional task to stretch to complete.

We would like to be able to have a rep. at the training session to see the questions and the process, but if this survey would not be repeated, there would be minimal value.

3. The committee would like 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.

INFORMATION:

1. Palomar: option to participate in a state-wide satisfaction survey for online students. Project is being launched in February, but Palomar hasn't determined if it will participate (as of January 23). The committee members discussed the pros and cons of participating but recommended vetoing our participation for the following reasons:

"The reasons were that the committee 1) would have liked to have seen the questions first, to determine the information we would gain from the results; 2) was concerned with the statistical significance of the sample since historically we do not get a strong response rate; and 3) the profs are spread thin, and it would be an additional task to stretch to complete.

Like, Barb and Michelle, the committee would like to be able to have a rep. at the training session to see the questions and the process. Lillian imagine sthis survey would not be repeated, so there would be possibly minimal value.

The Work Groups presented their status reports.

2. Work Group Report: BB Student Training  
All the videos are in place, and Lawrence said he can wrap up final details. The committee met with Elaine Armstrong, Academic Technology Resource Center, in order to make-over the Student Resource Page. The meeting was Thursday, November 15, at 2 pm in LL 111.
3. Work Group Report: Contest: The flyer is completed, and Lillian finished a web page with the requirements, procedures to enter the contest, and an online entry form. We have had some feedback, all positive. An all-college announcement was distributed on the first day of classes, and flyers will be distributed at division meetings, Senate, etc. (*Please review web page for clarity and accuracy: <http://www2.palomar.edu/pages/onlineshowcase>.)*)
4. New Library Workgroup Report:  
A few meetings have resulted in a plan and request for refinement of the floor plan, as well as some significant revisions in traffic flow and placement of classrooms, work areas, offices, etc.
5. Work Group Report: Policy, Proxy, Security  
Mike Bartulis noted that security is not really the challenging issue that is frequently brought up due to the advances that are projected through biometrics and other technical solutions. We should expect changes that will be built-into our CMS that will increase the security of logon and test-taking, for example.
6. The Blackboard upgrade: January 7 - 10, 2013 went fairly smoothly and David Gray reported that the SQL course that Dean Judy Cater funded was useful in planning the upgrade and dealing with the date base issues that are not document by Blackboard. He was able to complete the upgrade within the time that had been announced.
7. GOAL: DIL  
Jackie Martin-Klements will meet with Lillian prior to our next meeting to recommend a plan at our next meeting.
8. GOAL: POET review  
Lillian will distribute a copy of the survey results from POET v. 1 for the committee to review to determine what should be refined or changed. Some members felt that perhaps we didn't need to make a revision for an upgrade at this time. The workgroup for Policy, Proxy, Security will spend more time on this review since they are finished with their tasks.
9. Lillian gave a report of her activities over break at the state and county level. That report is attached.

MEETINGS: SCHEDULE (LL 104), 2:00 – 3:30 pm / 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> Thursdays  
**2013**  
 2/14, 2/28  
 3/14  
 4/11, 4/25  
 5/9

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 pm.

## Lillian's Report: Jan 24, 2013

1. ATRC: Full training schedule for spring semester. Branding: "Bistro Series, Training a la carte" – in-person, online, video, 1-on-1, hands-on, demos, and even custom take-out training.
2. "Best of the Best" Online site contest... please see flyers
3. 13 committee members + my name on the roster. Lost 3 due to sabbatical leave of absence.
4. POET stats (2012 to date):
  - 48 enrolled
  - 45 total trained instructors to date (includes POET and external credentials)
  - 13 POET certificates earned since last faculty tea May, 2012
  - 21 POET certificates since Jan 2012
5. State Distance Educators meetings / training sessions:
 

*(issues to pay attention to)*

  - a. a review of Title 5 DE regulations
  - b. accessibility
  - c. accreditation
  - d. prohibitions for fees for distance ed, such as charging for proctoring exams
  - e. Due soon: report from a state-wide student success task force
  - f. Noteworthy: Governor's Distance Ed Proposal for next year's budget:
    - Expand course delivery through technology
    - Almost \$17 million budget for Distance Ed
    - For creation of new virtual campus
    - Single centralized delivery and support system for all colleges
    - (CA Virtual U redesigned in 2004...eliminated regional centers)
    - Credit by Exam: PRIOR LEARNING ASSESSMENT = PLA
    - State wants faster and cheaper..but comm colleges want better...not faster cheaper...
    - MOOCs a hot topic now, but outside of traditional curriculum process? Should there be a different fee charged? Out of state and intl fees? (Massive Online Open Course)
      - MOOCs have 10-12% retention rate
      - not a solution for transfer courses or remediation
      - Mira Costa Prof: online courses aren't always MOOC format courses since so many are also remediation courses
    - Goal is to have seamless movement across a centralized system....work on standardizing transfer degree courses, to give students more options across the system, even out enrollment across systems.
    - Design will need to include sufficient collaboration and interaction, for quality experience.
6. Exploring standardized state-wide open-licensed text books and other consortiums-since last year's legislation sponsored by 20-Million Minds, the sponsors of RE-BOOT January 8 UCLA event.
7. "Rebooting California Higher Education" Conference at UCLA on Jan 8<sup>th</sup>
  - Sponsored by 20 Million Minds/CA non-profit
  - All day conference with leaders from gov, private industry, a number of publishers of online materials, private and public: universities, colleges, unions, administrators, etc.
  - Very informative and well-done
  - \$50 K to develop an online course... amortize that with greater enrollments and over longer periods... then less expensive to deliver online courses
  - Facing increasing costs (for student debt and admin of HE) with traditional classroom ed.
  - Current economics forces larger student/teacher ratio, greater standardization, and take delivery out of f2f classrooms.
  - Proposing larger, standardized national courses. Peer grading.
  - Other models, such as Western Governor's U: self-paced courses, 1-1, with a phone call contact each week to report progress.

- Challenges expanding online ed
  - Readiness levels /70% not college ready
  - Minorities
  - Digital divide
  - Part-time/returning students/older students
  - Lowered standards with peer-grading?
  - What is the goal of higher education?
  - What does a degree mean?
- 8. Finals week Chancellor, Dr. Cindy Miles has called a meeting for the Southern CA DE Coordinators, for a regional online learning proposal. There were 7 of us present and we formed an official group that will be recognized by SDICCCA. (San Diego/Imperial County Community College Association)
- 9. Blackboard stats: For 1<sup>st</sup> week of classes: we currently have a 40% course availability rate, a 75% student access rate (that is,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of all students at Palomar this term have logged into Blackboard), and apparently an average course enrollment size in Blackboard is 29.6 students.