

# UAS Regional TLTR Meeting

12/1/2011, 1:30-3:00 PM

Chancellor's Conference Room, UAS Juneau campus

**Attendees:** Maureen O'Halloran, Jill Hanson, Kim Schulte, Tony Martin, Colleen McKenna, Carol Hedlin, Michael Ciri, Emily Wall, Hildegard Sellner, Jen Ward, Jon Martin, Marnie Chapman, Bryan Hitchcock (for Megan Buzby), Maren Haavig

**Guests:** Mark Thompson

**Action:** Minutes from November 10 meeting – approved

## **Blackboard Transition Discussion:**

Update from Michael: goal was to have it installed in December. They are using a “server cluster”, i.e. multiple web servers running the system, can handle more capacity and one can take over for the other in the event of an outage. This has made implementation more difficult than anticipated – approximately 4 days behind schedule. Servers should be set up and ready to go next week. Test system should be ready before break.

January and February – goal is to get faculty input and fine-tune the system. Each faculty member will have a “playground” for testing, including importing from UASOnline. Faculty should provide input via forum.

Sitka Input: Sitka faculty have been using Blackboard for awhile and there are several features that they want to see in the UAS installation. They would like a list of possible features with descriptions to choose from. They also want to know whether they will be able to import their UAF Blackboard courses into our system.

Michael encourages everyone to have discussions regarding features and configuration in the discussion forum. UAS cannot guarantee that any faculty will be able to migrate their courses as-is into the new system, whether they are using UASOnline or UAF Blackboard.

**Action:** Michael will create a list of the modules that UAF and UAA use and post it in the forum today. All interested parties will read and provide feedback.

Default setup is also a concern – will there be choices of course “shells”? Blackboard shells are customizable, and the course menu can be rearranged. UAS goal was for more consistency, so this would need to be discussed. Would inconsistent shells defeat this goal?

Michael – project goal is to get Blackboard up and running. There are certain modules that will be included, but current scope does not include a wide-ranging review of modules/add-ons. Top priority now is base configuration and related policies. Discussion about improvements and add-ons should continue and will be considered in future phases of the project.

Carol - a lot of these concerns will be addressed as the project progresses. At the start, we are looking for some consistency so students understand how to use the system. Everyone has concerns about how to structure their classes to fit into the new system. Carol urges people to continue these discussions in the forum.

We should all continually remind our faculties to get involved in the forum. Sitka faculty should take all of their questions and concerns into the forum to get wider input.

Once the system is live, it would be helpful to get an email with specific instructions about getting started - not just how to log in, but how to start using it. Michael says that this will be part of the faculty development plan.

## **Blackboard Training**

Career Ed training ideas: Can training occur during convocation, and/or via asynchronous Blackboard class? Final exam week in spring semester might be a good time for in-depth training. Rick Caulfield is working on convocation with Faculty Senate. Sitka and Ketchikan don't generally come to Juneau, so any training plans should consider how to include all campuses (E-Live, Audio, Satellite, etc.).

Blackboard offers some asynchronous training on specific tools, but they are detailed and overwhelming. Would be better to get a broad overview/tour at first.

Kim is on the hiring committee for the instructional designer. Candidates have not yet visited - general consensus is that it would be best to get them here ASAP. Michael says that the position was to have a significant role in planning and conducting Blackboard training. He worries that there won't be a plan unless some other group takes it on, since it will take some time to get the person hired. He says that it should not be IT-driven. Current instructional designers will also be involved in the training. Face-to-face training is important for initial training. Follow-up can be phone or other distance methods.

Provost wants to know from TLTR what faculty need in terms of training. Maureen has already sketched out a broad plan for types of training.

**Action:** Maureen and Kim will review Maureen's plan, edit if necessary, add budget information, and forward it to Carol and Tony by Tuesday. Carol will take the draft budget to Rick.

### **Technology Fees**

What is TLTR's role in tech fees? Fee originated within the TLTR, but each campus uses it differently. This should stay at the campus level. Carol asks that the "special projects" information on the TLTR web site be removed/archived.

**Action:** Carol will archive "Special Projects" info on Web site, and will remove the link in the navbar.

### **TLTR Student Reps**

Ketchikan has one student rep on their campus TLTR (the campus president).

Sitka emailed a campus-wide invitation to students to serve on their TLTR - described it as a leadership opportunity and offered a three credit tuition waiver. They ended up with one low tech student from a rural native village and another who is highly tech savvy. The students will participate in Sitka campus meeting, and their contributions will be conveyed to the regional committee.

**Action:** Jon will forward the invitation to Tony for distribution to TLTR members.

**Action:** Carol will look into whether Juneau could also offer an incentive.

**Action:** Jennifer will talk to Jesse Grant about getting a regional student rep.

### **Classroom Technology Standard**

Is there a regional standard for classroom technology? Michael says that there has not been a standard in the past, but that campus TLTR committees should discuss the pros and cons of implementing one. Kim requests that we add this topic to a later meeting.

### **Statewide Technology Survey**

The statewide Office of IT will be conducting a survey next week to review academic technology. Purpose is to assist in planning for future use of technology. All UA faculty and students will receive an email invitation to participate in the survey, with some kind of prize drawing incentive. Consultant will write a report about academic/instructional technology throughout UA. Two different surveys - one for students, one for faculty, both are approximately 30 questions. Draft questions had to do with types of technology that students and instructors use, including printers, mobile devices, projectors, etc.

Timing could be problematic. UAS students are also doing course evaluations and this could cause some confusion/ aggravation.

**Action:** All - inform your faculties of the survey. Some might want to warn their students about it and advise them that it is completely separate from the course evaluation.

**Next meeting: December 15, 2:00-3:30 PM**