

University of Alaska Southeast
Teaching, Learning, & Technology Roundtable (TLTR)

Meeting Notes

Thursday, January 31, 2013

Chancellor's Conference Room

10:00 – 11:30 AM

Toll-free number: 800-893-8850

Participant PIN: 8955736

1. Call to order

Tony Martin, Sara Minton, Jason Amundson, Maren Haavig, Kevin Hurtle, Lee Graham, Hildegard Sellner, Eve Dillingham, Jon Martin, Maureen O'Halloran, Jill Hanson, Kim Schulte,
Guests: Kathi Baldwin, Lori Cheezem, Nicole Duclos,

2. December 6 meeting draft minutes review

3. Quality Matters Focus Group

a. Kathi Baldwin – SPROCC report (part of Title III grant)

Kathi went through a PPT presentation on "Sitka's Peer Review of Online Courses for Continuous Course Improvement" addressing the QM focus on course design assuring course content fits universal design, addressing ADA compliance and diverse learning styles. The peer review process is not to judge faculty, nor intended to be competitive. It is not prescriptive though will suggest areas needing improvement. Sitka Campus peer review tools used/referred to UAA Continuous Improvement in Distance Education through Review (*CIDER*), QM, and Central Michigan primarily.

Kenai Peninsula College (KPC) and Kodiak College are also both engaged with QM. KPC's Chem103 won the Blackboard Catalyst Award last year. KPC is in the third year of their Title III grant which paid for QM and faculty training; all their faculty are trained as informal reviewers. However, QM is expensive and sustainability following Title III is uncertain.

Kathi expressed some concern regarding the branding issue inherent in identifying some UA courses as QM certified. Does this mean these courses are better for students? Is a course without the QM stamp not good? There is value for both online and face-to-face courses in working with QM rubric and general principles without comprehensive (and expensive) participation in the entire system.

Other comments referenced some lack of trust in online courses, i.e. the UA online labs discussion, and whether the QM stamp will become a factor in promotion/tenure/scholarship of teaching and learning.

UAS Sitka folks engaged in this project are interested in working together toward a common goal, and in alignment with the UAS TLTR focus group. Maren (and the group) don't see any conflict but recognize that the regional UAS TLTR is just beginning this conversation and Sitka is in the third year the related project.

Tony noted that TLTR was obviously interested in sorting through these issues:

- Maureen will make recommendations about next step – rubric, support needed educate ourselves about these issues; need for discussion w/ faculty here in Juneau.

- Lee reiterated the need for conversation on the Juneau Campus and the importance of recognizing this is a slow process; others will want to join conversation, figure things out for themselves, take time to feel up to speed before making decisions and contributions
- UAS Sitka faculty engaged in this effort should of course continue, and coordinate w/ UAS Juneau and Ketchikan. It is important to keep people informed while providing a venue for feedback and sharing ideas and establishing an interactive process

Kathi commented on the initial peer review activities at UAA. Most wanted nothing to do with it but the team came back w/ a trial rubric and sample course and presented four public reviews of test courses and by the end people were enjoying seeing each other's courses and this process led to greater buy in. Kathi thinks CIDER would have been sustainable if funding continued. Peer review is already in use by some Sitka faculty; they have are working within common peer review practice and an adapted rubric. The group discussed ways the Sitka Campus project aligns with the current TLTR explorations.

b. Anne Jones, Chair TLTR QM Focus Group

Objectives of the QM Focus Group:

1. Explore QM rubric as well as other rubrics for course design and applications for these rubrics
2. As a focus group, develop recommendations about the value of course design rubrics in the UAS environment
3. Recommend next steps for using QM rubric or QM-type rubric at UAS

Anne indicated that the QM Focus Group is not yet at this level, but is still at 'do we want to discuss' stage; after that they will consider rubrics and review. There's the possibility of presentations at Convocation Fall 2013 or some face-to-face discussions since some faculty are curious about it. They are currently just getting out information out and taking to colleagues as most people aren't aware of QM, and presentations might be off-putting. Training is very important and presentations or a one-page rubric out of context can lead to misunderstandings. Creating assessments and aligning course content lies initially with faculty, with the reviewer. First, a context for resources required to support rubric implementation is needed, in combination with openness to training and provision of on-going support.

It's important that the conversation is not overrun by the existence of the specific rubric and QM applications. It is not an 'all or nothing' situation; gradual, strategic exposure will help to avoid misunderstandings or sense of an externally imposed approach. Mary Purvis spoke in support of rubrics, not as something punitive but tools like iTeach that help inform faculty about where they can improve instruction.

TLTR agreed to keep the existing charge for the TLTR QM Focus Group, incorporating experiences and insight from the Sitka Title III group and bringing suggestions for next steps to TLTR in April. There is interest in a broader dissemination of info regarding the peer review processes; perhaps showcased as a separate activity or brown bag gathering.

4. Innovation Grant for STEM MOOC-Lee Graham

The STEM MOOC is completely open, using only open tools. See: <http://www.diffimooc.com/>

The site includes getting started, course videos on YouTube, with work completed in open tools such as WikiSpaces, blogs, and Twitter Feed. Students work in blogs, and can use any avenue they like –

introducing themselves in video, using LiveText (donated keys for students) including rubrics. Students are not all happy but are warming up to this delivery mode. See Lee's blog at: akedtech.com

5. External blog site usage – Kathi Baldwin, Michael Ciri

[Note: This section does not completely capture the wide-ranging discussion that took place; look for this and related topics on future agendas.]

Kathi Baldwin mentioned the Sitka 'Faculty Learning Corner' in WordPress housing tutorials, links and other resources. Usability issues impact teaching and effective student learning. She checked with UAF where some are running a WordPress blog; ED593 used CampusPack; but some students worked in WordPress anyway. Kathi's focus is on usability in the context of her experience with the Sitka Campus and previous work with UAA faculty. She suggested possibility that the Sitka Campus could purchase WordPress with Title III funds but acknowledged sustainability beyond the Title III grant is an issue. Regarding IT support for WordPress Kathi's information from UAF staff suggests the routine maintenance on a WordPress server takes about 30 minutes a week to download software patches and keep it updated, but the real time consumption will come in the operational support of faculty. Further exploration of UAS needs and requirements by TLTR and the Web Strategy Committee are likely.

Michael Ciri discussed issues surrounding online info internal and external to the University particularly in relation to UAS material existing openly on the Internet. There are differences between much course content, and information specific to staff and UAS departments, and consequently different considerations. There needs to be a balance between institutional security and integrity, and seeing what's out there by taking an internet field trip.

Michael is expecting a one-pager from UA General Counsel on issues that arise when taking students 'off campus' along with information on requirements, best practices, ways to frame the situation in terms of risks/benefits, and determining where the instructional benefits outweigh institutional risks.

Web Strategy Committee established by UAS Executive Council (Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chan. Enrollment Management & Student Affairs, and Vice Chan. Administrative Services) working toward establishing common tools, connected look and feel, and including a review process for exceptions

Weblogs – different sets of needs – how are they used in instruction – students (customers/clients of University; mindful of FERPA and privacy rights). Blogs can become agents of university branding so important to have some record/ability to pull when out-of-date. Blog – organized by date, sequential comment.

6. Campus support for Apple computers

Continue discussion at Feb. 12th meeting?

7. Time/date for next meeting

Thursday, February 12, 2013, 10-11:30 am

8. Adjourn