Learning Technologies Advisory Board meeting
February 26, 2013 – Flite 108
11:00-12:00

Present: Emily Mitchell, Mary Holmes, Amy Buse, Jackie Hughes, John Urbanick, Eric Quilitzsch, Randy Vance, Steve Costello, Jody Gardei, Kirk Weller, Andrew Peterson, (Phone) - Mike Ennis, Robbie Teahen, Susan Bonner

11:00 am Clicker replacement committee updates

1. (Jackie) – 2 of 4 planned clicker demonstrations are done.
   a. Next demo on Wednesday February 26 : Tophat Monacle
   b. Last Demo Next Week: einstruction
   c. Demonstrations are being recorded and Jackie will send out a link to the recordings once all 4 demonstrations are complete. Jackie will ask individuals to chime in on what they think would be best for FSU.
   d. Criteria for clicker selection is available and will be shared by Jackie.
      i. (John U) – If turnout for clicker selection process is inadequate, will it cause issues when a selection is made?
      ii. (Jackie) – Expressed opinion that CPS system has certainly had issues.
      iii. There may be a client free version of CPS system. It could provide an improved experience.
      iv. (Randy) – We should understand what the issues related to the current system are so that proper comparisons can be made. Training and support issues may be similar across various hardware solutions.

11:15 am Video conferencing classroom for all locations

2. (Jackie) – Asked Kirk Weller and Amy Buse to share experiences related to courses using / needing video conferencing.
   a. (Kirk) – Discussing Elementary Ed and Secondary Ed coursework; courses are taught face to face in BR, Lansing, and GR with mixed enrollment. Individual courses may have low enrollment where overall enrollment would be satisfactory if combined. Enrollment problems lead to scheduling problems. Looking for a method to deliver a single offering; video conferenced to multiple locations. This would provide a good solution for the delivery of coursework to remote locations with a single faculty and no travel. Some courses are being offered with Tegrity lectures in an asynchronous arrangement. This does not satisfy hands on interactive requirements of the coursework. There is a concern that the chosen method will not have adequate support (training / technology / tech support) and will not be reliable for real time delivery.
   b. (John) – Problem: Current classroom technology is 1 to 1 meaning that there is one room that can connect to one other room whereas what is needed in Kirk’s
case is a 1 to many so they can have one room connected with several other rooms at different locations.

c. (Kirk) – Commented on the need to increase contact with students. Video conferencing and on-line delivery should not be isolating students from contact with faculty.

d. (Amy) – Discussing CIT and CIS Programs; Taught in at least 4 locations (BR, TC, Dowagiac, GR, and Muskegon) with at least 50% of students enrolled off campus. Individually some courses may have single digit enrollment. Currently some students are required to drive to a central location in order to combine for a larger group. Alternately using a 4 Saturday method to maintain contact but reduce trips. Students have expressed concern about time between meetings in the 4 Saturday method. Considering using the Polycom room in Pharmacy; set up and other logistics have been, and remain a time consuming issue. Using Adobe connect (with mixed results) to supplement the 4 Saturday method. This has also been an issue because Adobe has scheduled every Sunday night as a maintenance night and sometimes they are used and sometimes they are not used but this has been the only available time for Amy’s students to meet. Student feedback is that more face to face time is needed. Another issue is that current system (banner) does not allow for good description of a course offered with special times. It is difficult to communicate to students beforehand. Also it should be noted that rooms in remote locations listed as conferencing rooms may be audio only. CIT/CIS courses would require students to have a computer as well.

e. (Mike Ennis) – Describing distance learning courses with individual connections, connections to distance learning rooms, and face to face students simultaneously. Set up of connections requires significant pre-class preparation. It is desirable to have a support person at the remote location to assist with materials and tech support. (Amy) – In some cases a tech savvy student can be hired. (Mike) – Has had success with as many as 9 students simultaneously. Also described the benefit of a mandatory 1 on 1 conference with faculty to increase the students comfort level with coursework and expectations. (Robbie) – Faculty have had some success with weekly scheduled Adobe connect sessions (Optional) as a method to increase interaction. (Mike) – Syllabus item: Caution about awareness of other members of household so that members of videoconference are not witness to anything inappropriate happening in the background.

f. (Susan Bonner) – Question: Has anyone tried Google Hangout? (Andrew) – Same or similar limitations to Adobe Connect (10 participants with video)

g. The products available are just not robust enough.

h. When asked what would be the most important locations for a video conferencing room - Amy would Dowagiac, Kirk’s would be Lansing, and Mike’s would be Flint.

i. This appears to be an issue with delivering face-to-face courses off campus and not really with online courses.

3. Closing:

a. (Jackie) – LTAB: We need a plan for all of the remote locations so that consistency is maintained between sites. Many of the sites do not belong to us. (John) – Joe Strohkirch is in the early stages of research on 1 to many solutions
for videoconferencing. The need for “special” training and support technicians (when using the systems) may indicate that it is not the best (correct) solution for us.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 am