TLT Preliminary Minutes
March 10, 2015, 1403 GITC 1:00-2:30pm

Attendees
Voting Members: Ron Rockland, Bill Reynolds (co-chair), Dave Ullman, Ellen Wisner, Hsin-Neng Hsieh, Andrzej Zarzycki, Taro Narahara, Marvin Nakayama, Elizabeth Petrick, Victor Matveev, Andres Jerez, Gale Spak
Non-voting Members: Barry Broxton, Richard Sweeney, Blake Haggerty, Ann Hoang, Perry Deess, Jenna Walther, Michael Koskinen, Joe Bonchi, Nafiza Akter

Approval of the minutes of the November TLT meeting
Approved unanimously

TLT/CITLAR Committee progress reports:
  ❑ Technology Plan update – Dave Ullman
    ❑ Nothing to report at this time; in progress and draft will be worked on over Spring Break
  ❑ Converged class model – Blake Haggerty
    ❑ Feb 25th Meeting; reviewed courses offered in converged model last semester and current semester
    ❑ We need to have a clear description of each class, so we can see the design of each class to best assess and scale them
    ❑ Instructional Team will review how the instructional materials were consumed in each class; how often videos were used
    ❑ 2014 ECAR study link on Moodle, as well as HyFlex learning model study is similar to what we have
      ❑ The study revealed that the students liked the model but nothing in particular was researched about how they performed in future/subsequent courses
    ❑ Concerns from Marvin Nakayama: our vision states that by 2020 we would like to have 25% of our courses delivered in this model, but we have no rigorous study looking into whether convergence is an effective model. Convenience and effective teaching are two different things: students may like flexibility but they may not necessarily be learning the most from it
      ❑ In the initial discussions of convergence, it was not aimed to enhance learning, but rather to blend the line between physical classrooms and online classrooms
      ❑ Ron mentions that at least 2/3rds of his class prefer to come to class even though he has online modules but convergence may help with weather-related closings
  ❑ Motion: TLT committee recommends that Institutional Research works with the converged learning sub-committee to perform further research that examines the teaching effectiveness of the converged learning format. Motion passes unanimously
    ❑ Dave brings up that we have natural control groups, such as courses already being delivered in face to face or online modes, which we can draw information from
    ❑ Victor brings up that choosing a control group is a difficult issue, and there will be a selection bias, and the issue of whether the instructor is appropriate for online teaching over face to face teaching
The aim of the committee is to improve the learning outcomes of the students without increasing costs, while ensuring students are engaged. We have to have a better understanding of whether we can balance the three

Bill Reynolds brings up that the aim is not to improve the learning experience, but to make teaching and learning more accessible; the learning experience was not intended to be “better”

Marvin reiterates the need to do a study to figure out whether it is at least just as good as traditional learning

Ellen brings up that she has two sections of a hundred students, and she can’t see it being feasible supporting them with one copilot if she were to teach converged

Perry brings up: Cost savings can come from not taking up as much physical classrooms

We want to measure whether learning outcome achieved is equivalent in the converged model as it is in the face to face model. We can compare students taking a face to face class and see if whether students in the converged class performs the same

Andrzej brings up the fact that during research, there will be some things that cannot be measured; if two different people are teaching the same class, that changes things. If one instructor converges two classes at one time, it is difficult to administer an exam at the same time because the demand for the instructor goes up around the time of the exam

Perry: Overtime, we will learn the best practices and we might learn that administering an exam to a 200 student might not be a good idea and we might need to split that up. Once we have a few semesters of converged learning delivery, we can track and assess how students are doing over time

Gale suggests that we have a focus group with students who (have and) have not experienced the converged model, and see what they think about this/what their ideas are about whether this is a way they want to learn. We should have groups of students who have not taken converged classes because they don’t have a bias from already having taken one

Dave Ullman brings up that this is a direction that education is going, and we want to find out how we can make it best at NJIT

Rich Sweeney brings up the HyFlex model was appealing to students, but did not discuss whether the performance was of equal or better quality; we know that convergence will offer flexibility, but we don’t know if the outcomes are the same and whether it is affordable. We have had studies done by Murray and Roxanne, but those were for much smaller classes

Emerging Educational Methods & Assessment – Ron Rockland

Nothing to report at the moment

Undergraduate Computing Requirements – Elizabeth Petrick

Has already made an extensive report on this
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- Software Library Policies – Rich Sweeney and Rob Arms
  - Progress has been made; software has been installed in the library to see usage of application, websites, etc. After more data is collected, we will be able to better assess what the policy should look like based on that data
  - This will help us also understand whether we need more lab spaces
  - We will also have information on which times the computers are being most used
    - Ann mentions that the library lab is heavily used from opening time to closing; the data will help us better understand the other labs as well, such as GITC and PC Mall
  - We have data on what software is being downloaded, but not how it is being used; some people may install software, but not necessarily use it. Monitoring the labs usage and data will demonstrate the frequency of application use
  - The usage data will also help us negotiate a better deal with vendors
  - Data will not collect information on individual students, but overall usage

- Physical and Virtual Learning Spaces – Joe Bonchi
  - Nothing to report at this moment

Update on teaching and learning spaces designs – Joe Bonchi

- Central King Building
  - Joe and Blake met with Marvel Architects last Tuesday and looked at the A/V specs, so that the classrooms can have a camera installed in the back that connects to the podium (and any device connected to the podium)
    - Also discussed simplifying the technology in the lecture hall to make it more accessible
  - Also looked at what we learned from the 3rd floor of CKB; 303 is a A/V challenged and has been over engineered, and we will work over Spring Break on the room

Resolution to establish a stable source of funding for TLT activities (Faculty Institute, Proctoring etc.) in absence of DL Fees

- Last meeting, the issue came up with proctored exams and how we deal with them in the online environment
- The fee that previously covered things like proctoring (DL fees), is now a part of a larger fee. Where do students now go for proctoring? We have services like ProctorU, but students should not have to pay individually for proctored exams and it should be incorporated into fees
- Previously, faculty had to tell students in the syllabus (at the beginning of a course) that there will be proctored exams and if there was a cost, students need to know at the beginning of the class
- Now, we would like to see the university cover the costs for university-provided proctoring services and students will be told of the option to come to campus to take a proctored exam, or use a provided proctoring service
- Gale mentions that proctoring is a very time consuming process when a face to face proctor is present. The University already pays for Thomas Edison
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proctoring for the Pearson Embanet courses. We need to discuss whether online proctoring is acceptable for each department and the faculty body

- Perry brings up that the proposal is too broad to be taken seriously and may not be feasible. Dave brings up that in a traditional classroom, students do not pay extra for exams, so it is important we discuss the issue of distance learners having to pay extra for exams when it should be part of the fees

- This is being tabled for more discussion; we recognize there is a problem and we don’t have a solution, but we need one. We should research what’s out there and come up with a suite of options to handle the different assessment methods applied across the STEAM curriculum requirements, with a goal being that we don’t ask students to take on the costs. We should specify that it is for remote students enrolled in hybrid, online or converged classes. However, we want maintain the option that permits students to come to campus for proctored exams

- **Comments on what we discussed last meeting** - The University should provide proctoring services, whether the course is delivered online, hybrid, converged, or face-to-face, and students should not have to pay extra for proctoring services.

  - Currently, two scenarios exist, and we need to come up with scenarios how we can consistently offer exams without bearing the cost on students

  - The University will cover the costs for a midterm and final exam, and we need to find a better solution for “blue book exams”; ProctorU and Thomas Edison have been tested and work with exams where students are solving equations and proctors watch what students are doing

    - Thomas Edison can currently have a blue book exams proctored in certain locations, and they offer that for a small number of students because they also want to get out the business of proctoring blue book exams. Therefore, we have no definitive solution for STEAM classes

    - This issue is two parts: 1. we don’t have a solution yet and 2. who pays for the solution once we have it

    - This motion will be reviewed by a sub-committee to be better worked out before bringing it to the faculty senate

Report on Technology Support Center – **Blake Haggerty**
- Deferred to next meeting

Continuing report on the continuing Converged course pilot - **Nafiza Akter & Bill Reynolds**
- Deferred to next meeting

Status update of Pearson-Embanet initiative – **Gale Spak**
- Deferred to next meeting

**Next meeting**
- April 14th, 2015
- [Moodle section for discussion and adding resources](#)