TLT Collaborative Board Meeting, March 17, 2000

Present (TLT Board):

Appalachian State University: Steven J. Breiner
East Carolina University: Helen Parke
Elizabeth City State University: Derick Wilkins
Fayetteville State University: Akbar Aghajanian
NC A&T State University: Melvin Johnson
NC Central University: Franklin Carver
NC State University: Joanne DeHoney
UNC at Asheville: Chuck Bennett
UNC at Chapel Hill: Kathy Thomas
UNC at Charlotte: Sallie Ives
UNC at Greensboro: Ray Purdom until 11am (then John Major, as PROXY)
UNC at Pembroke: Tom Jackson
UNC at Wilmington: Jeff Brown
Western Carolina University: Frank Prochaska
Winston-Salem University: Angus Small (PROXY for Joyce F. Williams-Green)

Absent: NC School of the Arts: Margaret Mertz

Also Present:

Executive Director: Mike O'Kane
Larry Lee, Facilitator
Carolyn Revis, Administrative Assistant (minutes)

I. Agenda and Introductions -- Mike O'Kane
       A. Distribution of President Broad's 2/22 memo to the Chancellors creating the
          Collaborative and appointing the Board.

       B. Meeting was handed over to Larry Lee to facilitate the formalization of the
          Board.
       C. Quorum was determined to be 2/3 of the members present. A quorum was
          established.

II. Election of Officers – Larry Lee and Mel Johnson (after election to Chair)
       A. After some initial discussion, it was determined that the Chairperson's
          responsibilities should be:

          1. Provide the Board with guidance and direction
          2. Ensure effective communications with the Board
          3. Provide a liaison with the Vice President for Information Resources and the
             Executive Director

B. A vote was taken to determine whether to have an open closed process to elect a chair.
1. Vote was 12 in favor of an open process and 1 opposed.
2. The process was opened to elect a chair.

   a. Melvin Johnson's name was placed in nomination and properly seconded.
   b. No other nominees were nominated, Nominations were closed.
   c. A vote was taken and Melvin Johnson was elected chair by acclaim and he subsequently accepted the position.

C. The meeting was handed to the Chair, who called for discussion to create additional officers.
1. Decision was made to elect a vice chairperson and a secretary.
   a. The process was opened to elect a vice chairperson.
     1. Ray Purdom's name was placed in nomination and properly seconded.
     2. No other nominees were nominated, Nominations were closed.
     3. A vote was taken and Ray Purdom was elected chair by acclaim and accepted the position.

   e. The process was opened to elect a secretary.
     1. Frank Prochaska's name was placed in nomination and properly seconded.
     2. No other nominees were nominated, Nominations were closed.
     3. A vote was taken and Frank Prochaska was elected chair by acclaim and accepted the position.

2. Chair then opened discussion on standing committees.
   a. Two committees were created and chairs elected as follows:
     1. Standing Committee - ByLaws. Chaired by Chuck Bennett
     2. Standing Committee - Organizational Assessment and Evaluation. Chaired by Steve Breiner

   b. The two standing committee chairs were tasked to further define the tasking of their respective committee and select their committee members, and to report back to the Board at the next meeting.

3. Chair then opened discussion on non-voting committee members.
   a. Decision was made to include as non-voting members, representatives of the following organizations:
     1. Department of Public Instruction
     2. NC Community College System
     3. The University Library Advisory Council (ULAC)
     4. Faculty Assembly
     5. UNC Division of Academic Affairs

NOTE: In addition, the Vice President for Information Resources or her nominee will attend meetings as a non-voting member.

    b. Following discussion of other representatives, it was decided that a Stakeholders group should be created in order to ensure effective communications (including sharing of minutes) with other organizations and individuals with shared interests and concerns.

        Open Discussion: The importance of close communication between the TLT Collaborative, Web for Student Services, Alliance and DE initiatives within the overall IT Strategy were also discussed. Two members of the Board (Frank Prochaska and Tom Jackson) are also members of the Alliance.

III. Director's Report

A. At this point the Chair handed the meeting to the Executive Director to make his report.

Note: The detailed report can be found at:
                    http://www.ga.unc.edu/its/tlt/org/projects2000.pdf

1. The Executive Director walked through the proposed Spring 2000 project outline for the TLT Collaborative (URL). Overall, these projects are designed to achieve: efficient startup of the organization; establishing a clear identity; pursuing initial projects that have clear and immediate strategic value for the UNC system and campuses; establishing an early connection with the Department of Public Instruction and NC Community College System, and managing expectations.

2. The Director discussed the project details under the following broad categories:

    a. Startup Projects:
        Office renovation, equipment purchasing
        Staffing, staff organization and project management
    b. Governance :
        Formalize Board, officers, by-laws
        Schedule Board meetings
        Produce annual reports.
    c. Communications and relationship-building:
        Establish relationships and communications with administrative, targeted individuals, peer communities and strategic partners within UNC, with State government, DPI, NCCCS, and with regional, national and global organizations.

          Publicize startup of the Collaborative

          Develop and implement communications and PR mechanisms.

   d. Portal Projects:

          Design and develop the Portal and content

          Work with DPI and NCCCS towards achieving a common Portal

   e. Events:

          TLT Retreat

          Faculty Assembly Forum on Instructional Technology

          Service Provider Presentation Series

   f. Collaborative Grants and TLT Project Funding Initiatives:

          Collaborative TLT Projects, Spring 2000

          Populate Portal with resources & best practices related to TLT-
          related resource development

          Research and develop resource opportunities for the Collaborative

   g. Other Projects

          Assistive and Adaptive Technologies Initiative

3. Following are discussion points on these project proposals from the meeting:

   a. Staffing: Initial strategy is to focus on EPA contract staff in order to bring individuals on board quickly, and to provide time to consider the most appropriate permanent role. An emerging staffing model is to to consider an organization that is more focused on contracting the time of UNC faculty and staff for collaborative work to meet the organization goals. Such an approach will leverage professional skills and experience already available within the system, provide professional development opportunities, and build more effective communities and communications. Permanent staff would then be focused on communications, project management, and organizational support.

   b. Communications and Relationships building: The point was made that the list of primary audiences should also be reflected in the Stakeholders group and should be considered by the Standing Committee for Organizational Assessment and Evaluation.

   c. Portal Development Project will focus on:

        (1) a broad range of resources lookups of immediate value to TLT efforts;

        (2) Best practices and other more comprehensive content as detailed in the report. A number of the contract positions for Spring 2000 will focus on developing this initial content as well as initiating peer relationships within different TLT communities throughout the system.

d. An added suggestion to the resource list was discipline-based organizations (state/national)

4. TLT Collaborative Events. The following initiatives were discussed:

   a. Retreat for Instructional Technology Professionals and Teaching and Learning Directors (also potentially involving the UNC Teacher Education Technology Council Members). Center for Continuing Education at Boone was suggested as a location. Suggested subjects at the retreat included:
      1. Strategies to evaluate course management systems and pedagogical characteristics/value.
      2. Faculty transfer programs.
      3. Publication opportunities and strategies for faculty and TLT professionals (one suggestion was to create an NC Journal of TLT).

         The discussion on strategies to evaluate course management systems and pedagogical characteristics/value included issues associated with assistive technologies, promotion and tenure, faculty productivity, flexibility of different systems with regard to pedagogy. This led to creation of a workgroup that the Director will call on for continued work in defining this need (for the retreat and for the Portal effort): Sallie Ives, Steve Breiner, Helen Parke, Chuck Bennett, Joanne Dehoney.

   b. Faculty Assembly Forum. The Director explained the background for the Forum and handed out the agenda.

   c. Service Provider visits. This list led to discussion of the value of day-long vendor visits. There was general agreement that vendor visits should be preceded by detailed sales information, and packaged into a common event such as UNC CAUSE (Director indicated that he will followup to develop a relationship between the Collaborative and UNC CAUSE). It is anticipated that the Collaborative will begin to define key TLT-related service needs that can be outlined to vendors.

   d. Collaborative Grants and TLT Project Funding Initiatives General agreement on the value of this initiative. Caution was expressed to ensure that any efforts here were plugged in to campus offices and efforts.

   e. Assistive and Adaptive Technologies Initiative.

General agreement on the value of this initiative. Also mentioned was Bill Stahl's role on the IRMC Workgroup on Accessibility (IRMC = North Carolina Department of Commerce Information Resource Management Commission). Bill has indicated that the workgroup is soon to publish a report recommending accessibility standards for Web-based systems, IT procurement, etc. While UNC is exempt, it will be important for the Collaborative to remain well informed. The Director will be in touch with Bill to discuss this.

B. TLT Collaborative Budget:

The Director reviewed the budget in terms of the Spring 2000 projects. There was significant discussion concerning the line indicating a transfer of $80,196 to Web Services for Students. Summary follows:

Director was emphatic that there was/is no precedent here for future reallocation. The proposed transfer is based on need of a companion IT project and late startup of the Collaborative.

Questions: why the Web project has a shortfall. Two members of the Board are on this work group and explained that a campus had just withdrawn, and other adjustments had combined to affect this. They explained that was that this was not about mismanagement but about unforeseen circumstances.

The proposed transfer amount is still under review, and may be reduced further.

Question: whether the Collaborative could expect these funds to be returned in fiscal 2000/01.

Question: whether this was specifically for the Web for Students initiative. Answer: that it is the Administrative Services for Students initiative. Chair requested that this should be reflected in the budget report.

Chair postponed further action and discussion and adjourned for lunch

After lunch, Director indicated the end of the report. **Chair suggested that the Director should be approved to move ahead with the project outline and budget as outlined, with latitude to act on the transfer as circumstances should dictate. Motion made and unanimously approved.**

C. Director then went on to discuss the Collaborative Project proposals. Review process as follows:

General discussion of issues and criteria for evaluating the proposals:
Concern was raised that the perception on some campuses may be that the

process would not serve some campuses well, and was G-served. This process would be an early test of the Collaborative.

Criteria for evaluating the proposals will be:

Solves a significant TLT problem
Relevance to mission and goals of the TLT Collaborative
Benefit to the 16 campuses
Demonstrates, or holds high potential for, collaboration in the process
Has well-defined goals and measurable outcomes
Feasible within timeframes and budget

Group then broke into 3 sub-groups to evaluate potential for combining projects with common subjects as follows:

    Wireless technologies for TLT
    Assistive technologies
    Other potential commonalities within the proposals

The wireless group reported strong overlap between the NC State and WCU projects and suggested that each could be supported at 50% of the current level in order to achieve the same value. The UNC-G proposal was concerned to have lower priority.

The Assistive group reported that the ECU/WCU initiative could be expanded to incorporate more resource information associated with current standards and may also have some connection with other initiatives. The NC State proposal was considered to be of lower priority.

The "Other" group reported that they found no other areas of commonality among proposals.

The following strategy was defined

The appropriate Board members will go back to the wireless and assistive technology proposers and suggest that they modify their proposals to meet the collaborative goals discussed above. This work to be completed by 5pm Monday 3/20.

The Director will send a request on Monday evening asking each Board member to prioritize up to 5 proposals based on the criteria listed above, and incorporating the modification described above). These listings will be due by 5pm Thursday 3/23.

The Director will arrange a teleconference involving the Board members on Friday 3/24 at 10am to review the results and finalize the final prioritization and candidates for funding.

Diana Oblinger will be invited to participate; otherwise will be asked to approve the recommendations by the Director following the meeting. The Director will be responsible for contacting the proposer to adjust budgets as effectively as possible in light of available funds and to discuss any additional issues. The Director will prepare a draft memo to announce the projects, and submit this to the Board for review on Monday 3/27. Memo will be sent out on Tuesday 3/28.

The Director then handed the meeting back to the Chair

IV. Next Meeting Dates
The Chair discussed future meetings and dates were defined as follows:

Friday April 7
Friday May 12

V. Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 2:58 P.M.