

Community College *of* Philadelphia

MINUTES

Technology Coordinating Committee

November 16, 2011 2:30 p.m.

B2-26

2011-12 Committee Members Present:

Federation Delegates	
Eva Agbada	P
Heidi Braunschweig	
Steve Jones	P
Fran Lukacik	
Craig Nelson	
Noelia Rivera-Matos	P
Jessica Rossi	P
Melissa St. Pierre	
Karen Schermerhorn	P
Ted Wong	P
Administrative Appointees:	
Bhavesh Bambhrolia	
Jody Bauer	P
Gary Bixby	P
Bill Bromley	P
SK Calkins	
Arnold DiBlasi	P
Ellen Fernberger	P
Tom Hawk	P
Sam Hirsch	P
Peter Margolis	
Alternates Present:	
Ruth Baker (F)	P
Frank Bartell (F)	
Susan Hauck (A)	P
Diane Kae (A)	P
Aileen Rollins (A)	P
Jocelyn Sirkis (A)	
Jim Spiewak (A)	

Community College *of* Philadelphia

- I. **Call to Order**
 - a. Meeting called to order at 2:35pm by Jody Bauer
- II. **Attendance**
 - a. **See page 1 of this document. Ms. Rollins agreed to take minutes. Ms. Bauer chair in the absence of Mr. Nelson.**
- III. **Approval of minutes (Action)**
 - a. Approval of October 19, 2011 minutes.
 - b. Discussion: Two items corrected on Page 3
 - i. V.c.i.3.- change to reflect the word “impossible” revised to “difficult”
 - ii. V.c.ii.- Detail added to this statement for clarification. “Dr. Hirsch will assist in developing a communication to students concerning the change **in the hybrid campus information** for Mr. Margolis.”
 - c. **ACTION: Motion to accept the October 19, 2011 Minutes with the adjustments noted here. Motion Seconded and Approved.**
- IV. **New Business (Informational)**
 - a. **iTunesU – What it is and what we are planning (Hauck)**
 - i. Dean Hauck presented an overview of the iTunesU application available from Apple.
 - ii. The college is awaiting approval of the application with Apple to develop a site for CCP within iTunesU. This service is free to educational members.
 - iii. The FLOAT division intends to use CCPTV content to populate the site initially to meet the minimum podcast requirements for listing on the iTunesU site.
 - iv. Questions:
 1. Who is the “we”?
 - a. The application must be a college-wide effort therefore the “we” is CCP not the FLOAT division. The initial population of materials will be from our CCPTV archive. Others will be added over time. The purpose is to become a member to allow the posting of educational/multimedia materials.
 2. Are their issues related to intellectual property rights?
 - a. The site is open to anyone who meets the stated requirements for Apple’s application. Private access is not available at this time. IF you do not wish others to view the contents, materials should

Community College *of* Philadelphia

- not be posted since it is a public/open web environment. Dean Hauck reviewed the use of Creative Commons (<http://creativecommons.org/>) licensing suggestions and stated that individuals should be aware of licensing rules concerning publicly available materials prior to posting.
3. Is the site content reviewed for copyright compliance? How will the college ensure there are no property right infringements?
 - a. Apple encourages self-policing within the College. The use of the environment will guide the college in the need for a diligent gatekeeper”.
 4. Will anyone at the college be able to upload materials?
 - a. Not initially, an administrative role will be created which will have the rights to upload materials. This role can be a single individual or based on a department/division scheme. This is something that will be further explored.
 5. Dean Hacuk stated that an open question for the committee to explore is “are individuals using iTunes’ in a different way to enhance courses”. Apple is generous with the space allocation and file size limitations are not considered restrictive.
 6. Students will be able to use mobile apps to download content.
 7. Ms. Agbada stated that we should also review YouTube for pros and cons of both platforms.

V. Old Business (Informational)

a. Hybrid/OL conversion recommendation (Jones)

- i. A discussion concerning P&P 14. Mr. Jones suggested that the committee should identify issues that require further discussion. The subcommittee worked to divide items into Policy and Procedure/Guideline issues. The “must have” items should be stated in a P&P document as they require approval through the College governance process and “should have” items do not require a policy but can be reflected in a procedure document. He reminded the committee that the document presented reflects this concept.
- ii. A question concerning the following bullet on page 3 of the “P&P14 draft_9_28_11.docx” as posted on the TCC MyCCP groups Files section.
 1. “For instructors of online courses who require additional necessary software directly related to their courses, a copy of the software for use at home. (This applies only to software that students are required to have purchased and not to proprietary development software.)”

Community College *of* Philadelphia

2. No record from the past that software was purchased by the college for faculty to use at home for support of DE courses.
 3. Mr. Jones suggested that additional discussion on this point is required.
 4. ITS and Academic Computing reminded the committee that each software package is unique in the licensing stipulations for the product.
 5. It was noted that statements in the document are “self-correcting”. Students are not required to buy software therefore faculty aren’t required to have availability outside their office.
 6. It was suggested that if the committee is converting this document into a College Policy statement, more time is needed.
 7. A reminder that a consistent message is needed.
 8. A request to clarify the following bullet item on page 3 – Support sub-heading; “Library resources and other general resources (e.g., tutoring);”
 - a. Suggested revision: “Library resources and other general **services**;
 9. Question concerning the term adequate.
 - a. What does this mean? If we are managing expectation with the statements in the document, does the term adequate mean the same to all.
 - b. Ms. Baker stated that the subcommittee discussed this point and determined that “adequate does not always meet the need”.
 - c. This lead into a lively discussion concerning the equipment needs. It was suggested that equipment should be provided based on the role of the individual, not the individual. A discussion of the equipment inventory and replacement scheme was discussed. A suggestion was made to review the current replacement scheme to improve the process since no documented procedure exists. It was suggested the ITS and Academic Computing collaborate to determine a procedure.
 - d. A suggestion that the committee return to the 1998 Taskforce Report and the first Technology Plan.
- b. AUP revision to IWC (Bauer)**
- i. ACTION: Item HELD due to time constraint.**

VI. Adjournment at approximately 4:00pm. Next meeting scheduled for December 21, 2011 room B2-26 at 2:30pm.