

**Minutes of QEP/TLTR Meeting
Monday, March 29, 2010
Joan Tuck, Presiding**

Present: Jack Ancell, Melissa Back, Shannon Feinman, Kelly Goscinski, Crystal Jones, Ashley Leslie, Robert Owens, Joan Tuck, James Wilkerson

I. Windows 7 – Jack Ancell

Windows 7 is ready for use by faculty and staff but not in the labs due to compatibility issues. We may possibly be able to start with one lab where an operating system class will be taught in the fall. Room 21 on the Daniel Campus was suggested.

It will be suggested that we offer Windows 7 training during the in-service days during the first two weeks of the fall 2010 semester. Faculty who use course-specific software should now check with the software vendors to determine if the software is compatible with Windows 7.

Joan Tuck also gave information on Adobe CS4. A concurrent license may be available and, if so, the Christanna Campus may be able to get the software under the concurrent license. Joan also suggested that the maintenance contract be purchased so that we will automatically get the CS5 upgrade if it comes out within 12 months.

II. Subcommittee Updates

Goals 1 and 6 – Robert Owens

No updates

Goal 3 – Ashley Leslie

No updates. Since we are preparing to start early registration, Ashley Leslie will send out info on how to read READI scores.

Goal 4 – Kelly Goscinski

The Blackboard template has been used to create the summer course shells. Instructors will have access to summer courses as soon as VCCS does the last update, probably within a week.

The Deans of Instruction will be asked to send out a memo reminding faculty that we will be using Blackboard 9 in the summer and that they should take advantage of training that will be offered. A reminder will be sent out from QEP as well.

Goal 5 – Melissa Back

No updates.

Goal 7 – Leslie Cline

Crystal Jones presented the following update for the Goal 7 subcommittee on behalf of Leslie Cline:

After getting feedback from the committee members and a small sampling of online faculty, I have gathered the following information. 40% of the respondents thought class sizes should be smaller to allow for more personal interaction and preparation time with students. 30% responded that they thought class sizes were fine, with one even saying he wished his were much bigger. The final 30% responded that it really depended on the class and the requirements of that subject.

It was a very small sampling, but the solution seems to be that it should be variable by subject, and faculty should be able to restrict to a smaller class size if they and the administration agree it is necessary. Classes that involve a great deal of writing and personal responses from faculty can be overwhelming with large numbers of students. On the flip side, certain classes need larger amounts to create as one faculty member described it, a "buzz" in the online classroom. Furthermore, it seems the vast differences in how faculty teach in the online environment is a factor as well. What one faculty member considers adequate interaction with students online is very different than the standards of another faculty member. If faculty had a more control over the appropriate class size for their class, they could facilitate a more productive learning environment for students and instructional environment for themselves.

The committee members asked the sample size for the data presented. The report was accepted as presented.

Goal 11 – Kelley Barnes

No update.

Goal 12 – James Wilkerson

No update.

III. Next meeting date – TBA.