



31 Segovia, San Clemente, CA 92672
(949) 369-3867 • TECemail@aol.com

This file can be found on the TEC website at
<http://www.tecweb.org/evalrpt/tmapp01.pdf>
© TEC, 2001

TMAPP Grantees' Analyses

**Focus Interviews
Final Report Analyses
CCC Abstracts**

**Prepared for
Palomar
TMAPP Grant 98-0666**

by

**The
Education Coalition
31 Segovia
San Clemente, CA 92672
949-369-3867**

DRAFT – February 16, 2001

Table of Contents

Instructional Support

Statewide Delivery of Distance Education, Irvine Valley College, Joyce Arntson

Statewide Distance Education Delivery Models, Santa Barbara Community College,
Dr. Jack Friedlander

Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center, Santa Barbara Community College,
Dr. Jack Friedlander

Curriculum Design Training for Technology Mediated Courses-access by the Disabled,
De Anza College, Carl Brown *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Student Support: Online Tutorial Support, Palomar College, Joan Gipson-Fredin

Universal Internet Access, All Nine District Colleges, Dr. Robert M. Alworth

Student Friendly Services: Assessment Study, Foothill & De Anza Colleges, Kathleen Kyne

Online Student Services Center, Coastline Community College, Rendell Drew

Online Counseling and Advisement, All Nine District Colleges, Dr. Robert M. Alworth

Instructional Support, Rancho Santiago College, Irene Malmgren

Instructional Support, Shasta College, Dr. James Poulsen

Video and Internet Student Access (VISA), Modesto Jr. College/Columbia College, Juan Alvarez

Advising Online Support System (AOLSS), Contra Costa College, Tim Clow

Library and Learning Resources Services for the Remote Learner, Cuyamaca College,
Larry Sherwood *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Universal Remote Patron Access and Authentication Project, Glendale Community College,
Linda S. Winters

Administration Support

Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan, Allan Hancock College, Clay Waldon/Lill Clary

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants, Hartnell College, Gary Hughes

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants, LA Trade Technical College, Joseph Auciello

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants, College of Marin, Scott B. Miller

Napa Valley College Telecommunications Plan, Napa Valley, Vanessa Brown

Technology Model Application Pilot Project, Alameda, Laney, Merritt, Vista CC's, John Wagstaff

College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants, College of the Redwoods,
Dr. Jeff Bobbitt *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants, Santa Barbara City College, William B. Hamre

Shasta College Telecommunications Plan (SCTIP), Shasta College,
Dr. James Poulsen *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Ventura College Telecommunication Plan Mini –Grant, Ventura College, Carol Coltrin

College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant, Victor Valley College,
Mark Ingel *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant, College of the Siskiyous, Nancy Shephard

Staff Technology Education Program (STEP), Las Positas College,
Dr. Linda Lucas *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Establishment of Departmental Technology Fellows, El Camino College, Donna Manno

Strategic Technology Service Development, Ohlone College,
Deborah Hudson *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Faculty and Staff Development Plan for Technology, Napa Valley College,
Bonnie Thoreen

Information Technology and Communication Planning Group, Palomar College,
Stan Malley *As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.*

Staff Development for Distance Learning Using Video Teleconferencing Equipment,
College of the Canyons, Jan K. Keller *They did not do a final report*

Telecommunication/Technology Staff Development Planning Project, Ventura College, Carol Coltrin

Development of a Five Year Technology Plan, Yuba College,
Mick Holsclaw 1/29/01, *Per Mick Holsclaw there is no report out yet*

Napa Valley College Electronic Transcript Exchange, Napa Valley College,
Sue Nelson 2/16/01 *Final report requested but not received*

Electronic Transcript Exchange, College of the Redwoods,
Delores Smith 2/16/01 *Final report requested but not received*

Electronic Transcript Exchange, San Joaquin Delta College, Mathew Rosen

Electronic Transcript Exchange, Santa Barbara City College,
Jane Craven 2/16/01 *Final report requested but not received*

Electronic Transmission of Transcripts, Southwestern College,
Steve Bossi 2/16/01 *Final report requested but not received*

Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study, Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges,
Mick Holsclaw *there is no report out yet*

Digital Signatures Feasibility Study, San Joaquin Delta College,
Matthew Rosen *first draft report is not finished*

Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Institutes, Rio Hondo College, Dr. Susan Obler

Faculty Access to Computers and Technology, Hartnell College, Colly Tettelbach

Telecommunications Special Projects (TSP) 4Cnet-Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project,
Butte College, Frederick Sherman, Ph.D.

4Cnet-Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project, De Anza College, Ann Koda

Appendix A

Focus Interviews

Alan Hancock, Lill Clary

Butte College, Frederick Sherman, Ph.D.

College of the Canyons, Mr. Jan K. Keller

Chabot Las Positas Community College, Linda Lucas

Coastline Community College, Rendell Drew, Cheryl Chapman

Contra Costa College, Tim Clow

Cuyamaca College, Larry Sherwood

De Anza College, Carl Brown

De Anza College, Ann Koda

El Camino College, Donna Manno

Foothill and De Anza Colleges, Kathy Kyne, Larry Miller

Glendale College, Linda S. Winters

Hartnell College, Gary Hughes

Hartnell College, Colly Tettleback

Irvine Valley College, Joyce Arntson

LA Trade Technical College, Joseph Auciello

College of Marin, Scott B. Miller

Modesto Jr. College, Columbia College, Juan Alvarez

Napa Valley College, Bonnie Thoreen

Napa Valley College, Sue Nelson

Napa Valley College, Vanessa Brown

Palomar College, Joan Gipson-Fredin

Rancho Santiago College, Irene Malmgren

College of the Redwoods, Jean Butler

College of the Redwoods, Jeff Bobbitt

Rio Honda College, Dr. Susan Obler

San Joaquin Delta College, Matthew Rosen

Santa Barbara City College, William B. Hamre

Santa Barbara City College, Jane Craven

Santa Barbara City College, Susan Sargent

Santa Barbara City College, Jack Friedlander

Shasta College, Dr. James Poulsen

College of the Siskiyous, Nancy Shephard

Solano Community College, John Wagstaff

Southwestern College, Steve Bossi

Ventura College, Carol Coltrin

Victor Valley College, Mark Ingel

Yuba College, Mick Holsclaw

As of 2/16/01 the following final reports have been requested but have not been received

Curriculum Design Training for Technology Mediated Courses - Access by the Disabled

District: Foothill-De Anza CCD
RFA Number: 98-0661-001
Project Director: Carl Brown
Organization: De Anza College
Address: 21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
City: Cupertino, CA 95014-5702
Phone: 408/864-8491

College: De Anza College
Amount: \$300,000

Library and Learning Resources Services for the Remote Learner

District: Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
RFA Number: 98-0667-001
Project Director: Larry Sherwood
Organization: Cuyamaca College
Address: 900 Rancho San Diego Parkway
City: El Cajon, CA 92019-4304
Phone: 619/660-4402

College: Cuyamaca College
Amount: \$150,000

College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants

District: Redwoods CCD
RFA Number: 96-0482-007
Project Director: Al Kurki, Interim Replaced by Dr. Jeff Bobbitt
Organization: College of the Redwoods
Address: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road
City: Eureka, CA 95501- 9300
Phone: 707/476-4174 jeff-bobbitt@eureka.redwoods.cc.ca.us

College: College of the Redwoods
Amount: \$25,000

Shasta College Telecommunications Plan (SCTIP)

District: Shasta Tehema Trinity Joint CCD
RFA Number: 96-0482-009
Project Director: Dr. James Poulsen
Organization: Shasta College
Address: P.O. Box 496006
City: Redding, CA 96049-6006
Phone: 530/225-4813

College: Shasta College
Amount: \$25,000

College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

District: Victor Valley CCD
RFA Number: 96-0482-011
Project Director: Dr. Jim Pell Replaced by Mark Ingel
Organization: Victor Valley College
Address: 18422 Bear Valley Road
City: Victorville, CA 92392
Phone: 760/245-4271 x 2394

College: Victor Valley College
Amount: \$25,000

Staff Technology Education Program (STEP)

District: Chabot-Las Positas CCD
RFA Number: 98-0660-001
Project Director: Scott Vigallon Replaced by Dr. Linda Lucas
Organization: Las Positas College
Address: 3033 Collier Canyon Road
City: Livermore, CA 94550
Phone: 925/373-4966

College: Las Positas College
Amount: \$24,960

Strategic Technology Service Development**District:** Fremont-Newark CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-003**Project Director:**

Jim McCann Replaced by Deborah Hudson

Organization:

Ohlone College

Address:

43600 Mission Blvd.

City:

Fremont, CA 94539-0390

Phone:

510/659-6203

College: Ohlone College**Amount:** \$25,000**Information Technology and Communication Planning Group****District:** Palomar CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-005**Project Director:**

Stan Malley

Organization:

Palomar College

Address:

1140 W. Mission Road

City:

San Marcos, CA 92069-1487

Phone:

760/744-1150 x 2140

College: Palomar College**Amount:** \$24,922**Staff Development for Distance Learning Using Video Teleconferencing Equipment****District:** Santa Clarita CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-006**Project Director:**

Jan K. Keller

Organization:

College of the Canyons

Address:

26455 Rockwell Canyon Rd.

City:

Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Phone:

661/259-7800

College: College of the Canyons**Amount:** \$25,000**Development of a Five Year Technology Plan****District:** Yuba CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-008**Project Director:**

Mick Holsclaw

Organization:

Yuba College

Address:

2088 N. Beale Road

City:

Marysville, CA 95901

Phone:

530/741-6981

College: Yuba College**Amount:** \$24,960**Napa Valley College Electronic Transcript Exchange****District:** Napa Valley CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-001**Project Director:**

Sue Nelson, Acting Assist Dean, Admissions/ Records

Organization:

Napa Valley College

Address:

2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway

City:

Napa, CA 94558-9976

Phone:

707/253-3001

College: Napa Valley College**Amount:** \$27,429**Electronic Transcript Exchange****District:** Redwoods CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-002**Project Director:**

Cathy Dellabalma Replaced by Delores Smith

Organization:

College of the Redwoods

Address:

7351 Tompkins Hill Road

City:

Eureka, CA 95501-9300

Phone:

707/476-4100 X 4265

College: College of the Redwoods**Amount:** \$57,902

Electronic Transcript Exchange**District:** Santa Barbara CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-004**Project Director:** Jane Craven**Organization:** Santa Barbara City College**Address:** 721 Cliff Drive**City:** Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394**Phone:** 805/965-0581 x 2352**College:** Santa Barbara City College**Amount:** \$101,250**Electronic Transmission of Transcripts****District:** Southwestern CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-005**Project Director:** Steve Bossi, Director of Computer Systems Services**Organization:** Southwestern College**Address:** 900 Otay Lakes Road**City:** Chula Vista, CA 91919-7299**Phone:** 619/482-6336**College:** Southwestern College**Amount:** \$113,843**Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study****District:** Contra Costa & Yuba CCDs**RFA Number:** 98-0663**Project Director:** Mick Holsclaw**Organization:** Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges**Address:** 500 Court St.**City:** Martinez, CA 94553**Phone:** 530/741-6981**College:** Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges**Amount:** \$200,000**Electronic Transcript Exchange****District:** San Joaquin Delta CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-003**Project Director:** Matthew Rosen**Organization:** San Joaquin Delta College**Address:** 5151 Pacific Avenue**City:** Stockton, CA 95207- 6370**Phone:** 209/1954-5300**College:** San Joaquin Delta College**Amount:** \$25,000

TMAPP Grantees' Analyses

Focus Interviews Final Report Analyses CCC Abstracts

*1996-99 Telecommunications Model Applications Pilot Project (TMAPP)

Instructional Support

Statewide Delivery of Distance Education

District: South Orange County CCD

RFA Number: 97-0483-001

Project Director: Joyce Arntson

Organization: Irvine Valley College

Address: 5500 Irvine Center Drive

City: Irvine, CA 92618

Phone: 949/451-5244 jarntson@ivc.cc.ca.us

College: Irvine Valley College

Amount: \$499,512

CCC Abstract:

There is a strong need to expand the already overtaxed campus resources to meet the needs of the growing numbers of students who must continue their lifelong education to remain competitive in the world economy. Although "college by television" has been used for decades, there have been few demonstrations using contemporary telecommunications technologies: interactive televideo conferencing, Online interactive computer-based conferencing, audio/audio-graphic conferencing, and computer-based learning via web-based access.

This two-year project is designed to be undertaken in consortium with business and industry, Twenty-nine of the California Community Colleges, Regional Occupational Programs, and other institutions such as California State University. The project will do the following:

- Develop procedures to identify successful pre-existing or newly developed distance education programs
- Revise, edit, and improve existing courses for regional and statewide delivery
- Create distance learning processes that will enable faculty and staff of the California Community Colleges and others as appropriate to create and revise courses for delivery using contemporary technologies.
- Pilot Online courses using various telecommunications technologies

This Instructional Application Pilot activity is guided and monitored by a broadly-based, intersegmental advisory board whose task is to identify and develop for Statewide delivery distance learning curriculum designed to meet the learning styles and needs of adult learners. Participating faculty and students will have access to Online support such as e-mail, voice-mail, and other computer-based support systems, such as chat groups and forums. The project's activities will be closely coordinated with both the 4C@ONE and Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center projects.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Statewide Delivery of Distance Education

Joyce Arntson
Irvine Valley College

Purpose

A statewide delivery of distance learning, the primary purpose is to assist in getting California to get some courses online and to work with faculty in that process and to clear some of the hurdles in doing that.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

There are people who don't realize that with all the various technologies that we can in fact do many things that we didn't think we could do. People who feel that distance learning is a facade.

We work real hard and accomplish wonderful things and the grant is done. The reports are written and shared but then we're off and running to the next thing and we don't tie all that valuable knowledge to the next thing.

Solution

Dive in but hold out your arms to everybody who's already in there because we're all willing to work together.

Recommendations:

- 1- Allow sufficient time to develop a quality class to be delivered online.
- 2- Continue to provide a method of faculty sharing.
- 3- Continue to provide for up to date information.
- 4- Provide ongoing, low cost statewide faculty training.
- 5- Provide someone to garner assistance from the business community.
- 6- Provide the latest research on methods and practices from other colleges.
- 7- Provide faculty with the ability to have a mechanism to continue to brainstorm the best way to accomplish distance education related activities.
- 8- Continue interaction with other groups.
- 9- Stop "reinventing the wheel"
- 10- Provide small colleges in the Consortium needed resources.
- 11- Provide an ongoing statewide Consortium for the distance learning faculty to be able to continue to interact and learn from each other.
- 12- Continue to grow the inventory of distance learning classes.

Successes

We have developed an inventory of every distance learning course that's offered in the state of California's Community College system.

We have gathered a significant amount of data on such things as faculty compensation and workload. Our consortium has all embraced distance learning.

A list of the final products resulting from this project:

- 1- Distance Ed Directory of Courses
- 2- White Papers – Distance Learning , Intellectual Property Rights, Vendor Comparison Study, Comparison of Student Completion and Performance Data in Traditional and Online Classes
- 3- Sample online Classes, demonstrations, tutorials, research.
- 4- Evaluation guide
- 5- List of Distance Learning Consortium Members

Activities that were particularly effective in reaching the goals of the project:

- 1- The building of a website that provides easy online access to rich online resources for distance learning faculty statewide.
- 2- Developing extensive online resources for distance education faculty to use to develop and deliver online classes.
- 3- Developing a comprehensive Directory of Distance Education Courses that provides every course taught in every discipline via distance education in any mode at all California community colleges.
- 4- Developing a cadre of over 150 courses for faculty to draw from as they begin to develop their classes.
- 5- Developing a comprehensive Evaluation Guide for use by faculty not only in assessing their courses, but also, for use in developing classes.
- 6- Initiating dialog between the Distance Learning Consortium and the Library and Learning Resources for the development of distance learning Program on all campuses.
- 7- Providing low cost training for faculty wishing to develop distance education classes.
- 8- Performing research on such topics as intellectual property rights and faculty workload and compensation.

Next Steps

The biggest things that we'll be doing is offering full degrees.

Evaluation goals and standards to be achieved by each objective of this project:

- 1- Establish and work with an advisory committee of over 25 people that includes business people and educators with geographic distribution.
- 2a- Develop procedures to determine existing courses in the California community colleges that include all colleges, all disciplines, and all types of distance learning deliveries.
- 2b- Work out a plan to create an equitable system for sharing courses and ADA among colleges that can be piloted by a small group of California community colleges as a model to use for a state wide pilot.
- 3- Add Faculty and colleges from at least 50% of the California community colleges to the Distance Learning Consortium. These faculty and colleges will increase the number of courses offered via distance education to at least 150 courses.
- 4- Investigate and research using a minimum of 35 criteria commonly used vendors identified by the Distance Learning Consortium to provide information to colleges statewide and to provide volume pricing agreements.
- 5- Develop an inventory of at least 150 distance learning courses from which California community colleges can learn and use.
- 6- Monitor compliance with Title V of all courses developed through the faculty member's compliance with the college.
- 7- Integrate work and communicate with the Library and Learning Resources group in the Chancellor's Office so that distance learning faculty can assist their colleges in providing adequate resources for distance learning students.
- 8- Report work accomplished by the Distance Learning Consortium on a regular basis to DETAC and implement suggestions and improvements from them.
- 9- Design website for easy access by the distance learning faculty to provide resources such as placement of courses, demonstrations, tutorials, evaluation guide, and white papers.
- 10- Pilot a minimum of 50 courses online.
- 11- Publish access to a minimum of 150 active online courses.
- 12- Prepare an Evaluation Guide with a minimum of 50 evaluative parameters for faculty to use not only in evaluating their course, but also in course development work.
- 13- Prepare a tool to easily permit faculty to build a class website or work with students in the building of websites.
- 14- Compare student completion and performance data for classes in several disciplines between traditional and online delivery methods. Comparisons should be made by gender and ethnic background, retention quality of work, adherence to Article V and to the ADA requirements, level of interaction between instructor/student, and student/student, and grade distribution.
- 15- Publish a Distance Education Directory of Courses that provides a listing of all classes for all disciplines delivered via distance education for all California community colleges.
- 16- Develop a process for the online exchange of information for such subjects as intellectual property rights and faculty workload and compensation issues and the data to be exchanged.

The project website will continue to be maintained so that faculty statewide will have access to its rich resources for faculty in their continuing to develop classes to be delivered via distance education. The Project Director and Consortium members are anxious and willing to serve on the Advisory Committees and other committees of other distance learning projects to continue the work of this project. The Project Director and Consortium members are particularly anxious to serve on the Palomar project to present the ongoing needs, concerns, and issues of this project.

Analysis of TMAPP Report

The project has been an active one with many accomplishments and much work in a variety of directions. In addition to the project's distance learning consortium, there has been an active distance learning advisory committee.

The Distance Learning Consortium for this project has built a rich web site with many resources and much distance education related information for faculty interested in distance learning.

There is an extensive evaluation methodology presented from the students' perspective.

Colleges are very interested in working together to deliver classes via distance learning and have sought methods to do this through this project.

Consortium members have researched and worked with vendors for distance learning technologies throughout this project and have worked out methods for volume pricing and training.

The Distance Learning Consortium remained diligent throughout the project about Title V compliance and worked through their individual college Curriculum Committees to ensure this compliance.

The Project met with the representatives of Library and Learning Resources and worked together to ensure that the members of the Consortium were knowledgeable about the distance learning work of Library and Learning Resources.

Under the auspices of this project over 180 courses have been developed in 34 disciplines from 24 colleges.

A representative group of the Distance Learning Consortium conducted classes and provided data for a study on student completion and performance.

White papers have been used to share information throughout this project.

Statewide Distance Education Delivery Models

District: Santa Barbara CCD

RFA Number: 98-0665-001

Project Director: Jack Friedlander

Organization: Santa Barbara City College

Address: 721 Cliff Drive

City: Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394

Phone: 805/965-0581 x 2579

College: Santa Barbara Community College

Amount: \$276,832

CCC Abstract:

This one year project studies a range of distance education models to identify changes that need to be made in the California Community Colleges system for distance education to be more cost-effective and learner-centered. The project's central focus is in several policy areas including quality, student and academic support services, decision-making structures, mission, program approval, infrastructure, and financial aid.

Three objectives compose the project's work. Objective 1 extensively studies 4CNet to fully understand the network's capabilities and to propose ways to use 4CNet in building a variety of linkages to the work place, to new learners, to returning learners, and finally to the system. Objective 2, to determine all cross over points, intensively compares the project's work plan with the Statewide Distance Education work plan developed by the Distance Education Unit. Further, the project team reviews other funded projects to see what additional "cross over points" may exist and, then, develops ways to leverage human, agency, and project resources for the greatest efficiency in the related projects. Objective 3 studies in depth a series of identified issues that present serious challenges to the system in moving toward participation in global distance education.

From the work with these three objectives comes a Feasibility Report, including an Action Research Plan, which identifies each problem discovered and explains (a) who is affected, (b) a possible root cause, (c) the type of problem that really exists, (d) the goal for improvement, and (e) the possible things that can be done to resolve the problem.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Statewide Distance Education Delivery Models

Dr. Jack Friedlander

Santa Barbara Community College

Purpose

What we've done is we've looked at models that other states are using and other consortia are using to offer to programs that go beyond a single college.

The grant is designed to explore the feasibility of establishing a statewide system for distance learning. It is intended that the project will investigate the possibility of a centralized function for distance learning and the different approaches the Chancellor's Office and community colleges can take to support distance learning in an efficient and cost effective manner.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

We're just having trouble getting meetings with the CVU centers to look at the relationship with these sets of recommendations and in those centers. Then putting those centers in place for a couple more years, but their funding expires also. I think it's a scheduling problem.

We looked at what other states are doing with regards to sharing tuition, and when we proposed that here to various people we met with, there was anywhere from lukewarm support to a deal killer. With the whole idea of a host-college, a program-college, home-college concept, and some revenue sharing

involved in those things and a good distribution of services, but then there's just no support for that at this time among various groups, from the CEOs to senate fact.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

At this point in the study (June 2000), the preliminary recommendation is to call for the creation of a California Community College Distance Learning Coordinating Network.

A Distance Learning Coordinating Network could provide online access to the California Community Colleges for its 1.5 million students. As a full service utility, the Coordinating Network could offer a single point of access to all courses and programs and anytime, anywhere access to student services. There could be a single application process from which student data will be entered into a comprehensive database. Students would have the ability to identify distance learning programs and courses; search by college, discipline, semester and delivery method; and connect directly to a college to receive information about registration and enrollment. They would be able to utilize a 7x24 technical assistance center; a Virtual Library; a Virtual Bookstore; online Transfer Center and Career Assessment Center. Information on DSP&S, EOPS, CalWORKs and Financial Aid could be readily available. Links to college resources could heighten their level of awareness regarding higher education. The Distance Learning Coordinating Network could broaden the scope of information, amount of resources and assistance available to potential and enrolled community college students.

Analysis of Grant Report

A statewide Distance Learning Coordinating Network is being recommended to provide coordination and centralized online services for all California community colleges. The Distance Learning Coordinating Network could provide some agreed-upon state level services for which uniformity, universal access, or economies of scale would be important factors, such as a common application form and 7x24 technical assistance. The Network could offer the service of an online catalog and schedule of classes for all such courses offered by participating colleges as well as such college support functions as web hosting and 7x24 technical assistance. Colleges could also contract for student services such as online orientation to distance education, career counseling, and job placement. Colleges could utilize the Network to market their courses and programs that are available at a distance. Students would have access to a catalog of those courses and programs, with enough information to find what they need, and direct links to the colleges for further information and enrollment.

This model replicates the Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University (KCVU) that provides a full-service utility for the citizens of Kentucky. The KCVU provides students with a directory of online courses offered by both public and private colleges and universities, and offers a full array of online student support services. The KCVU model is designed to provide students with a single point of access for services while the actual provision of those services is carefully delineated between the Virtual University and participating colleges.

The coordination function of the California Community College Distance Learning Coordinating Network could include the following services:

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
Virtual Network Website
Virtual Catalog
Virtual Program Inventory
Online Schedules
Online Common Application
Transcript
E-mail Access
Online Bookstore
Online Fee Collection
Exam Proctoring

7x24 Technical Assistance
Counseling & Advisement Center
Online Orientation
Virtual Library
Virtual Transfer Center
Virtual Career Center
Online Tutorial Services
Bulletin Boards, Chat Rooms

COLLEGE SERVICES
Course Server Hosting
Curriculum Development
Registration/Enrollment Database
Computerized Tracking and Monitoring of Students
Faculty & Staff Development Center
Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center
Securing Copyrights
Review of Distance Learning Policies
Public Relations & Marketing

Local colleges would maintain local authority related to curriculum and instruction while employing the Distance Learning Coordinating Network as the coordinating mechanism.

In the areas of services, some services would be offered through the Network while others could be maintained at the colleges. The state level support functions to be provided directly by the Distance Learning Coordinating Network would be spelled out. For further information on possible coordination and support services that can be provided, see "*Appendix A: Coordination and Support Services.*"

The Organizational Structure of the Distance Learning Coordinating Network

A lead institution could be selected through the RFA process to serve as the coordinating body with contracts to individual local districts for the provision of specialized online student support services. This approach would replicate the structure taken by the Economic Development Network (Ed>Net). In Ed>Net, a lead institution is responsible for the coordination of economic development programs and services across the state while specific colleges and districts are responsible for specialized vocational and economic development programs, such as New Media/Multimedia and Entertainment, Environmental Technology, Biotechnology, Advanced Transportation Technology, Contract Education, Workplace Learning, etc. An Executive Committee oversees Ed>Net that is comprised of community college members and the Chancellor's Office.

In this case, the lead institution responsible for hosting the Distance Learning Coordinating Network could develop and maintain the virtual website, catalog, program inventory, schedule, online application and transcript, among other selected statewide activities. The lead institution could also provide college support functions, such as web hosting and 7x24 technical assistance. Colleges could have an opportunity to host programs and/or support services coordinated with the virtual Coordinating Network.

In addition to the lead institution, other colleges/districts could be selected through the competitive bid process to provide selected services offered by the Distance Learning Coordinating Network. These grants would be administered through the Chancellor's Office. The colleges/districts could be responsible for the development, maintenance and delivery of the Virtual Transfer Center, the Virtual Career Center or the Virtual Library; Online Counseling & Advisement, and so forth. A consortium of colleges could choose to apply to develop and maintain a full range of support services, such as counseling and advisement. Each component of the Distance Learning Coordinating Network could be linked to or housed on the Network website. In this manner, all students would be provided a single point of access to the California Community Colleges.

Voluntary Participation of California Community Colleges in the Distance Learning Coordinating Network
It is recommended that participation in the Distance Learning Coordinating Network could be voluntary for all community colleges. Colleges would have the option whether to participate as a full partner or a partial

partner within the consortium. A full partner would utilize all services made available through the Distance Learning Coordinating Network; a partial partner could select specific services of interest, such as the online bookstore, tutorial center, virtual library, etc. The lead institution could develop agreements with each district outlining the extent to which the colleges could participate.

The Implementation of Pilot Projects to Field Test Selected Services to be Offered by the Distance Learning Coordinating Network

It is recommended that a series of pilot projects be developed during the next few years that would provide support for program and curriculum development, joint course development and faculty training. Specific projects could include (but are not limited to) the development of:

- (1) model curriculum in areas that demonstrate a statewide need;
- (2) articulation of courses among colleges;
- (3) the uses of course articulation mechanisms such as the California Articulation Number (CAN) System and the Community College Articulation Number (CCAN) System;
- (4) joint course development;
- (5) faculty and staff training;
- (6) projects that identify issues related to copyright, privacy, and security matters; and
- (7) research projects that address student retention and success in distance learning courses and programs, specifically addressing issues of testing, drop out rates, and success of the student in subsequent classes.

These programs/projects could be supported by the Professional Development Center and the four California Virtual Campus (CVC) Centers within the state.

Financing the Distance Learning Coordinating Network

A stable state source of funding would be necessary for the success of a Distance Learning Coordinating Network. Funding would be required for both the technical and personnel infrastructures to support such a statewide system. The Distance Learning Coordinating Network could get base funding supplemented by compensation for student use of universal utilities such as 7x24 technical assistance and online career assessment--plus financing for college support services such as web hosting. The Distance Learning Coordinating Network could be established in statute so that its charge is clear and so that it can receive local assistance funds from the state. Districts responsible for various centralized services could receive state funding through the grant process. The model would support the coordination function of the virtual Network and allow participating colleges to make the primary determination of which services are provided by the Distance Learning Coordinating Network and which by the colleges themselves.

ACTION REQUESTED

Continued feedback to this concept paper is being sought from faculty, administrative, student, and policy-making entities. This paper is a working document being used for discussion purposes. The intent is that this effort will be thorough in raising pertinent issues, considering a full range of options and presentation recommendations that will focus future policy development in a positive direction.

- ❑ For organizations/groups who have been previously contacted, please review the above changes to the proposal and provide any additional feedback or comments to the project team.
- ❑ For organizations/groups interested in contacting the project team to provide input or to schedule a meeting, please contact Susan Sargent at: sargent@sbcc.net.

Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center**District:** Santa Barbara CCD**RFA Number:** 97-0484-001**Project Director:** Dr Jack Friedlander, Vice President/Academic Affairs**Organization:** Santa Barbara City College**Address:** 721 Cliff Drive**City:** Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394**Phone:** 805/965-0581 x 2579**College:** Santa Barbara Community College**Amount:** \$400,000**CCC Abstract:**

The response to this RFA is a proposed public-private partnership between Santa Barbara City College and government, a firm that distributes public databases on a subscription basis via the Internet. Additional input for the functional specifications of the Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center would be provided by the 4C@ONE consortium, as required by their grant.

As outlined in the RFA, the proposed center would be constructed in such a manner as to facilitate automated submission and retrieval of "best practices in the design of curriculum, in the delivery of instruction and related student services and staff development, and in the development of system-wide and district policies and structures most likely to support these best practices. The logistics-intensive nature of such an online center makes a compelling argument for involvement of a private partner with demonstrated expertise in implementing and operating such an enterprise. At the conclusion of the two-year grant period, the online center would be a self-sustaining operation providing a steadily growing Web site that could continue serving California Community Colleges without any subsequent funding from the Chancellor's Office.

Organizationally, a Project Director from Santa Barbara City College would oversee the project. Input and review of functional specifications would be provided by the 4C@ONE consortium, and all equipment, analysis, design, programming, and operations would be provided by government. Particular attention would be paid to coordination and integration of the resulting databases and Website with related databases being constructed by the 4C@ONE consortium and other CCC grant projects.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center

Dr. Jack Friedlander, Vice President/Academic Affairs

Santa Barbara Community College

Purpose

The Online Curriculum and Instructional Resource Center is finished.

Problems

Support Staff

Then chancellor's office asked us to continue with our project. I basically said I wasn't interested in doing it anymore. I wasn't getting enough support. The grant wouldn't work. I mean, the center wouldn't work unless the chancellor's office took a leadership role in populating the center. They didn't have the staff up there to do it.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution**Successes****Next Steps**

This is not something that belongs in a community college. It belongs in the Chancellor's office.

Analysis of Grant Report

Technology-Related Projects

This document has been developed in collaboration with the *Feasibility Study to Establish a Distance Learning Coordinating Network for the California Community Colleges*. The feasibility study recommends the development of a Distance Learning Coordinating Network that would support a centralized system for serving students enrolled in distance learning courses and programs. The proposal suggests that a Coordinating Network could offer a full array of online student support services and provide students with a single point of access for services. A listing of potential coordination and support services are proposed in the study.

This document attempts to examine the relationship between the proposed coordination and services being recommended for the development of a Distance Learning Coordinating Network and existing technology-related projects that have been or are being funded for the California Community Colleges.

The technology-related projects being examined include both past and present Telecommunications Model Applications Pilot Project (TMAPP) applications and the California Virtual Campus (CVC) Regional Centers. These projects/centers have been funded to support a statewide need for a distance learning system. Many of the projects have developed templates and/or models that can be replicated statewide. These projects address work that has already been done in the state and reflect the number of services that have already been developed online for students. Many of these services are those that have been recommended in the Feasibility Study. For example, the Study suggests that a common application and transcript could be made available through the Distance Learning Coordinating Network. A TMAPP grant, the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study has already developed the standards and elements that could be included in an application and transcript. The Study also suggests the need for a Virtual Library. There are currently two districts/colleges that have developed components of a virtual library through the use of TMAPP funds. Other services have also been developed, as noted in the following pages.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROJECTS
Virtual Network Website	California Virtual Campus (CVC) website (www.cvc.edu) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the Professional Development Center and the 4 CVC Centers (Bay Area, Los Angeles, Southern California, Statewide/Rural) Student Friendly Services (SFS) website (www.colleges.edu) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersegmental site for CCC, CSU and UC campuses
Virtual Catalog	CVC Catalog site (www.cvc.edu/catalog.asp) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists courses by subject, segment (CC, UC, CSU), institution, delivery methods and term.
Virtual Program Inventory	Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prototype developed to host the current program inventory for the California Community Colleges
Online Schedules	
Electronic Transcript	Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study - Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations made for a statewide

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROJECTS
	standardized transcript exchange process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards for a common transcript Advising Online Support System: Contra Costa <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcript retrieval - local Electronic Transcript Exchange: Napa Valley College, College of the Redwoods, Delta College, Santa Barbara City College; Southwestern College, Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcript exchange at a local level
Online Application(s)	EDI Feasibility Study: Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations made for a common electronic admissions application, BOG Fee Waiver and Residency form for statewide use • Standards for a common application Online Counseling & Advisement: LACCD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admissions & registration application • Financial aid application Advising Online Support System: Contra Costa <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online admissions application
E-mail Access	Online Student Services Center: Coastline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-mail access for all students
Online Bookstore	
Online Fee Collection	
Exam Proctoring	
24/7 Technical Assistance	
Counseling & Advisement Center	Online Student Services Center: Coastline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online registration • Online Student Educational Plan • College schedule and catalog • Internet chat sessions for counseling Advising Online Support System: Contra Costa College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online advisement Online Counseling & Advisement: LACCD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual Counseling: Rancho Santiago College • Videoconferencing counseling sessions Online Counseling & Advisement Project: Shasta College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Videoconferencing counseling sessions Video & Internet Student Access: Modesto Junior College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactive video used for counseling

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROJECTS
Online Orientation	Advising Online Support System: Contra Costa College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orientation
Virtual Library	Library & Learning Resources Services for the Remote Learner: Cuyamaca College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized online reference services • Online interlibrary loan processing procedures • Document delivery services • Information competency training • Access to commercial online databases • 800# for students to call-in Universal Remote Patron Access & Authentication Project: Glendale College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic library resources • Remote authentication
Virtual Transfer Center	Online Student Services Center: Coastline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer Center
Virtual Career Center	Online Student Services Center: Coastline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job search • Career and employment resources
Online Tutorial Services	Online Tutorial Support: Palomar College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive system for instruction or services-based tutoring with private and group messaging, chats, appointment scheduling and student/tutor tracking • Model tutorial contents
Bulletin Boards, Chat Rooms, Discussion Forums	

COLLEGE SERVICES	TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROJECTS
Course Server Hosting	CVC Regional Centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Server hosting for some regions
Curriculum Development	CVC Regional Centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint course development • Shared resources Statewide/Regional Delivery of Distance Education Demonstration Project: IVC, Palomar College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of barriers inhibiting collaboration & development of course • Exploring the forming of consortium for joint course development
Registration Database	
Computerized Tracking and Monitoring of Students	

COLLEGE SERVICES	TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROJECTS
Faculty & Staff Development Center	CVC Professional Development Center: Palomar College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Communities • Student Support Communities • Training • Conferences @ONE: DeAnza College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Center • Community resources • Trainers' Network Curriculum Design Training for Technology Mediated Courses for Access by the Disabled: DeAnza College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility training
Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center	Online Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center: Santa Barbara City College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prototype developed
Securing Copyrights	
Review of Distance Learning Policies	
Public Relations & Marketing	CVC Regional Centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website provides catalog for all distance learning courses and programs

Curriculum Design Training for Technology Mediated Courses - Access by the Disabled

District: Foothill-De Anza CCD

College: De Anza College

RFA Number: 98-0661-001

Amount: \$300,000

Project Director: Carl Brown

Organization: De Anza College

Address: 21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.

City: Cupertino, CA 95014-5702

Phone: 408/864-8491

CCC Abstract:

The California community colleges, along with most other institutions of higher education in the United States, are moving ahead rapidly with the development and implementation of video and Web based distance education resources.

Recently, the Office for Civil Rights has determined that the California community colleges have an obligation under Title 2 of the Americans with Disabilities Act to insure that these distance education resources are accessible to students with disabilities.

In order to provide training and support for the faculty and staff creating distance education courses, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office has put in place a number of resource centers around state. It is essential that the staff of these recently created training and support facilities have access to the specialized training, guidelines, technologies, and techniques used for creating accessible distance education resources for students with disabilities.

This proposal will put in place a highly skilled position which will provide training, technical support and online resources associated with the creation of accessible video and Web based distance education. We propose to locate this position and its attendant resources at the High Tech Center Training Unit. The state-of-the-art assistive computer technologies and strong network resources already located at the HTCTU will enhance the effectiveness and reduce the cost of service delivery.

Using a "train the trainers" model, the proposed position would offer a variety of specialized training, both at the HTCTU as well as MAJ, @One and other California community college locations statewide. Additionally, this resource would include establishment of a help desk, development of extensive Web based resources for creation of accessible distance education, associated list servers, chat rooms and other online resources.

This position will serve to close the gap between the extensive and complex access requirements for distance education outlined in the Chancellor's Office Distance Education Guidelines document and the current skill levels of CVU and @One trainers, faculty and staff presently developing video and Web based distance education resources.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Curriculum Design Training for Technology Mediated Courses - Access by the Disabled

Carl Brown

De Anza College

Purpose

This TMAPP grant is intended to support the five CVC sites with regard to providing training and support and information about the process for creating accessible Web pages that satisfy Title 2 of the Americans With Disabilities Act and meet the Chancellors office distance learning access guideline standards.

Problems

Support Staff

Commercial products Blackboard, Web CT, eCommerce are are not capable of generating Web pages which are uniquely accessible unless the people designing them are familiar with the requirements. What we are finding and what we are working with as vendors is that the companies are willing to discuss the possibility of changing how their products work so that the instructional Web pages they generate are more accessible but it is going to be a process over time before we see profoundly accessible Web pages in place. They're not going to do it overnight.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

There seems to be a lot of individual but disconnected efforts to create resources.

There is not a central Web site where you could go and instantly link to the Web resources of all of the TMAPP grants that are out there.

Web developers saying yes we're aware of the guidelines, we know we need to do them, we want to do them but it's unclear to us how much work this is going to be, who is going to do it and who is going to pay for it.

Solution

We created a large central Web based server that is a repository for mass amounts of information about how you create accessible Web sites.

The Chancellors office or some entity could maintain a comprehensive Web site of links to all of the TMAPP resources that the Chancellors office has invested millions of dollars in over the last few years.

Successes

We wrote a very large 14 million dollar budget change proposal to cover the cost of a lot of these things and fortunately it appears that well over half of our proposals are in the Governors budget. So there is for example 2.6 million dollars a year for the next six years to cover the cost of close captioning existing libraries of video material.

There is a little over a million dollars to buy close captioning editing decks for each of the colleges so that they can caption the new video material they make. There is almost \$700,000.00 to put in place a statewide alternate media center that will be able to produce books in Braille and electronic text in large print. There is an equal amount of money to put into place a pretty high quality Braille embossing equipment so that they can produce hard copy Braille on an as needed basis locally.

There is additionally funding in the Governors budget to put in place two permanent staff with the Hi-Tech Center Training Unit that will provide ongoing services of training and support to the CVC's and the alternate media people after the TMAPP grant ends next year.

Next Steps

I'm conducting this statewide needs assessment study is to get a sense of who they really are and what they're really doing after we've discarded this happy notion that they were all going to be working together. So now I need to know what I'm really working with and we're working on figuring that out now.

Analysis of Grant Report

This grant was transferred to Las Positas College, Livermore, CA per Karen Johnson. We left messages with Karen Holiday 925-373-5805 who was referred to us by Lavaughn Hart of Las Positas We have no final report as of 2/16/01.

Student Support: Online Tutorial Support**District:** Palomar CCD**RFA Number:** 97-0486-001**Project Director:****Organization:****Address:****City:****Phone:**

Gloria Floren / Joan Gipson-Fredin

NCHEA, North County Higher Education Alliance

1140 West Mission Road

San Marcos, CA 92069-14874

760/744-1150 x 2178

<http://www.miracosta.cc.ca.us/MCCWeb/OnTap/Web/default.html>

College: Palomar College**Amount:** \$273,000**CCC Abstract:**

We, a consortium of four institutions of the North County Higher Education Alliance (NCHEA), will address all of the Chancellor's objectives for Online Tutoring Support presented in the Technology Model Application Pilot Project's Request for Applications. We will review and assess available online learning resources, including tutorials, and available technologies for delivering instruction/tutoring and/or creating and delivering learning environments; produce high quality interactive Online tutorials in a number of disciplines, including English composition; produce an Online handbook with substantive and diagnostic aids in support of writing, critical thinking, research, and learning across the curriculum; create an Online college readiness course; widen the population of students receiving tutoring services; improve the convenience of tutoring and scheduling tutoring appointments; pilot products and services at three colleges and CSU; evaluate, and share *findings and* results at various stages, including listserve and Project Web Site; and recommend how we might proceed in the delivery of Online tutorial support statewide.

This consortium offers extraordinary benefits: a seven-year history of commitment to pooling resources for transforming education; a dynamic project partnership of Mira Costa, Miramar, Palomar Community Colleges; California State University, San Marcos; and at least one of the feeder high schools - all serving diverse, growing communities in north San Diego County; strong tutoring, graduate intern, and student technical consulting programs; excellent electronic information resources and technical support in the larger community and at MiraCosta and Palomar, project lead campuses; a strong model community of support and interest for assessing the project's potential utility in the statewide telecommunication infrastructure.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Student Support; Online Tutorial Support

Joan Gibipson-Fredin

Palomar College

Purpose

Our mission is to extend and enrich tutoring services through the provision of online tutorial support.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

In the more advanced subjects tutors are difficult to find and the students at far locations haven't been getting the same service on ground as their main campus counterparts have.

Faculty Problems

There is a tremendous amount of detail in getting something onto the Web that doesn't meet the eye at first. We've been striving for cross platform, cross browser compatibility and find that it is very difficult to achieve.

When we begin to talk about the details to publishing it so that it's accessible then there are some rules that apply and getting people to agree on those rules has been a challenge. Primarily it's in regard to copyright, intellectual property ownership and access for the disabled.

We still haven't found an adequate solutions for collaborative writing and I can see that by trying to cover

all bases come bases aren't being covered as well as they could be in other settings. I've found it difficult at times to bring people into agreement and get commitments working exclusively online. It's good to have face-to-face consideration of ideas.

Solution

There is a need to adopt tutoring for the learning styles and the handicapped for some students in our population so we see online tutoring as augmenting services for the on ground population as well as reaching a whole new group. We are hoping that what we've set up will at least lay the foundation for shared resources in the future.

What we need are protocols in the sense that we can say to people if you approach of publishing this way your end product is likely to be satisfactory in terms of access, easy for students to use.

Successes

Next Steps

In the future we'll be able to track students time in the online environment to ease the accounting burden for tutoring support.

Three years from now I'm hoping that the colleges will be using the software system that was created as a result of this project.

Analysis of Grant Report

The basic learning tools (e.g. e-mail, web boards, private/small group chat) necessary for Online tutoring and Online courses are fundamentally the same.

Tutoring needs Online management features that courses generally don't require, and courses need some that tutoring doesn't usually require. Most software has been written with traditional classroom needs in mind.

Online tutoring requires a mechanism for collecting information about the student and directly from the student; a system for checking student identification and controlling access to tutoring; an appointment/messaging system; a mechanism for tracking student/tutor time; and a simple, accessible, adaptable environment.

There is also a need to control who presents himself as a tutor.

Necessary accountability data for tutoring must be extractable for analysis and reporting. Locally this requires PeopleSoft compatibility.

The appointment and tracking systems are locally urgent. Both lead campuses will lose their existing semi-automated systems before the end of the year.

Online tutoring can occur inside or outside a course

Online tutorials may be among materials offered in a discipline or learning skills lab.

The Online tutoring system should support on-ground as well as Online courses.

Credit Online tutoring or "Supplemental Instruction" modules could be attached to either an Online or on-ground course. (When capitalized, "Supplemental Instruction" refers to a formal tutoring/teaching assistance program used at Palomar College and elsewhere.)

The ability to track student/tutor time is a necessity for payroll accounting as well as for positive attendance accounting.

No software product we have found satisfies all of these needs. Those that satisfy the most needs are course management packages.

Additional programming will be required.

Everyone cares about the tools they use.

No one wants to use clunky or undependable software or to invest much time in learning software that they won't continue to use.

User expectations will continue to become more demanding. The frustration threshold for delay in finding or downloading information is already quite low, some say ten seconds maximum before users "turn the page" or call for help.

The World Wide Web is a moving target, and related software continues to evolve.

Course management and related software packages are being marketed directly to teachers who will be able to download and use any package they choose.

Conclusions

It takes consideration of the issues from all vantage points to create a system that will work well. A system that students won't use is a waste of time. A system that teachers won't use is a waste of time. If a system breaks down frequently, neither students nor teachers will use it.

Keep expense of time and money as low possible by using as few software products as possible to accomplish our goals for OnTAP.

Create a unified system for supporting Online instruction and tutoring that will be as simple as possible for students to use, teachers and tutoring directors to use, and technical support staff to use, with primary consideration given to the environment for instruction (including tutoring) and learning.

Don't expect a permanent solution. Instead plan a system that is easy to maintain AND that will prevent contents from being lost when change inevitably occurs.

Don't expect a perfect solution, but do attempt to avoid foreseeable problems.

Do expect what is learned to be applicable to the next generation of an Online instructional/ tutoring system.

Universal Internet Access**District:** Los Angeles CCD**RFA Number:** 97-0487-001**Project Director:**

Dr. Robert M. Alworth, Director, Information Technology

Organization:

Los Angeles Community College District

Address:

770 Wilshire Blvd.

City:

Los Angeles, CA 90017-3856

Phone:

213/891-2255

College: All nine district colleges**Amount:** \$371,000**CCC Abstract:**

The Los Angeles Community College District proposes to provide Universal Internet Access to students, faculty, and staff using information in the District's student information and human resources databases, as well as valuable groupware services such as electronic mail, electronic forms, scheduling, and shared documents.

This project will address system-wide problems such as lack of access to Internet resources, lack of access to electronic mail, the difficulty of establishing and maintaining network accounts on a mass basis, the need to support distance learning initiatives, the difficulty of scheduling student-instructor meetings, the unstructured nature of current e-mail (when available), and the logistics of distributing course materials.

This project will address these problems in the following ways:

1. Colleges will be able to grant universal access to Internet and web resources.
2. Network accounts for students, faculty, and staff will be created, maintained, and deleted automatically on a mass basis, with little or no work by campus LAN administrators.
3. Colleges will be able to use electronic mail to bring students together with instructors in 'virtual office hours' and with other students in 'virtual study groups.'
4. Colleges will be able to use groupware to support distance learning initiatives.
5. Students and faculty will be able to schedule meetings and shared resources such as computer laboratories.
6. Students and faculty will be able to engage in structured discussion groups using electronic forms.
7. Students and faculty will be able to post documents in electronic folders, both public and private.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Universal Internet Access

Dr. Robert M. Alworth, Director, Information Technology

Los Angeles Community College District

All nine district colleges

Purpose

The Los Angeles Community College District proposes to provide Universal Internet Access to students, faculty, and staff using information in the District's student information and human resources databases, as well as valuable groupware services such as electronic mail, electronic forms, scheduling, and shared documents.

Problems

Support Staff

Project staff overestimated the extent to which groupware servers could be implemented in an organization the size of our district. As a result, although servers were installed at all colleges and accounts were created automatically for all students and faculty, actual usage was much lower and did not provide a sound foundation prior to the end of the project. Page 3 of LACCD 97-0847 final report.

We overestimated the ability of college LAN support staff to properly support the project on campus while still providing essential day to day services. We also overestimated the receptivity of college LAN support staff to use Microsoft Exchange.

During the course of the project, the District embarked on a major decentralization initiative that, in effect, reduced the responsiveness of the colleges to district-wide initiatives such as this. In addition, some of the colleges began toying with a 'do your own thing' approach to network matters. For example, as the project progressed, several indicated a desire to explore Novell GroupWise in preference to Microsoft Exchange. This created a workload for project staff that came too late in the project to be reflected in the Work Plan. Page 5 of LACCD 97-0847 final report.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Project staff will provide advice and recommendations to any college or district considering a similar undertaking. Fortunately, with e-mail, videoconference, and web resources, the cost of providing such advice and support is minimal. Page 7 of LACCD 97-0847 final report.

Successes

1. Colleges can grant universal access to Internet and web resources, using Exchange servers purchased with Project funds.
2. Network accounts for students, faculty, and staff are created, maintained, and deleted automatically on a mass basis, with little or no work by campus LAN administrators.
3. Colleges can use electronic mail to bring students together with instructors in 'virtual office hours' and with other students in 'virtual study groups.'
4. Colleges can use groupware to support distance learning initiatives.
5. Students and faculty can engage in structured discussion groups using electronic forms.
6. Students and faculty can post documents in public and private electronic folders.

Next Steps

As I have noted in a previous TMAPP grant report (96-0480), I believe that the State Chancellor's Office should provide more contact with and assistance to project directors. Perhaps a grant could be designed specifically for this. Greater assistance is especially needed by project directors who are new to the process, as I was in applying for these two TMAPP grants. Page 9 of LACCD 97-0847 final report.

Analysis of Grant Report

The following outcomes were achieved:

1. Colleges can grant universal access to Internet and web resources, using Exchange servers purchased with Project funds.
2. Network accounts for students, faculty, and staff are created, maintained, and deleted automatically on a mass basis, with little or no work by campus LAN administrators.
3. Colleges can use electronic mail to bring students together with instructors in 'virtual office hours' and with other students in 'virtual study groups.'
4. Colleges can use groupware to support distance learning initiatives.
5. Students and faculty can engage in structured discussion groups using electronic forms.
6. Students and faculty can post documents in public and private electronic folders.

To achieve these outcomes, the following activities were carried out:

- The project was coordinated with the 9 college LAN administrators.
 - A prototype Microsoft Exchange groupware server was installed at the District Office, based on.
 - An application was developed to create Exchange server accounts for faculty and students based on information in the district database.
 - The application was refined based on initial use.
 - The LAN administrators were trained in Windows NT and Microsoft Exchange.
 - Exchange servers were installed and made operational at all nine colleges.
-

- Project staff worked with colleges to make the servers operational, encourage usage, and identify any barriers to usage.
- Project staff established a parallel groupware capability using Novell GroupWise for colleges preferring GroupWise as an alternative to Exchange.
- Project staff visited selected colleges upon invitation to conduct training classes for interested parties.

The deliverable for this project is a model groupware environment, either Microsoft Exchange or Novell GroupWise, that provides Internet and network services to faculty and students and features automatic account creation and deletion.

As stated elsewhere in this Final Report, Project staff overestimated the extent to which groupware servers could be implemented in an organization the size of our district. As a result, although servers were installed at all colleges and accounts were created automatically for all students and faculty, actual usage was much lower and did not provide a sound foundation prior to the end of the project to assess the impact that these servers have had on the target clientele. However, based on anecdotal reports from participating students and faculty, it is believed that usage of these systems will expand greatly during the 1999-2000 academic year.

Specific evaluation goals and standards that were to be achieved by each objective of the report.

1. Create and maintain network accounts automatically using information from the District's student information and human resources databases .
2. Train faculty and students to use Internet and Web resources. Work with faculty to incorporate these resources in a minimum of 100 classes district-wide.
3. Train faculty and students to use electronic mail. Work with faculty to encourage its use in a minimum of 100 classes district-wide.
4. Train faculty and students to use electronic forms, scheduling, document sharing and other groupware technologies. Work with faculty to encourage the use of these technologies in a minimum of 100 classes district-wide.
5. Refine and improve the system based on project experience.

Those activities that were particularly effective in reaching the goals of the project.

The technical aspects of the project were complex but went relatively smoothly:

The application to create and maintain user accounts based on information in the district database was accomplished on schedule.

More than 20 people from all 9 colleges and the district office were sent for 16 days of training each (8 days in Windows NT and 8 days in Microsoft Exchange).

Exchange servers were installed district-wide.

A parallel system was created using Novell GroupWise to give colleges a choice between GroupWise and Exchange.

Those activities that were not effective in the implementation of the Work Statement.

The project goals were overly ambitious. We overestimated the ability of college LAN support staff to properly support the project on campus while still providing essential day to day services. We also overestimated the receptivity of college LAN support staff to use Microsoft Exchange.

During the course of the project, the District embarked on a major decentralization initiative that, in effect, reduced the responsiveness of the colleges to district-wide initiatives such as this. In addition, some of the colleges began toying with a 'do your own thing' approach to network matters. For example, as the project progressed, several indicated a desire to explore Novell GroupWise in preference to Microsoft Exchange. This created a workload for project staff that came too late in the project to be reflected in the Work Plan.

Project staff will provide advice and recommendations to any college or district considering a similar undertaking. Fortunately, with e-mail, videoconference, and web resources, the cost of providing such advice and support is minimal.

General Comments:

- The State Chancellor's Office should provide more contact with and assistance to project directors.
- The amount of paper that is currently involved in the grant application and reporting process should be reduced and replaced by electronic media.

***Student Friendly Services: Assessment Study**

District: Foothill-De Anza CCD

RFA Number: 97-0011-001

Project Director:

Organization:

Address:

City:

Phone:

Kathleen Kyne, Director of Admissions and Records, De-Anza College,

Foothill-De Anza Community College District

12345 El Monte Road

Los Altos Hills, CA 94022-4599

408/864-8292

College: Foothill & De Anza Colleges

Amount: \$59,450

CCC Abstract:

This proposal will conduct a study and pilot project to assess the California Community Colleges' future involvement in the intersegmental Student Friendly Services (SFS) project. The Foothill-De Anza Community College District proposes to do the following activities to establish the current capabilities, needs and assessments of each of the System's 107 community colleges regarding the feasibility of extending the Student Friendly Services Project to the Community Colleges:

Carry out interviews with CSU and UC segment representatives; conduct a statewide community college survey; use focus group interviews; conduct a pilot implementation test conduct four regional conferences

Matrices will be developed to tabulate, compare and contrast colleges' readiness and needs to participate in the Student Friendly Services project. In addition, a pilot implementation of the Student Friendly Services Project link to the Community Colleges' website application will be undertaken to identify anticipated and unforeseen challenges that may be encountered in development of SFS community college involvement statewide.

The Foothill-De Anza District is uniquely qualified to undertake this project, for the following reasons: it currently has in operation an interactive Internet application process; it uses the SPEEDE/ExPRESS electronic data interface (EDI) standard format for electronic transcript interchange among participating two and four year colleges; and this project's director, formerly Director of Admissions at San Jose State University, has extensive experience in the CSU Mentor Project.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Student Friendly Services: Assessment Study

Kathleen Kyne, Director of Admissions and Records

Foothill & De Anza Colleges

Purpose

The student friendly services is called CATS, Computerized Analysis Transcripts and basically it's to document image our transcripts as well as our OCR. So all the data from transcripts is OCR'd and imported directly into a degree audit which saves us about thirteen months of evaluator time.

Two key goals for the California Community Colleges' participation in the statewide, inter-segmental Student Friendly Services (SFS) project were the focus of this study:

1. Provide colleges/districts online application, online registration and online schedule of classes capabilities.
2. Create a common California Community College application to allow "import" of K-12 and portfolio data.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Missing in terms of student services, there is no ESL, there was no real intervention.

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

All 68 colleges reporting have or plan online A/R/S (Application/Registration/Schedule of Classes). The 68 colleges process over 500,000 applications and one million registrations per year. Such numbers indicate the importance of getting A/R/S online. Further, the growth of distance education will magnify the need for these online functions. It is no wonder that all California Community Colleges have or plan online A/R/S.

However, interviews and answers to survey questions on issues and concerns indicate that implementing online A/R/S will be a difficult task. So, while there is readiness, feasibility must be addressed with strategic tactical planning.

To summarize comments, a common application is acceptable if each campus can then have customizations added to the application. Registration and schedule of classes can use a common software base, but must be populated and maintained by each campus. The software used for application and registration must then provide flexible capability to produce data formatted as required by each campus for upload to each campus student information system.

Online Student Services Center**District:** Coast Community College District**RFA Number:** 96-0480-001**Project Director:** Rendell Drew**Organization:** Coastline Community College**Address:** 11460 Warner Avenue**City:** Fountain Valley, CA 92708-6248**Phone:** 714/241-6257**College:** Coastline Community College**Amount:** \$80,000**CCC Abstract:**

This is a proposal for a two-year project to design and implement online registration, counseling, and advisement services. The **Online Student Services Center** will target distance education and working adult students, non-native English-speaking students, and advanced placement and college preparation high school students.

Services will include online registration and interactive, web-based program planning that links the college Career Planning and Transfer Guide, the Student Educational Plan, and the college schedule and catalog. Interactive, real-time counseling sessions will be offered via scheduled Internet chat sessions, over Coastline's Edu-Cable channel, and using high school and industry-based Codec systems. E-mail. List-serves. chat rooms, and MOO environments will be used to provide asynchronous personal and group counseling and advisement.

Existing counseling and orientation to college courses will be adapted for Internet delivery. A series of brief video counseling segments will be developed for delivery over cable and via the Internet. College transfer events, featuring virtual campus tours and presentations by four-year university representatives will be cablecast live with opportunities for call-in questions from students. A web-based Career and Transfer Center will provide college and university information, including real-time or asynchronous versions of transfer events, and job search and preparation information with links to career and employment resources. Designated cablecasts and web-site information will be available in Spanish and Vietnamese in addition to English.

The project will undergo formative and summative evaluation, and project materials and findings will be documented and disseminated statewide.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Online Student Services Center

Rendell Drew

Coastline Community College

Purpose

Coastline received a two year grant to develop an online student services center. The goal of the grant was to take all of our information from our publications, our career transfer guide, parts of our schedule, parts of our catalog and put it into a virtual environment.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

One of the other major stumbling blocks is electronic signatures.

Faculty Problems

The problem with these grants is that once the money runs out the institute has to pick it up and sometimes the institution is not in a position to do that.

How do you distinguish between virtual counseling versus advisement services? When is it counseling, when is it advisement?

The current problems are that whatever system we developed could not communicate with our MIS system, with the Coast Community College District.

Solution

In our presentation, if we using counseling, we'd better say counseling/advisement.

Successes

The virtual streaming technology of having a counselor actually be able to use either a video phone and or a camera and the technology to stream themselves.

The grant required us to translate portions of the information into Spanish and Vietnamese. We've also done that on the site. The address of the site is Vcs.ccc.cccd.vbu/ossc.

Next Steps

Eventually are plans are to create a link to the existing main Web page of the college to this and we have to buy a new Pentium 450 application server to do the project.

Develop statewide generic applications, online applications. That's going to be very important should these projects continue to develop and move forward.

Analysis of Grant Report

Ultimately, the completion of this project has been an institutional success. Major contributing factors to the success of this grant were attributed to initially organizing a college-wide Advisory Committee & Task Force that met on a regular monthly basis. Multiple departments were involved in developing the Online Student Service Center (OSSC) project.

The OSSC will eventually be integrated into the college's main Web page site sometime during the Fall 1999 semester. The following activities were actually carried out to complete the project:

- 1) Organized Task Force/Advisory Committee with the approval of the College Council.
- 2) Three video counseling sessions (in English, Spanish & Vietnamese) were produced, taped and edited for cable cast and delivery over the internet via the OSSC.
- 3) Worked in subcommittee structure when necessary to develop "Request of Proposals" and Scope of work for professional experts hired for the project.
- 4) Developed "Power Point" presentations for presentation at local colleges and at various State-wide conferences: State Chancellor's Conference in Palm Springs, CA (March 31, 1998 -April 3, 1998) and in Monterey, CA (March 22-24, 1999); NISOD Conference in Austin, Texas (May 24-27, 1998); Tele-Learning Conference in Portland Oregon (Aug.10-14, 1998). Additionally, copies of the grant were distributed to participants in attendance.
- 5) Purposely prepared "Action Items" on agenda for monthly meetings and reviewed the Project timelines on an ongoing basis with the committee members.
- 6) Maintained and updated a Project Log replete with comments, insights, issues and Activities along with all other related activities of the grant.
- 7) Developed & monitored Professional Expert contracts & communicated on a regular basis.
- 8) Obtained buy-in from counseling staff and developed templates and storyboard for web site.
- 9) Utilized CCC District E-mail system to print and distribute meeting minutes & highlights to all Task Force & Advisory Committee members including other identified district-wide Personnel as requested.
- 10) Created a Counselor Survey Sheet (see Appendix) designed by Cheryl Chapman, to access each counselor's training needs in the utilization of e-mail, searching the Internet and how to use video-conferencing equipment.
- 11) Completed grant's first year requirement to develop and place the "shell" of the OSSC onto the Internet for connection to existing college web-site page.
- 12) Organized and video taped the University Transfer Event (April 23, 1998) at Coastline's Garden Grove Center for cable-cast delivery onto the Internet.
- 13) In Fall 1997 semester, the Matriculation Researcher developed and administered a random survey to all students enrolled in the Distance Learning classes to determine their access to The Internet and their interest in the newly developed Online Student Services Center.
- 14) Other completed project outcomes include development of the following: Online Registration Applications; Web-based Career Planning and Transfer Guide;

online Student Educational Plan (SEP); online college Schedule & Catalog Information; Administrative Access levels have been established.

List of Final Products Resulting From This Project

- a. The Online Student Services (OSSC) Web Site shell and links were put onto the Internet: (Address: vcs.ccc.cccd.edu/osscc2).
- b. Online OSSC Registration Application form was designed and put online.
- c. A two page Student Survey was developed and mailed to students in Fall 1997 semester. A sample of 800 students were surveyed. A total of 148 students (18.5% return rate) completed and returned surveys. A total of forty-nine post cards were returned from students who indicated an interest in participating in the Beta-Testing of the OSSC.
- d. A Project Log was developed and maintained by Project Director
- e. Conference Power Point Presentations were developed, and produced by Cheryl Chapman (Task Force member and Professional Expert for project's web site), and Project Director, Rendell E. Drew, for the 7 th & 8 th Annual State Chancellor's on March 31, 98 to April-3, 98 in Palm Springs, CA and on March 22-24,999, in Monterey, CA. Presentations were also done at the NISOD Conference in Austin, Texas on May 24-27, 1998; Tele-Learning Conference in Portland, Oregon on Oct. 10-14, 1998; American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) in Washington D.C. in August 1998 and at various local colleges within the region (Orange Coast, Coastline, Cerritos).
- f. Two Audio Tapes were recorded of presentations made at conferences by Rendell E. Drew and Cheryl Chapman.
- g. Three Video Tapes were recorded, and produced by the college's media center staff (Jerry Hein) of counseling sessions, and the University Transfer Event at the Coastline College-Garden Grove Center, on April 23, 1998.
- h. Conference Overhead Presentation Slides were produced, presented, and mailed to conference attendees and various constituencies by Project Director as requested.

A large NISOD Certificate of Acknowledgement was awarded to presenters, Cheryl Chapman and Rendell Drew, at the NISOD Conference for presentation entitled: "Developing an Online Student Services Center."

Evaluation:

The evaluation process for this project has been ongoing from the inception of receiving the \$80,000 to develop the Online Student Services Center (OSSC). As Project Director, the formative and summative evaluation requirements were consistently articulated during the past year while developing all related process, activities and objectives of implementing the grant. Instruments of evaluation include the following:

- 1) Completion of six month progress report
- 2) Continuous monitoring of the budget
- 3) Analyzing the input, concerns and fears of various colleagues and constituents from local and state-wide presentations (Power Point) and meetings
- 4) Ongoing logging in the Project Log
- 5) Completion of first year formative evaluation and Final Progress Report (utilizing the appropriate forms provided by the State Chancellor's Office).
- 6) Completion of the second year summative evaluation and Final Report (utilizing the appropriate forms provided by the State Chancellor's Office).

Specific evaluation goals and standards that were to be achieved by each objective of the project.

Objective 1: By June 1998, design and develop Internet-based counseling and advisement services that include online application and registration, personal and group counseling, interactive Educational Plan development, access to the college catalog and schedule, career and transfer information, and on-demand access to brief video counseling segments.

Objective 2: By June 1998, produce six video counseling segments and plan three live counseling, career and transfer events for cable-cast and delivery over the Internet.

Objective 3: By June 1998, train a minimum of six local high school, industry, and community -based sites that will be available for personal, one-on-one counseling using CODEC video-conferencing technology.

Objective 4: By June 1998, train a minimum of six counselors in the use of the online delivery technologies.

Objective 5: By June 1999, complete and evaluate a one-year pilot of the OSSC.

Objective 6: By June 1999, document and disseminate project findings and materials to all California Community Colleges.

Activities that were particularly effective in reaching the goals of the project.

- 1) Initially, regularly planned and scheduled Task Force meeting on a monthly basis. Reduced frequency of meetings with in the second year).
- 2) Established a college-wide Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee was not required to attend the regularly scheduled Task Force meetings).
- 3) Development of an "action agenda" by Project Director for each scheduled meeting and a thorough review of the project's time-lines at each meeting.
- 4) The organization of "sub-committee" meetings to accomplish tasks.
- 5) Utilization of the College/District's E-mail system to report the summaries of each meeting.
- 6) Sending out Requests for Proposals (RFPs) system-wide over the Internet for solicitations and hiring of Professional Experts (Net-work Specialists & Webmaster)
- 7) Organizing and obtaining information and input from our full-time (and adjunct) counselors to participate in meetings, brainstorming sessions, story board design and counselor template information for existing OSSC web-site.
- 8) Constant phone contact and follow-up with Professional Experts, counselors & staff.
- 9) Purchase of Server for OSSC (College did not have sufficient server space to run project).
- 10) Creation of conference budget line item for Project Director and Professional Experts to attend conferences.

Activities that were not effective in the implementation of the Work Statement.

- 1) Requests for Proposals (RFPs) should have been written in smaller, more manageable units.
- 2) Counselors were not initially trained in usage of technologies such as E-Mail and the Internet. This was primarily due to time constraints and trainer/counselor availability.
- 3) Counselors initially lacked requisite equipment (computers, faxes, etc.) to participate in project.
- 4) There was not a particular need to send a follow-up letter to the same group of student respondents who participated in the needs survey (because military students, and other identified groups of students doing continuous beta-testing of OSSC)
- 5) In contacting the various high school principals and businesses, it was difficulty to establish "a minimum of six local high school, industry, and community-based sites" that were to be identified for personal, one-on-one counseling using CODEC video-conferencing technologies. Budgetary, logistical and personnel issues were biggest obstacles to achieving this task. However, there are at least two high schools will cooperate.
- 6) It was not feasible, at this time, to develop "Chat Rooms" to provide asynchronous personal and group counseling and advisement services. Instead, we have created the E-Mail links and are in the process of creating "Bulletin Board" environments as the vehicle for students to communicate with counselors via the OSSC.
- 7) It was not feasible to develop a program and counseling schedule at this time

Recommendations:

- 1) Colleges should purchase equipment up front.
 - 2) Responsible administrators and Staff Development Dept. should schedule more frequent mandatory training sessions for counselors.
 - 3) Schedule more workshop sessions to assist counselors to create their own web pages.
 - 4) Ensure that all information is submitted on a disk, via e-mail or some other form of electronic input.
 - 5) Create an initial conference budget as it is a requirement to present the project at State Chancellor's conferences and at other conferences.
-

Online Counseling and Advisement

District: Los Angeles CCD

RFA Number: 96-0480-002

Project Director:

Dr. Robert M. Alworth, Director, Information Technology

Organization:

Los Angeles Community College District

Address:

770 Wilshire Blvd.

City:

Los Angeles, CA 90017-3856

Phone:

213/891-2255

College: All nine District colleges

Amount: \$71,000

CCC Abstract:

The Los Angeles Community College District intends to establish a new system called *CCAWeb* (Community College Advisement *Web*) to significantly expand the scope and accessibility of electronic advisement services for current and prospective students. *CCAWeb* is intended to address system-wide problems such as the difficulty of traveling to campus at convenient times for counseling, the difficulty of keeping students informed of important educational information, the reluctance of some students to initiate face-to-face counseling sessions, lack of ready access by students to career and transfer information, and frequent failure to develop or adhere to Student Educational Plans.

CCAWeb will be pilot tested at the nine District colleges and will employ world wide web technology that addresses the above problems by allowing students to:

- Have online access to college catalogs, schedules of classes, campus maps, admissions timelines and procedures, graduation and transfer requirements.
- Learn about campus support services such matriculation, counseling, financial aid, EOP&S, DSPS, Transfer Center, career advisement, GAIN, etc.
- Submit a financial aid application and request a financial aid transcript.
- Submit an application for admission, register for classes, and request grades and transcripts.
- Ask questions Online to the counseling department and craft a preliminary SEP that can later be discussed with a counselor, who will also have Online access to the same SEP.

Students and counselors will have access to *CCAWeb* from any web-connected PC whether on campus, at home, in a high school, in a local library, or around the globe.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Online Counseling and Advisement

Dr. Robert M. Alworth, Director, Information Technology

Los Angeles Community College District

All nine District colleges

He has two grants. He will email grant information but would rather not do a phone interview because he barely remembers anything as it was a year ago. He suggested doing email questions after you've seen the stuff he's emailing to you and his staff would have to help.

6/5/00 His latest reply was he couldn't answer questions but to look at the info he sent to us.

Purpose

The primary deliverable produced by the project is a web-based system for students and counselors to use for counseling and advisement support. This system is designed to be intuitive and to be usable without formal user manuals.

Problems

Support Staff
Counselors

Unfortunately, in mid-project the District Office of Research and Planning was sharply reduced as a

result of board-mandated decentralization, and a formal research study proved impossible. Consequently, counselor receptivity to the system was assessed through a series of interviews and face to face meetings, while student receptivity was assessed through a combination of counselor reports and an analysis of web-page hits. Admittedly, these approaches do not provide a basis for determining whether statistically significant differences were achieved.

In retrospect, I do not believe the above statements properly reflect either the activities involved in the project or the results that were achieved as discussed in # 1 above. This is no one's fault but my own, never having written a state grant application before.

A related issue involves the need to have accurate information about programs and courses in the database. Although the district database has had accurate course information for many years, program information was not available prior to the creation of CCAWeb, and even then it took considerable discussion with the colleges to get the work accomplished (one campus never actually did the work). Keeping this information up to date is a continuing issue

Student Problems
Faculty Problems

We were much less successful in developing a computer system that counselors felt was a useful addition to the counseling process. Despite the use of a relatively intuitive web interface, the participating counselors found it disruptive to use a computer during a counseling session.

Solution

- Determine whether counselors feel comfortable using a computer in a counseling setting, and devote adequate resources to training.
- Anticipate the magnitude of the task in converting catalog program requirements into computer logic.
- Develop a mechanism and clear lines of responsibility for ensuring that database information about programs and courses, as well as web site content overall, is kept up to date.
- Ensure that students and counselors have easy access to a networked PC.
- Devote adequate resources to the complex technical tasks inherent in linking web sites to back-end databases, and consider adopting packaged solutions where available.

Successes

- Online access to college catalogs, schedules of classes, campus maps, admissions timelines and procedures, graduation and transfer requirements.
- Online access to information about campus support services such matriculation, counseling, financial aid, EOP&S, DSPS, transfer, career advisement, GAIN, etc.
- Ability to submit a financial aid application and request a financial aid transcript.
- Ability to submit an application for admission, register for classes, and request grades and transcripts.
- Ability for students to create a draft Student Ed Plan.
- Online access to scholarship information.
- Ability to submit a W-9 tax form for Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credit under the Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997.
- Online access to transfer information to UC and CSU.
- Online access to job and career information.

The development of the student self-service web systems was probably the most significant benefit to students since telephone registration. As noted under #1 above, students now have access to a wide variety of information on the web and can perform a significant amount of campus business through the web. And they are making use of these services.

The CCAWeb system is in use in the Los Angeles Community College District and is extremely popular among students as indicated by usage statistics cited above. The popularity of student self-service applications is expected to continue as more students gain network access. The web is clearly a popular alternative to touch-tone phones for students seeking college information and services. As noted elsewhere, use of the system among counselors is far more limited.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

The following outcomes were achieved:

- Online access to college catalogs, schedules of classes, campus maps, admissions timelines and procedures, graduation and transfer requirements.
- Online access to information about campus support services such as matriculation, counseling, financial aid, EOP&S, DSPS, transfer, career advisement, GAIN, etc.
- Ability to submit a financial aid application and request a financial aid transcript.
- Ability to submit an application for admission, register for classes, and request grades and transcripts.
- Ability for students to create a draft Student Ed Plan.
- Online access to scholarship information.
- Ability to submit a W-9 tax form for Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credit under the Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997.
- Online access to transfer information to UC and CSU.
- Online access to job and career information.

To achieve these outcomes, the following activities were carried out:

- A project team was formed with a counselor representative from each college, to help define needed services.
- The project team worked with the Office of Information Technology to design and prototype a web-based system called CCAWeb (Community College Advisement Web) to support the above processes.
- The system was further refined and put into production.

The primary deliverable produced by the project is a web-based system for students and counselors to use for counseling and advisement support. This system is designed to be intuitive and to be usable without formal user manuals.

In addition to the present Final Report, a Program Review is available on the web at <http://marlin.laccd.edu/exchange/ccawwebprogre.htm>.

The original project plan envisaged a formal research study of students and counselors who did and did not use CCAWeb, to see whether the system had a statistically significant effect on within-semester retention, between-semester persistence, adherence to Student Ed Plans, student satisfaction, and counselor satisfaction. Unfortunately, in mid-project the District Office of Research and Planning was sharply reduced as a result of board-mandated decentralization, and a formal research study proved impossible. Consequently, counselor receptivity to the system was assessed through a series of interviews and face to face meetings, while student receptivity was assessed through a combination of counselor reports and an analysis of web-page hits. Admittedly, these approaches do not provide a basis for determining whether statistically significant differences were achieved.

Activities that were particularly effective in reaching the goals of the project.

The development of the student self-service web systems was probably the most significant benefit to students since telephone registration. As noted under #1 above, students now have access to a wide variety of information on the web and can perform a significant amount of campus business through the web. And they are making use of these services. For example, there were 160,000 hits to student web pages from January 1998 to April 1999. The most popular web pages during this period were grades (35,000 hits), transcripts (26,000), class schedules (22,000), class enrollment (18,000), financial aid status (14,000), viewing/changing personal

Activities that were not effective in the implementation of the Work Statement.

We were much less successful in developing a computer system that counselors felt was a useful addition to the counseling process. Despite the use of a relatively intuitive web interface, the participating counselors found it disruptive to use a computer during a counseling session. (Even if the counselor is using the system without the student present, it is unclear whether the sequence of screens associated with a Student Ed Plan can be made intuitive enough to win converts from the traditional approach to Student Ed Plans.)

A related issue involves the need to have accurate information about programs and courses in the database. Although the district database has had accurate course information for many years, program information was not available prior to the creation of CCAWeb, and even then it took considerable discussion with the colleges to get the work accomplished (one campus never actually did the work). Keeping this information up to date is a continuing issue

The CCAWeb system is in use in the Los Angeles Community College District and is extremely popular among students as indicated by usage statistics cited above. The popularity of student self-service applications is expected to continue as more students gain network access. The web is clearly a popular alternative to touch-tone phones for students seeking college information and services. As noted elsewhere, use of the system among counselors is far more limited.

- As noted above, I believe that the Work Plan that was submitted does not do justice to either the work that was required for this project or the results that were achieved, although this was nobody's fault but my own.
- I believe that the State Chancellor's Office should provide more assistance to project directors. This is not a criticism – I know the resource limitations that exist – but perhaps a grant could be designed specifically for this. For example, this year there was a grant, administered by Virginia McBride, to help the 'reporting out' of project results to the field. (This is the audioconference process that was discussed above in #5a. Greater assistance is especially needed by project directors (such as me) who are new to the process.
- I recommend that the amount of paper that is currently involved in the grant application and reporting process be reduced and replaced by electronic media.

Virtual Counseling**District:** Rancho Santiago CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0480-003**Project Director:** Irene Malmgren**Organization:** Santa Ana College**Address:** 1530 W. 17th Street**City:** Santa Ana, CA 92706-9979**Phone:** 714-564-6078**College:** Rancho Santiago College**Amount:** \$61,392**CCC Abstract:**

Rancho Santiago College is proposing to offer virtual counseling. First, the complete college catalog and a counseling web site will be put on the Internet so that students anywhere can access information about the College and counseling. Second, an e-mail address for the counseling department will be added to the web site so students can ask questions and counselors can respond to their requests. Third, one-to-one counseling sessions via videoconferencing between our two college campuses and two continuing education centers will be provided for students wanting to transition from non-credit programs and classes to college credit programs and classes. Our Continuing Education Division counselors are overburdened with the sheer volume of students they must serve and cannot provide the kind of counseling students need to focus their educational efforts. RSC has a huge pool of potential college students enrolled at our continuing education centers. With our proposed program, we will be able to serve one of most underserved populations in the state—non-credit students. To facilitate successful distance counseling sessions, faculty will have the opportunity to be trained by an expert communications consultant. Those initially trained, will train another in an "each one, teach one" format.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Virtual Counseling

Irene Malmgren

Rancho Santiago College

Purpose

We bought virtual computers and our goal was to establish a connection between continuing education and credit.

Problems

Support Staff

We didn't put any ongoing staffing in there. There is nobody whose job it is to schedule times so that there is a counselor on both ends or to facilitate both ends of the connection. It's something that doesn't happen as independently as we hoped it would.

We got permission to do a pilot where we're connecting the college credit counseling center with one of our big feeder high schools. The problem was getting the firewall cut in the two systems.

At continuing education we don't have staff all the time.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

We've been working on this for this whole academic year and we just got the firewalls penetrated.

Successes

Some of them think it's really fun and some are still intimidated by it all. Once we get them sitting down doing it, playing with it a bit, discovering there is no mystery, no genie in a bottle, it just works.

Next Steps

I'm going to be looking for more money to expand this. I've got high school teachers dying for this and I

want to take advantage of this energy. I'm going to have to find grant money to do it with.

Analysis of Grant Report

After numerous delays with purchasing, we have finally obtained all of our equipment. Four units are installed and three are completely operational. We have received a tremendous amount of enthusiasm from other campus sites and departments. We expect to be full operational this fall. We are in the process of establishing more high school sites, which will work with us to provide conferencing between SAC and Santa Ana HS, for example. Training has proven to be a minor activity and our vendor is going to provide on-going support to all the sites. We now have five more units to install in strategic locations.

We will log the number of students who are contacted through this new medium and evaluate the quality of the experience. It will be important to measure the efficacy of this new mode of counseling from both the student and counselor's perspective.

It has proven to be frustrating working with Information service Departments in other districts. While administration is quite supportive, it is difficult to gain the same levels of support, which we receive from our own campus.

The SAC counseling department is planning on incorporating this new technology into their services. Computers with video cameras will be stationed at the front desk and also in counselor's offices so as to provide immediate access to student calls from other locations. These computers are going to provide students with a critical "personal" contact to someone at the college. Research has shown that when new students have a contact person they can go to, they report that the school feels more comfortable and they feel less alienated. We hope this new mode of recruitment and support will support student persistence and foster the students overall experience at our school.

At this time, a new project has been spawned from our initial efforts. The tutoring center at Santiago Canyon College is planning a similar venture with Canyon High School. They are going to provide tutoring to students at the HS starting this fall.

Online Counseling and Advisement Project (OCAP)

District: Shasta Tehama Trinity Joint CCD

RFA Number: 96-0480-004

Project Director: Dr. James Poulsen

Organization: Shasta College

Address: P.O. Box 496006

City: Redding, CA 96049-6006

Phone: (916) 225-4813

College: Shasta College

Amount: \$79,000

CCC Abstract:

Shasta College is proposing to create an effective, cost efficient Online Counseling and Advisement Project (OCAP) by strategically locating twenty CU-SeeMe and/or PictureTel videoconferencing computers in a three county area of northern California that is larger in size than the State of Massachusetts. The videoconferencing equipment dedicated to Online counseling and advisement will be in "parallel" with the college's deployment of a TI and ISDN infrastructure supporting the 4CNet and it's own telecommunications classrooms on-campus and in eight remote sites.

Students, counselors, teachers, and administrators will convert their highway time to information time and have ready access to counselors, counseling materials, education plans, transfer and career information, Internet access, scheduling, class offerings, frequently asked questions and answers, and an Online tour of the campus, all from remote sites.

With the addition of an Online counseling and advisement system attached to the developing and deployed telecommunications classrooms, Shasta College will be able to reach 1,500 new students and 1,500 existing students each year. College aspirations and achievements can be enjoyed by those otherwise denied access to a higher education due to remote isolation or being home or community bound.

Shasta College is requesting \$81,248.00 under this state RFA. Shasta College will match the grant with an additional \$60,120.00 in order to deploy remote access equipment necessary to achieve a fully developed Online counseling and advisement system. The total project cost is \$141,368.00.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Online Counseling and Advisement Project (OCAP)

Dr. James Poulsen

Shasta College

Purpose

We've developed through the Chancellor's office with some other grants about 20 classes a semester which are virtual interactive classes using compressed video to fund the campus to these sites. We are a district that is 10,000 square miles. We have multiple mountain ranges to cross and we have outreach centers.

Problems

Support Staff

It is very difficult to deliver the support services that would be very typical for the on-campus student verse the student at a distance.

We have taken this grant and developed what we call the student services video network. It is actually 174 curobits (sic) per second, computer based small video equipment. The major problem was to overcome a lot of technical problems that we had because the technology kept changing.

There are technology pitfalls. The design work, the hours it takes to integrate technologies. I spent a lot of hours trying to make this system work right because the technology continually evolves and changes.

Counselors

Student Problems

Home computers cannot get into this network. It is not running over the Internet, it is running on our wide area network. The Internet is not in a condition yet where you can do video conferencing because it takes too much bandwidth and it is extremely unreliable.

Faculty Problems

Say I develop an on-line class on the Internet that has financial value to it, it has resources involved. Now the question is who owns that? The answer is we don't know. Intellectual property rights, major issues in terms of distance education also compensation and faculty load.

Solution

The typical kind of support services available for an on-campus are now available on the small video network. It is our way of meeting the student services need and the aspect of having the extended three county district that we have. We are starting to see the results of people starting to use this and it is a great access tool.

Successes

Our tutoring centers, math tutoring, science tutoring, writing centers. Students can now go into the local center, hit the math center and work with a math tutor. They have to make an appointment just like you would if you were coming into the actual tutoring center, except it is done interactively.

On our campus we have a lady who is a counselor and she has had some very serious health problems. She can no longer come to campus to work so we have taken an ISDN line out to her. She is still a fulltime counselor of the district, she is on the payroll, she works a day just like anybody else but she works through technology and she is actually now our counselor that counsels a lot of these students at these Internet education sites.

This has been more satisfying and fun because when you go up there to Weaverville and you talk with that 35 year old single mother who is struggling to survive and take care of her children and she comes up to you with a big hug and says thanks because I can now go to school without having to leave my kids for a full day or travel to Redding, now that I enjoy. They are greatly appreciative of the educational opportunities we are providing through technology.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

This has been a very interesting project to try to bring to a positive outcome. Since the project is totally dependent upon developing technology, the ability to complete the project in a timely manner has been most difficult. The original grant proposed using CU-SeeMe technology which would have been totally ineffective. The quality of the video would not be acceptable and the ability to communicate among students and staff would have been marginal at best.

With the implementation of H.320 based standards, Shasta College purchased computer based video conferencing equipment to do testing and experiment with the concept. The equipment used ISDN lines to connect various entities that would like to participate in a conference. From our experience with the ISDN based technology, the college developed the following conclusions: 1) The use of ISDN lines is very expensive. There is a flat rate charged for each line of \$38.00 plus all connections that are made including local calls have toll charges attached to them. 2) In the Redding area, the demand for ISDN services has exceeded the infrastructure that is available. At certain times of the day you are unable to complete an ISDN call because the bandwidth that is required is not available.

Based upon our experience with ISDN, Shasta College concluded that the project would not work due to the financial impact to support a large number of ISDN connections.

The next step in the project was to investigate the development of H.323 standard based equipment to support the grant. The H.323 standard allows video conferencing using IP addresses. Since Shasta College has just invested in a LAN on campus and is now in the process of adding a WAN to three of the major centers that were listed in the grant, the ability to deliver counseling services to the extended education sites became much more financially feasible. The drawback to this development has been the time lag that has taken place for the implementations of the new technology. The equipment has only become available on the commercial market at both a reasonable price and acceptable quality in the last year. There are still three sites that must use ISDN services to part of the project, but through the use of a gateway that is being installed, the H.320 will be converted to H.323 standard and be able to connect to various personnel on the college network.

Shasta College has purchased all of the equipment for the implantation of the network including the necessary equipment to expand the WAN to the extended education sites. We are now in the process of implementating the system for Fall Semester. Various activities will be completed during the Fall Semester to train and implement the grant totally to serves students.

The evaluation process to this point in time has been the evaluation of the technology used to support the concept as well as the evaluation of new technology that will be implemented in the project to test the feasibility of the project. Shasta College has done some testing using the ISDN based video conferencing equipment between the Writing Center on the Red Bluff Center campus. Interaction between students in Red Bluff and people located in the Writing Center has demonstrated to our satisfaction that the project is feasible when fully implemented with trained staff to assist students at the various sites.

One of the evaluation goals of the project was to test for the implementation of the concept using current technology. Based upon our experience, we were able to reject one level of technology and implement another. This aspect has been very beneficial to the college to asses our needs to meet the demand for student services in the extended education program.

The ability to experiment with current technology and purchase new technology over the life of the grant as it became available. Through this process Shasta College was able to develop a much more cost-effective system to meet the objectives of the grants.

Video and Internet Student Access (VISA)**District:** Yosemite Community College District**RFA Number:** 96-0480-005**Project Director:**

Juan Alvarez, MJC / Jane Saldana, Columbia College

Organization:

Yosemite Community College District

Address:

PO Box 4065

City:

Modesto, CA 95352

Phone:

209/575-6514

College: Modesto Jr. College/ Columbia College**Amount:** \$80,000**CCC Abstract:**

The Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) is proposing a project, entitled Video and Internet Student Access (VISA) that *will* enable students to access Online advising.

The project will accomplish the following objectives:

1. By June, 1998, develop WWW programs for educational plans and degree audits and the Spring 1998, class schedule, and test in a group of 101) students
2. By August 1998, make the online service available to an expanded group of students and obtain and analyze feedback
3. By June 1998, provide ten days of training to each of three counselors at Modesto Junior College and one counselor at Columbia College on how to effectively advise students utilizing electronic methods.
4. By January 1998, implement advising via video telecommunications at selected sites.
5. By May 1999, conduct evaluations and complete final report.

As a result of this project, a model will be created that will enable community colleges to adapt Online and video conference advising to meet the needs of distance students. The project *will* have the impact of enabling community colleges to serve larger groups of students within the context of online services. The project will greatly impact YCCD in that the district will further its commitment to enhancing the learning or educational opportunities for distance learning students. The project will also enable counselors to serve better those students who most greatly benefit from personal counseling by allowing other students to access the information they need electronically. Additional individual counseling time will be available to new, probationary and basic skills students. The project will be considered successful if at the end of the second year, ten percent of all eligible students will access advising information via electronic means.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Video and Internet Student Access (VISA)

Juan Alvarez, MJC / Jane Saldana, Columbia College

Modesto Jr. College/ Columbia College

Purpose

The purpose of the TMAPP project was to establish teleconferencing between the high schools and the community college and to develop an electronic educational plan and to upgrade our online admission application.

Problems**Support Staff**

A pitfall is time, assignment of staff. This project could be 100 percent completed if I was able to assign a counselor to do all the coordination and evaluation, the meeting with the high school counselors, principals and students. It really is time and staffing.

Counselors

Some eyebrows from counselors especially because they couldn't see video conferencing. It's pretty common in the educational institutions that the older educators are harder to convince in the use of technology and some of our counselors are in that age level. When it comes to technology the hardest part is to convince these people. I just have it available and those that want it can use it and those that don't I'm not going to force them.

Student Problems
Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

To continue the grant work. When the grant ends that is really just the beginning.

There is a lot of legwork and follow-up that you begin to realize and it is important to know especially to have somebody assigned to keep the grant project going.

Analysis of Grant Report

The electronic educational plan, video conferencing, online application and the WEB Class Schedule have all been completed. Video conferencing has been set up at Modesto High School, MJC's Career Center, EOPS Office and Counseling Department. In addition, Columbia College is preparing to book up with the EDD office in Sonora. The video Conferencing was delayed until April because of equipment problems but that has been rectified.

The videoconference is becoming very popular with high school principals, and 7 High Schools have inquired into establishing video conferencing with MJC. In addition to Modesto High schools, the following high schools will be connected to MJC for video conferencing beginning fall 1999: Elliott High, Hilmar High, Ceres High, Downey High, Davis High and Oakdale High.

The counseling staff at Columbia College and Modesto Junior College will begin using the Electronic Ed Plan during the Fall 1999 guidance classes. Although the project has ended, the Electronic Ed Plan will be tested on students the first two weeks of the Fall semester and any changes needed to the plan will be corrected. The Online application and WEB schedule have been very successful and are currently being used by students. The District programmer will continue to work on the project until all components are completed.

Online advising is becoming more accessible to students. And faculty advisors/counselors are using it for general advising. A counselor has been assigned as the "Online" counselor. Counselors/Advisors and students use the course schedule "timeframes" and this has been very effective. Video conferencing is just beginning to "get off the ground." The real test will be Fall Semester. Potential for use is excellent. Electronic Educational Plan will be used extensively. Not available until Fall 1999.

We were not able to develop an effective degree audit program. It became too complicated and expensive. Extensive programming time was not available.

The information brochure on the project and its components are being updated, printed and will be disseminated to students, staff and faculty. The brochure outlines the various components of the project and how to use them.

Inquires have been made from other colleges. Plans are being made to develop and organize a workshop/seminar to be available to counseling organizations, i.e., CCCCA, and other student service areas. A workshop proposal will also be submitted to ACCA.

Advising Online Support System (AOLSS)**District:** Contra Costa CCD**RFA Number:** 97-0480-001**Project Director:** Tim Clow**Organization:** Matriculation Services, Contra Costa College**Address:** 2600 Mission Bell Drive**City:** San Pablo, CA 94806**Phone:** 510/235-7800 x 303**College:** Contra Costa College**Amount:** \$85,000**CCC Abstract:**

Contra Costa College, located in San Pablo/Richmond, California, with an annual student enrollment of 8,248, is applying for a grant in the amount of \$85,000 from the Technology Model Applications Pilot Project (TMAPP) Funds. These funds will go towards the development and subsequent implementation of an online distance advising model referred to as the Advising Online Support System or AOLSS model. This model will be designed to serve a wide variety of students living in the western part of Contra Costa County. The target student population will be students the college has defined as at risk for failure. The college has been operating a distance learning system for more than three semesters and is very familiar with the tele-video technology from which the AOLSS model is an extension. This fund will go towards increasing our current five distance learning sites to a total of seven. The two additional sites will be located in one community-based collaborative career training center and another in a shopping mall, which is also a community service collaborative center.

The AOLSS model will include the ability to conduct a full matriculation process, i.e., admissions application, assessment, orientation, advising, including completion of a computerized educational plan, career exploration, the ability to review college catalogs from across the nation Online, transcript retrieval through the college Kiosk system and web site, and a weekly "Advising Show" conducted by faculty/counselor and student peer advisors. Every student who participates in the model process will be tracked for purposes of evaluation regarding the impact of the model and process on retention and persistence. Cohort based tracking outcomes from this model will be made available at the end of each semester.

The entire project is built upon the hypothesis that there is a correlation between degree of knowledge about programs and services, careers and majors and the possession of an educational plan among entering students and increased retention and persistence rates. As implementation of the model unfolds annual updates on the project to include problems with site development, software application, and initial tracking results will be made available through the Matriculation Services web site. At the end of the first year of implementation a manual will be published for dissemination to other community colleges that are interested in adoption of the model.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Advising Online Support System (AOLSS)

Tim Clow

Contra Costa College

Purpose

The Katell and with the online virtual matriculation which is our Web site.

An online system that would have all the components of matriculation that included online application forms. This is an online assessment orientation and advising in a chat format at the end. Page 69

It collects all MISD online and is the only comprehensive probe to bring student services to an online mode. Yet all these things are developing online curriculum and we have the only available resource to pick up MIS accounts, we're going through orientation. We have several types of assessment tests online.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

I've had what we call hating counselors, when I've done demonstrations they sit up there and holler how sure are you of the person who's taking the assessment test or nothing replaces a one on one counselor and I know there still using advisors. These counselors have gotten right in my face and gotten personal with me.

They were selling this test to other states. They had been given a grant by the Chancellors office to put this test together. They were specifically not supposed to sell it. It had become the states property. What I discovered was that UC San Diego was using this to fund their own programs because those of us who use this test spend about \$1200.00 a year just for the license and they're supposed to do the background research. Well, of course, you know what's going on there. The college board was much nicer but they also told me to immediately take it off the Web.

I did it for a purpose to alert people that I'm going ahead with this and to put second party test people online on notice that what I want in my edition is a pretest for California Community Colleges that is validated by ourselves because we already do that. I wrote Ed Bradley at 60 Minutes and said look, this is a 60 Minutes story about big corporations that are under the disguise of academic support services and that they've done none of the background research.

Student Problems

The drug economy really rules who is allowed to come to school and who is not allowed to come to school. Anonymity is really the factor that keeps, particularly African American males, from flourishing at my campus. The street economy doesn't just involve drugs it involves the fencing of televisions set and automobiles and all kinds of things.

Faculty Problems

Solution

They were all put on notice that they had to use this money that they'd been squeezing out of these colleges for years to actually do some of this research.

Successes

My area is probably the least tuned in into the Internet but I have proven that the development of this TMAPP in my area is making a difference.

The main programmer just got a job this last week because he's finished with his AA degree. He is from Nicaragua, had fled with Sandanistas, swam across the Rio Grande, he has a baby now and he walked into a \$60,000 job in Stockton. His first job!

Internationally we have a Japanese program and they go in and we have special messages to them. I can put these in their own language because I have access to speakers and all I need is a font and I can send information in Japanese. It's just incredible.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

All aspects of the Advising Online Student Success Model have been completed, this includes the following: development of Online application form, assessment, orientation and Online advising all interconnected on the web site www.virtualmatriculation.com. The picture/tele equipment including monitor and camera have been connected to participating high schools in the feeder high school areas. Demonstrations have been conducted at these schools.

The assessment portion of the online matriculation process displays a demonstration of both a timed math assessment and un-timed English assessment. Originally the project team completed a fully organized and developed English and math assessment test, however, due to locally validated proscriptive assessment standards these tests have not been used in the placement of students into courses. There needs to be a feasibility study on State-wide development and adoption of online assessment instruments which have been validated at several college sites. Online assessment offers the student one-stop placement using multiple measures and free access into individual college math and English curriculum and this important element needs further testing beyond the scope of this grant project.

Considerable knowledge has been gained from developing this project, particularly in the area of online student services applications. Another TMAPP grant feasibility project has been awarded dealing with the development of Electronic Data Interchange and a statewide online application. Continued instruction and on-site development of the Virtualmatriculation.com code structure is offered to any and all community colleges wishing to develop such a system. To date 6 colleges have been assisted.

Library and Learning Resources Services for the Remote Learner

District: Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD

College: Cuyamaca College

RFA Number: 98-0667-001

Amount: \$150,000

Project Director: Larry Sherwood

Organization: Cuyamaca College

Address: 900 Rancho San Diego Parkway

City: El Cajon, CA 92019-4304

Phone: 619/660-4402

CCC Abstract:

The purpose of this project is to provide remote access to the learning resources of the nine community colleges of San Diego and Imperial Counties. The immediate target group is the distance learner, but all students will benefit. Specific objectives are to: 1) provide centralized Online and telephone reference services; 2) create Online interlibrary loan processing procedures for all students; 3) provide document delivery service for distance learning and disabled students; 4) strengthen support for distance learning courses through information competency training; and 5) provide remote access to a wider range of commercial online databases through a centrally coordinated system for all colleges within the region.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will form a consortium with the Palomar and Imperial Valley Community College Districts. In the first year, the consortium will plan and begin the implementation of the above five objectives. In the second year, the consortium will be expanded to include the five other community colleges of San Diego County.

Institutionalization will occur in the third year, when the San Diego and Imperial County Community Colleges Learning Resources Cooperative (SDICCLRC) becomes the coordinating body. The SDICCLRC currently has in place a comprehensive resource sharing agreement for the management of its cooperative audiovisual library, and has negotiated the cooperative purchase of database subscriptions for the collective use of its 134,000 students. The SDICCLRC has an excellent track record over the past twenty-four years of providing services through consortium agreements and is the logical entity to coordinate the program once the grant is completed.

The project is intended to serve as a demonstration model in the state for remote access to library and learning resources. The grant project will also have the potential to become a testing site in the region for the common search engine feasibility study that will be simultaneously developed under RFA 98-0668.

A special web page has been created to provide progress reports throughout the term of the project (<http://cuyamaca.gcccd.cc.ca.us/library/rlrp.asp>).

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Library and Learning Resources Services for the Remote Learner

Larry Sherwood
Cuyamaca College

Purpose

To make the library resources, to which on campus students have access, available at a distance. Primarily for distance learners and students who are disabled.

A disabled student, for example, who has difficulty coming to campus and physically retrieving documents that he or she needs can actually make requests from home and then eventually have those documents delivered to their front door so they don't have to actually leave at all.

Problems

Support Staff

The logistical issues are most complex than we thought and it is taking longer to get it off the ground.

Counselors

Student Problems

We've made no provision for Braille although we are concerned about serving blind students.

Faculty Problems

Solution

The online reference librarian service which helps students define topics, develop search strategies and to some extent actually physically retrieve the material for students is definitely going to be a help to visually impaired and blind students who will be able to identify themselves as having these difficulties and in those cases the online reference librarian will actually do the research for them.

Successes

Next Steps

We have a plan that takes this process from a four college consortium to a nine college consortium that will be administered collectively by the group of library administrators responsible for each of the college libraries.

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Universal Remote Patron Access and Authentication Project**District:** Glendale CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0667-002**Project Director:**

Linda S. Winters

Organization:

Glendale College

Address:

1500 North Verdugo Rd.

City:

Glendale, CA 91208-2894

Phone:

818/240-1000 x 5579

College: Glendale Community College**Amount:** \$149,344**CCC Abstract:**

The Glendale Community College District Library in partnership with the Pasadena City College District Library is requesting TMAPP finding to:

- Develop a set of five (5) core library services and five (5) core electronic resources that should be available to students, faculty and staff remotely as well as on campus.
- Develop two (2) model web interfaces (including html, cgi, java with the ability to provide remote access to the core resources and services for Glendale Community College and Pasadena City College students, faculty and staff.
- Provide five (5) core electronic services with remote access for Glendale Community College and Pasadena City College students, faculty and staff.
- Provide five (5) core electronic resources for Glendale Community College and Pasadena City College students, faculty and staff, seven (7) days per week and twenty-four (24) hour per day.
- Produce a comprehensive feasibility study and report on possible methods of patron authentication.
- Develop, implement, and evaluate a program for patron authentication at both campuses.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Universal Remote Patron Access and Authentication Project

Linda S. Winters

Glendale Community College

Purpose

Getting a benchmark for where the California Community Colleges Library and Learning Resource Centers are as far as providing Web based access to their materials and services. We've done several surveys to pin that down and also to get a response on what resources and services the librarians feel are important to be available to remote learners. Remote patron authentication is a real issue for the licensed databases and for other services that we want to provide to our own community, to identify potential methods that would be appropriate for the community college library group to actually be able to allow remote patron authentication.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution**Successes**

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

The initial proposal was to use the five core electronic resources proposed by the Council of Chief Librarians. If possible, the libraries would like to include the resources that have now been identified as priorities by the California Community College Library and Learning Resource program staff. This would include both a health and a literature database.

Toward the end of having these core services and resources available to students both on campus and remotely, both libraries have developed web sites using individual interfaces. Web page design templates have been developed for each library. The Pasadena City College site was developed by Leslie Diaz. It is located at <http://www.paccd.cc.ca.us/library/> and became available in January 2000. Additional interactive pages are being developed.

The GCC library web site was redesigned by Nancy Hunt-Coffey. Located at <http://www.glendale.cc.ca.us/library/>, it's home or index page was redesigned as a "smart" page that can recognize whether the user is connected to the campus-wide network or coming from outside. On-campus users are given immediate access to all services. Off-campus users are directed to a validation page when they attempt to access a restricted or licensed resource. Patron verification has been established using a secure name server database. The database is maintained manually with the college web master entering data on college staff members and the library circulation staff entering student data. Students must complete a remote access request form, either Online or in person. Library staff verify that the student is currently registered before adding the information to the name server database. When successfully validated, the user is then directed to a "referring" web page that will admit them to the restricted or licensed database. Reference request and inter-library loan request forms are being redesigned so that all necessary information can be collected before the forms using CGI scripts are submitted.

Because the list of online services was finalized in February, some processes remain to be addressed. At Glendale, interactive reference and inter-library loan request services have been implemented as "mailto" e-mail to the online library computer. A library technician checks e-mail 2-3 times per day and directs requests for inter-library loans to the circulation department where they are filled in the same manner as on-site requests. Reference questions are directed to the reference librarian who responds directly to the patron. Pasadena's web site only became available in January, consequently the more difficult interactive pages have not been completed yet. However, remote renewal of books is available as a feature of PCC's new integrated library system. While most remote access is available to the patron 24/7, responses other than book renewal are still limited to the hours the library is open.

Both libraries have purchased access to the five components of the CCL-EAR recommended list, including online versions of the Encyclopedia Britannica, NewsBank newspapers including national and local papers, ProQuest Direct and Books in Print. Glendale has links to all of the resources both via the campus wide network and remotely, with the exception of Books in Print. While remote access availability was predicted for January 2000, it has been delayed until midyear. Pasadena has web page links to all the resources available for those connected to its campus wide network.

Pasadena City College Library preferred to have the college maintain their web presence on existing college servers. A Sun Enterprise 450 server was purchased for the Glendale Community College Library.

A comprehensive feasibility study on automated patron authentication is underway. A set of three surveys have been developed to gather information from the California Community College Library and Learning Resource programs, from vendors of subscription/licensed databases and from vendors of integrated library systems. Surveys have been mailed and responses are being received. A review of the literature is being conducted and several potential methods have been identified including proxy server, digital certificates, the SIP2 protocol (a patron record equivalent of Z39.50) and XML-based authentication systems.

Overall the project is on schedule and the progress report and survey results posted to the Glendale College web site by mid February.

The final report will be prepared and mounted on the Glendale Community College Web Site with a link also provided from the Pasadena City College Web Site. Information regarding the progress of the project will be mounted as it becomes available and prior to the final report.

Administration Support

Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan

District: Allan Hancock Joint CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-001

Project Director: Clay Waldon / Lill Clary

Organization: Allen Hancock College

Address: 800 S. College Drive

City: Santa Maria, CA 93454-6399

Phone: 805-922-6966

College: Allan Hancock College

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

This application requests funding to support development of a Request for Information for a fiber optic telecommunications network to serve students, handle administrative tasks, and connect to statewide networks in compliance with established standards. The college proposes to accomplish the planning work through its Technology Advisory Committee with the assistance of the telecommunications consultant who advised the college in developing its Technology Master Plan.

Allan Hancock College has just completed an 18-month campus-wide planning process resulting in a Technology Master Plan. Concurrently, the District completed its Educational and Facilities Master Plan. The District is positioned to create a telecommunications infrastructure based on direction provided in these plans. However the District requires technical assistance to develop specifications for the fiber optic infrastructure to connect internally and externally.

The college faces serious problems. There is limited access to the campus mainframe and only a handful of lines for connectivity to the Internet. Student computer labs are not networked. Existing cable conduits are in poor condition. Complicating the picture is the fact that the college has broken ground for a new Center that will have fiber optic, while the main campus systems are still based on twisted pair phone cable. Finally, staff lack requisite skills to evaluate potential new technologies.

On the positive side, the college has identified funding to remedy this situation, in phases over several years. Award of the planning grant funds will assist the institution in creation of detailed specifications for the work to be done.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan

Lill Clary

Allan Hancock College

Purpose

Developing appropriate bid specifications for our campus wide fiber optic infrastructure project.

Problems

Support Staff

You need plenty of money to hire a consultant and everything takes longer then you ever expected. We had no one on campus with expertise in the area of fiber optics.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Within the next three years I would guess that if funding is available we will complete the infrastructure development for the college.

Analysis of Grant Report

The main goal of this project has been to develop detailed specifications for construction of a fiber optic infrastructure and to take the specifications through the bid process to final award. With the Board of Trustees awarding the bid at its July 21 1998 meeting, college staff consider the project an unqualified success.

Although the process took much more time than was originally expected (final award in July '98, not Dec '97), staff believe that the additional reviews and careful development of the specifications paid off in terms of the infrastructure system selected. Staff is very pleased with the results of the bid process and feels that the college is on the verge of a major service improvement.

The Superintendent/President and the associate superintendents and vice-presidents were the ultimate evaluators for this project in that they had to be satisfied that the specifications document and bid processes were adequate for the purpose. In fact, the Project Director and the team met regularly with the Superintendent/President and 'cabinet' to provide updates and status reports, resolve issues related to facilities planning, and ensure that legal requirements were followed.

The objectives outlined in the Project Work Plan were for specific events, for example, to complete a review of campus buildings and conduit systems. In effect, the evaluation was 'did it happen?' With the exception of two activities which were deemed not necessary during the lifetime of the grant, all goals were met.

At the outset of the project, district facilities and business services staff realized that there was insufficient funding to 'wire' the entire college. Therefore the intent in writing the specifications was to develop a complete overview of the technology required, but to do the actual infrastructure work in phases.

The district identified block grant and Deferred Maintenance funding to complete construction of the infrastructure for 5 buildings. These were described in the bid documents as Phase 1. It is the intent of the district to re-use the same document to either go to bid on subsequent phases or to request that the vendor for Phase 1 obtain CMAS certification to complete other phases as funding is made available.

District staff have already shared the process with employees of other districts. The Director for Computer Services has provided information to members of the Chief Information Systems Officers Association (CISOA). In addition, the district is willing to disseminate copies of the bid specifications to any college or entity which is developing a similar project. However, since the specifications are so unique to the district's existing buildings and plans, much of the document would be of use only to help other colleges understand the detail in which the descriptive materials (current/future needs, building diagrams, legacy systems) must be written.

This project has been highly successful. The college will be able to abandon a 25 year old system of obsolete telephone cables used for data/voice communication and transition into a combination of fiber optic and Gigabit CAT 5 cable. System capacity will allow for greater access to mainframe activity from more sites on campus and will provide the capability to wire up whole classrooms for computer-based instruction. Staff are very grateful to have been awarded this planning grant. The outcome will be much improved service for students, staff and the local community.

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants

District: Hartnell CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-002

Project Director:

Gary Hughes, Director of Computer and Library Systems

Organization:

Hartnell College

Address:

156 Homestead Avenue

City:

Salinas, CA 93901-1698

Phone:

408/755-6725

College: Hartnell College

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

The Hartnell College "Telecommunications Plan" will provide the framework for technology development at Hartnell. The plan will identify every needed office and classroom computer network drop at the main campus and satellite campuses. These computer drops will be further identified as to bandwidth requirements (shared or switched 10 Mb). Included in the plan will be the identification of every needed office and classroom video (VCR, analog, videodisc, and digital videodisc) drop. As part of that effort, video conferencing requirements for networked computers will be incorporated in the plan, as will digital and analog satellite requirements. Distance learning requirements, both on campus and off, will also be identified in the plan.

Hartnell's Technology Master Planning Team will develop the technology plan with full integration within the educational and facilities plan. It will also be fully integrated within budget processes. The Technology Master Planning Team, a team consisting of faculty, administrators, staff and public institution and private business partners, is now in the process of developing a technology/ infrastructure needs assessment instrument that will serve as the starting point for this plan. All planning documents will use the "Baseline for Planning and Implementing an Internal-Campus Telecommunications Infrastructure Systems for the California Community College" and appendices in their development. The plan will also use all "Telecommunication Infrastructure Planning" (TIP) standards. Finally, the plan will incorporate to the maximum extent possible all IEEE and other telecommunication standards.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants

Gary Hughes, Director of Computer and Library Systems

Hartnell College

Purpose

The purpose of the grant was a mini-grant to start the development of a technology plan for the campus.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

The demand by students for access to technology is a problem that we're going to have to deal with and we'll have to do it with planning.

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

The following criteria are initially suggested as indicative of the type of criteria appropriate for the Technology Master Planning Committee to use in procurement evaluation. It is expected that the criteria will be reviewed, annually at a minimum, in recognition of the dynamic nature of the changing needs. These criteria will be used in setting priorities and approving projects for funding and implementation. Proposals

should address themselves to these issues, and the Technology Master Planning Team will determine by consensus how well each proposal addresses the criteria.

1. **Student Demand:** Students entering Hartnell College today are more diverse in terms of age, skills, previous experience, goals, and needs than ever before. Industry expectations and requirements continue to increase, whether a student's goal is retraining, initial job skills, or further education. Students must learn more content and develop more skills in less time than ever before. Program counseling and assessment is increasing. Technological tools must be accessible to all students. Before a program or curriculum can be integrated technologically, a critical mass of technology needs to be available.
 2. **Faculty/Staff Demand.** Faculty are gradually increasing their use of technological resources to support instruction. The percentage of faculty actually involved in technological growth and integration varies greatly between disciplines, and within disciplines.
 3. **Curriculum Need.** Simultaneously, curriculum requirements for instructional computing are becoming more broad and specialized. Expectations as to the amount of technological content in the curriculum are increasing. In the past, curricula were expected to be agents for social change. They are now expected to be agents for economic revitalization and global competitiveness by producing highly trained, educated and technologically competent students.
 4. **Training And Support Requirements.** The resource requirements associated with both initial implementation and on-going operation of a Technology Proposal are sometimes overlooked. This can render the technology ineffective or force unexpected additional expenditures to make it work properly.
 5. **Compatibility With Existing Systems.** In some cases, new systems need to be integrated with existing systems. In addition to the technical compatibilities there is the issue of support. If the technical components of the new system are substantially the same as other systems currently being supported by the District, the amount of technical training for the staff is significantly less than if new technologies are introduced.
 6. **Equity And Balance (with other Proposals).** It is important that new applications of technology be equitably distributed to all areas of need. In cases where some areas have received little or no technology resources, it should be considered as a factor in determining its priority, particularly in relation to other outstanding proposals.
 7. **Innovation.** In an effort to encourage progress and new ideas, innovative ideas and approaches to using technology should be favored over employing older and perhaps obsolete technologies. The advantages of innovation may be offset by the TRAINING and COMPATIBILITY criteria, which may render it unfeasible. Nonetheless, other factors being equal, the innovative properties of a proposal should increase its desirability.
 8. **Compliance With Legal Requirements.** With the ambiguities of the legal aspects of technology, special care must be taken to ensure that the proposal is compliant with all copyright, trade secret, privacy, etc. laws which may apply.
 9. **Cost.** It is easy to overlook or underestimate all of the cost associated with new technology. If all of the above criteria are considered appropriately, the costs for the equipment, training, facilities, staffing, and other resource requirements will become apparent. It is essential that all proposals address costs in all areas.
-

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants**District:** LACCD**RFA Number:** 96-0482-003**Project Director:**

Joseph Auciello

Organization:

LA Trade Technical College

Address:

400 W. Washington ST.

City:

Los Angeles, CA 90015

Phone:

213/744-9086

College: LA Trade Technical College**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

Problem: The business world uses High Bandwidth. 'FrontPage' Software to integrate WEB technology to PC, transfers Objects (Voice-Fax-Documents-Graphics-Programs), transmits MPEG video while our college, has no Homepage, doesn't respond to Internet-queries, has 10% faculty, fewer students online WHEN KNOWLEDGE IS EXPLODING, requires Global Perspectives, State-of-Art-technology, evolving ISO Quality Work Standards. If we were 'State-of-Art' meeting customers" requirements in 1990, we would we would have undergone 'Techno-Shock' keeping up with the 'profound revolution' created by Telecommunications in past 7 years!

Cyber-Communications & Info-Technology Consortiums - 'Microsoft - Boeing Satellite Project' - will provide 'high-speed wireless Internet access to remote villages within the next 10 years.' Colleges not adapting will see their client-base stay at home', using their educational vouchers online elsewhere. Colleges providing VIRTUAL Access and Quality Instruction will increase market share. The Technology transcends territory; supports unlimited enrollment. Without plans, there'll be no adapting; without adapting; we will cease to exist. Problems are Exploding Knowledge, Increased International Competition, and Cyber Shock. & Redefined Boundaries. No Time or Place constraints.

Solution: Virtual College. Students enroll; view outlines; profiles on WEB; study; perform assignments; and test in a TIME-SPACE format meeting their needs. Instruction will be 7 x 24 to anywhere. QUALITY INSTRUCTION CAPTURES MARKETSHARE. TECHNOLOGY MAKES IT ACCESSIBLE. 'How do we adapt quickly, keep quality, and present ourselves digitally?' 'Successful projects begin at Design-Level' We, with the Technology Committee, will use models from "Technical Infrastructure Planning' and 'Baseline for Planning & Implementing an Internal-Campus Telecommunications Infrastructure' in developing our Plan.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants

Joseph Auciello

LA Trade Technical College

Purpose

The project was to build a demo of what I would call a virtual classroom.

Problems

Support Staff

The politics are so hard that I have retreated from the TMAPP project and I'm doing my own thing with my own students. It takes three men, one man to design it, one to program it and somebody else to run the political interface. The system is so inert, so tragically behind that it just takes an inordinate amount of power to try to shift the paradigm. I know longer am willing to sacrifice myself to try to create more administrative awareness of technology.

Faculty Problems

There seems to be an epic struggle going between those that don't want to change and those that want to change who see the new movement coming. Unfortunately those that are senior in power are the ones least likely to want to change.

There is some administration that seem to block innovation and indeed actually punish innovation.

Solution

All we can do is increase consciousness, awareness, enrollment and increase the effectiveness and

quality of distance education courses and I think the movement itself will sustain it and remove obstacles. Have a face to face meeting with the president of the college. You have to have his absolute support on the project otherwise it's just nerve wracking and frustrating for faculty to create something new when it's not fully supported from the top.

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

Los Angeles Trade Technical College was founded with the charter to keep its citizens up to date as tradespersons and technicians, and for decades it met that commitment.

Recognizing the oncoming impact of the Internet and related technologies, the LATTC administration in the mid 90's began building a solid, fiber-optics telecommunications backbone, installing computer labs, and retraining its faculty.

The philosophy of LATTC is that "developing the Telecommunications Infrastructure creates Information Technology and Competency."

In 1997, planning began with installing the fiber-optic network backbone, purchasing workstations, empowering instructors with technology,

This will document the passage of LATTC across the digital divide, based on its Telecommunications Planning.

It is a mission at LATTC to provide each student with email, and internet access, supporting their career field with information technology.

LATTC made a commitment to provide Information Competency Skills to 100% of its graduates of the degree programs that it offers.

Equipment Specifics:

There are Compaq Pentium III networked -stations presently on campus, with CDs drives, 15 or 17" monitors.

This equipment is nearing the end of its useful term, and additional funds are planned for replacing them with leased, and more easily upgradable units.

Distance Learning

Currently 4 sections of DE classes are taught, with approx 12 more planned the 2000 – 01 academic year.

Chronology:

Prior to 1996, 6 computers classrooms operated. 5 as labs with stand-alone workstations, 1 with a Local Server (Winframe) that serves 30 stations with downloadable copies of application software.

1996 to 1998. High Speed Fiber Optics cabling between bldgs and master hub at the district office (4 miles away) was installed. Included were local and external firewalls, backup systems, and the routers and t/c equipment required for web access.

1999. By 1999, all labs, except word processing, were linked.

2000. In the 2000 school year labs were operating, including visual communication, cis, electronics, off. Admin, cad/cam, continuing education, and learning resource center.

All students have email addresses and internet access.

Senior Administration supports the Technology program on campus. Site licenses obtained for adobe, frontpage, correll, oracle, GIS, autocad, ms applications. The history is that admin has met the faculty's request for software.

100% of each department has at least 1 faculty member skilled in Information Technology. 15 flex day activities have trained over 150 faculty in application software workshops. The CIS dept has had 1 of its faculty Microsoft certified, another faculty is an accomplished web designer.

In June 2000, there were 16 classrooms / lab rooms / resource centers equipped with 525 workstations.

In the 1999 – 2000 academic year, approximately 3500 students accessed computers / internet. The goal is to have 100% of all students competent in Information Retrieval.

5 YR MIS PLAN

Equip each of the 35 departments with at least one smart classroom.

Train all faculty in internet / media skills. 100% of students given access.

Install a min of 2500 workstations, growing at 150% rate each year.

Upgrade T1 transmission lines to Higher Speed. Have dept servers hosting LANS, with most information, programs coming from the web, i.e., shifting toward a web-centered paradigm, in as much the web contains the latest releases, information, etc., and the workstations, are smart terminals that can download, process, manage. Refine, and present that information.

Hold annual advisory boards to involve the community.

Develop over 500K in funding for equipment from Block Grants, Corp Donations, sponsorhip, etc., Assist at least 10 depts per yr in applying Technology to their programs, Participate with CVC iii and iv in online courses. Develop complete online student support services: Registration, assessment, advising, tutoring. Create a web / media institute on campus.

By 2001, enable file sharing between (a cross-platform environment) between PC and Macintosh.

Ongoing: faculty and staff Planning Team to identify projected hardware, software, network, and technical support personnel needs.

College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants**District:** Marin Community College District**RFA Number:** 96-0482-004**Project Director:** Scott B. Miller**Organization:** College of Marin**Address:** 835 College Avenue**City:** Kentfield, CA 94904-2590**Phone:** 415/883-2211x 8100**College:** College of Marin**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

The College of Marin (COM) has no college-wide data network. The College of Marin's ability to serve students, develop relevant instructional programs and use a current technology administrative system is severely impaired the lack of a college network. The College has the academic expertise to leverage a network investment, and has obtained funding through the Telecommunications Technology Infrastructure Program for CSU Net connectivity, Video Conferencing, and Satellite Communications. COM's commitment to serve the diverse and lower income communities in Marin County is bolstered by recent funding made available as part of a Redevelopment Project in the City of San Rafael. However, the College's inability to transmit distance learning content internally has caused it to delay implementation of this project.

The College of Marin proposes to engage a professional telecommunications consulting firm to assist it in developing a comprehensive plan for voice, data, video, and satellite connectivity. The Plan will be driven by a vision of ubiquitous connectivity to all points on campus and to all communities the College serves, including off-campus locations. The Plan will include an assessment of student, curricular, and administrative needs, and an assessment of present limited capabilities. It will develop a full set of technical standards for the COM network, consistent with CCC standards. Most importantly, it will develop an implementation framework, which will include identifying the highest priority areas that would yield maximized benefit to students, faculty and administration. This will bring the network to the most appropriate areas first.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants

Scott B. Miller

College of Marin

415-883-2211 X 8100

Nothing Online yet.

Purpose: It was to partially develop a telecommunications plan for this district and then to create what we hoped would be somewhat of a format that other districts could use.

The plan has been basically developed and it is pretty much a general plan. It's looking at kind of the types of things we had and making a recommendation. Some of the things that we feel may be better suited for broader utilization are a lot of the things that went in the appendices which had to do with somewhat general types of standards. What they provided us with are considered general networking standards, general infrastructure standards, and then part of the appendices was a method for doing a campus infrastructure evaluation. In that they gave you guidelines as to what you should do to evaluate your infrastructure such as evaluating potential utility closets for putting the information, pathways between buildings and things like that, telecommunications closets. They provided a fair number of forms so that the district themselves could do this evaluation rather than hire a consultant to do the evaluation.

Problems: We went for a template type design because in talking with consultants there was no way with a \$25,000 grant we were going to get a telecommunications plan created for us. What we basically got was a whole lot of guidelines and a whole lot of procedures that would allow us to a great extent to walk through the project ourselves.

We've worked with a variety of committees and the committee structures are currently being reevaluated because we've had a great deal of problems with the committees. I think this district is way behind in the way of networking our facilities in comparison to some of the other districts that I know about in the Bay Area. We're way behind in even computerizing our facilities.

We're very limited in the way of computing resources. For example in the fiscal services area here, which is an area I'm closely associated with, over half of the staff do not have Windows capable computers. The other half have computers that the IT department has determined were not worth making Y2K compliant.

There is also the fact that we are nowhere near fully networked in our facilities. We probably have drops in less than ten percent of our faculty offices. The only way they can hook up is by modem. We're dealing with those types of problems.

The science center had a computer science lab in it and a fair amount of activity in the biology engineering area. They took the initiative when it wasn't getting done and they did it themselves. We ended up with what has on occasion been described as a rat's nest of wiring. When there were problems it was almost impossible to troubleshoot so for a number of reasons including the way the building is set up we made that one of the first buildings to be wired because of the level of need and the demand.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps: One element of the grant was to make it available for others to use, yes. One of the outcomes was to be this sort of template format that hopefully other districts could follow as a guide.

Analysis of Grant Report

The District has asked *inteliant* to provide assistance with a variety of data network related tasks associated with the development of a comprehensive plan for voice, data, fax, video and satellite connectivity. Provided below are descriptions of the analysis and assessment tasks, as well as guides, standards, strategies and recommendations that will be addressed in this Telecommunications Plan.

- a) Assess District telecommunications connectivity needs, which will include a review of educational/programmatic (e.g., computer labs and distance learning) plans. Based on this assessment, recommendations based on the positives and negatives of alternative solutions will be made.
 - b) Assess current and planned Ethernet network connectivity, including WAN and remote access connectivity. Based on this assessment, network expansion and upgrade recommendations will be presented to the District.
 - c) Develop a "brief outline" that will provide the District with a step-by-step guide to evaluate the existing campus infrastructure.
 - d) Develop a set of telecommunications related infrastructure standards that will be used in new construction and remodeling.
 - e) Develop a "set of telecommunications network standards" based on TIP and CCC baseline documents. The developed standards will include retrofitting or upgrading existing servers and isolated local networks.
 - f) Develop a "strategy" to provide network-wide security policies that will protect the privacy and integrity of network communications across the District's Intra-net and the Internet.
 - g) Make recommendations for server locations that will optimize network user access, management, backup and security.
 - h) Develop a strategy for providing remote network access for administration, faculty, students and the District's business partners.
 - i) Develop a "framework" for MCCD to implement the Telecommunications plan, including infrastructure and network standards. Prioritized projects will be recommended based on perceived near (immediate) and long term (1 to 3 years) infrastructure needs, the required order of completion ("if, then" planning), and presumed availability of funds and staff.
-

j) Develop guidelines, in a “brief outline” format, for managing and maintaining District’s telecommunications infrastructure (e.g., as-builts, cable records, trouble tickets, etc.) database records, as well as District staffing and training for network systems administration, day-to-day maintenance support, and faculty training on networked systems platforms and software applications.

k) Deliver all *inteliant* provided plan documentation in hard copy and electronic form.

Napa Valley College Telecommunications Plan

District: Napa Valley CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-005

Project Director: Vanessa Brown

Organization: Napa Valley College

Address: 2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway

City: Napa, CA 94558-9976

Phone: 707/253-3323

College: Napa Valley

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

Napa Valley College is aggressively engaging technology to enhance instructional delivery systems, and administrative and student services. Several developments both on campus and off campus dictate that the college needs to coordinate activities related to technology to give our campus community direction and information.

Some developments on campus include building a backbone for our own infrastructure, an automated library services network, development of an electronic classroom, the addition of distance education in our curriculum, and a general move toward electronic communication among faculty and staff. At the same time the college is moving ahead to connect with the community college telecommunications infrastructure, the 4CNet. The college also has an application with the Federal Communications Commission for the acquisition of 4 ITFS channels.

This project will give the college the opportunity to do an internal needs assessment and develop a plan in coordination with the Chancellor's Office Telecommunications Plan and the Chancellor's Office document titled "Baseline for Planning and Implementing an Internal-Campus Telecommunications Infrastructure Systems for the California Community Colleges." This process and plan will become a model for other community colleges throughout the state. The college proposes to accomplish this goal at the local level by identifying a consulting firm that can assist the project team with an internal needs assessment leading to a comprehensive strategic technology plan. Elements of this plan will include: description of the current situation, an ideal plan, the finance and architecture, final preparation, implementation, recurring activities and evaluation. On a statewide level the college proposes to accomplish this goal by communicating with other community college districts that receive planning grants to learn from and share information with them. After the plan is complete the college will make it available both in hard copy and electronically.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Napa Valley College Telecommunications Plan

Vanessa Brown

Napa Valley

Purpose

We wanted to develop a technology plan.

We decided to build a network. We ended up with a CISCO network, a switch network, and then we re-cabled the entire campus. All of this came out of the plan. The plan identified a structure for our IT department and additional staffing needs although it did not identify funding for that. As a result of the additional personnel that were defined we moved our data center into a remodeled classroom. We've got the network in place. We also defined equipment standards and we implemented those.

Problems

Support Staff

We've had a hard time hiring. We're possibly looking at going to a new salary schedule for IT personnel or offering a differential pay rate. A higher pay scale, significantly higher.

Well we want to move into Web registration. We're just now doing telephone registration implementation.

We've been many years behind the times so we're trying to play catch up. It's not easy.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

This is a very highly visible project and the board got involved and it was very positive.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

After evaluating several computing models, the client /server model is identified as the best among these to meet the present and future needs of Napa Valley College.

The client/server model has two main characteristics:

- central server for storage of programs and data
- client computers that can access these programs and data anywhere on campus and from off-campus sites

The model provides the following advantages:

- centralized data collection and storage
- password protection
- access to common software, e-mail, and internet
- software upgrades at the server level and immediately available to all users after testing
- regular backups for the protection of all stored data and software
- centralized system administration
- system backup servers to ensure the system will be available
- development of system performance standards and accountability
- universal login to any networked computer on campus
- access to print to all campus networked printers

This model will require an upgrade of our campus internet backbone and the addition of at least three main servers, making a total of five main servers in our system. Fiber optic wire will be installed throughout the campus. All switches, hubs, and routers will need to be replaced to ensure 100MB/sec system speed.

The system servers will be partitioned to load class specific software. Each desktop computer will have a large capacity hard drive to load specialized software. When necessary, smaller, more specialized servers will be made available.

Recommendations and Guidelines:

Hardware and software recommendations and guidelines were developed by Landmark Consulting Group in the Napa Valley College Campus-Wide Technology Architecture report. These recommendations were used as the basis for developing the network hardware and software budget. Prior to installation, a thorough review of those recommendations will be necessary. The college's network administrator and staff will make final decisions regarding implementation of this plan.

Workstations

The goals of the Technology Plan are to:

1. establish hardware and software standards
2. replace all desktop computers/workstations with Pentium II 266 Mhz or higher level computers.
3. provide faculty and staff with access to workstations, as needed
4. provide students with access to workstations, as needed, in classrooms and labs
5. provide all users with access to common software which may be customized to meet special needs.
6. provide all users with internet access
7. upgrade all workstations on a regular basis
8. provide faculty and staff with e-mail

Workstation Standards

Initial workstation standards are established and will be reviewed regularly by Computer Services staff. These standards will be updated, as needed, to keep up with industry standards.

Recommendations and Guidelines

Recommendations and guidelines for workstations and software were prepared for Napa Valley College by Landmark Consulting Group. These recommendations will be considered by Computer Services staff as the Technology Plan is implemented.

Napa Valley College requires a formal, centralized, and dispatched support structure that provides network administration and the appropriate level of support to users. The college's investment in support staff should include both personnel and tools such as help desk software, paging devices, testing tools, and others. The support staff are critical to the implementation of the Technology Plan and should be hired to support the installation and to establish procedures for computer services operations.

The recommended ratio of dedicated support personnel to workstations is 1 support person to 90-100 workstations. Thus, in order to provide adequate support the college needs to begin with 6 full-time equivalent computer support staff. As additional workstations are acquired, additional staff will need to be added to provide adequate user support and maintenance. (see attached staffing chart)

The support staff are divided into three levels described below: 1) Network Administration, 2) User Support, and 3) Outsourcing. Exact job titles may change as these positions are further defined.

1. Network Administration: Special problems that occur to hardware and software that are not due to user error will be resolved by the senior network administrator. The following positions will also be responsible for leadership, network design, oversight, and maintenance of the college's network system.

Director of Information Systems

- provide oversight and direction to the colleges' technology based operations: Data Processing and Computer Services
- coordinate internal and external resources to reach college objectives in technology
- define and articulate the current and future role of technology

Senior Network Technician

- provide recurring network administration (daily, weekly, monthly)
- maintain user accounts
- monitor disk capacity
- monitor network traffic
- administer system security
- provide disaster recovery administration
- resolve special problems that occur on a workstation level
- supervise user support technicians and help desk

2. User Support: Generally, users encounter the same problems and support staff provide the same kinds of assistance over and over. This is the most common and time consuming support activity. The college will employ Computer Services Technicians, students, and instructional assistants to provide support at this level. Tools and training will also be necessary.

Computer Services Technician

- maintain the help desk
 - resolve standard problems that occur at workstations
 - install software
 - provide basic hardware and software support to users
 - maintain systems for reliability
 - train and supervise student workers
 - install new hardware and software
-

Student Workers

- provide basic user support as assigned by help desk
- assist in the installation of hardware and software
- assist staff in the maintenance of workstations

3. Outsourcing: The value of outsourcing is in the vast array of technical expertise and resources available to the college on demand that would not be available or affordable from regular staff. No one or two individuals can maintain expertise in all technical areas of the information system. The best utilization of support staff is in the fulfillment of recurring tasks that occur on a daily or monthly basis. All other tasks, such as advanced network administration and new systems installation, testing, and troubleshooting will be outsourced to individuals or organizations that have specialized knowledge in the areas of need. The level of outsourcing should be based on the cost of maintaining the system, compared to that of the outsourcing cost.

- system installation and testing
- troubleshooting
- emergencies
- special projects
- web services

Webmaster

- serve as a resource for faculty, staff, program, and course websites
- solve technical problems
- maintain the college website(s)
- link and maintain NVC website with appropriate browsers
- maintain web server
- coordinate activities with college staff (Community Relations Office, student workers, data processing staff, computing services staff and others)

In addition, Computer Services staff will be responsible for reviewing the Napa Valley College Campus-Wide Architecture report, which includes recommendations for developing a formal help desk and user support procedures.

Technology Support Training

Napa Valley College recognizes a need for on-going training on existing and new hardware and software. Various learning styles, schedules, and financial constraints are the driving forces in technology training. As we move into a comprehensive technology plan, we need to consider innovative ways to deliver training. Ideas include short term credit courses at the 1 credit or .5 credit level, flex day training activities, self-paced web based interactive courses, interactive teleconferencing opportunities, and other options that may be developed in the future.

The recommended technology support training will include training for the technology support staff in the following areas*:

- NT server administration
 - NT workstation administration
 - Windows '95 workstation support
 - Microsoft Office support
 - Groupware
 - Network management software
 - Technical help desk training
 - Quality management and customer service training
- *or the equivalent (recognizing that the software applications may change over time)

Network administrators should know or participate in the following courses:

- NT server administration
- NT workstation administration and support
- Advanced Windows '95 workstation support
- Groupware administration
- Groupware development
- Developing the web using Domino/Intranet development
- Project management training

*or the equivalent (recognizing that the software application may change over time)

All end users will be offered technical training in the following courses:

- NVC systems orientation course
- Windows '95 or Windows NT Workstation 4.0
- Groupware user training
- Microsoft Office
- Specialized and instructional software
- Internet training

*Or the equivalent (recognizing that the software application may change over time)

Training on an on-going basis will be offered to all employees as new hardware and software is acquired and installed. Newly hired staff will participate in a technology orientation. Over time the college anticipates that we will have in-house experts who will be trained during our partnership with Cisco. In addition to staff development funding, allocations for training should be included on a formula basis as new software and hardware is purchased.

Technology Model Application Pilot Project

District: Peralta CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-006

Project Director: John Wagstaff

Organization: Peralta CCD

Address: 333 East 8th

City: Oakland, CA 94606-2889

Phone: 510/466-7268

College: Alameda, Laney, Merritt, Vista CCs

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

The Telecommunications Model Applications Project will produce a comprehensive telecommunications network-planning document for the Peralta Community College District useful to all California community colleges. The plan will reference the "Baseline for Planning and Implementing an Internal-Campus Telecommunications Infrastructure System for the California Community Colleges" and "Telecommunications Infrastructure Planning documents. The plan will include individual chapters on LAN/WAN standards, recommend LAN designs for student and administrative networks and provide suggestions for connecting these networks at security levels sufficient to protect sensitive files and databases from unauthorized access. The planning document will also show how to build a network that can combine Fast Ethernet and ATM technology to take advantage of the high data transmission speeds of Fast Ethernet and the capabilities of ATM to transmit video. Finally, the plan will include a detailed case study of Peralta's LAN/WAN design and implementation strategy. The plan will be supported by two related activities. First, a district-wide inventory of existing hardware and software capabilities will document Peralta's installed base and guide subsequent network planning and expansion. Second, a survey instrument will be drafted and administered to all Peralta District faculty and staff to determine how telecommunications technology is being applied to administrative and instructional activities now, and what specific program needs might be added or improved by an expansion of the infrastructure. All findings and documents will be attached to the final plan and disseminated throughout the California Community College system.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Technology Model Application Pilot Project

John Wagstaff

Alameda, Laney, Merritt, Vista CCs

Purpose

To map out the technology applications, services that would be implemented. We recommended an organizational approach to achieving some service objectives that utilized technology, most of Web based intra and Internet.

The grant itself really provided the opportunity to do a district wide network plan where the colleges were working together.

The grant was all about the physical network design.

Problems

Support Staff

The basic tension right now is that as far as I can tell we're building an ATM backbone, where most of the colleges are probably going to go Gig ether. The reason they are going that way is because video over the network as a separate ampeg signal is becoming unimportant because of voice and video over IP and that is where it's going.

I think that on one level the way the 4C Net was funded created some problems. They made it look like as they built the physical backbone at the CSU level they were funding that work through a mechanism that made it look like I was buying services from that network. If you precede on that assumption then you know for sure if you do some comparison pricing with what we were getting we were paying a hundred times more than we should. What was happening here is that by law there had to be an audit trail through the community colleges into the CSU's so we were buying equipment but we were making it look like services. That's misperception. I still get into meetings where people are saying we're paying more than

we should for this stuff.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

It's going to become a management problem for the faculty. They're going to have to learn how to manage student expectations in this new environment. If I attach an assignment to an email at midnight and I went back online the next morning and it hadn't been graded yet, you know, faculty has to set those boundaries.

Solution

We have an automated response to incoming messages that have attachments and the message says I've got your assignment and I'll have it back to you and graded seven days from now and students are accepting that.

Successes

We have three online courses going as pilot projects, one of them is criminal justice and the others are introduction to computers and introduction to business. We spent about 30 minutes showing our board members the course online. I stood up to conclude and I said, you know we've had a lot of questions about this form of instruction but does anyone here doubt that it's interesting and engaging, and they applauded.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

Success in completing all the objectives and activities of the project. Successfully compiled an inventory of the District's installed base of hardware and software from district records and field searches. Our findings were as follows:

- Our inventory of computer workstations has a paper value of \$3,000,000,
- Less than half of our computers can be considered worth connecting to the type of high speed data network being planned for the district.
- We have 34 student computer labs in the district utilizing 955 Workstations:
- 18 student labs are equipped 579 with Pentium grade workstations:
- Many of our administrators continue using obsolete computers.
- Most of our regular contract faculty do not have a computer in their office.
- The district is supporting six different Local Area Networks consisting of six different brands of hardware and software.

During the period of this grant, a consulting firm, Interactive Teachers, worked with the professional development committees at the four Peralta Colleges to develop a technology survey instrument. The purpose of the survey instrument was establish a base-line assessment of the how the respondents were using technology and the areas in which training was needed (See Attachment B. PCCD Technology Training Needs Assessment, 1997-1998).

Survey forms were mailed to all Peralta staff. Two hundred twenty-four persons responded.

- The computer is universally accepted; only 3% of faculty stated that they had never used a computer. These few have either found a niche in the academic world that does not require use of computers, or they believe that technology does not expedite "real learning" defined as the ability to develop and comprehend concepts.

- Most Peralta employees used computers first for word processing and many report their near-mastery of this application (85% self evaluate themselves as having intermediate or advanced skills).
 - Access to the Internet is the second most frequently reported application attracting faculty to computer usage (80%).
 - However, most respondents have not ventured beyond word processing and use of the Internet. Fewer than 1/3 claim that they have developed any degree of skill with other software applications, such as spreadsheet, database and desktop publishing applications. Presentation graphic programs, such as Microsoft Power Point and content specific programs such as Daedalus for English are the least frequently used, 65% and 74% of respondents respectively report not using these applications.
 - Computer usage remain confined to the office. Few faculty have attempted to incorporate the computer into classroom instruction. Only 1/4 of the faculty report using any sort of LCD projection device to display images and text from a computer in the classroom.
 - Faculty are more likely to use traditional technologies such as tape recorders and 35mm slide projectors and are least likely to use newer technologies such as LCD projectors, video disk players and video camcorders.
 - Employees admit to the gap between their current skills and the future demand for these skills. A majority of respondents acknowledged that they have intermediate or advanced skills with only 3 of the 10 computer software applications, but they believe that all 10 will be "Quite" or "Very Important" in the future (See Attachment B. PCCD Technology Training Needs Assessment, 1997-1998).or the list of software programs).
 - Faculty are aware of the large gap between current use and future demand for computer supplemented instruction in the classroom; projection of computer generated text and images during traditional lecture. However, the faculty do not know how to use presentation graphic software and LCD projection equipment necessary to accomplish this goal.
 - Most respondents are motivated to develop new skills, particularly where they see relevance. They are learning on their own or by sharing with colleagues.
 - Many respondents complained that they do not have enough computers and the computers they do have lack sufficient memory, speed and storage capacity to accomplish the tasks at hand.
 - Faculty are experiencing difficulty identifying, evaluating and incorporating software into their work area.
 - Few respondents are receiving any "hand-on" support from campus experts.
 - Faculty are spending little or no time attending technology workshops and instructional sessions conducted by professional trainers.
 - There are no college-supported learning centers to assist them.
 - Faculty believe that they will learn best through all these methods.
 - The faculty are worried that they are not adequately preparing their students for future jobs because the lack of up-to-date- equipment prevents them from teaching the technological skills required in the corporate world.
 - Part-time faculty and classified staff are angry and frustrated because they perceive that the technological lag in academia will seriously hamper their own career mobility.
- Overall, the survey provide strong evidence that District plans to install high speed data networks that support communications and information retrieval in the instructional process conforms with faculty expectations.

This objective was the most important of the three and required the most technical work. To accomplish this objective, the District teamed with Wolf & Associates, Inc. to draft a "Technology Network Plan" Their plan conforms to the Scope of Work articulated in the Request for Proposal. It answers all our questions about the current state of network technology and what is most cost effective for the District. As such, it will serve the District well in guiding efforts to produce a construction program and bid documents for a new network; one that complies with current standards, the provides universal access, and can be managed and maintained by the District.

We added one significant activity which had been assumed in the basic purpose of the Grant. That is, while we intended to retain the services of a private consulting firm specializing in the design of voice, video and high speed data networks, we did not include it as a separate activity. However, this became a major activity that took several months. In August we drafted a Request For Proposal (RFP) based on the Objective Three of the Grant Work Plan. On September 15, 1997, we sent the RFP to seventeen firms that indicated their interest in the project. In mid October, we convened a subcommittee of the District's

Technology Advisory Committee and charged it to review the proposals and rank them according to the following criteria:

- How did the Vendor Respond to the Scope of Work outlined in the RFP?
- Did the Vendor provide evidence of working with other Community Colleges?
- Did the projected timeframe to complete the project fit the District's needs?
- Did the Proposal Satisfy the Scope of Work?
- Were extraneous steps proposed. If so, what were they?
- Was the price quote all-inclusive?

The evaluation process was blind. That is, before the individual responses were distributed to the subcommittee, they were numbered and copied. Once copied, all company markings and references were removed. The documents were then recopied for the subcommittee members. In this manner, no one knew who had authored the responses being reviewed. Once the proposals had been rank ordered, the top three were invited to appear before the subcommittee for an informal presentation/interview. The selection process was completed in mid November, 1997.

With respect to the specific activities outlined in the Work Plan for this objective, the following results can be reported:

Network Standards - The network plan does propose that we construct a Gigabit Ethernet, but stops short of specifying manufacturers with makes and models. The process by which we came to this conclusion is explained in the section on "Fast Ethernet and ATM," below. After considerable discussion, we decided that any decision in favor of one manufacture over another would have to be based on a competitive bid. Since it is beyond the scope of this project to actually bid the network, we decided to postpone our decision on standards.

Wiring the District Buildings - The plan does establish standards for network cable, termination hardware, main distribution frame layout, as well as electrical cooling and ventilation. To make these recommendations, Wolf & Associates examined district electrical blueprints, physically walked through each building, interviewed technical staff, and examined existing electrical closets.

Workstation Standards for Hardware and Software - While we recommend a network operating system and management software standards, we do not specify standards for workstation hardware and software in the plan document. We have a committee working on this task now, and plan to revise the plan to reflect these recommendations later this summer.

Prototype Networks - Wolf & Associates provided specific designs for prototypical administrative, faculty and student LANs, as well as the interconnection of these networks at the level of security required. They included narrative and graphical diagrams that explain their designs.

The solution is for intelligent network switches utilizing IP addresses to create Virtual LANs (VLANs) that allow users to access only those part of the WAN for which they are authorized in the individual passwords and logons. In essence, users cannot "hack" into that which they cannot see.

In designing these networks, Wolf & Associates made extensive use of district inventory records and intensive sessions with college officials to gain an understanding of the size, age and location of the present installed base of workstation hardware. They also worked to obtain reasonable growth projections over the next 24 months. Wolf reasoned that while the District might wish to install the cable, it should not purchase switch hardware for offices and classrooms that would not be utilized within that time frame.

Therefore, the College were given worksheets to show Existing and Proposal Stations (defined as communications outlets in offices and classroom) and Existing and Proposed Ports (defined as termination jacks in the network closets) PC computers are connect to "stations" and switching hardware is connected to "ports." The results are shown in the Appendix D. "Campus Building Schedules" of the Technology Network Plan.

Fast Ethernet and ATM - Given that the State Chancellor's Office anticipates that 4CNET will constitute a high speed ATM network capable of combining voice, video and data transmission and given the emergence of Switched Ethernet capable of "Gigabyte" speeds, the District wanted to explore the

possibility of constructing a hybrid ATM/Switched Ethernet that combines the high data transmission speeds of Switched Ethernet with the video transmission capabilities of ATM technology.

Wolf & Associated took several weeks to analyze Fast Ethernet, ATM and Gigabit Ethernet. Wolf established nondisclosure agreements with the major network manufacturers, including Cisco, Bay Networks and Cabletron. These agreements provided Wolf with access to the latest information about how these companies are positioning themselves to exploit these technologies. In addition, Wolf interviewed the District's technical support staff to determine their experience and to see how they were organized.

Ultimately, Wolf recommended Gigabit Ethernet for three reasons. First, the estimated per port cost of Gigabit Ethernet is approximately half that of an ATM network. Second, it became obvious that the District was not prepared to undergo the expense of merging its campus voice and video networks with its data networks. To do so would require the district to replace all of its voice cable and add substantial equipment to its leased voice switch. Third, ATM networks require large, experienced and well organized technical staffs that are lacking in this District.

Full Service Internet Gateway - At a minimum, the District wanted the following attached to its WAN/LAN backbone:

Web Servers that support internal and external Web Pages

E-mail for students, faculty and administrators

File Sharing via FTP

Information Retrieval via Newsgroups and Usegroups

The district also wanted Wolf to design a district-wide INTRANET capable of supporting the District's internal communications such as E-mail, scheduling, and Online meetings. In addition, we wanted the INTRANET to support a WEB server that contains the District's Home Pages and provides access to internal information and data resources.

Wolf complied with recommendations and specifications for each component requested.

District LAN/WAN - The District did not intend to require Wolf & Associates to provide a construction program and detailed, building-by-building blueprints for the network. But it did want sufficient detail to estimate the cost of both upgrading and standardizing its existing networks and expanding service to those areas not yet connected. Wolf developed linked spreadsheets linking costs to station and port counts for the three network types under consideration. They also estimated the cost of work to create main and intermediate distribution frames in every building. They based their final recommendation on an evaluation of all this data.

Implementation Strategy - The District was wary that the cost of a network built to current standards, providing universal access might exceed district resources. Therefore, we requested recommendations on both a single and multi-phased approach to implementation. Wolf responded with recommendations for both contingencies.

As a result of this study, the District has announced its decision to enforce a single standard for all hardware and software located on the network, from the backbone to the desktop. We have also decided to purchase a new computer for all 300 of our regular contract faculty. The computers will be distributed beginning the first week of October; training will commence on October 15, 1998.

District technical staff participated in gathering data for the plan and critiqued its various drafts. In addition, the plan is being reviewed by Lucent Technologies, a telecommunications leader. However, since the Technology Plan became more specific to Peralta that was initially envisioned in the grant application, we do not intend to initiate a formal evaluation process where we solicit structured responses from other colleges and universities in the country.

Completeness and accuracy are primary standards for determining how this objective was achieved. Preliminary results indicated that the district's inventory records of telecommunications equipment were 40-45% inaccurate. Extensive physical searches were conducted to increase accuracy to the required level of 85%.

Percent of instruments returned and the relevance of the data were the primary standards for evaluating this objective. Surveys conducted by mail typically result in a low percentage of respondents, usually no higher than 40% and usually less than 20%. In our case, the return rate was slightly less than 20% which rendered the evaluation tenuous at best and reduced our ability to universalize our conclusions to the entire target population. However, the process did indicate support for the goals of the Technology Network Plan to extend telecommunications services to the instructional areas of the district.

In order to be useful, the Technology Network Plan had to address the scope of work articulated in the RFP and offer network planning concept and principles that could be understood and accepted by the district's technical staff. Most important, the plan had to direct the next phase of the construction process by providing answers to specific questions, such as size of the network, number and location of Main and Intermediate Distribution Frames, number and location of network stations (Communication Ports), type of network being constructed; ATM, Fast Ethernet, Gigabit Ethernet. The document appears to have met these criteria. However, until the district begins compiling its Build-As-Bid" construction diagrams and specifications, a final judgement is not possible.

All the activities associated with Object 3. were particularly effect in achieving the goal of Technology Network Plan that could advance the district efforts to expand and upgrade its existing telecommunications network infrastructure. The key factor was the performance of Wolf & Associates, Inc. in being able to interpret the intent of the scope of work and work with the district's technical staff to produce a useful document.

All the three activities associated with the three Objectives of the Work Plan were accomplished and therefore, deemed effective in implementing the Work Plan. However, some of the activities were extraordinarily more difficult to implement than anticipated in the Work Plan. This caused deadlines to become extended, thereby delaying the entire project. This had a particular impact on Objective 1 and Objective 3, which were closely related Objective 1. called for a inventory of District computing recourses. Compiling this information took much longer and was much more difficult than anticipated in the Work Plan. The District's inventory information is not accurate both in its description of the items and their location. There are not standards for describing computer equipment. Moreover, the database truncates at 18 characters. If processor type, amount of RAM memory and hard drive capacity are not included in the first 18 characters, this information is lost to the inventory and must be added later. Users cannot help because most of them have no idea what is in their PC. While software exists that is capable of detecting the hardware and software configuration of the PC's currently logged on, it is not installed in the District and it is not clear that the District's various networks would support these programs even if they were installed. Failure to compile an accurate inventory delayed Objective 3. In addition, the inability of the colleges to provide accurate estimates of their current and near future computing needs further compromised Objective 3.. Both the administrative and technical staff had difficulty setting priorities. There was a general notion that this planning effort represented the only chance to "get what we want" so everyone was afraid of underestimating. Accordingly everyone submitted worksheets that envisioned networking thousands of new PC workstations.

This planning document will provide the technical foundation for the District's effort to modernize and expand its high speed data networks

The District intends to provide indirect assistance to other colleges by providing other institutions access to the plan via the Internet. An HTML version of the document will be placed on the Districts Home Web page; www.peratla.cc.ca.us.

Based on our experience with the Grant, we can offer the following recommendations to those institutions about to embark on similar planning efforts:

1. Standardize your inventory data entry methods.
2. Maintain an accurate inventory of all workstation and network hardware and software.
3. Maintain accurate "as-built" diagrams of all buildings. Show all existing cabling, electrical and HVAC service. Have these converted to CAD format if possible.
4. Establish Network standards. Use them. Review and revise them every year.

5. Utilize independent network engineers and consulting firms to design your networks, Equipment vendors and manufacturers may be competent to design particular networks, but they usually provide you with what they sell or know, which may or may not be compatible with what you need.
6. Involve all facets of your community college, and guide their input closely.
7. Network technology is changing rapidly and dramatically. Plan your cable plant for the next 10 to 15 years, but plan you active port capacity for no greater a period than the next 2 to 3 years. That is to say, cable everywhere you can afford, but purchase switch and routing hardware for no more computer workstations than you can afford to purchase in the next 2 to 3 years. Remember, while you expand your service, a certain percentage or your installed base of computer workstations will become obsolete and will also have to be replaced

College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants**District:** Redwoods CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0482-007**Project Director:** Dr. Jeff Bobbitt**Organization:** College of the Redwoods**Address:** 7351 Tompkins Hill Road**City:** Eureka, CA 95501- 9300**Phone:** 707/476-4174**College:** College of the Redwoods**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

The objective of this project is to develop a comprehensive, district-wide, telecommunications plan that will inventory the District's current capability and provide strategies to implement future technological development. The District serves an extremely large geographic area (5,890 square miles) and the optimum use of technology is critical for the District to effectively serve its widely dispersed student body in the changing cultural, economic, and technical environment.

A comprehensive plan will identify the infrastructure necessary to connect the areas where technology applications currently exist to every other resource. Once this is in place, the District can reach beyond the traditional boundaries to deliver and support services to the community and add additional elements to further strengthen these areas currently lacking technology.

The development of this plan is will be concurrently used in the District's preparation of a comprehensive educational master plan and a facilities master plan. It will also be implemented as part of the design for a new 10.8 million-dollar main library/educational media center for its Eureka campus.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants

Dr. Jeff Bobbitt

College of the Redwoods

Purpose

We've completed the first cycle of developing a technology master plan for the entire district.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

We didn't have a good infrastructure for transmitting voice data and images outside the college or even that well for inside the college. Most of our thought about that has been on the origination end of that rather than the receiving end. We have not had many conversations here about handling courses that our students would receive or that we would make available through a link with some other college. Most of our interest has been from the faculty in terms of preparing courses to be shared with other populations that originated here.

Solution**Successes****Next Steps****Analysis of Grant Report**

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants**District:** Santa Barbara CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0482-008**Project Director:** William B. Hamre**Organization:** Santa Barbara CCD**Address:** 721 Cliff Drive**City:** Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394**Phone:** 805/965-0581**College:** Santa Barbara City College**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

This project will allow SBCC to develop a comprehensive telecommunications infrastructure plan in collaboration with its technology strategic partners: Oracle Corporation, Hewlett Packard (HP), and General Telephone and Electric (GTE). The Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan will develop specific strategies and implementation plans for the College to achieve the technology objectives contained in the *College Plan, Technology Visions and Directions*, and *Project Redesign* reports. The documents are clear and comprehensive statements of the College's future directions in instruction and learning, student support services, and administrative services. While these directions are clear, the telecommunications infrastructure needed to support these College technology initiatives needs to be carefully designed, developed, and implemented if SBCC is to achieve its future vision.

SBCC has developed strategic partner relationships with Oracle, HP, and GTE in order to enhance the College's technical capabilities in planning and implementing future technology. For this project, these partners will provide consulting assistance to SBCC in the development of the SBCC Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan, and in sharing the methodology, structure, and results of this project with other California community Colleges.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunication Plans Mini-Grants

William B. Hamre

Santa Barbara City College

Purpose

To develop an infrastructure plan for Santa Barbara City College, working along with one of our strategic partners, GTE. The project involved a comprehensive assessment of our faculty staff and administration about future technology directions, the development of a telecommunications infrastructure plan for the college based on that needs assessment. Also, the development of a general methodology for community college technology assessment planning that we worked with the GTE engineers developing and shared with other community colleges.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution**Successes****Next Steps**

We are very much moving towards the development of an online college. Two years ago we had four online courses with about 60 students enrolled. This spring we have about 40 classes with 1400 students enrolled. In the fall we are offering 55 classes and somewhere in the neighborhood of 2000 students enrolled. One of our directions is the development of common tools for faculty to do development and management of instructional content for delivery over the web and our own campus networks.

A second initiative for us is the development of a unified student faculty and staff portal that personalizes web page content for the individual students and faculty members based upon their roles, responsibilities. The courses they are either teaching or taking, the set of clubs and services that they are belonging to or participating in is a kind of a second initiative.

Our third initiative is around the redevelopment of our student system and we are working with five other colleges and universities nationwide, working with on student system development. Then again, making that entirely Web-based for our student administrative staff's use of student record system. On the instructional side, we are also rapidly developing our multimedia program.

Analysis of Grant Report

GTE has developed, in concert with campus IS, a network infrastructure capable of supporting voice, data, and video. This infrastructure will be comprised of Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) switching technology and is scaleable to support high speed connections over the WAN. ATM is the premier technology for LAN/WAN integration where there is a requirement for voice, video, and data. The greatest benefit to ATM is that your imbedded base of existing technology will work with ATM in a different role closer to the desktop. ATM is being implemented in universities across the nation to support high speed Intra/Internet applications.

A. Develop and Implement ATM Network

ATM is a cost-effective switching system that meets the needs of today's and tomorrow's networks. Designed to provide simultaneous LAN-to-LAN, LAN-to-ATM, and ATM-to-ATM switching, the planned infrastructure maximizes the life of installed LANs while providing a practical, flexible migration to ATM.

Multigigabits of switching capacity in the ATM architecture boost the performance of LAN backbones, increase bandwidth to servers and desktops, and improve network response time for mission-critical applications. GTE's choice of the Bay Networks ATM platform's modular design allows network connections and bandwidth capacity to be added easily and cost-effectively. The ATM backbone supports industry-standard Ethernet, Fast Ethernet, and Token Ring, and is compliant with ATM Forum specifications, enabling the switch to operate in any standards-based networking environment. ATM offers a cost-effective, high-performance desktop or backbone switching solution optimized for backbone connectivity

Limitation of Ethernet Switching Scalability

Ethernet switching provides fast connectivity to systems within a closed campus environment. Once the network grows to campuses where buildings are far apart, switching cannot carry the signal effectively. Ethernet switching also does not scale across the WAN.

Public Switch Connectivity

ATM campus networks provide ideal migration to the WAN via the public switched network. This will allow connectivity to Schott and Wake over the WAN using the Bay Networks ATM platform. In the near future these switch will be able to transport voice, data, and video over a common ATM link between campuses.

Integration with PBX

There are currently a number of devices being developed that will allow the SBCC PBX to connect with the ATM network. Although there are products available today which support this application, GTE recommends waiting until ATM is fully integrated to the PBX before implementing a voice over ATM solution.

Quality for Voice and Video

The ATM network supports what is known as "Quality of Service" or QOS. QOS allows for critical applications that require a constant bit stream (like voice and video) to take precedence over more forgiving network traffic like data. Other forms of fast networking like Ethernet switching can move the data fast but cannot provide QOS.

B. Implement Fast Ethernet Switching

Ethernet switching is a technology that makes good sense in a Local Area Network environment where fast access from user desktops to servers is critical. As ATM is implemented as the backbone, switching will be moved closer to the desktop. This technology is not a competing technology with ATM, but a complementary technology to ATM. GTE envisions the use of both ATM and switching as part of the infrastructure design.

C. Network Management

The key to the SBCC network is the ability to efficiently manage the network using various management platforms. With the use of Bay Networks advanced monitoring tools, this can be accomplished via a single centralized workstation. GTE has also implemented NetSuite software that allows modeling of changes in the network without disruption to the end users.

D. Increase Speed to Schott and Wake Centers

GTE is proposing an interim solution for connectivity to Schott and Wake centers. This will be accomplished through a technology known as Multi Media Data Service or MMDS. MMDS will allow 10 Mb/s Ethernet connections between the various sites and will also provide trunking for the PBX's. This interim solution will easily migrate to ATM WAN in the future.

E. Continued Centralization and Consolidation of Network Management Services

The implementing of the ATM network will allow more centralization of network resources. These resources include servers, network management stations, and printers. The ability to have servers in one location will facilitate a much more manageable network with the benefit of added network security. Depending upon the number of duplicated applications, the number of servers could even be reduced.

F. Lower Total Cost of Ownership of Desktop Devices

With the implementation of the ATM infrastructure, the campus will be fully prepared to connect the newer, more powerful desktops to the network. High powered users will be able to download information from Intranet applications and the Internet at speeds that will not impede learning or become a distraction to the end user.

Push Strategies

The campus will be able to take advantage of uniform distribution of software to the desktop using remote installation or "push" methods. New updates can be loaded on machines at convenient times with little interruption to the end users.

Lower Cost of Acquisition

A benefit of a faster network is that more reliance will be placed on the network and not as much on the desktop. This will increase the number of PC's required to be replaced on an annual basis. This assumes that the required number of desktops has been reached. Utilizing the network for applications and file storage, SBCC has the opportunity to implement the use of Network Computers or NC's. NC's are potentially more cost effective than PC's and provide greater security to the network.

V. Risks

GTE has analyzed the risks in implementing an infrastructure such as an ATM/Switched backbone. More importantly is the risk if this network is not implemented. The existing network was designed for networking PC's at a shared data rate of 10Mb/s with primary usage as file storage, data transfers, and email. Since that time Intranets, the Internet, WEB access, multimedia, and video have been introduced and are putting an increasingly amount of traffic on the network. Based upon analysis of the existing network and plans for new applications and services, the current architecture will no longer be able to support the amount of information being passed and will become slower and slower until it becomes

difficult at best to use for instruction and information sharing. Web based administration will overload the existing network and will render new instruction applications unavailable until upgrades are performed.

A. Implementation

Changes in Technology - If the ATM network is implemented, there is always a risk that a new technology is just around the corner. This is a valid risk as we see what is happening with desktops on a monthly basis. GTE is confident however that ATM is a sound technology that is being implemented in telco central offices across the country. GTE's currently uses a SONET/ATM backbone to transport data across the country. With ATM the only WAN technology the supports QOS, it is unlikely that a new technology will overpower ATM within the next two to three years.

B. No Decision

Should the infrastructure not be implemented, SBCC will not have the ability to fully implement the programs mentioned earlier in the document. Programs such as Universal Access to the Internet will not be possible in that the on-campus access will be slow and unacceptable to the end users. Regardless of whether or not video and voice are implemented, the existing network will eventually come to a crawl just by adding a significant number of high end workstations.

VI. Value Propositions

Costs for the will be significant when first implemented however, over time, the value added to the network will far outweigh any initial costs. Costs will also be deferred over a period of time as GTE implements the total solution using a phased approach. The overall value will be realized in efficiency of network performance, network manageability, and savings of multiple tasks centralized into one system.

Phase I – Implementation of Campus ATM

Phase Ia. – Implement MMDS as Interim Schott/Wake connectivity solution

Phase II – ATM Connectivity to Remote Campuses

Phase III –Voice integration to ATM

There will be value savings through the implementation of the ATM infrastructure, primarily through the redeployment of existing network equipment and through manageability of centralized systems.

Redeployment of Existing Equipment

As previously mentioned, when the ATM network is implemented, the switches, hubs, and routers don't go away. They are redeployed in areas of the network not requiring high bandwidth. This will typically be in closets nearest to the desktops. Switches will be used in concentrated LAN groups requiring high speed data only.

Manageability

The ability to manage the network from a centralized location will be a tremendous benefit to the campus. As servers are centralized, the workload will be reduced by part time administrators located within individual departments.

Purchase Options

GTE offers in-house financing and leasing programs that are very flexible and can be customized to meet SBCC's needs. For example, a municipal lease offers SBCC any term or payment schedule that they may like to suit the situation. Also, there is a non-appropriation clause that lets them out of the lease if funding is cut out of their budget with no penalty. In addition, if you decide to buy the lease out early, there is no pre-payment clause.

Shasta College Telecommunications Plan (SCTIP)

District: Shasta Tehema Trinity Joint CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-009

Project Director: Dr. James Poulsen

Organization: Shasta College

Address: P.O. Box 496006

City: Redding, CA 96049-6006

Phone: 530/225-4813

College: Shasta College

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

Shasta College is at a critical juncture in the nearly fifty year history of the institution. When the first ever strategic plan was completed in 1994, one of the major goals identified for the five year period, 1995-1999, was the development and implementation of a technology investment in practically every facet of the college's existence. The strategic plan set the college on a course of action that would dramatically change the culture of the campus.

With the convergence of new educational technology and the rebounding of the economy, Shasta College received new instructional equipment monies and two sizable external grants to invest in telecommunications equipment and facilities. Adding three on-campus and two off-campus electronic classrooms, more than 300 new computers, Internet, a library catalog system, some minor improvements to the main campus computers, and the hiring of several new technology technicians spread out over the campus highlighted the real need for a planning guide to an emerging college technology problem.

Shasta College is very interested in the refinement of a systematic technology plan with the help of leading experts in the field of educational technology. After meeting weekly for more than four months, the campus technology planning team recommended a strategy to bring to campus the IBM Global Services Corporation for the purpose of designing a Telecommunications Infrastructure Plan to cover every facet of educational technology.

Shasta College is requesting \$25,000.00 to partially fund the \$59,000 necessary to contract with the IBM Global Services Corporation to develop and complete the Shasta College Telecommunications Plan (SCTIP) per RFA 96-0482. Shasta College will match \$34,000.00 from District funding resources.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Shasta College Telecommunications Plan (SCTIP)

Dr. James Poulsen

Shasta College

Purpose

We have taken this grant and developed what we call the student services video network. A student can go out there to any of our centers, to Red Bluff, we are probably going to put them at some high schools and they can call, do a video conference with a counselor, financial aid, admissions and records, etc. The typical kind of support services available for an on-campus are now available on the small video network.

Problems

Support Staff

The major problem was to overcome a lot of technical problems that we had because the technology kept changing. It started out being ISDN based and that wouldn't work and now its basically WAN based.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

We have our tutoring centers, math tutoring, science tutoring, writing centers, They can now go into the local center, hit the math center and work with a math tutor. They have to make an appointment just like you would if you were coming into the actual tutoring center, except it is done interactively.

Today we are conducting interviews for Deans on campus. None of those people are coming to campus. We have eight or ten of them and those interviews are taking place all over the country by using video conferencing. This one grant that we got out of the Chancellors office was our way of providing support services and I think they are going to be outstandingly successful.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Ventura College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

District: Ventura CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-010

Project Director: Carol Coltrin

Organization: Ventura College

Address: 4667 Telegraph Road

City: Ventura, CA 93003-3872

Phone: 805/654-6455

<http://www.vcsun.org/~ccoltrin/redteam/minutes/Model2.htm>

College: Ventura College

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

Develop a comprehensive telecommunications infrastructure plan, using the input of all campus constituencies, external stakeholders and interface with the educational and facilities plan. In addition the 'Baseline for Planning and Implementing an Internal-Campus Telecommunications Infrastructure Systems for the California Community Colleges' and the "Telecommunications Infrastructure Planning" documents will be used as a tool to develop the plan. Under the direction of Student Development Dean, the project will utilize a project coordinator and a Telecommunications Consultant to assess current systems and telecommunications infrastructure, look at the direction of educational planning efforts underway and the resulting infrastructure needs in order to determine gaps in capability and systems needed to develop a comprehensive telecommunications infrastructure plan. This plan will build on ongoing efforts to improve library learning resources through the use of electronic media, existing projects to improve instructional delivery and learning through computer assisted education, existing Telecommuter/video Teleconferencing Center and Distance Education capabilities, as well as the planning and grant development efforts already underway to establish a county-wide shared distance education infrastructure network that all educational systems can access. This is joint effort with Ventura County businesses, local government, CSU, UC, K-12 schools, County Superintendent of Schools, and Ventura College, with the intent of establishing a virtual university in Ventura County that would also share instructional services in a true effort to link the 4 systems electronically to provide distance education and other services.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Ventura College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

Carol Coltrin

Ventura College

Purpose

To look at self-development and technology needs and to basically plan the activities or to plan the plan, to look at where we are.

The broader and longer-term mission is to develop an effective staff development technology training/ implementation process that can be utilized by other colleges in the district, business and other schools in the community.

The task of accomplishing these two goals is the basis of this three-year plan. Campus commuting 1999 National survey of Computing and information technology in American Higher Education listed, as it's most important informational technology issue in colleges and universities as the task to assist faculty efforts to "integrate information technology into instruction". The second issue was to provide user support as they work to integrate technology into education.

Problems

Support Staff

I think that the level of frustration on our campus has been pretty high as far as support. The level of interest in this change in technology is also not very high. We need a little bit more administrative support. I think there are still some huge concerns as far as things like the classing of course numbers. We don't have a central course numbers system in community colleges. We don't have centrally described course descriptions, those kinds of things.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

I think it needs to be a buy in for more than one type of thing. I can see where our campus doesn't have the kind of funding to really encourage huge amounts of staff development. We just don't have that kind of money at this point.

That was the next thing is that obviously the faculty has a tremendous worry as far as what their workload it going to look like, what the ownership of the course that they develop is, you know, how many students can be in one of these courses. What it does as far as can colleges go out and buy a course, buy a teacher and kind of import them. I think that's probably one of the things that substantially impact our movement.

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

"Increased costs along with decreased state and federal resources have resulted in the public demands that colleges and universities ensure greater quality control, productivity and effectiveness of their institutions. Colleges are being asked to be more responsive to state concerns and to be publicly accountable to their constituencies that include the public, parents, employers and the general public." There has an adoption in the state of California to implement performance measures. K12 teachers are being required to demonstrate competencies in the area of technology as well as teaching. The Academic Senate for the Community College system has developed implementation guidelines for integration of technology "Implementation Guidelines for Good Practice Technology Mediated Classroom instruction, which can help to serve as a guideline in assisting instructors to integrate technology into the classroom.

The Ventura College Staff development plan was last updated in 1996. Since that time there have been many changes in the demographics of Ventura College. The college now employs 160 full time and 400 part time faculty as well as 140 classified staff and 12 administrators. There has been a huge leap in the use of technology in the workplace in the last 5 years and with that leaps comes a need for increased staff development in the area of technology. As the focus of education shifts to the learner and the learners needs Ventura College faculty need support and education as life long learners and facilitators of learning. As Ventura College moves forward, there needs to be a support system created to ensure smooth implementation and on-going training for staff development, especially in the addition of technology to the classroom. This staff development needs to be planned and implemented in tandem with technology to minimize gaps, chaos and staff frustrations. This support system must include:

Specific technology staff development plan with outcome measures, time specific

Personnel to support technology and staff training

Tools: software and hardware

Facilities for training

Communication plan

Therefore the Red Team has been formed to address this need by:

- Developing a model for Staff Development and Technology use.
- Developing a plan for Staff Development and Technology use.
- Sharing model and plan drafts with the campus for feedback.
- Finalize the model and plan design and forwarding to campus groups for implementation.
- Identifying resources to assist in implementation of the plan
- Proposing the plan as part of the VC overall college strategic plan

B. The Mission of Technology Staff Development is to:

1. Provide activities designed to advance knowledge, skills and understanding of technology in ways that lead to increased use of technology in the college setting, specifically increased computer use.
2. Engage in an ongoing pedagogical discussion regarding the role and use of technology in education.

3. Increase the use of technology in the classroom for the development of VITAL (Vital Instruction in Technology for the Advancement of Learning) technology skills for all students.
4. Support the increased use and innovation of technology by all staff.
5. Develop an effective and ongoing staff development technology training/implementation process that can be utilized by other colleges in the district, business and other schools in the community.

III Model for Technology Staff Development

A. Methodology

The staff development model and the resultant plan for staff development in the area of technology were driven by the Ventura College goals and the direction from the TMAPP grant. This plan is the outcome of research, survey, assessment, site visits to community colleges and technology evaluation. The areas of assessment were:

- Research in the “Best Practices” in staff development for both administrative and academic needs through community college visits and technology staff development plan reviews.
- Data collected from 185 staff and 993 students in the technology need survey.
- Data gathered as to current technology needs and resources on other community campuses.
- Research done on funding sources to meet identified goals.

A systematic approach was taken to evaluate each proposed project’s support needs. We identified the different types of staff and student needs as they relate to technology thru a technology needs survey. The areas assessed were related to technology familiarity, skills, technology use in the classroom, and knowledge about instructional technology.

Once the survey returns of 185 staff surveys and 993 student surveys were completed we worked to identify the model that would best fit a more outcome specific method of staff development. In order to best implement the technology staff development plan it was necessary to identify the technology resources on campus including technology personnel, budget and hardware. The last step of implementing the plan was to identify potential resources to fund the needed equipment and activities.

In order to advance knowledge, skills and understanding in ways that lead to increased use of technology in the college setting, specifically computer use we need staff training in technology including the pedagogy to assess for the best use of technology and the need for a shift of focus more toward the unique needs of the adult learner, the ability to evaluate and problem solve the effectiveness of technology.

The new model includes the community, the college district, sister campuses, the campus departments and the individual staff members with a plan to form a cohesive and effective technology intervention plan.

1. The model is first, and foremost, outcome based with an increased focus on communication, support and innovation. The activities of the plan include an annual survey or assessment of needs, a set of organized activities and ongoing evaluation as to the effectiveness of the plan.
2. The second major component of the model is that it is learner focused, making use of andragogy or adult learning principles. Andragogy makes the following assumptions about the design of learning
 - Adults need to know why they need to learn something
 - Adults need to learn experientially
 - Adults approach learning as problem-solving
 - Adults learn best when the topic is of immediate value

In practical terms, andragogy means that the instruction for adults needs to focus more on the process and less on the content being taught. The instructor adopts a role of facilitator or resource rather than lecturer or grader. Andragogy applies to any form of adult learning but has been used extensively in the design of staff development courses. Adults prefer to have a say in what is learned and need opportunities to relate content to current endeavors. Many adults fear change and appreciate a learning environment that is non-threatening.

Most adults provide their own motivation for learning (e.g. teachers seek ideas they can use to solve their classroom problems. Those planning and implementing staff development can encourage and create conditions that nurture what already exists in the adult learner. Current research on effective staff training

suggests that programs delivered in a variety of formats are more likely to produce desired changes in practice than those that are not. (Brandt, 1987, Joyce & Showers, 1980, Villa 1989.)

College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant**District:** Victor Valley CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0482-011**Project Director:** Mark Ingel**Organization:** Victor Valley College**Address:** 18422 Bear Valley Road**City:** Victorville, CA 92392**Phone:** 760/245-4271 x 2394**College:** Victor Valley College**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

This Proposal outlines Victor Valley College's plan for the development of a telecommunications plan. The following identifies the scope of the systems, staff development needs, and the ongoing review and evaluation component that will be addressed:

1. **Near-term Improvements** - 4CNnet connections, upgrade of the satellite antenna system, restoration of the cable television distribution system, and network impacts of the central server.
2. **Technology Applications** - Academic and administrative computing, communications, and video education needs as they relate to telecommunications.
3. **Required Technology** - Campus voice system changes, computing applications and support, distance education, and teleconferencing.
4. **Building Infrastructure** - Voice, data, and video cable, pathways, and spaces within all buildings required to support future expansion of telecommunication services.
5. **Inter-building Infrastructure** - Cable and conduit between campus buildings required to support the identified applications, projected technologies, and future building projects.
6. **Staff Development and Training** - It is recognized that implementation of the proposed plan will require ongoing staff development and training for faculty, staff and administrators.
7. **Review and Evaluation** - Establish ongoing review and evaluation component in the telecommunications plan.

The proposal includes the management component of a vice president, consultant, Steering Committee, and two faculty members to assist in the development and implementation of the plan.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

Mark Ingel

Victor Valley College

Purpose

The purpose of ours was to develop, write, implement and publish a technology plan for the college.

Page 496 In our mind the purpose of that technology plan was to try to organize that attempt so that things would come together and move forward instead of just remaining in semi-chaos all the time.

Problems

Support Staff

Finding the expertise in people who are willing to work for the pay we can afford to give them is difficult. Finding people to serve on hiring committees, who have a clue as to what any of this is all about is difficult. We end up having people hired whose qualifications aren't as good as we would like because either the people who chose them weren't really as sharp as we had wished or because we couldn't afford to pay the ones with the talent to help provide the direction for implementing. Consequently we rely on volunteer help basically.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

My biggest concern is that we'll establish a policy and eventually straightjacket everybody into it and say this is the way the class will be. Those people for whom their particular material is not really amenable to the format that's been designed will be at a disadvantage and the classes won't be as good as they could have been had there been more flexibility in how they are structured.

I'm concerned about creating policy and using policy in lieu of judgment. My biggest concern is that we try to limit the innovation in an effort to control or to provide some structure. Structure is important but too much structure tends to stifle innovation and I'm concerned about that.

We really can't emulate a confrontational dialog online without video conferencing and we don't have the bandwidth to support that.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

District: Siskiyou Joint CCD

RFA Number: 96-0482-012

Project Director: Nancy Shephard

Organization: College of the Siskiyous

Address: 800 College Ave

City: Weed, CA 96094

Phone: 530/938-5331

College: College of the Siskiyous

Amount: \$25,939

CCC Abstract:

College of the Siskiyous, located in rural Siskiyou County, serves as a critical link to information and learning services for the many students and community members residing in an extraordinarily large district. An important part of the California Community College network, the college serves a huge portion of far northern California.

Located in an extremely rural and underfunded section of the state, the college must take a leadership role in developing a communication network that will serve the many isolated communities within Siskiyou County. This Telecommunication Planning Project will allow the college to develop a telecommunications infrastructure that will support clear reliable two-way real-time communication within and between the college's two campuses. More importantly, it will allow the college to develop a plan that will provide that same level of communication to numerous end-user sites located throughout the district. Public high school programs, libraries, social service agencies and employment training programs, reliant upon the college for leadership and guidance, will be assisted by the college to build internal telecommunication systems that will link directly to the college via a district-wide network. That network will provide them with the information and education services they need so desperately need.

This telecommunications planning model can be adapted to and implemented by the many community colleges within California who struggle to serve students residing in the most remote sections of their districts, creating a statewide network that provides equal access to all students, regardless of where they reside within our great state.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: College Telecommunication Plan Mini-Grant

Nancy Shephard
College of the Siskiyous

Purpose

Ours was a mini grant for telecommunications planning.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

I see a lot more online courses, we've done some of them and we're continuing to do more. We run several video conferencing classes and we are adding two more sites for this Fall. I see a lot more two-way interactive video conferencing classes.

Analysis of Grant Report

This project provided the opportunity to visit and begin working with schools, districts, telecommunications service providers, and other community leaders in Siskiyou County on ways in which we might coordinate telecommunication and distance learning efforts. Several of these representatives met with members of the College community and an outside consultant to provide the core information for a College Telecommunications/Distance Learning Plan. This plan has been written and returned to the College. After being reviewed and modified by the campus community, it will be incorporated into the overall campus technology planning process, providing direction for telecommunication and distance learning projects for the next few years. The work that has been done with entities outside the College has provided a good group of telecommunications contacts for ongoing and future projects.

The original goals of the project were to conduct a detailed inventory of "telecommunications equipment and network" (including telecommunications capabilities of other schools, businesses, and groups in the County), to define "all assumptions, principals, and priorities" for a telecommunications plan, to write the plan, and to follow up for its implementation.

Hiring a consultant to look at the College's telecommunications and distance learning needs from an outside viewpoint was helpful to gain perspective on the project and as a focal point for bringing together members of the local education and telecommunications community for a discussion on campus. Granting support for the Telecommunications Planning Coordinator (who has responsibilities for other telecommunications and distance learning projects, as well as being a member of the campus Technology Council and the Technology Services staff) helped fund a position that will be a source of continuity for ongoing and future telecommunications / distance learning projects.

When the grant proposal was originally written, we felt that we would be able to go out to some of the local K-12 schools and do a technology inventory, with the intent of "linking" to the College's network. While we may, and in fact hope to, be able to coordinate with the local school districts to provide distance education and do other projects, inventories and a formal County-wide network are not desirable nor, perhaps, even feasible. Outside entities (school districts, telecommunications service providers, businesses, etc.) need to know that the College would like to work with them without taking over and doing their work for them.

The document generated by this project, the Telecommunications/Distance Learning Planning Document, will serve as the starting point for future planning documents. The College has done fairly extensive planning for technology in the past, but this represents a look at the Distance Learning portion and the related telecommunications technology that supports that function. Future planning sessions will now include this component.

Many of the planning functions of the College are done, or at least begun, during this time. In working on a planning document, a difficult aspect was trying to plan for future technology without sufficient input from those who were too busy to make time for planning. We also found we lacked sufficient expertise in some of the areas we need to plan for. Hiring an outside consultant and incorporating this planning into the institutional planning day has helped immensely. Also, in order to get effective participation from the local community, much time must be spent meeting with people and getting a sense of what other schools and organizations are doing and what their future needs are.

Staff Technology Education Program (STEP)**District:** Chabot-Las Positas CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-001**Project Director:**

Dr. Linda Lucas, Lavaughn Hart

Organization:

Las Positas College

Address:

3033 Collier Canyon Road

City:

Livermore, CA 94550

Phone:

925/373-5520

College: Las Positas College**Amount:** \$24,960

925-373-5894

CCC Abstract:

This project will expand the current capabilities for providing staff development at Las Positas College by creating a training setting for 6 to 12 participants, equipped with 6 computers and appropriate demonstration devices (Objective One). A series of workshops will be pro video that will involve all of the administrators, all the staff, the full faculty and many of the adjunct faculty. The first workshop (Objective Two) will provide GroupWise for E-Mail Training to eighty percent of all staff, full-time faculty, and adjunct faculty who have requested e-mail accounts. Staff and administrators completing Using Basics of NT Workstation 4.0 (Objective Three) will incorporate these practices to eliminate need for technical assistance more than once a week. Intermediate Skills in Using NT Workstation 4.0 workshop (Objective Four) is designed to further refine and expand on the skills learned in the basics class. The use of Netg Office 97 tutorials (Objective Five) will be explored in teaching the use of Excel and Word in an NT environment. Instructors teaching telecourses or web based classes will be instructed in the use of ETUDES as a template for including interactivity for their students in their courses (Objective Six).

The expected outcome of this series of workshops is that the efficient and effective use of technology for completing assigned tasks will increase; distance learning students will be able to interact with materials and with their instructors with ease; and there will be an ongoing staff development program growing out of the use of tutorials and workshops to accomplish these goals. The development of the additional training site is key to facilitating this project to expand the current program.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Staff Technology Education Program (STEP)

Dr. Linda Lucas

Las Positas College

Purpose

It was to develop a little staff development training world where equipment like new computer scanner, projection equipment, software that is appropriate to that and then a substantial amount of money for trainer time so that we could do training for classified faculty in particular and anybody else who came along for the ride. So it is a six station training center.

Problems**Support Staff**

Our biggest problem was we had the intent to do these things, but we really didn't have a viable space. We had a professional development center but it had gotten so busy developing faculty materials to use within the instructional program that it was never available to us as a training site. By having this room dedicated as a training site anytime we needed to use it, but open to adjunct faculty or anyone else to use the computers in there if we weren't using it for training, it fit two needs for us. That space was almost more critical than anything else.

The thing that is holding us up frankly is that when the last state funding for TTIPP came out, they insisted that we go with Foresee Net. It is so much slower than the service we already had. Probably half as fast. Our Lomita County had a wonderful system and we were paying them a fee at about one third of the cost and twice the speed so we were not happy campers. The way the state made the grant, you didn't even get the money, and it went automatically to Foresee Net so you had not choice in the matter.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

In order to use the e-mail, it is a system that you can access from home through the web, but it acts differently on a web-based environment than it does from a client-based environment. Therefore, the adjunct faculty particularly were having problems dealing with it and trying to figure out how to make use of it because it is group-wise and it is not as robust as a web server version as a client version.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Establishment of Departmental Technology Fellows

District: El Camino CCD

RFA Number: 98-0660-002

Project Director:

Donna Manno

Organization:

El Camino College

Address:

16007 Crenshaw Blvd.

City:

Torrance, CA 90506

Phone:

310/660-3871

College: El Camino College

Amount: \$24,960

CCC Abstract:

Recognizing the need for technology leadership within the faculty, we are proposing a pilot program to create "Technology Fellows" in nine departments during 1999-2000. Technology Fellows will be full-time or part-time faculty who already have a wide range of computer skills, including facility in various forms of computer-mediated communications such as e-mail, and who will agree to lead their planning efforts, create a public Web presence for their departments, and generally encourage and support their colleagues in discipline-specific faculty development in the new technologies. The Technology Fellows' efforts will be supported by the creation of a Virtual Learning Web.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview Establishment of Departmental Technology Fellows

Donna Manno

El Camino College

Purpose

The other purpose was to try to put together a virtual learning site that faculty could access to assist them with some of the questions they might have about Internet browsers and also to link them to sites where technology was successfully being used in instruction.

Problems

Support Staff

The scheduling was that we have some real fast movers in the group and we some people that are struggling and trying to accomplish what the objectives were set for has been not impossible but it has been the most difficult and challenging part.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

When you try to get ten faculty together I couldn't believe how hard it was, even with the promise of money attached to it. That's what I think I'd stress a little bit stronger next time even though we listed out what it was that was going to be expected of them. There's the true ones who do have a schedule conflict and you know those right away and then there are the ones where it's just not convenient for them. That is always a tough thing to deal with.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

In the fall of 1999 an announcement was sent out to all full-time faculty announcing the program and inviting interested parties to apply. We had ten responses representing faculty from the following departments: Automotive Technology, Chemistry, Childhood Education, Counseling, History, Humanities, Instructional Services, Nursing, Philosophy, and Physics. All ten were accepted. All but one completed their responsibilities and

duties as "tech fellows." An orientation meeting was held in October and two training sessions on FrontPage were conducted during the months of November and December. The Tech Fellows developed and conducted a survey of faculty members in their departments to get input on what they would like to see included on the department Website and to what extent faculty were using technologies in the classroom. This information was used to develop the website and to write goals for 2001-2002 year. During the spring of 2000 the tech fellows began the development of their websites.

Objective 1 – Tech fellows would participate in training, create and conduct a department technology needs assessment, develop a department technology plan, exchange ideas for incorporating technology into instruction with other tech fellows and develop and maintain a department website.

Objective 2 – A virtual learning web would be designed and operational. An evaluation to determine the usefulness of the site would indicate that at least 40% of the full-time faculty and Staff have visited the site.

The tech fellows team of ten faculty members was established. The fellows developed and conducted Technology needs assessment surveys for their departments, Training was conducted in FrontPage 2000. Department websites were designed and developed.

The Virtual Learning Web was designed, however the development into a Web site was not fully implemented. One of the components Web based Netg tutorials is housed on the College's Information Technology Services site.

All of the activities were behind schedule for a variety of reasons. The tech fellows, although only ten faculty, were not able to attend all of the trainings and meetings because of schedule conflicts. The variation of skill levels made it hard to keep the group together. The timelines for the activities were not realistic.

As for the Virtual Learning Web, much of the information and links are developed, However The website is not yet published. Again the project was much bigger in scope than initially Anticipated. The site will be completed by August 31, 2000.

Because the project in all areas was behind schedule information was not shared at Either the Chancellor's Mega Conference or at the CVC conference in spring 2000. However, the project was shared as a GIFT presentation at the 4C/SD spring conference.

The first recommendations is to hire a faculty member to coordinate the project. The skill level Of the participants needs to be determined early to establish levels of training. There needs to be a computer lab available for group training. Activity timelines need to be clearly defined and agreed upon upfront.

Although the project fell short in many of the planned activities, there Was a great deal accomplished. Too much was anticipated to happen in such a short time Frame. The website design and development was a major undertaking. More training was Needed than initially anticipated. However eight of the ten participants want to continue With the project next year even if there is not stipend involved. The Virtual Learning site was a struggle in finding a web designer to complete the site within The grant year. The concept was hard to create.

Strategic Technology Service Development**District:** Fremont-Newark CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-003**Project Director:**

Jim McCann replaced by Deborah Hudson

Organization:

Ohlone College

Address:

43600 Mission Blvd.

City:

Fremont, CA 94539-0390

Phone:

510/659-6203

College: Ohlone College**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

Fremont-Newark Community College District/Ohlone College has recognized the importance of a well-focused technology plan to address both educational and administrative objectives. Technology has become pervasive in not only the content of our curriculum, but in the way we plan, deliver and administer the process of learning. To address these dramatic new requirements, we must adopt new methods for planning and implementing technology to assure the most effective application of this capability to these educational needs.

Fremont-Newark Community College District has recently completed a study of our current Information Systems and Technology support structure. This study identified the need for a strategic plan, and for an "Information Utility" support structure that provides services via internal Service Level Agreements. We have also determined the need to update the design of our telecommunications infrastructure to support the projected growth in workload as well as new functions to be identified in the planning process. The final step will be to institutionalize a cross-campus participation planning process into a shared governance committee structure. The College has made a firm commitment of resources for this project including over 500 man-days of faculty and staff time, as well as additional outside consulting services, at an estimated cost of \$167,077. The TMAPP funds requested in this proposal will assist in supplementing the cost of this important project. (TMAPP: \$25,000; District Match: 142,077).

This grant request will supplement existing funding and help us accelerate the planning process and provide more effective use of technology to support our educational process.

The proposed planning effort will include four phases:

1. Strategic Technology Planning. An off-site retreat with participants from all segments of the College and District to develop Strategies and Objectives for the application of Technology to the Educational Process.
2. Service Level Agreements. A working process to map the requirements developed in the Strategic Technology Planning process against the existing technology support infrastructure, with adjustments as required.
3. Update Network Architecture and Design. Project functional and capacity needs over the next 3-5 years to meet the functional needs identified in the planning process.
4. Institutionalize the planning process. To assure the District and College can maintain an effective technology infrastructure.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview Strategic Technology Service Development

Deborah Hudson no interview, she said she would email answers to questions. LM 510/659-6203
Ohlone College

Purpose**Problems**

Support Staff

On 7/21/00 Deborah Hudson would do no interview, she said she would email answers to questions only.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.

Faculty and Staff Development Plan for Technology

District: Napa Valley CCD

RFA Number: 98-0660-004

Project Director:

Bonnie Thoreen

Organization:

Napa Valley College

Address:

2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway

City:

Napa, CA 94548

Phone:

707/253-3014

4csd-talk@onemail.fhda.edu

College: Napa Valley College

Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

During 1997-98, Napa Valley College completed a college technology plan, funded by TMAPP. Over the past year, resources have been committed to implementing much of the plan. By fall 1999, the infrastructure, a college network, and equipment will be in place. All of our faculty and staff need to learn to use the technology to improve the delivery of instruction, student services, and administration.

NVC requests \$25,000 to fund the next phase - planning for faculty and staff development. Funds will be used to hire a planner who will assess the development needs among our faculty and staff, identify effective training/learning options related to the use of technology, and develop a comprehensive plan. All segments of the college community will have the opportunity to be involved through a special task force and college-wide open forums. A pilot "Train the Trainer" activity will test the feasibility of this teaching/learning technique.

The project has the full support of the college president. The project co-directors will be the NVC staff development officer and the planning director. A special task force will be appointed to develop the plan, with guidance of staff. All major employee groups will be represented on the task force.

The anticipated outcome is a faculty and staff development plan for technology that will serve as a model for other California community colleges and serve the interests of the Chancellor's Office.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Faculty and Staff Development Plan for Technology

Bonnie Thoreen

Napa Valley College

Purpose

To develop a technology training plan for the Napa Valley College staff.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Then the real pitfall is the business of collective bargaining.

Solution

Successes

Our needs assessment document, instrument is being looked at statewide right now. It was featured at a recent staff development conference and also people were asking for models and so we posted those on the Internet and we've had some pretty interesting responses.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

In September 1999, NVC contracted with Company of Experts (COE), Dillon Beach, California, to assist the college in meeting the four objectives. Objectives 1 through 3 were previously met and reported on.

This report will complete objective 4: a comprehensive faculty and staff development plan for technology training. The plan is based upon relevant information from five previous reports developed by COE for NVC.

This report, "A Comprehensive Faculty and Staff Development Plan for Technology Training at Napa Valley College," is the sixth in a series of reports developed by Company of Experts (COE) for Napa Valley College during 1999-2000. As such, this report integrates relevant information from all of the previous reports. The previous reports were:

- 1 List of current and proposed uses of technology for instruction, student services, and administration; this list, together with other information gathered for reports 3 and 4 below, was submitted in Fall 2000 in several drafts of the "Technology Training Needs Assessment" survey instrument.
- 2 "Technology Training Needs Assessment" survey instrument, January 2000
- 3 "Results of an Assessment of Successful Faculty and Staff Development Models for Technology Training," March 7, 2000
- 4 Results of an Assessment of Faculty and Staff Development Resources for Technology Training, "March 7, 2000.
- 5 Responses to the "Technology Training Needs Assessment," dated April 11, 2000

This sixth and final report has six major sections.

1. Employee responses to "training Sessions" section of survey.
2. Faculty responses to "Motivational Factors" section of survey.
3. Employee responses to "Functions and Technologies" section of survey
4. Recommended guidelines for 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003.
5. In-house technology training resources.
6. External technology-training resources.

Information Technology and Communication Planning Group

District: Palomar CCD

College: Palomar College

RFA Number: 98-0660-005

Amount: \$24,922

Project Director: Stan Malley

Organization: Palomar College

Address: 1140 W. Mission Road

City: San Marcos, CA 92069-1487

Phone: 760/744-1150 x 2140

CCC Abstract:

This is a proposal to support an intense planning process to improve implementation of advanced information technology and communication for the Palomar College. Specifically, a planning group is formed that reflects the interests of all segments of the college community. It functions under the direction of co-leaders who have responsibilities for developing academic technology and information systems. With the help of outside consultants and input from users, the group is expected to make recommendations to the Vice Presidents that will render appropriate consideration for information technology and communication techniques in development of the Education Master Plan and budget development. Another outcome is that the Information Technology and Communication Planning Group will become a permanent functional entity in the Palomar College planning and budgeting structure.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Information Technology and Communication Planning Group

Stan Malley
Palomar College

Purpose

They're rewriting the technology plan, haven't started doing the project yet. April 6 is their first meeting. No interview.

7/21/00 LM for him to call and or email. No response

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 Final report requested but not received.

Staff Development for Distance Learning Using Video Teleconferencing Equipment
District: Santa Clarita CCD
RFA Number: 98-0660-006
Project Director: Jan K. Keller
Organization: College of the Canyons
Address: 26455 Rockwell Canyon Rd.
City: Santa Clarita, CA 91355
Phone: 661/259-7800
College: College of the Canyons
Amount: \$25,000

CCC Abstract:

This proposal will result in the design and implementation of a staff development program for faculty, staff, and others. Staff development activities will enable those completing the training to develop, utilize, and deliver distance learning courses and activities using video teleconferencing equipment already in place on campus.

This project will support the objectives contained in COC's Technology Master Plan (1995-2002), the College Telecommunications Planning Guidelines (CCCCO, 1996), ED>Net, and the Video Conferencing Guidelines for the California Community Colleges (1996).

Training faculty to design and deliver distance learning programs using the videoconferencing equipment will help COC become a fully-linked participating partner in statewide efforts to connect CSU and CCC campuses using telecommunications technology. However, this training will result in supporting the, accomplishment of other important goals, as well:

- Improve access to instruction for all students;
- Allow COC to develop and deliver teleconferenced courses in specialties not offered at other colleges, such as multimedia;
- Enable the College to provide access to teleconferencing by local business and industry, local governments, and community-based organizations; and
- Have the potential of decreasing a student's time-to-degree.

The following program components will be implemented:

- Appointment and training of a video teleconferencing lead instructor
- Design of course outline, curriculum, and training materials
- Recruit and select faculty-mentors (campus resource specialists)
- Deliver training
- Develop/adapt training for other on/off campus users

Project outcomes will include findings that effectively use video teleconferencing equipment in instructional delivery, administration, student services, and the community will result in a more technologically capable faculty, improved enrollment, retention, and performance of all students participating in videoconferenced programs.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Staff Development for Distance Learning Using Video Teleconferencing Equipment

Mr. Jan K. Keller
College of the Canyons

Purpose

Problems

Support Staff

We could ask for an extension and we are going to have to. The thing is that we didn't get word until after our timeline was already two months in arrears. It kind of threw everything out of whack. I haven't really had the need to really focus really carefully on the TMAPP thing and I intend to do that very soon. I'm a little concerned whether or not we are going to be able to spend all of the money.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

The kind of enthusiasm and sort of fearlessness that some of the faculty exhibit has helped to bring along some of the other faculty who were not quite so sure of themselves.

Successes

We've doubled our faculty in the last two years. We're just growing leaps and bounds. Most of our new faculty are just so hot on the technology that it's hard to contain them.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

1/29/01 Per a phone conversation with Mr. Jan K. Keller, they need to return most of the money. They asked for an extension and received it too late. They did not do a final report.

Telecommunication/Technology Staff Development Planning Project

District: Ventura County CCD

College: Ventura College

RFA Number: 98-0660-007

Amount: \$25,000

Project Director: Carol Coltrin

Organization: Ventura College

Address: 4667 Telegraph Road

City: Ventura, CA 93003

Phone: 805/654-6468

<http://www.vcsun.org/~ccoltrin/redteam/minutes/Model2.htm>

CCC Abstract:

This project will result in the establishment of a plan for staff development needed to implement and use advanced telecommunications/technology that improve both student learning and services provided. To arrive at this juncture, staff must develop a conceptual framework for automating or electronically enhancing various aspects of instruction, student services and administrative services, using the most appropriate advanced technologies available. This will be accomplished by sending a "Red Team" to technology conferences to learn about current and future developments and to use this knowledge to stimulate interest in creating change. A task force will study and recommend telecommunications/technology solutions and staff development efforts needed to implement them, conduct an updated survey of staff development needs, and incorporate these solutions/training needs into unit plans. The project will dovetail with current efforts to design a new Library /Learning Resources Center that will incorporate advanced telecommunications/technology mediated learning/distance learning, and participation with CSU/UC/California Virtual University/local K-12 and Adult School distance learning efforts. Throughout the process, input and direction will be received from various internal college constituencies (both established committees and all staff), as well as an external body already established to guide the future direction of the college. The resulting plan will be incorporated into the Ventura College Master Plan by the committee charged with its development, which will insure future implementation. The plan will include recommendations for staff development needs related to advanced telecommunications/technology, funding/budget needs, and possible external funding sources. The plan will be disseminated via web-site and conference presentations.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Telecommunication/Technology Staff Development Planning Project

Carol Coltrin

Ventura College

Purpose

The grant is a three-year grant that is designed to look at self-development and technology needs and to basically plan the activities or to plan the plan, to look at where we are.

Problems

Support Staff

The level of frustration on our campus has been pretty high as far as support. The level of interest in this change in technology is also not very high. We need a little bit more administrative support.

They need some support and technology. Someone who really fixes the computers and helps the students to get their Acrobat reader to come up etc.. The other thing is that they need the support in time.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

We need something to help faculty to see the need for technology in their courses.

Faculty has a tremendous worry as far as what their workload it going to look like, what the ownership of the course that they develop is.

There is a cohort of staff that is very reluctant to use it.

There has to be some type of comp benefit and I think the faculty doesn't seem to benefit at this point.

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

"Increased costs along with decreased state and federal resources have resulted in the public demands that colleges and universities ensure greater quality control, productivity and effectiveness of their institutions. Colleges are being asked to be more responsive to state concerns and to be publicly accountable to their constituencies that include the public, parents, employers and the general public." There has been an adoption in the state of California to implement performance measures. K12 teachers are being required to demonstrate competencies in the area of technology as well as teaching. The Academic Senate for the Community College system has developed implementation guidelines for integration of technology "Implementation Guidelines for Good Practice Technology Mediated Classroom instruction, which can help to serve as a guideline in assisting instructors to integrate technology into the classroom.

The Ventura College Staff development plan was last updated in 1996. Since that time there have been many changes in the demographics of Ventura College. The college now employs 160 full time and 400 part time faculty as well as 140 classified staff and 12 administrators. There has been a huge leap in the use of technology in the workplace in the last 5 years and with that leaps comes a need for increased staff development in the area of technology. As the focus of education shifts to the learner and the learners needs Ventura College faculty need support and education as life long learners and facilitators of learning. As Ventura College moves forward, there needs to be a support system created to ensure smooth implementation and on-going training for staff development, especially in the addition of technology to the classroom. This staff development needs to be planned and implemented in tandem with technology to minimize gaps, chaos and staff frustrations. This support system must include:

Specific technology staff development plan with outcome measures, time specific

Personnel to support technology and staff training

Tools: software and hardware

Facilities for training

Communication plan

Therefore the Red Team has been formed to address this need by:

- Developing a model for Staff Development and Technology use.
- Developing a plan for Staff Development and Technology use.
- Sharing model and plan drafts with the campus for feedback.
- Finalize the model and plan design and forwarding to campus groups for implementation.
- Identifying resources to assist in implementation of the plan
- Proposing the plan as part of the VC overall college strategic plan

B. The Mission of Technology Staff Development is to:

1. Provide activities designed to advance knowledge, skills and understanding of technology in ways that lead to increased use of technology in the college setting, specifically increased computer use.
2. Engage in an ongoing pedagogical discussion regarding the role and use of technology in education.
3. Increase the use of technology in the classroom for the development of VITAL (Vital Instruction in Technology for the Advancement of Learning) technology skills for all students.
4. Support the increased use and innovation of technology by all staff.
5. Develop an effective and ongoing staff development technology training/implementation process that can be utilized by other colleges in the district, business and other schools in the community.

III Model for Technology Staff Development

A. Methodology

The staff development model and the resultant plan for staff development in the area of technology were driven by the Ventura College goals and the direction from the TMAPP grant. This plan is the outcome of research, survey, assessment, site visits to community colleges and technology evaluation. The areas of assessment were:

- Research in the "Best Practices" in staff development for both administrative and academic needs through community college visits and technology staff development plan reviews.
- Data collected from 185 staff and 993 students in the technology need survey.
- Data gathered as to current technology needs and resources on other community campuses.
- Research done on funding sources to meet identified goals.

A systematic approach was taken to evaluate each proposed project's support needs. We identified the different types of staff and student needs as they relate to technology thru a technology needs survey. The areas assessed were related to technology familiarity, skills, technology use in the classroom, and knowledge about instructional technology.

Once the survey returns of 185 staff surveys and 993 student surveys were completed we worked to identify the model that would best fit a more outcome specific method of staff development. In order to best implement the technology staff development plan it was necessary to identify the technology resources on campus including technology personnel, budget and hardware. The last step of implementing the plan was to identify potential resources to fund the needed equipment and activities.

In order to advance knowledge, skills and understanding in ways that lead to increased use of technology in the college setting, specifically computer use we need staff training in technology including the pedagogy to assess for the best use of technology and the need for a shift of focus more toward the unique needs of the adult learner, the ability to evaluate and problem solve the effectiveness of technology.

The new model includes the community, the college district, sister campuses, the campus departments and the individual staff members with a plan to form a cohesive and effective technology intervention plan.

1. The model is first, and foremost, outcome based with an increased focus on communication, support and innovation. The activities of the plan include an annual survey or assessment of needs, a set of organized activities and ongoing evaluation as to the effectiveness of the plan.
2. The second major component of the model is that it is learner focused, making use of andragogy or adult learning principles. Andragogy makes the following assumptions about the design of learning
 - Adults need to know why they need to learn something
 - Adults need to learn experientially
 - Adults approach learning as problem-solving
 - Adults learn best when the topic is of immediate value

In practical terms, andragogy means that the instruction for adults needs to focus more on the process and less on the content being taught. The instructor adopts a role of facilitator or resource rather than lecturer or grader. Andragogy applies to any form of adult learning but has been used extensively in the design of staff development courses. Adults prefer to have a say in what is learned and need opportunities to relate content to current endeavors. Many adults fear change and appreciate a learning environment that is non-threatening.

Most adults provide their own motivation for learning (e.g. teachers seek ideas they can use to solve their classroom problems. Those planning and implementing staff development can encourage and create conditions that nurture what already exists in the adult learner. Current research on effective staff training suggests that programs delivered in a variety of formats are more likely to produce desired changes in practice than those that are not. (Brandt, 1987, Joyce & Showers, 1980, Villa 1989.)

Development of a Five Year Technology Plan**District:** Yuba CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0660-008**Project Director:**

Mick Holsclaw

Organization:

Yuba College

Address:

2088 N. Beale Road

City:

Marysville, CA 95901

Phone:

530/741-6981

College: Yuba College**Amount:** \$24,960**CCC Abstract:**

Yuba College has developed a good conceptual plan for telecommunication infrastructure. This plan was developed by the CIA Technology subcommittee, reviewed by the normal consultation committees, and will be transmitted to the Board of Trustees for approval in September 1999. Over the last three years, a high quality data network has been developed on all three campuses, and extended to three centers. Several important steps have been taken to infuse computer and multimedia technology throughout the faculty and curriculum.

While the plan addresses more advanced technologies that would merge voice and video into the network, and would expand the use of multi-media, specific designs are not addressed. The plan also lacks an implementation plan and budget. In addition, the plan needs additional work in the area of timing. How fast are the curriculum and student services demands for improved infrastructure going to unfold? What does this mean for the purchase and deployment of telecommunications technologies?

This grant proposes to purchase the time of qualified technical consultants to assist the college in a broad-based review of the existing plan. Spearheaded by the Superintendent/President and Director of Information Systems and Technology, three workshops will be held to review the current status and the emerging needs of the district. As this review takes place, special attention will be given to the timing of the needs for advanced technology deployment and training requirements. The consultants will assist in the development of a phased implementation plan that will cover the next five years and will include implementation, operation and training costs. The plan will guide budget development and staffing plans in the years ahead.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Development of a Five Year Technology Plan

Mick Holsclaw

Yuba College

Purpose

Our project is charged to conduct a feasibility study regarding the statewide implementation of electronic data interchange with specific focus on an electronic application interchange and electronic transcript interchange.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

The scary thing about that is I don't think that that distance education activity will be evenly distributed among the 71 or 72 districts that we have. I suspect that it will be concentrated into a dozen or less districts and would be causing financial problems for the others.

The other issues that come up have to do with the conflicting views about the ownership of those student records. Some people believe the record of the students enrollment in a college belongs to the college and the state primarily and other people believe it belongs to the student primarily. That affects who has authority to release the records.

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

We didn't actually advertise our project outside of the California Community Colleges and CSU and UC and yet our Web site did attract the attention of some business and industry folks. In talking to them we found out that they are quite interested in more efficient means for students to both enroll and also to retrieve documentation of their completion of courses of study or individual classes. Page

Analysis of Grant Report

1/29/01, Per Mick Holsclaw there is no report out yet.

Napa Valley College Electronic Transcript Exchange

District: Napa Valley CCD

RFA Number: 96-0481-001

Project Director:

Sue Nelson, Acting Assist Dean, Admissions/ Records

Organization:

Napa Valley College

Address:

2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway

City:

Napa, CA 94558-9976

Phone:

707/253-3001

College: Napa Valley College

Amount: \$27,429

CCC Abstract:

Electronic transcript exchange is a relatively new technology that will benefit student services. Current paper-based transcript exchange is slow and resource intensive. Napa Valley College has been interested in electronic transcript exchange, but until recently was not technologically prepared. In addition, staff and funding shortages prevents the college from pursuing this technology.

This application will give Napa Valley College the opportunity to implement electronic transcript exchange and provide a service on the statewide level by serving as a model. The identified trading partners, Solano CC and CSU Sacramento are leaders in electronic transcript exchange. By working with these two colleges, Napa Valley College is well positioned to develop a model process. Electronic transcript exchange will be accomplished on a district level by engaging key staff at these colleges as consultants, hiring additional programming staff to provide technical support and train staff. The process will be evaluated and an implementation manual will be developed for statewide dissemination. The manual will be developed from analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the process and determining strategies for successful implementation. The manual will be disseminated statewide and will be available in both hard copy and electronically. In addition, staff will be available for consultation for at least 24 months after completion of the project.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Napa Valley College Electronic Transcript Exchange

Sue Nelson, Acting Assist Dean, Admissions/ Records

Napa Valley College

Purpose

Our project was related to the electronic transcript exchange. When this round of TMAPP grant applications came through we decided to apply for funding to hire a consultant to do that for us so that we could do an electronic transcript exchange.

Problems

Support Staff

I would not recommend hiring a consultant for that kind of work unless the person happens to be somebody moonlighting from an college that knows the registration system. We had a lot of difficulties with the company that we hired making promises because they thought we could find a Cobalt programmer but unfortunately it was the same time Y2K was happening so all the Cobalt programmers were working on Y2K and they had a lot of difficulty in finding someone to do it.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

I realized that each time you bring in another partner there is going to be some work that has to be done. I guess what I ultimately learned is that I would love to see some kind of statewide consistent model. If you have electronic exchanges you could be able to send it to just about anybody who does that also rather than having to do some programming and twiddling with it a little bit to make it work for each college.

If we could somehow, similar to the statewide application, get the colleges to agree to what we need on the transcripts and how it would be laid out then it would be consistent and it would make it much easier to implement a statewide electronic transcript exchange.

Successes

Next Steps

I'm hoping to expand. It's Sacramento State at this point but I'm hoping to expand to more colleges. I think it's such an effortless way to transfer transcripts and I would love to be able to do it with a lot more colleges.

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Electronic Transcript Exchange**District:** Redwoods CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-002**Project Director:** Delores Smith**Organization:** College of the Redwoods**Address:** 7351 Tompkins Hill Road**City:** Eureka, CA 95501-9300**Phone:** 707-476-4100X4265**College:** College of the Redwoods**Amount:** \$57,902**CCC Abstract:**

This project will enable College of the Redwoods (CR) to develop electronic transcript exchanges with other educational institutions. The current manual process is inefficient and paper intensive. The faster, more efficient electronic process also provides rapid acknowledgment of receipt from the receiving institution.

Increased timeliness and efficiency will provide better service to students and expedite their entrance and exit from CR. Besides helping in the movement of transcripts, this project will allow counselors to assemble composite transcripts and provide better advisement to students and avoid duplication of effort. Once online sending and retrieval systems are established, there is the possibility to expand intra- and intercampus, as well as inter-district capabilities.

Humboldt State University (HSU) has indicated their willingness to work with CR in establishing a three way electronic exchange with Eureka High School. In addition to HSU, CSU Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Sacramento, and San Jose are interested in electronic transcript exchange with CR. Community colleges willing to develop exchange capability with CR include DeAnza, Solano, and West Valley. After completing connection with Eureka High, CR will work to establish trading partnerships with Fort Bragg, Fortuna, Hoopa, and Willits High Schools. Because of the potential linkages to additional institutions at each level, a CR project offers an expansive network once implemented.

An online and hard copy users manual will be developed that documents the implementation and operating procedures necessary for the successful transmission of electronic transcripts. CR and its partners will disseminate information at professional conferences. CR staff will also provide assistance to others interested in adopting electronic transcript transmission.

This project is an important contribution to an eventual system-wide electronic transcript exchange. It establishes linkages among three levels of California public educational systems (CSU, Community College and High School). The proposed trading partners offer a concentration of major institutions in Northern California as well as other parts of the state.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Electronic Transcript Exchange

Jean Butler

College of the Redwoods

Purpose

The original intent of this program was to develop a three-way transcript exchange among College of the Redwoods, Humboldt State and Eureka High School.

Problems

Support Staff

In the space of the last two years we have lost five of those individuals to other jobs or to retirement. Not that that's an excuse but I think that will explain that with that kind of turnover here it's been difficult to find that constant thread to keep this effort going.

I think with the staff turnover that is one issue but I think one even more pressing issue has been this integrated student record system which CR purchased back in '97-'98. I can tell you it is really the main reason in my mind why we are nowhere near what we need to be doing with the electronic transcript exchange.

The challenge is trying to adapt what has been needed and translate it into a way that this current computer system can read and adapt to. The conversion in this system is taking much longer than people expected and it's with any institution going through a conversion, the first and most important part of that conversion is their accounts receivable component. So that is what we start with in the business office and then filter into some of the more academic areas that directly related to this.

Given the paper trail that I'm looking at there I think the reality of trying to do this and doing it with systems that were not designed to talk to each other has probably been the most eye opening for the people who have been involved in this. I truly don't think that they had expected it to be quite this lengthy and this complex but that's what it turned into.

The technology in terms of the conversion process that CR has been involved in with this integrated student record system has hindered us making the kind of process that we would have like to have made on this electronic data exchange.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Take it to the next level and translate it so we can then start to interconnect our systems with other groups of these systems across the state with the hopes that ultimately we'd all have the same interconnection.

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Electronic Transcript Exchange**District:** San Joaquin Delta CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-003**Project Director:** Matthew Rosen**Organization:** San Joaquin Delta College**Address:** 5151 Pacific Avenue**City:** Stockton, CA 95207- 6370**Phone:** 209/1954-5300**College:** San Joaquin Delta College**Amount:** \$25,000**CCC Abstract:**

Electronic exchange of academic transcripts and other related information can currently be accomplished, by:

1. Applying relevant X. 12 and SPEEDE standards.
2. Utilizing off the shelf software to handle electronic data interchange (EDI) issues.
3. Establishing a network link with trading partners.
4. Adding interface capabilities to administrative applications which store and process academic history information.

The ubiquitous connectivity offered by the Internet promises to change, along with many other things, the manner in which electronic document interchange is implemented. This project proposes to:

- Apply state of the art encryption and authentication technology to implement electronic transcript exchange over the Internet in a secure and reliable manner.
- Utilize distributed object technologies and standards, such as CORBA and HOP, in implementing EDI services. This will enable other kinds of information interchange between institutions using the same interchange services.
- Utilize commercial, off the shelf and cost effective products to improve opportunities for other institutions to implement the services.
- Demonstrate the capability by implementing transcript exchange with a local school district.
- Disseminate project design and implementation products to interested institutions.

San Joaquin Delta College has a proven ability to deliver working, production quality results utilizing cutting edge technology. Its expertise in object oriented technology is particularly relevant in this project. This project represents an opportunity to research and develop an electronic transcript exchange capability which is compatible with emerging *Internet ready' and distributed object software applications.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Electronic Transcript Exchange

Matthew Rosen

San Joaquin Delta College

Purpose

We were able to actually implement production transcript exchange with CSU Sacramento and CSU Stanislaus. They are our closest institutions geographically.

Problems

Support Staff

The biggest issues that we ran into were one, that there isn't yet complete agreement on what data elements should be included in the electronic transcript exchange.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Once we had worked out a complete agreement on what data elements should be included in the electronic transcript exchange with the two sites that went pretty smoothly.

There is a service that is offered by the University of Texas at Austin for AACRAO, the national body that sponsors the SPEEDE/Express standard for electronic transcripts. www.aacrao.org, resource center, 05 Electronic Data Interchange, 01 Basic Technology of EDI, 02 EDI Standards, 01 SPEEDE

Basically any institution can sign up the service. It allows you to exchange transcripts using their server so that if we are sending transcripts to say ten different institutions we can indicate which institutions are going to get which transcripts within the exchange file that we are producing. It's all free.

Successes

That went fairly well. We're exchanging transcripts even now.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

In summary, the project was very successful in creating the local ability to send and receive electronic student transcripts under the SPEEDE/Express standards. The project was also successful in establishing production level electronic transcript exchanges between the district and its two largest trading partners in the CSU system. The project was ultimately unsuccessful in its effort to establish production level exchanges between the CC district and its largest high school district.

Specific activities carried out under this project include:

8. Acquired and installed server hardware and supporting software at the CC and high school district sites.
9. Built software within the CC district student information system for creation of data structures to support the mandatory and desirable optional data elements for Transaction Set 130 exchanges.
10. Created software to wrap data elements in required EDI header, control, and summary records.
11. Created software to integrate electronic exchanges using the existing transcript printing request system, and to track acknowledgments received.
12. Conducted negotiation with trading partners (2 CSU, 1 High School) to determine file exchange mechanism, encryption policy, common business rules, identify optional data elements to exchange, and select coding schemes where choices existed.
13. Created test exchange files, conducted test exchanges, identified issues, and resolved them (CSU Stanislaus, CSU Sacramento).
14. Established production level exchange procedures and implemented them.
15. Collaborated with Santa Barbara CCD in creation of project description and resources web site (<http://www.deltacollege.org/admin/div/cs/transcripts/>).
16. Gave joint project presentation with Santa Barbara CCD at "Mega" Conference in Monterey.
17. Gave project presentation to Higher Education Consortium of Central California (HECCC) and provided implementation detail information to interested institutions.
Began preliminary activities for transcript exchange with a third CSU campus (CSU Fresno).

In addition to the above, the following activities took place in working with the pilot high school district:

18. Performed analysis of data element availability from legacy student information system at source high school district.
 19. Created intermediate relational database containing transcript data from legacy student information system at high school district.
 20. Assisted in creating program to frequently populate relational database with new and modified transcript data.
 21. Created an intranet application service and a web browser interface to allow high school district counseling staff to view transcript data in real-time.
 22. Created software to build Transaction Set 130 data records from intermediate relational database.
-

23. Attempted to establish production level exchange procedures with high school district. This attempt ultimately failed.
24. Began process of establishing transcript exchange with a (different) high school district. This activity is on-going at the time of this report.

Two specific difficulties were encountered in attempting to complete production level electronic transcript exchanges with the target high school district. High school district technical staff did not complete all of the application development work agreed upon when the project was initiated. CC district staff completed some of the work, but work requiring access to high school district legacy applications and source code could not be done by CC district staff. The high school district was not paid for the work left incomplete, as can be seen from the final grant project budget report.

The second difficulty will apply more generally to CC districts implementing transcript exchanges with high school districts. Typically, high school transcripts are **not** sent to community colleges during the admissions process, except in rare instances such as advanced standing. High schools are reluctant, therefore, to begin processing high school transcripts on a large scale basis. Automation of transcript request/response is not feasible in this case due in part to lack of student permission to send academic records, and in part due to the lack of collection of a unique, common student identifier, such as social security number, at the high school district.

Negotiations and preliminary work has begun to investigate transcript exchange with a separate high school district joint powers agreement (JPA) which provides data processing services for local districts. The JPA is using a more mainstream student information system (SASI XP) and has other capabilities that will more readily allow automation of the transcript request/response process. Unfortunately, this work could not be completed within the timeframe of the current grant project.

The final product of this project are located at the project web site:

<http://www.deltacollege.org/admin/div/cs/transcripts/>

The site includes the project description presentation slides from Santa Barbara CCD and San Joaquin Delta CCD. Resources such as links to the AACRAO and UT at Austin web sites, TS 130 data element descriptions, and an implementation guidebook are provided at the site as well. Distribution is in electronic form and so is free to any interested parties.

The project was monitored by the project director to ensure that activities were completed on schedule, where possible. The project director maintained a log of project activities, resources expended, activity status, problems encountered and resolutions found. This information formed the basis of the project description web site published in conjunction with Santa Barbara CCD.

Of the four major objectives of the project, three were fully met and one was partially met. The objectives which were fully met were: Preparation of hardware and software to allow electronic transcript exchange within the district student information system, Initiate electronic transcript exchange with one CSU campus, and Initiate electronic transcript exchange with two additional CSU campuses. The objective which was partially met was Initiate electronic transcript exchange with one high school district. This objective was not met for reasons described in the comments in the Work Plan description for Objective 3.

Consultation between trading partners prior to initial transcript test exchanges were found to be essential. The exhaustive specifications under the X.12 TS130 transaction set include a number of coding options for the mandatory data elements as well as an extensive list of optional elements. Negotiations between trading partners enabled paring this large list to a subset of data elements and common data encodings that greatly simplified the testing and implementation process. Some statewide initiative to determine a standard set of data elements and data encoding choices for electronic transcript exchanges among UC, CSU, and community colleges would be extremely useful. Common use of the Univ of Texas at Austin server would also greatly facilitate exchanges between multiple trading partners.

Contracting development work to high school district technical staff was ineffective. Development resources within high school districts are especially constrained. In addition, initiating electronic transcript exchange in cases where paper exchange is not already taking place is highly problematic, especially when the process cannot be fully automated.

Relying upon high school district staff to perform some of the critical application development work was not effective. This was due in part to the very constrained nature of development resources within the K-12 districts, and in part to the lack of adequate management "buy-in" to the project. Electronic transcript exchange is not mission-critical, nor can it be readily justified on a cost/benefit basis for institutions which are primarily transcript senders. Transcript receivers can justify assigning development resources to such a project since electronic transcripts lead directly to automation of records evaluation services. Transcript receivers must be prepared to provide additional resources and other incentives to transcript senders to assist in the creation of electronic exchange infrastructure. In retrospect, additional resources and incentives should have been provided for in the project proposal to ensure adequate participation the K-12 district partner.

Electronic transcript exchange development and testing has led to permanent production level exchange with two partners. Additional trading partners have been identified and are in various stages of the process, from testing to preliminary negotiations.

Plans are also underway to implement exchange using the University of Texas at Austin EDI server. This will allow new trading partners to more rapidly begin trading with multiple partners through a single physical file exchange.

Electronic transcript exchange is now a mainstream service of the CC district.

The project description web site provides other colleges with a description of the activities that took place in developing electronic exchange, the issues encountered and solutions found, and provides a list of resources to assist in designing and implementing an exchange program.

Informal consultation and encouragement has been provided to several interested institutions. This service will be provided indefinitely to interested institutions. The district has also agreed to provide assistance in partnership with its CSU trading partners.

Finally, the district is prepared to provide consultation and assistance in regard to system-wide initiatives that rely upon or use electronic transcript exchange, such as the Student Friendly Services project.

Transcript recipients should be prepared to examine ways that they can increase resources, incentives, assistance, and cooperation to transcript senders in the implementation of electronic transcript exchange. The cost/benefit of EDI does not justify creation of an electronic transcript exchange infrastructure for most transcript senders. Transcript recipients must be willing to go the extra mile in order to realize the benefits of EDI.

Districts should carefully consider using free enabling services, such as the University of Texas at Austin server in their implementations. System-wide programs informing districts of these services should be implemented.

Projects that examine alternative technologies, such as XML and CORBA, should continue to be encouraged. EDI remains a moderately arcane and tedious technology that is often not easily integrated with legacy student information systems.

While not every objective of this project was achieved, most were. By any measure, a great number of benefits have been realized by this project to various institutions, staff, and especially students. This project has been very worthwhile.

Electronic Transcript Exchange**District:** Santa Barbara CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-004**Project Director:** Jane Craven**Organization:** Santa Barbara City College**Address:** 721 Cliff Drive**City:** Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394**Phone:** 805/965-0581 x 2352**College:** Santa Barbara City College**Amount:** \$101,250**CCC Abstract:**

This project involves a consortium approach and will allow SECC to implement an electronic transcript exchange in which 1) SBCC's four local feeder high schools will send electronic transcripts to SBCC, CSUN, and UCSB and 2) SBCC will send electric transcripts to CSUN. As a result, SBCC will develop and implement a workshop for other colleges seeking to implement electronic projects. The project addresses two areas of service delivery: students and administrative services. Although transcripts are recommended, the college finds that many students do not provide them. As a result, advisors are limited in their ability to effectively help students choose the right programs and course work. Requesting electronic transcripts will make it easier for students to provide their high school transcripts once SBCC and the local high schools develop an effective method of requesting these transcripts. The electronic exchange of high school transcripts will increase the number of applicants who provide transcripts, will provide these transcripts in a timely manner, improve the placement of incoming students into appropriate SBCC courses, and will assist transfer students to four-year institutions in assessing their eligibility for transfer. This regional model, involving all segments of education, is one that can be replicated in other areas of the state through project dissemination activities.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Electronic Transcript Exchange

Jane Craven

Santa Barbara City College

Purpose

We wanted to increase our number of trading partners. We wanted to add CSU Northridge. That was one of our goals. One of our other goals was to be able to receive transcripts from the high schools. We have four feeder high schools basically in two districts.

Problems

Support Staff

What ended up being the tricky part is that all of the high schools do things differently. While they all may use SASSY 3 software, the way they've figured out how to do little things like their little cheat sheets are all different. We needed to come up with a pretty generic way to map.

Then we ended up having some problems with the engine. It's like their mapping engine. I don't remember the name of it right now. Things just weren't as clean and as quick as we wanted them to be.

It's the speed thing that kind of held everything up.

In order to be successful in translating transcripts from the high school to the community college you are just going to have to get some standardization in your high schools.

It's standardization and you know we have real problems in California because just for starters our course numbering system is not universal. Just starting right there you can see the nightmare.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

We're one of the partner schools with the Oracle Student Project. I just happen to be the project lead for that so I get to work very closely with the Oracle Student group.

Oracle has purchased the software package out of Australia. That becomes like a base student information system for them. Of course they bought it because it was all rule based and was using Oracle databases but it would only deal with about forty percent of the needed functionality that American colleges needed so they put together a team of six colleges and universities. We've been working with them to develop the business requirements for their package. Now we've gone through business requirements definition for prioritization of those requirements and we're actually reviewed the high level design for their student system. Beginning in June we're going to be doing BETA testing for them. Then on our own campus one of the things that we are doing is we are getting ready to install that product here. We're doing a lot of mapping of our future business process models and detailing our needs out and things like that.

It's also a Web system. Everything can be done via the Web. Students can do their business via the Web. Faculty can do their business via the Web. It's going to be very exciting.

Successes**Next Steps****Analysis of Grant Report**

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Electronic Transmission of Transcripts**District:** Southwestern CCD**RFA Number:** 96-0481-005**Project Director:**

Steve Bossi, Director of Computer Systems Services

Organization:

Southwestern College

Address:

900 Otay Lakes Road

City:

Chula Vista, CA 91919-7299

Phone:

619/482-6336

College: Southwestern College**Amount:** \$113,843**CCC Abstract:**

This proposal by Southwestern College (SWC), requesting \$113,843, from the Technology Model Applications Pilot Project (TMAPP) Funds, under RFA#: 96-048 1, Electronic Transmission of Transcripts (ETT) will be augmented by \$17,803 of district matching funds. The College has formed a consortium with Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) and San Diego State University (SDSU) for the purpose of developing a seamless informational delivery system regarding the use of electronic transcript information.

This proposal addresses the issues that arise from a paper-based student record system within high traffic educational entities such as timely service to students for admissions and registration services, and costly administrative support (i.e. postage, supplies and staff time). The high volume of exchange of student information is best understood by the following statistics: annually, approximately 40% to 45% of SUHSD graduates attend Southwestern College and nearly 70% of the SWC students who transfer to a senior institution do so to SDSU.

The project's objectives are: 1) technological infrastructure of each consortium member will be expanded to include SPEEDE/EXPRESS format/Supply Tech software; 2) ETT project will reduce time for receipt of student information by 90% within the first year; 3) processing time for applications and registration will be reduced by 50% during the first semester; 4) increase potential adaptation of project by creating operations manual by the end of year two; 5) increase awareness of project through dissemination activities to CCCs (abstract and conferences) and 6) expand likelihood of replication of project through consultation services to interested CCCs and their educational partners.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Electronic Transmission of Transcripts

Steve Bossi, Director of Computer Systems Services

Southwestern College

Purpose

It was to share transcripts between the high school, the community college and the local state university.

Problems

Support Staff

It will probably not ever be completed per our expectations because the K-12 partner kind of flaked out. Actually San Diego State is involved in a huge implementation and they've kind of just put us on the back burner.

We got it all working and then the partners just don't have time for us right now. We bought some hardware. We put hardware in our admissions records office. We put hardware over at the high school. We put hardware at San Diego State. As I said, State is going through a major migration and they just flat don't have the time. Part of our problem is that we already have a homegrown version of the same functionality with State. The other part, to be honest, is that the concept of our grant was wonderful except it came from us. It's not like the other partners came and said, oh we really need this to happen. We kind of coerced them. Well we didn't coerce them but we presented it and they said, yes it sounds wonderful. In hindsight we just really never got the level of commitment that we needed.

Counselors

Student Problems

At the high school level the people that were there when we started the project, particularly my counterpart, subsequent to the beginning of the project left. His successors, I'm not even sure who they are at this point, have not at all been inclined to participate.

Faculty Problems

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

As of 2/16/01 final report was requested but not received.

Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study

District: Contra Costa & Yuba CCDs

RFA Number: 98-0663

Project Director: Mick Holsclaw

Organization: Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges

Address: 500 Court St.

City: Martinez, CA 94553

Phone: 530/741-6981

College: Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges

Amount: \$200,000

CCC Abstract:

This project is a feasibility study in the use of Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) technology for statewide adoption, conducted jointly by Yuba and Contra Costa Community College Districts. EDI is an application of technology involving data transmission between computer users assuring both parties that data are authentic, reliable and valid. This project will focus on the development of a formal recommendation of the best model to follow with regards to a standardized transcript exchange process, admission application, BOG Fee Waiver and Residency Form provided in an electronic mode. The joint District effort represents the expertise of a former Chancellor's Office Vice Chancellor, now Director of Information Services at Yuba College and a Director of Programs and Services with TMAPP grant experience in online student services development, from Contra Costa College.

Building from information established from previous TMAPP EDI funded projects, the Feasibility Study will be presented in two phases. Phase I establishes a project advisory structure involving CACCRAO, CISOA and the Student Friendly Services Work Group. This combined effort will assess the current state of implementation of electronic data interchange concerning transcript, admissions applications, BOG grants and residency forms. Identified linkages regarding these professional associations concerned with the stated EDI applications will be discussed both through a northern and southern state workshop format and on a designated web site. An outcome of these workshops will be a statement of functional requirements for implementation of EDI technologies for use in developing transcript exchanges, admissions applications, BOG waivers and residency forms. The use of workshops will assure broad-based participation in both the development and evaluation of solutions. The intent is to increase the likelihood of institutionalization, as well as to maximize the benefits to students. Additionally, solution options and cost projections for statewide implementation will be part of the outcomes derived from these workshops.

Phase II contains the collection and reporting of data and input for the development of standards for system-wide EDI implementation. This report will be a draft standard based on input from UC, CSU, K-12 as well as from CACCRAO, CISOA and Student Friendly Services Work Group. The final report will provide the best model for statewide adoption. The final report will be presented to the Chancellor's Office.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Feasibility Study

Mick Holsclaw

Contra Costa & Yuba Colleges

Purpose

Our project is charged to conduct a feasibility study regarding the statewide implementation of electronic data interchange with specific focus on an electronic application interchange and electronic transcript interchange.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

The scary thing about that is I don't think that that distance education activity will be evenly distributed among the 71 or 72 districts that we have. I suspect that it will be concentrated into a dozen or less districts and would be causing financial problems for the others.

The other issues that come up have to do with the conflicting views about the ownership of those student records. Some people believe the record of the students enrollment in a college belongs to the college and the state primarily and other people believe it belongs to the student primarily. That affects who has authority to release the records.

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

We didn't actually advertise our project outside of the California Community Colleges and CSU and UC and yet our Web site did attract the attention of some business and industry folks. In talking to them we found out that they are quite interested in more efficient means for students to both enroll and also to retrieve documentation of their completion of courses of study or individual classes.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

1/29/01, Per Mick Holsclaw there is no report out yet. They received a year extension, it's still going on.

Digital Signatures Feasibility Study**District:** San Joaquin Delta CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0664-001**Project Director:**

Matthew Rosen

Organization:

San Joaquin Delta College

Address:

5151 Pacific Ave.

City:

Stockton, CA 95207

Phone:

209/954-5302

College: San Joaquin Delta College**Amount:** \$50,000**CCC Abstract:**

Digital Signatures provide tremendous opportunities to realize the advantages of digital, electronic documents over traditional paper documents. The required technology is proven and available. The legal authority finally exists. The final challenge to allow implementation of this important technology within the California Community Colleges is to create an operational plan which will:

1. Be open-standards based to allow interoperability of various products available from reputable vendors
2. Ensure complete integrity of the technology and the applications for which it is applied
3. Provide total compliance with all applicable requirements as established by the various policy-making bodies
4. Provide for interoperability with procedures and standards adopted by colleagues in other educational systems within the state, and with other technology projects and initiatives within the community college system
5. Create workable and clearly understandable procedures, implementation guidelines, and solution templates that will allow the technology to be adopted and used in a mainstream fashion by individual offices, colleges, and districts.

This proposed project seeks to perform the required research and analysis to determine viable alternatives which can meet the goals above, to create a study describing these alternatives in detail including their relative benefits and costs, to construct a demonstration solution which can be examined in detail by decision makers and their technical advisors, and to provide standards documentation and guidelines to facilitate the implementation of digital signature technology statewide and on a local district basis.

San Joaquin Delta CCD's information technology staff has a proven track record of effectively researching and successfully implementing cutting edge technology in mission-critical applications. Its staff has received several national industry awards and its projects have been the focus of a number of articles in major information technology publications.

NOTE: Congress recently passed a digital signature law which will further enable this/

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Digital Signatures Feasibility Study

Matthew Rosen

San Joaquin Delta College

Purpose

They basically implement a technology called Public Key Encryption or Dual Key Encryption. What happens is you have a public key and a private key and anything that you encrypt using the private key can be decrypted with the public key and vice versa. Typically what you do is you take your private key and you make it secret so that only you can access it. Then your public key you actually advertise. You publish it in a directory or something like that. Then that can be used to digitally sign documents among other things. For example, you could send me a document. You would sign it using your private key. Then since I know your public key I can validate that signature and that tells me two things. The first thing it tells me is that since you are the only person that has access to the private key that document actually came from you or that signature was made by you. The second thing it tells me is that that document has not been modified in any way since you sent it. If it's modified by even one bit or one character or anything then that signature would not be valid. This technology can be used then to replace traditional signatures on documents.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

1/29/01 Per Mathew Rosen, first draft report is not finished.

Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Institutes**District:** Rio Hondo CCD**RFA Number:** 98-0662**Project Director:****Organization:****Address:****City:****Phone:**

Dr. Susan Obler

Rio Hondo College

3600 Workman Mill Rd.

Whittier, CA 90601-1699

562/908-3414

College: Rio Hondo College**Amount:** \$149,902**CCC Abstract:**

This one-year project will provide two institutes and follow-up activities for CEO's to understand the language and the critical issues in Information Technology. Higher education institutions are increasingly dependent upon IT systems; campus chief executives need timely information and strategies for planning and funding decisions.

The two-day institutes will include experienced leaders from public and private systems in California and nearby states. Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, an affiliate of WICHE, will contract for full services of the institutes including curricula, materials, speakers, lodging, and travel. This group currently provides high-profile summer institutes for managers of distance education programs. The institute venues are: Mills College Conference Center in Oakland and the Kellogg Conference Center in Pomona. Robert Threlkeld, CSU-Fresno, is the primary facilitator. The CEO's Advisory Committee (co-chaired by Jess Carreon, Rio Hondo and Martha Kanter, DeAnza College) will review and confirm topics of the proposed institute curriculum by phone. The institute evaluation will be conducted by Robin Zuniga, Associate Director of the award winning national Flashlight Project. An experienced team has provided input for this proposal: institute design and follow-up activities.

To continue support of CEO needs for understanding IT, the project includes a web site to house higher education IT resources: models for planning and budgeting and a password-protected Forum for on-going dialogue. Project dissemination will include audiographics conferences, now under development by the Chancellors Office. Virginia McBride, Director of the System Think Tank project will serve as facilitator. A final report will go to the Chancellors Office, to CEO's, and to interested others - in hard copy and as published on the project web site. Rio Hondo will monitor and direct the project within its scope of experience with Distance Education, including its Virtual College, CVU LA Regional Center, and the FII Flashlight Project. Project Monitor: Ding-Jo Currie, Project Director; Susan Obler, Rio Hondo.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Chief Executive Officer (CEO) InstitutesDr. Susan Obler
Rio Hondo College**Purpose**

The grants' purpose was to inform and engage some of the CEO's on the broader issues.

Problems

Support Staff

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

It was preaching to the choir kind of stuff. Probably the most critical reason that the turnout was low was that (a) its spring and (b) they had just had an all presidents meeting about three weeks before. They had seen each other quite enough I guess.

Solution**Successes**

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

Project Monitor is Dr. Ding-Jo Currie, VP of Economic and Community Development at Rio Hondo College. The Project Director will be Dr. Susan Obler, Title III and Grant Development. Dr. Obler has long experience with new technology with the leadership of Rio Hondo's Teaching-Learning Center, a precursor to the Virtual College at Rio Hondo. She most recently directed the FII grant, Flashlight on Learning: Assessing Web-Support Courses in ten California community colleges.

Rio Hondo College has demonstrated its commitment to staying in the forefront of information technology and distance education. Our three-year-old Virtual College will offer over 20 GE courses this fall. The Director, Dr. Andy Howard will soon lead the CVU LA Regional Center for support of 25 colleges' development of online courses and support systems. Rio has been the lead college on 5 consortium grants including a regional Workforce Development projects, a Title III Cooperative Arrangement, a Teaching-Learning Project among staff developers, and the Flashlight Project. Our commitment and our leadership has been consistently strong and effective in state-wide and regional initiatives. This project is no exception. A project organization chart follows.

Project Feasibility

The project is designed with program simplicity in mind: we are contracting with Western Cooperative to do the institutes, to include all materials and printing for the curriculum, all speakers, all lodging and conference space arrangements, and travel reimbursements to the attending presidents. The Project Director will see that all of this is moving forward. She will stay in weekly contact with Western, especially Dr. Threlkeld. Dr. Obler will also cover all arrangements of the Project and Institute Web site, the follow-up activities such as the audio-web conferences, and the Web Forum (or listserv if more convenient to CEOs) for continuing dialogue on topics launched at the Institutes. The small staff includes clerical help, web-site technician, and evaluation and web-audio consultants. It is a small but powerful team that will be able to succeed.

Project Dissemination & Institutionalization

The project dissemination plan is delineated in the narrative on Objective 2 and on the Workplans. The following are included:

- Following the institutes, CEO's will be invited to participate in a Web-site Forum or an email listserv to continue discussion topics reviewed at the Institute. Guest moderators such as experienced CEO's and experts from the field in both public and private sectors, will be invited to moderate for a week or more. Continuing updates will be a routine part of the exchange. This online process can be open or closed, depending on the CEO's preference. We would recommend that it be open so that more college leaders can learn from the discussion.
- After the institutes, three audio-web conferences will be scheduled in "real time" and managed by Virginia McBride, System Think Tank director. These tools are another way to collaborate and will give CEO's further practice with technology while getting updates on relevant developments. We will also invite Trustees and CIO's to participate in the third audio-web conference.
- Our curriculum materials and final report will be submitted and distributed by request; all CEO's not attending the Institutes will receive full copies.
- Project leadership, key CEO's, and invited consultants will share conference presentations where appropriate. We will ask Sherrill Amador, serving on the Project Advisory Committee and President next year of the CCC-CEO Board, to keep the Board informed on the project and to help with dissemination.

Faculty Access to Computers and Technology**District:** Hartnell CCD**RFA Number:** 97-0485-001**Project Director:** Colly Tettelbach, Executive Director Community College Education Consortium**College:** Hartnell College**Amount:** \$371,000**Organization:**

Hartnell College

Address:

156 Homestead Avenue

City:

Salinas, CA 93901-1698

Phone:(408) 755-6916

CCC Abstract:

The problem this grant application addresses is twofold: (1) the need of student populations in particular in rural and semi-rural areas to have access to low-enrollment or otherwise unavailable courses that any single community college cannot offer and (2) to create learning communities between community college faculties and students using video conferencing (PictureTel) and computer mediated instruction. This proposal allows for the intensified training of 28 faculty from 7 colleges who will serve as master teachers on their respective campuses for redesign of curricula that are competency-based and for the use of technology as an instructional tool allowing for the transformation of faculty and students to "facilitators of life-long learning".

For this purpose, seven community colleges have joined together to form the Community College Education Consortium. These colleges include Hartnell College, Butte College, College of the Siskiyous, Feather River College, West Hills College, Evergreen Valley College and Ohlone College. Partnering with the colleges in this proposal are two industries: Pacific Bell and Lucent Technologies. Through technology each college can overcome geographic isolation to offer their student constituencies a comprehensive curriculum employing the full breadth and depth of the expertise of faculty from seven community colleges. The linking of faculty and students through technology will create new learning communities and dynamic multi-sensory educational experiences unprecedented in the California Community College system. Indeed, the new generation of students anticipated to be an additional 750,000 by the year 2000 will expect nothing less than dynamic, technologically mediated instruction.*

TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Faculty Access to Computers and Technology

Colly Tettelbach, Executive Director Community College Education Consortium

Hartnell College

Purpose

The project had a twofold purpose, to prepare site preparation for the community college setting and also to provide training for 28 faculty over seven colleges.

Problems

Support Staff

Coordinating seven colleges is extremely difficult. It was important but I think that projects need to be a little bit smaller, more discrete.

The relevance for three years in the future, when you do projects they probably need to be more regional rather than spread out as far as ours was. There needs to be more collaboration and cooperation up front. A policy that would help most would be a policy on how to share courses, how to reimburse colleges, how to pay line charges. Line charges were a tremendous surprise to us and also the fact that we don't know what the line charges are which is another interesting thing. It's very difficult to get a handle on what line charges are.

Technology is not the stumbling block, it's the policies and procedures and the politics that are the stumbling blocks.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

A group of seven colleges were brought together with campus liaisons identified from each campus to discuss the needs for distance education in order to promote technology mediated instruction.

A faculty training learning center for faculty and students was established; \$20,000 was given to each of the seven participating campuses to provide site preparation to reconfigure existing videoconferencing equipment to support compatible distance learning environment between the colleges.

Four faculty members from each campus were identified as faculty participants and special workshops and written materials were given in videoconferencing and other technology mediated instruction.

Funding for travel, lodging, release time, supplies, and materials were also provided to each faculty member to be able to attend relevant conferences and other educational opportunities.

Additionally, each faculty participant received funding for computer hardware and software to establish connectivity with peers and students. Each community college received funding to establish a virtual faculty office to promote connectivity between faculty members and students in distance education courses.

The specific evaluation standards and goals that were to be achieved by the objectives of the project were that each campus be responsible for offering two distance education courses and making those courses available to other campuses. Other evaluation goals were that each campus would develop the technological facility to be able to offer distance education courses and that each campus would develop a "smart classroom" capable of supporting existing and future technologies.

The funding provided to purchase needed technology and equipment to each campus was well received and spent to promote distance education on each campus.

Coordinating seminars to be provided to all faculty members was less effective. It was more effective to provide travel and lodging to allow faculty to schedule their participation in individual conferences and seminars that best met their own needs.

Gathering data from participating colleges has been particularly problematic. Campus liaisons were busy and placed this particular project in low priority, with the results that collating reports and even expenditure summaries was a difficult process. Coordinating the schedules of the 28 faculty on seven campuses in order to offer specific seminars for all of the faculty was very difficult. Even when we scheduled videoconferenced seminars at four different locations, attendance tended to be spotty.

Plans for local institutionalization of this project include an ongoing effort on the part of the colleges involved to develop and offer technology mediated instruction, both interactive video teleconferenced courses and web-based courses. Hartnell College has developed several web-based and video conferenced courses as a part of the Medical Laboratory Technician Program. Information about this program can be obtained from the project web site at www.rhorc.com.

It is quite unwieldy to coordinate a project between seven different colleges. The personnel turnover and lack of priority given to project may make it very difficult to achieve consensus or cooperation in achieving the project goals. A recommendation would be that project of this magnitude be accomplished between two colleges rather than among seven. The campus liaisons should be permanent staff who are committed to the project for the duration of the grant. Funding should be adequate to provide the kinds of technology needed for the program.

In general, this project was a great learning experience. It has led to development of meaningful project in a variety of colleges and a more knowledgeable and technologically sophisticated faculty.

***Telecommunications Special Projects (TSP)
4CNet - Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project**

District: Butte-Glenn CCD

RFA Number: 96-0483-001

Project Director: Frederick Sherman, Ph.D.

Organization: Butte College

Address: 3536 Butte Campus Drive

City: Oroville, CA 95965

Phone: 530/895-2609

College: Butte College

Amount: \$2,644,000

CCC Abstract:

Butte College has applied to serve as the fiscal agent and coordinating body for the Chancellor's Office 4CNet Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project. The College has the skills and requisite experience to complete successfully the project and its objectives.

The goal of this project is to expand the current CSU computer network from seven to 12 nodes and allow all 106 community colleges to access this expanded system. The system, when upgraded will be renamed to the 4CNet

The objectives for Butte College are to serve as fiscal agent for the project and coordinate activities between the Chancellor's Office and 4CNet. Also we will coordinate an electronic and printed newsletter to be disseminated to users of the 4CNet system. We will also coordinate a pilot project to test the capabilities of the upgraded network backbone. The pilot project will involve two or more colleges who will use the network to transmit simultaneous video and data over the system.

Butte College will also evaluate the project for achievement of stated goals and objectives, A final report will be submitted to the Chancellor's Office as required in the RFA.*

**TMAPP Project Director Focus Interview: Telecommunications Special Projects (TSP)
4CNet - Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project**

Frederick Sherman, Ph.D.

Butte College

Purpose

Our particular TSP project was called the 4CNet – Backbone Upgrade Project and was basically a grant to do a couple things. One was to act as fiscal agent for the development of the 4CNet-Backbone so we basically worked closely with the 4CNet group out of Cal-State to make sure that they had the kind of fiscal resources they needed in order to complete the development of the 4CNet-Backbone.

The other things that we did on this grant included developing what we called a TIP newsletter. It's basically a technology newsletter that goes out to all community colleges as well as several other kinds of stake holders. We also worked on a video pilot project which was to test some video conferencing technologies and determine and make recommendations to the Chancellors office as to what the best type of video conferencing would be. So we executed that particular project and made the recommendations.

Problems

Support Staff

There are a lot of nay Sayers that do not believe the money that is being spent on technology is the best way to spend the money at this point. So there is some controversy over that issue.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

Solution

Successes

We have basically entered into a cooperative development with the Cal-State system to develop a unified video and data backbone that now connects every single community college in the state of California together on one common communication element. This was a pretty large undertaking. In fact it is now in operation, so it's not only going to effect us three years in the future as we continue to grow but it has already had an immediate effect on the ability of colleges to share information and communicate with each other.

Next Steps

Analysis of Grant Report

Objective # 1: As directed by the Chancellor, the College will finalize a Service Agreement with CSU / 4CNet to expand the 4CNet data backbone in preparation for video services. The College will then oversee the Service Agreement on behalf of the Chancellor's Office.

Major Tasks	Task Completion Date	Deliverables	Status
1. Finalize a Service Contract with CSU/4CNet and schedule appropriate payments	6-30-97 M. Wescoat-Andes	A signed contract is in place and progress payments to 4CNet are scheduled	Complete
2. Finalize the node design at CSUC for the College to access video on 4CNet backbone to support activities of video pilots	2-15-98 R. Ellsworth / 4CNet	Final Design delivered to 4CNet for implementation	Complete
3. Attend IMAC Committee Meetings	9-1-97 to 6-30-99 F. Sherman	Attendance at all meetings	Complete
4. Submit Project Midterm Progress Reports as required to the Chancellor's Office	1-31-98 7-31-98 5-10-99 A. Suleski	Completed forms are mailed to Chancellor's Office	Complete
5. Secure approval from Chancellor's Office to close out at task completion the existing 2-year service Agreement with 4CNet	6-30-99 F. Sherman	Chancellor's office approves "completion of original Contract" with 4CNet and authorizes final payment.	In-process
6. Continue to oversee 6-29-97 Service Agreement with 4CNet	6-30-99 F. Sherman	There is an orderly progression towards completion of service contract by 4CNet	In-process
7. Close out the 6-29-97 4CNet Service Agreement with a final payment on the contract	6-30-99 A. Suleski	All tasks comprising the Service Agreement are completed and the final payment is received by 4CNet	In-process

Objective #2: Publish a monthly newsletter in both printed and Web format chronicling statewide projects and issues relating to the growth of telecommunications and technology supporting California Community Colleges.

1. Hire newsletter/Web journalist	9-22-97 R. Ellsworth	New 2-year employee	Complete
2. Set design for newsletter and Web pages	10-1-97 C. Palmarini	Completed designs	Complete
3. Install 4CNet Web site at Butte College	9-8-97 S. Roberts	Hardware/software in place	Complete
4. Purchase computer and accessories as required by newsletter/Web journalist	9-22-97 R. Ellsworth	Hardware/software in place	Complete
5. Publish monthly newsletter and Web pages	10-15-97 to 6-30-99 C. Palmarini	Newsletter mailed - also Web access available	Complete
6. Develop an information network comprised of community colleges, 4CNet and others as required to solicit input for monthly newsletters and Web pages.	10-1-97 to 6-30-99 C. Palmarini	A listing of available sources for news items	Complete
7. Submit required Project Midterm Progress Reports to Chancellor's Office	1-31-98 7-31-98 5-10-99 A. Suleski	Written Report	Complete

Objective #3: Through an RFA process, the College will select two or more other community colleges to participate in a pilot study to test the impact of adding video on the 4CNet Backbone and will file a report at the end of the study. The College as a result of the study will also make recommendations for future investments.

1. Write RFA for Video Pilots	1-1-98 R. Ellsworth	Final RFA documentation	Compl
2. Sign Service Agreement with 4CNet to provide services for video pilot testing.	2-15-98 M. Wescoat-Andes	Signed Agreement	Compl
3. Contract consultant to write project evaluation			Canc
4. Release RFA to Community Colleges for video pilots	2-15-98 R. Ellsworth	Mailings	Compl
5. Evaluate responses to RFA and make awards	4-27-98 Committee	Mailing of selection notices	Com

6. Develop testing, data collection, and reporting procedures for evaluating video traffic over ISDN and the 4CNet Backbone	6-1-98 R. Ellsworth	Written Procedures	Corr
7. Conduct pilot testing - three technical events - using ISDN and the 4CNet Backbone	5-1-98 to 8-31-98 R. Ellsworth / S. Roberts	Event Completion	Corr
8. Submit required Project Midterm Progress Reports to Chancellor's Office	1-31-98 7-31-98 A. Suleski	Reports Completed	Corr
9. Conduct three Open Forum Videoconferences for discussion of a proposed CCCC CO project to implement statewide videoconferencing for Community Colleges	9-30-98 Pilot colleges, 4CNet, and the CCCC CO	Documentation of conference minutes	Corr
10. Release draft project report on video tests conducted over ISDN and the 4CNet backbone	10-30-98 R. Ellsworth / F. Sherman	Written documentation	Corr
11. Release final report on video over ISDN and on the 4CNet backbone with recommendations for future designs	11-30-98 R. Ellsworth / F. Sherman	Written documentation	Corr
12. Secure final approval from Chancellor's Office for report distribution	12-1-98 R. Ellsworth	Signed approval from project monitor at Chancellor's Office Approval received on 1-15-99	Corr
13. Secure approval from Chancellor's Office for Report cover letter	2-22-99 R. Ellsworth	Written approval from Chancellor's office Approval received on 2-26-99	Corr
14. Place final report on the Web and release a final printing to all community colleges and interested parties	3-3-99 R. Ellsworth / C. Palmarini	Mailing	Corr
15. Submit Year #2 Project Midterm Progress Report to chancellor's Office showing completion of Video Pilot Study	5-10-99 A. Suleski	Written report submitted to Chancellor's Office	Corr 5-10

Objective #4: At the expense of 4CNet and as an amendment to its existing 4CNet Service Agreement, Ric Matthews will be paid \$11,000 in consultant fees for the development of a Chancellor's Office Technology Plan II.

- | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------|
| 1. Obtain written agreement from 4CNet to reduce the agreed amount of payment under the preexisting service contract by \$11,000 | 12-31-98
F. Sherman | A written authorization is provided by 4CNet to reduce payments received under its contract with Butte College by \$11,000 | Com |
| 2. College to make payment to Ric Matthews for consultant fees up to \$11,000 | 6-30-99
F. Sherman | A \$11,000 consultant fee is delivered to Ric Matthews for completion of service contract | Com |
| 3. Submit a Project Midterm Progress Report to the Chancellor's Office exhibiting completion of activities 1 and 2. | 5-10-99
F. Sherman | A written report to the Chancellor's office | Com
5-10- |

Grant Augmentation \$151,000 (4-29-98)

Objective #5: The College will support the installation and daily operations of the Chancellor's Office video bridge by processing Chancellor's office approved payments from grant resources for 1) Chancellor's Office long distance charges in multipoint videoconferences, 2) the installation of Pac Bell PRI-T1 lines and other recurring charges, and 3) unforeseen costs associated with the video bridge software or hardware installation, Network/ISDN additions and hardware repairs not covered by existing maintenance contracts.

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------|
| 1. Place an order with Pacific Bell , directed by the Chancellor's Office, requesting installation of the required PRI lines to make the Chancellor's Office video bridge fully operational | 10-30-98
R. Ellsworth | Installation of the video bridge is complete and operational | Com |
| 2. Pay for ongoing Chancellor's Office line charges and other unforeseen changes occurring as a result of its use of its multipoint video bridge | 6-30-01
A. Suleski | All charges approved by the Chancellor's Office are paid by Butte College from grant resources | In-pr |
| 3. Submit a Project Midterm Progress Report to the Chancellor's office | 5-10-99
A. Suleski | A Midterm Report is delivered to the Chancellor's Office | Com
5-10- |

Objective #6: Progress payments are made by Butte College from grant resources as approved by the Chancellor's Office to a selected community college to conduct a series of surveys on distance education in California community Colleges that will 1) review distance education course and program development 2) assess the need and effectiveness of distance education, 3) identify the strengths and limitations of existing distance education course offerings and programs, and 4) assess the need for further development of distance education courses and programs.

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------|
| 1. Chancellor's Office will approve the contents of a Memorandum of Understanding that is to be delivered to a Chancellor's office selected community college to provide the services specified | 1-1-99
F. Sherman | A Memorandum of Understanding is completed and approved by the Chancellor's office | Com |
| 2. Coastline Community College agrees to perform the tasks outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding | 1-15-99
F. Sherman | The Memorandum of Understanding is appropriately authorized by Butte and Coastline | Com |
| 3. Analyze and report on data collected through a newly developed and circulated Institutional Survey, a Faculty Satisfaction Survey, and a Student Satisfaction Survey - each monitoring the progress of Distance Education in California Community Colleges | 1-31-2002
Coastline College | Progress Reports are received annually by the Chancellor's Office - first report is to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office on December 1, 1998 | In-pr |
| 4. Butte College will process payments from grant funds to Coastline for project expenses that are approved by the Chancellor's office | 1-31-02
A. Suleski | Payments are made as approved by the Chancellor's Office | In-pr |
| 5. Submit a Project Midterm Progress Report to the chancellor's office | 5-10-99
A. Suleski | Midterm Report is received by the Chancellor's Office | Com
5-10- |

Objective #7: Payments from grant resources are to be made to Ric Matthews for reimbursement of expenses associated with the development of a Technology Plan II for the California community College System.

- | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|-----|
| 1. Butte College will make payments from grant funds as requested by the Chancellor's Office to Ric Matthews for expenses associated with the development of a Technology II Plan | 1-1-99
A. Suleski | Payments are made as individually approved by the Chancellor's Office | Com |
|---|----------------------|---|-----|

2. Submit a project Midterm Progress Report to the Chancellor's office	5-10-99 A. Suleski	Report Submitted to Chancellor's as requested	Com 5-10-
--	-----------------------	---	--------------

Grant Augmentation \$3,200,000

Objective #8: Under the terms of a Chancellor's office specified service agreement, the College will send funds to CSU/4CNet to deliver video services over the 4CNet backbone to all California community Colleges.

1. Execute a Service Agreement with CSU/4CNet that delineates task and sets a specific schedule for progress payments	1-1-99 M. Wescoat-Andes	Agreement is reached on a service agreement	In-pr
2. The College is to make all payments on the above service contract as scheduled and as authorized by the Chancellor's Office	2-1-99 A. Suleski	All payments are made as scheduled and authorized by the Chancellor's office	In-pr
3. Submit a Project Midterm Progress Report to the Chancellor's office	5-10-99 A. Suleski	Report delivered to Chancellor's Office as requested	Com 5-10-
4. Attend IMAC Committee Meetings	6-30-01 F. Sherman	Attendance at IMAC Meetings	In-pr
5. Oversee 4CNet Service Contract for its duration	6-30-01 F. Sherman	There is continuing progression to a completion of the contract	In-pr

Objective #9: The College under the direction and advisement of the Chancellor's office will continue with the monthly publication and statewide circulation of the TIPS Newsletter (July 1, 1997 through June 30, 2001).

1. Continue to publish the TIPS Newsletter on a monthly schedule. Place each issue on the Web	6-30-01 C. Palmarini	Monthly issues of the TIPS Newsletter will be mailed and also placed on the Web	In-process
2. Purchase equipment and software to upgrade those facilities used to produce TIPS Newsletter and house Web site	8-15-99 C. Palmarini	TIPS facilities are upgraded	In-process
3. Submit a Project Midterm Report	5-10-99 A. Suleski	A report is submitted to the Chancellor's office on activity	Complete 5-10-99

4CNet - Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project

District: Foothill-De Anza CCD

RFA Number: 96-0490-001

Project Director: Ann Koda

Organization: De Anza College

Address: 21250 Stevens Creek Blvd

City: Cupertino, CA 95014-5793

Phone: 408/864-5651

College: De Anza College

Amount: \$1,034,283

CCC Abstract:

This project is designed to be a coordinated statewide response to the tremendous challenge of integrating technology into instruction to improve community college Student outcomes, expand access and reduce per student cost. This project design establishes a virtual organization in which faculty take a leadership role in the state's technology effort. This new structure will facilitate the integration of resources and expertise from community college districts, business and other segments of education to develop a training process for faculty and staff to learn how to use current hardware and software to design effective learning experiences for community college students.

A consortium team, comprised of one faculty member from each of the ten partnering community colleges, will act as staff to the project and take the lead in analysis of needs, research of bench marking models, development of a training plan and best practices criteria, and act as a website and data base interface team. CSU and UC will be called upon for planning, expertise in instructional design and coordination with the 4CNet infrastructure. The lead community colleges will become regional training sites for training trainers from other districts.

As the 4C@ ONE Center, De Anza will provide online database resources to faculty and staff regarding professional development opportunities, available courseware and products, and service providers. A highly interactive bulletin board system, listserv, FAQ and suite of chat rooms will address individual knowledge needs, allow interaction and collaboration across the system and educational segments.

An Advisory Committee, comprised of high-level industry and education representatives, will give policy direction to the project, voice to relevant constituencies and play a key role in identifying resources for continued funding of the project. Of critical importance is the final plan for continued maintenance and support, based on the collective learning of the statewide participants, to support technology-based learning and verifiable learning outcomes of community college students for the 21st century.*

4CNet - Backbone Upgrade Coordination Project

Ann Koda

De Anza College

Purpose

We are a training grant for the 60,000 faculty and staff in the State of California on effective use of technology. Since that is so broad we started out with effective use of technology in instruction. We focused on faculty first and our goal was to find ways to support faculty. We have now developed five courses which are focusing on effective use and it's not just using a Web site it is what are the components you should have in your Web site to support your instruction.

Problems

Support Staff

We're working now on developing training resources for information technology because the technical people don't have much training.

Counselors

Student Problems

Faculty Problems

We were going to initially just move them all over to the Web but the faculty said, "We don't want to be

trained on the Web. We want trainers and we want classrooms.”

the communication system in the Chancellors office system is so difficult because we’re so diverse and spread out in the colleges. We have to have a better communication system and it has to be required.

Successes

One of the most valuable outcomes has been the linkages established with other grants and segments of the California Community College system. The @ONE project has worked with Santa Barbara’s Online Curriculum Resource Center, The State Academic Senate, Virginia McBride’s System Think Tank Project, Chancellor’s Office TTAC Committee, 4C/SD, FACCC and Butte’s Telecommunication Project.

Next Steps

The @ONE project has the potential of becoming the communication and linkage center for instructional technology in the community college system. @ONE has built the infrastructure. Now the system must support and grow this resource by requiring grant projects and colleges to input their training events and relevant resources and information.

Analysis of Grant Report

What @ONE has learned:

1. There is a need for a central “meeting place” or “portal” to collect and communicate about instructional technology use and training.
2. There is a need for a wide range of skills for course development.
3. There is a need to promote and teach effective methods and pedagogy to use technology.
4. To locate and broker quality existing training may be more cost effective than development.
5. Activities most valuable to the community college system may not meet a cost recovery objective e.g. “Train the Trainer”.
6. There is a need to coordinate training efforts. One source of competition to @ONE training is free or paid training from the state funded grants.
7. There is a need to assess how technology effects student outcomes.
8. Effective use of technology has made working at a distance possible among the @ONE project team and partners.
9. Continuous change and evolution will be part of the way we work.

Appendix A
TMAPP Focus Interviews

The following Project Directors were unavailable to be interviewed:

**Dr. Robert M. Alworth, Director
Information Technology
Universal Internet Access
Online Counseling and Advisement
Los Angeles Community College District
All nine district colleges**

Dr. Alworth will send information via email but would rather not be interviewed because he barely remembers anything because it was over a year ago.

**Deborah Hudson
Strategic Technology Service Development
Ohlone College**

We left several phone messages to Deborah requesting a phone interview and also requesting an email address to send our questions to. There was no response to our messages.

**Allan Hancock College
Santa Maria, CA
Lill Clary
March 23, 2000**

Lill: This is Lill Clary, Associate Dean Learning Resources at Allan Hancock College.

Evaluator: What was the purpose of your TMAPP project?

Lill: Our TMAPP project was aimed at developing appropriate bid specifications for our campus wide fiber optic infrastructure project.

Evaluator: What was the most important thing that you learned?

Lill: That you need plenty of money to hire a consultant and everything takes longer then you ever expected.

Evaluator: That's right, so the importance of that lesson was?

Lill: Ask for more money. I think the issue for us was we had no one on campus with expertise in the area of fiber optics.

Evaluator: Where is Allan Hancock?

Lill: We are in Santa Barbara County. We're half way between Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo. It is rural agricultural area.

Evaluator: What is the relevance three years from now for this project?

Lill: Actually, we should backtrack. We finished the grant portion of the project a little over two years ago. It was the key portion of a three phase infrastructure development on our campus. Immediately after the grant project we went out to bid with the specifications we developed and have since connected up in two phases about two-thirds of our campus. So within the next three years I would guess that if funding is available we will complete the infrastructure development for the college.

Evaluator: Are there any other secondary things you learned in this process?

Lill: No. The issue for us was this was very cut and dry. We simply needed the expertise to develop the appropriate bid specs. What kind of fiber should we be using, what kind of signal splitters, etc. What kind of carry capacity should we expect? It was very much like, you need six of those and fifteen of those and it will cost you X number of dollars.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy, an electronic copy that you could send over email?

Lill: Not electronic but I did fax a copy of the important portions of the grant project materials.

Evaluator: What you think of for the California community colleges in the future?

Lill: I'd say the crying need right now is to get going with the Technology II Project which, based on what the March 13th-14th Board of Governors agenda looks like, intends to help us out with continuation of our infrastructure projects. I'm talking about on site, on campus, in the ground cable, microwave etc. to connect up our offices, services and off campus centers.

Evaluator: Is there a policy that?

Lill: When we developed the project we were asked to stay within limits of a CSU document for information technology. I don't know if that counts as policy per say or not. It was a policy promulgated by the Chancellors office before the TMAPP grant.

Evaluator: Just so that your cable fits into someone else's when you get to that point.

Lill: Exactly. What I will say though is this infrastructure will bring us, for the first time, email at every desktop on campus. I haven't had email for all that and it is allowing us to do a lot with Internet services. We have our own proxy server now and we can provide Internet services to campus and of course the force of that is development of distance learning materials. So it has ramifications well beyond just cable in the ground.

Evaluator: Are there committees forming on these topics at your institution?

Lill: Yes and no. We have a preexisting technology advisory committee and the preexisting distance learning committee. Those have existed pretty much for the same time the grant was developing. Of course now it's almost four years later.

Evaluator: So those committees are defunct now as well or no?

Lill: No. They were pre-existing committees that continue on into the future. They are basic shared governing committees to deal with issues related to instructional and institutional technology and distance learning. The grant didn't really have anything to do with the committees themselves.

Evaluator: The committees were aware of your task?

Lill: Right, and provided advisory input.

Evaluator: Are there any policies coming from the committee that would help you in your endeavor?

Lill: No, again it's not really appropriate to the topic. This was how to figure out how to build this project and very much the mechanics of creating a fiber optic system.

Evaluator: Any problems, any nay sayers, any why can't we do this?

Lill: The one issue we ran into was because we started the project in a time when instructional equipment dollars were not generous. There was concern by some participants that we should be spending the money on purchase of instructional equipment such as beakers for the chemistry lab, embalmed cats for the biology lab, that sort of thing as opposed to putting what's going to be in total almost three million dollars into a fiber optic system. I think those are the kind of concerns that are raised anytime big funding is made available. Why don't we do something else with it? In the district, the decision was the most important baseline project was fiber optics incoming. So everybody else got a little less.

Evaluator: I hear you. Any words to the wise for others embarking on a project such as yours?

Lill: Again, I know what the other TMAPPS grants were. They weren't as technology as they looked as at issues related to staff development and training and encouraging use of technology. All I could say is if you don't have the expertise on site hire appropriate consultants. Again, this is specifically relative to the fiber optics kind of activity.

Evaluator: Okay, one final question. What were some of pitfalls?

Lill: Too many committees. What we had to do was meet as committees at the outset and the problem was there.

In order to ensure shared governors' participation many constituent groups were asked to appoint members to a generic technology committee and that was not the appropriate committee to oversee this project. In fact, what we eventually developed was a director of computer services, myself, a plant services manager and a vice president of the facilities was our consultant. We developed the project materials and then simply invited

input from various other shared governors groups on campus. They didn't understand a word of the specifications. When you get to something as technical as this I think probably the better way to do it would be for a campus group to identify the need for fiber optic kinds of activities, bless the project and tell someone else to go forward with it.

Butte College
Frederick Sherman, Ph.D.
March 23, 2000

Fred: My name is Fred Sherman and the college that I work with is Butte-Glen Community College District.

Evaluator: Dr. Sherman, what was the purpose of your particular TMAPP project?

Fred: Well, first of all, we didn't have a TMAPP project. What we had was called a TSP, and don't ask me right now what the initials stand for. There were two TSP projects given out and of course a whole lot of TMAPP projects. The TSP, one went to De Anza College and the other went to Butte College.

Our particular TSP project was called the 4CNet – Backbone Upgrade Project and was basically a grant to do a couple things. One was to act as fiscal agent for the development of the 4CNet-Backbone so we basically worked closely with the 4CNet group out of Cal-State to make sure that they had the kind of fiscal resources they needed in order to complete the development of the 4CNet-Backbone.

The other things that we did on this grant included developing what we called a TIP newsletter. It's basically a technology newsletter that goes out to all community colleges as well as several other kinds of stakeholders. We also worked on a video pilot project which was to test some video conferencing technologies and determine and make recommendations to the Chancellors office as to what the best type of video conferencing would be. So we executed that particular project and made the recommendations. There have been a few others things and of course the grant continues year to year so we're called on to do other kinds of projects as well.

Evaluator: In all of these activities is there something you can point to that was the most important thing learned in the process?

Fred: Well, see, therein lies the difference between what's a TMAPP project and what's a TSP project. As a TSP project we weren't so much involved with developing new applications as we were basically putting the infrastructure in place. One exception would

obviously be the video pilot project we did and we did learn several interesting things out of that project which included the type of network that you would want to setup to do video conferencing. Specifically debunk the idea of using ISDN for a statewide network and we are now using the basic 4CNet-Backbone as the main carrier for video traffic. There were some other things that came out of that report but that was one of the main things.

Evaluator: In terms of this project, what is its relevance three years in the future?

Fred: We have basically entered into a cooperative development with the Cal-State system to develop a unified video and data backbone that now connects every single community college in the state of California together on one common communication element. This was a pretty large undertaking. In fact it is now in operation, so it's not only going to effect us three years in the future as we continue to grow but it has already had an immediate effect on the ability of colleges to share information and communicate with each other.

Evaluator: In terms of any unexpected things learned or findings?

Fred: No, I can't really say they were unexpected. The project was more of an engineering project in that you're building something rather than it being a discovery type project. I can't say really that there was anything that we were really surprised at.

Evaluator: Okay, any other valuable findings that could speak to other institutions going through this process?

Fred: Well, again there won't be any other institutions that execute this process that we're doing because we're basically providing service at this point and there is only going to be one college providing that. In other words you only need one fiscal agent to fund 4CNet-Backbone development and that's system wide. We are going to be doing some more on D-task and the other suggestion there is that if and when they decide to renew this contact, and it will come up in another year or so for renewal. You'll certainly probably want to pick a college that's close to a Cal-State University so that you could take advantage of some of the capability that exists in the IT area there for furthering the R & D.

Evaluator: Do you have an electronic form of the results of your TSP grant report to be sent over e-mail?

Fred: We have a periodic report that we send to the Chancellor's office, I think it's called a mid-term report.

Evaluator: The other question to ask is what is the future for California community colleges? Do you have any feedback on that or that's not your area of expertise?

Fred: First of all, there certainly is higher quality but it also has to do with the fact of simply providing access to more people in different places as well as improving communication and efficiency of the different kinds of administrative processes. So all these TMAPP grants and TSP grants are orientated to moving California community colleges toward that goal of getting more for your money that the legislature gives us, by becoming more efficient in the administrative processes. By having access to more students who normally wouldn't be able to attend and by increasing the quality of instruction in the classes and so this is where not only California community colleges are going but in fact is where the entire nation will be going.

Evaluator: Now in terms of your role, are you involved in any policy making for your institution or the institutions across the state?

Fred: Yes on both counts. My role here at Butte College is simply that of a chief technology officer. I basically am very involved in the policy generation having to do with the technology and specifically my role as an executive here at the college as well as having to do with policy in all other areas of the college as far as the executive counsel.

I also have a role in the statewide Chancellors office committees, particularly the technical committees having to do with setting policy there as well. The TSP project that we're involved with 4CNet-Background grant actually established Butte College as the technology center for the California community college system. In that role I've been working very closely with the development of the strategic plan for the California community college system in conjunction with representatives that come from across the system.

Evaluator: So in other words, you've been working with policy on how to combine and collaborate across all the different institutions?

Fred: Yes, it's basically a strategic technology plan that will take the community college system through the next five years. That's what we're looking at right now.

Evaluator: Is there one policy that you can think of that is most helpful in this process?

Fred: I would say it was the technology strategic plan. The nickname right now is the Technology Plan Two. It is in fact the system wide strategic technology plan.

Evaluator: On that level does that involve anything concerning shared tuition or expectation of classes?

Fred: No. It has more to do with providing resources and specifying how the infrastructure, technology infrastructure, will be built out so that it's there to support community colleges.

Evaluator: In your point of view, do you see any major problems or nay sayers saying that it's not possible?

Fred: There are certainly a lot of nay sayers in the system. Not so much that they're saying it is impossible, you'd have to talk about specific goals in that context, but there are a lot of nay sayers that do not believe the money that is being spent on technology is the best way to spend the money at this point. So there is some controversy over that issue.

Evaluator: How do you usually respond? Any words to the wise?

Fred: My response to that is you just have to look at the direction the prestigious institutions of our country, educational institutions, are going at this time. That they are starting to embrace technology and that is the direction it's going and technology is really no more than a tool that allows you to enhance quality, enhance access. It is not an overarching enemy that's going to fundamentally get rid of faculty or lower the quality of education. It's a tool and you can use a tool for good or for bad. The fact of the matter is the rest of the country is moving in this direction. This will become the norm, the standard. We won't even be asking this question five years from now because my feeling is in five years

there will be critical mass of expectations within the community college system to actually be fully implementing technology.

Evaluator: You yourself are in an important position strategically in this whole process. In your institution at Butte, is faculty asked to sit on different committees as they move toward this connected system?

Fred: In terms of committees right now we have kind of a distance learning committee that I would say are composed of the pioneers, the ten percent of faculty that want to be out there on the edge using technology. There is another committee that's composed of, well it's what we call a new running paradigm committee. It's basically a group of some of the same faculty that are very interested in looking at new ways that students learn and how we should structure or maybe change our pedagogy to accommodate the new learning styles that are out there and also to focus more on student living rather than to focus just on instructing. Those are the two committees that I think are very forward thinking at this point on our campus. They basically are probably not widely embraced across campus and they are not, let's say, a central point of focus for the faculty senate that is on campus but nonetheless these committees exist.

Evaluator: How are they sharing the information in their groups that they are working in with the rest of the faculty or the faculty senate, or are they?

Fred: They hold meetings that are open for anybody to come for starters. Of course when you do that you are going to get a few selected faculty that want to come to these things anyway. The meetings are open and lots of different folks come, they do have demonstrations from time to time on the use of technology or the use of new techniques in the classroom and those are attended somewhat sparsely, sometimes a little better than that. They will occasionally produce a newsletter or something and send that around.

Evaluator: Thank you very much for your time Dr. Sherman and good luck to you.

**Staff Development for Distance Learning Using Video
Teleconferencing Equipment
College of the Canyons
Mr. Jan K. Keller
March 10, 2000**

Evaluator: We want to make sure that the experience that the colleges have had in going through the TMAPP grants is something that then becomes reflected or is already reflected in the Technology II report. My impression of that is it sort of becomes a guideline for what they are trying to do next.

Jan: Right. I think that what I've found from just my technical staff alone, which consists of two people, that they have suddenly realized that this technology of videoconferencing has a lot of power. It's almost invasive in a way that I don't think that they anticipated before. I think that has been interesting to me. I sort of thought that when we started doing this and that's been interesting. I'm also going to be interested to see whether the interactive classroom situation ends up being replaced by on-line. I think that there is something to be said for that immediacy of the classroom. Obviously on-line you don't get it but then it's synchronous so it creates other kinds of problems.

Evaluator: I've taught on-line for over ten years. I think what you'll find is that you will end up with both.

Jan: That's true. I think that there is a lot more power in sort of a multiple approach than there is just a single one.

Evaluator: It reaches all students learning styles and the other thing is that you have limited time in the distance learning classrooms. You begin to use those for something that's really appropriate, things that you couldn't do on-line. If you just have somebody standing and lecturing put them on an audio conference. Put them someplace else. Then if you really make that a very special place to be and you have students who are able to be in there for very specific reasons you get a lot more use out of those rooms. If you just allow the talking head to occur and you just keep endorsing that it's wasted. We have to move to facilitation

so you ask instructors to do both. If they do the teleconferencing classroom, the on-line and do some work with audio conferencing as well then you get it all.

Jan: Tell me, where are you?

Evaluator: I'm in San Clemente, my company is The Education Coalition. We are working on this together with Palomar College.

Jan: Okay.

Evaluator: I'd be glad to help you any way I can with ideas and things.

Jan: That would be great.

Evaluator: Something that you might start looking at is a system called the IMS Project. It's Instructional Management System. It's www.imsproject.org. It's an international project. That is based on the idea of moving to learning objects. We start talking about the granularity of the content. It begins to work extraordinarily well for on-line programs but you can augment the on-line programs with what you are doing with the video conferencing or satellite delivery or whatever. What you end up with are multiple media. Students really like that and it gives you a lot of leeway. I'm looking at your address, too. Where is Santa Clarita?

Jan: We're 30 miles north of Los Angeles. We're across the road from Magic Mountain.

Evaluator: If I was going to put down what you found with your project, what do you think is the most important thing that we could pass on at this point to some other struggling group?

Jan: First off, I think I told you that I've been pleased at how my staff and at least one faculty have found the video conferencing technology a really powerful and very interesting idea. I suppose if nothing else, that's been important for me.

Evaluator: And the training?

Jan: Yes.

Evaluator: You really need to do that. I'm so glad to hear you say that you are doing that. Too many organizations take a teacher and put them in there without any training at all.

Jan: We sent the lead faculty reps to be our AV Tech II and we also sent a faculty member to that place in Oklahoma.

Evaluator: The Tele-training Institute?

Jan: Yes he really enjoyed it and got a lot out of it.

Evaluator: It's a good session. They do good work so that's a very positive thing. You've gotten a very good background in it then.

Jan: Yes.

Evaluator: You can trust what they told you. How do you plan on disseminating that to the rest of the organization?

Jan: What we hope to do with the mender faculty folks, once we can get them identified and get them some training, is to offer workshops during the course of a semester. There will probably be some more intensive things during the summer when more people are free. I would like people just to be comfortable if they've got a state-wide conference or even if they want to enrich their course by contacting a professor that they know at UCLA who is doing some work that they want their students to look at. I think video conferencing really lends itself to all of those kinds of things. That's the comfort level that I'm hoping for. If people can just see that it works and that their colleagues are comfortable using it that would be good. That's sort of the direction I hope that we go.

Evaluator: Have you had too many faculty members just digging in their heels and saying I'm not going there?

Jan: I think in our place we tend not to pay any attention to those people. We've doubled our faculty in the last two years. We're just growing leaps and bounds. Most of our new faculty are just so hot on the technology that it's hard to contain them.

Evaluator: That's great. You are one in a few that are experiencing that.

Jan: I think it's only because we've had this real infusion of new people. What's interesting of course is that kind of enthusiasm and sort of fearlessness that some of them exhibit has helped to bring along some of the other faculty who were not quite so sure of themselves.

Evaluator: It just takes awhile.

Jan: I remember working with an instructional technologist before Proposition 13 and it was like pulling teeth. It was horrible.

Evaluator: Is there any paper that you have created or anything?

Jan: Not a thing.

Evaluator: When are you supposed to report out on your project?

Jan: At the end of this year but as I said Chris said that we could ask for an extension and we are going to have to. The thing is that we didn't get word until after our timeline was already two months in arrears. It kind of threw everything out of whack. I haven't really had the need to really focus really carefully on the TMAPP thing and I intend to do that very soon. I'm a little concerned whether or not we are going to be able to spend all of the money.

Evaluator: I'll give you some notes on how to spend all that money.

Jan: Great. I may call you.

Evaluator: What you might want to do is take a look at our Web-site. There is a lot of information up there that you might find useful. Do you have a teaching learning model in place on campus?

Jan: No or if we do I don't know that it's called by that name and I don't know of anything off the top of my head that would match that.

Evaluator: There are not a lot of places that have it. As you move more into distance learning it becomes useful to have it because it would describe the sort of things that you have already set in place such as make sure that the faculty are trained. Don't put them in front of the cameras without this and that. We're facilitating. We're not just doing the old instructional design stuff. I don't have a teaching learning model up there right now but there is one that we just created for Johns Hopkins.

Jan: What do you call it again?

Evaluator: It's called a Teaching Learning Model. We just shorten it to TLM but it defines how your teachers work and your instructors.

Jan: I'm assuming that this is something that you don't impose but that you get your faculty to talk about and come up with themselves?

Evaluator: You can do that. Usually I start out with a generic model, which has a lot of the things in it, that I feel are appropriate. Then we talk through it. We talk about what they are doing and what they have done and opposition and support for each individual thing within it. How do things vary because of content? One of the things that is so expensive in distance learning is that every instructor wants to create their own course. On a campus like yours there might be three, five or ten instructors teaching English 101. It doesn't make any sense to have ten versions of that on-line. What you do is try to get them to come together and do a team creation of English 101 that is taught on the Internet and then any of them can use those resources. They learn from one another and they begin to think about how it works together so it's sort of an adult model. You create it and use it all at the same time. You start trying to use the Teaching Learning Model on the teachers, which is an interesting thing but it begins to work because most of the time our instructors are content experts. They are not first instructors. They have no place to learn it. If they taught at the K-12 level they haven't really gotten much either. If you are a content person the chances that you've gone to a school of education is nada to zip. Most of them teach the way they were taught or they teach according to what their own learning style is. If your learning style and your teacher's learning style don't mesh then you don't learn anything or it becomes six times as difficult for you to learn something. What we try to do as we create the new classroom is try not to bring in the old classroom and put it on video conferencing. It wasn't working in the first place so why support it so expensively in the second place. Another thing is to train students and help students understand how to learn in these new learning environments because they don't have a clue. They feel very unsupported and very isolated particularly if the only contact that they have with the campus is through distance learning. If they come to campus for other courses then they won't feel that as much. There's a lot to it. I need to get going. I appreciate your time.

Jan: Well thank you and I may give you a call. I really enjoyed talking with you.

Evaluator: Well, do that and anything that you commit to paper, would you just send me a copy as well?

Jan: Yes I will.

Evaluator: Are you going to the Mega Conference?

Jan: I don't think so. After going to Tech Ed I just thought I couldn't deal with the time away.

Chabot Las Pintas Community College
Linda Lucas, Ph.D.
March 23, 2000

Evaluator: How's everything going on the campus? Has there been more of a build out in the buildings?

Linda: Well, we built the library building six years ago. Then we built the science building. This is probably our third year in the building. We went in mid-year. We can't do anymore unless we get some State funding or unless we pass a bond. I don't know which is likely to happen first.

Evaluator: Do you think it is something that will happen?

Linda: Eventually. I certainly wouldn't bet on it happening in the next two years. I know that they are talking about going for a bond election locally, and I would be very surprised if it passed, unless they can separate us off somehow from the rest of our district.

Evaluator: That is unlikely. That would probably be awfully hard to do, wouldn't it?

Linda: Well it has been hard to do in the past so I don't really know. It won't be an issue that I deal with because I am planning on retiring this summer.

Evaluator: What is the TMAPP grant that you all have? When did it begin?

Linda: Actually, I think we got the letter finally funding it about the middle of September.

Evaluator: Okay, so you are a brand new one too. Yours begins with the 98 number on it.

Linda: You know I don't have a clue. I think it is a 98. As soon as we got it funded, I hired a couple people to help me with it and put it out of my mind.

Evaluator: Good, are you still listed as the project director on it?

Linda: Yes.

Evaluator: I thought you were. What was the purpose of the grant then?

Linda: It was to develop a little staff development training world where equipment like a new computer scanner, projection equipment, software that is appropriate to that and then a substantial amount of money for trainer time so that we could do training for classified faculty in particular and anybody else who came along for the

ride. So it is a six station training center. We are using it really quite heavily. I have been very pleased with it. I think we finally got all of it in place probably the first of December when we started offering some of the workshops. We have been offering them two to three times per week since then actually.

Evaluator: Is each workshop a couple of hours long?

Linda: Usually they are two hours and then a little bit of time left after that for questions. We did one a week ago Saturday for adjunct faculty that was scheduled for two hours and went three and one-half because they got turned on to it. We have put everybody on e-mail here whether they are adjunct faculty or not. In order to use the e-mail, it is a system that you can access from home through the web, but it acts differently on a web-based environment than it does from a client-based environment. Therefore, the adjunct faculty particularly were having problems dealing with it and trying to figure out how to make use of it because it is group-wise and it is not as robust as a web server version as a client version.

Evaluator: I used to have that too. I always had trouble with it working on my Mac too.

Linda: I didn't have any trouble with my Mac. I have a Mac and a PC on my desk and I had less trouble actually when it was in the Mac version.

Evaluator: I think what it was when I was working for West Ed. That was the system they had there. They had set a Gateway on it so you could not pass more than five megabytes or something.

Linda: Yes that would be a real pain.

Evaluator: Yes, here you are, a research institution and I mean if it were less than five megabytes you probably wouldn't work there. How many trainers did you hire?

Linda: We are doing them all as professional experts, so I think, altogether we have used five or six. Initially we had predicted using three or four. We have very skilled trainers available to us because we have been doing some more things with some of the stuff, development money with TTIPP. We sort of combined everybody's staff development training and took a look at it and we are doing some of it through a TMAPP grant that is being done by our PDC full-time person. We are doing additional ones with his part-time assistant and then using some outside trainers for the others, both as TMAPP and as TTIPP. We just put out a list of

TMAPP workshops maybe two weeks ago. I think there were 14 workshops on it. It is a very active workshop. We are paying \$50.00 per hour to the trainers. I would like to be paying them \$75.00 because I think that is closer to the going rate, but they seem to be willing to do it since most of them are local and get repeat gigs sometimes.

Evaluator: That does make a difference.

Linda: I think we are paying them for an hour of set up, an hour of planning and then two hours onsite. So I think they are getting \$150.00 each time.

Evaluator: That's a good fee. It makes it work going out the door. How many full-time? It sounds like maybe two to three.

Linda: The equivalent?

Evaluator: Yes, the equivalent.

Linda: Oh, no it is not that high, because even with 14 of them, if you figure that is over a two to three week period, that is probably 70% of one position. Besides, one person couldn't do it because of the specializations of what they are teaching.

Evaluator: Exactly, and I think you always put in more time than you would if you were full-time on something special like that because you want to make sure you have done a really superb job.

Linda: We are paying our staff development person, a coordinator, out of the TTIPP funding. It may be out of the staff development funding; I can't remember which pot it comes out of. She has been a trainer for 15 years. She brings a lot of those skills. At the same time, she is one of our adjunct faculty in computing information systems. She has been coordinating a lot of this and then we hired a clerk to actually manage my part of the TMAPP so that I didn't have to do anything. She is a woman who worked for me for several years in a different capacity here at the college and had retired. We are paying her actually only \$10.00 per hour as a college clerk to do this. She is actually acting as sort of the administrative coordinator for TTIPP and TMAPP staff development and then working with Levonne who is the coordinator for staff development as well as the faculty member. So it has been a wonderful experience for me because I have had to do nothing except enjoy the fruits.

Evaluator: Isn't that great!

Linda: Twenty-five thousand dollars doesn't go very far.

Evaluator: What was the total grant?

Linda: Yes. I think we had \$6,000.00 of that for trainers. What we really wanted was an opportunity to do a training session practically at the drop of a hat when the need arose.

Evaluator: That is a wonderful concept. If you were going to recommend this to other colleges, a small amount of money, how would you suggest that they go about doing it if they didn't have a grant?

Linda: Well, they have to have a commitment to the concept first. We needed the space. Our biggest problem was we had the intent to do these things, but we really didn't have a viable space. We had a professional development center but it had gotten so busy developing faculty materials to use within the instructional program that it was never available to us as a training site. By having this room dedicated as a training site anytime we needed to use it, but open to adjunct faculty or anyone else to use the computers in there if we weren't using it for training, it fit two needs for us. That space was almost more critical than anything else.

Evaluator: How big a space was it anyway?

Linda: It is one of our smaller conference rooms actually. It is only barely big enough to put six computers in. It would be better if it were twice the size that it is. I don't think it is more than 16 feet one way by 12 the other.

Evaluator: Because it is so small and you can't enlarge it, then the chance of putting too many people in there so you are able to get really good one-on-one participation with the instructor and the teacher/trainer.

Linda: Yes. We had predicted we would put six to twelve, with two to a computer. We have not done that. We have been able to do that with just six. That works very well. A six-to-one ration is a very intensive training and it works very well.

Evaluator: What are the courses covering? E-mail?

Linda: They are covering both versions of our e-mail system, the web version and the client version. They are covering anything that is in the office sweet. We

have done those multiple times and multiple levels of them. For the secretaries, for instance, I think we did three different versions of Excel. We focused on individual concepts within Word of Mail Merge or something like that. We did some intensive work with people on those. It has been primarily in that arena. We haven't gone very far from that yet because that is where our primary need is so far.

Evaluator: Okay, so it is primarily to administrative uses of the technology.

Linda: Right, and faculty use of technology to create some basic instructional materials.

Evaluator: When you say basic, what are you thinking about Linda?

Linda: Well, the things like the syllabuses or class assignments that they want the students to use the Web to go out and locate things. They can create the material. They can learn how to make hot links within a program. That is supplemented by the PDC where they are actually learning to use the server that is similar to Web CT and then the faculty can put those skills together. They can learn to scan in the PDC because that is part of their system of workshops. We haven't offered a scanning workshop within ours because we already had it available in a different setting.

Evaluator: The teachers who are taking it really gave traditional face-to-face classes that they are using the web in these materials they are developing to enhance or augment? Are they actually doing any web-based courses? Is there a part where the students are collaborating or having discussion online?

Linda: They can do it easily with ETUDES. Some of them are and some of them aren't. In our classrooms here, I think we have 52 of them now, all but about four have Internet access into them now. Two more of those will get it over the spring break that is coming up. Our goal is to have all of them have it. I think of those, 35 of them have computers with data projectors in them. We have invested very heavily. The thing that is holding us up frankly is that when the last state funding for TTIPP came out, they insisted that we go with Foresee Net. It is so much slower than the service we already had.

Evaluator: Interesting. How much slower is it?

is to the student, what is there, what the statistics mean. Sometimes it is animation. There is a lot of science material out there for instance that they can access easily that way. Some of the faculty have actually downloaded the links onto their own site. They just open their own site and click on it.

Evaluator: Sort of a bookmark kind of thing?

Linda: Yes.

Evaluator: As far as the TMAPP then, any pitfalls that you ran into? Any warnings that you would want to share?

Linda: The only pitfall that I ran into was their incredibly short time to get that application in. We knew about it seven days.

Evaluator: You're kidding.

Linda: As a result, I think there is only seven projects statewide.

Evaluator: You mean from this last round?

Linda: Yes. I think we heard about it maybe a week before school was out and it was due the Friday after school was out last year.

Evaluator: I think Palomar knew about it a lot longer.

Linda: They may have had one the year before.

Evaluator: Yes, they have had a number of TMAPP's and Palomar is the one that got the CSAT as well. They are talking to the office there probably more than most people would need to simply because of that.

Linda: We don't have anybody designated as a grant writer.

Evaluator: That makes a big difference, following that up.

Linda: It took me, with two secretaries helping me, the better part of three days to put the grant together. It made it with five minutes to spare.

Evaluator: You should have asked for \$200,000.00 Linda!

Linda: No. It is a nice grant. I have no qualms about getting the money. I think it has been well used for us. I think it will make a difference that is longer term than just this year. That is what I was hoping it would do.

Evaluator: I do to. How many teachers do you think have gone through some sort of training now? Have you got any idea yet?

Linda: You know, I don't. I would have to ask somebody else because since we mix up the staff development, TTIPP, TMAPP and PDC training, I am not sure I could separate out the TMAPP piece of it. As far as using the room, I would guess with had four or five workshops a week with probably an average of three participants for the last 10 weeks. It has made a substantial difference. Our adjunct faculty and our classified staff have been the primary participants so far. Our full-time faculty have had a lot more exposure through flex days and other things in other settings.

Evaluator: Do you have any sort of an assessment you set up to determine the impact? I mean, that is a very small grant.

Linda: No.

Evaluator: Just the general technology throughout the campus.

Linda: No.

Evaluator: Are you doing a lot of distance learning at this point?

Linda: We are doing some. Dr. Koda would like us to be doing an online degree with everything locally produced and I don't think I have gotten it through her head yet that that is an extraordinarily expensive undertaking. You have to have a lot more support staff to do it as well as a facility where you can develop some materials. We have been participating in the California Virtual Campus Initiative. That is probably where we are going to get most of it. We have had three classes developed locally and they are all working. One of them is working less well than the other two. I think they all have potential to work very well. Other than that, we are doing telecourses or straight telecourses.

Evaluator: What are you using, Web TV?

Linda: No we are using ETUDES. It is so intuitive for teachers.

Evaluator: I am going to have to go look at it. Can I access it?

Linda: If you access our Web site and then go to either Faculty Resources or Distance Education, I believe is the link, then from there Scott has some tutorials on it. We are looking at Web CT only because that is what CVC is using along with ETUDES. If we have to pay a separate license, it is probably a toss up which

way we will go. ETUDES has the great advantage of being able to be taught to a faculty member, how to make use of it within an hour.

Evaluator: That is great. That is substantial.

Linda: That is where the Etudes comes from – Easy To Use Distance Education Server. It was developed by Michael Losceff who was at Foothill at the time. I think he has gone off on his own now. Etudes is out there on the Web site too. I think you can access it. They are quite anxious to work with other companies. They have been going out in the industry now to use it in that setting. Web CT may have an advantage to us because it talks to Banner. Michael is working on that with ETUDES. Then we could actually download our class list with our students intact into an ETUDES file and then manage it that way and file the grades that way.

Evaluator: Banner?

Linda: Banner is our administrative software.

Evaluator: Okay, some of the TMAPP projects worked on administrative software in articulation of transcripts from high schools through the community college through to a CSU. There has been a lot of work on that and that is a nightmare.

Linda: We went for a grant for probably \$90,000.00 to put video conferencing equipment at each of the local high schools so that we could do counseling. There was a technician working on it that said that is the last time he would ever suggest anything that dumb. The problem is the high schools don't have the support staff. Even though they have a lot of technology, they don't see it as their advantage to have us have our counselors talk to their students.

Evaluator: Yes, they want their counselors to talk to their students.

Linda: Not only that, in many cases they don't even have counselors. There is nobody even to facilitate it.

Evaluator: We are putting together an advisory committee that, you know I was thinking about having some presidents on it and those who are very interested in trying to do distance learning. We haven't made any of these contacts yet. We have just been putting together these groups of people. I'd ask you to be on it, but since you are retiring I won't. When is your final report due for the TMAPP?

Linda: Well, we were supposed to have an interim report in December. We never go any forms, we never heard hi-ho, and we never heard anything from the state. I have no clue. I think the project ends June 30 and the report is due within 30 days.

Evaluator: Okay, well since you are almost done with it, are there are reports or internal reports or anything you have that I might get my hands on to just read?

Linda: I doubt we have done anything yet. I think all I asked the clerk to do was to keep track very carefully of everything and to evaluate everything as we went. We have a standard evaluation form that we use on all of our staff development anyway. She is supposed to be maintaining that. I don't think we have anything else.

Evaluator: Would that be more like a database at this point?

Linda: I suspect it is a handwritten file in a file. It will turn into statistics when we get done. It might have things like the promotional materials announcing the workshops. Would that be helpful?

Evaluator: Yes that would be very helpful to see what I am doing. I am building a file on each one of the grants and trying to understand how do we learn from your experience and how does that become part of the bigger picture. I think the coaching, the ongoing workplace to go be with people, and so forth is a very useful concept for most places and doing something on a small level is something that we don't normally do. That is why I think it is a very important concept. With \$25,000.00 look at the people you have reached. Look at the change you have been able to make because of that small amount of money.

Linda: Well, we also used the money in a way that maximized other grant money. That was part of the initial hop to. We didn't say to people this is TMAPP, not the same as TTIPP and you can't mix the two. We have tried to make it sort of a seamless staff development program for the people in the institution, even though it comes out with TMAPP on the top of the page, or staff development or whatever.

Evaluator: Just sent me the URL report.

Linda: Okay, great. I'll see what we've got and I'll see if we can get Joan to send it off to you. She comes in a couple of days a week, so it is possible she is not

Coastline Community College
Rendell Drew and Cheryl Chapman
April 4, 2000

Evaluator: This is Rendell and Cheryl. You did the online student services center?

Rendell: Correct.

Evaluator: Why don't you just talk me through it?

Rendell: Basically as it states there in the Fall of 1997, Coastline received a two-year grant to develop an online student services center. The goal of the grant was to take all of our information from our publications, our career transfer guide, parts of our schedule, parts of our catalog and put it into a virtual environment. This is where Cheryl Chapman came in and played a key role as the faculty trainer and hired professional expert for the project.

As outlined for you here on paper, the college and services developed there, we did create the Web site shell. We did the online registration forms and the Web based career transfer guide. We took our student education plans and the registration application form and put all that into a virtual environment, created the fields and it's really developed to a point to where it's ready to go. However, some of the current problems are that whatever system we developed could not communicate with our MIS system, with the Coast Community College District. The district is currently in the process of developing and implementing a new MIS system referred to as a PNI system. It's Protocol National Institute or something.

Cheryl: Basically they are from England and they are doing a pilot project with our district. I think the bottom line is that it's pretty much an Access database fact end kind of thing. We found out that the registration form and student education plan fit right into them because it is done in Access and Colt V. That will work once they get online. At least we hope so.

Rendell: Once again, Cheryl was responsible to a great extent in doing as much as we conceptualized what we wanted to do. That's where her expertise came in and she developed, after we identified what we wanted to do and what our counseling group who are the primary focus group for this thing as well as the students but we developed the

frequently asked questions that are posted on the site. Eventually our plans are to create a link to the existing main Web page of the college to this and we have to buy a new Pentium 450 application server to do the project.

Cheryl:

I think the unique thing about the whole grant was the fact that the counselors were involved from day one. They are actually the ones who created the content and went in and actually storyboarded them, the whole thing. You know, let them be involved and find out what they do from day to day so that we could find out what the virtual environment would mean for them. Of course there was a lot of training. They weren't all on email yet. So we've got them now, I think 99.9 percent of them are emailing.

The other fun part of the grant was doing the virtual streaming technology of having a counselor actually be able to use either a video phone and or a camera and the technology to stream themselves to the other centers. There is a setup there.

Rendell:

The Sheriffs Department.

Cheryl:

The other part of it is the archived materials. Orientation videos that Rendell has done from the actual sessions for orientation and some of them that were put together and scripted. Those will be available so that a student will be able to figure out what they need to do, to either register or the whole process.

Cheryl:

Well you're familiar with real audio and video right?

Evaluator:

Yes.

Cheryl:

Well it actually is still a streamed file when it's delivered but it's archived. Then you can actually add the time also available for those who don't have it.

Rendell:

Also what Cheryl is kind of talking about is what we learned early on. It is that you have got to create a site that is user friendly and that has as much animation and is moving and easy to use. Stuff that will be captivating for the counselor as well as the student and the general public who go to it. I think we've accomplished that goal.

Cheryl:

Now we're going to change it all because a lot of it should be incorporated into the Web site of the college office of financial aid information. The key is maintenance and we're not responsible either as a project or as his department to maintain financial aid or

scheduling so we'll brand that off. We're trying to build a hierarchy for the student to come and say am I new or am I returning and give them a path on the Web site until they actually need to contact a counselor, either personally or virtually. The email schedule has been better and they're coming to terms with one calendar for all of the counselors so that they can decide who is available and who isn't.

Evaluator: A floor line schedule so the student can look at it?

Cheryl: Right or we could direct the student into which area maybe. However your counselors are divided into their specialty area, that kind of thing. If you think of a student and you are one when you see your doctor when you need this information right now, the first that they are trained to do is search. So that would be a really important part to include first off but also to train them on how to use the Web site.

Rendell: That is very important. One thing too that we found out is by using professional experts we were able to move this project much better as opposed to just using internal people and the resources and say okay well find ten or twenty hours out of your busy schedule to develop this site. It just worked better for us and that's one of the lessons learned on the back page that we listed out there for you. In addition to, I think Cheryl already hit on that, you've got to get the buy-in and the counselor with the primary group that we got the buy-in, but you also need it from the top. From your presidents, from the CSSO's on down because if they don't buy in to the concept you're not going to get very far.

One of the other major stumbling blocks is electronic signatures. It continues to be an issue and you may be aware that the Department of Finance has now passed legislation for community colleges and districts to use the electronic signatures but it takes a whole special software packet. It has to be done a certain way. You can't deviate from that.

Evaluator: Well there was a TMAPP or a couple of TMAPP grants that worked on that. Have you talked with them?

Rendell: No I haven't. What colleges were they?

Evaluator: I would have to look them up to know who they are.

Cheryl: I think that Joyce Arntson had done a little bit on intellectual copyright and I think she did a little on electronic signature but I'm not sure where that ended up.

Evaluator: There was one huge program that did nothing but look at the electronic signatures.

Cheryl: Oh, one that just finished?

Evaluator: Yes, I think they have. That's one of the things that we hope to be able to do with this grant. The real idea is letting people know how that all worked together. They just did summaries of all of this stuff.

Rendell: I'd like to throw one other thing in and speaking in a general sense, one thing that we find and one thing that's being talked about at the state level especially at the academic senate are two issues. How do you distinguish between virtual counseling versus advisement services? When is it counseling, when is it advisement? Obviously we don't have the parameters quite set for that yet because we were the first ones to develop this kind of a site and now it brings up all these new issues.

Evaluator: What do you think they're in?

Rendell: I don't know what those exact distinguishing factors would be yet other than to say this. Number one, to a large extent it is online advisement and we learned early on in our presentation that we had better say if we using counseling, we'd better say counseling/advisement. Every time we make a presentation and there are counselors in the group we'd have a major confrontation. It is issues of confidentiality, arms length. I really think to a great extent it is advising. With advising, just like my guidance staff, if someone was to call Coastline College and say I heard your commercial or I see your ad and I want to get enrolled in an AA degree or certificate, can you tell me about it? My guidance staff would be able to tell them okay on page whatever of your catalog in order to get a certificate in purchasing you must complete X number of courses and so on and before you do that you must make an appointment to see a counselor, take the advisement English and math placement tests, etc.

So that to me is advising. Where the counseling aspect comes in is when the counselors come online. Cheryl has already explained that we created the emails on each counselor's template that has their name, background and area of specialty because once again we're trying to make it accessible. Once that link is made if a student comes here from the Web site they can email the counselor, they can call but that is where the counseling actually takes place.

Cheryl:

It's like anything else, if a counselor answers one question 15 times a day, if you give them one direction or even if the phone system now says, if you have a question about so on and so forth, visit our Web site. Many of those questions are taken out of the realm and the counselor has more time to spend doing what they do best. Also, them developing frequently asked questions helped a lot and I think it will promote the student to become more independent and more proactive instead of just saying okay counselor tell me what to do.

I think another important issue is their self-testing. On that Web site we can ask them a few different questions about which way they want to go.

Rendell:

With the onslaught of these new projects, there are other issues I think that really have to come to the forefront. For example, how do you create generic applications? That was being talked about up until last year at the state level and I haven't heard anything else on it. How do you develop statewide generic online applications? That's going to be very important should these projects continue to develop and move forward.

Evaluator:

When you say an application you mean?

Rendell:

A generic online application, registration application. That is what I'm saying.

Cheryl:

A lot of students are confused. Even in my classes they'll say why do I have to fill this out again, you know I'm here or I'm a returning student. I tell them you still have to fill this out and just check the return box.

Rendell:

Do you have any nutshells for us?

Evaluator:

I guess the next step is to ask is this all in place already?

Cheryl: No, we just finished the grant this past semester so by the time we get the registration form, the student education plan will have to wait until their system is up totally in the district. What we're doing right now is revising the Web site with the counselors and making sure all the information is updated because it was a model and then linking it to the main Web site so students will use it.

We failed to mention that Coastline has had distance education for 25 years.

Evaluator: I do know that.

Cheryl: The military students who were in need of this the most were using the bits and pieces of it via the distance learning department and yet the Dean there is able to use some of the elements such as the registration form or a product of it.

Rendell: It's at the general matriculation and students services information center that's there.

Cheryl: Right, and because it's a little unique in that the military credits are exchanged and all that they have been able to use part of it and of course they are the ones that are totally at a distance. They can't come.

Rendell: One other aspect that I think we should mention is that the grant required us to translate the information, portions of the information into Spanish and Vietnamese. We've also done that on the site. The address of the site is Vcs.ccc.cccd.vbu/osscc.

Evaluator: I'll have a look at that. The idea behind all the TMAPP grants was that you would develop things specifically for some of your needs as far as would be able to raise to a higher system level, so how do you see this articulating it's way up there?

Rendell: Well the way I see it articulating itself up the ladder is by doing the exact things that we are doing here. By making presentations at conferences, by helping to be some of the forerunners in giving some of the foresight and information based on some of the lessons learned on the project that we developed here. Also to apply for additional monies and grants as a continuation of this because where we're at and where we were, in addition to what Cheryl told you that we're in the process of revising and making it more of an orientation piece, we need more money. The problem with these grants is that once the

money runs out the institute has to pick it up and sometimes the institution is not in a position to do that.

So my recommendation that I would like to make is that, for example on this grant once again an eighty thousand dollar two year grant, there could potentially be some supplemental funding in that third year should the requirements of the grant be developed and it is a success. I think that there should be a contingency type funding that is built in. I don't know how that could work with the state Chancellors model of funding but I'm throwing it out there.

Cheryl:

Statewide everyone is going to need student services, everyone is going to need components of it. What made this model perhaps is the fact that the counselors are included in the beginning, the fact that they create the content and that there is a difference made upfront of advisement and counseling. Also that if your student is truly distant, you cannot touch them and you cannot bring them next to you, so what is the best way to deal with that and we've just shown some technologies that are possible and hybrids thereof. The other challenge is that the colleges themselves do have some infrastructure for Web sites period. You know, that these staff members or programmers or designers are built in and that each department is going to need someone who can update and maintain that information.

Evaluator:

The other thing was one site for counseling throughout the state or to actually call it advisement. I mean if you called it advisement to begin with.

Rendell:

In a real practical sense that would be real hard to have.

Cheryl:

No, I know what she is saying, like a portal informational site because each college would be a little different.

Evaluator:

Each would be a little different but there are still more similarities.

Rendell:

That is true.

Evaluator:

The cost of doing this at every college is prohibitive.

Cheryl: You're right and I think the key there though is things like financial aid until the state does have more continuity of some of those issues then we have to start small. I think starting small is good at least if you have one place for the student to go.

Evaluator: Kathy had come over to talk to you because I think that your two TMAPP grants are the prime ones that worked on this area.

Cheryl: We present tomorrow together.

Evaluator: Do you? I wish we were going to be here for it.

Rendell: I wish you could too because we're doing it with Larry Miller and Kathleen and one other college.

Cheryl: Maria Wong. I forget where she's from though.

Evaluator: They did such a wonderful job of giving us all the information.

Rendell: Is this helpful for your project?

Evaluator: Yes, we're doing national and international, looking at delivery systems and then figuring out how all that is going to work together. Eventually what we want to do is to select a number of models or probably it will be one overall R2 model and then a bunch of variable actions if you will underneath because not size does fit all.

Cheryl: She's from American River College. Maria Wang.

Evaluator: So the idea is that we would try to do some simulation things and figure out how all of this will work together. That is the basis of the TMAPP and it's been three years worth of working on things.

on our existing matriculation assessment English and Math tests. I had been calling the second party providers to alert them that I was going to do this and no one responded so I went ahead and put it on and then I called them up. Secretaries only took the information because they wouldn't address me. One of them was the college board of New York. By the time I got home, and it was late at night about 10:00, at 10:30 this fellow from UC San Diego that owned the MDVP math test, had called me up and called me several expletives. He threatened to sue me and I said look I have been trying to reach you for weeks and you would not respond. I gave the secretaries information that I wanted to talk with you about putting this assessment test online.

Well, basically he was in shock, he also admitted they were selling this test to other states. They had been given a grant by the Chancellors office to put this test together. They were specifically not supposed to sell it. It had become the states property. What I discovered was that UC San Diego was using this to fund their own programs because those of us who use this test spend about \$1200.00 a year just for the license and they're supposed to do the background research. Well, of course, you know what's going on there. The College Board was much nicer but they also told me to immediately take it off the Web.

I did it for a purpose to alert people that I'm going ahead with this and to put second party test people online on notice that what I want in my edition is a pretest for California Community Colleges that is validated by ourselves because we already do that. I wrote Ed Bradley at 60 Minutes and said look, this is a 60 Minutes story about big corporations that are under the disguise of academic support services and that they've done none of the background research. This was born out the year later with the assessment work group. These are second party people, you know College Board, I mean ETN. It's been around for years and had no backup information to validate us. They were all put on notice that they had to use this money that they'd been squeezing out of these colleges for years to actually do some of this research. That they couldn't just go to Dwight, Iowa where all these students are that they could pay to take a test and then retake it seven

months later. They had to take it with minority groups who don't like taking tests, especially taking it again even for money.

So I put them on notice as well and they admitted to me that they had never thought about putting it on the Web and were developing a CD version that's the computerized ISMA test. I said yes, I know because you're going to squeeze ten dollars out of a college to give the rights to students to take the test.

Evaluator: Ten dollars a head?

Tim: Yes, that's what they're getting for the computerized placement test. It's nonsense. So there is the assessment part and I have several – have you gone into the Web site?

Evaluator: No.

Tim: You must do this. It's www.virtualmatriculation.com. So then, I have a timed math test and an untimed English test so that people can see one or the other. In addition, we have an online orientation that Jan Paulsen, who used to be the MIS Vice Chancellor at a college, considers this as an orientation and that pulls a MIS flag down. We get counts for students who go through orientation. A student goes through our orientation and that pulls down a MIS flag. Prior to that they've gone and taken their assessment test, they've been given a password, that is the current security that we have, and then they're given a placement on what the test would indicate and our background research indicates of what English and math. They're told that won't upload into our operating system until they have discussed this placement with a counselor or an advisor. We want them to go through our orientation so they click on Orientation and this contains all the information basically from the catalog but it also has links to the Department of Interior has a number of career tests, these are all creatively put on there.

They have CD's that students are asked to buy at other colleges, called Student Success. All they've done is take these links and put them on a CD. Well the whole thing is just a ruse. Anyway after they've completed the orientation then they can click to find out the schedule for our advising. Right now, we change this constantly because we work with

each high school, if you went in there now I don't think that we have this weeks advising schedule on yet but we'll have it on Monday. We tailor these orientations to fit the high school. We put big banners up saying, welcome El Cerrito Gouchos. When the students go into that in their computer labs they see a Web site that's customized for them for that day. Oh, they just love it.

Evaluator: I bet they do.

Tim: Then we go into talking with a counselor and an advisor. Those are at set times and they're done, we can take up to 200. We have had 200. I used to work up in the Yukon in Canada setting up an Athebaskin education system and this is just perfect for distance learning situations, of extreme distance and extreme weather conditions because Eskimos and Athebaskins way up in the north were coming in to our site. Then I had a counselor from the Education Institute in the Yukon and I was down at Contra Costa College way down in California and I was facilitating a discussion with Athebaskin Indians. It was 60 below and they wanted to find out when they could come for an onsite check of this Athebaskin Indian Institute at White Horse, which was about 300 miles away. Incidentally this whole thing is put together by student programmers.

Evaluator: Oh, how wonderful.

Tim: Oh, it's incredible. The main programmer just got a job this last week because he's finished with his AA degree. He is from Nicaragua, had fled with Sandanistas, swam across the Rio Grande, he has a baby now and he walked into a \$60,000 job in Stockton. His first job!

Evaluator: What a story, it's incredible.

Tim: The Web master is still taking DSL. He's from Michigan and the other programmer is from the Philippines. That's the kind of college this is. They have learned how to do ASP, on their Web site it's in ASP, which is the latest, we do CTI, applications. They work right with me at the district for district research. The Chancellor knows them. They are not wonder kids and every one of the colleges has these students they just don't go asking. So anyway that is basically it. Really this was a grant to get PictureTel out into the high

schools. I don't see much future for PictureTel because it's only good on talking one to one. If you have a classroom, at least the technology that we bought at least a year and a half ago, you get all this. You know it's not appropriate and students in the mean time, the cost in making sure that you've got someone from your campus on the other side it's just prohibitive for colleges that don't have that much money.

The Internet is so easy, and these students don't demand to see what you look like. So, yes, I had to go spend \$19,000 just to buy the stupid DataTel stuff and it's ancillary to this. Yes we have it out in the high schools and yes we use it for all kinds of demonstrations but the real nuts and bolts of this TMAPP is the online service. Some other interesting features to this is several corporations found our site, word of mouth is incredible, but we're also linked on search engines. These are major corporations that are in the process of developing their own training programs. They are bypassing the community colleges for the simple reason that people just don't get it.

You can probably tell my character is pretty straightforward. I've had what we call hating counselors, when I've done demonstrations these old farts sit up there and holler how sure are you of the person who's taking the assessment test or nothing replaces a one on one counselor and I know there still using advisors. Or they'll ask what constitutes a load factor and it goes on with these hating counselors and I won't present this anymore. I am now tuned into the bypass. There is a technology bypass and we need to bring that out. I'm working with corporations that don't use counselors and what they want is what I have which is the student services process, they want an assessment test. These counselors have gotten right in my face and gotten personal with me. I could take you arm in arm and I would go around this conference, I would point to the nasty looks that I get from some of these counselors. My name is well known and I'll be sitting next to somebody and they say, "oh yes, there's that crazy guy with that online stuff." So the magnitude of this is that the corporations have bypassed. Chevron has their own and it's called Chevron University.

Evaluator:

Yes, there are so many corporate universities.

Tim: What is so sad is that this could be such a new realm for counselors to get into and yet they have personalized this as I have a personal affront to rid them of their jobs.

Evaluator: The same way that many faculty have reacted to distance learning courses.

Tim: There are some other things that enter into this foray. It's that still these community colleges are dying. If you look at the numbers over the years and if you take those community colleges that are in quote, growth areas, they are actually declining because if you do a Vectra analysis of the amount of people moving in and new housing you're still not gaining any students.

Evaluator: Really? Even in Contra Costa, Los Casitas?

Tim: Well they are thinking about adding a new facility there but why build a college five miles from Los Casitas? Especially when my college is doing everything it can just to maintain regular enrollment.

One thing is that curriculum is wrong, eighteen weeks has got to stop for most of these courses. It's way too long for learning technology that can get our students jobs. Our students are in need of repair that's for sure. They don't come to community college unless they basically are in need of some kind of repair. They need a job first. We've got the social outcast, the academic outcast.

In my area the street economy is really running the college. I've written a paper, I'm an anthropologist by profession, and I've proven it to myself that the drug economy really rules who is allowed to come to school and who is not allowed to come to school. Anonymity is really the factor that keeps, particularly African American males, from flourishing at my campus. The street economy doesn't just involve drugs it involves the fencing of televisions and automobiles and all kinds of things. It's kind of a second market and if you drive around my neighborhood you'll see very few drapes open. That's symbolic of the lack of trust or participation that is allowed by peers to join in on prolonged, eighteen week type goal oriented, transfer oriented type pursuits. I have proven almost like the lost arc, thinking anthropological here, I can hold a computer up to the street and in about four weeks train a streetwise kid in how to do general html Web site development. That is a tool

that they can go out and make a gainful employment with. I'm not asking to sheer off their dreads, or if they've got pink hair or rings in their ears or whatever, somebody will hire them to do a Web site or else they can work at home. We are missing such an opportunity here. My area is probably the least tuned in into the Internet but I have proven that the development of this TMAPP in my area is making a difference.

Evaluator: When you say my area you mean Contra Costa?

Tim: Yes, San Pablo, which is West County. The west part of that county which is probably deep forest in the Bay Area outside of maybe Hunters Point but even then they own their homes whereas the homes that people own in Richmond and San Pablo nobody wants to buy.

Well, that's why I've put all this together. The sad thing is to be a part of a system that is so firmly entrenched and institutionalized. I chaired the ad hoc assessment review committee last year so I'm right in the midst of all these issues.

Evaluator: So much is going on with this and it seems to me that what we will probably end up with is trying to recommend some sort of a business model. I'm in total agreement with you that we're going to get killed and the community college is going to suddenly be off the face of the map if they don't realize what else is going on. This particular project I believe will be able to show some of that. We decided we would do a simulation after we get a lot of the information together so we'd like to continue working with you.

Tim: I see something interesting that's happened with innovation. I was in a meeting yesterday, I didn't know any of the people there but I heard people say, well we've got to do something, we need a conference on virtual matriculation. I just sat back and said yes. I came up with the term virtual matriculation at home. I said this is going to be two or three years of constant dialog and so forth so invent something that explains what it is so that when people institutionalize it they can call it something like EnterStudent or StudentChallenge.com or ComeToCollege.com. I actually own the ComeToCollege.com url.

I just figured to get this kind of technology out it would take about two or three years and the first year and a half would be a lot of hating going on.

Evaluator:

Are you working with distance education students?

Tim:

We don't have that part, at my campus very well implemented because we're in the Bay Area in a highly congested urban area. We do have a couple of distance courses.

I also want to make mention that internationally we have a Japanese program and they go in, if I'd had the assessment piece they could have taken their assessment test online but they go in and we have special messages to them. I can put these in their own language because I have access to speakers and all I need is a font and I can send information in Japanese. It's just incredible.

I was at an assessment conference last year here in Palm Springs and a group from Micronesia was there and my team of student programmers were working with them in developing their online student services. They have populations in over a hundred islands in Micronesia. They have computers in these various sites and they want something like this.

Evaluator:

Is this all in place? Are students actually matriculating this right now?

Tim:

No. They have to print out the online application form because we're a DataTel college and DataTel has not yet released the software that will allow us to have students feed into it. There are 23 of these colleges in the state and we are all working together. Those of us who had Y2K issues are probably far more advanced than the others who didn't have to go through it because we had to develop these networks out of desperation. I spend more of my time now interacting with those few colleges that speak the same language, which is DataTel. We're constantly solving each other's problems. We are the corporate model where as all these other colleges are not linked up into the users group.

Evaluator:

Is that the only group that's done that?

Tim:

Yes. Well there is a smaller users group. The DataTel is a bigger group. Yes that's another, in terms of technology, that is like a Y2K issue. Further advanced those of us who had to make these choices because of change that was hoisted on us. What I

developed on this virtual matriculation as soon as we get the software that pulls information from the user into the operating system I'm making this available for free to any government. All I need is their logo and I'll change it, because we all have this common application form.

Evaluator: All the DataTel colleges?

Tim: Right. We've got the MIS flags in there at the various parts to process. They just go ahead and put their own information in the orientation stage and then for \$40.00 to get the chat room, it's Chat World, it is off the shelf software. You basically just plug it into your site and then they would need their own url. You know, like YubaVirtualMatric.com.

Evaluator: Could it get to the point where you log onto the California Community Colleges, you say "I want to matriculate" and it takes you to that and sorts you through everything? Not necessarily for one particular college. I've had a number of people say to me that every college is different.

Tim: No, there are not.

Evaluator: I don't think they are. You would agree that they are not that separate?

Tim: There are various forms of resistance.

Evaluator: So up at state level there is no reason we couldn't do that and finally get us out of this thinking of what is the college that you're closest to. If you had to take a course face to face where would you go?

Tim: That's the obvious. If they are not thinking in terms of online services and redirecting their curriculum they're certainly not going to think of centralization of on online service.

Mick and I have this other grant McConnagate Interchange grant, which you interviewed him on. The centralization is the economical way to do it and to use a data farm like linking up to a Microsoft data farm up in Washington and run the giant, do you know what those are?

Evaluator: No, I don't.

Tim: They're warehouses filled with servers and you secure a server and they collect all this data and it's sent and received all over. Originally I wanted my

college to be the site with the huge server that would serve student services, the virtual matriculation site but the technology changes so often that it's much cheaper to contract with a data farm.

They're called data farms and they have drones and people to service them and they haven't a clue what information they're sending and receiving. It's just too expensive even for this California college system to pay for technicians that understand the inner workings of this and to make sure that even during earthquakes a person can enroll. A little college like mine wouldn't have the manpower to run something like that, or the expertise. So we'll be contracting out.

I would like to see a virtual matriculation set up. Why it couldn't be statewide I have no idea. It's bizarre that there is no statewide assessment test. We're working towards that, a statewide test that local campuses send in their outcome scores. So it is constantly validated so it really rings true and it's not just kook data to support some colleges need to get by with the prescriptive validity problems. One application form online, one assessment test for English and math in ESL. One test, various placement scores and multiple measures. The multiple measures is a feature that is unique to California, you can't use a single instrument replacement you have to use a variety of locally constructed measures. We use what's called life style and academic concerns or measures. For instance, a lot of our students don't have a clean, well-lighted place to study and on surveys that we've penned for them they've stated that. Not in those terms but that they don't have anyplace to study. They have to go to the library.

We asked them to consider these features in their life before they make their placement and then that placement score and the course goes directly to the counselor on his Web site who can then upload and download background information. This, in a short amount of time, accomplishes much more then sitting in a real live orientation.

Evaluator: Also you've got the information to work on.

Tim: I'm really frustrated. I don't bother about the hating anymore. It comes with the territory when you try to change something. I used to take it so personal, I was just hurt really bad because I have worked hours and hours outside of my job. I got

no extra pay for this, I got nothing but a headache. I developed a team, in fact it was put together by Community College students, most of whom are still learning English. It is incredible and it isn't incredible. The fact that it isn't incredible in business circles and it is incredible in a learning environment is cause for great concern.

Evaluator: Yes, because the whole idea of what goes on in community colleges it's so old.

Tim: Yes, the bypass is what's going on and I spend more time really with corporations than I do with fellow campus sites. There are some that are turned on but there are others that are run by these "Pagen" counselors.

Evaluator: Thank you so much, I really enjoyed it. We'll be in touch with you again. I'll take a look at the site and give you a ring after I do that.

**Cuyamaca College
El Cajon, CA
Lawrence Sherwood
March 23, 2000**

Larry: My name is Lawrence Sherwood from Cuyamaca College.

Evaluator: What is the purpose of your TMAPP project?

Larry: I was to make the library resources, to which on campus students have access, available at a distance. Primarily for distance learners and students who are disabled.

Evaluator: What was the most important thing you learned in that process?

Larry: Well it's an ongoing process. We are in the first year of a two-year project and at this point we are still in the latter stages of setting up the various components of the project. There are five components and some are well along the way and others I have a ways to go yet.

Services are being directly provided to students through our Web page in the library so our online distance learning activities that require access to online, commercially available online databases. Our libraries catalog, the catalogs of other libraries which are part of our consortium and students can search and find information in online databases and catalogs and when necessary they can request those materials electronically through a structured inter-library loan request form. That would include photocopies of journal articles, books and so fourth.

Evaluator: You're saying that you are trying to make those accessible to students with disabilities?

Larry: Yes we are.

Evaluator: Was that the primary purpose of your project?

Larry: I would say it was one of the primary purposes, yes. The problem that students have in taking distance learning courses or students who are disabled is that they must come on campus every time they want to do traditional library research. That is quite an impediment to developing and expanding our program. A disabled student, for example, who has difficulty coming to campus and physically retrieving documents that he or she

needs can actually make requests from home and then eventually have those documents delivered to their front door so they don't have to actually leave at all.

Evaluator: So in that process are there some things that you learned that stick out in your mind?

Larry: Again, we are in the middle of doing it so I can't give you any final conclusion but we provide access to the materials through the catalogs that I just mentioned to you and then we have a reference librarian who is dedicated to serving these people. We do that through an 800 number and a document delivery service thorough the U.S. Post Office and United Parcel Service. I guess what we have learned at this point is that the logistical issues are most complex than we thought and it is taking longer to get it off the ground. However, we're optimistic that we'll have these issues resolved and by the end of this academic year in June we expect to have all of those delivery systems fully operational.

Evaluator: Now you obviously have a plan in order to act out some of these things. What do you think would be the relevance three years from now for what you are doing? Are you going to be able to continue providing this service?

Larry: At this point we think so, yes. We're receiving financial support through the TMAPP program for two years. We have a plan that takes this process from a four-college consortium to a nine-college consortium that will be administered collectively by the group of library administrators responsible for each of the college libraries.

There is an organization that has been fully operational, its quite a healthy one, its been going on for about 25 years. They've done a number of cooperative consortia type activities in the past and so we expect that after the initial period of two years we should have all of the various distance learning and disabled student services issues worked out and through a cost sharing program between the nine colleges of San Diego and Imperial counties we will be able to support the program on an ongoing basis.

Evaluator: Are you keeping ongoing reports of your progress?

Larry: We are keeping track of how much activity there is in our program. That is the number of hits that we get on various Web sites. We keep track of the inter-library loan

requests, internal photocopies and things like that so we're able to generate a lot of reports. We'll be doing that in June when we evaluate the program in a formal way.

Evaluator: Would that be available electronically?

Larry; I don't know the answer to that for sure but we stated that in our grant proposal. It is our intent to do that and I can see no reason why such a report would not be available to anyone.

Evaluator: If you have students who are blinded are you making Braille copies?

Larry: We've made no provision for Braille although we are concerned about serving blind students. We have a professional disabilities specialist who is on campus and is on the advisory committee for this project and she has been quite forthcoming with suggestions and solutions to students with all kinds of disabilities, blind and visually impaired students included. That's a fuzzy answer. The short of it is we'd answered some of the questions and others we don't know the answer to yet. I can't go beyond that except to say we are looking at all of the issues.

Evaluator: Well I only ask the question because coming up is a policy question. If you're combining your efforts with other community colleges, you're linking up and going online and doing distance learning the population of students with disabilities will also increase from your immediate community. Are you sitting on any committees or are there any policies coming down that you are aware of on how to combine and collaborate these efforts so that you are not overwhelmed with requests, etc.?

Larry: There are such committees. I don't sit on them. I'm generally pretty well informed about what is going on within the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District. Cuyamaca has a sister college, Grossmont College and they are participants in this project and there is a district wide committee that deals with disabilities issues. They are very aware of what we are doing and both Grossmont and Cuyamaca are in close communication with these people. As far as coming to developing a formal plan that specifically identifies the parts of our program that will be seamlessly interfaced with the disabled, we have not done that. It is definitely our intention to do so and I suspect that once our program is well

developed and all five components of the project are fully operational we will be very careful to bring all aspects of what we're doing online in line with the disabled.

I should probably tell you that there are five components of this project and I've only talked to you about the inter-library loan part and a little bit about the online reference service. All of the others provided document delivery service that is physically delivering the documents to the front door of disabled students. Plus making provision for them to return those documents to the campus without having to leave their home. The same is true for online inter-library loan request procedures. We have that up and running right now. The online reference librarian service which helps students define topics, develop search strategies and to some extent actually physically retrieve the material for students is definitely going to be a help to visually impaired and blind students who will be able to identify themselves as having these difficulties and in those cases the online reference librarian will actually do the research for them.

Evaluator: Is there a fee attached to this?

Larry: No, not at this time and we don't anticipate charging a fee. Well, let me revise that. Students pay a fee per unit for the courses they take. It's about \$11.00 per unit and that fee entitles them not only to the instructional services but also the support services, counseling services, that is the testing the matriculation side of things, career planning, college articulation. All of those kinds of student service support activities are paid for through the \$11.00 per unit fee. Library services are part of that as well so if you are an on campus student and you want to borrow magazines and books you don't pay for that directly you've already paid for it through the registration fee and we intend that this service will be no different than the other traditional ones.

Evaluator: Is that going to work for out-of-state students as well who are taking your distance courses?

Larry: It is a good question and it's been raised before. I don't know the answer to that at this point but the nine-college consortium will have to address that issue in the second

year. Probably we will address it when we start getting a significant number of requests from out-of-state distance learners.

Evaluator: At this point in time you are not aware that they are writing policy for these before they happen?

Larry: To out-of-state students?

Evaluator: Yes.

Larry: I'm not aware of it. That doesn't mean it isn't happening it is just I'm not aware of it.

Evaluator: Any problems, any nay sayers on why this wouldn't work your particular plan?

Larry : No, I haven't heard of anybody who is looking for reasons to not do it. We get a lot of support, moral support. People say it's a great idea, long overdue, it ought to be done. I guess the request or the suggestions are not to discriminate at all between any kind of student whether they are an on campus or off campus student, disabled or fully able bodied, that the program ought to be available to anyone regardless.

Evaluator: Are you working with the Hi-Tech Center at De Anza College?

Larry: No we're not. Oh, let me say that I'm not and my committee is not. We have a Hi-Tech Center here at Cuyamaca College as does Grossmont, our sister college, and they no doubt are quite aware of what De Anza is doing. I know that the guidelines and standards, if that is what they are called, I guess they're just called guidelines are De Anza developed. I have seen them and our DSPS coordinator has shared those with me so we're aware of them. I assume that they are but I'm not.

Evaluator: Any words to the wise as we write this report that others will see and learn from?

Larry: We're going to produce a report at the end of, well we'll produce an interim report in June and another one at the end of the project which will summarize our experiences, evaluate what worked and what didn't work and encourage people I suspect to improve upon what we have accomplished. Our hope is that it will be useful statewide and perhaps even nationally. Beyond that I think as far as words to the wise, I guess what I would say is colleges should do this because it is the right thing to do. Electronic forms of education are very much in the future of community colleges and we need to provide access to students

who need these kinds of learning resource services. The Internet and all of the technology that is centered around it is making resource delivery easier all the time and I think bringing disabled students into the mainstream of higher education is certainly a very noble and worthwhile thing for colleges to be doing. So I guess I would really want to encourage that.

Evaluator:

Thank you so much for your time Larry. I appreciate your calling back today.

Larry:

Okay Rose. Good luck with your other people and I'll look forward to seeing a copy of your report.

**De Anza College
Cupertino, CA
Carl Brown
March 23, 2000**

Carl: I am Carl Brown of the Hi-Tech Center Training Unit, California Community Colleges. We are hosting a TMAPP grant for the Chancellors office here at De Anza College.

Evaluator: Carl can you tell me about the purpose of the project?

Carl: This TMAPP grant is intended to support the five CVC sites with regard to providing training and support and information about the process for creating accessible Web pages that satisfy Title 2 of the Americans With Disabilities Act and meet the Chancellors office distance learning access guideline standards.

Evaluator: In this process what has been the most important thing you have learned?

Carl: We are still learning. What we're finding is that the CVC's although they were initially supposed to be similar in design and purpose, have evolved into five very separate, very unique entities that each have their own unique sets of needs and practices and procedures. So what we're finding is that we're having to learn how they are different from one another, what their goals and objectives are and how we can best serve them in terms of providing training and support for assisted computer technology. We are also finding that there are wildly varying degrees of awareness and expertise from site to site in terms of what they are doing with faculty, what they imagine their system technology to be and what the requirements of the guidelines are.

Evaluator: Could you define CVC?

Carl: California Virtual Campus.

Evaluator: Okay. What is the importance of this learning?

Carl: The importance is that California Community Colleges are projecting that something like 30 percent of all of its course offerings are going to be delivered via distance education sometime in the next few years. In order for all of those virtual classrooms to remain accessible to students with disabilities in order for the colleges to meet it's

obligations under Title 2 of the Americans With Disabilities Act faculty and staff who are creating Web based distance education resources need to know what's involved in designing Web based instructional resources which are accessible to students with disabilities.

Evaluator: How about the commercial products that the universities are using, Blackboard, Web CT?

Carl: Yes, the commercial products Blackboard, Web CT, eCommerce are moderately accessible at best. They are not capable of generating Web pages, which are uniquely accessible, unless the people designing them are familiar with the requirements. What we are finding and what we are working with as vendors is that the companies are willing to discuss the possibility of changing how their products work so that the instructional Web pages they generate are more accessible but it is going to be a process over time before we see really profoundly accessible Web pages in place.

Evaluator: So the companies then, the commercial companies, aren't going to make major changes until this demand?

Carl: They're not going to do it overnight. They're aware of the issues and are slowing making changes. With each revision of their product they try to make a few changes that make the Web pages their products create a little more accessible but we're not seeing quantum change from any of these companies at this point.

Evaluator: What is another important thing that you've learned?

Carl: Another important thing that we've learned is making sure that we deliver training and support and services in a format and in a fashion that these centers can make use of. What we are doing right now is we are involved in a statewide needs assessment study with each of the five CVC's to come to a better understanding about what kinds of services and resources they're going to be creating for their unique region. Also where they are, about how to design accessible Web pages and what kind of time they have available for support and training. How they want that training delivered whether they would like to come to an off campus location, whether they would like the training delivered locally, whether they

would like it to be a combination of local and online resource. We are learning about what's going on with that so that we can provide the best possible environment for delivery for the support and training services.

Evaluator: Now, in terms of making the Web pages accessible, how involved are you with the technologies that are being developed for the person who has a disability.

Carl: The Hi-Tech Center Training Unit has been a national leader for the last 12 years in developing the standards and guidelines and practices in trainings and protocols that have made up much of the change you've seen in computer accessibility possible over the past 12 years. We were actively involved in helping to writing some of the language that went into The Americans With Disabilities Act and Section 508. In fact I think it would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that the Hi-Tech Center Training Unit has been instrumental in helping to design some of the metaconcepts that are now integral to how we think about providing access to computers for students with disabilities.

Evaluator: For the readers and all that sort of technology?

Carl: Screen readers, the large print display systems, the speech recognition systems, the keyboard control programs, the grammar and usage checkers. The tools that facilitate writing for students who have learning disabilities, all of that.

Evaluator: Do you keep reports or copies in electronic format for others to have access to?

Carl: We often, several times a year, develop extensive reports in which we evaluate the various projects. We do general assessments statewide of students in the Hi-Tech Center program. We just completed one that had to do with the level of access to the Internet that California Community College students have from home, students with disabilities. That was based on having looked at some of the data coming out of the national surveys, one specifically called Falling Between the Net that spoke to the digital divide on a national level. We wanted to look at what was going on at a community college level here in California so we did a comprehensive statewide survey of students at every hi-tech center in the California community college system. We got back a very substantial,

very representative sample and did the data analysis. All of those reports for the past couple of three years are posted on our Web site.

Evaluator: That Web site is?

Carl: The Web site is www.htctu.fhda.edu.

Evaluator: Thank you. Lets see here, in terms of your talking about CVC, where do you see the California City or community colleges in this mix?

Carl: Well the CVC's are the California community colleges. The five CVC sites are located on community college campuses at five locations around the state. They are designed to serve specific geographical regions. There is one in Southern California that serves Orange County and San Diego. There is another one that serves the greater LA area. There is another one at El Camino Community College that is the teaching of the training and support facility for CVU's. There is one at De Anza College that supports the greater Bay Area. Then there is a rural CVC that is located in the Los Rios Community College District near Sacramento. So they each serve distinct geographical regions but they all are based on community college campuses. Is that what you had in mind?

Evaluator: That's right. Again, I'm making phone calls to individuals all over the state working in the system and they are all at very different levels.

Carl: Oh yes.

Evaluator: In terms of that and thinking about that are you privy to committees or meetings on policy?

Carl: Yes. I sit on several policy development committees right now at the Chancellors office. Right now at the Chancellors office the distance learning access guidelines committee, the alternate media committee, the library access committee, the review committee for the office for civil rights. Yes, several of them. I was very involved in writing the distance learning access guidelines for the community college system.

Evaluator: In terms of the policy, the question I've been asked to ask you is, is there policy on how to combine the efforts into collaboration with one another in terms of what you are discovering down in your part of it all?

Carl: Initially, as I understand it, when the CVC concept was first drafted the notion was that these five sites would work very closely together. They would in fact agree on what Web development software they were going to use as a group. They would agree on how they were going to provide Web services and resources. The sense that I have is that they have since that point in time kind of evolved into five unique entities. I'm not certain how much communication there is.

I do know that they are meeting in a couple of weeks. In general TMAPP funded projects, in my view, don't talk to one another and there is very little articulation between the projects. I am aware of more than one TMAPP project that seems to be an exact duplicate of another one already in existence. There is a TMAPP study of how the production of alternate media should be carried out but then there is a TMAPP project which is carrying out the production of alternate media. In my view they are not terribly well articulated at all.

Evaluator: In certain things like the exporting of courses and using Web technologies or what one would charge for those, there is not really a unified vision right now, or you are working towards that?

Carl: It's difficult for me to speak to the issues of how courses are articulated across the whole community college system through the CVC's. I'm not sure how or if that is going on. There seem to be a lot of individual but disconnected efforts to create resources. What there isn't, well there actually is, one of the things that we created as a part of what we are doing to support these CVC's sites is we created a large central Web based server that is a repository for mass amounts of information about how you create accessible Web sites. It's also the only place on the whole system that I'm aware of where you can go and actually instantly link to all five of the Web resources from the CVC sites. So we have them all tied together in one location. There is not a central Web site where you could go and instantly link to the Web resources of all of the TMAPP grants that are out there.

Evaluator: Speaking of that, that question I have to ask is what policy would help you most and perhaps if there was a policy would that be of help to you?

Carl: Oh, I think probably it would be a great idea for the Chancellors office or some entity to maintain a comprehensive Web site of links to all of the TMAPP resources that the Chancellors office has invested many millions of dollars in over the last few years. There is no central point. First let me back up a little bit. I would be willing to bet you that on most community college campuses no one could even begin to tell you what the TMAPP projects were that the Chancellors office funded, where they were, what resources they were creating and how you could contact them. I think there are a lot of really amazing resources but they are completely disconnected from anything. They need to be connected.

Evaluator: In terms of committees at your institution, are there different committees working on distance learning efforts and how much communication do you have with them?

Carl: De Anza specifically or community colleges in general?

Evaluator: Your institution first and then across the system.

Carl: First, the Hi-Tech Center Training Unit and our TMAPP grant here really works as a statewide resource. So we are not particularly any more involved with De Anza's distance learning efforts than we are with any other community college districts distance learning efforts. We don't have any particular influence over what the college does. One of my staff here does sit on a number of the technology committees on the De Anza Community College campus and we are frequently consulted by community colleges all over the state about issues that arise in terms of distance learning and accessibility.

As a general practice distance learning at the California community colleges is, although it's been around for a while, its really only in the last couple of years that it has begun to develop enormous momentum and we are starting to see huge numbers of instructional Web pages being generated. That is a fairly recent kind of thing. There are the distance learning access guideline standards that speak to accessibility issues purely. They do not address issues of academic soundness or any of that. It is my understanding that the academic senate has given a great deal of thought to distance education and the soundness of the curriculum and the processes for developing it and reviewing it. The

content issues are not ones that are in our domain. We are purely concerned with the accessibility of the content rather than the content of the context.

Evaluator: Now you are a resource and I would be curious to know when people come to you when they need or want help is there a policy or mandate in the system yet that it will be accessible?

Carl: No there is no mandate to say that they must receive a certain degree of training before they can proceed down the road. What the Chancellors office has done through the distance access learning guidelines is to say very clearly and in no uncertain terms that here are the issues around distance education, the five or six modalities in which you probably are most likely to deliver distance education. Here are the potential access problems, here are some remedies for those problems. Here are the standards and guidelines that we strongly suggest that you follow in order to be compliant with Title 2 of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Now if you choose not to do that that's entirely up to you but you have been advised and should you come into a situation where you are being sued by a disgruntled student and the U.S. Department of Education's Office For Civil Rights decides to weigh in on the students behalf you have very little recourse.

Evaluator: Now, what about the television classes?

Carl: The television classes we speak to the accessibility issues of as well. We talk to such things as real-time captioning and the need to provide perhaps an interpreter or the need to provide descriptive narration for students that are blind. All of those things are reference in the guidelines.

Evaluator: How does a city or community college in Shasta for example afford to incorporate these techniques into their courses?

Carl: Great question. Last year we wrote a very large, almost 14 million-dollar budget change proposal to cover the cost of a lot of these things and fortunately it appears that well over half of our proposals are in the Governors budget. So there is for example 2.6 million dollars a year for the next six years to cover the cost of close captioning existing libraries of

video material. There is a little over a million dollars to buy close captioning editing decks for each of the colleges so that they can caption the new video material they make. There is almost \$700,000.00 to put in place a statewide alternate media center that will be able to produce books in Braille and electronic text in large print. There is an equal amount of money to put into place a pretty high quality Braille embossing equipment so that they can produce hard copy Braille on an as needed basis locally.

There is additionally funding in the Governors budget to put in place two permanent staff with the Hi-Tech Center Training Unit that will provide ongoing services of training and support to the CVC's and the alternate media people after the TMAPP grant ends next year.

Evaluator: Well, congratulations.

Carl: Yes, we tried to plan very carefully to make certain that we didn't just put together a whole collection of paper guidelines and didn't provide training and support. There is abundant training and support.

Evaluator: That's excellent. Well, those are all the goods things. Do you see any problems, any nay sayers happening?

Carl: I've been doing a lot of presentations around the state. What I see is people, Web developers, kind of at the point of saying yes we're aware of the guidelines, we know we need to do them, we want to do them but it's unclear to us how much work this is going to be, who is going to do it and who is going to pay for it. So we are kind of at the stage of that first level of awareness in which we do yeah, okay, we see it.

I would say on a more positive note, we started this whole educational process by helping people understand first why it was important and the difference it was going to make for students. Then we got into, you design Web pages in this particular way because if you do they work with the access technologies that these students that are online use. So there is a method to why you design Web pages in a particular way.

Next we told them what the guidelines were, then we talked about the kinds of training and support structures that we were putting in place and how all that was going to work. So

the CVC's are at wildly different stages of startup. Some of them are still very much in their infancy. Most of them are still in the process of hiring staff, getting their equipment together, figuring out what they're going to do. One of the reasons why I'm conducting this statewide needs assessment study is to get a sense of who they really are and what they're really doing after we've discarded this happy notion that they were all going to be working together. So now I need to know what I'm really working with and we're working on figuring that out now.

Evaluator:

Well, good luck to you on that.

**De Anza College
Ann Koda
April 6, 2000**

Evaluator: This is Ann Koda at De Anza College.

Ann: Some of the results of our survey and recommendations that were made were incorporated in the Technology II Plan. I'll send you that and you can go to our Web site which <http://one.fhda.edu>. Actually the report and our survey instrument and everything is on our Web site but I'll send you a hard copy. I'll send you our last progress report, the narrative part anyway from June of last year. Also a catalog of our training services and the other thing was I did present with the Chancellor's office yesterday on system lessons learned I gave nine of those system lessons learned. I'm trying to remember where I have the others, I've done one every year, lessons learned. We're now in our third year as a project.

Evaluator: That's pretty long did you get funded?

Ann: Yes and we've just gotten funded for the fourth year. This is a statewide consortium project of ten colleges. I can email you this systems learned but I can also pop it in the mail too.

Evaluator: Okay.

Ann: I did a voice conference thing with Virginia McBride last year with our second year system lessons learned and I'm trying to find that right now.

Evaluator: Do you have a transcript of that, is that what you mean?

Ann: Well, the general ideas. I think Virginia has one but I haven't seen a written copy of it. I'm trying to figure out where I filed mine so carefully, with all these electronic mailboxes I'm not sure. If I find it I will mail that too.

When does this need to be done?

Evaluator: I have a little length of time on it but this was one of the very first things on the list. To interview all of the existing TMAPP Project Directors.

colleges and faculty would rather have local training rather than go to a location. We're making our training that we have developed available for this to each college so that they can take it and adapt it to their use and the types of ways they want to use it. So we've divided out the pedagogy from the tool so they can add their own tools but the concepts and activities are all separate. Now we're developing a trainer's network to help trainers to use the materials effectively, we're conducting orientations on how to use the materials and incorporate into what they already have. Also we are developing a trainers network to share resources among trainers.

Evaluator: Is that just beginning now?

Ann: We're just starting that. We found about 25 percent of the schools have trainers that we found but many of the schools don't have that and they hire faculty that are good in technology but don't necessarily have the training expertise so we are trying to provide them materials to do that. We're trying to get a sharing network going and we're holding seminars to help the trainers improve their skills, we're holding a senate with the Summer Institute and one of the tracks is for trainers and the others are for faculty to develop materials for their classroom using technology. We have a database of resources.

Evaluator: Is that the one under community resources or is there another one?

Ann: No, that's under the training center.

Evaluator: Okay, I'm in the training center.

Ann: Just click on one of those and it links into a database of different training on different topics. On one side it's training tools and the other side is strategies because we felt we wanted to stress both for faculty. We're working now on developing training resources for information technology because the technical people don't have much training.

I'm going to the Chief of Informational Officers conference next week to kind of do an assessment on some of their training needs and how we can help them out quickly. Our community resources are different listings of Web sites and news and conferences that people might want to know about in technology. The training center has a database and

the trainers network is what we're developing right now, to locate trainers and develop a network of trainers of the California Community Colleges.

We feel if we provide the infrastructure for people to share and find information it would be of more value than creating a lot of stuff.

Evaluator: Yes, that's the truth.

Ann: There is so much overlap. If we can help to provide a central portal for training for the system we feel because we only have three people on our staff and we can't train the whole state. If you look at the bottom people we serve, we serve faculty, trainers, IT and support staff and administrators and we can't train all those with just three people.

Evaluator: You've been trying Ann, I can tell.

Ann: Yes we've been trying hard. We have one instructional designer and the way we develop our courses under AtOne Services is we hire subject matter experts from different faculty to provide input then we hire one developer per course. They then develop and our instructional designer who's here works to make them consistent and makes sure the pedagogy is included and oversees the development.

Evaluator: Who is your instructional designer?

Ann: Carla Fizzler.

Evaluator: I don't think I know her. I used to work with De Anza a long time ago.

Ann: Carla has come last year from San Francisco City and she has worked with the different teams on that development. Our concept is of providing resources and support to the local campuses and hopefully our efforts will go farther doing that. What we use our consortium team is for local contacts and input for information of what will be valuable and we're now working – I think it's unique that we've worked with a lot of different groups. We're co-sponsoring the Summer Institute with this Academic Senate and we are developing that with them. We're starting to work with the foundation because the California Foundation has gotten very good pricing throughout the state but they don't have the materials or training to go along with it so we're starting to work with them.

We are working on using a lot of the communication, the group is throughout the state so we talk every other week using voice conferencing or using the computer or a combination of the two to do all our work remotely. We meet only twice a year.

Evaluator: Are they coming along in using those technologies for meetings?

Ann: We found, depending upon what you are doing, initially to get a program started it is really good to meet face to face and develop that rapport. The technologies are improving. We found the phone is about the best way to communicate and discuss things. We use a list serve and email primarily to disseminate information. It is not a good way to make decisions because until you get everybody talking in one place it's very difficult. We have used video conferencing but it's not as reliable, we've tried that a lot. Not everyone has desktop video conferencing but that will be coming. Most of the schools don't have the bandwidth to do that.

Primarily the best way we found is we have voice conference every other week and people are sitting at their computer like we're doing now, saying go here and go there and what do you think of this or that. So we have a test site and we develop things and we tell them before our meeting to go look at this, what do you think of it, provide us with some input and that kind of thing. After we develop training these local colleges provide the test location and give us feedback so that's how we work together with our team.

The first year we just had faculty and the second year we added staff development officers and instructional designers and that has really added a lot in there. Now we have to add more of other people. I think more of the student services because we couldn't do everything at the beginning.

Evaluator: No you never can and there is so much to do.

Ann: Right, you just go on and on. I'd rather do a few things well then trying to spatter the universe.

Evaluator: Well if you have good adoptions, people who are interested, they understand what they're doing and they become role models for the ones around them. That is much

more important than having 30,000 of them who've had a bad experience and don't know how to do the full program and don't continue using it.

Do you stay in contact with the ones that you have trained, is that part of what the list serves?

Ann:

Well that's the first step because right now we're going out and training the trainers and so as soon as our instructional designer who is doing that – what she does is conduct a three hour session on how to use those packages. Then they need a bit of time to go out and use them. After that she will follow up probably this Summer and next Fall, after she's conducted about four of them and has a few more to go throughout the state we will follow up with those trainers and ask how did you use them, how many people did you train. It's too early to go out now and do that. We'll then go out and ask for suggestions or improvements.

We were going to initially just move them all over to the Web but the faculty said, "We don't want to be trained on the Web. We want trainers and we want classrooms."

Evaluator:

How do you justify that then with putting them online? Are they able to make the move after that?

Ann:

Well those are what our initial courses are about, getting them familiar with that. We will offer two ways of doing that. Our Internet research course, faculty can take it as a tutorial online or we also have a trainer's manual that the local trainer can sit people in a lab and walk them through it. So we're trying a couple of different approaches on different classes and we'll see how that evolves. We want to go to an online load but if we would have just put these all online initially people wouldn't have used them so we thought that would be a waste.

From our survey results we're trying to implement – we did a survey two years ago and we chose the topics for our first five packages from the survey and our delivery mode from the survey. We just completed a second survey and the results of that will be out in May. Our researchers that we've contracted with are writing the report right now. We will compare attitude changes from the faculty from the first year. We've surveyed 20 colleges

representative of the demographics of the state, so that is another one of our projects we'll be getting out in May.

Evaluator: Could you get me a copy of the first survey?

Ann: Right, I'm including that in the package. What I need to know is how to get this to you.

Evaluator: What do you think is the most important thing you've learned over this three or four year period, Ann?

Ann: As far as the system goes?

Evaluator: The system or working with teachers or how do we all begin to work together because that's what the TMAPP grants are trying to build up to.

Ann: Well I've always said, well one of the things is that the Chancellors office has to provide some leadership across the projects to help the coordination. These projects are funded on an annual basis and we are not building on lessons learned. Everybody else goes out and redoes what was done before. There are a lot of training projects out there and we built a database if you notice on our training center at the bottom people can put in or add their training tool or whatever. If you have a training session you could go in and add it to our database and it'll show up. Well we approve it first, one of our team members goes through it with our checking process but the issue is I can't get people to put their stuff in there. If that were required in the grant here at the Chancellors office, you know we're spending a lot of time just going out and finding what's out there and they are already Chancellors office grants.

I guess if you ask me one of the things I've learned, it is that the communication system in the Chancellors office system is so difficult because we're so diverse and spread out in the colleges. We have to have a better communication system and it has to be required.

Evaluator: I completely agree.

Ann: It has to be, not just go out and try something out but because you tried this out you have to put this information in. It has to be tied to these kinds of requirements so that there is value out of what has been done.

Evaluator: I think when you're able to do, for example what I'm doing right now I've learned probably more in the last two or three weeks about what's going on and how many different things have been happening. For example, have you heard about the DataTel group?

Ann: Yes, I know about DataTel.

Evaluator: Yes, because I think De Anza is part of it.

Ann: I don't think we're in DataTel.

Evaluator: Well I totally agree with you. There is just not enough information that's available and it's not on any Web site at the Chancellors office and then the Chancellors office people have through and done some abstracts and summaries of reports and things but they are not making those available. If you want to go up there and sit and read them feel free, they are public documents. It's ridiculous that it took them six months to write the summaries. So out of my side of the grant I'm not going to take people and send them up there to sit and read a bunch of things.

Ann: So what is the outcome to be of your project?

Evaluator: The outcome of ours is to gather all of the TMAPP groupings and any other pieces of technology that have happened during the last four to five years and pull them all together. Originally we talked about doing a demonstration course that would benefit everyone but what we've decided since then is that we will do a couple of simulations. That way we can plow through it much more quickly and see how all these things would work together. Palomar has the CSAT Satellite so that will be up in probably 90-100 days or so. They've just let that contract out. What we're trying to do is to put it all together in a model that will have a number of variables to it, one size does not fit all. We're not going to create one model that would be useful for everything but we will try to come up with a number of different projects that would be useful for the entire community college system to work on and that would also be a national availability of courses.

Ann: Courses? Is it for distance?

Evaluator: Distance delivery. For example, there is apparently a dearth of math courses, math associates degrees, math degrees of any type that are offered online or through any sort of a satellite or video conferencing mechanism. So that might be a way that we would go, it might not be. I mean there might be a real good bunch of reasons for that but primarily I think it probably focuses around a bunch of teachers who prefer to teach the way they've always taught rather than try to learn the technology.

Ann: Are you going to put your results in a Web format so people can look at it?

Evaluator: Yes, there will be a Web part that will go with it. We just started, this was supposed to be funded last September and we were supposed to be one of the culminating grants in the TMAPP series. The one that Virginia McBride is working on, TMAPP 65 is looking at primarily Internet based course information. They've also been interviewing a lot of the TMAPP Directors. Their focus is different than what this one is supposed to be and the Chancellors office changed what we were supposed to be doing and it doesn't tie in the way it used to with the requirements they put out in the RFP.

So it's completely changed. They just funded it and gave us our walking orders essentially in January and I didn't start working on it until late February. It's taken this long to get a lot of the administrative procedures in place.

Ann: Some of these policy and things, Santa Barbara is doing some of this too. Have you talked with anybody there?

Evaluator: Yes, that is the one that Virginia McBride is working on that is the TMAPP 65. Yes, I've talked with them, I know some of the things they're doing and hopefully some of what they are doing will feed into what we are doing. Theirs does not actually include a demonstration project at the end of it and ours does.

Ann: Have you also looked at the Gardner Report?

Evaluator: No, I haven't. That is a Technology II.

Ann: What's the precursor to Technology II? I think it included some of these issues also.

Evaluator: I guess I don't have that. I have Technology II and then I understand that Vicky M. is rewriting the Gardner paper.

Ann: She's not going to rewrite the Gardner paper because the Gardner's brought that paper out. Who is it, Sherry?

Evaluator: Sherry Hargraves?

Ann: Yes, Sherry should have a copy of that. That is an excellent document so you might consider using that or at least looking at that.

Well I've got a couple different things that I've just come up with, recommendations and I'll just put them out knowing that they are my opinion.

Evaluator: That counts Ann. You've been doing it longer than most of the others have.

Ann: It's from different times and different years and things we've suggested and we will send you these things.

Evaluator: I understand you are leaving town?

Ann: I'm leaving tomorrow and I have three conferences next week for the orientations. I'll be gone most of the week and all I will do is run in and pick up my next batch of stuff and run to the next conference.

Evaluator: Well what I'll do is go through and take a look at the site and all the things that you all have been doing and review the materials that you send. Obviously the training component and what you are doing is so important to the successful operation of anything that we might recommend and I'd very much like to continue working with you.

Ann: Great. There is also another training project that is not funded by them which is the CVC centers, the California centers. We are working with them also. We've been working with pretty much all the different constituents. The California CVC Professional Develop Center focus is completely on distance. That is why I asked is your focus distance learning.

Evaluator: Yes, it is.

Ann: Well you might look at some of what they are doing. If you look at our site there are links to the CVC centers.

Evaluator: I have looked at their site and I'll go back and look again.

Ann: Their focus is totally distance where ours is a readiness for distance and also has a lot of constituent groups that we serve.

Evaluator: I think part of what you're trying to do is to get faculty used to the idea of using technology regardless of whether it's a more traditional face to face class or a distance learning class or some combination thereof?

Ann: Correct. You can't jump into teaching in a distance environment without a lot of background.

Evaluator: Yes, I agree. I taught online for ten years and I help set up projects to so I understand exactly what you are saying.

Ann: There is just teaching online and there is doing it effectively to so there's a lot of different issues.

Evaluator: Well Ann I know you need to leave. I really appreciate your time and we'll talk to you when you get back. Thank you.

**El Camino College
Donna Manno
March 27, 2000**

Donna: I am Donna Manno at El Camino College and I am a staff development coordinator.

Evaluator: Donna, the purpose of the call today is to talk about your involvement with the TMAPP grant. The first thing I'm interested in is what was the purpose of your project at El Camino?

Donna: This was probably a little proactive thing that we did. We knew during the summer when we saw the announcement for the grant that there was a very good possibility that all our fulltime teaching staff were going to be receiving laptop computers in October. So the idea behind the grant was to identify from department techie people faculty that could serve in assisting their department to come on board with technology. Maybe using it in a classroom or maybe just simple assessing of what some of the training needs might be and so that was where we titled it the Tech Fellows. That was kind of the name we gave those so that was our one purpose.

The other purpose was to try to put together a virtual learning site that faculty could access to assist them with some of the questions they might have about Internet browsers and also to link them to sites where technology was successfully being used in instruction.

Evaluator: In that process what was the most important thing that you learned?

Donna: Quite frankly, we have terrible schedules and it's hard to get them all together.

I think I learned and I was semi-aware of this, that we have people at so many different levels of skill and knowledge. Well skills and even the pedagogy of using technology with instruction or to enhance instruction. That has been a little bit of a challenge. Besides the scheduling was that we have some real fast movers in the group and we some people that are struggling and trying to accomplish what the objectives were set for has been not impossible but it has been the most difficult and challenging part.

I think that we learned a lot from that in that even though I think this is valuable enough that we're hoping to try to do it just with our own funding next year. Maybe we needed to be more specific they needed to be to be sort of the techie person in their department but nonetheless I think the most technology advanced probably came forth.

Evaluator: What do you see the relevance three years in the future?

Donna: One of the things that they also did was develop a department Web page. Three years in the future, well since another one of their tasks was to develop kind of a – where does their department want to go with technology on a three-year basis which we haven't done. That is our final piece that we'll be putting together.

I think it's certainly going to move us forward with introducing technology and its enhancements to instruction to our faculty. Already we've seen that many of them are excited about getting their own Web pages where they can put their course materials on their so I think I'd have to say that it is really benefit the students over the next three years immensely.

Evaluator: The two things so far that you've mentioned are the faculty schedules were lessons learned and you've mentioned pedagogy. Are there any secondary things that you've learned or any surprises that have come up that you hadn't anticipated in this process?

Donna: Well, a few mavericks in the group that don't want to use the page because that's what we're kind of promoting campus wide. To be expected with faculty we had some groups that wanted to go off on this and that and that was fine as long as they accomplished our objectives. We left it so that people could individualize, even the initial assessment that we put together to assess where people were at within the departments. It's ten departments that are working on this that self-identified to be a Tech Fellow. I think even though we let people do individually, what's going to happen at the end is we will have a pretty good core assessment instrument that our next group could use to ask these questions of their department. The main thing was really to have at the grassroots

department level somebody there that was kind of getting things moving toward adopting technologies to instruction or enhancing instruction.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy in electronic format on the results of your grant process that could be sent to Dr. Lane?

Donna: I don't have it yet.

Evaluator: Will you at some time?

Donna: Well I haven't heard but I'm assuming that at the end of the grant period we would be doing a report. I guess I should read over the terms and conditions again.

Evaluator: Well just your own report for your own self-benefit?

Donna: Oh yes we would definitely. I'm planning that our report will have a core little assessment tool that you could use for your departments to ask the questions and then we should have really the department plans for what they see over the next three years. We will have the department Web pages because that was part of their thing to create a department Web page.

Evaluator: You may even have this information up on a Web page at some point.

Donna: Some of them do already have their Web pages up.

Evaluator: No, I mean the result of the grant.

Donna: Oh, yes it could easily be done that way.

Evaluator: Dr. Lane can put that together with your interview today and give some more information about this project. That leads me to the next question which is this is certainly something that's happening within your ten departments but it feeds into the greater California Community College System so how do you, Donna Manno, envision the California Community College of the future?

Donna: I envision it using technology to extents that I don't think we've even realized yet. I know that just in our small three or four years that we've done online instruction and we haven't done a lot but our one instructor who has been instrumental in not only training our new people but, you know, doing that. Just in what he's seen the dynamics of the classroom change even for his on campus students. I just think it's going to be such an

assist to students so I'm really a techie promoter actually. I think it's going to answer so many of the dilemma questions that we have in the way students learn and how they learn.

Evaluator: In terms of the way your students and your faculty producing among courses do you personally sit on or are you aware of or are you contributing to any committees working on policy to combine and collaborate across campuses in the state of California?

Donna: I belong to the 4CSD, which are the statewide staff development officers, and I think we certainly do a lot of contributing. I'm not sitting on any committees that are dealing with policy.

Evaluator: Are you aware of them?

Donna: If something like that came along I think I would prefer that one of our faculty people be involved in that. We happen to have a person who is the person setting up the California Virtual Campus. We have a distance education list serve and he is constantly sending us information about policies being developed and people who are dealing with the issues of being online and also just copyright issues and all that. I don't consider myself to be the one here that would necessarily be on that committee.

Evaluator: Do you have the list serve address for that that you could send?

Donna: It's our internal list serve.

Evaluator: It's internal?

Donna: Right. It's a list serve that we set up internally for our distance education people to have a format to say gosh I'm having this problem is anybody having the same experience. It is always very active at the beginning of the semester especially if we have new people that are doing online courses.

Evaluator: So it is one of your faculty who is sending information to your in-house list serve about that California colleges?

Donna: He is now the manager or the director of the CVC but he's attached to our campus and he still just seems to find just anything and everything so we get a lot of information coming to the list serve from him that deals with everything about distance education.

Evaluator: Has he participated in any of the activity around your TMAPP grant?

faculty A has done an amazing amount of work because they were starting from scratch where faculty B may have had a kind of crude department Web page already and they are refurbishing and updating. We did have a lot of different levels like that.

Evaluator: What are the problems in approaching something like you've done? Were there major issues that someone would say we can't do this or it's not going to be done?

Donna: No.

Evaluator: So in terms of pitfalls you've already mentioned scheduling issues.

Donna: We did provide training for them and when you try to get ten faculty together I couldn't believe how hard it was.

Evaluator: Even with the promise of money attached to it?

Donna: Well that's what I think I'd stress a little bit stronger next time even though we listed out what it was that was going to be expected of them. There are the true ones who do have a schedule conflict and you know those right away and then there are the ones where it's just not convenient for them. That is always a tough thing to deal with.

Evaluator: Donna, one last question is do you have words to the wise for others approaching something like your project?

Donna: I think it's very valid when you're just going through it the first year, I think it's going to be much smoother next year. I think maybe if I were to do one thing very differently next year is at our first meeting I'd have some real conversation about assessing their level of skills and how much assistance they thought they were going to need. We sort of went into this wanting them to be sort of the promoters. I felt like we gave them a lot of handholding. One of our Tech Fellows, well, we actually had a couple of them that are pretty technologically advanced and they really provided a lot of assistance and we had a trainer that worked with them a couple of different times.

I think it is a time factor too. People have to realize that this is going to take some time and do they have that time to commit.

Evaluator: Also it's just with the development process learning not only what skills they all need to have but what the other faculty are going to ask them as they become more

sophisticated. The lean on these particular faculty will become greater and that is something you can only learn through your process.

Donna: Right. Having done programs for several years now I know that the first run through is always the last if you really do some good learning with it. So like I said I'm certainly hoping that we'll support this next year with some of our technology funds because I do see the value to it and it would be great to have ten more very different departments come on board.

Evaluator: Okay. Donna thank you so much for making your time available, I know it was hard and good luck with your Friday training.

The initial plan is to have a counselor Web portal and we'll have a student portal so students can actually go in and look at their own records and interact with counselors online as well. Then we want to have a faculty portal so faculty can go in and interact with students or counselors or any other student services like DSS or anything that we feel they need to access online, they should be able to do that. We did not look in particular at distance ed. students but we think this whole concept is really geared more toward distance ed. students. A lot of our students don't want to be hassled, they don't care how they get served they just want to be able to get it now. So we are seeing this as going to change the entire way both campuses deliver student services. They built on a campus center for student services really looking at how that Web is to deploy those services outside the building. You don't have to come to a building.

Evaluator: Right. So they're able to go online line and access everything that they we normally have to do with appointments. Is there sort of a FAQ area?

Kathy: There will be online FAQ. Some of these things we haven't thought about. We've just starting building this one portal and that's primarily what the grant was to find.

Evaluator: How much was your grant for?

Kathy: Our grant was only sixty thousand but our district came in with PFE dollars of about two hundred, about three hundred thousand. Also over three years almost seventy thousand is the districts support.

For the to have made a significant commitment to the change in the way we do our services in tremendous and really we were not thinking too much about distance education students at the time we started really it's just all students in general.

Evaluator: Will this be built by July?

Kathy: Yes, we will have it in production at the end of July. We have a prototype now.

Evaluator: It's going to work for the entire district. It will work for Foothill as well as De Anza. What is the database in, Sequel?

Kathy: Sequel.

Evaluator: If a student was to go online and begin to sign up for courses then the next step, at least for the distance learning group, is they sign up for courses online. They can do that with this as well?

Kathy: Yes.

Evaluator: Okay so they can sign up for the courses and they take them and put them over to some distance learning area where they could take the courses that way and all of that tracks back into the system as well. So you could actually find out how long they spend online, the time, their assignments, is it a CPT system as well?

Kathy: No. We haven't even gotten that far. Basically, right now what we're doing is trying to collect information as students go in to an online lab. We have a smart card with a chip and that will start collecting information.

Larry: We're designing it to work with our homegrown Web teaching tool called A-tudes.

Evaluator: Yes, I've seen it.

Larry: That is how we plan to integrate this.

Evaluator: It looks pretty basic. What are the plans for it? Who is developing it?

Larry: The computer science instructor over at Foothill – he's got all sorts of plans to expand the interfaces. He's working to get more conferencing, streamline video, etc.

Evaluator: Is there a plan where we could take a satellite signal in streaming the video? Is that what you're saying?

Larry: That's his project.

Evaluator: It sounds to me like you probably could. If he can accept any sort of a streamline video then he would be able to accept a satellite feed as well. It's just a matter of getting the power to some interface that they need to be able to do it.

Besides that one there are so many learning environments that have been created would it be able to accept others as well?

Larry: Our plan is to use open architecture.

Kathy: It's important that we're not stuck with one platform. We're trying to be as open as we can knowing technology today. A campus may have two or three standard protocols

and we want to be able to handle and be open enough to just have faculty who are happy with one be able to use that one and not have to have them all standardized. Even with the student information system if we decide to change something on the information system two years down the road we should be able to have the common hooks and links into that and it's just a matter of writing that interface. It should be seamless to the user.

Evaluator: Yes, because the faculty has to be comfortable with it as well and lets face it, that's the real problem here.

All right, so you think that this system is the only one that's being developed within the California Community Colleges that has the capacity, the abilities that this one does?

Kathy: Yes.

Evaluator: How do you actually know that, Kathy?

Kathy: Well when you talk to campuses who are doing online kinds of things most of it is going to one site, clicking, getting static data and there is no interaction. So what we're actually doing is building something that interacts and provides students with the dynamic education plan. We can go in and change it. It actually feeds as courses are completed and as courses come it to change that it will actually change dynamically. So there are campuses that do have an electronic ed. plan but it doesn't really do the interaction that we're planning to do.

Larry: Nobody, I don't think, integrates data from transcripts immediately into the system.

Kathy: Currently it's all hand entered. Some of the CSU's are actually taking transcripts and feeding into the same system and populating their admissions and some of their embryotics.

Larry: Yes, but their not doing any student services.

Kathy: No, no. Then we have the assessment tool that nobody else has built.

Larry: Right, she has so much that we need in this records business. Kathy used to be our registrar.

Kathy: So we put in this imaging system down at state and seven to eight of the campuses are actually using that hardware/software to image the documents. So then we started to think about how the data that we collect should be used to help make an assessment of that students success. Larry came up with the idea to perform the database and how we can begin to do retention and success. That's where all that came from. CATS really is a sort of a foundation, a whole piece. It provides the map.

Evaluator: What will be interesting is there is also a lot of brand new data about the students in distance learning programs, you said that was added to it?

Kathy: Right.

Evaluator: Back in the 1990's Joyce Billings starting doing a bunch of those and I did some research with it but it had to be reduced down, cluster analysis in order to get it to the point where I could have just some basic ideas. Essentially the answer at that point was courses that were required offered an easy load at a time when students could take them and pretty much have synchronous. Those were the main things that you needed to plug into the students success factors which was probably based on other studies that had been done since then. So they tied those.

Larry: You did that recently?

Evaluator: Everything I do is essentially research based. Campuses normally have a 60 percent retention rate and sometimes less and distance learning tends to have less than that. So the programs that I have created are all based on research that have a 95 percent complete rate. If you have that kind of a complete rate then you get the money that goes along with it, if you don't have that complete rate than everybody asks why should I bother. It's more expensive and everything else.

Larry: Justify it through the retention rate.

Evaluator: Yes. So if they complete it and they go on then it's retention and they take three courses at university pleadings and found that if they took two courses they would actually probably stay and finish the degree. That was the likelihood at that point. The first three

courses are very, very important. That becomes again the user friendliness, the sort of work you can provide for them, how easy is it for them to get into the system.

Larry: I think the first three classes they're more likely to require a sequence.

Kathy: Yes, because they're comfortable with the technology. One of the things about our ESP database is we want to report it to our institutional research database so it becomes part of the whole. Then the individual ed. plan for students identified by quarter what they want to take, we want to use that data to drive the scheduled classes so we can begin to offer the kinds of courses the students need.

Larry: Are you doing work for a University of Phoenix?

Evaluator: I used to teach for the University of Phoenix. I taught there for ten years online. I know pretty much everything that goes on because I was on the steering committee, I was on faculty senate, and I ran the marketing department.

Larry: I imagine they have a fairly aggressive distance ed. investment, a lot of research?

Evaluator: They had a lot of research. I quit teaching for them because they took the teaching-learning model and reduced it from about six months worth of training for the instructors who are for the most part content people and most of them have a master's degree. Some don't even have that. The idea behind it was they wanted to reduce the length of time it took to train a teacher to teach online. So they reduced it to two weeks and I think it's totally ineffective. I just really think it's a bummer and they shouldn't have done it that way.

Larry: Is this their advance degree program?

Evaluator: Yes, it's everything.

Larry: For people who need to get preparation in distance ed. as teachers?

Evaluator: This is only for teachers who are teaching online. What they would teach online and they would have structured courses where the courses are developed by the curriculum developers.

Larry: I just wondered when you have that kind of a production going online what are the issues around student services?

Evaluator:

They don't have student services. The student decides that they take courses that start here and go to here and there is for the most part very little choice in what they take. The courses are all formed back in Phoenix and the curriculum developers are there. They write the curriculum all the way down to what are the discussion questions. The teacher will maybe go in and write a lecture but for the most part all the assignments and everything are already put together.

The requirement to have students be online a certain length of time – I used to give breaks in the courses that I taught which were management and marketing and I had 250 thesis students that I ran through the mill. Well, 250 students over a ten year period of time and they were wonderful students but that is a lot of work to do online and its hard to even imagine how you could do that much work but as the technology increased you were able to do it. You were reading every word but I mean they didn't have to have a committee in that sense. There's a lot of work that went into it and I thought it was a great little program.

Larry:

Is there anything missing in terms of student services, since you were designing it from the ground up?

Evaluator:

Well, yes, there is no ESL, there was no real intervention.

**Glendale College
Linda S. Winters
March 9, 2000**

Evaluator: We're working with Palomar Community College. They received one of the TMAPP grants that were awarded this year and we've just begun working on it with them to determine some next steps. Part of that is to go back in and review some existing TMAPP grants, what people are doing and how you think that everybody could begin to work together.

Linda: The grant Larry Sherwood was working on or a different one?

Evaluator: This is a different one. This is at Palomar and is with Sherry Hargraves.

Linda: Okay.

Evaluator: Sherry and I are working on it. It's a two year grant and we're supposed to develop the next steps that would eventually become policy at the state level, ways that all of the community colleges could work together based upon what has come before. We are not creating it out of whole cloth. We are trying to find out what has worked and assemble it in maybe a slightly different way than they would at the chancellor's office where they are just reporting on here's what happened. I downloaded your progress report form. I've gone through part of it. Unfortunately when I print it out I can't get all of the columns on the page. There's no way of adjusting that. I have that trouble with my Web designer all of the time.

Linda: Which part is that?

Evaluator: It's anything when you move the margins in so that you can print it on an 8 _ X 11 sheet. I get the words that are in paragraphs but the actual charts or tables don't collapse.

Linda: Okay, so the first page and what?

Evaluator: On the first page I can read the word "Grant Numb".

Linda: Interesting.

Evaluator: Yes, what happens is when they design it you have to make sure it collapses well enough because the other problem is once you start trying to print it out most Web pages

don't print a second page where it gives you the column that is over on the right hand side.
That's what is happening here.

Linda: Actually I just took what came off of the chancellor's office Web page and filled it in.
I will take a look at it because I am working with our Web master so I will see if he knows of
some way to do this. I was just trying to get it up in a hurry and didn't spend a lot of time with
it. If you would like I could just send you a digital file.

Evaluator: That would be great. Then I could actually manipulate it on my own.

Linda: Where should I send that?

Evaluator: Send that to Carlalane@AOL.com. Tell me in your words what is the purpose of
your grant? What have you learned so far?

Linda: Okay, you are aware that we are not exactly through with it?

Evaluator: Yes, I know that.

Linda: The purpose was kind of a couple different directions. What we are interested in
doing is actually kind of getting a benchmark for where the California Community Colleges
Library and Learning Resource Centers are as far as providing Web based access to their
materials and services. We've done several surveys to kind of pin that down somewhat and
also to get a response on what resources and services the librarians feel are important to be
available to remote learners. Beyond that, because remote patron authentication is a real
issue for the licensed databases and for other services that we would be wanting to provide
to our own community, we are looking in that direction to try to identify potential methods
that would be appropriate for the community college library group to actually be able to use
to allow remote patron authentication.

Evaluator: In other words, I dial in and I have some PIN number or user name?

Linda: Yes, something like that because there are a lot of different ways of doing it. Some
are more labor intensive and some more automated depending on if you've got a good
user database to use. One of the things that we have done is to survey the Integrated
Library System vendors. Basically we have surveyed the vendors that provide our library
systems that have our library catalog and patron records. We have also surveyed a number

of the vendors who provide licensed databases of indexing and full text magazines, journals and assorted other information because that group in particular is concerned about not letting their information out to just anybody. They want us to pay for it and of course we feel like that is kind of fair that we should do that. We have done a lot of information gathering and are putting two sort of pilot model projects up. One is here at Glendale and one is at Pasadena City College that will provide our community of users remote access to five services and five resources. Then we are going to try and identify how useful it was and what the response was to those resources and services. There is a group called the Council of Chief Librarians, which is composed of the directors or head librarians, or whatever of each of the community college library learning resource programs. That group had actually come up with a potential list of five resources that included a magazine journal database, a newspaper database, an encyclopedia and some things like that.

Evaluator: Are those full texts?

Linda: Yes for the most part. One of them was a bibliographic utility, which would be like books in print. It lists titles, authors, publishers and that sort of thing. It is a little bit different from the others. We took that group, initially thinking we would use them, however because of changes within Encyclopedia Britannica they have been charging and have now kind of gone to an advertising based version. There's a lot of flux in that whole area. We kind of included in what we are going to be putting up a literary database because that was very highly ranked in the surveys that we got back. Of course most of us teach English Composition and Literature courses so that is another type of resource that we are going to be adding to our pilot program.

Evaluator: Are these full textbooks then?

Linda: It is full text criticism for the most part of literary works. It's a database of critical works that are indexed and it is full text.

Evaluator: Okay, but not the actual original material?

Linda: No it's not.

Evaluator: You wouldn't have Jane Ere up?

Linda: No, we would have criticism of Jane Ere.

Evaluator: Okay.

Linda: Then as far as the services go, that was more really an open area. We have just taken what the response to our survey was. Even defining what an on-line service is is a little bit hazy. My personal definition in writing the grant was that I was thinking to some things that would be more interactive rather than just putting up Web pages with information. What we have come up with as the major services are an on-line library instruction tutorial. That includes the ability to renew books that have been checked out of the institution, e-mail access to and information about library staff, reference questions asked and responded to by e-mail or form and a remote inter-library loan request form. Those are the things that garnered the most votes from the group that we surveyed. We will be and are in the process of instituting those services at both Pasadena and Glendale.

Evaluator: When will they go into effect?

Linda: Some of them are up now. At Glendale we have e-mail access sort of to library staff. We have a reference question form up. We have an inter-library loan form up. Pasadena has the ability to renew books and has e-mail access to their library staff. They are in the process of getting an inter-library form up. One of the things that surprised us was this on-line library instructional tutorial because neither of us had actually developed such a thing. We've been looking for something to put up and I think we have agreed at this point and have agreement from various other people to link to their tutorials. We will probably be linking to several levels. The Cal States have developed one based out of San Luis Obispo. There have been a couple of the other Cal States that have revised it more for their students so we will probably link to one of those. I am guessing that we are going to decide on Northridge. Santa Ana Community College has I believe an SSS grant to develop a tutorial. I've talked with Matt Saxon down there and I think we will try linking to his tutorial also. Glendale Public Library is putting together a very basic one and we will probably link to that also.

Evaluator: Between all of those you should have pretty much everything covered.

Linda: Yes, we are hoping that we will have something that will be appropriate for everybody. Of course, then the issue is do they find the thing that is really appropriate for them. I think there will be a lot that will come out of just having the stuff up and surveying our users to see what their response is and get their reactions which is yet to be done.

Evaluator: That's another part of your grant though?

Linda: Yes.

Evaluator: Okay, what you are finding out is that there are bunches of things that are available. It doesn't sound like a lot of cohesion.

Linda: That's true and in our survey of the Library Learning Resource Programs it was just all over the map. We started out and did a Web survey. We just looked at each of the Web pages for each of the libraries and identified what we could see there. It went from nothing there at all to coming soon or under construction to really highly developed Web pages that have a lot of services. The responses have been interesting to the survey, too. There has been a fair amount of concern I think from some of the institutions that are feeling budget and staffing constraints that these are services that they can't even offer on site. They don't even want to think about trying to offer them remotely or unless there is substantial support for it.

Evaluator: Is there a fear that a movement toward electronic access is going to get you to the point where you don't have as much staff or staff will be matriculated?

Linda: I can't really speak for everybody. My impression is more that people are fearful that they will be asked to provide these and the funding won't be provided to allow them to do it with new staff. Everyone is going to be expected to do more with the same or less. I know there is a movement afoot to try to get state funding for the resources themselves, the databases, the full text, the indexing and databases.

Evaluator: At this point is every library doing all of this individually?

Linda: Yes. Well, let me take that back. The CCL that I mentioned before has put together a committee that I am actually a member of. We have been working with Evan Reader at the Cal State Chancellor's office to do consortium pricing and purchasing for the libraries. That I

think has been quite successful. There are a lot more libraries buying the databases because we've been able to get the prices down to where it's doable. There is a lot more information out there about what's available because we are reviewing the databases. E-mail is flying and paper mail is flying. There is quite a bit of interest I would say in being able to provide these. Again, if you have to do your own contracts and your own negotiations it takes you more time. This consortium thing I think is a real benefit to all of us. I did get one comment from a librarian about some other distance learning sorts of things that she was suggesting such as TV tapes that I guess that they mail to their remote learners. She wondered if there could be a statewide central area for that where we all don't have to buy and mail the same tapes. I would hope that we could do a lot more cooperating that way.

Evaluator: I would definitely think so. I think actually with video streaming, once that capacity gets into place then pretty much an individual could do it. There are so many things of that nature that are just right around the corner. They're just about ready to break open and become economically feasible particularly on a consortium basis.

Linda: Yes and if we could have the support on a consortium basis or have the support somehow that would help. In talking with librarians around the state and around the nation having someone to help you with it because a lot of it is getting pretty involved is something that really needs to be done.

Evaluator: It would be great if you were able to have all the databases and things that you are buying now and you had them available at one central area. The bandwidth is available for students to dial into. You don't even have to have, maintain or even think about the database. It becomes somebody else's whole problem. Have you looked at or do you know anything about the GEM process that is going on at the United States Department of Education?

Linda: No.

Evaluator: You might go to that Web page. Are you familiar with the IMS project? It stands for Instructional Management Systems.

Linda: No.

Evaluator: It doesn't sound like it. Go look at their Web page. It's a whole idea of looking at materials as learning objects so that you can chunk materials out. It ties in with here's a piece of a database that has an article or an abstract or here's a piece of video that would be useful in maybe helping to explain a piece of biology. You start looking at the way you put a course together as being a bunch of pieces and then you assemble the pieces but because they are learning objects students don't have to go through them in linear way. They are able to go through them in a much more digital way and put it in order where it meets their learning style. The IMS project looks like it's going to enable that. It's based on a directive from the White House that went to the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce and the military. The idea was to quit inventing and inventing all of these materials. The military has taken it to heart. They have their cut on the whole thing that they call SCORM. It works very well for students who are isolated as distance learners. Then it ties in with all the libraries and everything else.

Linda: I would be interested in what you get at the end of this after you talk to everybody.

Evaluator: We'll be issuing reports and trying to figure out what in the world is going on and probably putting together a group of committees that will help pull in everybody to continue the work and make sure that we are all working together rather than working in a vacuum.

Linda: That's one other thing that I did want to throw out. We have been in touch with Mark Parker at the Library of California group because they are very interested in this remote authentication also. I don't know where it will go but we are at least in the communication stage with them.

Evaluator: That sounds good. We need to do it at the statewide level.

Hartnell College
Gary Hughes
March 27, 2000

Gary: My name is Gary Hughes at Hartnell College. I'm the Director of Library and Academic Technologies.

Evaluator: What was the purpose of your TMAPP grant?

Gary: The purpose of the grant was a mini-grant to start the development of a technology plan for the campus.

Evaluator: Is that still in progress or is it completed?

Gary: The grant completed about a year and a half ago.

Evaluator: Could you share with us what was the most important thing you learned in the process?

Gary: I think the most important thing we learned in the process was first of all to better understand what people across the campus, particularly in the academic departments, how they saw technology impacting instruction and where they would like to go with that. So collecting those individual desires and then trying to formulate an overall plan to achieve them.

I think it was unification of vision and goals.

Evaluator: Why was that important?

Gary: First of all we need to develop the right type of infrastructure and the right type of support. Also we need to measure and at some point in time you need to take a litmus test to see just where we're at, where you're going and how well you've done and these types of reviews help to do that.

Evaluator: In terms of this process that you went through what do you see the relevance of the work three years from now?

Gary: I think the relevance, the significance of it will be having crystallized the schools think a bit on the technology what it provides us is a better road map on which direction to take with technology. I think because we have a plan and start to think more about planning

we have a much higher probability of reaching some of those goals then if we had not written them down and focused on our direction.

Evaluator: What was the second most important thing?

Gary: Well I think the second most important thing is the realization of both in the administration and particularly the faculty but not limited to faculty just primarily in faculty, that they need to be more forward thinking and that a lot of their needs individually are collectively the same.

Having a plan I think helps to crystallize the thinking and probably makes you think more in the future then you would otherwise.

Evaluator: Are they any other things that were a surprise to you that came out of this?

Gary: I think the biggest surprise and probably the biggest lesson learned is that most of us are not very well equipped to write a technology plan for a couple of reasons. We don't know the kinds of things that should go in them and we don't have as much opportunity to go out, particularly in technology, and understand where a discipline or a technology is going. It's moving too fast.

We did a fairly credible job in trying to do it in-house but since I made that initial effort on the grant we've brought professionals in to help us. There's a big difference between what we're doing locally and what a technology plan will be when you bring someone in that has more knowledge in this area. It's a substantial difference.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy that is in an electronic format?

Gary: Yes. The original one, yes I do.

Evaluator: Could we get an email copy of that?

Gary: Absolutely.

Evaluator: Okay, yourself personally, how do you see the California community college of the future?

Gary: Boy that's a tough question. I see all education in the future certainly being more outreach then it is today and certainly more technology based then it is today. I also see it

being more real-time than it is today and certainly using more of a student census than it has in the past.

People coming to us now, a lot of those students are computer literate and they will be more computer literate in the future. I was reading a statistic this morning that kind of surprised me that, I think it said that 80 percent of students now across the country are expected to bring a computer with them to college. We're talking about wiring in classroom for example that can use observatories to watch the skies for astronomy, to tap into some research institutions that are close by to us to show us what the seabed floor looks like.

Education in the future is going to be much more interactive with audio visual than it was in the past and it's certainly going to be much more outreach with Web delivered courses, with live video, wireless cable, satellite downlinks, it's all going to be here very quickly. I think we need to understand and figure out how we're going to meet that challenge and yet still maintain a lot of the essential services that will be required in the future as they are today. I do think that will be the challenge.

Evaluator: Do you sit on any committee that is driving policy on how to combine and collaborate efforts across the community college system in California?

Gary: I don't sit on any committees per say. I have substituted for the president in TTAC meetings and occasionally I will get to other conferences but I'm not sitting in on any standing committees that the state has currently.

Evaluator: You are aware of them and do you keep abreast of them?

Gary: I am aware of some of them yes.

Evaluator: In terms of policy that you've seen how do you feel about the combination and collaboration across the campuses in this state?

Gary: I think overall there is a lot that they are doing. I think we're doing a lot of things right. There are a lot of things that we all know have to change to create an environment where distance learning and more interaction can occur. There are going to have to be some changes to policies on how we charge tuition, how we share students and these kinds of things. Those are real roadblocks to the progress that absolutely needs to be

made in these areas. I think the need for technology and the need to support the technology is crucial, just crucial at these colleges.

Community colleges currently have no way to sustain the technology that they have today. There is no money for obsolescence and if we are even going to come close to staying even we are going to have to see a substantial change in the way technology is funded at community colleges or they're going to slip farther and farther behind.

Evaluator: Right. What you are pointing to as one of the major problems is your funding formula.

Gary: Absolutely, the funding formula in many different ways.

Evaluator: What else do you see as a pitfall for this in the community college system? This being the distance learning efforts.

Gary: Well, I think, certainly the issues of sharing as it relates to FTS and sharing students. We shouldn't have 80 or 90 different institutions writing the same type of Web program for the same type course to compete for students when the Internet doesn't have those geographical boundaries.

I think we still think territorially more than we want to admit. The taxpayer, whether they like it or not, are paying multiple times for the same development and we just can't afford to do that.

Evaluator: Do you see some policy or some protocol within the California system helping out with that change of behavior?

Gary: Well I think issues about – particularly in the Web environment of students outside your geographical area, issues about how they're shared and maybe even issues about students out of the state tapping into California. California has one of it's natural assets is it's educational institutions. The cost of another student taking a Web delivered course is not nearly the cost of a student coming to a campus. I think we have to address these issues.

Evaluator: Currently there is nothing at your institution that defines the difference in credit per hour charge?

Gary: No, that is set up by the state.

Evaluator: One last thing Gary, do you have any words to the wise as we move forward in this? Anything you'd like to share with your colleagues?

Gary: I think most of them are doing a reasonably good job. I think all of us need to look at better ways to collaborate between us and most of us know that. We also need to find more ways to collectively solve the problem of obsolescence costs and of getting more computers in the hands of students. I cannot build computer classrooms and I don't think other people can fast enough to meet the need. If I put 100 new computers in they would be filled up immediately. The demand by students for access to technology is a problem that we're going to have to deal with and we'll have to do it with planning. A lot of it comes back to planning.

Evaluator: Gary, I appreciate so much your taking the time to do this. We'll get you a copy of this transcript and the words of your colleagues as well.

Gary: Okay great.

**Hartnell College
Salinas, CA
Colly Tettelback
May 15, 2000**

Colly: The project had a twofold purpose, to prepare site preparation for the community college setting and also to provide training for 28 faculty over seven colleges.

The most important thing that was learned was that coordinating seven colleges is extremely difficult. It was important but I think that projects need to be a little bit smaller, more discrete.

What is the relevance for three years in the future? When you do projects they probably need to be more regional rather than spread out as far as ours was. There needs to be more collaboration and cooperation up front.

The second most important thing is it's not so much the lack of technical expertise that gets in the way of doing distance education as it is the lack of established policies and procedures for sharing of courses. That was important because I think that before we can really use distance education in any meaningful way we have to overcome some of those barriers.

Other valuable findings? None that I can think of right now. Do I have an electronic report? No.

Evaluator: What is the future in your mind for the California Community College, what will it look like?

Colly: Oh. I think it's not going to change that much by and large. However I think some of the smaller more rural areas are going to have access to programs because we are using distance education. I think that there are still people who want to come to the college, have a teacher up front, etc. so that's not going to change that much. We will use more distance education, I fully believe that.

Policy, how to combine and collaborate. That's a very important question. I assume you're talking about distance education courses?

Evaluator: Right.

Colly: That is a major issue and I think that the Community College Chancellor's Office needs to take a real lead in assisting colleges to develop those policies and procedures. Tuition doesn't exist in the community college, we can share FTES, certainly. There are a variety of mechanisms by which you can do that. Export courses? I'm not sure what you mean by that.

Evaluator: It would go outside of the California Community Colleges, will you go out of that system?

Colly: No. I don't think that there is a mechanism for going out of the system however when you offer courses, particularly Web based courses, anybody can take them so they in a sense come into the system.

Evaluator: Have you personally sat on any committees on these topics or are you aware of committees who are meeting on the various topics?

Colly: Well we have the distance education coordinators that meet but I don't sit on that committee.

Evaluator: Do you have some policy committees?

Colly: I don't know of any policy committees.

Evaluator: In other words it's one of your most important things but you are not aware if there are any committees?

Colly: I'm not aware of any. It became a most important thing because it's what we learned out of the project so it's not something we went into to address up front, it was something that came up later.

Evaluator: True.

Colly: Okay, what policy would help most? That would be a policy on how to share courses, how to reimburse colleges, how to pay line charges. Line charges were a tremendous surprise to us and also the fact that we don't know what the line charges are which is another interesting thing. It's very difficult to get a handle on what line charges are.

Evaluator: What are the pitfalls? Were there any nay sayers in your group that were saying distance learning isn't going to work there are too many problems in front of it?

Colly:

Oh yes. I mean the nature of our particular thing was that we only recruited those folks who wanted to do distance education. Yes, there were nay sayers and of course there always will be.

Words to the wise? Again I think we need to take a look on a more global level in terms of what are the issues in sharing. The technology is not the stumbling block, it's the policies and procedures and the politics that are the stumbling blocks.

Evaluator:

Thank you so much Colly.

**Irvine Valley College
Joyce Arntson
March 27, 2000**

Joyce: My name is Joyce Arntson and I'm at Irvine Valley College.

Evaluator: Joyce what was the purpose of your TMAPP project?

Joyce: The TMAPP project that I have is a statewide delivery of distance education and it had a number of purposes. The primary ones were in fact to assist in getting our state to get some courses online and to work with faculty in that process and to clear some of the hurdles in doing that. In the course of doing this grant we have in fact done some pretty significant effort in that regard.

We have a very, very active distance learning consortium statewide that is about one hundred people in the various colleges. We work on a number of things such as creating courses looking at the platforms and the vendors that are available to work with us in distance learning. We have developed an inventory of every distance learning course that's offered in the state of California's Community College system. We have worked with the library and learning resources people, we have a very, very full and rich Web server with many, many courses and kinds of information available to faculty statewide to create courses. We have gathered a significant amount of data on such things as faculty compensation and workload. We've looked up student completion and performance data compared to traditional classes. We've just done a lot in the area of property rights so those are some of the things that we've addressed.

Evaluator: Well I imagine that everyone is anxious to read your report.

Joyce: Well we've just finished our closing conference at a seminar on Wednesday of this week with all of our consortium and the Chancellors office and I think that everyone is very pleased with the many things that we have done. That they have done, I should say because this was a consortium effort and they did a great, great job.

Evaluator: That's good. Now you had sent a url to The Education Coalition, is the report on that home page?

Joyce: No, the project is just closing today. So the report will be done over the next month.

Evaluator: Oh, I see. Will the report then be available?

Joyce: Yes.

Evaluator: That's great. What is the most important thing that you learned in this project, Joyce?

Joyce: Oh my, that's a great question.

Evaluator: Just to get you set up we ask the most, second, and anything else valuable so you can think about it in those terms.

Joyce: I think that I would have to say that the thing that has been probably most important to me is the absolute essential requirement that we quickly do good systems learning through the California Community Colleges. I believe that it just comes through loud and clear more and more in terms of the requirement for it to reach our students.

I believe the other thing, that of course has been wonderful, is the learning that I've done of the industry that has evolved over the last three years of the grant. We of course have come from a real, lets see how would I say that. We have really come from quite a place in terms of where we were when the project started three years ago and where we are to date. The quality of the technology has just incredibly improved.

Evaluator: You experienced three years of working on your distance learning project, what is the relevance that you see three years from now of the work that you just accomplished?

Joyce: I think that the real relevance of the work that our consortium accomplished is the fact that we have all embraced distance learning. That we have all built courses and we've come to a place where we all have campus plans and people are moving forward with those campus plans. Three years ago that was a very different situation and I believe that three years from now we are going to be much further ahead as a result of the grant. I don't think that if we hadn't been able to work together for the last three years and make all the things happen that did we'd be quite so far along.

Evaluator: Are there any other surprise findings over the last three years?

Joyce: You know I think that I've been surprised mostly about the rate of evolution. I have been really surprised that it's moved so quickly, I mean really quickly.

Evaluator: Let me your opinion of what does the California Community College look like in the future? We've just talked three years from now but what do you see the California Community Colleges looking like or growing to be?

Joyce: I believe that the California Community Colleges three years from now will have a very full and rich program which will consist of degrees, not just courses which is where most schools are today. I believe that we will have a significant portion of our student enrollment, at least 25 percent, that will be distance students. I believe we will have a very sophisticated distance learning program. I believe that we will have worked out a way to share courses, share revenue, share expenses and so on.

Evaluator: How do you see yourself fitting into the, as these things evolve and go online, the local feel of the California Community Colleges which may be changing in terms of a California Virtual University, the Cal-Sate system, etc. How do you see the California Community Colleges of the future in relationship to other efforts in the state in this regard of distance learning and going online and virtual learners?

Joyce: I believe that we will all be doing distance learning on a very active basis. However, I do believe we'll be doing those on a separate basis. I can't think about what I think will happen in the Cal-State system and in the UC system quite so comfortably. I'd be hard pressed to believe that they wouldn't have a similar situation but I'll be genuinely surprise if we're not looking at a quarter of our student population in distance education. I do believe that the biggest things that we'll be doing is offering degrees. Full degrees which at this point we don't have anybody that's got a full on degree quite but we're real close in a couple of instances.

Evaluator: The question I'm getting to is combining and collaborating with other institutions. You're in a position with online learning to combine and collaborate certainly with the other community colleges in your state. Are you personally sitting on committees that are driving the policy for that?

Joyce: No I'm not.

Evaluator: Are you privy to those committees?

Joyce: No I'm not.

Evaluator: Okay. Within your group have they discussed things like sharing tuition or student numbers, expectation of courses, those types of issues?

Joyce: Oh, definitely. We most definitely have discussed those things. Of course the concern is that be a process worked out where some of us who have played such leading roles in these TMAPP grants and other distance learning endeavors not lose the value of all the writing that's going on by not including us in those kinds of things. The biggest concern that seems to be rampant is that people are saying, "gosh I sure hope we're going to take advantage of all this that we've learned and that these grants won't end and all that information would stay relatively closed in as opposed to being shared with everybody."

Evaluator: What are the problems that you ran into or were there any strong nay sayers saying we can't do this and how did you approach that?

Joyce: I think that we have experienced, and all our of consortium have experienced on all of there campus, people who feel that distance learning is a facade. I think there are people who feel the quality can't possibly be there. I know that they are people who don't realize that with all the various technologies that we can in fact do many things that we didn't think we could do. For example science labs come to mind. I believe that science labs are a big stumbling block and it has been very difficult over the three years to see how to do lab kinds of things. However, we have such great technology now that that is no longer a stumbling block. We can do science labs and we can show things in science labs that we can't show face to face in a real lab.

So definitely there have been nay sayers and we have had to show them to be wrong. I'm sure that some of them still feel the way they do.

Evaluator: Do you have any words to the wise as you've gone through this process?

Joyce: Yes. My words to the wise is dive in but hold out your arms to everybody who's already in there because we're all willing to work together. There are fabulous resources that exist today that didn't exist even a year ago or two years ago.

If I were a faculty member somewhere or an administrator who wanted a faculty to develop a course I would open up this gigantic directory that we've developed. I would look for a school who had developed a course that this particular faculty member or administrator was interested in and I'd get in touch with people at other schools throughout the state who have done that course and I'd call on them for help. I'd look at how everybody else had done it and then I'd make my own mind up about what would work best for my students and at my particular campus. What I think is that it's just a matter of diving in and giving it a try. There is nothing you can do until you really get yourself out there on the firing line.

Evaluator: Well, thanks for sharing some time with us today.

Joyce: I'm just one of many who have the same situation. The only way that we're going to survive, I think, over time in the most economical way and the most creative innovative way is if we put all of us together in some fashion and we continue to work.

Evaluator: Well hopefully the effort of this morning, this call and the bringing together of the words of all of the individuals who worked on these TMAPP grants will be a powerful document that will drive that.

Joyce: I hope so. The thing that normally happens with our grants is that we work real hard and accomplish wonderful things and the grant is done. The reports are written and shared but then we're off and running to the next thing and we don't tie all that valuable knowledge to the next thing.

Evaluator: I think that this grant is more than just a passing phase. We are at a critical moment for the survival of the California Community colleges right now.

Joyce: I think it's wonderful that you're doing it. I was so elated when I got the word that you were going to be talking to all of us.

We need a group that will include people like Lill Clary and me and Jack Friedlander from Santa Barbara and some of those people who've really done some pretty

LA Trade Technical College
Joseph Auciello
March 27, 2000

Joseph: This is Joseph Auciello, Los Angeles Trade Technical College.

Evaluator: Joseph, the call today is about the TMAPP project and I understand you were involved in one of those.

Joseph: Yes.

Evaluator: What was the purpose of your project at LA Trade?

Joseph: What we did is surveyed the various disciplines on the campus of which there are over 70 types of courses discipline certificates given out as to their readiness to participate in an online environment. It was questionnaire, it was personal contact, it was lobbying and educating faculty as to what things they could do such as in those days just email, talking to students and building homepages. Part of the project was also to build a demo of what I would call a virtual classroom.

Evaluator: In this process what was the most important thing you learned?

Joseph: That there is a very interesting relationship between politics and technology, between those who have the range of power in an institution and those that are technologically talented and have the energy to try to shift to what I call a digital paradigm. The lesson that I learned is that you cannot have high technology exists unless you have a fully empowered and highly motivated faculty with a high morale level. Leadership has to begin at the top. Administration has to create an ambiance and environment where ideas are respected and nurtured and nourished. Only in that kind of setting can technology blossom. That is one thing I learned.

The second thing that I learned is almost a contradiction to that. We are faced with onrushing technology, I call it a tsunami wave, the is hitting us and it doesn't matter what any of us does because the market place which is over 60 million homes that have IBM PC's wired to the Internet will control what we do. In other words our option is to get with the program or get swamped.

The third thing that I learned is that teamwork is extremely important. By trying to educate your peers, communicate with them, you can go a long way towards creating the perfect environment that supports technology.

Evaluator: In the project that you've just completed or are in the process of, where do you see the relevance of the work you've done three years from now?

Joseph: Three years from now hopefully everything I would have done will be very, very obsolete. What we've done, I had a co-facilitator, is we created an interest and awareness. We've got people asking questions and created a level of consciousness and helped move this college from traditional stand up instruction to the point where it is two courses running by telecommunication with about five more ready to be approved.

In three years there is going to be -- if growth is the way that I predict it, it will be three times the growth. It's going to double every year the intensity, the number of classes, the number of students and everything. Everything will double so in three years -- well look back at six years ago and it will be almost priority knowledge. Everybody will have email, which was a big thing two years ago to get faculty online. Everybody will have home pages which was again kind of rare two years ago.

Evaluator: You are at LA Trade, right?

Joseph: Right. Larry Toy of the Chancellors office inspired me and also Juan Cruz and Jose Michele were really key players. Some other key players in this arena are David Diaz from, I think it's Cuesta College, and there are a couple of college presidents that are very proactive. Roe Darnell at Saracosa and the college president at Taft College are also key players. I would call them fellow coconspirators.

Evaluator: Are going to tell me about a California Community College in the future. Does it exist and what does it look like?

Joseph: I have students now who are complaining about the traffic gridlock on the freeways. I have parents who are worried about the safety of students as they travel or even go to our on campus courses. The movement always, just like water takes a path of least resistant, the movement always is to go with whatever is faster and better. What is

happening is that Internet education and Web based training is becoming increasingly more interactive. Critical thinking skills can be taught by students solving problems together in a team environment. Some of the lessons I have in my virtual classroom require students to respond to me in a forum that is automatically emailed so I instantly know their status of where they are in the course. Increasing the amount of sound, animation and color and animated text so to speak, all increase the amount of information that is streaming towards the student from the screen. The vision is glorious. The future is glorious.

The computer is going to reach the point of being better than a poor standup instructor. We will see in our lifetime the computer instruction rival the instruction of average to good instructors. As far as the future goes the future is sort of already here. It turns out that if you calculate and track the number of high speed data communication lines that are installed in the United States you'll find out that the amount of cable and band width is doubling every nine months. So with what started in 1995 has doubled every nine months and it's going to include nearly every office and most homes in the next year or two. We really are on the edge of an incredible digital revolution.

Evaluator: Now in saying these things and talking about vision are you yourself consulted or are you privy to or sitting on any committees that are driving policy for the CCC of the future?

Joseph: For which institution?

Evaluator: For your institution as part of the greater California Community College system.

Joseph: Who reads this report?

Evaluator: Who? More or less this report is going to give a better picture of all the TMAPP activity to see how the isolated efforts need to be put together.

Joseph: Well let me tell you, being honest with you the politics are so hard at some colleges, I won't mention which one, that I have retreated from the TMAPP project and I'm doing my own thing with my own students. It takes three men, one man to design it, one to program it and somebody else to run the political interface. The system is so inert, so tragically behind that it just takes an inordinate amount of power to try to shift the paradigm.

I know longer am willing to sacrifice myself to try to create more administrative awareness of technology.

There have been some great gains here but the next thing that has to happen is legislation. It has to be legislated that colleges will show increased enrollment, improved performance, greater numbers of distance education courses or they lose their funding, period.

Evaluator: As you're saying this you are saying that someone at some point has to make some hard decisions about the expectation of courses, the way in which tuition will be shared, resident requirements and that sort of thing, have those discussions taken place at your institution.

Joseph: I'm out of that loop. There are some very good people at my institution who do think about that but I am out of that loop. I am in the loop in terms of California Virtual University and Rio Honda and Saracosa online colleges. I support the work they are doing. They are sharing kinds of people, they're informative, they're empowered and they are mission focused, so I'm very please with the overall results outside of this college of the movement in the community colleges.

Evaluator: Are there any thoughts you have in terms your doing your thing, getting your stuff up and online. Are there any concerns that there may be some dictates that will go through the system at large that would prevent creativity or would try to institute a formula on this effort?

Joseph: Yes. I understand. Right now there seems to be an epic struggle going between those that don't want to change and those that want to change who see the new movement coming. Unfortunately those that are senior in power are the ones least likely to want to change. That's all I can say about that.

Evaluator: Your effort, for example, to build your course, how will the class be sustained over time? A course that has tremendous multimedia capacity that is innovative versus one that is using lets say Web CT and gets up online on a very short turnaround time?

Joseph: I think that the market will always root out the weaker courses. I think a successful course has to have an exceptional quality and attractiveness, both have to exist.

Evaluator: What policy would help you the most Joseph? I hear you telling me that you are putting a lot of effort and thought into an innovative, interactive type course that is going to exceed even the kind of education one could get in a face to face environment. That costs money and takes time.

Joseph: I understand. The answer to that is someone who has the ability and the position in the state, in the Chancellors office or in our community needs to tell our president, my president, and senior administrators that they must support the digital paradigm shift. Unfortunately people seem to only do things when they ordered to do so. People do not work by vision, they are so encumbered by rules and a can't do attitude that they are basically inert.

The other part of your question is the cost effectiveness. I've been compensated by the TMAPP. I'm going to be compensated by being able to teach some courses from home saving me commute time. I'm also in the information technology field so whatever skills I put into my course I also teach in my programming courses. I think the karmic rules work. I think the universe finds a way to reward those who innovate and develop.

Evaluator: As you've been doing this what do you see as some major problems? Any nay sayers saying this can't be done or can't be done in the way you are envisioning it?

Joseph: Yes. There are definite individuals who I call the last remaining barriers to technology. I think what will happen is that as we increase the consciousness and the awareness for the cyber age I think the people with that dinosaur personality will cease to exist. All we can do is increase consciousness, awareness, enrollment and increase the effectiveness and quality of distance education courses and I think the movement itself will sustain it and remove obstacles.

Evaluator: Is that in line with the pitfalls, do you see any major pitfalls that are in your way in the near future?

Joseph: In the short term, there is some administration that seems to block innovation and indeed actually punish innovation.

Evaluator: Did you experience with this last TMAPP?

Joseph: Well I'm not going to go into that right now please, I'm on tape. I think that is a very short-term thing. There is no way that a college can survive not being in the digital world, no way. I think that the market will correct itself.

Evaluator: I guess the question is, or a way in which the question could best help others or your colleagues for an example is in sharing these things it's good to share the pitfalls and problems so that others don't fall in the same pit.

Joseph: I understand what you're saying. The answer to your question is before you get a TMAPP and before anyone gets involved with this they have to have a face to face meeting with the president of the college. You have to have his absolute support on the project otherwise it's just nerve wracking and frustrating for faculty to create something new when it's not fully supported from the top.

Evaluator: Good.

Joseph: I'm going to quote Dr. Demming's fourteenth point.

Evaluator: Okay, let me ask you the question first. Some words to the wise?

Joseph: Words to the wise, Dr. Demming's fourteenth point in his principles for effective management is that the innovation and the progress towards cultural change must be fully supported by upper management every day in every way, end of quote.

Evaluator: Well Joseph, thank you so much for persisting in getting on tape with us.

**College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants
College of Marin
Scott B. Miller
March 10, 2000**

Evaluator: We have a TMAPP grant and the purpose of it is to consolidate a lot of the information that all the other groups have been getting as they work through their TMAPP programs. Can you tell me the name of your project?

Scott: The specific name I'm going to have to look at. I'm sorry I didn't have the material in front of me that I should have had. Okay, the name of the grant is the College Telecommunications Plans Mini-Grants.

Evaluator: What was the purpose of that grant?

Scott: It was to partially develop a telecommunications plan for this district and then to create what we hoped would be somewhat of a format that other districts could use.

Evaluator: How far have you gotten with it?

Scott: The plan has been basically developed and it is pretty much a general plan. It's looking at kind of the types of things we had and making a recommendation. Some of the things that we feel may be better suited for broader utilization are a lot of the things that went in the appendices which had to do with somewhat general types of standards. What they provided us with are considered general networking standards, general infrastructure standards, and then part of the appendices was a method for doing a campus infrastructure evaluation. In that they gave you guidelines as to what you should do to evaluate your infrastructure such as evaluating potential utility closets for putting the information, pathways between buildings and things like that, telecommunications closets. They provided a fair number of forms so that the district themselves could do this evaluation rather than hire a consultant to do the evaluation.

Evaluator: Would they eventually have hired a consultant to finalize it? Was that the thinking or would you just go directly from that to a contractor?

Scott: The perspective we had when we started to develop this was that you would probably go then to someone who would put it together in a bid perspective. What we've

actually ended up doing is designing our own schematics for the building based on this information and then working with a contractor to place all of the wiring within the building. We're still doing a fair amount of the set-up ourselves because of our funding situation. Many districts may feel that they don't want to get quite as involved as we've had to because they might be better off resource-wise. I think doing this sort of evaluation does a couple of things. It provides you the ability to establish the kind of back-up that they say everyone should have. I know from our perspective we have very little of this. Even in doing the review we've had a hard time finding the people to do it. I think most people hire consultants because their understaffed and you just have the consultant come in and do what they can. We went for a template type design because in talking with consultants there was no way with a \$25,000 grant we were going to get a telecommunications plan created for us. What we basically got was a whole lot of guidelines and a whole lot of procedures that would allow us to a great extent to walk through the project ourselves. One of the things that we had hoped for out of the project, some of which when we went out for the RFP we got some feedback on, was a method for developing criteria as to how we would establish our priorities. That really wasn't answered. I think what the consultants really came down to was it's a challenge that the district really needs to identify. They need to set up their own criteria and create their own guidelines. What we had hoped to do was to have them help us establish what some of that sort of evaluation criteria would be. How do you create those levels of importance? I think what they saw was what we were attempting to perhaps deflect to an outside agency and that is the constant struggle between providing good academic resources while you are also attempting to maintain the administrative functions that support those academic resources. It's a constant chicken and an egg. It's a constant who's more important and that's a very difficult balance. Frequently if the administration sets the criteria it's viewed with skepticism by all parties. If you get some outside input as to how you establish that criteria it sometimes is better accepted. I think what the consultants found is pretty much exactly what someone like me would find. The instructional people felt clearly that the instructional areas were the priority and the

administrative people, although perhaps coming at it from a little more balanced perspective, saying you've got to have the administrative structure in place to be able to support the instructional program. That one really got pushed back to us with basically the guideline being you need to establish your own guidelines.

Evaluator: How did you go about doing that? Were you able to accomplish that?

Scott: We've worked with a variety of committees and the committee structures are currently being reevaluated because we've had a great deal of problems with the committees. I think this district is way behind in the way of networking our facilities in comparison to some of the other districts that I know about in the Bay Area. We're way behind in even computerizing our facilities. We're very limited in the way of computing resources. For example in the fiscal services area here, which is an area I'm closely associated with, over half of the staff do not have Windows capable computers. The other half have computers that the IT department has determined were not worth making Y2K compliant. In general the perspective was anything less than a certain level of 486 would be very difficult to make Y2K compliant. There are still areas in this office that either didn't have computers or are working with 386s. I guess it's a clock issue where to replace the chip is a couple of hundred dollars and a 386 isn't even worth a couple of hundred dollars anymore so there are those types of issues that this district is dealing with. There is also the fact that we are nowhere near fully networked in our facilities. We probably have drops in less than ten percent of our faculty offices. The only way they can hook up is by modem. We're dealing with those types of problems.

Evaluator: There are 28.8s and 56?

Scott: Yes.

Evaluator: Both, a mix?

Scott: Yes. Anyway in establishing a priority we've worked with some of these other committees and we had sub-committees. There was a committee called the Technology Committee which was made up of administration, faculty and staff that tried to make some overall technology direction decisions. That became very challenging. A sub group of that

committee was what was called the Wiring Committee. I'm responsible for supervising the facilities area and I recently, about a year and half ago, also got responsibility for the IT area. The Wiring Committee was primarily functioning before the IT area was under my authority and we had a vacancy in the director of the IT area so it was a way of trying to establish some wiring guidelines. Most of the actual wiring was being done by in-house staff in the facilities area so it was establishing priorities. Who gets first crack at what needs to be wired? We looked to the Technology Committee to try and establish some of those priorities. We are currently reevaluating how that committee works. In fact the recommendation is that it be a completely different type of committee because basically it was not happening. The decisions were not being made. The structure wasn't the right structure.

Evaluator:

Did they not have enough authority or understanding?

Scott:

I did not serve on that committee and I don't want to criticize anyone that was on that committee but the basic perspective as I understand it was and one of the reasons the sub-committee was established was because decisions were not being made. There was a fair amount of discussion. There were very few recommendations that were made. Since I was in a position of having the ability to direct, the wiring committee with me involved in it was able to make decisions and say okay this is what's going to happen. I would take input from the faculty, staff and administrators on the wiring committee but it was a much smaller cross section than the larger committee so a lot of the issues being discussed at the larger committee were then brought down to our level and I guess you could say that somewhat arbitrary decisions were made. You kind of listen to the arguments and in general the five or six people there would come up with some things that they thought were appropriate directions. Then I would say okay fine facilities director, here's what you are going to do over the next two weeks or month. When you finish those here's the next set you go to. Now we have hired an IT Director within the past year. Then what we have attempted to do primarily on our Kentfield campus, which is our main campus, was to make some administrative decisions as to areas that we thought were the most important to get wired first. We pretty much established that criteria among ourselves. It was not a big committee

structure. It was looking at what was working and what was not working and areas that had the greatest demand for computer utilization right now. The first thing we worked on somewhat was our learning resource's center because there were computer labs there. We still haven't finished that area. That was one of the areas we were doing piecemeal. We've gone to a new process now utilizing a little bit some of the results of this study in the way of guidelines and in the way of evaluating our facilities. The science center had a computer science lab in it and a fair amount of activity in the biology engineering area. Again this is not a criticism to the people involved but they took the initiative when it wasn't getting done and they did it themselves. We ended up with what has on occasion been described as a rat's nest of wiring. When there were problems it was almost impossible to troubleshoot so for a number of reasons including the way the building is set up we made that one of the first buildings to be wired because of the level of need and the demand. We also went to a new process basically doing a schematic of the facility and working with a contractor on the number of drops we wanted in the total facility. I consider a normal construction project to be something where you have very formal bid documents and you have a detailed blueprint as to where the drops are to be placed. This was more of a schematic drawing and we bought a certain number of drops and a certain length of wire from them. We have change orders based on additional drops or fewer drops and we have change orders based on additional feet or fewer feet of wire rather than having very detailed diagrams of where everything is going to be. To a certain extent it requires more supervision but it also got out to bid a whole lot quicker and eliminated the cost of very detailed drawings. We are in the process of doing that right now for the science center and it's actually working fairly well. I had mentioned that we had been held of for funding. The reason we are proceeding right now is because it was decided last year with our partnership for excellence funding that the institution identify it as one of the highest needs to get more of the facility wired so faculty could get on-line, the labs would be better served and staff would be better served. The three buildings we are focusing on right now are student services which houses admissions and records and the counseling departments, finishing

existing stuff it would be different for every district but it would at least show the type of review that should take place when you review your existing standards. Then it goes through all types of things like here's what you need to do to move between buildings. Here's what you need to do to move within buildings. It's a very good general guideline or as we had hoped template for putting together this study or for putting together an actual plan. It is the format that we are continuing to use to put in place our telecommunications plan for the district.

Evaluator: How many sites are in your district?

Scott: We have two campuses.

Evaluator: Are both campuses using this?

Scott: You mean the telecommunications plan?

Evaluator: Yes.

Scott: Yes they are.

Evaluator: The next question would be have you shared this with any other districts or campuses?

Scott: No because we are still in process of finalizing the report. The final draft was presented last summer. There have been a couple of odds and ends. All of the final reports have been submitted because of the payments that have been made but in the past six months one of the individuals in the company that we worked with has left. There were two individuals that were involved with this company that we worked with. It's a matter of wrapping up loose ends so no we have not done anything in the way of sharing this either in some of these group meetings or the other things. We have participated on a very limited basis in the overall TMAPP process.

Evaluator: Was there a dissemination component to your grant or was it just to develop it for your own use?

Scott: One element of the grant was to make it available for others to use, yes. One of the outcomes was to be this sort of template format that hopefully other districts could follow as a guide.

Evaluator: When do you expect the final piece to be done then?

Scott: I probably haven't contacted this company in like two or three months to get this finally wrapped up.

Evaluator: Are they responsible for doing it?

Scott: The final wrap-up? Yes but it's my feedback that they are waiting on to finalize the plan and quite frankly it has not been a priority and therefore it hasn't gotten done. I'm thinking in regards to your question if I were to call them on Monday I would assume it could be wrapped up within two to three weeks. That's probably what I should do. Whether or not I call them on Monday is another question.

Evaluator: What I'm thinking about is that the Mega Conference is coming up and the chancellor's office is having a pre-conference. I think what they are trying to do is get all the TMAPP project directors together. I don't know whether it's old and new or what. Part of it I know is that Sherry Hargraves, who is at Palomar and is a project director for this grant that I am working on, is supposed to be doing a presentation and I think I am too but I don't know what it is about yet. One of the reasons I decided to go ahead and do these interviews very quickly before we got there is so I would have some sense of what is available and what we can collectively use. It seems to me like your template would be a really wonderful thing for them to have. Are you going to that conference?

Scott: No.

Evaluator: Do you think we would be able to say this will become available fairly quickly?

Scott: Yes I think that's a fairly safe assumption. I have a whole series of paper clips here and I'm looking at how critical these paper clipped items are. A lot of it is talking about our heavy dependence on a Microsoft NT operating system. They are making some recommendations on some things that we haven't done. Actually they are suggesting that even at this point in time we should consider Novell's NDS system. Quite frankly you're beyond my capability when I start looking at some of this. It raises the question then, are we doing that? What is our position on that because that is something that internally we need to respond to? As far as are there any wholes in the report that we feel need to be filled, I'm

not sure that there are any wholes of that type. I need to walk through this one more time and look at the types of things that we are noting to see whether or not it's really something that the company needs to deal with us on or we need to deal with internally. It may be that we can really finalize this report very quickly. It's certainly possible that by the end of this month we might be able to make this report available.

Evaluator: It seems like that would be the most positive thing because essentially the template is asking the questions. Then it becomes their responsibility. You're looking at two different things. What do you need to finish for your campus and then what is it that belongs in the template that could be usable for other groups? If you are that close it would be great particularly in terms of the grant that we're working on to be able to pull that together. Our job is to look at all of the TMAPP grants that have gone before us and then within some period of time try to understand what policy or policies should be put into place. Have you seen the Technology II report that the chancellor's office has been working on?

Scott: Yes I've heard of that.

Evaluator: I haven't read through the whole thing yet. I just got it. I'm not sure whether everything that is in that really reflects the experience and the needs of the colleges. It was put together first by Gardner Group and then I believe that the chancellor's office rewrote some parts of it and then it was issued a couple of weeks ago.

Scott: From that perspective I have not looked at it all. I'm familiar with the fact that it was being done but I'm not knowledgeable in it at all.

Evaluator: Why don't you think about it and give me an e-mail maybe the middle of next week or something. Just let me know when you think that the template might be available. Is there a chance that you could e-mail it to me now? I won't release it to anybody but I'd like to get a look at it.

Scott: I don't think that I have it that way. I just have hard copies. I don't have the disc yet. What could probably really help is nothing else is the appendices, which are the networking and infrastructure standards and evaluation guidelines. Those are the types of template

things I was referring to. The first four are pretty much what I said. The first one is network standards. The second one is infrastructure standards. The third one is evaluation guidelines and the fourth is guidelines for management and maintenance of a telecommunications infrastructure. They are referring to our infrastructure but it's going to be the same for any community college district. The rest of the report to a certain extent develops with how you go about establishing those standards and that may all be very beneficial.

Evaluator: I think if somebody doesn't have a technology plan in place, to see a live one would be most informative. I think it would be really useful for them to see both, to be able to see the templates as well as what you have gone through.

Scott: Okay.

Evaluator: Okay why don't we do that? Let me give you my e-mail address.

Scott: What I'm going to attempt to do is see if I can get the report as it exists right now on a disc or something. If I can e-mail the whole thing to you I will. Even with what we've got, the \$25,000 grant didn't cover it. It came to a little over \$35,000. I certainly have no problem since the vast majority of funding came from the chancellor's office of sharing this with everybody. The one thing I am a little concerned about is just kind of a personal perspective. That's probably a little bit of a pride issue here because I think when some districts see where we are in the way of having our network they are going to be kind of shocked. That's all part of how we develop all of this so I will just leave with that up front. Please don't be surprised at how far behind we are. We are aware of it and we're maybe a little sensitive about it.

Evaluator: Are you offering any distance education?

Scott: Yes.

Evaluator: Is that included in this report?

Scott: No this was really primarily focusing on the internal telecommunications structure. We've gotten some grants to set up some things in the community. There again, I think we've got an individual who is very interested in doing it so we are offering some distance

education but not a lot. We're trying to set up some interactive counseling programs, getting some sites out in the community where some of the under-served populations can get some counseling without trying to get here by bus or anything like that.

Evaluator:

Okay, I'll go to your Web-site and take a look at what else is there. Thank you very much.

Modesto Jr. College / Columbia College
Juan Alvarez
March 27, 2000

Juan: My name is Juan Alvarez. I'm Dean of Student Services at Modesto Jr. College.

Evaluator: Mr. Alvarez, what is the purpose of your TMAPP project?

Juan: It was to establish teleconferencing between the high schools and the community college and to develop an electronic educational plan and to upgrade our online admission application.

Evaluator: Is that project completed or is it ongoing?

Juan: The project is completed as far as the grant determined but there were some follow-up activities that I needed to do and I'm still doing those.

Evaluator: In terms of the project what was the most important thing that you learned?

Juan: You need to have somebody to continue in the grant work. When the grant ends that is really just the beginning. There is a lot of legwork and follow-up that you begin to realize and it is important to know especially to have somebody assigned to keep the grant project going.

Evaluator: Why is that important?

Juan: The communication with high schools and counselors needs to continue. You just can't stop. There is an in-service training that needs to keep going, updating needs to be done and then more importantly is the legwork with high schools, principals and high school counselors and that takes a lot of time.

Evaluator: With this project where do you see the relevance three years from now?

Juan: I see it being actually pretty well utilized statewide. I think community colleges will be using a lot of video conferencing within the college itself or between the college and high schools and in the community.

Evaluator: What is the second most important thing that you learned from this project?

Juan: The second most important is to have the person who coordinates the project stick with it. The project is not enough and there is no money available to continue with that

coordination. What I find out that is second most important to keep the project going is to have me assign or release a counselor or a staff member to continue with the coordination. I was coordinator and director but with my job it's not enough time to spend. I just don't have enough time.

Evaluator: Were there any surprise findings? Was there anything that you weren't expecting or didn't anticipate?

Juan: Not really. I guess sort of a pleasant surprise was that the equipment was cheaper.

Evaluator: I think you mentioned that you had a report copy that you could email to the coalition?

Juan: It's a real thick copy.

Evaluator: Is it online anywhere or is it on disk?

Juan: No. You are talking about the computer project itself?

Evaluator: Yes that's right.

Juan: I'll just have to send you a hard copy.

Evaluator: In your opinion Juan, what does the California community college of the future looking like?

Juan: I think it's looking like it's going to be one big centralized technology center where everyone will have online access to each other. To some extent that is already available. I can log on to any community college in California and am able to see how their transfer center works for example or their library or what courses they offer and what the class schedule is like.

That is available now and in the future I see it as being more advanced. Perhaps we could teleconference with a counselor at another college and we can share information. Also specialized majors, our college has an agricultural program that is very well known across the state. They recruit students who come from other counties in our state and wanted to come to MJC for the agriculture program. Then a particular student can then

video conference with their advisor in the agriculture department and get information, probably register online and then comes through here.

Evaluator: In terms of those activities do you personally sit on any committee that is driving policy or are you familiar with them and do you provide any input?

Juan: I'm not on any committee that develops or implements policy. Actually only our board does that. I'm on a committee that recommends program changes and curriculum changes and then it goes through a process but only our board implements policy.

Evaluator: Do they consult with you?

Juan: They consult through the process but not with me personally just through the committees.

Evaluator: As far as you know there is some formula being written up for the exportation or courses, sharing of tuition or that sort of thing?

Juan: At this point there is only discussion. It hasn't gotten to the board yet. We have a person who is the dean of technology/instruction whose responsibilities include technology and questions that arise. If a student is out of state do they pay out of state tuition and all these kinds of questions have not been answered.

Evaluator: Is there a policy or protocol that would help you realize the project that you've just completed?

Juan: No, there isn't. It's wide open.

Evaluator: As you were doing this project did you run into any major problems, any nay sayers saying that you couldn't do this?

Juan: Not really any of that just some eyebrows from counselors especially because they couldn't see video conferencing. It's pretty common in the educational institutions that the older educators are harder to convince in the use of technology and some of our counselors are in the age level. When it comes to technology the hardest part is to convince these people and I don't do that anymore. I just have it available and those that want it can use it and those that don't I'm not going to force them.

Evaluator: I hear you. Now as you're doing this and again your words will be transcribed and available, what were the pitfalls in trying to establish a system like this with the high schools and across campuses.

Juan: It's having someone to be on the project all the time. A pitfall is time, assignment of staff. This project could be 100 percent completed if I was able to assign a counselor to do all the coordination and evaluation, the meeting with the high school counselors, principals and students. It really is time and staffing. The pitfall is staffing and I really am considering right now assigning a counselor to have time just to do that but it will take away from the regular program but I might just have to do it. I have to get permission from my boss first.

Evaluator: Well I'll ask you to end on a positive note. Do you have any words to the wise?

Juan: My words to the wise is in developing a project is not to consider the end date but look two, three, four years ahead and plan how you want to continue with the project after the deadline date. I think many of us who write grants for projects assume that once they are completed that's it. That is really a downfall that we have in education. We don't realize that it has to continue.

Someone needs to be responsible and coordinate the project.

Evaluator: Well Mr. Alvarez, thank you so much for your time.

**Napa Valley College
Bonnie Thoreen
March 27, 2000**

Bonnie: Bonnie Thoreen, Napa Valley College.

Evaluator: Bonnie the purpose as you know is to ask about the TMAPP project that Napa Valley College had. Is that project still ongoing or has it been completed?

Bonnie: I think you're talking about the one that we currently have which is the technology training grant, plan grant. We did have one in the past for a technology plan and that one is finished.

Evaluator: What is the purpose of this current project?

Bonnie: To develop a technology-training plan for the Napa Valley College staff.

Evaluator: So far in your development what has been the most important thing that you are learning?

Bonnie: Well the major thing we are working on right now is the needs assessment. That is the heart and soul of the whole thing.

Evaluator: Why is that important?

Bonnie: It wouldn't do us much good to develop the whole plan if we don't know what people's training needs are. The needs assessment will determine their training needs.

Evaluator: How far in advance are you planning for? What is the relevance for this three years from now?

Bonnie: Well we hope that it will have some impact three years from now. It will be a long range plan, not more than three years. It could easily include up to three years of training and we hope that we'd have some goals that were measurable, like X number of people will have been trained in the basics of Word 2000 or whatever. It should have some real lasting effects in terms of the way people approach technology and new technology if they are more comfortable after some training they'd be more open to trying some new things.

Evaluator: So you're doing some pre and post testing?

Bonnie: We hope to.

Evaluator: Any secondary things that you've been learning in this process?

Bonnie: Not that I can think of right off hand. We have consultants working on it for us and one of the things that they have been investigating are models for training. We're learning quite a bit about what other people have done that works and what other people have done that doesn't work.

Evaluator: Have there been any surprises that you have come across so far as you've been working through this?

Bonnie: No.

Evaluator: Do you have any personal ideas about the California community college of the future, what it will look like?

Bonnie: That's a tough one. I expect it's just going to get bigger and more diverse. It will be going into a lot more technology delivery courses, distance education, Internet classes, using the Web for communicating with faculty, staff and students. I just see it kind of exploding.

Evaluator: Do you feel that your colleagues have the same opinion as yourself?

Bonnie: I'd hate to say I speak for everybody but that certainly gets discussed frequently and those are the kinds of issues that are brought up frequently.

Evaluator: Do you personally sit on any committee that is discussing policy for the community colleges statewide?

Bonnie: A statewide committee, not at the moment I don't.

Evaluator: In your own institution are there any policy committee meetings on how to combine and collaborate resources across the system?

Bonnie: I sit on our district budget committee, which is a policy recommending board, and our facilities committee. Both of those issues are huge issues on this campus. I do not sit on the planning committee, which is closely tied to budget. Our planning document drives the budget.

Evaluator: In terms of exporting knowledge, your particular project is faculty training, faculty development, is that right?

Bonnie: Well faculty and staff.

Evaluator: Faculty and staff. Now the questions I was asked to ask you are about exporting courses but I'm going to ask what is the prognosis for exporting information learned across the system?

Bonnie: We've already done one thing. Our needs assessment document, instrument I should say, is being looked at statewide right now. It was featured at a recent staff development conference and also people were asking for models and so we posted those on the Internet and we've had some pretty interesting responses.

Evaluator: That's great. Now, you say you have a report, a copy of your work to date in electronic format?

Bonnie: No, our survey is out on the Internet, our survey instrument.

Evaluator: Do we have that Web site?

Bonnie: I don't know.

Evaluator: Could we get it for this report?

Bonnie: Yes, let me think where we have it.

Evaluator: Again, we're talking about the exportation of knowledge. The question is how do you think the exportation of courses is going to happen as well as the sharing of tuition, any thoughts on those topics?

Bonnie: Well a lot of thoughts but that has nothing to do with this grant.

Evaluator: In terms of your grant and faculty/staff training, is there a policy that would help you in this endeavor or perhaps a protocol?

Bonnie: I'm not sure I understand what you mean by that.

Evaluator: In other words as you adopt a system, as you look at models and come to some conclusions, in order for that to be enforced across a system would that need to be enforced or would there need to be a policy?

Bonnie: I don't think so. I think training is an opportunity not something that we want to force upon people.

Evaluator: Okay, in your travels in this process are you running into anyone that says we can't do this or any nay sayers?

Bonnie: Oh sure, always. People are also getting tired of plans, its time for some action you could say. However this grant is for a plan and we don't have a comprehensive technology plan at this level. We do have one that's at the state level but this one is a lot more in depth.

Evaluator: Are there any pitfalls as you roll this out and get this plan going?

Bonnie: Well buy-in by faculty first and foremost. Then there's always the question of how were going to fund it.

Evaluator: You're mentioning that a possible pitfall and their buy-in, and just a few seconds ago you mentioned that training is not something you enforce. It's just something that is a bonus or something that's available. Do you think that this will work if the faculty is not trained on how to use the systems?

Bonnie: Well that is what our plan will do is train them on how to use the system.

Evaluator: So you don't necessarily see anyone refusing that training?

Bonnie: It would be voluntary and sure some people always will refuse to be trained.

Evaluator: Do you have any words to the wise that you would offer to your colleagues as that go out into this world of distance learning?

Bonnie: I think it has to be done and it's just going to be difficult to get as much support as we need both from faculty and from the institution.

Evaluator: So what you are looking for then is some –

Bonnie: Incentives would be good.

Evaluator: Has that been discussed at your tables?

Bonnie: Yes, that is one of the subjects that we are discussing with our grant.

Evaluator: So in other words, again just to get things straight, if the faculty is going to move forward and teach lets say online, they know they need training however they would like to know that there is some incentive to do it in the first place?

Bonnie: I think so. Then the real pitfall is the business of collective bargaining.

Evaluator: I'm sure as you're working with your groups there is the realization that courses could come from other institutions.

Bonnie: Correct, we definitely recognize that.

Evaluator: So that is sort of like the first incentive, if you will?

Bonnie: Yes but it doesn't hit everybody at the gut level. I mean it's theoretically true but until we see our dollars blowing away to some other institution in a real way we could talk about it a lot but we're not doing anything about it.

Evaluator: How do you help faculty at certain institutions that may not fully understand the weight of this? You know, some who are in perhaps more metropolitan areas or those who are more advanced than this, in certain areas I'm sure are not even paying attention?

Bonnie: Yes, I suspect that's true. I could say we are paying attention but again I would say it's not at the gut level. I think, in fact we were talking about it this morning, that we're looking at competition from private industry, from other institutions worldwide and we may become obsolete.

Evaluator: Well I think the trick here is to educate without scaring anyone. That is the trick for sure. To help people move along and not have them despair as they go along.

Bonnie: Yes.

Evaluator: Well I wish you the best in the world Bonnie. Thank you for taking the time today.

Bonnie: Certainly and I will post the address for you.

Evaluator: Thank you so much.

Napa Valley College
Napa, CA
Sue Nelson, Acting Assistant Dean, Admissions/Records
March 23, 2000

Sue: Sue Nelson, the Assistant Dean of Admissions and Records at Napa Valley College.

Evaluator: What is the purpose of your project?

Sue: Our project was related to the electronic transcript exchange and we had been approached several, many years ago by California State University of Sacramento asking us to be a partner in electronic transcript exchange. At that time we didn't have the funding for the programming staff to do that so we had to decline. When this round of TMAPP grant applications came through we decided to apply for funding to hire a consultant to do that for us so that we could do an electronic transcript exchange.

Evaluator: And what was the most important thing that you learned in that process?

Sue: The one most important thing is that I would not recommend hiring a consultant for that kind of work unless the person happens to be somebody moonlighting from an college that knows the registration system. We had a lot of difficulties with the company that we hired making promises because they thought we could find a Cobalt programmer but unfortunately it was the same time Y2K was happening so all the Cobalt programmers were working on Y2K and they had a lot of difficulty in finding someone to do it.

Evaluator: So the importance is you lost time?

Sue: Lost time and we are really short staffed in computing services. Even more so than most colleges because I think all colleges are short staffed in computer services and we are really at bare minimum. So that's why we couldn't do it but it ended up that because we had the grant and the project moving along they had to take out time from other projects to do it even though that wasn't the agreement that our computer services wouldn't be doing the programming.

Evaluator: Right. Now, in terms of this effort what is the relevance for lets say three years in the future?

Sue: Well, I think its great. I'm hoping to expand what we – you know it's Sacramento State at this point but I'm hoping to expand to more colleges. I think its such an effortless way to transfer transcripts and I would love to be able to do it with a lot more colleges.

Evaluator: Great. Now the second most important thing you learned?

Sue: The second most important thing was I believe I was a little naïve when I first went into this project thinking that you program it once and it works for every college that has electronic transcripts. Then as I got into it I realized that each time you bring in another partner there is going to be some work that has to be done. I guess what I ultimately learned is that I would love to see some kind of statewide consistent model. If you have electronic exchanges you could be able to send it to just about anybody who does that also rather than having to do some programming and twiddling with it a little bit to make it work for each college.

Evaluator: That was important again because of your staff?

Sue: Yes.

Evaluator: Are there any other valuable findings that came out of this effort?

Sue: Lets see, those were the two main things. In general, I think I found that working with all the other colleges it is quite different working with four-year colleges than it is with high schools to implement this. We aren't working with the high schools right now but some of the other colleges that we've talked with about our projects were using high schools and I saw that it's even more difficult and even more steps, issues and problems that you have to deal with to get high schools online too. So I'm trying to say it's a huge project out there and again I would love to see a statewide project, I would really support that although it would be a lot of work.

Evaluator: I asked you if you had a copy of your report in electronic format and you are getting that?

Sue: Yes, and I will send that to you.

Evaluator: What do you envision CCC for the future, California City Colleges?

Sue: Of course in my case my TMAPP grant was very focused just on electronic transcript exchange so I'm not going to be talking about all the technological things that could be discussed but I would really love to see all of the CCC's doing this on a consistent basis. Regardless if you only have one transcript that you send to that college once a year it would be really nice to have us all connected so that we could do it all through electronic transcripts.

Evaluator: In terms of policy are you involved in policy in how to combine and corroborate with other universities in your focus area of electronic transcripts?

Sue: Only to the extent of the ones that I'm actually partners and the other TMAPP grant recipients. I haven't really been involved with the other colleges that are moving this direction.

Evaluator: When you were sending or asked to send transcripts were there committees involved with this?

Sue: Of course we had to have committees here on campus to talk about policy changes and things that we would have to do differently. For example, how do you charge a student if it's going to be electronically transmitted? Also we would meet, we did mostly phone committee meetings with other colleges. I have sat on a couple of panels regarding it and have attended a lot of, like our registrars group, if they had something on electronic transcripts I would make sure I attended that so that I could contribute to any suggestions about that, also at the Chancellors office.

Evaluator: Now the question here, when applied to you, is on shared tuition but what I can ask you is were there different charges to different parts of the state when a student requested a transcript?

Sue: No.

Evaluator: So that was a uniform already?

Sue: Oh, let me understand your question. Different colleges do charge different amounts for transcripts. For example we charge \$2.00 after the first two free ones but I

know other colleges charge up to \$5.00 or \$7.00. Some do only \$2.00 so it's not a consistent amount that is charged for transcripts.

Evaluator: Would that change with the distance?

Sue: I think that would be nice if everybody was consistent although I don't think that would be necessary.

Evaluator: Okay. Exporting courses won't apply to you necessarily.

Sue: No.

Evaluator: In terms of your focus what policy would help the most in your effort?

Sue: Consistency in the requirements of the fields on the transcripts. If we could somehow, similar to the statewide application, if we could get the colleges to agree to what we need on the transcripts and how it would be laid out then it would be consistent and it would make it much easier to implement a statewide electronic transcript exchange.

Evaluator: So in other words, someone creating a data dictionary or field dictionary so that everyone's field is similar?

Sue: Yes.

Evaluator: What are the problems? Do you feel this could be done?

Sue: I do feel it could be done. Its going to be some give and take in talking about what is necessary on the transcript. At least with transcripts it's a little different than with applications where there are some basic things that you absolutely have to have on there, obviously. Some colleges list CAN numbers and others don't so there would have to be some give and take and some discussions on what it is that all the colleges would agree would be on there.

Evaluator: Are you involved in statewide discussion on these issues?

Sue: No, I am not.

Evaluator: Do you know that they are taking place?

Sue: Am I aware of it? Yes, I have heard some about it. When I went to one of the Chancellors offices meetings I put my name down on one of the signup sheets but I really

haven't gotten much information on it. I assumed they got other people that were volunteering so they didn't need my input.

Evaluator: Well I think that your lessons learned would be very valuable to other committees working on this.

Sue: Right. It could be that they had some of the other people from the electronic transcript exchange TMAPP grants that volunteered and they just didn't need all of us since we've all learned a lot of the same lessons. If I see committees or forums that discuss that I do attend and try to give my input.

Evaluator: Any words to the wise?

Sue: Just keeping going, I think its great. Like I said, I would love to see a statewide system where we can all do it. I think if the Chancellors office can encourage it to be statewide implemented that would certainly help. In the big scheme of things with computing services this may not be a top priority for them when they have so many other competing priorities. It would be nice if this was something that the State Chancellors office gave its support for so that more colleges could do it.

Evaluator: Any major pitfalls that you can think of in terms of your focus area?

Sue: Again, mostly not having the dedicated staff to do it. When you're talking about exchanging a transcript electronically when you can do it by paper, you know it's not something that is so required or needed that you can't do it some other way. The computing staff has to be pulled away to do emergency type things and this is something you can keep plugging through on paper. It will be an effort to get everybody's priorities high for this particular project.

Napa Valley College Telecommunications Plan
Vanessa Brown
March 10, 2000

Evaluator: What is your position at Napa Valley?

Vanessa: I'm the interim Director of Information Technology.

Evaluator: You replaced Jerry Levin?

Vanessa: Yes.

Evaluator: How long have you been in this position?

Vanessa: Well, I co-directed with Jerry for about a year and now I've been the interim for about a year making it two years. Even while he was here I was doing the technology plan implementation.

Evaluator: Was the purpose of the TMAPP project that you had?

Vanessa: We wanted to develop a technology plan and we did that. I think that's the one you are referring to isn't it? We have so many grants. We finished this one in the summer of 1998. It was a \$25,000 grant to develop a technology plan. Judy Walterburke and Bonnie Thorain were highly involved as well as myself.

Evaluator: Okay, here I see it. The RFA number was 96-0482-05. Does that sound right? It would have been one of the very first ones. The called it the Telecommunications Plan?

Vanessa: Yes that's it.

Evaluator: How long has that been over?

Vanessa: Well we finished it in the summer of 1998. We've made a lot of progress but we still have some more work to do on our network. Do you want me to tell you a little bit about it?

Evaluator: Yes, tell me what you did and then how you benefited from it.

Vanessa: Okay.

Evaluator: The other thing I'm looking for is this kind of global thing that you can extract from what you learned and how we can apply that to the California Community Colleges. How could other schools follow in your footsteps and do something like what you have already done?

Vanessa: I had some notes written out to you. Basically we had a collaborative effort between administration, faculty, classified staff and a board member. We compiled a team of people that looked at our campus and what they perceived were our needs. We also hired an outside consultant that kind of walked us through the process. We benefited from that but there was a perception of a business tone to their documents and that politically didn't go over very well. We kind of made that company less visible and just retooled the document internally so that was a benefit. We looked at our network and it was really just a hodgepodge of coax and different hubs. We decided to build a network. We ended up with a CISCO network, a switch network, and then we re-cabled the entire campus. All of this came out of the plan. The plan identified a structure for our IT department and additional staffing needs although it did not identify funding for that. As a result of the additional personnel that were defined we moved our data center into a remodeled classroom. We've got the network in place. We also defined equipment standards and we implemented those. That's been a positive thing. We have a centralized exchange server on campus now. We decided we wanted to go towards being able to schedule appointments across campus. We wanted to have roaming profiles so an employee could go to any workstation and have it look and feel like their workstation. We implemented anti-virus protection and we got our equipment behind a firewall to help our security. We've done a lot but we still have a ways to go as far as implementing the main logons. We've had a hard time hiring. We have to look at that whole structure. I have a survey out to the other information service officers and human resources. I've received a lot of responses back. We're possibly looking at going to a new salary schedule for IT personnel or offering a differential pay rate.

Evaluator: Would that be system wide or only in your district?

Vanessa: Well, we're one campus, one district, but we would do it for information positions only. That would possibly include the computer science instructors as well.

Evaluator: Okay, so what you are finding is that you need a higher pay scale?

Vanessa: Yes.

Evaluator: Is it significantly higher?

Vanessa: Yes it is. For our classified positions we were able to obtain a Web-master recently and we're in final negotiations with a network administrator but we had to go to one year professional employee positions to get the pay up to what we wanted. That's a concern for people just having a one-year position even though it's going to be an ongoing position. We're finding people are a little reticent to do a one-year contract versus being a permanent employee.

Evaluator: I can see why they would. What city are you in?

Vanessa: We're in Napa. We have people living in Napa that are commuting down to Silicon Valley. That's one of the reasons I think this one candidate has been considering us because he's commuting to Berkeley from Napa right now.

Evaluator: I've got your report that you sent to me. At this point you have implemented pretty much everything that is in this technology report?

Vanessa: Yes most of it. We still don't have the centralized file storage and the domain logons.

Evaluator: Are you doing anything with an encrypted key?

Vanessa: No we aren't.

Evaluator: Are you thinking about anything like that?

Vanessa: Well we want to move into Web registration. We're just now doing telephone registration implementation. We've been many years behind the times so we're trying to play catch up. It's not easy.

Evaluator: Do you know Matt Rosen over at San Joaquin Delta?

Vanessa: No I don't.

Evaluator: Let me give you his phone number. You might want to talk to him. He's doing a lot of this encrypted thing because of transcripts and so forth. They were another TMAPP project. One of the things we are supposed to be doing in our project is to understand what were the benefits, what actually happened with all of these TMAPP grants and then how do we put all together. What sort of recommendations can we be making to the

chancellor's office to establish policy and recommendations and ways for them to go? What is it that seems to work the best? With your technology plan, is it your perception that most of the other community colleges have a technology plan or not?

Vanessa: We have had some interest from some other colleges. I can't tell what they are at the moment. I'd say we've gone from having a network maybe similar to other campuses to being very state of the art. It's been a very positive thing for us. I couldn't really say just where other campuses our size are. I think they are moving in a similar direction.

Evaluator: If you hadn't had the grant, where do you think you would have been?

Vanessa: I don't think we would have had the momentum that we did and maybe the visibility. This is a very highly visible project and the board got involved and it was very positive.

Evaluator: It sounds like it. The report looks great. Have you sent this out to a number of people?

Vanessa: Judy's office would know more about that.

Evaluator: Who is Judy?

Vanessa: Judy Walterburke is probably the contact on that e-mail or it could be her secretary, Carolyn Sanchez. She's our grant writer.

Evaluator: How much did the technology and all of things that you did cost? Do you know what the final cost was?

Vanessa: Oh it's been over a million dollars. For the network we paid \$300,000 for the cabling. I would say it was over a million dollars. That doesn't include staffing. We identified in the plan that we needed an additional \$250,000 for staffing. I think one thing we changed is we had a VP of Information Technology as kind of a lead visionary and they went out to hire for that and said no, you can do the job. We'll give you the experience. Politically there is the other Vice President saying that's as much as we make. There can be some internal resistance to the high technology salaries. You get the presidents and vice-presidents going wait a minute. It may not be \$250,000 when it's all said and done but that's what we identified. I was very pleased with this Technology II push that may result in some monies for staffing.

Evaluator: What is that?

Vanessa: It's something that is being developed. I guess it's not ready for presentation now but some people are working on it.

Evaluator: Oh, you mean the new plan?

Vanessa: Yes you know we've had money for equipment and hardware but not money for staffing.

Evaluator: Are you doing distance learning?

Vanessa: We do a little bit of it now. It's mostly in our non-credit courses. We have an agreement with a company in India. We need to move into that area more.

Evaluator: A company in India? What do they do for you?

Vanessa: It's our community education and somehow they have this agreement and our courses are delivered there I believe. As a result of that we expanded our mission statement. Our mission statement was more localized.

Evaluator: Well I guess so if you're delivering to India. Is there anything else you think I need to know?

Vanessa: I can't think of anything. When you talk with Bonnie Thorain about the other grant you could ask her if she has anything to add because she was involved in this one.

Evaluator: Okay, I will do that.

**Palomar College
Joan Gipson-Fredin
March 27, 2000**

Joan: My name is Joan Gipson-Fredin. I am the director of the online tutorial assistance project and my formal employer is Palomar College but actually I'm working on behalf of Palomar and Mira Costa College who have gone together as a consortium for this grant. They in turn are in partnership with Cal State San Marcos and all three institutions helped put the grant together.

Evaluator: Joan, what was the purpose of your grant?

Joan: Our mission is to extend and enrich tutoring services through the provision of online tutorial support.

Evaluator: Are you in the middle of this or at what stage are you?

Joan: Well we are nearing the end of our grant and we will wrap up this spring.

Evaluator: As you were doing this what was the most important thing you learned?

Joan: I've been thinking about this. I think the most important thing that we found is that the learning tools necessary for online tutoring and online courses are fundamentally the same. Tutoring needs online management features that courses generally don't require. Courses need some that tutoring doesn't require but essentially we're talking about having space for email, Web boards, private and small group chat and then of course for tutoring you need appointment scheduling. Hopefully in the future we'll be able to track students time in that environment to ease the accounting burden for tutoring support.

Evaluator: In terms of the project that you set forth to accomplish where do you see the relevance of this project from now?

Joan: Three years from now I'm hoping that the colleges will be using the software system that was created as a result of this project. If not that system then something that's very similar. We were able to link up with a partner, A-ttude Systems, and it is easy to use distance education systems that originated actually with Michael Loseff, a faculty member at Foothill College. He adapted a course management software package that would

accomplish what we need to accomplish for online tutoring and created a coherent system that is very easy to use. I imagine that there will be growing interest in the system.

Evaluator: Who is doing the tutoring, the instructor of record or others?

Joan: Actually it's a mixed bag. In some cases instructors are setting up office hours online and do tutoring themselves. That is happening with ESL tutoring. It's also happening with tutoring that is set up specifically to be part of an online course where students can go to a tutorial, answer some questions, fill out a feedback form and then get a response from their actual teacher. In other cases tutoring is happening because a tutor hired by the tutoring center is meeting with students online.

Evaluator: Now are many of these courses when offered face to face also accompanied by a tutorial session?

Joan: Certainly with all on ground courses students have been able to meet with teachers during office hours and in most cases have been able to see a tutor in the tutoring center. This environment is extending the capabilities and we're just now starting to field test it to see how creatively it can be used.

Evaluator: Well I asked that question because later on in my list of questions I'll ask things about the exportation of course and sharing tuition and the policies and how the extending of the instructor of records duties will have implications for a statewide system.

Joan: Absolutely. The consortium that encouraged an application for this grant was very interested in a regional system for online tutoring. In the more advanced subjects tutors are difficult to find and the students at far locations haven't been getting the same service on ground as their main campus counterparts have. There is a need to adopt tutoring for the learning styles and the handicapped for some students in our population so we see online tutoring as augmenting services for the on ground population as well as reaching a whole new group. We are hoping that what we've set up will at least lay the foundation for shared resources in the future.

Evaluator: Do you sit on any policy committees or attend any meetings, etc.?

Joan: No, not at Palomar but this project has been influencing policies and it's been interesting to see for example that Palomar has embraced the idea that tutors can work from a distance and be accountable without the direct supervision in the tutoring center.

Evaluator: Going back to the original purpose when I asked you the most important thing learned. Can you think of other things that you learned? Perhaps the second most valuable thing you learned from this process?

Joan: Well it seems kind of funny to say we just learned it but it came up and smacked us right between the eyes that the Web is foremost a publishing environment. Take all of the rules that apply to publishing on paper in terms of making the document easy for the reader to follow and use and then add a whole layer of html considerations that make it legible via any browser. There is a tremendous amount of detail in getting something onto the Web that doesn't meet the eye at first. We've been striving for cross platform, cross browser compatibility and find that it is very difficult to achieve.

Evaluator: Is this important because of class considerations?

Joan: It's important, especially for tutoring, because we can't predict the level of sophistication of the user. I think with tutoring we are more likely to attract novice users than we are with online instruction. In online courses there's a teacher who systematically leads the students through the process of getting used to working on the Web. With online tutoring a student may not be taking any online class at all and just come to an online tutoring center seeking help for the first time.

If I had to give you the nutshell of the single most important lesson we've learned, and this backtracking a bit, is to keep it simple.

Evaluator: Is training available to students wishing to avail themselves to online tutoring?

Joan: We're hoping that our system will be so simple that no training is necessary beyond the introduction that can be provided on the Web.

Evaluator: So online tutorials?

Joan: Or a system that is just so intuitive that people can follow it easily.

Evaluator: Well you are an optimist, Joan.

Joan: Well we're sure trying. Have you seen the bluelight.com Web site by any chance?

Evaluator: No I'm not familiar with it.

Joan: It's a fairly new portal that's been put up by some people who are absolutely committed to ease of use. I just mention because it's the kind of thing that we're striving for here. What we're trying to avoid is the situation where novice users want tutoring and find the system a stumbling block and then call the tutoring center for technical support.

We think prevention is the key and simplicity is the best way to prevent a lot of technical problems on lessons learned.

Evaluator: Those are important lessons learned. Do you have a report copy of this that could be passed on electronically to the coalition?

Joan: I'm working with Palomar and I could pass on the latest report. We are also getting ready to present at the Mega Conference so we're spiffing up our Web site.

Evaluator: In your opinion Joan, what does the California community college of the future look like?

Joan: Gee, I hadn't thought of this. I can only look near term and see that there will be a combination of on ground and online services that will assist students whether they are primarily online or on ground. I would think that more and more teachers who teach right on the campus will begin to use online tutoring as an adjunct. It is just such a neat way to post materials that students frequently request and to extend access to the teacher and access to tutors.

On the other end where students are taking classes primarily online I'm wondering if some on ground service centers might not begin to appear to serve students who might be taking courses from a variety of institutions, maybe places to go and take tests or to get some orientation on using online systems.

Evaluator: As you say these things and you're thinking in terms of a California community college system have you personally been invited to sit on any committees in terms of the statewide CCC?

Joan: I haven't thought that out. I've barely been able to get my head above the details of this project to see what else is going on. Perhaps when people see what's been done TMAPP Directors in general will be tapped for service in some way that I haven't been seeking or been asked to do.

Evaluator: Is your institution expecting to export courses way north and south of your location?

Joan: I haven't heard anything about that. Cheryl Hargraves might have more information on that because she works with distance education instruction more directly than I do.

Evaluator: What are the major problems you see in this tutorial effort and is there anyone that has come and said we can't do this and how have you responded?

Joan: We are essentially talking about two aspects of this project. One is the software that provides the learning environment and the other is the content that will ultimately become the meat of the system.

When it comes to the content we've asked faculty to be solely responsible for it's development. When we begin to talk about the details to publishing it so that it's accessible and so on then there are some rules that apply and getting people to agree on those rules has been a challenge. Primarily it's in regard to copyright, intellectual property ownership and access for the disabled.

As far as the software goes we're trying to create a coherent system that has all of the pieces of the learning environments that we need. We still haven't found an adequate solutions for collaborative writing and I can see that by trying to cover all bases some bases aren't being covered as well as they could be in other settings.

Evaluator: Now because you said that I wonder if there would be some policy that would help?

Joan: I don't know if policy is what we need so much as what we need are protocols. Protocols in the sense that we can say to people if you approach of publishing this way your

end product is likely to be satisfactory in terms of access, easy for students to use, on the up and up in terms of acknowledging sources, etc. The policies will continue to evolve.

Evaluator: You've actually been working with your faculty to come online and guide students through the process but how have you approached getting the tutors online?

Joan: It's been a combined approach. In some cases the teachers have wanted to be the tutors themselves, in other cases teachers have identified tutors that they would like to work with and in some cases the tutoring center has perceived a need and identified tutors who've begun to work with faculty blessing. So they are coming from various sources, which is great.

Evaluator: Do you see any pitfalls in this process?

Joan: Trying to go too fast I think would be really hard and not productive in the long run. It's like building a battleship and once it's headed in a direction it doesn't turn around easily.

It's good to plot the course carefully at the outset.

Evaluator: Do you have any words to the wise for someone else who is going forth in this area?

Joan: I'd say take a look at what has been done by people who have had the experience. Listen very carefully to the needs of all the key players including faculty, tutoring center people, the technical support staff and the administrators who have to be accountable for following rules. Then do your best to synthesize a simple solution with the student user foremost in mind.

I know that sounds abstract but this really is an abstract environment we're working in. Keep the student in mind.

Evaluator: In looking back on this and as you've been going through it do you see any personalities working better in this mode than others?

Joan: I don't know if I could identify a particular type of personality but let me put it this way. It sounds trite but there are advantages and disadvantages to working in this medium and for the person who is very isolated this medium brings connection with other people.

For people who aren't isolated it can be an isolating environment to work in because we start missing those other elements of human interaction.

I've found it difficult at times to bring people into agreement and get commitments working exclusively online. It's good to have face-to-face consideration of ideas.

Evaluator: Let me ask you this. The age group of your instructors of record, is there a difference between the ages of the instructor typically and the ages of those who are signing up to be tutors?

Joan: Yes. Interestingly almost all of the people in this project are baby boomers. We have a few who are on the young side and a few who wouldn't qualify as that but we tend to be in our 40's and 50's.

Evaluator: Even the tutors?

Joan: These are the faculty and staff who've been working on this project. The tutors tend to be younger. Primarily people who are student age although there are some exceptions. There are older folks who are very involved with the Internet.

Evaluator: I asked that question because typically the younger individuals are coming in with greater computer sophistication.

Joan: Absolutely. The teachers that we've been working with on this project are primarily pioneers on our campuses. They haven't been the ones who have been inside the computer rewiring it but they're the ones who quickly saw the possibilities and they began to experiment on their own usually with the expense of an enormous amount of personal time and money.

Evaluator: That is a great relationship to have an instructor who is learning the computer and a tutor who comes in with the skills to work together.

Joan: That's interesting. Yes, I think we'll probably see that. One of the things that has happened to this project is that since we had to develop software, since we couldn't just find it on the Web and begin to use something that was satisfactory to us we've had to really truncate our field test time. We are just now starting to use the system to data test the system with students.

Evaluator: Well good luck to you Joan.

Joan: Thanks a lot and I'd be happy to answer any follow up questions on this. Let's see did you want me to send a report to someone?

Evaluator: If you have a report copy of your project on a disk and if you could email that to the coalition that would be greatly appreciated.

**Rancho Santiago College
Irene Malmgren
April 4, 2000**

Evaluator: I'm working with Palomar College and they have a TMAPP grant and the last two numbers in it were 66. It was funded this year and part of what we're doing is talking to existing and former project directors of other TMAPP grants and trying to first understand what the project was and second find out what did you learn and maybe some pitfalls.

Irene: I'm Irene Malmgren at Rancho Santiago College with the virtual counseling TMAPP grant. I've got one or two major ones.

Evaluator: Tell what they are.

Irene: In terms of pitfalls? I need to do it in the context of the project. What we did was we bought virtual computers and our goal was to establish a connection between continuing education and credit. We felt that if the continuing education suit could talk easily to our counselors that we would facilitate them transferring their matriculation to credit because they would know somebody, they would have made a contact. It all sounded good except two things.

We didn't put any ongoing staffing in there. There is nobody whose job it is to schedule times so that there is a counselor on both ends or to facilitate both ends of the connection. It's something that doesn't happen as independently as we hoped it would. We're still working to get the kind of staff support that it takes to make this work really easily. It's working and we're using it but I don't think to the extent that I had dreamed. Of course, maybe it'll never be used to the fullest extent I was hoping it would be.

The other piece was we had a little bit of extra money so we got permission to do a pilot where we're connecting the college credit counseling center with one of our big feeder high schools. That actually, in terms of contact time, has worked out better because we have a person at the other end who is really invested in getting her students to college and community college for many of the Santa Ana students is the best option. The problem

that we never dreamed we'd have was getting the firewall cut in the two systems. To get it set up so the two computers could talk to each other through the unified school district and our district was amazing. That was the biggest barrier and I didn't know enough about technology to know I was walking into that one. We've been working on this for this whole academic year and we just got the firewalls penetrated. We've got that programming done. They're afraid of people hacking in and in all the preliminary meetings nobody said anything about it and so I didn't anticipate it.

Evaluator: So how did you get around it?

Irene: Well it just took a lot of meetings and we finally got an agreement to do it but we just had to push. We had to finally create a meeting where all the decision makers were present so that they could say you have to do this and it is not a choice.

Evaluator: That's interesting isn't it?

Irene: Yes. In terms of the work, it works well. The high school one is really fun because we have a new teacher education program and a new Mesa program so when they have their club meetings we turn the system on and our counselor sits here and talks to them. So we've made the connection and when we go out for recruitment they've already seen this persons face they know their name and the counselor knows some of the students. That part has really worked well and I think it will ease the transition. Our students often don't have transportation and this allows them to be much more frequent in their connection with the college personnel.

Evaluator: I imagine it does.

Irene: We've actually had our best luck with the high school, better than with the non-credit because of staffing and that energy. However, both are up and running and I see them moving ahead it's just that those were the unexpected things. The firewall was the real issue. It finally took a senior administrative person to say you're just going to make it happen and if we take a hit we take a hit.

Evaluator: Well it's true. You can be so protectionist that you can't get out of the system. Our site has a descriptor in it that's called Adult Education and we found out the firewalls were preventing people from coming to our site simply because of the word adult.

Irene: Oh how interesting.

Evaluator: Yes, its nuts. Its just paranoia and then they go back and don't want to change it and these are the people building the firewalls. They build the rest of us into a box out of which we cannot get and you're stuck there and you don't know why you're not getting the hits you ought to be getting.

So how many students do you think have used the system at this point?

Irene: I don't know. In any given meeting there might be 12 or 15 students and that's only been up and running a month so probably under 50 there, the same students though, probably. Then with continuing education and credit probably another 75 to 100. I actually haven't asked them to give me data yet so I don't know for sure but I would say that would be reasonable.

Evaluator: So the technology at this point is working nicely, no big problems with that. What computer program did you use to connect the two?

Irene: Oh, I don't know. I'd have to find out. We bought computers with virtual capabilities that are different then our district standard. We went out and found ones we could get built, we could get a couple extras because that's what they did versus buy our district standard and they upgrade them. I'd have to look that up to be honest with you, I didn't pull that out.

Evaluator: Pretty simple little program though?

Irene: Yes, the computer capacity for the virtual connection is built into the computer. We didn't have to buy a separate computer, separate program. We just loaded all of our district stuff right on to the computers. At the high school for instance they are using the computer when we're not using it virtually they use it for word processing and they have it hooked up to their career stuff. We've made it so it can be dual used and it wasn't sitting there being wasted.

Evaluator: That's wonderful. So the response then from the counselors, how do they like doing this?

Irene: Some of them think it's really fun and some are still intimidated by it all. It's more a matter of getting them to touch it but once they do it they're okay with it. It seems like a big deal, they get nervous and then when they actually do it they're okay. It's been really funny to watch the response because where they start and where they end is very different. Once we get them sitting down doing it, playing with it a bit, discovering there is no mystery, no genie in a bottle, it just works.

Evaluator: Does it take maybe three sessions before they're feeling comfortable or maybe five?

Irene: We have a nineteen-hour computer technician that works for us. I use matriculation money to pay for that. That means at least nineteen hours a week he is on call to help. What we did was we set up all the initial sessions for times he was here, very specifically so that way we have him as a backup on call no matter what for the first three or four weeks. Basically for most people it took a couple of supervised sessions and then a couple sessions on their own before they didn't regularly run into something that they wanted to come and ask a question about.

Evaluator: Okay and then about the students. Is somebody helping on that end?

Irene: Well that's been the part that we had trouble with. At continuing education we don't have staff all the time. Students are better at it then we are for the most part but not necessarily in – we thought it would be more of a problem for students then it is. It's Santa Ana students here so we have the poorest zip code in California in Santa Ana. However, our students are more literate then we thought they might be. I mean they're getting there faster, they're more willing to try, they don't expect things to blow up. People of my generation are afraid to push the wrong button like it all might blow up. The students have played so many video games that they know it doesn't matter they just make it work. They just keep trying until it works.

Evaluator: It's that great?

Irene: It is, it's wonderful. So we do need staff and that's what is holding us back with the continuing education connection. We're still working on it but we will get there, we're working it out. If I'd have known what I know now I would have made a match or something out of a staff member to watch that and then I would have had the district online and committed for it.

Evaluator: So the actual cost, it sounds, would be minimal.

Irene: It really is.

Evaluator: Can you give us some idea of what you're thinking about?

Irene: I'm looking at needing a couple of nineteen hour employees to staff the center, to be in that center or maybe another nineteen hour person to enhance it and they probably wouldn't make over ten dollars an hour. You're only talking \$190.00 a week, so \$800.00 a month is really all we're looking at. If we could add nineteen hours to their staff then the people who work there already would have the workload reduced and then I think they'd all be willing to participate.

Evaluator: Is there any possibility for something like a work study?

Irene: We may go that direction because they work at a different site in the continuing education site and I've demonstrated where the barrier is and they're working on what they think the best solution is. Before I start telling them how to solve it I've got to give them a chance to solve it. Maybe they'll come up with a better solution so I need to let that be a possibility too.

Evaluator: Now tell me what state you are in with this project then, is it almost over?

Irene: Well I think we're pretty well done. That is everything is purchased, everything is installed and setup. We're now just on trial and error on how to best staff it. We're playing with do we have counselor on call all the time or do we set up specific hours. We've been trying different combinations and how do we staff the other end, the continuing education end. It may have to be a counselor who says I'm going to just tell all my students who have credit questions to come in at four o'clock. Well can a classified person do it? That's the

piece we're at right now is the fine tuning. We've got the equipment and the lines all setup now it's a matter of how to bring it to play and work on a regular basis.

Evaluator: Are there several high schools that you're working with?

Irene: Right now only one because our grant wasn't originally to hookup the high schools so we just have one. If that will work then I'm going to be looking for more money to expand this because that part is probably where we have the most energy. I've got high school teachers dying for this and I want to take advantage of this energy. I'm going to have to find grant money to do it with.

Evaluator: Well it seems maybe you can even ask for an extension.

Irene: They'd have to give me more money and I have to find out the process to do that with.

Evaluator: Who is your grant monitor?

Irene: Janie Marcus, so I'll work with her.

Evaluator: Yes because it sounds to me that if you were able to do it and show how profitable it can be for students this way and get some of the staffing then the next step in it would be how do you do that with another community college. How could you both work using some of the same systems, so how do you scale this to the next level, which might be within a district or a region? If the number of schools were taking care of the support that need to be there, the technical support, instead of having to have ten people.

Irene: Yes there are ways to blend them together, absolutely.

Evaluator: That's what helps so much with so many of the large virtual reality, virtual things that are going in most teaching is that they are able to maximize it over a number of sites and you don't have to just have one person at each site.

So the benefits then to the students are that?

Irene: They're not credit students it's that they're feeling connected to the credit side and we're hoping that it will increase the number who choose to matriculate to transfer over. Then the high school students, same thing, they're feeling connected to the college. Research shows us the more connections, the more times they make contact the better

the chances they have of making the transfer. Now we're trying to see if virtual connection does the same thing as person-to-person connection.

Evaluator: What do you think?

Irene: We don't know yet. All of our intuition says it will help but we still have to wait and see.

Evaluator: Are you doing a research component to this?

Irene: Well we will follow the students once we get this up and running. We'll follow the students and see who checks in and where they land. Yes, we'll do that.

Evaluator: Okay so you will have some information that way. Have you filed a report?

Irene: I don't have a final report yet. I don't think the final report forms are out yet.

Evaluator: I have no idea.

Irene: I was told that they are late. I've been looking for them but I think all the report forms are late coming out so they're not due until June 12th or something. Usually they're due the end of April.

Evaluator: Will you do it electronically?

Irene: If I can, absolutely.

Evaluator: It would be most useful if you could send me a copy when you do it.

Irene: Okay, do you want to email me with your address and I'll just add it to my list.

Evaluator: What is your email?

Irene: It's malmgren_irene@rsccd.org.

Evaluator: Okay, anything else that you think I ought to know?

Irene: At this point no. It seems real simple but those couple things that we didn't write in. One was the staffing piece and the other was the firewall issue. Other than that it's just now a matter that we have to finesse it. What is the best way to maximize usage and schedules and all of that stuff so that's where I'm headed next?

Evaluator: It sounds like such a cool project, I really love it.

Irene: You know it's real simple and yet it's really something that can be replicated, it's doable, any place with multiple sites could do the same thing.

Evaluator: Is part of your report going to be on that.

Irene: Well I haven't done a TMAPP before so I don't know what they're going to ask me to write about yet. If there is a comment section those are the kinds of things I'd put in there.

Evaluator: I think it's just the first cover page, and a lot of people replicated it last year. They just created it as a form online or in the word processing. It's nothing more than a word processing form anyway so they filled in everything that way so everything was electronic. Then most of them also filed it on their Web site so that plenty of people could also get to it. That is one of the things that have really been helping me. I can go in and download the materials and look to see what's going on. If you are able to do that it seems to me like an awful lot of other groups can benefit from what you've done including what we're doing. I think that is a really big piece.

We're going to probably end up doing some simulations rather than a demonstration and we'll simulate maybe a week to two weeks of a course. However it's not so much offering the course as it is all of these things that you've run into with the advising and the counseling and how do you get past all that. Then you take it to registration then to articulation of diplomas and courses that have been taken and you take that from the high schools to the community colleges and then on to the university. It's all of these sorts of administrative things that get in the way of helping students. What a shame.

Irene: I'll be interested to hear what you gather from all of this. It will be fun.

Evaluator: It's really been great. We're just about at the tail end of everything and I actually see a pattern of what the Chancellors office has done. It's wonderful.

Irene: Well I'll be glad to see your results.

College of the Redwoods
Jean Butler
March 27, 2000

Jean: This is Jean Butler. I'm the Director of Enrollment Management at College of the Redwoods in California. We're talking here to give you an update on the electronic transcript exchange grant.

I have been in this position for about two months now and want to begin by saying that looking at the initial proposal and the initial offers I would say that in the space of the last two years we have lost five of those individuals to other jobs or to retirement. Not that that's an excuse but I think that will explain that with that kind of turnover here it's been difficult to find that constant thread to keep this effort going. I believe now that I'm in this position we can sort of pick up the gauntlet and move it forward.

Evaluator: Okay. As we all know there is no excuse for retirement, right.

Jean: This is no excuse except the excuse for why in the world they didn't take us. I think with the staff turnover that is one issue but I think one even more pressing issue has been this integrated student record system which CR purchased back in '97-'98. I can tell you I've never seen anything quite like this in my professional experience and it is really the main reason in my mind why we are nowhere near what we need to be doing with the electronic transcript exchange.

This system is still in the conversion stage. I'm looking at the information that was left here for me about this grant and there's been a constant communication and exchange among the partners for this program which are CR, Humbolt State and Eureka. The challenge is then trying to adapt what has been needed and translate it into a way that this current computer system can read and adapt to. The conversion in this system is taking much longer than people expected and I have to say that it's with any institution going through a conversion, the first and most important part of that conversion for any institution

is their accounts receivable component. So that is what we start with in the business office and then filter into some of the more academic areas that directly related to this.

I think we've just reached a point last fall that we finally felt confident and comfortable in the accounts receivable. They are now beginning to attack some of the issues on the academic side and we have some very real issues in how this new system has been able to convert our academic and our transcript information in a format that could be usable on this electronic data exchange program. We're right in the stages now of continuing the conversation particularly with Humboldt State to get our computers to talk to each other. We're still reviewing the data elements and we're still trying to develop the walk through that makes sure that all of the communications are working. I know this is taking lots more time than anyone expected because of some of the issues we've had with conversion.

I think the intent is still very real. We are so very interested in getting this going but it is that ongoing challenge of trying to get this system to a point that the information that it is storing is absolutely accurate. I mean that is critical with the academic transcript to make sure that we've got our ducks in order before we start sending it out to other institutions.

Evaluator: The original purpose of the project was to get this conversion system in place?

Jean: The original intent of this program was to develop a three-way transcript exchange among College of the Redwoods, Humboldt State and Eureka High School.

It's patterned after what some of the other institutions and community colleges in California have been doing. We just felt that it was a real good idea because we have a very large student population that comes to us from Eureka High and in the same token we have a great number of students who, as soon as they finish at Sierra, transfer on to Humboldt State because that's the local institution for us. It's ten miles away from us. So the intent of the program is to help speed this process for students in making the transcript and the academic information much more readily accessible to those institutions.

Evaluator: Do you have any idea, and this question might be hard because you weren't a part of this developmental process – did anyone share with you the most important thing that was learned as this process was going on?

Jean: I think probably what I'm seeing in here is that it has taught people the complexity of technology and how even though you have a very good and wonderful project the ideal of it is very difficult to translate into a technology format or a phase. Given the paper trail that I'm looking at there I think the reality of trying to do this and doing it with systems that were not designed to talk to each other has probably been the most eye opening for the people who have been involved in this. I truly don't think that they had expected it to be quite this lengthy and this complex but that's what it turned into.

Evaluator: What is the relevance for this system three years from now? Do you think you're right on the money?

Jean: Oh I would hope so, my gosh, this is technology. This is where institutions are moving in their conversations about how to provide better service to students and provide better communication among institutions. We just absolutely need to get away from the paper trails that we've created with academic transcripts and let the technology work for us. I think this allows us do it in a very nice controlled environment so that we can make sure all of the processes are absolutely squeaky clean. Then take it to the next level and translate it so we can then start to interconnect our systems with other groups of these systems across the state with the hopes that ultimately we'd all have the same interconnection.

I don't know how familiar you are with records programs or some of the discussion that's been going on for years about electronic transcript processing and some of the programs and software that have been out there and developed like Speedy. I think this is a small more localized version of that process to see and to make certain that it's going to work best. Above and beyond everything else I think that intent to make sure that the service is provided for the student has been the primary focus but being the good admissions and registrar people that we are the other intent is making sure that the integrity

of the student record is absolutely intact and that we can guarantee that through the process that we're doing electronically.

Evaluator: You mentioned that the first thing that was a surprise to the folks was the technology, are there any other secondary things that came out of this in terms of ideas that came out of this that people weren't anticipating?

Jean: At this point, it would be hard to say. I think what it has done though is open the door to that nice open communication that we've been able to establish and continue to establish with our local state university and our local high school. I think what it has allowed us to do is talk about this as a technique or a process. Also in the context of the big picture and in terms of how our application and transcript processing work and what the time frames are what the entire process is, what kinds of things are used for admission, for example, at CR versus what Humbolt State is looking for. So I do think from that context it's been a great learning experience for all of us to get a feel for what our two partners are doing in terms of their students and helping their students through transition.

Evaluator: Do you have a copy of this in electronic format?

Jean: Yes, right here in front of me.

Evaluator: Could you email it to us?

Jean: Sure. I was kind of hoping that I could have connected with our computer guy who has been helping us with the conversion but he isn't in today. I've got a copy here of what the application abstract is if that would help.

Evaluator: Any information that would be out there with your words would be helpful.

Jean: What I'll do is I'll check and see because I've got a hard copy here but I don't know if it exists electronically.

Evaluator: Now, let me ask you this. You mentioned you are following the specs or the model of other issues. Have you personally been involved in any policy or policy discussions on the combination and collaboration with other California Community Colleges?

Jean: No. As I've said I'm still so new to this system experience that I'm still wading my way through my own campus meeting these people. I am hoping this summer that I can begin to make some connections to my counterparts to the other schools. I want to get a reading from them not only about this particular process but about some of the other processes they do just to get a little bit more experience and information about how community colleges in California operate.

Evaluator: The reason I asked that is we all know that technology is definitely a moving target. As technology changes and becomes more sophisticated particularly in the area of object architecture and the moving of data it's interesting. There must be some talks or something going on within the greater system on how to make sure you're adjusting as you put these software programs into place.

Jean: Yes. I think the state as a whole is trying to look at some of these issues but again, being so new I don't know where they might be in the discussions. I think everyone understands that we need to take advantage of all of the technology and advances that have been made in the last three to five years and really get up to speed in using it. I get the sense that the system has been watching all of us who have been developing these small groups of kind of shared information or electronically. Maybe, hopefully that's going to drive it to the top and say let's really look at this in making it a full system wide effort.

I'm sure they're talking about it. I can't imagine why they would not be talking about it but in terms of where they might be or if this is a very real possibility, I truly don't know.

Evaluator: Well your efforts are going to be definitely driving the solution. If there were a policy what policy would help your project the most?

Jean: You know I'm getting kind of a good feel for Title Five and all of the policies that drive California Community Colleges I don't believe that any of the policies that might even relate to this would block this or be a barrier to what we're trying to do.

Evaluator: As you've been doing this and picking things up what were the major problems or were there any major nay sayers saying we can't do this?

Jean: Oh gosh no. One of the things that has attracted me to this place and what keeps me happy to keep coming back every morning is I'm working with folks who are very forward thinkers who are willing to take on this kind of risk. They understand that change is kind of eternal especially when it comes to the technology and they seem to feel comfortable living and working within that kind of environment of change. So we're not dealing with people here who have phobias about computer or technology and have sort of dug their heels in and said this absolutely won't work. If anything it's the opposite. People see the benefits of this and understand what it might be able to do to help strengthen our connections and help students and they are all for it. No, I have not had any inkling of anyone feeling that way.

Evaluator: Now again, as part of this learning process and sharing, the major pitfalls you've already mentioned the technology being an issue. Is that the major pitfall that people ran into?

Jean: Absolutely. I'd say without question if you were to track any of these folks down that have been working with us in the last couple of years that that would be the first thing they'd say.

Evaluator: What would they say?

Jean: The technology in terms of the conversion process that CR has been involved in with this integrated student record system has hindered us making the kind of process that we would have like to have made on this electronic data exchange.

Evaluator: Is that because the talent was not there?

Jean: It is a system that was purchased by CR that is called a Coco system, do you know it? I was not familiar with it at all but as I'm getting more involved in the system and getting a little bit of history here my feel for it and my understanding of it is that it's a rather small kind of a corporation that develops integrated systems for numbers of business and industries that does include education but it doesn't have a very large clientele. So I don't think it's a very well known integrated student record system. It has several different components that

you can buy one or all of these components as a package and I think we've probably purchased three of their modules and those are what we were attempting to integrate.

Evaluator: To a central depository versus Web based?

Jean: Yes. So what we're dealing with is taking a system and trying to convert it to have all the bells and whistles that we're looking for. The limit we have is the support for this particular system is based somewhere out of Houston, but now I'm really talking off the top of my head and quite frankly I don't know where they are but they aren't local.

What's happened then is a lot of the conversion issues of course are if you can't get somebody by phone or you're getting a delayed response by phone then of course the next knee jerk reaction is to pick up the phone and call your computer people downstairs and see if they can step in and help.

Evaluator: Well, do you have any words to the wise Jean, before we sign off?

Jean: To me it's that weird kind of a question like gee would we do this all over again? Absolutely. It's true because you learn something from everything that comes along and what I think this has allowed us to do on a much smaller scale before we go big term is to really understand the complexities and understand whatever issues might come out of this and to be able to resolve them and learn from them. This is the right thing to do, it's really taking that leap of faith in allowing technology to help us be better workers and provide better service to students.

My words to the wise are go for it. Don't be held back, this is certainly an idea and a concept that the time has come and we need to pursue it.

Evaluator: Thank you so much Jean.

**College of the Redwoods
Eureka, CA
Dr. Jeff Bobbitt
March 23, 2000**

Jeff: I'm Jeff Bobbitt. I'm the Vice President for Academic Affairs at College of the Redwoods in Northern California.

Evaluator: You have taken over for someone who retired, that is my understanding?

Jeff: Yes, it has been a series of transitions here. I'm completing my third year. They did a search for me during the academic year in '96-'97 and I joined the college and I joined the college at the very end of the springtime of 1997 so my first year was the '97-'98 year. The interim vice president who served back in the '96-'97 year while they were searching for me was Al Kurki. He stayed on in '97-'98 on a special assignment for the president and I'm not positive but I have sort of lost the time trail on this in terms of when exactly the TMAPP project that he worked on began. I don't know if he actually initiated it in the year that he was here as academic vice president, which was '96-'97 or whether he initiated it in '97-'98 but he was the person who I have mentally affiliated that project with from the beginning. I don't whether that's helpful or not.

Evaluator: Well anyway we'll put it into the bank and see what we get. In my next question, the million-dollar question is, do you have enough familiarity with the project to answer a handful of questions?

Jeff: It's a bit risky. I mean I know that my understanding is that it was a planning grant and that we used it as a seed for the beginning of our developing our local technology master plan, which is something that we got into very heavily last year. We have made some great strides in terms of developing a technology master plan for the college. I understand that some of the information gathering and preliminary work that was left for us was done as a result of that grant but in terms of actually tracking what exactly was done when and by whom, that's not real easy for me to be perfectly honest with you.

Evaluator: Well let's just take it from where are you at right now and what would you say is the purpose of the project you are working on right now, this technology project?

Jeff:

We've completed the first cycle of developing a technology master plan for the entire district. We convened a technology planning task force at the beginning of the '98-'99 academic year. Actually, we probably began it more in the spring of '99. We set some initial institutional goals for technology planning and implementation for the district. We produced an interim report at the end of '98-'99 and as we went into '99-2000 we began to try to flush out that plan. We've appointed two technology planning committees to help drive that plan. We have a technology strategy committee, which is the overall planning, and goal setting and steering for our technology planning. Then we have a technology operations committee, which is the interface with the operations people who actually execute the acquisition and training and upgrading and implementation of technology.

We just recently have reached the end of another part of the planning cycle to where we have established eight basic principles to guide technology planning for the future. We have a restructuring on ongoing technology planning group around a series of 11 or 12 primary goals for technology for the next few years. Again, we understand that technology is probably as close to a genuine oxymoron as exists today because it changes and it is moving so rapidly that planning for it is almost impossible. We are looking at planning a two to three year maximum planning horizon. The next important thing that we're going to be doing is not only did we have an interim vice president before I got here but after my first year here we lost our president and so we had the same person as our interim president for year. We got our new permanent president last July and she has immediately helped us in kicking off an institution-wide strategic planning initiative. We have just appointed what we call an integrated planning committee for the college.

During the fall semester we conducted an extensive set of what we call listening sessions all up and down the district. We took a road show out to the community and had evening and daytime community listening sessions where we listened to the community and what people perceived the role of the college to be. We are fashioning that into a revised vision statement for the college and that is being fed into a new integrated planning committee to try to set strategic goals for the near future. This is sort of following the lead of

our technology planning. We started with technology planning because it just stuck out to us as that being one of the most critical areas to where planning was so essential and we knew we had to do a good bit of work on our overall planning strategic when I got up here. So we started with the technology planning initiative and it has served as sort of a model for the creation of a totally integrated planning, evaluation and budgeting process for the whole college that will actually be kicking off next week.

Evaluator: Well congratulations.

Jeff: Well, we'll see how it goes.

Evaluator: In all of that was there something that sticks out in your mind as the most important thing you learned?

Jeff: I would say a couple of things. I think one of the things that we learned was that over the years and I don't know why but I think that if you don't constantly pay attention to the changing needs of your community then it's easy to get a little bit out of touch with the community. I think one of the things that we clearly learned in the listening session process was that there were needs in the community that the college was probably not meeting as well as it could. I think that a renewed and visible commitment to community relationships, community partnerships particularly with respect to career and occupational certificates and degree programs is going to be a renewed emphasis for the college.

I think we're going to be looking at some different delivery systems for courses that have come out of our planning and listening exercise. We are right now a pretty traditional campus, at least on the Eureka part, in terms of the kind of courses we offer, the formats in which we offer them, the scheduling that we use, we do not have an extensive evening or weekend program. One of the things that we learned was that we think that is a potential area where our community is underserved. I think it is likely that we will be looking at a renewed offering of programs on the evenings and weekends. We also found that we've not done as good a planning process as we could in terms of how we are delivering classes to the more remote regions of our service area.

We have an enormous district up here and we've been experimenting with distance technologies in terms of offering courses and we need to focus our planning, we learned that. A little more in terms of identifying what specific populations we might be able to better serve through distance course technology and trying to put a mechanism in place to determine which courses and programs would be the ones that the community would most likely respond positively to if taught by distance technology. I think that is clearly something we've learned in the process.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy of any of these findings that you could send electronically?

Jeff: We're working on it. Casey, our President, has been synthesizing the information that she has found from the listening sessions and we're trying to, I think by next week we would. I think probably what's going to happen next week when we convene the first meeting of the integrated planning committee I believe it's her intention to share with them a synthesis of what has come out of the listening session process. I don't want to preempt her but I think that is Monday or Tuesday.

Evaluator: Well we'll wait and perhaps get back in touch with you to get a copy of that. Now what is your impression on the California community colleges for the future, what it will look like?

Jeff: I don't know, you're asking a pretty short term transplanted Texan here to speculate about the future of California.

Evaluator: They searched all the way to Texas for you?

Jeff: Yes, they searched all the way to Texas and found me.

I guess one of the things clearly that I think will be sorting itself out in the future of California is going to be this entire remote access issue, particularly in terms of technology. You know, what are colleges going to be able to reasonably do in terms of offering courses through nontraditional formats. I just came back from a professional meeting last week where a lot of conversation is about what courses and programs that colleges are offering to students who can't come to campus on a regular basis. I see a lot of experimentation with

that in the state and I think that that has got to take a more coherent focus in terms of what the community college are going to offer and what other colleges and universities are going to offer and how those are going to fit together and what people from outside the state are going to make available to residents of California because everything comes in on the Internet.

Evaluator:

Now speaking of that is there, in your meetings, talk about any kind of policy for combining and collaborating with your other community college in the state? You're talking and traditionally we've talked just about our footprint but in this case are you looking at statewide policy or do you have a policy development committee at your institution talking about courses that might come from other community colleges or ones you might send out?

Jeff:

In general terms, yes, and in specific terms no. We're a little bit behind probably where we need to be in that kind of discussion and speculation. Our involvement with distance based classes has happened pretty much the way I think it's probably happened in almost every school in the country that's doing this. It sort of began with faculty interest. There were faculty members here who were interested in that technology and how they might deliver courses through it so we began with some fairly traditional experiments in televised courses. We are in a pretty remote area up here and at the time people started experimenting with this we didn't have a good infrastructure for transmitting voice data and images outside the college or even that well for inside the college.

We've made some tremendous progress up here in recent years in terms of strengthening the infrastructure and more and more faculty has become interested in experimenting with the new infrastructure. We're reaching a critical mass I would say. I think a lot of schools are probably in the same position we are in where we've got a certain critical mass of interest now in terms of delivering courses through those technologies. Most of our thought about that has been on the origination end of that rather than the receiving end. We have not had many conversations here about handling courses that our students would receive or that we would make available through a link with some other college. Most

of our interest has been from the faculty in terms of preparing courses to be shared with other populations that originated here.

The need that we have now is to try to make intelligent decisions for the future about what the focus of those efforts is going to be. I laugh with people here and talk about lets do it on purpose not by accident. Part of our planning exercise, one of the features of it, one of the focal points is going to be our involvement in distance courses and what are we going to do by intention. What are we going to do on purpose and we're going to have to sit down and evaluate what we've done in the past and what we think we can do in the future. We know no college is going to be able – everybody is not going to be able to do everything. There simply aren't time and money resources available to do that. I think we are going to have to make decisions about who and where are the remote populations that we should serve and how can we best use that technology to deliver the courses and programs to the people that we're supposed to serve in our district. We have a very natural need for that because our district is so remote and so huge. One of my priorities is to make sure we use that technology first for serving members of our own district and community that we're probably under serving now because they cannot get to one of our sites.

Evaluator:

Well you are probably one of the few institutions in the world, I might say, that has done a market analysis in your listening tour to what their constituents want to learn in order to survive in their environment.

Jeff:

Well I think it's been a very important thing that we did and I give full 100 percent credit for that whole concept to our new president because that was the very first thing she put together when she arrived. We spent most of the Fall semester doing road shows as I call them. We met in community facilities and high schools and community centers and our district runs, you know we laugh and call it from Elk to Oregon. Elk is about 15 to 20 miles south of Mendocino, California and we go all the way to the Oregon border so that is several hundred miles in distance north and south. Then we have service areas in four counties, the coastal section of Mendocino County, all of Humbolt County, all of Del Norte County and portions of Trinity County to the east of us. One of the Native American reservations,

the Hoopa Reservation, is in our service area just about 12 miles north of Willow Creek, which is about 30 miles east of us. One thing that I'm interested in is how we could better use technology to serve that Native American population that is in our district. We are just beginning to get the technology links up there that we haven't had in the past to be able to communicate.

Evaluator: Well you'd certainly be using your community college for economic development in these areas.

Jeff: Absolutely.

Evaluator: Well is there a policy that would help you at this point or is that something that doesn't even make sense?

Jeff: Policy relating to?

Evaluator: Any help as you approach the getting of the funding or creating your technology. You're going to be part of a, you are a part of a bigger mass in the community college system. There will be decisions made now that will impact you as a unit, now more than ever before, because you are linked electronically. Before you were linked in name, now you're all plugged into each other, in a sense, in a much more profound way so programming and policies that are developed for the southern part of the state will impact, more now than ever before I would imagine, Elk, California.

Jeff: That's right. You know a lot of this.

Evaluator: It could help or hurt you if that's true.

Jeff: That's right. Part of the problem is trying to – this cries out for a degree of organization and regulation, which is very difficult, and there are a lot of people who don't like regulations. This is simply a personal view of mine. The difficult thing is you cannot police the communication link. Anybody can go to any Web site anywhere in the world and anybody can put instruction out there on any Web site available anywhere in the world. The thing I'm personally concerned about is how the state is going to end up. Is there going to be any reasonable effort at central coordination, are we going to have any guidelines about who is going to do what? Is it going to be just a wide open entrepreneurs market, anybody

puts anything out there for anybody anywhere? There are resources issues involved, the technology human infrastructure resources continue to be an incredible problem. As you know the state has been relatively generous in recent years in terms of funding for hardware. The human resources that it takes to keep the hardware running and keep the software updated, you know, the humans that are needed on both ends of a distance education class, the humans that support the originate end and the humans who support the receiving end are going to be a massive resource problem for the state, I think, in the future.

Evaluator: Well, let me end on a positive note. Any words to the wise that you have to offer?

Jeff: To anybody?

Evaluator: Well, I think you've already given me the answer. I think the words to the wise that I heard loud and clear was the listening tour. I applaud you on that, that sounds like a really important step that a lot of people don't start with.

Jeff: I think it is an incredibly important step. I think it's been one of the most important things that we do. It's very easy in this business to forget that we are community colleges and the primary thing that we do should be to serve our community. That is our first responsibility. If I have a chance to support faculty members who are interested in meeting the educational needs whether it is by on site courses or by distance courses that are targeted to people in our service area my inclination is to support that absolutely first before we worry about making courses available to people in North Carolina. I think that the community colleges have a local obligation that comes first.

Evaluator: Right, I hear you. Jeff, I want to thank you for your time today in answering these questions.

Jeff: You're very welcome. I hope I've helped. I sort of feel a little bit like I'm not in a great position to be much help to you because of the timing and the transitions that have gone on.

Evaluator: It sounds like you're planning has carried on the original work of the TMAPP.

Jeff: Absolutely, I do know that part of getting some of the ideas that we have for how to set up the planning structure I know came from some meetings that people went to, that I think were based on the original TMAPP project. It's been helpful and we have a lot more work to do.

Evaluator: So you're not putting AI back into all those meetings?

Jeff: No. AI has absolutely promised that he's out.

Evaluator: Well there you go, you can't bring those guys back. Thank you so much Jeff.

Jeff: You're very welcome and if I can do anything else don't ever hesitate to call.

**Rio Honda College
Dr. Susan Obler
March 30, 2000**

Evaluator: Dr. Susan Obler at Rio Hondo.

Susan: We just called it CEO Institutes for Understanding Technology and we hired Western Co-Op to do them. They did that Management of Distance Ed. Workshop. They have done some stuff for presidents too and other kinds of leaders and broader prospectives than the Chancellors office purpose.

The grants' purpose was to inform and engage some of the CEO's on the broader issues. They don't really get a prospective if they go to some kind of conference that is designed to help them with decision making and with key elements of what's coming down the pike and that sort of thing. It was two days in Pomona on March 9th and 10th and the following week, the 15th and 16th I think it was at Berkley so there was a northern one. It was designed for 90 because there are 107, whatever, plus there is 17 Chancellors and 26 signed up for each one and 30 percent of them did not show.

So either it's (a) like to resist with the Chancellors office or (b) they didn't perceive that they needed this. Interestingly the people that are the most engaged are the people who turned up. It was preaching to the choir kind of stuff. Probably the most critical reason that the turnout was low was that (a) its spring and (b) they had just had an all presidents meeting about three weeks before. They had seen each other quite enough I guess. A few friends of mine called and said, can I go to the other one, and I said sure I think we'll do fine. Obviously presidents can't be gone when they're being accredited. So there were people who had difficulties and snags. A couple of people couldn't come the first day and came the second and then the opposite. However they were extremely engaging and the folks were very exciting and our evaluations were quite high. I think Western does a very nice job and lead the Chancellors office part. We had kind of a balance between the big picture and California.

Evaluator: Did you bring in some of the people from the Chancellors office?

Susan: Yes, La Baron spoke and Wendy Ryans attended. The two of them attended throughout. I was really pleased. The major glitch was that La Baron was supposed to set up the Chancellor to come and welcome people but that might have, you know in some states that would have meant they all think of it as a command performance, in ours in might have sent them away.

Evaluator: Of course if he'd stayed for the whole thing it would have been interesting.

Susan: Well I think that Tom's pretty savvy on this stuff but everybody – I mean I've been immersed in it for 15 years and I learned some more and enjoyed it thoroughly and didn't worry a bit about repeating it all. I was fascinated with it and they are just really good and I'm pretty fussy about that.

Evaluator: Did Sally Johnstone attend?

Susan: Sally did it, yes, and Rose.

Evaluator: She's great. I've known Sally since probably 1986. We've been around the horn together so many times.

Susan: Yes, she is awfully good and her self-presentation is excellent and I hadn't met either of them except on the phone when we planned it. Anyway Robin, you probably know Robin Zuniga at Flashlight.

Evaluator: I know the name. I haven't met her.

Susan: She's working with Steve Irma. Robin did the evaluation piece and she's helping us with the CVC's so it was a good thing.

Evaluator: I think you sent me the Flashlight evaluation too because I've got that. I was glad to read that and see what was going on with that too. Would you think that having another one of these face to face meetings would be a good idea or would you go a different way this time?

Susan: I don't know, you know I had a funny flash and its just one of those intuities that Jerry Hunter at Chaffey was talking, and I suddenly saw Jerry surfing at a machine. I went, wait a minute, maybe that's what should occur here. Although I bet you they could do well to do this every other year. Then do a little bit more push on command performance

although we had some presidents secretary saying if you call us and nag us one more time we won't answer the phone so we were pretty pushy. The Chancellors office called and we called and then Russ called quite a bit. We called, we sent a gorgeous flier, we sent email alerts on the dates in December so we may have exhausted all the possible ways to rush the crowd.

The other thought was that we have four regional drive in surf days where presidents, we said it was for CEOs and then if you absolutely can't come then send somebody else. Frequently send their MIS person who probably isn't the right person to go, ironically enough a lot of people think it is the MIS person but it is the other person standing in the way.

Evaluator: True.

Susan: My thought was in alternate years maybe and I talked with La Baron and Wendy about it and they didn't bat an eye so maybe they thought that was really dumb thinking of drive in surfing. I think as much as you can talk about this you fact those snappy Web sites of WGU, not particularly WGU, but you know maybe even Phoenix and then their trustee colleagues have pretty hot sites and are getting more and more flexible. In a year from now there's going to be some really smart models. One thing La Baron said though when we first started was I don't want this to be on distance ed., so I could hear that was this big defensive thing. Like we're not supposed to push.

Given Western's perspective and the inevitable it just sort of slid that way.

Evaluator: Well a TMAPP grant is for technology.

Susan: That was technology but it was supposed to be broader like infrastructure issues but people are past that. I mean they're getting savvier about, okay we've got to replace it all every once in a while, that's the way of the world. Okay so we might try some wireless hubs and ditch the fiber. That's just kind of much later in their developmental stage if you will.

Evaluator: Well they've been working on it for nine years now.

Susan: Exactly. It seemed to us we needed to shake them up a little bit about the competition and how higher ed. may just be spun around completely. It's time to wake up to that stuff. Sitting there surfing is something they simply won't do but we had everybody from, who was it, Steve Effers said, I just tried email last week; down to the ones who are like Sandy Escebo who has been at De Anza and is now at Butte who eats and drinks this stuff.

Evaluator: There are so many variations and I think there are still an awful lot of people who have their email read by somebody else and print it out.

So if you were to do some things like this, what you are talking about obviously is the implementation models strategies of adoption. How do you get the guy on the white horse going that way, going in the right direction and that was the entire basis of trying to do this type of grant. With the ones then who attended, how do you see spinning off from what they've done? Can they influence the other ones or are they just going to run away with it.

Susan: One thing in our original proposal, I don't know if you've read it, was to continue conversation and I just think I'd change the conclusion early on. If you can't get them to show up at this thing then there isn't a conversation. A couple of people wanted to start a conversation last Fall and they are just so overwhelmed. It's just like wait a minute. I just hated having to spend that much money although I think Western is going to help the Chancellors office in another way just to atone the fact that we had to guarantee them money enough for ninety and basically we paid for fifty of them. I don't begrudge Western a penny because they were wonderful.

Evaluator: Yes, it is not their fault.

Susan: I think they are going to come and do a little study session for the Board of Governors, which was a great idea. As far as follow up on this great idea of the Web site I don't think the Web site and this – I was going to have this dreaded conference discussion continuing the issues that emerged there and I bet you five people maximum would participate.

Evaluator: The continuing discussion I think it's getting harder and harder for people to do that. The thing I see taking and having a little more impact is the online event if it is properly positioned.

Susan: Yes, I like Virginia McBride has done with the audio conferences and Web space to match. I think some of them are very poorly done and some of the ones out of the chancellor's office have been dismal where they just read the slides to you, right?

Evaluator: You want to have some sort of a topic that appeals to them and if not all of them show up but that the ones who if you were able to target specific things that you happened to know are going on at a certain group or colleges where there are certain problems, you know, if you've got your ear to the ground that might be a method that would involve in.

Maybe it's just initially some smaller group work. Maybe if you did five or ten on a very specific topic that they could do because I think that what you're trying to do with it is just incredibly necessary. I've been working with the community college since '91, I think, always as an outside consultant and I was sort of -- David notices closet distance learning person. Then he would go to these meetings and then call me and say, so what do you think Carla what should we be doing? So I've known a lot about what's been happening with it and this has always been the problem, that the presidents are just so sharp about it and others obviously still need a lot of help.

Susan: Well we've known that about them and learning and student centeredness. Some of them know little about instruction. It's been pretty frightening. I've been knocking around with the community colleges and been at my college for 30 years watching. I have to say though a couple things that have changed is that we have gotten with any technology at all, which is probably amazing given our resources in California, and that we're really worried now about assessment. The faculty has finally sort of come around on being more accountable and working with assessment. I wouldn't say a hundred percent but they're still lecturing and I don't think many presidents stand up for students that are learning.

Evaluator: No they don't.

Susan: So I think that there is an analogy to that in this technology stuff. I don't think they get it, they're not on top of their own craft really or mission I would say is better.

Evaluator: No. I think with so many of them it wasn't their craft in the first place, they were content experts and hired for that purpose but never really have gone through any sort of an educational process.

Susan: That's true. I think that universities are slaves to having the person of reputation in a given field as the president or the faculty won't play. What I'm more frightened about then that because some of them are fairly bright people who pay attention to what matters but what bugs me in community colleges is that more and more student services people or community services people are getting kicked upstairs and haven't clue about instruction. I know that as a faculty I'm going to harp on that.

Evaluator: Which area are you in Susan?

Susan: At the current time I'm in grant development but I was in faculty development for a long time and now I'm starting in English and writing assessment.

Evaluator: So you've been there as you said 30 years. I didn't realize that college had been there that long.

Susan: Oh it's been almost 40 years.

Evaluator: All right, what are your next steps?

Susan: I think the next ones are to recommend this alternative when it comes to this. I don't think we'll do a conversation, I think we've seen that is not going to do Plan A which was that. Then I think I'm going to literally go up and talk to Wendy, La Baron, Jose and Michelle. It wouldn't be bad if we had something that you called these people on from these various things or maybe said what's next. I find that as I was looking at the various TMAPPs and what's going on and the more I sat there thinking about it at these workshops I'm thinking that the TMAPP overlaps is giving me the creeps. There is too much going on the other people in the TMAPP projects don't know about. If it weren't for Virginia I wouldn't have a clue what the other ones were doing. She is the best spy we've got.

Evaluator: Virginia and I are working together, we're old buddies.

Susan: Has she talked with you at all about the snags at Santa Barbara?

Evaluator: We've talked about it, yes. We've gone through a lot of the ramifications and her TMAPP 65 and mine 66 had amazing overlap.

Susan: Yes it did. I noticed that in the RFS.

Evaluator: Ours got changed afterwards so I'm looking at all of them and I'm doing some different things than what she's doing. Charles Moss did a bunch of summaries and then expected me to go directly from the summaries and I'm not doing that. It's more of his cut on what happened and so between interviews with people who ran the project and then reading your reports and going to everything we'll try to assemble it. There is not going to be one right plan.

Susan: No there isn't but I sure wish we would get some thread and I wish people – maybe we need to actually have a, and I suggested this, a current TMAPP Directors meeting and nobody would do it.

Evaluator: I'll tell you what we're trying to do with this one. Sherry Hargraves at Palomar is the project director, and what we've suggested there and has been approved is that there be an advisory committee. So one enormous body of trend leaders and thinkers and people who are interested in all of this, the choir, as well as some other ones, and then there would be a smaller group. All of the TMAPP Directors are on the list and nobody has been contacted about this yet I mean we're still pulling the list together and trying to decide what to do.

Susan: That would be a great idea.

Evaluator: So if we put that together what we are trying to do originally, Christina Mora told us that we would be having a TMAPP meeting next Monday at the Palm Springs Mega Conference.

Susan: That's very nice but they turned down the Flashlight project and I wrote to Michelle and said this mega conference is really blasting me because it's so student services oriented. I can't do anything about it. I tried. I'm not going.

Evaluator: No and that's why you and I are doing the interview. I mean I was supposed to be doing these interviews at the Mega Conference and what has happened is I think I've got five interviews maybe four to do at the Mega Conference. That's how many TMAPP Directors are going to that. That's why we're doing these audio conference interviews which is probably better anyway because we don't have people trying to run off and we can really get to it and it's a good process.

Susan: You might help me with one thing. I'm also more concerned about Flashlight getting a second round. I've talked to Michelle a little bit. La Baron and everybody says yes that's a good idea .

The assessment institute just happened last week and Julie and Linda were here working with me yesterday, Julie Slurk and Linda is president of RP this year. I said well do you want me to do something on Flashlight and they said no, no not yet because people aren't even there yet. They all are not thinking about this creeping alligator that's going to catch up with them.

Evaluator: Well it's a huge part of them. Obviously it's a type of thing we do and it's an assessment of the students but it's also the learning and because we've got so many federal grants everything we do has to conform with GPRA which is the government.

Susan: GPRA, yes. Obviously GPRA is going to get serious.

Evaluator: It is serious. What I'm doing with most of my clients is recommending because most of them, say at the K through 12 level are going to a statewide test or some sort of a standardize test which doesn't desegregate well when you're trying to work down, like there were two questions that dealt with the content we were interested in. So what we're doing are pre and post to a sample group that we can extrapolate to larger groups. Now that may be one interesting way of starting to do it but any federal money coming into the system is going to have to have that accounting process and they are furious about it. I just did three, I work on three different Star Schools grants, we had a mid point.

Susan: On which ones?

Evaluator: Star Schools. Those are the ones when Reagan was in office he wanted Star Wars and Kennedy wanted Star Schools and so Star Schools is actually legislation.

Susan: I served on a committee with ATS on a New Jersey basic skills and talked about rubrics. Well writing assessment was one of the specialties of mine for ages but let me ask you more about GPRA because what I'm doing in the Fall. I'm leaving Rio Honda at the end of October when my 30 years are up. I'll be doing more consulting for Title 3 and Title 5 with a consultant that works with us. We've been worrying quite a bit about GPRA and we just submitted another Title 5 for Rio Honda. As it's sneaking up on us, I mean the field is totally out of touch with what's going on there and what was published in the guidelines is like these little sort of non-measures like how many faculty got fixed. What can you tell me, what people in Washington have you worked with on GPRA? Anything you can tell me to give me a clue on this?

Evaluator: You can start with Pierce Hammond who is head of OERI.

Susan: I'm going to write this down. Diana in the Title 3 office, oh what is her last name. Tell me that name again.

Evaluator: Pierce Hammond. He was originally with NSF and the mind bent at NSF is if you have a five-year grant you have a midpoint review and if you don't make all your marks at the midpoint review you lose your money. That's where the Department of Education seems to be going.

Susan: Where is he now?

Evaluator: He is the head of OERI, which is the Office of Educational Research and Information and is under the Department of Ed. He is a top dog now and thinks he knows it all. He is basing most of what he knows about reform and restructure and systemic reform based on books that were written in the early 1990's. His idea of assessment is good, I mean it's thorough but I don't think it's particularly well informed at this point.

Susan: At least as far as learning goes?

Evaluator: Yes. He is much more into control and fiscal responsibility and if you don't make your marks he would just as soon take your money away from you.

Susan: Oh fun, one of those guys.

Evaluator: Now it hasn't happened yet but what he did was there were a series of challenge grants and the regional tech labs, no the labs but the tech labs, went through the early period last September/October of their midpoint reviews and they were absolutely horrible. People were being reduced to tears.

Susan: My God, they have no business doing that.

Evaluator: No. It was just very, very confrontational. Well, a lot of word got back on it about how people were feeling about it. It was sort of like take this money and shove it. Who needs it, I didn't sign on for this.

Susan: That happened with Title 5 when it came out to Chaffey. They tried to torture them.

Evaluator: It's just this whole idea, it's part of the old structure. They catch up doing something wrong rather than catch you doing something right. It is the old style of evaluation, the old style of management. Anyway, the next group that came in we were with the Star Schools project, five years are on that. I was dreading it. I mean I've got a doctorate, I should be able to live through this but I was really fearful about it. I had three of them, one in the morning, one in the afternoon and one a week later because of all projects that we evaluate.

Susan: Did you go to sites and things?

Evaluator: Well, when I do that. I mean what they did was drag everybody into a room at the Department of Education and they had four peer reviewers and those were people who had good credentials. They knew distance learning and they understood what they read and so fourth.

We provided them with our reports for the last three years and the evaluations. I write 600 page evaluation reports and so the likelihood of somebody really reading through the whole thing is probably not going to happen. They had your project monitor with you, they had Pierce Hammond and then the two people who are directly responsible for Star Schools and this is a person who knows an awful lot about the GPRA and her name is Cheryl Garnett.

Susan: I just thought of this, Diana Hammond, have you met her?

Evaluator: No I haven't.

Susan: I think that Diana is very sharp. Now where is Cheryl?

Evaluator: Cheryl is the head of all of the Challenge grants and all of the Star Schools grants. She is the technology leader within OERI. She has been there for ten years and has a master's degree. Then what they did with this meeting was to drag everybody in and listen. They had very pointed discussions about what are you doing in evaluation, how are you meeting GPRA and so forth. Each project has had to set benchmarks for GPRA and we have to meet those so a lot of it was bean counting. I've been working in GPRA for four years and trying to help the department understand how they could put this together and not feel you had to collect all the apples at the same time. That it would be okay to have different benchmarks for different projects, that you might three or four projects that had this set of benchmarks because of what they are and you might have another six that did something else.

Susan: I cannot believe they believe one size fits all.

Evaluator: That is what they came up with. They finally trashed everything that the group of Star Schools evaluators came up with. It would be difficult – arguably this is the most well informed group of evaluators in technology in the free world and the department chose to ignore us. There were ten of us that were working on this very early on because there were ten Star Schools projects and now there are about 20 Star Schools projects and we're all still grumbling and carrying on as they are. We'll comply but what good is it? I will still do everything I perceive to be important for my project that will advance the understanding of technology, the synergist of technology, how people are learning from it, what can we do better.

I'm pretty well known for my evaluations and what I do with them because I try to do really special things. Just trying to figure out when you're using four or five different technologies. Most of the research that we have is based upon using television and students. We have over 600 research studies that say there is no significant difference.

Well if there is no significant difference why are we putting money into this? There must be a significant difference someplace. So what I'm doing now is controlling the variables as much as I can. You've got to understand that most of what we do on a certain subject area has other variables that intervene. I can't control everything in a math project or when people come in with certain levels of knowledge and teachers are using other programs to teach the topic as well as what my client might be doing. I've tried to set up model focus sites where I can say don't use that other stuff, I don't care what's going on. I get the district's support in not looking at all these other materials and just have people stick to what we are doing until I can at least get some other information.

Another thing is if you are using Internet and television there is a synergy between the two, one makes the other work better or it seems to be and we're trying to do is look at why is it different. What is the proactive approach to it, how does independent learning's self-directedness tie into this? How does student centered teaching and facilitating make it work differently? How does the convenience of learning when you want to and what you want to, how does that tie in? There are so many variables that in what you'd consider to be a perfect distance learning program but are completely different than the old style, one variable, here is the treatment now let me test that.

So it's very confusing when using Anover's Multiple Linear Regressions, you know very sophisticated techniques to try to disaggregate this information and then most because of mainstreaming. We've got students in a class that are special ed., all the way up to gifted and Title 1 and everything else. So it's that sort of problem that GPRA is not addressing and it's difficult to address and the people at the United States Department of Education are not thinkers in that way.

Susan:

No they aren't. They just want to get Congress off their back. They have a ready set of numbers saying this works, that doesn't get it out. It's just so simple minded and painful.

Evaluator:

Yes and this stuff is just not simple. Over the years I've targeted Joe Wilkes. I've talked with Joe a lot and then I have another monitor who is a really nice guy and I like what

he does. One day I was complaining that there is nobody in the department that I could consider a mentor to me as an evaluator. There is nobody there who is smarter than I am in my field. Wouldn't that be great, so I go find people because it's not that they aren't out there but there is nobody there at the department that has a clue and he says well you know you're right and the department has been addressing that. I say, oh really, how are they addressing that and he said just the other day we had a two-hour seminar on what standard deviation is. I started laughing. He said you're right, when you're right you're right.

Susan: I've found few and far between a few of the folks at Title 3 who have done a few things and they are the most isolated, miserable Feds I know. Tom Sees in Title is like that. He is so funny, he'll write back an email to me and say what I'm supposed to say.

Evaluator: Well Susan if I can help you some more.

Susan: I'd really like to sit down with you and talk more about GPRA and walk through the history of the thing. Where are you? Are you down in Palomar?

Evaluator: No. I'm down in San Clemente, my office is here.

Susan: That would be good actually because my mother is in Escondido and I'm running back and forth a lot.

Evaluator: Oh dear, I suddenly realized I'm supposed to be doing a 9:30. Let me give you my phone number. I'm at 949-369-3867 and my email is carlalane@aol.com. Susan, thank you so much for your time.

Susan: I think I'll forward you some stuff as I get it. I know that we get some stuff from what they are talking about in the Department of Ed., and I'd like to continue this conversation because I'd sure like to learn what is going on over there.

**Electronic Transcript Exchange
San Joaquin Delta College
Matthew Rosen
March 10, 2000**

Evaluator: I talked with Jane Craven a little while ago. I have also been up on your Web site. I downloaded the materials that were up there. Did you and Jane do a joint final report?

Matt: Yes we did.

Evaluator: Have you got copies of it?

Matt: You mean a joint final report for the TMAPP grant?

Evaluator: Yes.

Matt: No we did separate ones.

Evaluator: Okay. Have you got a copy of yours you could e-mail to me?

Matt: I've got it somewhere. I'll find it and send it to you. What's your e-mail address?

Evaluator: I downloaded and printed out the Power Point slides that were up on your site. I've also got a note that says that you've got another grant. What's your second grant?

Matt: It's a digital signature feasibility study report.

Evaluator: That would be to do what?

Matt: Are you familiar with digital signatures or public key infrastructure?

Evaluator: Not really.

Matt: Basically a public key infrastructure is a set of software services that are backed by policies that an organization implements. They basically implement a technology called Public Key Encryption or Dual Key Encryption. What happens is you have a public key and a private key and anything that you encrypt using the private key can be decrypted with the public key and vice versa. Typically what you do is you take your private key and you make it secret so that only you can access it. Then your public key you actually advertise. You publish it in a directory or something like that. Then that can be used to digitally sign documents among other things. For example, you could send me a document. You would sign it using your private key. Then since I know your public key I can validate that signature and that tells me two things. The first thing it tells me is that since you are the only person

that has access to the private key that document actually came from you or that signature was made by you. The second thing it tells me is that that document has not been modified in any way since you sent it. If it were modified by even one bit or one character or anything then that signature would not be valid. This technology can be used then to replace traditional signatures on documents. There is legislation here in California that allows that to happen. The Board of Governors has actually created regulations in Title V that also let us do that in the community colleges. This report was to basically look at the feasibility of implementing this technology throughout the state system and in particular to allow students to use this technology to submit applications for admission, residency forms, financial aid applications, petitions of all kinds, requests for transcripts and all of that sort of thing.

Evaluator: Could it also work for assignments?

Matt: Do you mean class assignments?

Evaluator: Yes, if you were doing distance education.

Matt: It certainly could be used for that.

Evaluator: Okay, because that's one of the questions that keeps coming up in distance education. Do you know that you are dealing truly with the person that you think that you are dealing with if you are the instructor? How do you validate?

Matt: The bottom line is that public key infrastructure really takes the anonymity out of the Internet, which is one of the big problems of the Internet today I think. You don't know for sure who it is that you are dealing with and so that also reduces accountability. The technology exists to do this. This is going to be the year for PKI I think. The technology is not new. It's been around since the mid-90s.

Evaluator: Yes but it still needs that length of time to really be adopted.

Matt: It's like anything.

Evaluator: What is your position at San Joaquin?

Matt: I'm Director for Technical Services.

Evaluator: The one that you just described to me is your second grant. Is that right?

Matt: That's correct.

Evaluator: Okay, then the first one is the one that you worked on with Jane?

Matt: Yes, actually there were six schools that worked on Transcript Exchange.

Everyone's project was separate. Jane and I and actually Shelley Dixon, who is a technical person at Santa Barbara, did a joint presentation at the Mega Conference last year. That's what we really collaborated on. The Web-site that you went to is basically the outline of our presentation itself. Actually I'm going to have to send the report to you in hard copy because the way the chancellor's office works is that they have these special forms and you can't replicate the forms electronically. You have to actually do them in hard copy and type them up and everything. I could probably send you the part of it that I do have in a word processing document that just basically tells you how we did on the project.

Evaluator: I'm more interested in reading through what you did, what your findings were and actually kind of following the whole thing. I'm a researcher and evaluator so I tend to want to go through everything. Charles Mossen has just done a group of summaries of the projects that are over. Part of the deal, I thought, was that he was going to box these up and send them to me. I got an e-mail last night saying he doesn't have the staff to do that. Tell me what did you think about the first one that you worked on with Santa Barbara? What were the major findings?

Matt: We were able to actually implement production transcript exchange with CSU Sacramento and CSU Stanislaus. They are our closest institutions geographically. Most of our students transfer to one of those two schools within the CSU system. That went fairly well. We're exchanging transcripts even now. The biggest issues that we ran into were one, that there isn't yet complete agreement on what data elements should be included in the electronic transcript exchange. That was one of our recommendations that somewhere at the state level there should be agreement on that between the community colleges, the CSUs and the UC sites. Here is our minimal set of elements that make up a transcript and here are the encodings that we all agree on. It's not that hard to do. You just have to sit down and do that. Once we had worked that out with the two sites that went pretty

smoothly. There is another thing that would be advantageous. There is a service that is offered by the University of Texas at Austin for ACRO, the national body that sponsors the Speedy standard for electronic transcripts. Basically any institution can sign up the service. It allows you to exchange transcripts using their server so that if we are sending transcripts to say ten different institutions we can indicate which institutions are going to get which transcripts within the exchange file that we are producing. Then we can just send that one file to this University of Texas at Austin server. Then they take care of splitting that file up and delivering the various pieces to each individual institution.

Evaluator: Is that a fee-based service?

Matt: No, it's all free.

Evaluator: How do they do that?

Matt: Well, it's all automated so it doesn't really cost them that much to run the server. At least at this point it's all free. The advantage there is that as you add trading partners you don't need to manage connections to all these different servers to send all these files and get your acknowledgements. You just have to work with one server. As the state looks at implementing this on a more widespread basis our recommendation was that they look at offering a similar service or else just look at using the University of Texas at Austin server.

Evaluator: It sounds like eventually a major cash flow.

Matt: Again, it's probably not that hard to implement. I think what Mick Holsbaugh's group is looking at is offering that similar kind of service. Those are the two main findings that we had.

Evaluator: Okay, so Mick's group is already working on this?

Matt: Yes there follow-up project that is actually in progress is to look at statewide implementation of electronic transcript exchange and also electronic submission of applications for admissions.

Evaluator: From your point of view then, what has to happen in order for a service of this type to be in place between all of the community colleges, the CSUs and UCs?

Matt: Well, again we need to decide what the common set of data elements are and what the common encodings are for those elements within the options that are offered by Speedy. Speedy is a worldwide standard. It's still leaves a lot of options. The second thing is to have a common communications infrastructure that we can rely on. Basically a common server would be an ideal implementation. If we're going to use the Internet then we probably should have digital signatures so that we know that these transcripts are coming from the officials at each college and we know that they haven't been tampered with. We should probably have Encryption as well since this sensitive information. That ties in pretty well with the digital signature project we just mentioned.

Evaluator: At the statewide level then, do we need policy? Do we need legislation? How do we make sure that all of the community colleges are part of this?

Matt: I think initially it should be voluntary. I think it should be at least to start with more of an enabling type of approach. Here we are going to try to remove these barriers by working out these details and making the service available. Each institution is going to have to provide hooks into their student information system to make this happen and that's something that you can't really do for them. I guess you could provide funds but I don't know how much that helps. You really have to have people who are knowledgeable for their specific implementation. It's just going to be something that takes time for them to do that. You can now offer carrots that provide incentives but I think it's up to each institution to decide what timing works best for them as far as when they actually implement this. I would imagine it's something that is going to take a few years but the folks that are ready should have the resources available so they can move forward.

Evaluator: Who do you think is ready at this point then?

Matt: Obviously of the six, four of us are doing it now. I think some other institutions have done it on their own.

Evaluator: Who are the six that were involved with you?

Matt: The six that have projects are Southwestern, Napa Valley, Santa Barbara, Ohlone and Redwoods. I think Redwoods' project was postponed a year. They had some Y2K

issues or something so I think they are implementing this year instead but I believe the others were able to implement. I know that Solano has been doing transcript exchanges with CSU Sacramento. I believe San Jose Evergreen has been doing exchanges with San Jose State so there are quite a few.

Evaluator: Would you say that half of them are already doing something?

Matt: Half of the community colleges? I would guess it's somewhere between 10 percent and 20 percent that are exchanging with somebody.

Evaluator: Yes but not necessarily everyone they could be and they are not all doing the key encryption that you spoke about.

Matt: Nobody is doing digital signature technology at this point that I know of. I was not able to find anybody who has actually implemented this. That is a separate project. The final report for the digital signatures project has not been accepted as far as I know by the chancellor's office. They are really just starting to review it but if they don't have any objection I could send you the first draft. In it there is a complete description of what needs to happen for this technology to move forward.

Evaluator: That would be really useful to me. If I could just read it that would give me a much better sense of where we are going with all of this. Are you part of the Oracle project that Jane is working on?

Matt: No we are not. We have actually implemented the Oracle financials package so I'm somewhat up to speed with what Santa Barbara is doing. We have our own student information system. We're actually pretty satisfied with that. My impression of Santa Barbara is that they really want to be in a partnership arrangement and have a large vendor that is responsible for support. They feel that they don't have the technical resources to actually implement their own system or to support it all themselves.

Evaluator: Do you provide distance learning courses?

Matt: Yes we do actually through a variety of mechanisms. One is through video conferencing. We have four remote sites. We're doing that with H.323 video conferencing

through point to point T1 lines. Then we also have Internet classes. We've partnered with E-College to offer those.

Evaluator: Are you using them as a portal? Is that the idea?

Matt: Basically they provide the hosting services. Our classes actually live on their server forum and then they also provide technical support for students and support for the faculty both in the course development and in the use of their tools.

Evaluator: Do they have their own learning environment?

Matt: Yes they do. They have their own tool kit basically. The tool kit I believe is free. Go to their Web-site. It's ECollege.com. They have more information about that.

Evaluator: I think that I've looked at ECollege.com so I'll go look again and see what it's like. They don't use anything like Blackboard?

Matt: No.

Evaluator: Are they IMS compliant or do you know?

Matt: I don't know.

Evaluator: Are you familiar with IMS?

Matt: No not entirely.

Evaluator: It's the Instructional Management System that's engineering standard was T1484 but the basis of it is learning objects that can be put into systems. The system then delivers the information to the student. They still have an instructor that goes along with it. The instructor puts the information together. Oracle is working on that as well. They're coming out with a new program. Beta probably hits around May or June. Then if everything works, probably in September there will be the general release of it but it needs a database of some sort to sit on top of. That's one of the reasons that they are doing it. Is there anything, any caveats or pitfalls, that you want to point out as other groups begin to do what you have been trying to do or what you have already done?

Matt: No, other than what I have already mentioned. I think most of the issues are not really technical. They are really more operational.

Evaluator: If you can find any of your materials I would appreciate getting a copy of it. Are you going to be at the Mega Conference?

Matt: At this point, I don't think I am.

Evaluator: I think they were going to have a pre-conference day where they were going to have a lot of the TMAPP people together. I think Christine Amorro was putting that together but I haven't heard.

Matt: No one has told me about it. I will be presenting at the CIO conference in April especially on the digital signatures.

Santa Barbara City College
William B. Hamre
March 23, 2000

Evaluator: What is your name?

Bill: I am Bill Hamre, Associate Vice-President of Information Resources at Santa Barbara City College.

Evaluator: Okay, I am Rose Hessmiller in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Bill, what was the purpose of the Santa Barbara City College TMAPP project?

Bill: We had one of the telecommunications planning mini-grants, the \$25,000.00 grants to develop an infrastructure plan for Santa Barbara City College, working along with one of our strategic partners, GTE. The project involved a comprehensive assessment of our faculty staff and administration about future technology directions, the development of a telecommunications infrastructure plan for the college based on that needs assessment. Also, the development of a general methodology for community college technology assessment planning that we worked with the GTE engineers developing and shared with other community colleges.

Evaluator: What was the most important thing that you learned in that process?

Bill: I think the most important thing was the need to be comprehensive in the assessment of future technology directions. We interviewed every academic and administrative department within the institution and found that every department had plans for the future application of technology within their particular department and without a thorough assessment, I don't think we would have been nearly as successful in building the technology infrastructure needed to support those future directions.

Evaluator: How big is your institution?

Bill: We have 13,000 credit students and 17,000 non-credit students enrolled each term at the college. Our total full-time equivalent student population is about 13,000.

Evaluator: What is the relevance for three years in the future?

Bill: Well, as a result of our planning project, we went to our college planning counsel, our cabinet and our board of trustees. We successfully got funding for technology upgrade for our campus backbone; a \$600,000.00 project over a three year period and we are in the second year now of that implementation.

Evaluator: You were talking about what was the three years relevance for the future. What I would like to ask you now is what was the second most important thing that you learned from your process?

Bill: Was the comprehensive.

Evaluator: The comprehensiveness, yes.

Bill: I think another lesson learned was in terms of methodology, an important step being moving from a highly technical infrastructure plan to a higher level statement that can be understood by the college leadership or college planning committee and cabinet members; having to translate the technical structure into terms and a presentation that our leadership groups could understand to be able to support those initiatives.

Evaluator: Why was that important?

Bill: Well, it resulted in the end of their approving funding for the \$600,000 infrastructure development process which was a significant redirection of college resources and wouldn't have happened without a clear understanding on their part of the future benefits of the technology development.

Evaluator: Were there other findings that were guiding to you?

Bill: Yes, I think the one other piece that was central was the development of a stated methodology for the needs assessment process. We worked fairly closely with GTE Network engineering folks to develop a template for other community colleges to use in that planning assessment. I think just having a standard methodology to apply, it will save other colleges time and energy and resources in not having to reinvent that process.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy in an electronic format?

Bill: Right. That was, of the two documents I sent to you on e-mail, there was one called Method II.

Evaluator: Network Audit and Design Methodology?

Bill: Right.

Evaluator: That is the document you are speaking of?

Bill: Right.

Evaluator: Good. Now what about California City College in the future? Where do you think it is going?

Bill: In terms of our particular direction?

Evaluator: Right.

Bill: We are very much moving towards the development of an online college. Two years ago we had four online courses with about 60 students enrolled. This spring we have about 40 classes with 1400 students enrolled. In the fall we are offering 55 classes and somewhere in the neighborhood of 2000 students enrolled. One of our directions is the development of common tools for faculty to do development and management of instructional content for delivery over the web and our own campus networks. A second initiative for us is the development of a unified student faculty and staff portal that personalizes web page content for the individual students and faculty members based upon their roles, responsibilities. The courses they are either teaching or taking, the set of clubs and services that they are belonging to or participating in is a kind of a second initiative. Our third initiative is around the redevelopment of our student system and we are working with five other colleges and universities nationwide, working with on student system development. Then again, making that entirely Web-based for our student administrative staff's use of student record system. On the instructional side, we are also rapidly developing our multimedia program. We started that program two years ago with 30 computers in a lab. This last fall we opened a facility that has 150 high end SGI work stations in the three classrooms and one open lab in that facility and we are starting to do video post-production and web development, multi electronic music and music distribution. It we continue to expect from the telecommunications area that they rapidly expand our Internet

access and make sure we have continued security on campus while still exposing those web instructional offerings and our administrative applications to our faculty and students.

Evaluator: Now, in terms of policy, there are committees on your campus talking about the plans to combine and collaborate with other CCC institutions.

Bill: Well our instructional technology committee is our primary group on the instructional side. We have a district technology committee that has representation from both the academic and administrative staff. We are very much interested and have participated in the work of California virtual colleges and are in the process of working with one of the regional centers to host our online courses using the Web CT framework.

Evaluator: Okay. Now I wonder talking about your higher end multimedia courses at your physical campus and your needing to distribute those types of courses, right?

Bill: Yes, we have a lot of interest from local business and industry to be able to have working sessions out at their sites and we are in that multimedia program we have our group doing streaming audio and video, and developing SPCC broadcast radio station for web deployment. So yes, there are a number of initiatives where we need to be able to increase out to the Internet.

Evaluator: Right. Which you are going to use more than just your web CT format?

Bill: Right.

Evaluator: So how are you thinking about tuition? Are you going to share tuition, how will that work across the other campuses?

Bill: Well, right now Santa Barbara has a project that we are in the midst of evaluating and recommending to the State Chancellors office. A policy framework for supporting distance education and so we are looking at models from the Oregon Community College Consortium, the Kentucky Virtual University and other intra-state initiatives for those revenue sharing models. We are still in the midst of doing that study, it's not completed until June.

Evaluator: In terms of exporting courses, you're going to be exporting, as you mentioned, courses across city colleges as well as into local places around Santa Barbara, is that correct?

Bill: Right now the model is that because of the free flow policy within California anybody in the state can sign up for an SBCC online course and pay the \$11.00 per unit resident tuition. We have, along with courses that our faculty has developed, we have a number of courses that are using the textbook publisher materials, CD-ROM and Web page posted by the publishers. So there is sharing that way and we are also envisioning, although it is not currently in place, that over time the California virtual colleges will be hosting electronic repositories and course materials that community colleges will share in the distribution of.

Evaluator: Now we have talked about in California, do you have any students and do you expect any students coming from out of state and if so will your credit per hour charge change for those students?

Bill: Yes, we do have out of state and foreign students enrolled in our online courses. We charge our standard nonresident rate which is about \$125.00 per unit.

Evaluator: Is there a policy, a residency requirement or time line like in the state system, state college system?

Bill: Well you have to be a resident of California for fee purposes. Yeah to be a California resident you have to have maintained residency for a year.

Evaluator: One year?

Bill: Yes.

Evaluator: Okay. Now in terms of committees you have different committees for different dialogues around the development of these issues we're talking about?

Bill: We have our instructional technology committee which provides general policy and prioritization direction in terms of instructional development. We have a web committee that looks at the structure and design and development priorities for our college web page. We have our faculty resource center that provides the faculty training and support those

new cohorts as faculty move into the development of technology instructional materials. So we have our city well structured training program that occurs in several two-week blocks in summer and fall break to do that faculty training.

Evaluator: Is one of those committees a policy committee, maybe?

Bill: Well a policy committee, the instructional technology committee is charged with developing the overall policy and prioritization of resources for educational technology. The district technology committee spans both instructional and administrative policy development resource ranking activities.

Evaluator: Now, do you have any – in terms of a policy what policies has your committee come up with that have helped you the most in this endeavor. Can you even answer that? Is there one policy that has helped you most?

Bill: Not that I can think of right of the bat. I guess if anything it would be the policy that before we authorize faculty to develop online courses we have them go through the structured training program so that the differences in teaching online versus classroom are reinforced. We try to make sure that the new faculty entering online instruction learn the lessons that our pioneering faculty members learned as they started classes. Hopefully, we will continually improve our initial efforts in offering new online programs.

Evaluator: How are you doing a policy on intellectual property rights?

Bill: Yes, we do have a formal policy there although it is viewed by both the administration and our faculty group as an interim policy until some more federal guidelines are developed. We do have one on which we are operating currently.

Evaluator: You probably have a liability policy or something like that.

Bill: We have appropriate use policies.

Evaluator: Okay. What are the problems? Do you have any nay sayers about your broad vision plan? Any why can't we do this remarks that you are aware of?

Bill: Well, I think our faculty are driving the change we do have probably more faculty interest than we are able to support given the limitations of time and resources so we do have a formal process for assessing what faculty are going to be supported through the

faculty resource center. Anytime you are having a selection process there are people that are dissatisfied with that process. In terms of our faculty – you know we don't have a large cadre of faculty saying why are we making all this investment in technology. I think they are pretty much of the mind that if we are going to continue to be competitive and offer distributed learning opportunities within our community as well as other online efforts we need to look at new ways of distributing the instructional content. So we're doing a lot more work now with business and industry locally where we're providing all of the professional development activities for our county employees and we're doing a similar program for our local healthcare provider, Cottage Hospital. We are doing a lot more in the way of going out to high schools and allowing high school students to take courses concurrently at the college. We have a formal structure with our local high schools, community college and UCSB to have a program for a three-year baccalaureate degree from graduation from high school by picking college courses while students are still enrolled in high school.

Evaluator: So the development of the technology plan and your ability to offer courses electronically or online has created new courses for your institution.

Bill: Right. Supporting our local business and industry.

Evaluator: Great. That's great. Any words to the wise, anything you would offer in terms of someone else reading this?

Bill: Well, I think in terms of our online activity the major lesson we learned is to make sure that the students are engaged and there is a high level of activity early on in the course. By far, during the first three weeks in an on campus course the faculty are determining whether the student is activity enrolled and engaged in the course and at the end of the third week have to make a determination about whether to drop the student or to continue. It's a lot harder to get that assessment done in a remote environment. So I guess the lesson we learned is building in a lot of interactive communication up front those first few weeks to make that assessment and make sure the students get engaged early on.

Evaluator: I hear you. In terms of your customizing the web site for faculty or students, is that simultaneously happening at other city college campuses in California?

Bill: Yes, I think it's a fairly pervasive set of discussions that are going on around the issue of how do you provide universal student e-mail and internet access in community college budgets that are significantly below major research universities and in our case in California, even the K-12 district funding. So in our assessment we were looking at a \$300,000.00 initial investment to provide that set of services to our students and an almost like amount on an annual basis in terms of staffing and support for a seven by twenty-four operation. What the student port promoters like the college club or student online or campus are doing is they will host that offering for student e-mail and internet access will help you build the integration to your student systems, will integrate with Web CT or other instructional content. Of course management tools, their revenue is based on student use of the electronic commerce market which is part of the overall porting.

Evaluator: Okay, so let me understand this. The \$300,000.00 you are talking about isn't just for Santa Barbara it's across the CCC system?

Bill: No, that was our estimate of the costs for universal student Internet access and e-mail and Internet access and then the maintenance for that on a seven by twenty-four basis.

Evaluator: Okay. Now, I guess my guess then in terms of all the many pitfalls or words to the wise, if your particular campuses is very forwarding thinking in your plans, and they are, and you are going to be hopefully going to that next step in terms of online learning to customize a site for the needs of the individual? This is a sophisticated step and will the other campuses in other parts of California have similar screens available to the students in other parts of the state? Is that a conversation happening across the CCC system?

Bill: I wouldn't say, at this point, across the CCC system. Certainly I'd say probably 30 percent of the campuses that have investigation and planning underway, and I believe that pieces of the Ten-Two plan that the state chancellors office is developing that relate to kind of a common student interface.

Evaluator: Right. We get spoiled really fast you know. If they're given a lot of features that's where we want to go, that's why I ask that question.

Aside from that, are there any pitfalls that you've encountered as you've been up here?

Bill:

The only other thing is not on the technology side its on the human side that change is hard and it takes a lot of work and communication internally within the institution to make sure the people are understanding why we're making these technology investments and that it is not just putting the latest and greatest in place. That it is driven by the vision of where we want to be and what we want to accomplish and that is something that takes hard work at times. Sometimes technology is the easy part.

Evaluator:

Right, I understand that. Thank you so much for your time.

**Electronic Transcript Exchange
Jane Craven, Project Director
Santa Barbara City College
March 10, 2000**

Evaluator: I went up to the Web site and I pulled down what was there. It looked like it was almost in a Power Point slide.

Jane: Yes it's Power Point. It's a Power Point presentation that we actually did last year at the conference.

Evaluator: Okay, great so this project is finished? Is it over?

Jane: It's never over. You know how that goes. Everything is living and breathing. Essentially we couldn't do anymore. Essentially it was just like little things that need to get cleaned up and we needed to bring closure to the grant and so we did.

Evaluator: Okay. Tell me what the purpose of the grant was.

Jane: Basically we wanted to increase our number of trading partners. We wanted to add CSU Northridge. That was one of our goals. One of our other goals was to be able to receive transcripts from the high schools. We have four feeder high schools basically in two districts. What ended up being the tricky part is that all of the high schools do things differently. While they all may use SASSY 3 software, the way they've figured out how to do little things like their little cheat sheets are all different. We needed to come up with a pretty generic way to map. We figured that we pretty much solved that. We pretty much got that except that then we ended up having some problems with the engine. It's like their mapping engine. I don't remember the name of it right now. Things just weren't as clean and as quick as we wanted them to be. It's the speed thing that kind of held everything up. I haven't been working on it but I know that our analyst who has been working on it and who by the way is on a national speedy committee is still doing that kind of light cleanup work with our high schools to get that totally in order.

Evaluator: If you exported what you've learned about this to the rest what do you see?

Jane: We've actually had a lesson learned about our Power Point but I think one of the most important lessons learned is to go in and really analyze the high school stuff first. You really need to do a lot of that up front type of thing.

Evaluator: Is it at the district level that things need to be handled for high schools?

Jane: I'm sure if you went throughout the state you'd find that how ever many high schools there are you might find two that did things the same way. Even that would be unusual. For example if a student gets held back and then they make up credits then things get all screwy. Everybody just does it differently. It's just like the community colleges. We all do things differently. It's a nightmare. It actually was a fun project for us and we did learn a lot. I think that in order to be successful in translating transcripts from the high school to the community college you are just going to have to get some standardization in your high schools. Even with the three high schools in the district they all did things differently.

Evaluator: In order to do that it sounds like a very expensive proposition if we don't have some standardization between the high schools and the community colleges.

Jane: You do have to have that standardization. Otherwise it's just going to take you more time.

Evaluator: If every one of the community colleges has to figure out what every one of the high schools is doing and they don't have a grant to do it, it sounds like it was fairly labor intensive.

Jane: It was and you know what? Most of the high schools use this SASSY software. They have this SASSY EP now. I think that's it so they do have a Windows version so for the most part the high schools do have the same software. It's just that they need to be able to do things in the same way. When they start doing things in kind of strange ways it's almost like you're doing a fix for one unique problem. You're doing a fix for all these little unique problems that may crop up once at one school per term or something like that. Right now in community colleges we just got a call from a woman named Tish from Weblane, which is a consulting group. I guess the chancellor's office has retained them and they are

Jane: I don't know. I do know that there is a consortium of 22 colleges that all went with one software vendor. They came up with a standard application. Along with that standard application they had sort of an attachment for unique information that each college could use if they wanted to.

Evaluator: Were you part of this?

Jane: No. We're going with a different software vendor.

Evaluator: Who are you going with then?

Jane: We're one of the partner schools with the Oracle Student Project. I just happen to be the project lead for that so I get to work very closely with the Oracle Student group.

Evaluator: How is that going to work?

Jane: Basically Oracle has purchased the software package out of Australia. That becomes like a base student information system for them. Of course they bought it because it was all rule based and was using Oracle databases but it would only deal with about forty percent of the needed functionality that American colleges needed so they put together a team of six colleges and universities. We've been working with them to develop the business requirements for their package. Now we've gone through business requirements definition for prioritization of those requirements and we're actually reviewed the high level design for their student system. Beginning in June we're going to be doing BETA testing for them. Then on our own campus one of the things that we are doing is we are getting ready to install that product here. We're doing a lot of mapping of our future business process models and detailing our needs out and things like that.

Evaluator: Are the other colleges and universities in California?

Jane: Oh no. Most of them are on the East Coast. The closest one is Tulane. I think the farthest one away is Skidmore.

Evaluator: How did you get involved with it then?

Jane: We decided a couple of years ago that we needed an infusion of technology and we were looking for strategic partners. Oracle came knocking at the door along with a whole host of others. They kind of rose to the top. They've got great tools and great databases.

Ninety percent of Fortune 500 companies use their databases. That's how we got involved. The University of Maryland system and SUNE and George Mason University are the other partner schools. It's very exciting.

Evaluator: Does this have what you would think of as export capability for the rest of the community colleges in California?

Jane: You know it's a little early to say but I do think so because of the way that they are setting things up. Everything is configurable. It's like a piece of architecture. You configure the system yourself so I think that all of the elements will be there. If the elements aren't there we can probably use flex fields and workflow and things like that to get what we need. It's also a Web system. Everything can be done via the Web. Students can do their business via the Web. Faculty can do their business via the Web. It's going to be very exciting.

Evaluator: What would be a good way for me to continue following this and include it in what we are trying to do for the grant that I'm working on? Since we are not going to be making policy but recommending it and recommending ways that things be done it sounds like this would be helpful.

Jane: I think that it may be a little early to do that since many community colleges have already gone with new systems. Let's just kind of sit back and wait and see. I'm trying to think whether it's best to just kind of stay in touch with us and see how our development is going or to be more in touch with the higher ed. division because they've got press releases going out all of the time. Just give me a call every couple of months and I'll let you know what's going on.

Evaluator: I could probably keep in touch with Patrick, too.

Jane: Oh, Pat will know.

Evaluator: Is there a Web page that you are using? How are you keeping in touch with one another?

Jane: No. Right now we are kind of keeping the lid on things because they are still in development.

Evaluator: I understand.

Jane: The University of San Diego is actually looking at it right now. They just did a big presentation to them so that's another school that might be added to the mix. I know that Santa Cruz was interested earlier but I'm not sure what their status is right now. People are just kind of finding out about it. They are just kind of going out and doing marketing and sales with it but they are in detail design right now. We'll know a lot more after the summer, after the BETA testing.

Evaluator: Okay, I'm trying to make a list. You said it was George Mason, Tulane and you. Who else was part of it?

Jane: State University of New York at Binghamton, the University of Maryland system and Skidmore. Those are the six colleges.

Evaluator: The materials that were up, the Power Point slides, did you also do a final report or was that the final report?

Jane: No, we did a final report as well.

Evaluator: Is that available electronically or what?

Jane: It may be. I mean I may be able to find it because you know we had to send a final report into the chancellor's office.

Evaluator: Yes, I've been working with Charles Mossen for that and he's had them stacked around his desk for probably three months. I thought what he was doing was summaries of findings and so forth and that was going to be what they would use at that level. Then I would get the boxes. Last night I got a note saying no he wasn't going to send the boxes because he didn't have the staff to do it so I'm going around trying to get our project monitor to say kick those things over by my desk and I'll Fed Ex them. At this point I don't have access to whatever your report was. If I could get it electronically that would be the best thing. Even if it was bits and pieces I could still put it together here and print out a copy if that's available.

Jane: I just pulled up my final report but it happened to be a blank template. Let me just look.

Evaluator: Is your school doing distance learning?

Jane: Yes.

Evaluator: Do you have any idea of the cost? That's one of the things that we have been looking at such as if they offer the courses outside the state what they are charging.

Jane: They are charging just what we would charge if a non-resident was taking it here. We would charge them the enrollment fee and the tuition. That's all that we are authorized to charge.

Evaluator: I thought that you could charge more for someone out-of -state.

Jane: We charge them out-of-state tuition but we don't charge them any more than we would charge our folks on campus. Whether you are taking a distance learning class or an on-campus class if you are a non-resident you pay a non-resident fee.

Evaluator: How much higher are they?

Jane: Our California residents pay \$11.00 per unit. Our out-of-state probably pay \$125.00 per unit plus that \$11.00. That's regardless of whether it's distance learning or not. I know that some of the distance learning companies want you to charge an additional fee. That's how they'll get paid but we are doing it pretty much on our own. Pablo Buckaloo is our dean that deals with that.

Evaluator: Did you find the rest of your report?

Jane: No, actually not. I'm looking at all of the other titles in there and it's not budget objectives. I'll find it.

Evaluator: Let me give you my e-mail address then. You can e-mail me the bits and pieces. What is your e-mail address?

Jane: It's Craven@sbcc.net.

Evaluator: I appreciate your time. I enjoyed talking with you. You're doing some great stuff.

Jane: Well, we're having a lot of fun. I think that we are the only community college that actually sends transcripts electronically to one of the UCs.

Evaluator: That's interesting.

Jane: Yes. Just recently Fresno contacted us. We are going to be adding Fresno as a trading partner. We will be sending to Fresno.

Evaluator: Are there any other community colleges that you have been talking to that look like they are following in your footsteps?

Jane: Well I know the Hancock and Quester send to Cal-Poly and I think that they are pretty well developed up around San Jose. I think that they probably have a pretty well developed type of thing. Of course there is Matt Rosen. He does real well there. He's miles ahead of us.

Evaluator: Really?

Jane: Oh, he's so bright. Are you kidding me? He is sharp as can be. He's just way ahead of everybody else.

Evaluator: How did you happen to partner with that college for this project?

Jane: Oh I don't know. We were probably just too shy to do something on our own and we decided we'd do it together. We probably figured that between the two of us we could fill a whole session. I don't think the other TMAPP people participated actually at that time. Shelly is a person who is on the National SPEEDE Committee. She's gone today. She's actually up in Sacramento at a SPEEDE meeting. She is a really good person to talk to also about lessons learned because she was our analyst on there.

Evaluator: What is her last name?

Jane: Dixon. You might want to give her a quick call, too. She actually might be more help than I am.

Evaluator: Well you've given me so much.

Jane: She'll be more help than I am. Like I said, she is on the National SPEEDE Committee, which I think is a great honor being a California Community College person.

**Santa Barbara City College
Santa Barbara, CA
Susan Sargent, Consultant
April 7, 2000**

Evaluator: This call is to Susan Sargent at Santa Barbara City College. I'm working with Palomar on a TMAPP grant that they have and their number ends in 66. Are you working on the one that ends in 65?

Susan: Yes.

Evaluator: So tell me what it is that you all are doing?

Susan: The distance learning project is a feasibility study. We're taking a look at what approach California can take to develop a statewide system for distance learning which does tie very much to what you are doing. Ours is sort of at the policy level. We're examining organizational structure, planning, instructional and support services. Actually the intent is to look at what options we have available as a state and then running by all the constituencies around the state seeing what they feel would be a reasonable approach to doing things on a statewide basis. So what we've done so far is we've spent a great deal of time talking to other states and determining what they've done, how they're working, what lessons they have learned, what's working or not working and their advice to us.

At the same time we've also been looking at the TMAPP projects which you are doing as well, just to say if we looked at some online student services what projects are already in effect that can be replicated statewide, so we're trying to match those. Recently we developed a proposal that lists options, potential options and then we put in some recommendations. We just did that to get a written document out there so people could start responding and talking about how they really see the states involvement, the Chancellors office role and of course the colleges role. I can get you a copy of that.

Evaluator: I think I actually have one from the Chancellors' Mega conference in Palm Springs.

Susan: Good. Bill Scroggins spoke on the project and what we're doing at this point.

The intent was to go out and talk to all the different groups so it included financial aid, transfer centers, matriculation, EOPS, DSPS. Anybody involved in anyway that would

be able to look at it and say from our prospective it doesn't include this or it does include that, the benefit of this approach but here may be the barriers. So we're looking for responses from everyone in terms of how they're thinking.

Evaluator: How is it going so far?

Susan: Well, the Mega Conference is really the first time we've gotten a paper out. We heard that it caused quite a stir. Part of the problem is that the state went ahead and funded the CVC's but it never went through consultation. It was never a decision made by any sort of governing body, I guess money just sort of ended up and they went forth. We're trying not to threaten the CVC's but the study should have been done years ago really. It's a timing issue in some ways, but it may be that the proposal that's out there and people may say we really like the concepts of the CVC's but we think there should be more. They say five but there really are only four of them. In general our state is ten regions and we do a lot of work within those ten regions. One of the thoughts is that maybe we need to look at a more regional approach.

Evaluator: Has any region come to the floor, is there one that looks like they are more interested than another?

Susan: Well no because we've just started this part of it. This phase has just been initiated so we haven't had a lot of response but we have heard that people are real concerned about the CVC's mostly because there is not equal playing ground and they're not equitable. So some people are saying, I want a server and they say that we don't do that in this CVC that's a different region. I think what I am hearing is that people do want to say if we are going to provide these services they should be pretty consistent and equitable for everyone.

Evaluator: That does seem to be the main thing. Some colleges are so far ahead and others haven't even thought about it.

Susan: Right, exactly. That is the sad thing for CVC's, some are hosting classes and some are doing other things but if you're not in the particular region of that center then you

can't access the service. That is what we're sort of hearing out there now. However, the proposal just went out last week.

Evaluator: What will be your next steps then?

Susan: April and May are when we're meeting with all the groups and trying to explain a little bit. Unfortunately it's a real tough time of year because everybody is in their last parts of executive boards and its pretty backed up. What we're finding is that mostly we can just get a five minute explanation out to them and they have to take it, read it, process it and get back to us. There were a couple of agendas we were on for more then five minutes. It was 20 or 30 minutes so we can start to get some of the responses from people.

After that we are developing a report that assess the state response to moving into a system for distance learning and that will happen around June.

Evaluator: Okay. When is your TMAPP through?

Susan: Well it was set for one year and what happened is, of course, the money was delayed so we started late. It was our intent to be done in June. We are now having discussions with the Chancellors office about maybe just doing a no cost extension because we have the money and also because we need to be sure we get enough information to come up with the report. The other thing is the Chancellors office is interested is that they need a little more help with the policy development side of it so we may end up extending it a few more months.

I think we decided we'd wait until the end of May to make that decision and see where we are.

Evaluator: Then probably you would do your report maybe by September?

Susan: Yes, that would probably be right. Then whatever report we write would have to go into the consultation process and when it gets to that place then it's a whole other opportunity for the fields and all the different groups to make comments and changes and review it. So it's sort of at the preliminary step right now of providing the Chancellors office with information and to look at what do they want take to consultation and through that process.

Evaluator: Do you mean the financial aid group?

Susan: No, the Chancellors office.

Evaluator: When you say the financial aid is difficult, in what way do you mean?

Susan: Well, what happens is if students take courses from multiple institutions there needs to be a place where the transcript is held and where financial aid is basically distributed. So one of the things we have in the proposal is a recommendation for what we call a home college where students would identify a home college. That college would house the transcript and financial aid could be provided in that setting rather than applying for financial aid at every college they take courses at.

The state has done some things. Santa Barbara has a health information technology program that is like eight different colleges the students attend. Initially financial aid was the most difficult of all areas so they finally did this sort of concept in a sense. If they were in Santa Barbara the student enrolled in Santa Barbara and they may be taking the courses at Moorpark but they still remained a student of Santa Barbara so they could get financial aid.

Evaluator: Is that working or not?

Susan: Yes it's working now. It went through a lot of difficult times. Also what we are trying to look at, if you read the proposal or if Bill said anything about the centralized services, the same thing so the students don't have to complete six different admissions forms they could apply one and be admitted to all colleges.

Evaluator: So are you building on top of the other TMAPPs? There were a couple of them that looked at applications.

Susan: Yes, exactly. Right now the proposal is laid out there for people to respond. In the meantime we're looking at all the TMAPP projects. So that if it comes out, which it obviously will, for the admissions forms and the transcripts, we'll write into the report one of the benefits is that the study that Mick Holsclaw is doing is providing all the data elements that would go into the transcript or the common application. That's how we will tie those in.

If we look at online student services, I've been talking to the project directors for the online matriculation center and the counseling, and there are a lot of models out there and that is to our benefit. Most people don't know about them so that's the only problem. Nobody knows what's going on. The way they'll tie into our report is when we get a sense of what the recommendations would be to the Chancellors office then we'd tie in those TMAPP projects that would support them.

Evaluator: Have you come up with a way for different colleges to share the tuition if they offered courses jointly?

Susan: No. What we have looked at is what other states do. They refer to it as a host institution and provider institution. Usually a student would enroll at the host institution but pay the tuition to the provider and the provider would get the tuition but the host institution would get the FTE. The only problem with California is that our tuition is so low it doesn't really cover the costs. That's a whole other aspect of the project, what is the incentive for colleges to coordinate in that manner.

Evaluator: Have you invented anything on that yet, has there been any breakthrough?

Susan: No. Basically I think what we're saying is there needs to be a mechanism in place that would actually encourage the participation of colleges. There has to be a financial incentive. Part of it too, of what we're doing right now is that we don't have the answers to the issues until we know if anybody would even be interested in going that way. That is where the will be a phase two. If we find that people say yes we'd be interested in looking at it, we're calling it a program college and a provider college, we would be interested in that concept, we'd like the state to take a look at it, then we would go more in depth with how we could set it up. We're not quite there yet. It could turn out that everyone in the state says we're not going that way. We're not doing this.

Evaluator: I think eventually they are going to have to. There are so many universities that are offering courses within this state and they're offering them from out of state its something, and it gets to the point where it's not even money it's convenience.

Susan: Exactly, and there is no way we should have 107 English 101 online courses and the cost is phenomenal for a college to develop all the online courses so it certainly does look good for the joint course development and sharing and teaching. I think what we've found so far, one of the reactions from the counselors were that the whole mock college would be a tremendous burden on them right now because they're maxed out in their time already. Now we're suggesting that students would identify their college as their home but maybe never take any courses there so their immediate reaction was, "Oh my God we have enough to do." However, again if you tie funding or some support to that college for having those students then that may make a difference.

Evaluator: It seems like there will have to be some additional funding that comes from the Chancellors office to set all of this up and keep it in motion until it stabilizes. Do they look to you like they're more willing to come up with policy?

Susan: Oh yes, I think so. There are so many projects out there and there's been tons of money put into technology across the state but there is not a coordinated effort. I think that they are really clear about that now. It's been good to do a lot of pilot projects to find out if it will work but it's time to take a more coordinated approach to do it statewide. It's tough here. It's was really nice talking to little states where they have seven community colleges and they can just pull off all kinds of stuff. You just think about it and you think how this state is just so huge.

Evaluator: Well it's just such an old system. You'd think that by this time we would have gone to more regional governance instead of one community college district for a single college. There is just so much leftover baggage that doesn't fit into what we're trying to do now. If those people with their administrative skills were moved into a different arena and were able to collectively, I mean nobody has to move because it's all distance learning, be able to use all of those skills and that money in a significantly different way it would be great. It's not that the money isn't there, it just hasn't be reallocated and that look's to me to be one of the bigger problems. I started working on this problem in 1992.

Susan: I believe it. Slow movement.

Evaluator: Well at that point it was La Baron, Carolyn Norman and another woman named Kathy. Kathy has since died and La Baron has moved on and Carolyn is still working in the library parts of it trying to make sure that the libraries are really included in all of this. Back then what we were trying to do is count the types of technology that were in place and I was doing a lot of work with De Anza. I lived in the Bay Area then. De Anza was probably the most technologically sound college.

Susan: Yes and they still are.

Evaluator: Yes they really are but they've had different leaders that have gone through that technology group so it isn't as cohesive as it used to be. They didn't even step forward and apply for the satellite grant, the CSAT. That was kind of surprising.

Who do you work for Susan?

Susan: Santa Barbara City College.

Evaluator: Okay, so you are an employee?

Susan: No, I'm currently a consultant. I was a dean in academic affairs there and then working on this project thought I'm not on staff.

Evaluator: Now are you working with Virginia McBride on their project as well?

Susan: Well Virginia was working on this project for a while but then I think she is also working on that think tank. Is that it? Yes, I think she's got the think tank which is confusing because there is a student services think tank too but there is also a technology think tank grant. I'm not that familiar with it.

Evaluator: The other project that you mentioned, tell me about that one.

Susan: The online curriculum. Now that was another major TMAPP project. I think it was a three-year project and I got involved in it last year. That is basically a depository of all curriculum information and resources. Santa Barbara City College contracted with a company called Governet and they basically developed a working prototype for depositing and searching information. So they developed the prototype, got it up and running, we had some beta site colleges involved in the project and then it ended. It's actually in the Tech II plan and we're waiting to hear if they're going to continue it and to use it statewide.

Right now it really is not in effect. The working prototype is out there and it's complete but they are waiting to figure out how the Chancellors office might support it.

Evaluator: What was the basis of the technology for that?

Susan: It was Oracle, is that what you mean?

Evaluator: Was it based on the IMS, Instructional Management System project?

Susan: No.

Evaluator: P1484, I triple E, Learning objects, aggregation, chunking, one of those?

Susan: All I can tell you is Cofusion, Oracle. You know I'm not sure. It's still on the Web if you want to take a look at it. Okay the email address is www.governet.net/c4 and that will get you on and you can at least see what's been put in it.

So we're waiting on hearing about it. The recommendation was made that it clearly works, colleges were excited about it, they were using it and putting on course of study outlines. Just really a good resource for curriculum material but to use it really needs to happen at the Chancellors office so that if, for example somebody applies for a new program, the sequences of courses and the program would go into this database. It would go up to the Chancellors office, they'd approve it and then it would be one of the programs in the courses that are actually deposited into the center. Everyone would have access to course of study outlines for all the colleges but if they don't use it that way it's a nice thing for colleges to do but it's not a working center.

Evaluator: Who is responsible for it right now?

Susan: The Chancellors office right.

Evaluator: Were you taking material that had already been produced and then committing those? They were digitized, obviously if they're on the map they've almost got to be.

Susan: Right.

Evaluator: Cofusion I think is a software program that you can store materials in. A teacher can go in and select the materials that they needed for say an English 101 and put those into a holding tank that Cofusion provides and then the student could be tracked as they went through the program?

Susan: Well the center was actually designed for colleges so it's really for faculty and administration. A lot of uses of the center would be, for example I had an interim position over at Gavalin College and they had a Paralegal program. Perfect example but I wasn't in Vocational Education and I didn't have any familiarity about paralegals and the program was not doing well at all.

I would be able to logon and find out where else there were paralegal programs in the state of California, take a look at the curriculum in those programs, call up a resource person associated with the program at the other college and say here is what I'm dealing with. There are a lot of the multimedia programs that are being developed now and faculty would have access to the course of study outlines at different colleges to help them build their own. So it really was meant to help faculty and administrators and not so much for students.

Evaluator: I'm looking in the Web site. I was looking at one that was a virtual fly lab that you did and it says it's been moved. A virtual earthquake, they've all been moved over to Cal State LA, I guess, is what that is. Cal State so, statela.edu to run this virtual lab.

Susan: Did you go into materials?

Evaluator: Yes that's where I went.

Susan: If you go in browse by category, that helps a lot. Now see I haven't been in here for a while because it's just basically sitting here, not a dynamic site anymore. I'm not getting anything on the browse. It's not there.

Evaluator: Okay browse came up but it's still coming up as an alphabetical though.

So all of these are considered to be pieces of courses? I'm trying to get a grip on what it really is.

Susan: What are you at?

Evaluator: I'm looking at this entire alphabetical list.

Susan: Okay. That's why it helps to find the category but it's not clicking into categories at all for me. It breaks it out there into administration, course development, there are all these separate areas. Alphabetical does do it.

Evaluator: Are they explanations of programs as well? Here's one, Sterling Video Comparisons, let's see what they did to that one.

Susan: It won't go in. There is nothing in Exhibitors. That one and Tools might have been the ones there were just demos.

Evaluator: So you are not familiar with the IMS project at all?

Susan: No, what project is that one.

Evaluator: Let me give you the url for that one. It's www.imsproject.org. It started out as Educom and Educause and it's based on IEEE, International Electrical and Electronic Engineers. It's an international association that sets standards for video conferencing and Jpeg and Mpeg and that entire thing. They set a standard that they've been working on now for a couple of years that is called P1484. So the IMS project is a derivative of P1484 and it is entirely based upon that inner-operability standard.

The idea behind it actually started out with a White House initiative that was an executive directive that went to the Department of Labor, Commerce and Department of Education. That was the reason and the impetus for them. The purpose of the executive directive was to say we're spending too much money developing the same thing time and time again. Stop that, don't do that anymore, figure out a way to use the same materials over and over and then when something new does come along you spend the money to develop that.

So the IMS project has been working with very large contributing members who have actually been continuing to work on developing standards. That includes IBM, Apple, Oracle, Sybase, Asymmetric and everybody and his brother that is big time in this business. Very stable companies, there are about fifty of them. The IMS project has now gone to the point where the Department of Defense has issued it's own standards, obviously the military always figures it has to do something. So they have their own standards called Scorem. You can go look at their stuff, its, ADL stands for Advanced Distributed Learning and that's what they've been calling it. They were very interested in it because it helps them if you have to put a bunch of people on a plane to Sarajevo and you have to give them

immediate training. It taps into just-in-time training so you can very quickly pull together materials that people can use. So what happens with the project then, lets says you've got a piece of video old and it had to do with English 101. You chunk those things apart rather than having a linear programming. You turn it into chunks of learning and some chunks are very small, others will be a little bit larger. Some people are putting in 40 hours of programming and saying that there is not way they could possibly chunk it any differently which of course is ludicrous. It entirely defeats the purpose of doing this.

The idea is that you can then as an instructor go in and select different pieces that are available, assemble them into a course, then an IMS type of software would hold the materials and present them to the student.

Susan:

Like learning objects in other words?

Evaluator:

Exactly, learning objects and the whole thing. You can have as many students go through as you want to. You can have as much instructor based work with them as you want, you can pretty much do anything you want with it. It's a very nice way of doing it. Oracle is developing a program called I Learning and it will be their software that delivers that. Sybase has been doing something along that line and Asymmetrix invented Toolbook7 and then changed their name to Click to Learn. So there has been all of that that has been moving toward that era. I keep saying someplace behind this has to be or at the very least it's set up perfectly to move into an IMS system. It's just sort of sitting here waiting for those systems to be finalized and standards to be put into place finally. They just came out with version 1.1 January 1st. So all of these programs that you have found and categorized here would be an immediate move into that system which will be an international based system. There will be huge libraries in the same way that this is a library of material but these materials don't look to me like they are Metadata tagged. There doesn't seem to be any way of going in and actually searching for some part of something outside of the alphabetical.

Susan: Well what they do is you can search but what happens is when it's under the retrieve when somebody deposits the material then they list in for the keywords and then you can search it by what listings they've had.

Evaluator: Okay.

Susan: So you can deposit any material, it can be a Word document, it can be on the Web, and it allows anything to be deposited in it. Then you have certain fields you fill in, the title or keyword or what you would want so that if you search for something it's going to come out. Usually title words would come out so say English in the title English will be a certain one.

Evaluator: So the descriptors would definitely be in there.

Susan: You could ask it to retrieve something that has the word English in it and you would get all the course of study outlines that were English plus you might get materials on English and that sort of thing.

Evaluator: At this place, to deposit materials, it says you've got to have somebody's permission.

Susan: Yes you have to have a user name to get in.

Evaluator: I don't even see Palomar on here.

Susan: The problem I'm having right now is I'm not sure if its just there as a demo site but it is not a workable site right now. Not functional because basically the project is over. I haven't been in it for so long but I don't see that anything actually is working in there.

Evaluator: This is just such an interesting project. I loved it. If you can check on the IMS thing and see

Susan: Sure. In fact I'll talk to George Thomas who is the CEO for Governet and see what he knows about it. He works really closely with Oracle.

Evaluator: Everything that you're saying about this leads me to believe that somebody knew what was going on. The thing is just sitting here sort of waiting for the rest of P1484 to catch up which is one of the things that was going on nationally for a couple of years. Actually it was international. A number of people all over the country have been working on this. I've

been working with TV Ontario and they have been looking at their materials trying to decide how best that they could re-purpose their materials. I work with PBS and they've also gone into this so it's not something that is going to go away and it is very, very well thought out and it certainly makes a lot of sense for all of us.

So much has already been developed and it also gives you another revenue stream. With the MetaData tagging you can put all the copyright information there as well as the cost so once you know who it is you could do a penny a head or some other really low piece of income or higher cost, ten dollars a head depending on what the priorities are for the course.

I'm so glad you showed me this. No one had ever told me about this before.

Susan:

It was basically a pilot and we had some Beta colleges involved in it, a number of colleges throughout the state. They got very involved in trying to put in their course of study outlines.

One of the problems is that you go in and look at a course of study outline and it's just the text and so you really can't search it. San Diego Community College District contracted with Governet to develop, basically what they've done is they've taken every element of the course of study outline and made it an independent data element into the program so now you can search for anything. You can say I want all the three unit courses in accounting and they will come up and that's what we couldn't do on this. So they've been doing a lot of work. In fact, they presented at the Mega Conference.

Evaluator:

Did they?

Susan:

Yes, it was very interesting. They've done a great job. It's been a while since I've been involved with it because we were working on it simultaneously, they were one of the pilots sites for the curriculum center here. So I hadn't had any contact with San Diego and I was quite impressed when they pulled it all up. So they're setting up the whole process, the approval process, the review process, everything within the system so it could be paperless.

Evaluator:

That would be incredible.

Susan: It's really neat stuff.

Evaluator: There is so much in here already, just so many things.

Susan: What we're trying to do really is get the Chancellors office to refund this, get it to a working center and then tie in districts and try to get the colleges involved in work that is being done in San Diego so when all of that goes in we would have the richest resource of curriculum material.

Evaluator: Do you know about the Merlot project?

Susan: Yes.

Evaluator: Okay. Merlot is IMS based. If you know about that one then what you know about that one should start tying in with this. Have you got their address?

Susan: No, I don't think I do.

Evaluator: It's Merlot, M-e-r-l-o-t, //merlot.csuchico.edu This one has not been in business a very long time and it's just beginning to take on courses and they built the shell and people started adding things to it. The IMS project is heavily centered at CSU Chico and CSU Sonoma and a bunch of the officers of IMS, I believe, are still at those institutions, primarily Sonoma.

Susan: Okay I've gone in and it's working. It's great. I'll take a look at this.

Evaluator: It might be a tie in and be a super way to bring those two projects together.

Okay, Mark Resmer is at Sonoma and he is the head of the ISM project for Educom. His number is 707-664-2889 and there is another man, Louis Zweier and he is also heavily involved with the Merlot project. He is at 707-664-4337. I've had Lou and Mark both speak at conferences. I've been promoting IMS for a couple of years at TeleCon and other shows. My interest in it is that once you have all the MegaData tagging you would be able to tag those materials with a learning style and multiple intelligence and that company is developing an authentic learning assessment that will define those two things. The multiple intelligence and the learning styles and then pass a cookie from our program to the master ISM project file so that when a student logs on it would know who the student is and that their top three or four preferences might be visual, auditory, hands on and maybe

some fourth one so it would then present the materials in that order. It wouldn't present only one.

The MegaData tagging is what makes it very individualized instruction. Without the MegaData tagging for multiple intelligences and learning styles its just more fluke yet again. So a teacher who traditionally teaches by lecture or just qualitative would still do that and there is not reason for them to try to go find out something else. Anyway that is why I've gotten into it so deep. I think it's not technology for technology sake it's because the technology meets the needs of student learners and it becomes very learner centered in that way. It seems to me like it is a very positive thing to do.

Susan, I've taken up so much of your time, I'm sorry. It's been so much fun to talk to you. Our Web site is www.tecweb.org and we've got a lot of things up there on learning styles and so forth.

Evaluator: Is there anything that we haven't talked about or we have talked about that you would need to send to me?

Susan: Well you have the proposal. I'm trying to think if I have anything else.

Evaluator: Have you got anything that describes the next steps?

Susan: What I do have are the recommendations that were made to the Chancellors office.

Evaluator: About the online?

Susan: Yes.

Evaluator: Could you send me those?

Susan: Sure, yes.

Evaluator: That would be great. Do you have those by email?

Susan: Yes, I can send you this, sure.

Evaluator: Can you give me your email?

Susan: It's ssargent@redshift.com.

Evaluator: All right. Well anything else you think of that could be helpful I'd appreciate. I think we're going to be doing some policy things too so it makes some sense that we're trying to present some sort of a coordinated front to the Chancellors office.

Palomar has the CSAT thing and part of what we'll probably be doing we were talking about originally it was going to be a demonstration series or a couple of courses. I think we've decided now it will be more like simulations rather than try to get everybody geared up to do real courses and the approval process and everything that includes. We just thought it would be easier if we did a couple of simulations and see how it would work that way. Then papers or reports and so forth would come from that. When that happens will probably be six months down the road, probably October. If your report came out in September and we keep on talking –

Susan: We could tie them together.

Evaluator: Yes, and it could be that we try some simulation that you are interested in because we are actually a two year grant so we've got a little bit longer and from what I understand we're probably the last TMAPP grant.

Susan: Oh, is that right.

Evaluator: Yes, we are the last one. So whatever happens I guess the final things come from yours and ours, 65 and 66. All right Susan, thank you so much, I appreciate the time.

**Santa Barbara City College
Santa Barbara, CA
Jack Friedlander
June 21, 2000**

Jack:

What we've done is we've looked at models that other states are using and other consortia are using to offer to programs that go beyond a single college. So we documented the various models that are out there. Then we've taken that and developed a series of papers, I think we're on draft nine or draft eight, getting feedback from various groups across state, and continuously modifying our proposal to something that is going to work for this state.

What Susan Sargent has done, she's like a project manager, is to get a sense of what they've done. Where we're going with that is to say what if a structure is in place or could be in place to support any kind of statewide initiative to support colleges of discerning efforts. She is in the process of writing all the summaries in terms of all the Team AP projects she has contacted.

Then we met with some people representing information service officers who try to learn more about where they're going with infrastructure issues, and what's worked for them in terms of where they are and their outcomes. It was due last week.

The rest of our grants we spent continually in a consultation process of continually to meet with different consultative bodies to try to come up with the best set of recommendations from the chancellor's office in terms of what role they should play or any kind of state group to support discerning instruction, just where we are and what we've done.

Evaluator:

Have you found a consensus or set of alternatives?

Jack:

Pretty much what people seem to like is having a type of arrangement where this supports our basic utilities, yet it would maintain local control over their discerning offerings. For example, if there's a way of doing web hosting of courses, for example, with some basic information about where they can go to learn about an on-line catalog, schedule, on-line

advising in terms of what's available and where they can get it, an on-line transfer center, for example, on-line bookstore, just centralized functions or a generalized orientation that people can use.

Evaluator: So everybody is not recreating the same wheel.

Jack: So there's lot's of support for the whole notion of utilities, and the support for the group that looks at policy issues, but instead of polices, body, per se. To look at areas of volunteering coordination. There's a forum that comes together to do any kind of coordination issues if they wanted to, but they don't have to, just pretty much where it's headed.

Evaluator: So it's not a mandate; it's an option?

Jack: Yes. Colleges don't even have to be a member of this group. They can join it if they want. They're not mandated. They don't have to use all the services or any services if they don't want.

Evaluator: With the funding, what's the recommendation you are coming up with for the funding?

Jack: Well, the recommendation would be to seek funding. We haven't finished yet. What we're proposing with all the funding that's going to four or five CVU centers is where do they fit in. We're just having trouble getting meetings with the CVU centers to look at the relationship with these sets of recommendations and in those centers. Then putting those centers in place for a couple more years, but their funding expires also.

Evaluator: Aren't they interested in meeting, or is it just a scheduling problem?

Jack: I think it's a scheduling problem.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: I think their agendas are so full. I think it's more of a scheduling problem.

Evaluator: Is there one person who runs or manages all five?

Jack: Well, there's a center that coordinates it all at Rio Honda. It's hard to know how effective they are as a group working together. I just have no way of commenting one way or the other.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: So basically, that's what we're doing.

Evaluator: Okay. Have you looked at sharing tuition, or how that works?

Jack: We looked at what other states are doing, and when we proposed that here to various people we met with, there was anywhere from lukewarm support to a deal killer. With the whole idea of a host-college, a program-college, home-college concept, and some revenue sharing involved in those things and a good distribution of services, but then there's just no support for that at this time among various groups, from the CEOs to senate fact.

It makes a lot of sense to me that some other states are doing a model we proposed, but it's premature. There just won't be any support for it initially.

Evaluator: Well, tying all of this bunch to work together, I think, where some other states have three to fifteen community colleges, it's quite a different thing to get them to agree.

Jack: We're a decentralized model.

Evaluator: Yes.

Jack: I'm happy with the proposals going out. I think what we're proposing will be of value to everybody. It's not threatening to anybody.

Evaluator: I think that's the thing. It can't be a mandated threat. You're ahead of us as far as the timing because this went round and round and round the chancellor's office.

Jack: We'll have like version eight or nine done, it's probably even done now. Since it's summertime, what we vest for is no-cost extension. Then we file that in November. The reason why is that the various groups we still need to be with aren't really functioning this summer. So the fund report was completed in early November.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: Interim reports are available to anybody.

Evaluator: Is it on-line?

Jack: Ms. Sergeant, I can ask her to send you a copy. We haven't put it on line yet, but I can ask her to do that.

Evaluator: Okay. That would be great because what we're trying to do is supporting what you're doing.

Jack: Right.

Evaluator: We don't end for another almost year.

Jack: Oh, boy. We'll be long done before that.

Evaluator: What I'm thinking, we're trying to work on the work that Joyce did at Irvine.

Jack: Yes. I knew her project, but there wasn't anything that came out of it.

Evaluator: It hasn't come out yet.

Jack: Ms. Sergeant is the key person.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: Susan can just send you the most recent version of the report.

Evaluator: All right. Our two projects have so many similarities. I don't know whether they're looking for us to validate one another.

Jack: I have no idea. That's why it's really good for you to talk to Susan.

Evaluator: The other part of this one is that Palomar produces some programming trying to use the model. That's, I think, one of the reasons why it took the chancellor's office such a while to finally come up with what they wanted this project to do.

Jack: You're six months behind us. The time we started going was October.

Evaluator: This one should have been, and we were essentially funded at the same time, but they kept dancing with what it was going to be. They like what we turned in, what the proposal was, but I think because your proposal and their proposal were so similar, it didn't make any sense to us to keep on doing what you were doing.

They said you had two grants.

Jack: What's the other grant?

Evaluator: Statewide Educational Delivery Models and the On-line Curriculum and Instructional Resource Center.

Jack: The On-line Curriculum and Instructional Resource Center, that one is finished.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: We had a concept approved that could work.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: Then chancellor's office asked us to continue with our project. I basically said I wasn't interested in doing it anymore. I wasn't getting enough support. The grant wouldn't work. I mean, the center wouldn't work unless the chancellor's office took a leadership role in populating the center. They didn't have the staff up there to do it. They're very interested in doing it. They just didn't have the staff to do it. Unless you take the time and put all the key documents from the chancellor's office on there and use it as a workable center, I'm not going to ask other colleges to get involved in this because nobody's going to go to that site.

Evaluator: I completely agree.

Jack: I felt for my credibility I wasn't willing to ask anybody, including our staff at our college, to invest any time until I saw a real commitment on their part. I think what they've done now is they put into a Tech Two plan, ongoing funding for the center concept.

Evaluator: Okay.

Jack: Which would include getting the proper staffing to get all that stuff done, unless I heard Butte College was interested. They're exploring doing it, but I'm not sure if they're going to do it or not.

Evaluator: I haven't heard anything about it.

Jack: I don't know where it is right now. As a college, it's really a statewide function.

Evaluator: Yes.

Jack: I was trying to prove a concept, which I've done, and they're very pleased. They're excited about it. It's not my role as a vice president at a college to spending my time, or staffers' time to trying to do a statewide function. This would be a distraction for us, as opposed to what I'm being paid to do.

Evaluator: It should also be sustainable if they're going to put that much work into it.

Jack: This is not something that belongs in a community college. It belongs in the chancellor's office.

The fund report's submitted, and Lebaron can give you access to that.

Evaluator: I cannot get anything out of that office.

Jack: That's another reason why I decided not to pursue it.

Evaluator: Do you have it electronically?

Jack: Susan does.

Evaluator: Can she send it to me?

Jack: She can send it to you.

Evaluator: Okay. I'll ask her for it then too because I've tried to get everything.

Jack: We did too, and we couldn't believe it, so we had to go chase all the Team AP projects. We shouldn't have to do that.

Evaluator: No. You've had to do it, and so have I. We got no support all from the office there. They did their summaries at the chancellor's office and said we were supposed to use that. That's useless. What were the pitfalls? What were the problems? Most of the summaries had nothing like that in it.
I'll ask Susan for it. Okay, Jack. Thank you.

**Shasta College
Redding, CA
Dr. James Poulsen
March 23, 2000**

Jim: Jim Poulsen. I'm at Shasta College in Redding, California. Way up north about 160 miles north of Sacramento.

Evaluator: Dr. Poulsen what is the purpose of your project?

Jim: There was one that was I don't remember the date, that had helped fund a self-study in technology that we did. I don't remember much other than it was a source of funds and we had a consultant come in to look at our technology and that was a partial funding for that study. It was a source of support for that kind of thing and to be honest with you I don't remember what the outcomes were off the top of my head.

Evaluator: Is there a written report?

Jim: Yes, there is.

Evaluator: I understand you don't have that necessarily online or in an electronic format –

Jim: No, it was an IBM thing. It was produced by IBM and there is a written report, I assume on file through the grants office.

Evaluator: Okay. Could we get a copy of that?

Jim: Let me write it down and I'll see what I can do.

Evaluator: All right, that would be appreciated. What was the second project you had?

Jim: The second project we had was what we call an online Calslean (sic) kind of grant. Basically we are a district that is 10,000 square miles. We have multiple mountain ranges to cross and we have what we call student centers, some people call them outreach centers. We have Bernie, which is 40 miles east over one mountain range which is snow capped and the whole nine yards, travel is about an hour and a half away. We go to the west about 40 miles we have another place called Weaverville which is over another mountain range making travel difficult. Going to the south and we have a big center in Red Bluff which is 30 miles south. What we've done basically is we offer classes live out there like most schools but it is really difficult. Calculus in downtown. Bernie is not a winner, see. We've developed

through the Chancellor's office with some other grants about 20 classes a semester which are virtual interactive classes using compressed video to fund the campus to these sites. They are late in the morning, ten at night and it's very successful. If you read the literature on distance education it's pretty easy to deliver the courses. It is very difficult to deliver the support services that would be very typical for the on-campus student verse the student at a distance.

We have taken this grant and developed what we call the student services video network. It is actually 174 curobits (sic) per second, computer based small video equipment. The major problem was to overcome a lot of technical problems that we had because the technology kept changing. It started out being ISDN based and that wouldn't work and now its basically WAN based. A student can go out there to any of our centers, to Red Bluff, whatever and we are probably going to put them at some high schools and they can call, do a video conference with counselor, financial aid, admissions and records, etc. The typical kind of support services available for an on-campus are now available on the small video network. It is our way of meeting the student services need and the aspect of having the extended three county district that we have. We are starting to see the results of people starting to use this and it is a great access tool.

Evaluator:

When you say its computer based or small video could you clarify that?

Jim:

What we have basically is your typical IBM computer. One company and there are other kinds that do that by adding a card. You make them into small video conferencing units. There is a camera on top of them and you can, especially since they are now IP addressable, basically use our T1's to make a phone call except it being a phone call it's a video/audio call so you see and talk to each other just like on the telephone. You can also do a shared document application. Let's say I get a student who wants to know how to fill out his financial aid forms or whatever. You can bring that particular form up in the videoconference. Now you are both looking at the form on your screen, you are talking about it and both of you can actually work on the document to fill it out. It is very interactive.

Evaluator: Why are they going to a specific location as opposed to doing it on their own home computers?

Jim: Because your computer cannot get into this network. It is not running over the Internet, it is running on our wide area network. The Internet is not in a condition yet where you can do video conferencing because it takes too much bandwidth and it is extremely unreliable. In this case whether we use ISDN technology as we do in some cases or we use our wide area network. We have the bandwidth available because of the dedicated lines and the quality is much better. If you've ever seen it on the Internet the voice never syncs with the mouth and those types of things. This always syncs up and it's a private network and its much better.

Evaluator: In terms of the most important things you learned in that process?

Jim: I learned a lot about technology because we are still overcoming some minor problems. I learned that I have to teach students how to use the tool to overcome their fear and we have to work with them out there. I also am really committed to the idea that technology can solve many problems, that we can overcome these problems through the use of technology and do provide these services and access. I think it will be very successful. It's just starting to grow now and to be used. We will have it out there so that you can use every service on this campus from our other sites.

Oh, another thing we do with it we have our tutoring centers, math tutoring, science tutoring, writing centers, you know those kinds of things, we've never been able to offer tutoring services out there. They can now go into the local center, hit the math center and work with a math tutor. They have to make an appointment just like you would if you were coming into the actual tutoring center, except it is done interactively and they provide those support services to those people out there.

Evaluator: Your wide area network, how far reaching is that?

Jim: It runs, Bernie, Weaverville and Red Bluff basically which is 40 miles east, 40 miles west and 30 miles south so if you put a triangle that is where it goes.

Evaluator: Are you extending down to the rest of California at some point?

Jim: Well we also, if you wanted to – you're familiar with 4CNet I assume?

Evaluator: Right.

Jim: We could actually, they don't have our link up here but we were going to 4C link. Ours was the last of the video networks coming up but that does mean the potential is there to take the same equipment to our bridges and all the technology that we have. I could put that student in contact with somebody down at San Diego State over 4CNet and it wouldn't cost anything in terms of a line charge. When you start spreading this whole thing out it really becomes quite a tool that individual students can do that. Just as some other points right now what we are doing up here with video conferencing, today we are conducting interviews for Deans on campus. None of those people are coming to campus. We have eight or ten of them and those interviews are taking place all over the country by using video conferencing. It saves people travel and time. Then we will bring on to campus the final two or whatever it is the committee decides to do but we, because of isolation up here we have to use technology in all kinds of ways to overcome distance. This one grant that we got out of the Chancellors office was our way of providing support services and I think they are going to be outstandingly successful.

Evaluator: So you have a good reason to get your report out there so that other branches of your university system can emulate that?

Jim: Yes. We've had a real technology problem, we've solved that and now we are implementing the thing and starting to use it and about a year from now I will be able to give your people a firsthand view of how successful it is. The thing I find interesting is we are very rural up here. You go down the state of California to the Bay Area and they don't see the need for all this stuff. Well if you drive across your whole district in 30 minutes. They are not very big whereas our is 10,000 square miles and its challenged geographically and I don't think the people in the majority of the state understand what we are trying to do in terms of rural America. In the small towns up here it is much different and technology is a real salvation to do that.

Evaluator: I absolutely agree with you. I live in New Mexico so I understand.

just really expensive. We are now down to, I think, one ISDN line that I'm using on a regular basis.

There is another aspect of this that I think is very important that I'd like to point out that I think is really neat. On our campus we have a lady who is a counselor and she has had some very serious health problems where she went through a liver transplant basically. She can no longer come to campus to work because of her high susceptibility to infections and things like that so we have taken an ISDN line out to her. She is still a fulltime counselor of the district, she is on the payroll, she works a day just like anybody else but she works through technology and she is actually now our counselor that counsels a lot of these students at these Internet education sites.

Evaluator: That's exciting.

Jim: That's an ADA kind of consideration you know, and all those other kinds of things. I think that is really neat. If this technology did not exist to do what we did I don't think that she would be working, and she is an outstanding employee, and she had to be very careful of her environment. Personally I think that's terrific. Through technology she uses she does a great job, the students know her and it works out well for her.

Evaluator: When you were working through some of your changes, some of your technology issues and also the facilitation of this particular staff person where there policies being written, rewritten or changed in any way?

Jim: No. I find that we're probably like most schools where our policies are obsolete. For instance if you look at our policy book it really doesn't talk about distance education. Faculty load doesn't talk about distance education. We're like everybody else. We are struggling with those issues. We're struggling with property rights issues and all those kind of things. A lot of those things are basically going to be settled in court at some point in time but I do things and our faculty is very cooperative when we are trying to do things. We don't get a lot of hassle that way and then we try to work out the details and then try to come to some kind of an amicable agreement that we both agree on. We have been able to do that and eventually I know that a lot of this stuff will make its way into the contract but

concurrently it isn't in our collective bargaining agreement or anything. We are not a highly proactive union, I don't know if that's the right thing to say, but there are issues out there but we just work through them as we see them.

Evaluator: You've been mentioning technology as bridging distance between your communities, as you come online you're coming online with the greater state and policy will be important, certainly as it comes from the southern tip all the way up to your area. Are you invited, or privy to the statewide policy discussions going on?

Jim: I just know there are a lot of them going on out there. I have a lot of e-mails going by but most of these things that I am concerned about tend to be local faculty contractual issues. Basically they have to be negotiated since they are the right to work issues and those kinds of things and I know that every district is struggling with that. Just because the technology has changed the way we deliver.

The second thing I see that technology has changed is the – if I taught a regular class like I used to teach, I mean that has value to me but it has no value to anybody else, okay. Let's say I develop an on online class, whatever it is, online on the Internet that has financial value to it, it has resources involved. Now the question is who owns that? The answer is we don't know. I think that's going to be a major, major point of discussion because a lot of stuff that didn't have value except only to the faculty member in the first place is simply going to start developing into a value in terms of the marketplace.

Evaluator: In other words the policy that you'd see the most helpful would be some policy along intellectual property rights?

Jim: Yes, intellectual property rights, major issues in terms of distance education also are compensation and faculty load, I can see the day very quickly coming. We don't have anymore classrooms up here. We are not big enough to build. I can see the day quickly coming where we may have fulltime faculty who basically don't come to campus. That is where I think distance education is going to go. Currently we are just treating them as hourly pay with extra assignments right now but you know that will change down the road.

Evaluator: How do you see shared tuition happening?

Jim: I think it will be just the regular tuition thing. I don't see that as a major problem because the community colleges in California are so inexpensive. The problem that I see is how are we going to treat the out-of-state issue, it will become more of a problem because they can have access to things. Are you familiar with our tuition rules, like California is \$11.00 a unit but at our campus if you're out-of-state it's \$117.00 a unit. That is a big discrepancy where as probably in New Mexico at a community college you pay a tuition fee which is somewhat much larger than that. Probably along the lines of what you pay to go to a university now but California for years was free. So I can see the tuition issue as a concern as we develop more access. I know in Colorado I talked to them and basically if you take an online class in Colorado, no matter where you are from, they charge you in-state tuition not out-of-state tuition which I thought was kind of interesting. It's a policy that they made, I don't if that will ever happen out here but I don't see that being too much of an issue. I also see things like online registration and online counseling being important. I see a lot more of these things growing hand in hand as we develop this concept of distance education.

Evaluator: In terms of export courses, if the entire system was flowing is there concern that certain teachers would lose their jobs up there in Shasta if courses were coming from the south or the Bay Area, etc., on the same topics that they teach?

Jim: I think that's becoming more of a perceived concern. My point has always been that if we don't do something that might happen. If we are proactive and develop distance education courses then the people we serve which is the three counties, will choose to take the courses from us as opposed to going down to Foothill or De Anza or somewhere like that because they are available. If we don't develop these areas then, yes, there will be students who will by choice say I need English 1A and Shasta College does not provide it in any formats available to me therefore I'll take English 1A from De Anza and it will work fine. That is a perceived threat and I think if we are not proactive it can become more real to us.

Evaluator: Before we leave do you have any words to the wise?

Jim: I would personally like to pass on my thanks, if you could do that, to the Chancellors office for the support. It has been a tremendous learning experience for us

Maybe in the bigger cities they do but not here and so as we expand this concept out using technology there is a greater appreciation for what we're doing and you're not generally attracting your general 18 or 19 year old kids.

If you look at the classes out there you will find more of the 30 year old single parent. They all have gender, they all have reason to be there and as I talk to faculty who teach on this the best students in their class, the majority of them are out there and not sitting in the classroom on campus. We will have some students on campus also but the ones out there and these are the people that are motivated. They are older people, more mature and self-disciplined, they know where they want to go and they greatly appreciate being able to get some of these classes that they could not take, number one, or it would be very inconvenient for them to do that. It's been a very successful project. We allowed the money from you know the regular telecommunications money that's how we built this network out plus we put some federal grants together and it's been very successful for us.

Evaluator:

Well, I'm glad that you've been there for them James.

Jim:

It's been a lot of fun for me. The other thing that we have on campus, you may be familiar with this, Chico State which is to the south of us has a big satellite network that is going up off the satellite and it's one-way. It's one-way television with a back link being you pick up the phone and call and the differences in the teaching styles and the differences in the level of education, the interaction when you use the compressed video mode versus the old way of doing it over a microwave or satellite is a lot of difference.

Our students can ask questions live, they can be seen live, they can talk live and talk to their colleagues from one town to another and that is an integral part of what we do. I've done a survey of people out there, I ask a bunch of questions about technology and how they felt. One question I asked was something like, realizing that the best relationship is between you and the faculty member being face to face and realizing that due to financial constraints or whatever, this is not a possibility can you rate the education that you received on what we call our interactive television system, we call it the ITV system. My memory says something like 85, 90, 95 percent said it was very good or good. They were very satisfied.

**College of the Siskiyou
Nancy Shephard
March 27, 2000**

Evaluator: This is Nancy Shephard from College of the Siskiyou. The first question, Nancy, is what was the purpose of your TMAPP project?

Nancy: Ours was a mini grant for telecommunications planning.

Evaluator: Has that been complete or are you in the process of it?

Nancy: It has been completed. We finished it and wrote up a final report and we've also incorporated those final findings into our annual technology plan that we did toward the end of January.

Evaluator: Okay, do you have this report in electronic format that you could email it?

Nancy: Yes I do.

Evaluator: Okay. What was the most important thing you learned?

Nancy: It is really hard for an outside person to come in and know what's going on inside the institution and make some good recommendations.

Evaluator: What would you have done differently or how would you have done it differently?

Nancy: I think that we embarked on the project because we felt we needed to do some telecommunications planning. Actually telecommunications and technology both but mostly for telecommunications and distance learning. I don't know if we really had a clear sense of what we wanted to find out or the direction that we wanted to go. I think we thought or we hoped that someone would come down from the sky and tell us this is what you need to do. When it comes right down to it no one else necessarily knows that any better than we do.

So the money came in and we had this project to do. I found that it was really difficult to get together enough of the people from the campus to do planning when they weren't sure exactly what the outcome was going to be. I ended up doing interviews, as

much as I could, individually with people and then gathering that altogether and working with a consultant to get a few other outside ideas.

Evaluator: What do you see the relevance three years from now?

Nancy: As much as it was difficult for someone else to say you should do this it was good to hear. Someone else came in and said well I see for distance learning you might wanted to do this and this and this based on what I've seen happen at other colleges. However, when it came right down to it we still wanted to do things the way we want so more than anything else it was an exercise in some of the things we're going to need to think about doing in the next three to five years.

Evaluator: Are there any secondary things that you learned, hadn't expected to learn or were there any surprises?

Nancy: Mostly that it's much easier to get money for equipment and very specific projects and go ahead and carry them out then it is for planning. Planning really involves so much direction from the top thing, you will do this and you will be involved with this and this is a useful exercise but I think in technology it's very hard to expect people to want to do planning. It's an important thing to do but we tend to see things more in terms of just equipment and doing it and getting it done rather than looking out three to five years.

Evaluator: Speaking of three to five years, how do you see the community colleges of California in the future?

Nancy: I can't speak for the community colleges of California, I can only speak for our community college. I see a lot more online courses, we've done some of them and we're continuing to do more. We run several video conferencing classes and we are adding two more sites for this Fall. I see a lot more two-way interactive video conferencing classes. I think for a lot of other community colleges they have in the past and maybe are tending to in the future look more toward canned classes. Either purchased from outside sources or video taped and distributed or distributed through television and we aren't looking in that direction at all so I think that in some ways we're maybe headed in a little different direction though I think everyone is looking more strongly at online courses. I don't know about

video conferencing but in an area like ours where we have a lot of students who are very spread out and we really want to give them the best learning experience we can we feel very strongly that two-way video will give them that. It is the next best thing to being there when they can't actually be there.

Evaluator: In terms of working with the other community colleges as you go online as a system are you privy to or sitting on any committees that are driving policy for the combination and collaboration across campuses in the state?

Nancy: We've been involved in the CDU4 and what they're doing. That's mostly one of our curriculum development specialists.

I think for my piece the project that we've been involved with was the video conferencing project with four other northern community colleges and it was a grant from RUS. When we started that we really hoped to be able to build and develop a program by which we would share video classes and because of politics across the campuses we haven't been able to do that as much as we wanted to. It's still kind of sitting in committees.

Evaluator: Do you think that in terms of these committees that there is a policy that would help you? Could you see policy assisting in more combination collaboration?

Nancy: Policy from the Chancellors office?

Evaluator: Perhaps or coming out of these committees a policy for the CCC system or whatever.

Nancy: The only thing I reasonably see happening are recommendations unless the Chancellors office just does as they did with the purchase of video equipment, this is what we're going to do and this is what you will do and we'll give you money for this.

I'm not sure what kind of policies would change the political landscape particularly.

Evaluator: Do you see your campus exporting beyond the four colleges in your area?

Nancy: No, not in terms of broadcasting but we do offer online courses and anyone is available to take those.

Evaluator: So your videoconferences are on a right-area network?

Nancy: Our online courses can be signed up for by anyone and those are the courses that would probably go out beyond our service area. Our videoconference courses right now are just on a network right here, there are four locations in Siskiyou County. I'm very hopeful that with 4CNet we will be able to share courses with other community colleges.

Evaluator: Okay, now in terms of any talk about shared tuition or how that would work?

Nancy: I've been only in on the fringes of that, I'm not a vice president or president and so I can't make those decisions I can only help it along from where I'm at.

Evaluator: All right. From where you're at do you see any major problems? Anyone standing up and saying we can't do this, anything like that?

Nancy: Everyone from this college is very supportive. We have a lot to gain from that kind of collaboration. We are a very small school and we have a lot of people to serve, not a lot in numbers but we have a spread out population to serve. So anything that we could receive from other colleges would mean that we don't have to take on the cost of instructors for those courses.

We have a few things that we can offer other sites too.

Evaluator: Sure. Where exactly is your campus?

Nancy: We're about 50 miles south of the Oregon border in Siskiyou County up by Mt. Shasta.

Evaluator: Well, having gone through this process do you have any words to the wise?

Nancy: I think everybody should do some planning for their distance learning and technology in general. We have a president who has been very supportive of planning and we've done a lot of it over the last seven or eight years since she's been here. Just the process of thinking ahead I think really keeps you in the mode of looking ahead rather than looking at things you can't do.

Evaluator: Are there any pitfalls that you see in this whole process as you're moving forward in this technology age with your campus?

Nancy: There always are concerns, certainly money concerns and concerns from the faculty of not being willing or able to put in the time on retraining. I probably mentioned

pitfalls earlier in the conversation about having a hard time getting people together for planning and hard for someone else to come in from the outside world and say what you should do. Everything has pitfalls and you just have to keep moving forward.

Evaluator:

Well, I want to thank you very much for your time Nancy.

Solano Community College
John Wagstaff
March 27, 2000

John: My name is John Wagstaff and I'm currently at Solano Community College. During the grant period I was at Peralta Community College District where I was the director of information technology, management information systems. Now I'm up at Solano and I'm the associate vice president for technology and learning resources.

Evaluator: Well, congratulations.

John: Thank you. I've got a better title but the world still pretty much looks the same.

Evaluator: That's right, your mom still doesn't know what you do for a living.

John: Yes. I've been around in the TTIP and that whole thing from the very beginning when we thought it might be wise to construct a community college network. In discussing down at Irvine when they rolled out this engineering from Merlot's plan.

Evaluator: When was the beginning?

John: I think it was 1995 initially that La Baron Woodard and Christina Lopez went after and got a huge grant from the MTIA which is an arm of the commerce department that really built the public broadcast system. MTIA was really getting interested in helping public institution get on the Internet.

Evaluator: Are you going to be talking to us today about Peralta or Solano?

John: Well if you have questions about what transpired in my grant I'll be talking about Peralta but I know them both intimately now so I can give you insight into both. What's happened at Peralta is really disturbing because it's not a priority down there anymore. I made it a top drawer priority.

Evaluator: You didn't hire your replacement?

John: I didn't but I recommended – actually what I did was we'd reached the point at Peralta where the individual wanted to network but they didn't want to connect. It's a sad story and they have problems. So what I recommended is what happened. They looked to a private company, they outsourced my job I believe for a year or two to a group that I

thought could pull it off. Then I got out. It's a long story I won't get into but basically people who know Peralta can probably fill in the details. We had completed a district wide strategic technology planning effort that involved eighty people and went to the board and became board policy and is still supported down there. As that process was nearing its completion we went after and achieved one of those mini grants.

Evaluator: Was that the purpose of that Peralta project?

John: The purpose of the Peralta strategic planning process was to map out the technology applications, if you want to call it that, services that would be implemented. As I tell people, we recommended an organizational approach to achieving some service objectives that utilized technology, most of Web based intra and Internet. It was pretty detailed and it's published on Peralta's Web site and you can go look at it.

Evaluator: So that was a question I'd have further on down was the report copy.

John: It's out there as a file that can be downloaded and can also be searched online. If you go to the Peralta Web site and go to staff directory, Cecil Harrell is the Web master down there. He's the DC Director. He'll be able to spot it for you. If you have trouble call me back and I'll find it out. I've got electronic copies of it. It's pretty big because we hired a facilitator who is now the acting director down at Evergreen.

Evaluator: You do have an electronic copy that you could send even though it's large?

John: Well it's pretty big. I'll try to attach it, if we're on a fairly quick network we'll be all right but we produced it with Office95 and we put some graphics in. Office95 Power Point graphics were huge elephants so we've got one section of it that's almost three megabytes, mostly graphics and there is only about four pictures in there but sure I can send that out to you.

I still find little bits and pieces that are wrong with it, as many times as I've I gone through it.

To wrap this up the strategic technology plan I tell everybody didn't specify what kind of network we should put in or how we should do it. It was a detailed explanation of what we were going to do with the network once we got it put in. How we were going to use

it administratively and how we were going to use it instructionally. We'd talk about things like student information systems and faculty information systems, how we were going to make our legacy data available to the decision makers. We'd talk about business reengineering and getting into data warehousing and as that whole process was nearing a conclusion I realized that we needed to design the network.

None of us were current on the technology. I got the grant because I could see the need coming so I wrote the application and got the grant. We put a grant out on the street and it was basically an invitation for companies to tell me how they would work with us to put a document together that had several sections. Basically it was going to get into things like how your student lodge should be configured and interconnected with say your administrative users. It was very specific and we didn't publish that but I have a copy of it.

That yielded about 15 proposals so we duplicated them, we took the headers and footers off and inked all references to the company's name and numbered them. I put a technical group together and made copies for everybody and said here ranked them. Throw away the outliers and give me the best three that you think. Out of that we interviewed and wound up hiring Wolfe and Associates, now Intellient, and they worked with us to produce the initial network design. That was later extended and as I was leaving it was ready to go to bid, in fact it did go to bid and it came back at nearly a ten million dollar project which scared the district so I think they're going to pare it back.

I'm getting ahead of myself. The grant itself really provided the opportunity to do a district wide network plan where the colleges were working together.

Evaluator: Let me just stop you there for a second. You mentioned the policy word in that mix and I'm going to ask you did you put policy to this or was there policy written with this project?

John: Oh, yes. We're talking about two documents here, two different documents at two different periods of time.

Evaluator: Lets stay with Peralta.

John: They are both germane to Peralta. The strategic technology plan, the statement of how a modern highspeed data network would impact our instructional activities, student services and administrative activities, that is the strategic technology plan. As one board member said, boy there is a lot of change in here. You bet there is and that's where we say the obvious. Looking back I would say it's a revolution. It's the convergence of low cost computing devices off campus for faculty, staff and students with the Internet and the Worldwide Web and it changes the way people do their business. It all comes down to communication and information retrieval and utilization and it sets up a completely different relationship with the teacher and the student in that now it can be virtual. You can do a lot with email including attach assignments, virtual office hours are a possibility. If you want to take its logic extreme it's instruction, anything, anytime, anywhere. While we didn't have a clear image of where online instruction was going three years ago we do now.

Evaluator: Okay, stop there. This was a plan you were funded to create a plan and you –

John: No, I wasn't funded for that one. The plan that I was funded for actually resulted in a detailed network specification.

Evaluator: Okay stop there so I can get a better understanding. You created this detailed spec, what happened with it? Was it implemented or is it being implemented?

John: It is, yes. Now the strategic technology plan, the statement of services, that is what went to the board of trustees and they adopted it as board policy. What that means is that they endorsed it as a group of activities that they wanted to see accomplished. Subsequent to that vote it October of '97 we retained the services of an engineering firm then to work with us to design the physical network and that's what I had the grant for. The grant that I got from TTIP underwrote their costs and that project launched in January, it took us a couple of months to screen the firms, and in January the project launched and we finished it on time. We submitted the plan back to TTIP in June, we finished it in June and I think it was the first few days of July when we sent it off to everybody. So that's what the grant was all about, the physical network design.

Evaluator: Okay, then you left Peralta?

John:

Well, what had to happen is that initially when we finished the plan in '98 I wanted to proceed. What we did, I have to confess, is we had two different versions. We had a generic version for everybody to look at and then we pressed on and we had a version which we actually got some feedback on from a couple of the vendors. I think, Nortel Bate took a lot at it and one other firm but I can't remember what it was. What happened was we wound up not using that initial reaction.

What we were asking is here is a detail of one of our colleges, we listed it out, and we said we'd like you to plug in some estimates of about what the network would cost at one of our average size campuses. We were trying to figure out what kind of a ballpark are we playing in because what had happened to us was we were stumbling in to realize that we were on the cusp of a major change in networking technology. You're moving from TenbaseT or Fast Ether, which was the Cisco proprietary architecture to something we're now calling Gig Ether, gigabit. In other words moving data not at 10 to 100 or 150 megabytes a second but going to 1000 megabytes a second over the back point. On top of all that we were beginning to hear that users were going to be able to logon anywhere in the network. The old network architects used what we call a Mac address which is a machine address in conjunction with you logon so you're kind of locked onto one workstation or maybe a series of workstations. If you go with somebody else's you really can't get through because there is a mismatch between that machines Mac address and your logon.

So what we were beginning to hear is that there were schemes were the vendors were saying either through a hardware or software solution we're going to be able to deliver layer three services even out to the edge. Students and faculty are going to be able to logon anywhere and be reassigned back to their original virtual land grouping. So for example a fulltime professor in a CIS lab logons on and has access to a wide variety of resources at that instructor station. Eight hours later a part-timer logs on and sees only a fraction of those resources all by virtue of logon password. We got real excited and we went out and asked for a couple of estimates. I got ahead of my Chancellor who got really

concerned that that looked like a bid when it wasn't. After many conversations and hours we've chewed up probably three months after July, we decided that we should declare a district wide project to do cabling and hardware acquisition and installation. The districts architectural consulting firm got involved and that slowed things down even further because they had to be educated.

The basic fact was that you couldn't wire first and then design your hardware backbone. It has to happen exactly the opposite because your wiring layout will determine whether and if so how easily you can implement this new technology. So there began a detailed process of producing building blueprints and laying and identifying cable drops and locating, what I would call MDF and IDF, main distribution facilities and immediate distribution facilities. We had to educate them to the fact that you couldn't just have one in a multistory building. In the old days of shared technology you could group your routers in one location and feed all your cables from say a three story you put your routers in the middle. In switched technology it doesn't work that way, if you've got users on all three floors you're going to have a main switch somewhere in that building and then you're going to have edge switches feeding into it from various floors. We had to fight that out over a six month period and we got to the point where by late summer of '99 we were ready to go.

We had cad rungs of all the buildings, we had run through all this detail with the college people probably three times where we would take almost a week with each college and go through this stuff. The spec was ready, the statement of hardware was ready and they actually launched a bid in mid-September and it came back in mid-October and it was a mess. The vendors who bid didn't follow the rules, we only got one clean bid and by November it was pretty obvious we were going to have to re-bid the thing and revise it and by that time I had my office from Solano. I really made a commitment to bring that project to bid and I was ready to move on.

I understand they are reworking it and intending to go back out to bid. That initial project that was funded by the state that started the process of specifying the actual physical network is paying off and I'm intimately involved enough to know that they're going

to move it forward. What they're doing right now is checking to make sure that in the time span between the technology plan and the network design that they haven't missed anything.

Evaluator: Okay now let me stop you because believe it or not we're still on the first question. That is quite a story and I'll weave about three or four other questions into that answer you just gave me but I have to ask you this. When you were doing all of this were you in your mind creating a networking prototype for the California Community Colleges as part of your contribution to the state funding this or were you simply looking for state-of-the-art for Peralta?

John: In my mind I wanted to do exactly what the K through 12 people did about two years earlier when they produced a document that really was intended to guide the K through 12 schools in the whole process of putting up a network.

Evaluator: In the entire state of California?

John: Yes. What got me interested in this in the first place and I think what lead La Baron to fund me and get me off his back was once I knew that the state was going to fund an interconnection of all the community colleges I started saying things like, Okay so having done that how can the colleges prepare? Some are networked and some aren't, some have networked long ago so they should be upgraded and I said is anybody giving any thought to some guidelines? What are you going to be putting up? Is it ATM, you know, where are you going with this? As I continued to talk in these meetings I said I think what we need is a cookbook.

Evaluator: So now you've left, in your heart do you think that the guidelines that you left when you left Peralta will be followed?

John: Yes, I do. For one thing – how can I say this without it appearing to be a conflict of interest? The company that is sitting out there in my place I consulted with, whom my wife works for. The current Chancellor didn't have this connection, didn't know about it and nobody told him. It was his decision to bring this company in. I merely suggested that we'd

reached a point where more horsepower was needed. I said I could probably do it but I'd probably get killed in the process.

Evaluator: Now as you implement this at the Peralta site then you think it can be a prototype for the other campuses?

John: I think it can in the sense that De Anza did the same thing. The issue here is, and you would probably do it after the fact, last year began putting a system like this in and everybody was watching.

Evaluator: You were watching or were you working?

John: You bet I have their spec.

Evaluator: You have their spec, okay. Let me just stop you just for a second because the purpose of the focus here is to have your contribution of your TMAPP project to the greater whole, eventually. I'm going to ask is either putting this thing down on paper and looking at other campuses like De Anza you now have lessons learned and the pitfalls and all that good stuff that you can share but do you also get a sense that someone, the Chancellor, would say okay this what works, this is what we have to do as a comprehensive system?

John: I'm going to give you one of these yes no answers. I think what's needed is not a raw specification that meets the construction standards index requirements. When you build a building it's the infamous CSI Section 1750, technology projects go there to die because what precedes them in the spec is the kind of thing the contractors is looking for, piping and paint and all these kinds of detail. Section 1750 is where, if you're building a new building and you're putting in a new network that's where you state your network needs and it's basically useless. It gets so specific that it works for your institution but it's not going to mean much to anybody else and that's what the De Anza bid looked like to us and that is what are bid will look like to everybody else.

The booklet that preceded it was more specific to us than I wanted to see it. What I was looking for in the grant and just wasn't able to pull it off, we got the document put together and yes you can learn from it but I still think what's needed is a planning guide. What we found out, for example, is that the inventory of your existing installed base is

critical. It has got to be accurate. You've got to know what you have out there, how much of it's going to be useable in the network and where it is. You've got to lay those densities out on blueprints. The building blueprints have to be accurate or you can't position your switches so counting becomes critical. Actually if you do it right – you're putting a network so you may not have one or the network you have may be too dumb to tell you. With modern networks I can log on and there is software I can use that will monitor and inventory all of the users but we had to do it by hand.

We had no idea going into this our inventory records were so bad. They're typed at the purchasing process but they truncate after 25 characters so there were no data input standards for describing a computer. Ultimately we threw up our hands and it cost almost \$100,000 to go out and inventory the installed base one machine at a time. The data we brought back was distilled down into an Excel spreadsheet that is not 19 mega in size but it tells everything at that point in time. It had to be done. We kept looking back over our shoulders, meeting after meeting saying to ourselves we've got enough and looking back six months later it was no we don't have enough, we should have done it by hand. That was the first major hurdle and I think we need some guideline on how is it best to do that. What tools should you be using, how can you go about making the job easier.

The second thing that we learned is that we had to have accurate building blueprints. Most colleges don't, especially if they've been wiring they are probably not keeping track of what they've got. What we found out as we went through it was the wire didn't always go where we thought it did or the way we thought it did and when we tested it we found out that in some cases the existing cable was far less than even ten megs. By today's standards an enhanced Cat 5 ought to be able to go full gig, if you do it carefully. So that was a problem for us, we need some generic tips. If its Gig ether, and that's where it's going now even Cisco has given up on their gig, they have a gig modification for their 5.5 box. Then we can start talking about workgroup clustering and recommended switch layout and how buildings get interconnected and what kind of V land groupings that you can create are recommended for say fire walling administrators from faculty from students.

Also your labs come in two or three flavors, dedicated teaching about computes and networking, dedicated teaching something else and general access like walk-in Office '97 applications and what is recommended on a multi-building campus. Should you put these things out at the department level or should you cluster them in say a single building.

The document that we produced didn't go there the way I thought it would.

Evaluator: You go there, you know that stuff.

John: Oh, sure. I could probably write it now.

Evaluator: Let me ask you this, one of a series of questions that I'm asked to ask you I don't see them relevant to your project. They involved sharing of tuition, exportation of courses and committees etc. but I'm going to ask have you thought about the sharing or the exportation of your information, your talent across the California Community College system? You know, you hear from a couple of the other sites that they needed to do a plan but they realized one of the lessons they learned was they didn't have the talent in house to do it and they don't necessarily even know who to go out and ask.

John: Yes, I'd be more than happy to share everything.

Evaluator: Just in this conversation we're having in terms of the exportation of the learned talent coming off of these TMAPP you are very micro focuses, very keen and knowledgeable now. Your information and not just your report is invaluable.

John: Yes, what happened to me was I got to be leading edge because I literally lived it for two and a half years. It's all I thought about. We went out, vendor after vendor, we kicked tires and we talked to other people. The consultants I hired were excellent in that Sean Jennings and Vonda Sulky at Wolfe and Associates were really good at scheduling technical sessions on their site with engineers from these major networking companies. We kept it as neutral as we could. I think that the group that also needs to be involved in this, and I think they are somewhat alienated unfortunately, is the association of chief information officers for California. They call themselves Ciosa. They're going to have a conference starting April 9th up in Tahoe. They meet every year.

Evaluator: Chief information officers for whom?

John: For the California Community Colleges. These are the data people, the DP guys and gals.

Evaluator: Are you in communication with them?

John: I go to it. In fact, I'm on their directory. They're Website is www.ciosa.cc.ca.us and they have a directory. You can also get their annual conference and their complete agenda on that site for this upcoming conference. They get together once every year and there are a lot of technical sessions. Basically these are management information systems people but they are also in the middle of 4C Net so they get some briefing on that and TTIP. In general there isn't the kind of real tight connection between that group and what La Baron is up to. Some of them think it's kind of silly, like if you sat them all down and asked what do you think of the video conferencing equipment they'll laugh and say it's a waste of money. They are keen to be on the network and these are the leading edge guys that people are putting in at the local level but there seems to be somewhat of a disconnect and in some cases they could use the help, you bet.

Evaluator: You're answering questions I didn't ask yet. This is great John, you're fabulous.

John: One board member asked me what I do and I said well I answer technology questions nobody has asked yet.

Evaluator: This is great. Somebody that talks more than I do and answers questions before they are even asked. I love that.

If you are gearing up to be a network across that state is policy something that would be important to having everyone on the same page or at least sharing the resources or knowing that they should?

John: I don't know how you would enforce it because the local boards have fiduciary responsibility so you can suggest things to them and you can motivate them by giving them money with strings attached but you can't tell them what to do.

The basic tension right now is that as far as I can tell we're building an ATM backbone, where most of the colleges are probably going to go Gig ether. There will be some exceptions. ATM is this –

Evaluator: I understand.

John: You understand that, good. The reason they are going that way is because video over the network as a separate ampeg signal is becoming unimportant because of voice and video over IP and that is where it's going. I've been sitting here saying eventually we'll get compression that will give me near bandwidth, near broadcast quality at my desktop and I see it within three years.

Evaluator: Yes, probably sooner.

John: So at that point who cares? We're already saying we can already do voiceover IP so why would I want to make an ATM network backbone statewide when all I really need is just real blazing fast data speeds. At Peralta we spent a lot of time talking about this because we knew where the state was going. The question we were asking our consulting engineers from Wolfe and Associates was is there a disconnect here if we go Gig ether and we decided we're going Gig ether because first we don't want to have to reinstall our phone system. All the needs that we could see coming out of the strategic technology plan were telling us it's going to be data. We have to have big huge pipes moving data as fast as we can move it. So yes, I think at some point in time this is going to get a wider airing. As far as I can tell though that backbone is ATM right now. We just put the T1 lines in for video conferencing. So we'll see.

Evaluator: Let's talk about the issue of a make sense plan for the California Community Colleges as a whole, what are the problems and what would the nay sayers be saying who say we can't do this and why. How would you address that?

John: I think there would be a couple of different kind of groups that would look at that. First of all, data people are usually real honest about what they don't know.

I think that on one level the way the 4C Net was funded created some problems. I understand why they did what they did, they made it look like as they built the physical backbone at the CSU level they were funding that work through a mechanism that made it look like I was buying services from that network. If you precede on that assumption then you know for sure if you do some comparison pricing with what we were getting we were

Whether it's a traditional course or not they'll probably be engaging the students in what we call threat of discussions. To discuss quote the problem of the week and you can do this in a general classroom where multiple lecturing is being done on site with the students working after hours. I think that they're going to have to learn how to manage student expectations in this new environment. If I attach an assignment to an email at midnight and I went back online the next morning and it hadn't been graded yet, you know, faculty has to set those boundaries.

For example what we're doing here is we have an automated response to incoming messages that have attachments and the message says I've got your assignment and I'll have it back to you and graded seven days from now and students are accepting that. I think that in terms of the access to information and the way we interact, communication, it's a revolution.

I'll give you a concrete example. My master's was in American diplomatic history and when we studied the Cold War we had to imagine the other side, what was going on, who was standing at the last May Day parade or whatever. Now, if I'm teaching a course about the Cold War the Wilson International Studies group at Princeton have a Cold War history project going and they've got into the KGB and Soviet archives and they've got them translated and published. Now if I'm talking, if I've forgot my students thinking about the Soviets response to the Marshall Plan I can send them to that site, they can pull down the top secret memo that Stalin send Molotoff at Paris telling him how to behave. That is where we are now.

We've got primary sources out there that are free that are going to influence how we have interpreted events and we can send students right to that stuff regardless of where they are. When I was doing my Masters I seriously thought about traveling from Iowa to Princeton just to see the Wilson papers because I only had copies of a few of them. Now it doesn't matter, they're out there.

Evaluator: John you're certainly excited and I want to thank you for sharing your time. What you're talking about is actually the improvement of education so we can only hope that after you're done with your gig bytes that teachers rise to the challenge.

John: I'll leave you with a thought. We have three online courses going as pilot projects, one of them is criminal justice and the others are introduction to computers and introduction to business. We spent about 30 minutes showing our board members the course online. I stood up to conclude and I said, you know we've had a lot of questions about this form of instruction but does anyone here doubt that it's interesting and engaging, and they applauded.

Our runners are telling us the same thing. It's the closest thing that we've had to a revolution in centuries. If you want to know where I think California is going, I think we're going to interconnect our libraries. Information sharing across the network, it's already going on out at the Chancellors office, more and more information about the districts themselves and as a collective whole. I think it's a whole new ballgame and we've got to make sure our community colleges know how to put these networks up and organize them and manage them and upgrade them over time.

Evaluator: Well, thank you so much John. I'm sure if you're there and you stay there and you can get on the pipeline –

John: Absolutely. I don't have the latest spec document that would hit the street but I'll email you the technology plan and when I do I'll attach that Ciosa Web site with its directory. There is a directory by school, it'll tell you what kind of hardware they've got, what kind of software they are running, what kind of staff they have and what they are doing for each and every community college in the state and they update that regularly.

Evaluator: Well again, any information will be very helpful.

John: Well let me tell you that California is a unique bird. There is a lot of stuff going on – there's a reason why we're 51st in reading comprehension. It's a strange environment in the sense that they're starting to fiddle around now with free community college education with no boundaries. It's going to be interesting to see how this happens, when the coffers are

rich they try – our retention rate at the community college level is less than the retention rate for telecourses in elsewhere in the country. You're lucky if you can get 60 percent of these people through to complete a course. Out of all the community colleges students, 1.5 million of them, only five percent go on and actually achieve a degree. What I mean by that is a four-year degree. I don't know what the percentage is that get an associate degree but our numbers, out of 10,000 students in our district we may have 150 who actually get a two year degree.

Evaluator:

Well it's a fabulous mission.

John:

Yes and I think we can pull it off. The thing that surprised us is we're not getting students from Timbuktu we're getting our own local residents who drive by us on they're way to work who are telling us we don't have time to stop but we do have time to do this at night at home.

Southwestern College
Steve Bossi
March 10, 2000

Evaluator: Tell me about your project. What is the name of it?

Steve: What is the name of our project? I don't know.

Evaluator: I'm sorry to get so technical.

Steve: It was an EDI link thing. I don't know what we called it.

Evaluator: What was the purpose of it then?

Steve: It was to share transcripts between the high school, the community college and the local state university.

Evaluator: Here it is, Electronic Transmission of Transcripts. Tell me are you through with it yet? Are you still working on it?

Steve: We will probably always be working on it. By that I mean it will probably not ever be completed per our expectations because the K-12 partner kind of flaked out. Actually San Diego State is involved in a huge implementation and they've kind of just put us on the back burner.

Evaluator: Tell me then, this was a 1996 grant?

Steve: Yes.

Evaluator: You probably didn't get your award until a little bit after that knowing them. How long have you been working on it then?

Steve: We probably didn't start on it until 1997 and we worked on it through most of 1997 and parts of 1998 very sporadically. Then we put somebody on it pretty heavily in the early part of last year to really look at what needed to happen on our end of it from a technical perspective. He got it all working and then the partners just don't have time for us right now. We bought some hardware. We put hardware in our admissions records office. We put hardware over at the high school. We put hardware at San Diego State. As I said, State is going through a major migration and they just flat don't have the time. Part of our problem is that we already have a homegrown version of the same functionality with State. The

other part, to be honest, is that the concept of our grant was wonderful except it came from us. It's not like the other partners came and said, oh we really need this to happen. We kind of coerced them. Well we didn't coerce them but we presented it and they said, yes it sounds wonderful. In hindsight we just really never got the level of commitment that we needed.

Evaluator: Tell me then, what are you doing with it now? Where is it now?

Steve: Nothing.

Evaluator: Do you hope to be able to go ahead and complete it?

Steve: Yes, we probably will. To be honest, it's not really high on my priority list. We are now in the midst of a very large conversion to a new version, if you will, of our Legacy System. That's taking a considerable of my staff's time. We've joined them in more or less putting it on the back burner.

Evaluator: It sounds like you've got a project from which a lot of them could learn a lot. Most of the other colleges could probably learn a lot from the problems that you've encountered in trying to do this. The first problem might surround the high schools. We're they all using different types of systems?

Steve: It was not at all technical. It's purely a matter of commitment and organization.

Evaluator: Really?

Steve: The people that were there when we started the project, particularly my counterpart, subsequent to the beginning of the project left. His successors, I'm not even sure who they are at this point, have not at all been inclined to participate.

Evaluator: That's at the high school level?

Steve: That's correct.

Evaluator: What school district is that?

Steve: It's the Sweet Water Union High School District.

Evaluator: How many students are in the district?

Steve: I have no idea.

Evaluator: Okay. Is it like probably 50,000?

Steve: I couldn't even begin to guess.

Evaluator: At the state level then, at the university their problem originally was what? Was it that they were not committed to it or they didn't have time?

Steve: Well, no they were very committed initially. We had some very good meetings with them. Then there were some glitches from just an operational perspective and how it was going to work. Then they bought Banner and they got side tracked working on that. I think it was Banner. The last we heard was, we'll call you back when Banner is done.

Evaluator: What is Banner?

Steve: Banner is a Legacy System. It's a packaged software from a company.

Evaluator: Tell me what have you learned from all of this then?

Steve: Just to make sure that when you get people to commit to things that they really commit to it and understand it. They understand what they are committing to. To be perfectly frank, that the inception of grants and so on, that those folks that conceive of it should be the ones who end up being responsible for the implementation. That was not the case here, as is typical of computing. Somebody in another office, in an operational thing, says, oh yes it looks like we can get this grant. Our people at this institution look through these grant RFP things like a kid going through the candy store. The rationale for applying or pursuing some of these grants isn't whether or not we really need it. It's whether or not we can win it. Then oh, yes we win it and it's a computer project. Here Steve, make it work. They're gone. They're not physically gone but they are emotionally gone.

Evaluator: Was there a grant writer then that pulled the high school?

Steve: It was a grant writer that pulled it together. It was the student affairs folks who conceived it and worked on it. I had input from a technical perspective. We did meet with the partners and they said, oh yea this sounds great. We even had a couple of subsequent meetings. Then again, the data processing director over at the high school I think got another job and left. Again we did follow up and have some interesting follow up with State. I can't even remember the names of the folks right now to be honest with you. They were

very committed to it but then they got involved in this other thing. It more or less died on the vine. Then we're just as bad as they are. We're involved up to our ears in this conversion of our Legacy System. If somebody wanted to work on it right now I would have to tell them to call me in December.

Evaluator: What do you do with the money then? Have you spent all of the money?

Steve: The money that came from the state?

Evaluator: Yes.

Steve: It's all been expended. There's no additional funding coming in for this thing. We filed the reports and so on. It's long gone.

Evaluator: Is there a report that you could e-mail to me?

Steve: I'd have to see if I could find it. The person who was heading it has gone. I'd have to dig through her stuff. I'm a little confused. Tell me what your role is here.

Evaluator: Okay. Palomar College has the grant. It was awarded this year. It's a TMAPP 66. This is the grant that was meant to pull information from all of the existing TMAPPs, all the ones from day one through the ones that are in process right now. We can pull the experiences that people have had and use them to inform the next group.

Steve: Palomar got a grant and farmed it off to an outside company to do the work for them?

Evaluator: Essentially. They have part of it in that once we have identified some other things then they begin to do a lot more with it as well.

Steve: What would you need from me if I can do it?

Evaluator: I have tried to get the reports from the chancellor's office. Did you send one there?

Steve: We filed with them yes.

Evaluator: Yours is probably sitting in a box and I have been trying to get them to mail the boxes to me. That seems to be a problem for them. I would just simply like to read what you wrote and what your conclusions and things were.

Steve: As I recall they were mostly forms. We'd be glad to share that. If I can find them I'll send them to you.

**Ventura College
Carol Coltrin
March 23, 2000**

Carol: I'm Carol Coltrin and I'm the TMAPP project director, our grant for self-development for Ventura College.

Evaluator: Carol, let me ask you a few questions. What is the general purpose of your project?

Carol: The grant is a three-year grant that is designed to look at self-development and technology needs and to basically plan the activities or to plan the plan, I think it is, to look at where we are.

Evaluator: So are you in the beginning stages of this?

Carol: I have been doing this since January and so far I have a team called the work team. That is the name they put in the grant but it doesn't really have any significance except that it has served us well. So far we have a team that has gotten together and done some research on campus as far as what resources we have, what software and hardware technologies and those kinds of things. We just sent out a survey, we're about half way through picking it up and counting it.

Evaluator: In terms of this process, can you say what is the most important thing that you've been learning?

Carol: Well, I don't really know yet. I think that the level of frustration on our campus has been pretty high as far as support. The level of interest in this change in technology is also not very high. We need a little bit more administrative support, I believe, that's probably one of the things. I think the other thing we need is something to help faculty to see the need for technology in their courses.

Evaluator: In terms of this staff development effort, where do you see the relevance of this work three years from now?

Carol: If we don't get going with this staff development work which is in the very beginning stages of this and have some kind of plan that we actually can implement I can see that our campus will have tremendous difficulties retaining and recruiting students.

Evaluator: What is the second most important thing that you're learning beside the tension or the questions you've received from the staff, anything on your part in this process?

Carol: Well I have never been involved in a grant project before. I have never written a grant, except for small grants, but nothing like at federal level or anything like that. Personally, I am learning a whole lot about the grant process. I've attended a bunch of conferences and I've read more grant proposals than I've ever thought were available. That is what I have learned.

Evaluator: Now, it's interesting that you talked first for the need for administrative support and now you are talking about the grant. Do you see a problem there? If the grant is coming from somewhere else and the administration isn't paying for this type of thing is there a conflict there? Do you see any problems?

Carol: I think it needs to be a buy in for more than one type of thing. I can see where our campus doesn't have the kind of funding to really encourage huge amounts of staff development. We just don't have that kind of money at this point, and the fact that this campus administrative isn't supporting broadly doesn't mean that it's not an interest to them or a priority to them but I think they are pretty spread out as far as funding goes. I think there has to be some commitment whether it's co-paying or not. I think the other issue is that in order for us to work better with our community we have to look at partnerships broadly and I think that's where the grant process comes in.

Evaluator: Are you filing minutes of meetings, do you still have any report copies that you could send?

Carol: They are actually on the Internet.

Evaluator: They are?

Carol: Yes. They are on a staff development site that we have and all the minutes are posted as far as we are in the process they're posted. It's

vcfun.org/~ccoltrin\staffdevelop\index.htm. This is a staff development page. It actually has a sample survey on it right now although we will probably take it down soon. It also has the minutes.

Evaluator: In your words, what do you see in the future for California community colleges?

Carol: I spoke with someone yesterday and I think one of the big concerns is that I don't know whether this TMAPP grant that I'm working on, the staff development grant, will actually receive funding. I guess there is a lot of money for planning grants but not so much money for implementation grants. I've attended a number of the more recent things in the Chancellor's office where they are looking at having a satellite based community college online program.

I don't really know. We are one of three colleges in a small area, in a community setting, and unless we have some money I really think we're going to have a terribly difficult time. I think we're competing with huge corporations and some of those corporations are educational corporations, whether its Jones University or one of those kinds of things I think we going to have a lot of struggles. For the most part the community colleges at least in California that I have gone to seem like we have been a little behind the eight ball for a while. We're playing catch up with some of the technology.

Evaluator: Are there any policy meetings that you are attending at your institution?

Carol: Well I have been attending some. We are starting to look at distance education policies and we are certainly looking at a technology plan broadly. As always the academic affairs that are trying to decide what our guidelines are for implementing things like online education.

Evaluator: So those policy meetings are talking about how to combine and collaborate with the other CC systems?

Carol: No, mostly with our own community colleges. Like I said there are three in our area, although we have been meeting with Rio Honda which is the same regional area that we are. They are looking at putting up a server that we would all have access to and have Web CT on it. We've met with them a number of times and have gone to few educational

conferences with them. I've talked to a lot of self-development people either through the Internet or at the Tech-Ed 2000 meeting. We went to a conference in San Antonio College and they were talking about distance education, so yes I guess I have.

Evaluator: In terms of discussions on exporting courses, have you talked about that?

Carol: We have talked about that. In fact one of the teachers from Oxnard College is offering a video conference course that is being underwritten by GTE. That's actually a history course that's being offered from Oxnard to Ventura and Moorpark College. So we are doing it internally a little tiny bit but we have talked about it as far as other big conferences that we've gone to. I think there are still some huge concerns as far as things like the classing of course numbers. We don't have a central course numbers system in community colleges. We don't have centrally described course descriptions, those kinds of things.

Evaluator: Are there any concerns by your faculty about courses?

Carol: That was the next thing is that obviously the faculty has a tremendous worry as far as what their workload it going to look like, what the ownership of the course that they develop is, you know, how many students can be in one of these courses. What it does as far as can colleges go out and buy a course, buy a teacher and kind of import them. I think that's probably one of the things that substantially impact our movement.

Evaluator: Right, and the exporting of courses that would perhaps at some point do away with the need for a course being taught from your institution.

Carol: Right, displace the teacher. The other thing I think is the community colleges serve a really specific population or I think one of the things we do is serve a very diverse population. There are some very big concerns about what will happen to those students if we start making courses outside of our community because not all of these people have access to computers or to the resources they need to take an online course. Our goal is not to put the world online, it is more to use the technology to support education in whatever way it needs to be. We don't want to really put everything online we really just

want to be able to use the computer or use some AV equipment or overhead or whatever it may be to the best advantage of the education.

Evaluator: We've talked about policy. What policy would help you in your endeavor the most? Can you think of a single policy or policies that would help you?

Carol: I don't know if it would be a policy as much as I think if we actually had a plan. I'm out working on the staff development section, the Red team, so I think if we had a plan that better determined how much technology we wanted to integrate and at what level and with what kind of technology support then my piece of the puzzle, which is the staff development piece would say this technology is available and this is what will be implemented and this is where we fit in the piece. Right now it seems that we need a technology plan, as far as how many courses we think we want to put online and who we are going to collaborate with, what kind of resources are available as far as time and effort for instructors.

Evaluator: In doing this a question about Blackboard versus Web CT does the faculty have access to both and are they thinking of training in both?

Carol: It's interesting, we have one course online on our campus and we have a couple of people, and I'm one of them, and there are a couple of others that have made support materials available. Presently we are all using Blackboard I think partly because it's a freeware type of program. The one we're using, which is a lower version, is version two and they are up to version four in the sale model.

I have taken some courses on Web CT as well. I really think what we are going to see is that those are going to be offered and made available to all campuses. We're going to get to choose or use both. I don't think we will end up having to stick with one. Through Rio Honda started out with Top Class and now they are using Web CT and they are actually looking at having a contract for our regional area that would allow us to use their Web CT server without having to pay.

Evaluator: Do you personally as an instructor see any difference with the programs? Web CT versus Blackboard?

Carol: I think that pieces of them are a little bit more user friendly but they seem to load about the same. Visually they are sort of close. They have a lot of queues for the students as to how they are going to get around. I think they are fairly similar. If we were actually going to look at one, from what I understand, part of the reason Blackboard is more to our liking, not because we love the program but because we happen to use Banner which fits into Blackboard's management system. So that is part of how I think Blackboard is going to come out.

Evaluator: You seem pretty computer savvy. You are talking to us about staff development and how training is critical and involves commitment of time as well as administrative support. How do you think people will feel about learning two different systems?

Carol: I don't think that will be a real problem for them. To me it is the process of learning. I keep trying to say to people we really are not learning the system or that program we are really learning how to put our courses online. It may take a number of different things. You almost can't do this without knowing how to use a word processing program. If you use Word or WordPerfect or something similar, once you get one of them down there are just a few differences and you can sort of work it all out. I feel like kind of the same thing with Blackboard / Web TV. I think you figure out how to upload and download files, it's pretty incidental as to what you uploading and downloading to.

Evaluator: Any major problems that you see on why someone would say we couldn't do this?

Carol: Staff. When looking at our staff, I wish I had the survey results, but so far there seems like there is a cohort of staff that is very reluctant to use it. I think that one of the things they need is some feeling of support and that support has to come in a couple of ways. It has to come with some actual technology support. Somebody, not just me who is computer savvy, but somebody that when their computers go down in their classrooms or something happens or the students need to know how to do something they don't have to fix it all. We have a classroom in the science department where I work and I've actually myself put the computers together, somebody came and helped put the operating system into and then I went back and loaded probably 30 programs on these computes, organized

them, locked them down and I go in there regularly to cleanup the mess. That is a real frustration to me. I am fairly committed to this but it is something that I can't see other staff very vigorously for very long and it is a very big frustration because the real job is teaching. So one of them is that they need some support and technology would be one. Someone who really fixes the computers and helps the students to get their Acrobat reader to come up or their whatever reader. The other thing is that they need the support in time. Whether we have smaller class sizes or we develop some way of having conferences. I spent a tremendous amount of time just figuring out how to put a course online I can see that that everyone might not have that huge of a commitment time or interest in doing do.

Evaluator: At your institution, Ventura, are you also doing any interactive video or television?

Carol: We are doing a video coursing for quite a while. In fact I think it's been eight or ten years. So there is a video conferencing kind of thing and there is a project that we are really looking at using more video for teaching some of the art courses.

Evaluator: So in all of this as your faculty is gearing up for this, they have choices. Who helps them decide what type of course? Do you compute distance learning work with your television distance learning?

Carol: So far we have a distance learning course and that is really separate and part of a business course and they really kind of stand by themselves. It's not like you have distance learning and it's integrated into anything like history or something else. That is not what we have at present, our distance learning is a very specific department.

Evaluator: How are you using your television?

Carol: All I can say is we are delivering courses on it. I don't really know very much about it. They are not using it very widely. I don't know that I can answer that.

Evaluator: I'm confused in that you're saying you have one distance course.

Carol: We have one, we have a distance education business course. I want to say course but it's not really a course obviously it is a series of courses but it is a specific department and so far they are the only ones that are using this video conferencing. Does that make sense?

Evaluator: Are there committees at your institution that come from both of these areas or that are dealing with the issue of distance learning or a distributed CCC system? You have what you are calling the Red team, are there other committees on campus that were coming together either before you were funded or have started up since?

Carol: I can't say that I really know that. There was quite a while ago, probably three years ago, a computer users committee that I served on and that was active for probably a year and then went fairly defunct. We happen to have a Science Dean who is very, active in this and sort of has been doing some of this without a committee but I don't really know otherwise on campus. I can't tell you that I know that. I mean as far as I've looked I can't find one but there might be one out there but I'm not informed about it.

Evaluator: All right. Well, good luck looking. Any words to the wise as you are going through this process?

Carol: I think that my one request is that I'm not the only campus doing this and I think one of the biggest problems I'm having actually is finding out what other campuses are doing and sort of brainstorming it a little bit. We're doing it from two levels, one is we are doing it internally and we can come up with some ideas but we are starting from an area that hasn't been problem solved out a hundred percent. We can go back and look at what we've done. We can look at our wish list but because we don't have all these committees on campus and we really are in the very beginnings of some of this it would be really helpful if we knew there were other people who have done this.

Evaluator: So the question is in terms of these two things that you are looking for, staff development and support, what are the pitfalls that you see at your institution? Anything blocking that from happening?

Carol: Probably one of the biggest things, and there's not much we can really do at this point, but I think one of the big things is economics. Even if we come up with a great plan everything I read trying to look at a corporate model and the fact that there are outcome standards and guidelines and time frames. In order to do that there has to be some type of comp benefit and I think the faculty doesn't seem to benefit at this point.

Evaluator: Just out of curiosity, do you have outcome standards if it wasn't technology based? Is there any evaluation of the job that your particular campus was doing for the community?

Carol: I think that is what we are looking at trying to come up with. Something much more measurable as far as, this is our plan to reach community or reach whoever it is and that we can actually have some outcome.

Evaluator: It's interesting, until there was as much competition as is coming online from all these corporation etc. it wasn't necessarily asked was it?

Carol: No. I teach in nursing so our whole life is based on outcome standards. Everything that we do for clients in a hospital we measure it be their blood values or oxygen saturation levels or their ability to ambulate a certain distance or whatever, so I really think in that forum. It is really frustrating to come into an area and see how little people want to be held to any kind of an outcome standard. That is a frustration for me and I think a problem that we are going to have on campus.

First of all we have a population of our staff that is in their forties or fifties and some of them are not terribly computer savvy and they are not totally interested. They look at five more years or seven more years and they will be out of here.

**Victor Valley College
Victorville, CA
Mark Ingel
March 27, 2000**

Mark: I'm Mark Ingel and I'm from Victor Valley College in Victorville, California.

Evaluator: Mark, this morning's call is concerning the TMAPP grant and you had a grant, correct?

Mark: Yes.

Evaluator: Is that grant in process or has it now been completed?

Mark: Well I believe it's been completed.

Evaluator: What is the purpose of your grant?

Mark: The purpose of ours was to develop, write, implement and publish a technology plan for the college.

Evaluator: What was the most important thing that you learned on that project?

Mark: One, that we had no idea what we were doing at least not initially. I think what we learned out of it was that while there was a lot of interest on integrating technology into our instructional message we were really poorly equipped to do it at the time. There was only about ten percent of the faculty that I would call technologically capable plus our infrastructure was in a state of flux. We had a backbone that didn't work like it should and a lot of networks that seemed pretty disparate.

In our mind the purpose of that technology plan was to try to organize that attempt so that things would come together and move forward instead of just remaining in semi-chaos all the time.

Evaluator: What is the relevance for your project three years from now?

Mark: Three years from now. Well, the project got us going on a technology plan and we are going to be rewriting that starting this year because technology changes so rapidly that much of what we decided we wanted to accomplish then has either been accomplished or needs to be updated.

Three years from now I expect that most of what we decided that we needed to do will still be relevant but there will still be a large portion of it that will be completely replenished.

Evaluator: As you were going through your process, you already told me the most important thing you learned, what was the second most important thing you got from this project?

Mark: Well I've got a number of items out of it and I'm not sure I could put any of them in second place per say. I don't know that any one stands out higher than the others. It did help to focus not just the faculty but the administration on the issues involved. I think administration needs to be involved. We had a few people who championed the use of computer technology in education but for the most part many of the administrators figured that a laissez faire attitude with respect to the classroom instruction was just fine.

After we identified all of the things that we wanted to do, the administration put up quite a bit of money in the budget for accomplishing that, infrastructure. Upgrades of network facilities within the campus, smart classrooms have been scheduled, a new technology center has become the next building project and so forth. So I think it has helped to coalesce a lot of previously uncommitted factions into a more of a single minded approach to technology.

Evaluator: Do you have a report copy of the work that was done?

Mark: The technology plan was incorporated into our master plan. I'm sure that someplace around we could find a copy of the master plan and there would be a copy of it in that.

Evaluator: If that would be possible to email to the coalition that would be great.

Yourself personally having gone through this process at Victor Valley Community College, how do you see the California Community College looking in the future?

Mark: What changes do I think it should be doing, is that what you're asking?

Evaluator: Yes.

Mark: So much of what I say is my own personal bias and I'm not sure that all the other people who were on that committee would agree. I think that community colleges, in order

to make the educational services that they deliver more accessible, need to incorporate technology to the extent that we can provide education through distributed means over a network, over distance education, online classes and so forth.

While we're building a technology center the cost of that building is going to be extraordinary and it still will only serve those people who can actually come to the campus. I think the one thing that has come to mind is we can make most of the process that we do more efficient and make them more equitably available if we utilize technology that is at hand now and the emerging technologies that seem to be coming out.

Evaluator:

Having said that Mark do you personally or are you aware of, do you have input into any committee meetings that are going on that are developing policy for these efforts?

Mark:

Yes. We have a distance education committee that is developing procedures and protocols to establish a more coherent effort in putting out distance education. Up until this point it's been ten, perhaps twelve, instructors who do it actively and a number of instructors who say they would like to and the administration who is wondering how it could be done in such a way that we're not all heading in different directions. For that reason an open committee was put together that anyone can attend. It's had wide participation, perhaps 25 to 30 different people, and their effort is to establish some policies and procedures and common goals and address some of the issues that are unique to the faculty perspective. Also some of the issues that are administrative and try to come up with a policy that we can all accept so that we can move forward in this area. We are moving in that direction.

Evaluator:

In terms of your own personal bias that you shared is there a policy that would help you the most to see some of your ideas come fore?

Mark:

Well we can always throw money at the problems. No, I don't think so. Actually an open policy of allowing us to develop our classes in the way that we think that benefits the material best I think is important. Not all classes can be placed in the same structure. There are those that require some Socratic methods and there are others that don't. My biggest concern is that we'll establish a policy and eventually straightjacket everybody into it and say

this is the way the class will be. Those people for whom their particular material is not really amenable to the format that's been designed will be at a disadvantage and the classes won't be as good as they could have been had there been more flexibility in how they are structured.

So the one thing I'm concerned about is creating policy and using policy in lieu of judgment, which is fairly common just as in life. My biggest concern is that we try to limit the innovation in an effort to control – you know to provide some structure. Structure is important but too much structure tends to stifle innovation and I'm concerned about that.

Evaluator: Has your institution adopted any setup software like WebCT or Blackboard or that sort of thing?

Mark: We have not adopted it. There has been some talked about it but we are just now in the committee passing around the final document of what they think the policy will be. It is there for corrections and additions at this point. I'm not sure what the final shape of that document is, I haven't received my copy yet.

Evaluator: Now, in terms of combining and collaborating with other community colleges around the state has there been dialog on that?

Mark: Yes there has been. We do have some efforts that are being done with Palomar and some of the other colleges. I'm not privy to those projects and I'm not sure exactly what they're doing at this point or if they're even doing it at this point. I know that we just started that about nine months ago.

Evaluator: So you think, yourself personally, that there will be an exchange of courses, an exporting of courses from Victor Valley?

Mark: Yes, I think so.

Evaluator: Any ideas about tuition and how that would be handled?

Mark: I have no idea. I'm not sure what they're going to do about the tuition. I'm also not sure what they're going to do about faculty compensation which of course is a big issue because a distance education class with 30 people can create far more effort than a

traditional classes when you count all the emails and the IRC sessions and all the rest of the stuff that goes on you could spend a good bit of time.

Evaluator: Let me ask you this, have there been any problems, any nay sayers, anyone saying we can't do this?

Mark: There are a few. Most of them are in disciplines, which are heavily dependent on Socratic, dialog such as law and business law. We really can't emulate a confrontational dialog online without video conferencing and we don't have the bandwidth to support that and they do have a point. Then there are some who are just ensconced in the traditional structure and hope to stay there until they retire.

For the most part there is positive interest. We don't find too many that say no it can't be done or no we're not interested in doing it that aren't in these other two categories.

Evaluator: You mentioned earlier on that one of the things learned was the talent or the support to help get this thing going but what were the pitfalls that you found as your were going through this process?

Mark: In going through the process of creating the document or the subsequent events?

Evaluator: The subsequent events.

Mark: Actually the pitfalls are the fact that we do need expertise in order to accomplish this. We have limited expertise within the college itself, you know, those of us who know this kind of material. My discipline is computer science, computer information systems and this is old hat to me but I teach and I'm really not interested in becoming an administrator or even being a part-time consultant.

So we have to go out to get expertise to help a lot of the others in the college to sort of come on board. Finding the expertise is difficult. Finding the expertise in people who are willing to work for the pay we can afford to give them is even more difficult. Finding people to serve on hiring committees, who have a clue as to what any of this is all about is difficult. We end up having people hired whose qualifications aren't as good as we would

like because either the people who chose them weren't really as sharp as we had wished or because we couldn't afford to pay the ones who really knew it.

I think progress is really slowed down by the fact that we lack talent or the funding to hire the talent to help provide the direction for implementing. Consequently we rely on volunteer help basically. The committee that we were talking about is a volunteer committee and it's made up of those of us who know a lot and those of us who would like to know a lot. We're doing the best we can to direct those activities but that slows the process down. So the committees we create don't operate as fast as we would like because it is not our primary function and so progress toward our intended goal tends to run slower than we'd like to see it run.

It's kind of a catch twenty-two, if we had infinite amounts of money we'd go out and hire the best people we possibly can and this would be up in six months. With limited resources and shared expertise things just run slowly. By the time we've made a goal and achieved it technology has moved on ahead of us and we wonder why it is that we're dealing with this obsolete technology we just implemented when we should be doing something else.

Evaluator: There you go, welcome to the rest of the world.

Mark: That's the way it is.

Evaluator: Well I think that certainly in the California system, maybe the first thing that should be exported is the talent.

I'd like to ask you to end on words to the wise, do you have any?

Mark: Well as Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, there is nothing that is said that has not been said before.

I think that somebody who is interested in distance education as I am and as we're moving sometimes walking this road is walking a real tight rope. If you move too fast you find out that you've spent far too much money because given a little bit of time the prices drop but if you move too slowly the technology outruns you and it's a very medium course that seems to be wisest. It hovers somewhere between being outrageously expensive and

affordable. It hovers someplace between being non-applicable anymore in terms of current technology and having the very leading edge technology. So if you're thinking about developing this kind of curriculum careful, measured, directed steps are important and establishing short, mid and long terms goals is crucial and you have to be willing to change those goals continually because it is a moving target that you're trying to hit.

You have to be patient with it and you also have to have administrative support the whole time and hope you have an administration that doesn't get flustered when you change the target. A lot of them like to set targets and just keep going until they hit it but sometimes we set targets then realize the prey has moved. We need to reassess where we are heading and then change directions so the administration has to be flexible enough to support that.

Evaluator:

Well, Mark, you've been very helpful and thank you for sharing your thoughts. You will probably get a copy of this transcript as well as words from the other sites around the state.

Mark:

That would be great, I'd love to see them.

Evaluator:

Well thank you again and have a great day.

**Yuba College
Mick Holsclaw
March 27, 2000**

Mick: I'm Mick Holsclaw and I work at Yuba College.

Evaluator: Can you tell me, is your project ongoing or has it concluded?

Mick: My project is ongoing at the present time.

Evaluator: What is the purpose of your project?

Mick: Our project is charged to conduct a feasibility study regarding the statewide implementation of electronic data interchange with specific focus on an electronic application interchange and electronic transcript interchange.

Evaluator: When you say electronic data interchange what are you referring to?

Mick: Basically it means the exchange of data from college to college or institution to institution because it could be from high school to college or college to university. The computer data exchange of electronic transcripts instead of printing a transcript and putting it in the mail the computers at the college could directly transmit to the computers at the receiving college or university or high school.

Evaluator: In the process of your project what was the most important thing that you learned?

Mick: First of all that the application is feasible. The technology exists and is in use and proven effective. Secondly that the practitioners at the college that have participated in the various requirement definition activities see substantial value in the implementation of those technologies at the community colleges.

Evaluator: Why is that important?

Mick: It can guide the action of the system and then suggest the system should undertake an initiative to implement statewide use of this technology.

Evaluator: What is the relevance for the work that you are doing three years in the future?

Mick: I believe that three years in the future of the system we will have implemented a system of electronic data interchange such that students will be able to go to a single Web location and be able to apply for admission to California Community Colleges, any college

Evaluator: Do you have a personal view of the California Community College of the future, what it will look like?

Mick: Well, looking say 15 years in the future I think that a number of our colleges will be somewhat smaller in terms of the physical presence and on campus activities. I think that somewhere between 20 and 30 percent of their activity will be occurring via distance education or I prefer the term distributed education because it included more modes of delivery than people now may associate with distance education. I think the average student will have maybe 15 to 30 percent of their academic programs taken in a distributed education delivery mode.

The scary thing about that is I don't think that that distance education activity will be evenly distributed among the 71 or 72 districts that we have. I suspect that it will be concentrated into a dozen or less districts and would be causing financial problems for the others.

Evaluator: Do you see a difference in the production as well as the received that certain ones will produce and others won't?

Mick; Yes, I think that there is reason to believe that education will follow the model of the entertainment industry and when distance became less of a factor based on high speed transportation and it ended the entertainment industry became a lot more concentrated. You have the relatively few very well known and wealthy stars and relatively fewer regional stars if you will. To a student whose hands are at the keyboard and eyes in front of the screen it makes no difference whether the college providing the content is around the corner or half way around the globe.

I think that the quality of the content and the comprehensiveness of the services surrounding that content will out compete lesser quality offerings.

Evaluator: So you see jobless and job development at the same time?

Mick: That could very well be.

Evaluator: Do you personally sit on or advise any committees that you are aware of driving policy for the California Community College of the future?

Mick: The system as a whole?

Evaluator: Well your institution and then the system as a whole, are you being referenced or consulted with?

Mick: At my institution, yes, I am a part of those discussions. In the system as a whole because I worked at the Chancellors office for ten years I do have relationships with people who are putting those committees together and conducting those discussions so sometimes I do get involved.

Evaluator: Then the questions concerning the future expectation of courses or shared tuition, those things are being discussed at your institution?

Mick: They're being discussed at my institution but not very thoroughly yet. I think we're just sort of in the early stages of the discussions. To my knowledge at the system level the discussion is not very far along at all.

Evaluator: What policy would help you the most and I imagine that would mean in your area of your TMAPP which is in the transcript distribution. Would a policy help you at all or a protocol in terms of having this be mainstreamed across the system?

Mick: Our recommendation for the two focal areas that we studied, is there should be a system level initiative that would take the form of a couple of prior initiatives like the video conferencing or something like that where there would be monies released and a sort of a minimum standard participation level requirement for the receipt of those funds. We believe a significant part of the potential for those technologies cannot be realized unless there is universal participation.

For other things more general, distributed education questions, I don't think I have an opinion about what the right answer to the question would be. I don't think I even thoroughly understand the question.

Evaluator: Was there any software developed to help manage the transcript distribution exchange?

Mick: Not in our charge. Part of the proposal is that such software would be developed but our charge was to do a feasibility analysis and a cost analysis for such a project but not to actually conduct the project of developing such software.

Evaluator: In the process of your charge, what major problems were there? Were there any nay sayers saying we shouldn't do this, can't do this?

Mick: I think there continues to be concern about the appropriate role of local colleges and local college districts vis-à-vis the role of the system and what the appropriate division of labor is. I think that's alive in the particular discussion that we were conducting but it was not real strong but it was present. I think in some other areas it's stronger.

The other issues that come up have to do with the conflicting views about the ownership of those student records. Some people believe the record of the students enrollment in a college belongs to the college and the state primarily and other people believe it belongs to the student primarily. That affects who has authority to release the records. Financial aid officers based on their charge to monitor student performance and important legal requirements related to that would like to have access to the full history of a student. They believe they have a right to do so and others believe that students have a right to make a fresh start. To deny that they had prior college attendance and basically hide the failure of that attendance in spite of the legal requirement to disclose it if you are a financial aid applicant. So there is a debate and a policy question there that will eventually need to be sorted out. Our feasibility study said that it didn't have to be sorted out before there was value to the project. Then the project when implemented would focus attention on the policy question there and bring further discussion.

Evaluator: The other question was, for others who will read your words and this being a TMAPP project and focusing back on what was learned, are there any pitfalls that you can share that might shed light on this topic?

Mick: It's always to be aware that California Community Colleges is a very large and very diverse system of colleges. There are significantly different perspectives and sometimes significantly different issues in rural, urban and suburban colleges of vastly different sizes. It

takes a considerable effort to gather enough information to be able to conduct an analysis of the impact of a proposed course of action on the system as a whole.

Evaluator:

It's really one issue to think of transcripts coming from a high school as a feeder into your system and then it's another to think of the requests for transcripts that a student has related to the work that they're going to be doing and you're exporting courses into the workplace. Have those discussions come up?

Mick:

That actually reminds me of a surprise. We didn't actually advertise our project outside of the California Community Colleges and CSU and UC and yet our Web site did attract the attention of some business and industry folks. In talking to them we found out that they are quite interested in more efficient means for students to both enroll and also to retrieve documentation of their completion of courses of study or individual classes. One of those companies reimburses employees for the expenses related to such course work but the employee has to provide documentation using the form of a transcript if they have in fact completed the work satisfactorily. That company was very interested in becoming a participant in this electronic transcript exchange.