



Online Learning Advisory Committee (OLAC) Meeting Minutes

November 23, 2015 (3:00 – 4:00 PM)

OLAC met May 2015 – this was the first meeting since summer break.

1. Linda reported back about Faculty Senate meeting demo – she put together some questions regarding feedback from the demos and will send this out to OLAC.

Suggested alternate to above:

Anna – Anna asked why Debbie wants MHCC to just have one LMS?

Linda responded that she has not stated that we Must have one LMS, but has discussed the desire for students to have a consistent experience when moving from class to class.

Anna indicated that even within Blackboard every experience is different because Faculty have the freedom to design their classes as they'd like.

Members asked why When Mary Girsh joined this committee 3 years ago – why did we bring up this question.

Cat and Anna indicated It was all about money (used to have on 3 year contract – whole bunch of money).

Is there something better out there that is cheaper?

Linda clarified that we have completed our 3 year contract and we are now going year to year pending a decision on our direction.

Mary – another question – likes Canvas – how difficult would it be to move everyone to Canvas?

Don't know how much money it would take. Never did a formal RFP process to know cost. The group discussed that Susan was going to provide a document outline the previous process and feedback received at that time which was never completed. Members are still interested in seeing that document.

Linda suggested that the most important information from that document is additional feedback/insight from faculty – the history of the process that was done is less relevant. It will be important to understand what functionality BB may not have that OLAC and Faculty feel is needed. Cat and Don took feedback that was provided by faculty and incorporated into a formal RFP which was shared with OLAC. Linda will resend that to the group. It contained a lot of very good information on priorities and needs.

If OLAC/Faculty feel that eLearning can't provide what we need in order to utilize a single LMS and a second product is needed for fully online classes, that recommendation will be taken forward to Debbie/PC.

Anna will share Academic Senate notes. We really need to close the loop - what were the opinions, feedback? Got really good feedback and input – more of an emotional feedback.

Anna read through all of the feedback and a lot of people said they would use eLearning if they had more training on it. People are open to the fact that eLearning could be beneficial. Anna suggests that more resources go to training on eLearning. Anna suggests that we use either (eLearning or Bb).

Cat – Online Learning has a lot of work to do to get the courses ready. We need to know the SIS with OL. Linda/Cat don't know how much work there would be in IT for eLearning – transferring to eLearning.

Right now, more people use Bb than eLearning – but likely because there hasn't been much training in eLearning. OL is offering more training in eLearning (3 – 2 hour trainings + drop in + come in to eLearning anytime).

How many new OL faculty are coming in each year? It's not slowed down, but those who don't finish it has increased. OL support faculty more in building, complete Academy. Right now we have new ID – a lot more resources. TLC wants to bring back "This is my class" – what are you doing in your classes? eLearning concerns is the "look" of it. The beauty of the presentation is critical (Mary Girsh).

Action Items:

- ✓ Linda will provide questions for OLAC/Faculty to provide feedback on the demos.
- ✓ Linda will send the draft RFP that was created previously.
- ✓ Anna will follow-up with Faculty Senate to review information and provide feedback.
- ✓ Christie will follow-up with Susan on providing additional feedback and information that was gathered during initial process.

Members agreed that it's important to get closure on this to determine if will move forward with a formal RFP in the 16-17 fiscal year, and also to clearly identify what functionality we are looking for that neither of our LMS's currently provided.

We also discussed that a decision not to enter into an RFP next year, does not prevent us from doing so in the future. An RFP and search would require a significant amount of time and commitment, so it's important to decide a direction and to plan for resources accordingly next year – either focus on an RFP, or dedicate time/resources to other OLAC priorities.