

## IT Governance Program – Teaching & Transformational Learning Technologies Committee

### *Meeting Minutes*

March 22, 2019

10:30a.m.-12:00p.m.

*Computing Services Center, Conference Room 04*

#### Attendance:

TTLTC Members		TTLTC Members		Ex-Officio Members	
X	Dr. Christian Brannstrom		Dr. Tim Jacobs		Dr. Karen Butler-Perry
X	Dr. Craig Coates X (Parliamentarian)	X	Dr. Catharina Laporte (Chair)	X	Regina Greenwood (Ex-Officio)
X	Dr. Trina Davis		Ethan Albert Martinez	X	Dr. Ann Kenimer
X	Dr. Kim Dooley		Dylan Murray	X	Dr. Jim Snell (Ex-Officio)
X	Tracy Hammond	X	Dr. Heather Wilkinson	X	Jalal Moussoui
X	Dr. Beverly Irby	X	Kris Wuensche	X	Dr. Jocelyn Widmer

ITG Program Support		TTLTC Guests	
X	Sharon Gibson-Mainka	X	Juan Garza
	Joshua Kisse	X	Cynthia Kauder
X	Missy Mouton	X	Jeff Kurtz

#### Minutes: Scheduled Business

##### Item 1: **Welcome & Announcement**

Description: *General welcome and opportunity for announcements & items of interest relevant to the TTLTC.*

- Welcome and announcements.
- Round the table introductions.
- Opportunities and campaigns for teaching in the 20<sup>th</sup> century classroom will be coming soon.
- 03/26/19- There will be a women’s symposium in Rudder.

**Item 2: Update from Peer Review Writing Tool Task Force**

Description: *Update on the progress from the Peer Review Writing task force.*

- Dr. Craig Coates gave an update from this task force.
- If anyone has suggestions on names to add to this task force, send those to Sharon Mainka. Sharon will follow up with those named as possibilities, anyone is welcome.
- Reviewed and edited the document posted in GoogleDocs describing members, charge, tasks, requirements, features, use of ratings, and licenses and fees.

**Item 3: Update from Examity Task Force**

Description: *Update and recommendation from the Examity task force.*

- Jeff Kurtz presented this update.
- The revised report the task force had prepared was distributed. This group reviewed and discussed this report.
- Examity proctoring fee structure was discussed in comparison to ProctorU.
- Examity is a University wide sanctioned tool, ProctorU is not.
- The committee needs to identify major issues about how proctoring is charged as well as costs.
- Proctoring fees are paid by students by most departments using ProctorU.
- SACSCOC states we must be very clear to students what the fees are for, and must be provided upfront when they sign up for the class, at registration.
- Recommendations which are also listed in this report were discussed.
- Jeff proposed these recommendations be broken down into pieces and discussed as a committee.
- Juan’s committee is working through what information needs to include contracts and this ties into this as well.
- Discussion about what our recommendation should be and should it include putting a rule at the enrollment level?
- Vendor will not completely waive the late fees, but they could reduce them.
- What does this committee want recommendation to be in this report?
- Discussion on recommendations: The University should absorb the fee and not charge students, and ensure that this is communicated to departments.
- Adopt Examity as the preferred vendor, and require that all vendors follow same rules and standards .
- Committee decided that they do not want to accept report as is, it needs to be revised.
- Recommendations for revisions: based on our discussion
  - First recommendation: A motion was made by Heather Wilkinson for the colleges to absorb the fees. This was seconded all voting in favor, none opposed, motion passes charges rejected.
  - Second recommendation – The vendor must go thru TAMU vetting process- make sure all vendors pay by same rules, meaning students not pay fees. Making them a Texas A&M approved vendor.
- The revised report was placed in BoardEffect and was accepted as revised on March 26, 2019. Seven members of the committee voted to accept the report. 5 members did not vote.

**Item 4:** **Call for Task Force to begin review of duplicated services across the campus**  
Description: *Request for Task force members to determine how to identify and review duplicated services across campus as related to Objective 3.*

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

**Item 5:** **Review of Committee Objectives**  
Description: *Review of the committee objectives and how to move forward with addressing the objectives.*

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

**Item 6:** **LMS Update**  
Description: *report from the LMS Sub-committee*

- LMS subcommittee – Is wrapping up. All three vendors have been on site. The feedback Forums are April 3 & 4, then the survey will be distributed.

The next meeting will be on 04/19