Attendees:

UAA		Barbara Hegel
Sarah Hill	**UAF**	**Statewide**
Gianna Ridgeway	Colleen Abrams	Mary Gower
Linda Kay Davis	Anna Brumbelow	**CDE**
Patty Itchoak	**UAS**	Barbara Paskvan
Charese Gearhart-Dekreon	Jan Crichton	**CRCD**
	Jeanny Wharton	Pam Leist

I. CCS TRs for Testing

    A. Catalog search re-structure (UA#301 = TR#1) – *BST priority level 4, state 3 (in progress)* -**Waiting for approval from UAF and UAS –** *issue of missing GER types not part of this TR – that is something that can be addressed w/ programmers later (per Colleen)*

    B. Class schedule (public) search re-structure (UA#302 = TR#2)* - *BST priority level 4, state 3 (in progress)* – **Email from Mary with questions from Jim – waiting for response from UAF**
Waiting for response from Mary Gower about testing now that LRGP has refreshed (TRs no longer in LRGP for testing)

II. Schedule Change Work Flow
Now in PROD and emails are being sent! Verified that the work flow is working for all campuses with Pat.

III. BST Report – no report

IV. Old Business:
Distance Education Discussion

    A. Proposal sent to SAC from Mike Driscoll
- Need to discuss and analyze for feasibility.
- What will work?
- What won't work?

This body has been working toward that goal of consistency and accuracy in coding across all MAUs, and strongly believes that a combination of minor modifications to the codes in the session field and instructional methods, and consistent, agreed upon use of those fields and codes can accomplish most of what the proposal aims for. The data retrieval and transparency to the student can be improved without the massive overhaul in the proposal.

In general, the changes to Banner are not feasible with the current SSASECT screen. There aren't enough fields to capture all the info being called for. We aren't currently able to abandon the use of the existing fields on SSASECT because there aren't any other fields to utilize. The proposed change would require the creation of another,

locally programmed screen (SSA2???) that could have multiple fields for coding the "2nd Level" data. It is only through the creation of this new screen that we can see being able to capture the many layers of information in the manner described in the proposal

Proposed 1st Level coding – changes to session code: Loss of D, E, and W **(day, evening and weekend)** codes are significant due to how UAOnline currently uses them as one way students can search for classes. The session code field is used for a number of purposes aside from just distance education and a lot of the information being currently coded in session is important for students planning their schedules.

The current use of session code allows the distance information to be coded in with non-distance and synchronicity information, all of which are crucial for the various student interfaces and which can't currently be added anywhere else.

Proposed 2nd Level Coding – this actually appears to be more than a single level of coding, because classes can have many combinations of the attributes listed in the proposal. With the SSASECT we have now, this could be accomplished by creating more options under instructional methods (additional combinations), which is an option we are considering. A new, locally programmed screen could also accommodate this, but it isn't possible in the short term. The team believes that the existing instructional method field captures most of this as it is and could be modified to include more. We suggest that the self-paced information could be put in SSATEXT as schedule notes.

Regarding the implementation of 1st level changes before 2nd level changes are put in – The change of one without the other would mean a loss of data and a significant loss in the continuity of reporting as well as reduce the amount of information that we already provide students.

What else would be affected – The following are a list of programs and sites that would need significant programmer attention to cope with the nature and breadth of the proposed changes to how we use Banner: UAOnline, the Distance Gateway, possible Blackboard, QMENU, QADHOC, the roll process, a number of Banner reports, and macros and processes at the individual MAU level.

What would be needed to successfully implement changes – any significant change to how we are currently using SSASECT would require a great deal of programming time and manpower. Programmer assistance would be needed from Banner down to the MAU to reprogram all process to accommodate the change. The creation of a locally programmed Banner screen may be very useful for the future, but the current lack of programmer time and staffing indicates that it is not an immediate option. While it should be looked at closely for the future, we need to find a way to make our processes more consistent and accurate in the immediate future.

For the future – In the short run, we should continue with the work we've started and improve what we can right now as it can accomplish a lot of what was requested in the audit. In the long run, it may be very useful to consider more radical modifications to SSASECT, when there is programming time available and so that the change can be done all at once.

The CCS team has been actively working on this issue since 9/11/09 and by studying our practices in distance coding, CCS members have realized a more consistent understanding of how distance education has been and should be coded, and more campuses are gaining expertise in using coding to give a detailed reflection of all UA distance classes. If given a chance to continue with this, CSS will be able to fully develop and implement their new and better understanding of distance coding, and

those who retrieve the data will find it increasingly specific and well populated. Communication between retrieval staff and input staff (what to target and where to find it) would bridge many of the perceived gaps. We agree that we can accomplish the goals of consistency in coding for reporting purposes and the transparency to the student that were set out in the audit if we are able to continue the we work we have started.

    B. Continued discussion of instructional method
       Definition agreed to 10/8/09 - the predominant method used to present class instruction, which does not have any ties to fees.

- Already looked at AB, AC, AW, and BB. Next up is BD.

V.   **New Business:** none

VI.   **Adjourn**

Next scheduled CCS meeting: December 3, 2009 at 10:30

Instructional Method, Attendance Method, and Meeting Type Field Options

Instructional Method

AB	Audio/Blackboard	EL	Elluminate Live
AC	Audio Conference	MM	Multimedia
AW	Audio Conference & Web-based	PW	Partially web-based
BB	Blackboard	SL	Live Broadcast by Satellite
BD	Blended: Clsm/Audio/Web/Field	TV	Television Delivery
CA	Audio Conference & Classroom	VC	Video Conference
CI	Correspondence/Traditional	VW	Video Conference & Web-based
CW	Correspondence/Web-based	WB	Web-based

Attendance Method

A	Lecture	N	Internship
AC	Audio-Conference	NA	NORTHWEST COUNCIL STUDY ABROAD
AW	AWS and PER		
B	Lab	NE	National Student Exchange
BC	Brokered Concurrent Enrollment	O	Open Entry
BH	Brokered HS Dual Credit	P	Practicum
BK	Brokered	Q	Optional Lab/Study
BT	Brokered Tech Prep	R	Research
C	Combined Lecture/Lab	S	Studio
CI	Correspondence (trad written)	SA	Southcentral Academy
CN	Contract – no fee	SI	Live Broadcast via Satellite
CO	Cooperative Education	SS	Self-support
CW	Correspondence: web-based inst	T	Thesis
D	Directed Study	TC	Telecourse
DE	Developmental Education	U	Recitation
E	Credit by Exam	V	Computer-Assisted Instruction
EA	eLearning Agreement	VC	Video-Conference
EP	eLearning Agreement Primary	VI	Video
ES	Expanded Section	VW	Video conference and Web-based
F	Field	W	Workshop
G	Grant Funded	WW	Web
HS	High School Dual Credit	X	Distance Teaching Group
IE	International Student Exchange	Y	Distance Teaching Independent
M	Seminar	Z	Zero/Noncredit
MM	Multimedia		

Meeting Type

ARR	Arranged	WORK	Workplace
AUD	Audio-conference		
CLAS	Class		
FLD	Field		
LAB	Lab		
OFF	Off campus		
REC	Recitation		
SEM	Seminar		
STU	Studio		
VID	Video-conference		
WEB	Web-based		