DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
<u>**Adopted Minutes**</u>
March 11, 2013
Room 101
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Dale called the meeting to order at 3:13 p.m.

Dale Crandall-Bear, Chair; Ferdinanda Florence; Scott Ota; Svetlana Podkolzina; Sandra Rotenberg; Steven Springer; Robin Sytsma; Connie Adams
Absent/Excused: Jeffrey Lamb; Philip Petersen

1. **Online Instructor Training Proposal**

Dale presented the proposal to the Academic Senate last week and it will be a Senate action item in April.   Dale asked the Committee for feedback on the proposal. Robin reported that she presented it to HP&D and all faculty were very positive. Steven received positive response from Physical Science. Sandy reported online instructors are delighted.   She suggested an introduction to Canvas could be offered to instructors who don't teach online, especially counseling and library, due to more student issues coming through there that faculty need to address. The library homepage has a link to Solanonline and a link to Canvas.

Dale held trainings for online instructors. He presented Canvas Workshop 1 and 2 training modules to the Committee and reported the scheduled training for Wednesday's Flex Cal filled quickly along with more trainings that were added.   Dale spent last weekend working on a Canvas shell. There are four online workshops for the training process and each workshop will have a module for hands-on work. As instructors proceed through workshops they'll create a shell and use it to transition to their first course. Workshop 2 and 3 will be about adding to the shell. Dale will give a module to faculty members who complete a workshop.   The training process is designed to work sequentially or to allow faculty to jump in where needed. Instructor initiated contact examples will be found in Workshops 2 and 3.

Surveys are set up in each shell. Instructors who are already familiar with shell creation and set-up will just take a quiz. Documentation will show when a workshop was completed.   The first workshop ends with transition. There will also be a survey for faculty to indicate who would like to go into phases one through four over the next two years. Instructors can choose to transition one course or all of their courses at one time and there will also be flexibility for everyone to create their own transition schedule. The transition process will include fully online, eCompanion and hybrid courses.

Ferdinanda considered this a great opportunity for all faculty to know this exists and to choose if they want to leave My Courses and move to eCompanion. Dale stated that Canvas will base the contract on the entire FTES, so they set lower FTES rates. Once hooked up with Canvas, Banner will automatically create a shell for each course and eCompanion whether it is needed or not. My Courses will become redundant at that point. Sandra suggested it might be good to enroll all online instructors into a "switching to Canvas shell" direction. Students are automatically enrolled in eCollege now and a shell could be created for students to explain how to log in and what to expect, if needed.

2. **Training Process Update**

Dale confirmed that instructors will have access to their shells for the next two years while the eCollege contract is still in place. He recommended the optional training for faculty who are only using eCompanion.

Workshop 2 covers tools, communication, assignments, course analytics, and publisher materials. Faculty who want to use Pearson materials can look at this and use Canvas. Videos can be run inside the shell. Dale is working on workshops 3 and 4. There are a lot of training modules available and Dale chose some of the best of the 268 that Canvas has and arranged them in sequence. The training modules will go live on Wednesday. Everyone agreed the workshops are very thorough and well done. Dale will set up one discussion thread in each module for faculty interaction.

Dale queried what type of cohorts to move people through with general information. Members decided to begin with chronological groups and later by departments for pedagogical reasons.

Workshop 1 and 2 are both scheduled on Wednesday with two of each filled. It is helpful to have Dale answer questions directly and he told the Committee, as well as the Academic Senate, that he would be happy to speak to individual schools. He has scheduled to meet with math and science.

3. **DE Course Review Process**

Dale reported the review process will be the most sensitive part as faculty are used to having privacy. Accreditation and Title 5 are requiring course evaluation. Questions can't be answered without looking at the classes, otherwise Accreditation could see things we don't. Dale has been looking at what other schools do and he wants course reviews to be entirely faculty driven. He pointed out these will not be reviews of course content or faculty evaluations and everyone should ensure that instructors understand that. Only the shells will be reviewed to ensure they contain what is needed along with a good structure. A rubric is provided and a goal is to get on one page, sit down with a group, and check for components to ensure a course contains components required by Accreditation, including the instructor's presence in the shell, easy to follow navigational structure, and plenty of opportunity for student feedback.

DE Survey: The first student survey was done last semester. Dale has heard concern from faculty regarding the mention in surveys of instructor names by students. He has let faculty know he doesn't share that information with anyone. There is a definite issue when instructors don't respond to

concerns. Ferdinanda noted that requirements should be the same for face-to-face and online instructors. Dale would like to create a faculty driven survey to intervene with colleagues rather than going to the dean. Ferdinanda replied that Dale and/or the DE Committee shouldn't be exposed to a grievance.

Checklist process: Shells must be reviewed before going into Canvas; the Committee will coordinate, rather than review, the courses.   The actual review with the rubric will be done by colleagues who should be instructors related to their departments, but non-online instructors could take part to add a different point of view. Faculty will meet in groups, look at the shell, connect all reviews, and bring the reviews to the DE Committee. If unsure what to do with the course, it can be brought to the Committee.

There will be a review process for new online courses and the new courses will still have to go through the Curriculum Committee as well.   During Curriculum Review courses go through the Curriculum Committee. If revisions are required, the status will be transmitted to the DE Committee for review and revision before sending back to the Curriculum Committee.   Everything needs to meet the Title 5/Accreditation checklist.   Mentors can assist in the process. The DE Committee should look at the course without instructor interaction and be the final approval when everything is completed. Weak points or issues can be sent back to mentors to resolve the issues with the instructor before resubmitting to the Committee.   Instructors can also be sent back to training modules for help. Ultimately, the Committee will be at the end of the process.

Fourth workshop: will be on Accreditation/Title 5 ADA guidelines that need to be very clear for people doing the review as well.   The deans have agreed in concept that instructors cannot teach in Canvas without the training, but this needs to be presented in full to deans at a later date. If a course doesn't pass the review process, it won't proceed to Canvas, but can continue in eCollege.   Two years remain to get everything into Canvas.

Dale hopes volunteer mentors will come forth through the training process. As more instructors complete the training and become familiar with Canvas, the mentoring will grow organically. Ferdinanda suggested that, until things reach enough growth, Item 4 could state "this period of modification will work with (instructor) to reach an acceptable level for submission" so instructors will understand it will likely not go through after just one review. Another statement could be "will use rubric to guide suggestions for improvement once shell has reached acceptable level based on faculty review based on assessments".   She also pointed out the importance of using positive verbiage such as "guided".   Dale looks forward to it being a creative process.   Dale will send a revised document to the Committee to review the language. Item #3 will have a list of which courses are going into Canvas and a check-off or approval will be needed.   Dale will take the Course Review proposal to the faculty association and Academic Senate for discussion as soon as possible.

Dale explained that he pulled the Course Information checklist from the website. Jeff noted that it is focused more on course design, as it should be, rather than on effective instruction.   It could also state "this is the proper framework for deans to successfully evaluate you in a course that has the right components". Dale replied that these will be evaluations of courses that haven't been done yet. Jeff

suggested adding "image of yourself, bio, video, etc". Dale agreed an opening page is important and he will create a bullet list. The Committee agreed the course syllabus, navigation, and SLO lists were good. Jeff suggested defining "navigation" and "clear" and addressing the opportunities for interaction with a bullet list. Dale will rewrite with "instructor initiated contact", add bullet points, and take out "clocked hours". Insurance is needed that they have all the tools, not whether they're using them. Canvas has a great learning outcomes tool and with the idea of writing assessment tools, maybe outcomes assessment could be included. Outcomes are simplified as assignments are linked to them and using the outcomes tool is in Workshop 2. Dale note there should be evidence that students are told what student services are or have a link on the opening page and create a mini-workshop on student services. One link to Student Services could land in a portal with links to all student services.

A statement on the course and how long it will take instructors to get grades back could be included in the syllabus as a good way to manage expectations. It would be reasonable for all instructors to have those timelines stated for feedback, engagement, and response within a virtual timeframe. Jeff suggested adding as a policy within a class but cautioned against being too intrusive by stating "such as" or "guidelines for communication". Because exams are sometimes few or far between "frequency" could be added to "variety of assessments".

Dale will send a revision, based on today's discussion, to the DE Committee and forward to the Academic Senate once the DE Committee has approved it.

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

DE Committee Minutes 03.11.13/ca