



DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Adopted Minutes

November 26, 2012

Room 101

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Dale called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

Dale Crandall-Bear, Ferdinanda Florence, Jeff Lamb, Laura Maghoney, Philip Petersen, Svetlana Podkolzina, Sandy Rotenberg, Steve Springer, Robin Sytsma, Connie Adams

Absent: Scott Ota,

1. Review of Minutes (Oct 8)

Motion to approve – Robin; Seconded – Ferdinanda; Passed - unanimous

2. Spring 2013 Preparations

Shells are being created now, later than planned due to receiving the schedule from administration just before Thanksgiving. As soon as ECollege resolves their technical problem shells will be available.

3. Survey of Online Students

The survey resulted from brainstorming at a previous DE meeting. It was sent to ASC (Academic Success Center). They just completed a face-to-face survey, but one is needed for online students as well. The DE survey will be loaded in Survey Monkey and should be sent out in the next week or two. Sandy will show Dale how to set it up as pop-up. It will be an anonymous survey with one of the goals to learn online student needs. Sandy suggested it go out to all students as everyone is a potential online student and some of the questions would be valuable for students who may take online in the future. Dale will check with Research & Planning Director Peter Cammish regarding sending it to everyone. It could be separated out per online and not yet online students. If anyone has urgent changes or additions, Dale will send them to Peter. The Committee will spend some time reviewing the results. That could lead to actions, including what kind of workshops DE instructors can offer. Dale asked everyone to consider what workshops they'd like to give. The survey started with 20 questions and ended up with 40. Depending on the response, the volume of questions will be considered for future surveys. It is being created by ASC with input from DE. Jeff suggested it might be best to have two surveys rather than just this one which seems diluted with one part for online experience and the second part that ASC put in about learning. Dale replied he suggested that to ASC but was overruled. Ferdinanda recommended questions could be divided into sections by subject to make it less tedious and more focused. There could be some kind of incentive, such as a raffle prize. Sandy noted that students who want to enter the contest could provide an email address that wouldn't be attached to the survey. Dale added that if instructors or specific courses are named in completed surveys, they will be removed from further discussion. The plan is to send out surveys on an ongoing basis that can be revised as needed.

4. Planning Outline for DE Program

At the last meeting Dale reported on his extensive meeting Dr. Laguerre. In response to his request for something more formal, Dale sent a document (see [Strengthening the DE Program](#) emailed to members) that he prepared for a follow-up meeting. Dale looked at the College DE program as well as other college programs for what is ideal, where we are, and how to close the gap. Dr. Laguerre and EVP Reyes were very supportive. Staffing is an obvious place to start, Dale felt he made a good case, and it appears a position will actually be created. He will follow-up to ensure it will be done. Jeff opined that it will be difficult to find someone who can be tech savvy and familiar with academic administrative work as a 50/50 job. Dale agreed it would be best to create separate staffing positions and obtain a good pool of candidates with the necessary skills.

Items 2 & 3 are mostly in direct response to ACCJC. Dale included fairly typical information from LA Mission College regarding the course approval process. Dale met with Curriculum Committee Chair, Joe Conrad, and he

liked this process. A lot of campuses have their curriculum committees review generic courses during curriculum review, rather than individual instructor courses; they forward online courses to the DE committees for their review; the DE Committee would create a checklist (series of guidelines) for course evaluation; after DE reviews the online parts to ensure standards are met, it would be returned to the Curriculum Committee for approval of course shells. A new course would need to be substantially written by an instructor before approval. Jeff noted a byproduct of guidelines would be development of what deans could use for faculty evaluation for online classes. Guidelines could state basic key element expectations and deans could ensure instructors are using the checklist. Currently, some faculty don't know what is expected but they would like to know. An instructor who submits an online course for approval would be the only instructor who could teach that course.

The cycle of curriculum review would get this started by opening up and actually looking at the substantially written sample shell, looking for instructor contact and SLOs. Shell content belongs to the instructor who created it. Sandy noted that College-wide acceptance would be needed as all divisions will have to fall in line with this process. That would incur pre-planning and a change in culture. Dale added that courses would not go in the schedule until approved. Sandy stated there will need to be a way to do this more than every five years and something will need to be planned outside of the curriculum review process and treated as new courses. Dale agreed it would entail a shift to consider online a new course. Jeff felt there might be incredible resistance if a class has been taught successfully for years and another faculty wants to teach it online. As a trained online instructor, they may feel that is invasive. Sandy responded this is basically about a peer review process which has been resisted by this campus. Dale pointed out that ACCJC states "show us where you're getting instructor content".

The College doesn't receive appropriation funding and students don't receive financial aid for fairly unmodified publisher correspondence courses that are placed in a shell. If audited, the College would be in trouble if that type of course is called "online". Jeff noted a distinction needs to be made that the DE Committee would not be looking at content, but rather manifestations of the way a certain number of things are established. A very clear set of guidelines will be needed to show the Committee that requirements are met. They would not be approving the course content. The process will need to ensure accreditation standards are met and have models and templates so faculty can feel, see and know how to meet guidelines. Caution was urged going forward with expectations and the Committee should anticipate the faculty responses; ways will need to be devised to make it all accessible; the union will need to review the plan as well. Dale stated it won't be practical to look at all courses and divisions could be the first line of review. Committee reps could engage with a few others in their schools and report to the DE committee. This should be faculty driven in every department. The DE Committee task is to create a process that is non-threatening, creative, supportive, and with clear expectations from the state, accreditation, and best practices. DE has the opportunity to be a microcosm of excellence. A focused cohort would make that process less threatening as well as framing it as a positive thing to show off the DE program rather than looking for flaws.

Dale suggested the Committee work on this next semester: create the process and a checklist; discuss with schools; when ready to move forward meet with the Curriculum Committee Chair; submit to the Academic Senate. This can demystify online, make it more accessible, create a common practice, increase faculty interest and expand the variety of online courses. All state schools have to respond to the course approval process. Dale will begin work the process and is willing to meet with colleagues in their schools for discussion.

5. New Course Review/Approval Process

The Academic Senate is working on a major program review that will have online and face-to-face program review data. The Senate will vote on this at the December 3rd meeting and training will be planned for spring. Publisher pre-packaged courses have always been a concern and Dale hopes that by having faculty demonstrate how they modify courses so they are not correspondence courses it will be resolved.

6. Workshop for Online Faculty

DCB stressed to S/P the College needs to be much more supportive.

--Introduction to Canvas

--Training Course for New Online Faculty

--Brainstorm other ideas....

In process of switch to canvas

Dale addressed some of the items on the Strengthening the DE Program document he emailed to members. He noted the whole technology landscape is changing, not just online. Jeff suggested the Flex Cal form could include a place for faculty to note what they are doing online. Their evaluations could be based on their percentage of online

and face-to-face classes. Another third of campus courses could be opened up with online classes. Phillip suggested offering some required flex time specifically for online instructors.

Whatever Pearson has planned for the implementation of the digital integration with the LMS will happen sometime during the summer, since they aren't ready to do it now. Dale will meet with Pearson next week to discuss implementation and will share details when he knows more. He would like to have more time to work with online faculty and Jeff added it would be advantageous to include professional development specifically for online instructors, such as ASC trainings and archived webinars etc.

Dale reported that only one instructor has accepted the Pearson digital integration rollout. Robin commented that their reps encourage faculty not to as they can get materials to the College at less cost than the Pearson agreement. Dale added that Pearson rep, Heather Stratton, has inquired how to make their offer more attractive.

Dale reminded members that all services offered at the campus have to be offered online as well. Sandy asked if Erin Vines, Dean of Student Services, is aware of how Canvas can be used for all services, not only online. Dale will meet with Erin Vines to follow-up. He stated more than \$200 per person needs to be budgeted to take advantage of technology training and information. There are local and regional conferences. Members agreed that the EDUCAUSE conference would be a good opportunity. Dale will plan to notify DE faculty of upcoming conferences and they can speak to their deans about flex options. Funding can be requested from the DE dean and school deans. Jeff to-date has not received requests.

Sandy queried if funds for purchasing technology for instructors to use cameras, recording studio set-up etc., are available in the DE budget. She noted that compliance with ADA, such as closed captioning, is a Title 5 requirement. Dale will add that to the list. Jeff pointed out that investment in DE will generate more back to the College. A good quality DE program will generate higher quality programs that will attract more students and optimize resources. In recent budget cuts, DE courses in English were eliminated because retention was lower than face-to-face. The program can get to a place on par or better than face-to-face.

Regarding workshops, ASC is getting off the ground looking at what kind to provide based on student response, but faculty input is also needed. Dale would like to get together with online instructors on a regular basis for discussion. Dale has two online workshops scheduled December 4th and 5th. He would like to see a comprehensive beginners' training course, which instructors could create and teach together. Sandy suggested Canvas videos could be linked or put in a Canvas course shell. This could also track time faculty are spending on training. Sequenced assignments could be created to demonstrate proficiency. The eCollege SLO tools don't work as they're not set up the same way. Dale will check the student and faculty 800 help desk number and chat availability with technical support. They were not to decrease their services.

Dale will begin drawing up ideas for the course approval process.

Documents:

Minutes (Oct 8)
Online Student Survey
DE Planning Outline
Staffing Scenarios
Course Approval Process (LAMC)

Next DE Mtg – Fall 2012

Dec 10 – DE Committee