



## **DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

### **Adopted Minutes**

**August 26, 2013**

**Room 101**

**3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

Dale called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Members present introduced themselves:

Dale Crandall-Bear, Coordinator/Chair; Kathleen Callison – CTE/Bus; Laura Maghoney – CTE/Business; Philip Petersen – Math/Science; Svetlana Podkolzina – Math/Science; Diana Reed – Social & Behavioral Sciences; Sandra Rotenberg – Library; Steven Springer - Counseling; Robin Sytsma – Human Performance & Development; Lauren Taylor – Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Connie Adams – admin assistant

Absent/Excused: Tim Boerner – Liberal Arts; Roger Clague – Chief Technology Officer; Scott Ota – IT

#### **1. Adoption of Minutes** – Jan. 28, Feb. 25, Mar. 11, and May 8, 2013

Motion to group and approve Jan. 28, Feb. 25, Mar. 11, and May 8, 2013 minutes – Robin Sytsma;

Seconded – Laura Maghoney; **Passed** – unanimously

#### **2. Update & status report on transition from eCollege to Canvas**

Svetlana raised concerns about technical problems using Canvas. She expressed frustration putting the roster together manually, losing half of her classes due to different problems, and that help from Canvas has been minimal. Dale pointed out that the Canvas help desk is in process of being set up.

There has been pressure from administration to change the DE Coordinator position to that of dean or director, but Dale hopes to keep this release time position in place to best support faculty. Support staff is also needed. The current administration oversight is split between two people, the IVP for academic enrollment issues, and the Chief Technology Officer for technical issues. With Dale as the Coordinator, it is kind of a three person team.

Dale explained the DE Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate and all curricular items are under the purview of the Senate. About four years ago the Senate created the DE Committee with faculty representatives from each school. There are also representatives from the library, counseling, IT, and administration, typically a dean. Dale doesn't know yet which dean will join the Committee. Sandy asked about the approved full-time IT support staff. Dale confirmed the program can't run on a 40% basis, it was always the intention to increase staff, and the College told Canvas there would be support staff on board to help with technical issues. Around February, administration agreed to hire a full-time administrative support person but the process has not moved forward. Dale recently spoke with IVP White and learned there is an Administrative Assistant III employee in another area who would like the job. Someone can be hired as a temp and transition into permanent and should be in place in a couple weeks to handle all technical issues for faculty and students. It will be up to that person to decide what issues to pass on to Canvas. The intention has been for the Coordinator role to move into

instructional design and work with faculty to build online courses. Plans are to have most everything ready this October and the IT staff will be in conference with the Canvas staff to make the integration hookup in spring 2014. IT will start building now and the loading should all happen automatically in the spring.

Sandy noted that some Canvas issues are related to browsers. Dale had a meeting with Roger Clague, CTO, and found out the College computer system needs to catch up. Banner could be used to send emails to students if Canvas isn't working. There were problems in eCollege as well due to students not checking their email.

The DE Committee and the Senate approved the Course Shell Review last year. The form is in Training Shell 3 and the checklist is based on the ACCJC list of what is needed. Shell review is basically working through a checklist. The SCFA notified the administration that faculty course shell review can't be required without an agreement because it is a workload issue. The Committee approach has been that, if it is optional, it doesn't mean anything. However, any online course that is not reviewed will not be scheduled. Deans have that oversight. The union is open to an agreement. The key things about shell review are: they are entirely collegial; deans and administration won't be involved and shouldn't be; the assumption is that faculty would have colleagues (can be adjuncts) in their departments do the review, but it could be at least two instructors from any department they choose. If questions come up, the DE Committee will resolve them and they may have to open the course shell up to do so. The purpose is to have the simplest and most effective review possible by using a checklist. The whole course doesn't have to be completed for the review, but SLOs, assignments showing links to SLOs, and ample instructor contact will be important. Dale added another component – the course shell review can be done as a one-year pilot. After the first semester, it can be reviewed to see what to add/change to make it easier for faculty to get into the system. Other components can be added later. Dale stated he doesn't want people hung up on the review. He has done five or six over the summer which offered a great opportunity to discuss teaching with colleagues and to learn many things. Dale noted there are some sample courses and examples of course content that could be used to meet the criteria and there will be more. He looks forward to the Course Shell Review being a great collaborative teaching opportunity.

The final date for readiness is October 30, 2013. If not ready, instructors can still use eCollege. Dale will resend the timeline and suggested everyone pass the timeline out in their schools.

### **3. Recap of summer work on the DE Program Review**

- Canvas Transition Timeline

Dale emailed the timeline to members and he will send it out again to all faculty. DE reps should have a hardcopy available to answer questions within their schools. The transition was accelerated due to eCollege's decision to pull out. The plan was blocked for this year because they did not inform the College of their intention in writing. Many faculty will need to join Canvas to meet the spring 2014 goal to run about 50% of online classes in both Canvas and eCollege. Banner will run both as well. Summer 2014 will not include eCollege, all courses have to be moved by fall 2014, so training and course development have to accelerate. The training sessions Dale held this month were full. There are about thirty eCompanions this term and ten fully online courses that are helping everyone get used to Canvas. Dale suggested that instructors begin making a list of problems to be addressed which he will give to IT and Canvas. He is also keeping a log of questions to ask Canvas. Instructors who have attended a workshop can expect shells soon and will receive a message from Canvas Instructure that the shell is formed and a link for access. Building the shell is incorporated in the training so instructors will have their shell mostly completed upon finishing the training.

- **Draft of DE Program Review**

Dale emailed the draft to the Committee. This is the first Program Review for Distance Ed. Because DE is one of the four items on the Accreditation Recommendations, a DE report has to be filed with the Accreditation Commission (ACCJC). Accreditation began looking at DE programs which hadn't had a lot of oversight. Their report listed 11 items that had to be addressed and that require documentation. Learning outcomes for onsite and DE have to be at a comparable level. They were given online syllabi for SLOs which they verified. The DE report submitted last year included: ASC workshops; online writing support; embedded tutors; Program Review; course shell review; DE handbook. ACCJC guidelines have been followed as needed for compliance. ACCJC concluded last year that Recommendation 6 had been satisfactorily addressed but they also stated it was too new and they need to see an assessment provision developed.

Dale explained that instructors can go through their department or the Tutoring Center to get a tutor. Tutors can lead discussions but not change the grade book. A role can be created with permissions to indicate what they can and cannot do.

- **Data Comparisons-FF/OL-draft1 - attached**

Dale emailed a 2010-2013 Data Comparison document to members. It shows fill rates are lower for online but it was unknown if the number was from the first census or the drop deadline. Sandy will check on that and report back to Dale. The Committee will begin reviewing the data at the next meeting. Retention rates are affected by instructor contact. Students also need to understand how to log in. Kathy reported recent discussions considered creating a class, and Diana suggested bringing up eCompanion in face-to-face classes to demonstrate how to work online.

Dale identified and highlighted problem areas that need to be dealt with, due to significant differences in the numbers. He added that this presents a new territory regarding what to do with the information. The DE Committee won't strategize on that but will forward information to the departments to discuss. Sandy did a ranking from highest to lowest fill rates and retention. Everything is coming down to retention for appropriation/funding so that will have to be dealt with. Laura noted that more and more faculty see students use a class as a place filler and then experience substantial drops before more than one activity or any quizzes are done. She sees the biggest drops mostly in online classes. Dale agreed the same problem occurs in history and students are turned away because administration doesn't want over enrollment in classes.

The DE Committee will be responsible to take a look at the data to work towards what can be done, not to blame anyone. Dale asked members to communicate with colleagues who are looking at data to find problems and ways to build a better program. He hasn't sent the data to everyone yet and it may be best for the Committee to gain understanding before sending it out to all faculty.

#### **4. Next steps to finish the Program Review**

Dale met with IVP White last spring regarding how to deal with the next report for ACCJC and they decided the best way would be through PR as a way of writing the Accreditation report. Sandy Rotenberg, Ruth Fuller, and Chris McBride 20 hours each to work on PR over summer, but were not able to finish. PR is undergoing major change and is very comprehensive. Dale worked with PR Chair Amy Obegi on the PR handbook, designed for departments, and adapted it for DE to do as a campus-wide review of a program. There are still some blanks to fill in and the Committee needs to discuss how to complete the PR. He would like to begin the process as the first item on the next agenda and moving forward as needed. There are no learning outcomes for DE and they may not be needed. The

Committee can make a decision on whether PLOs are appropriate for DE. Dale asked members to read through all they have so far before the next meeting when it will be on the agenda for further discussion. Members can check with other schools what they do regarding SLOs and PLOs etc.

Dale reported about one-third of the report is completed. Ruth Fuller collected face-to-face and online SLOs and tried to get feedback from faculty to see if having SLOs in online courses is making a difference. The other focus was basically data, including enrollment, fill rates, retention and success rates. Peter Cammish, Dean of Institutional Research & Effectiveness, was able to flag all online courses and pull out online group data. This is the first time to see campus-wide numbers separately for face-to-face and online classes. Sandy focused on that part to make comparisons for the last three years. Steve pointed out part of the question in fill rate numbers could be a problem with getting add codes. Svetlana raised concern about students registering, getting financial aid and books, and then dropping and noted that she sees the same repeat offenders. Dale affirmed that using online programs for financial fraud is an issue with the Chancellor's Office and all over the country. The Chancellor's Office is insisting that instructors clear their rosters. Anyone who doesn't respond with a first activity or introduction by a certain date should be dropped. This is on the Course Review checklist and it has to be explained clearly to students. The parameters for dropping students should be decided in the departments. Robin noted that she uses a quiz on the syllabus and drops students who don't respond in three days. Canvas has a good mechanism to show who hasn't responded to notifications.

#### **5. Review of the DE section of the upcoming Accreditation Report**

- ACCJC Comments on SCC 2012 Report
- Draft of 2013 DE Accreditation Report (Rec. 6)

Dale emailed a draft of the DE Accreditation Report that will be sent to ACCJC sometime in October. Draft #2 was sent to Accreditation Coordinator, Annette Dambrosio, last week. There are some gaps to be filled in and corrections made, if needed. Dale asked everyone to read the report and add information or make suggestions on anything that may be left out. He reviewed the points on ACCJC report and will list evidence that will be sent. The second section on student success workshops and orientations needs to have more done and added. Dale asked Svetlana to write a summary on what she did in her orientation. Chris McBride, in the Online Writing Center, would like to put all of this into a Canvas shell for all students to have access. There is only one example of an embedded tutor in the report, so more can be sent by instructors deciding to use tutors online.

#### **6. Confirming the representatives on the 2013-2014 DE Committee**

- School reps & Administration reps, +IT

Dale suggested the Committee should have two reps from each school, except Health Sciences will have one rep. An additional rep is currently needed from Liberal Arts, Human Performance & Development and Health Sciences.

-----  
The next meeting will be on September 9, 2013.