



DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Adopted Minutes

October 27, 2014

Room 801

2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

The Distance Education Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Coordinator Dale Crandall-Bear.

Members present were Isabel Anderson (LA); Dale Crandall-Bear (DE Coordinator/Chair); Erin Duane (substitute Librarian); Neil Glines (Dean of LA); Mary Gumlia (COUN); Laura Maghoney (AT &B); Sarah Nordin (AT&B); Lindsay Padilla (SBS); Svetlana Podkolzina (MS); Robin Sytsma (HS); Lauren Taylor-Hill (SBS); and Carol Zadnik (DE Tech)

Absent/Excused: Roger Clague (CTO); Julia Kiss (Nurs); Leslie Minor (Dean of SBS); Scott Ota (IT); and Sandra Rotenberg (Lib)

1. Adoption of Minutes (10/13/2014)

Adoption of October 13, 2014 Meeting Minutes:
Motion to approve – Sarah; Seconded – Erin; Passed – unanimously.

2. Correspondence Classes

Approve latest draft of Course Modification Form (Curriculum Committee). Dale said he felt like progress is being made regarding Correspondence Courses. Dale mentioned adjustments to the program include progression in stages.

The first stage of the project will be for Spring 2015 with only 3 or 4 pilot courses. The objective is to try out the process, try the forms, and revisit the process for discussion later in spring to evaluate what was learned and what worked before going forward.

Dale mentioned the second adjustment will involve offering the first set of courses as 8- or 10-week late start classes. The participating courses would not begin until February or March. Dale presented Curtiss Brown's timeline for the correspondence course process. He said course packet review by DE Committee Members would probably take place on February 2, 2015.

Lauren asked if this modality of teaching will be voluntary. Dale said it is his understanding that it will be voluntary.

Dale shared with DE Committee Members the most recent draft copy of the Course Modification Form. He asked if there were any questions regarding the form.

Sarah asked why instructor-initiated contact is only once per week, which does not compare with online instructor-initiated contact. Dale explained that once per week contact is the minimum amount for a full-term course; however, there will be a courier service that will run daily between Solano Community College and the Vacaville Prison that will allow for more contact per week. Dale said 8 week classes will require a minimum of twice per week instructor-initiated contact. Dale addressed Page 3 of the Approval of Correspondence Courses Form which lists the following Best Practice Recommendations for Instructor-Initiated Contact:

- Weekly announcements via course packet or correspondence notebook
- Correspondence notebook
- Student questionnaire/feedback form
- Visits to the prison to meet with students
- Regular, timely, meaningful feedback and evaluations of student work
- Audio or video of lecture, introductory information or other course information
- Introduction of new material every week

Dale reiterated the program would be adjusted as needed to stay in compliance with accreditation. Dale pointed out that an additional bullet point was added under *Regular Effective Contact* on Page 2 that states, "Clear statements of instructor-initiated contact should be outlined in the course syllabus." He said the section on the form that asks instructors to describe the plan for maintaining regular effective contact with students throughout the course of study will be a very important section.

Carol asked if EOPS is planning to keep a digital copy of all the approved correspondence courses. Dale said they probably will.

Isabel asked if each instructor's course packet will go through an approval process just as each online instructor's course shell goes

through an approval process. Dale said that is the second part of the process which is in the Correspondence Course Packet.

Dale asked for a motion to adopt the Addendum Form for Approval of Correspondence Courses (Curriculum Committee). He said the Curriculum Committee will vote on this form tomorrow.

Discuss first draft of Course Packet Review Form (DE Committee). First the Curriculum Committee approves a subject through the Course Modification Form, and then DE approves individual sections of a subject by individual instructors. Dale said the correspondence course packet does not have to be 100 percent complete for review. The syllabus and instructor contact material must be complete along with 3- or 4-units of course material. The form is divided into items that are required and content items.

Lauren asked if standards should be made with regard to what font size is used in correspondence course packets. Dale said things like that would be addressed in the pilot evaluation process moving forward. Sarah suggested something be listed on the form about ADA. Dale said ADA compliance is another consideration to review in the process. Erin inquired how support services that students normally have will be handled for correspondence course students in the prison. Sarah said the prison has an educational officer. Isabel pointed out that many concerns were addressed in a question and answer segment by Dean Minor that was emailed to all by the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, Diane White. Erin said library services will be available to support staff that plan to teach correspondence courses.

Dale asked committee members again if they were ready to vote on the Course Modification Form. Laura and Sarah chose to abstain from the vote at the present time. After much debate, the consensus among other members was to have a discussion about correspondence courses at his/her next school meeting before voting. Dale reiterated that we are voting to use the Course Modification Form and move forward with an approval process for the four pilot courses for the Spring 2015 semester. The committee agreed to revisit this topic at the next meeting on November 10.

Dale asked if there were any other suggestions for alterations or changes to the Course Modification Form. He also asked if there are any suggestions for additions to the Course Packet Review Form.

3. Online Education Initiative	<p>Dale feels The Online Education Initiative could have a significant impact on our Distance Education program at SCC, and asked if committee members had a chance to read the article from Senate Rostrum. Dale said they are proposing to set up a state-wide consortium with a common learning management system. Specific course requirements will be established and any courses meeting the requirements could be part of the state-wide consortium. This would mean any student anywhere in the state could sign up for a course in that program. Dale mentioned this program may or may not impact current online programs within the college system.</p> <p>Dale said committee members should be aware of The Online Education Initiative Program, and the committee will revisit this topic in the future as needed.</p>
4. New Course Shell Reviews (for Summer/Fall 2015)	<p>Course shell review applications submitted previously to DE with only one faculty review sent in their second review.</p> <p>Dale asked for a motion to approve the following new courses: Motion to approve – Sarah; Seconded – Erin; Passed – unanimously:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIST 017 (CC) - Final • MUSC 013 (MA) - pilot • BUS 005 (CO) - pilot
5. Committee Review of Pilot courses	<p>Dale asked faculty members how they felt the pilot review process worked and if they had questions regarding the review process. Erin said it is difficult to evaluate and address some of the methods of instructor-initiated contact. Mary said publisher components like <i>McGraw Hill Connect</i> made the evaluation process difficult. Dale reminded members that DE passed a policy regarding the use of publisher material in a course. Dale said it is a problem if instructors who choose to use <i>Connect</i> are missing visible instructor-initiated contact in his/her Canvas shell. Sarah asked Dale if he could send out a reminder to faculty regarding the policy on publisher material.</p> <p>Dale suggested that pilot reviewers collaborate with the instructor of the pilot course. He said the instructor should be involved in the process to answer questions. Members agreed and said it is easier when the instructor is involved in the process. Faculty members agreed to revisit the first set of pilot courses at the next meeting.</p>
Adjournment	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 10 in Room 801 from 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.</p>