

**Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee
Meeting Summary**

Tuesday, April 19, 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m., 18-206

Members Present: Tania Beliz, Diana Bennett, Jacqueline Gamelin, Joe Mangan, Theresa Martin, Lee Miller, Erica Reynolds, Chris Smith, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza

Guests Present: Trang Luong (Counseling), Teresa Morris (Library), and Stephanie Roach (Library).

Action on Agenda: Approved agenda

Action on Meeting Summary: (March 15, 2016) Approved meeting summary by acclamation.

Issues Discussed:

- Welcome to new Instructional Technologist, Erica
- District Updates – Jennifer
 - May 5 DEAC (District-level distance education advisory committee) will hold its first meeting of the year. Will discuss district-wide plans for distance education. Members of DEETC will receive an update by email about what was discussed.
 - District will be hiring an Accessibility Specialist, to be shared by the 3 colleges. Among other things, this person will help address accessibility issues in distance education. Chris asked whether there would be funding for captioning and other time-consuming activities. Theresa Martin said there is a grant that can help pay for captioning.
- Canvas Implementation Plan - Jennifer
 - Proposal for mandatory 40 hours of training for new online instructors and 10 hours for current online instructors (by @One or Instructional Technologist).
 - Chris suggested that the instructors who already use online course management system should be treated differently from those who don't.
 - There was some discussion about whether those who have recently completed STOT training should be required to take 40 hours of additional training like those who had not received any STOT training.
 - Teresa Morris asked about the ratio of online pedagogy training and technical training. There was some discussion about how this

could vary depending upon previous training and online teaching experience.

- Erica suggested that the training might be concurrent with first online teaching experience.
 - Theresa suggested looking at individual courses to determine what gaps there are in relation to the Rubric. Training could be structured based on the results of such a study.
 - There was some discussion of whether the goal should be a certain number of hours of training, or whether it should be to achieve competency in certain areas, regardless of the number of hours of training. Theresa suggested that faculty should be able to skip a particular unit of training if they can demonstrate competency in the particular skills taught in that training (competency both in terms of understanding the skills and actually employing it in one's classes).
 - Teresa suggested offering modules of training for all faculty using Canvas, rather than just those teaching online.
 - Trang said she did 40 hours of training with @One. She said it was a high workload and that it would be better if the training was spread out over more time. Those who did STOT training made similar comments. Joe said that it was helpful to be able to refer back to the STOT videos after the training was completed.
 - There was some discussion of compensation for training. Lee noted the those who completed STOT training had received stipends and suggested that if training for 10 hours or more is required, faculty deserve financial compensation. Teresa felt that there should be compensation for the 40 hours of training that is required in order to teach one's first online course. Trang indicated that she'd received one hour of release time for doing the 40 hours of @One training.
 - Theresa suggested that the 10 hours of training be modularized, making it possible to do 2 hours on each of 5 flex days.
- Course shell review for best practices
 - Should Erica, as Instructional Technologist, evaluate the course shells faculty had created and notify those faculty members if she identifies deficiencies?
 - Chris suggested that those who undergo the mandatory training be required to submit to a rubric review as part of the training.
 - Jennifer indicated that the course shells of all faculty need to be evaluated because of legal requirements for accessibility. Teresa universal evaluation would be perceived as more fair than evaluating some but not others.
 - Teresa suggested that faculty could sign up for voluntary comprehensive review of their course shells.

- Tania indicated it is important for faculty to know what is expected of them.
 - Theresa suggested that Appendix G faculty evaluation and Program Review could be forums in which compliance with the Rubric could be evaluated.
- Jennifer announced that the faculty to pilot Canvas in summer 2016 have been selected. Fall cohort is still to be selected.

Meeting adjourned at 1:38 pm.