Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, September 4, 2018, 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m., Center for Academic Excellence (18-206)

Members Present:

Sue An, Tania, Beliz, Diana Bennett, Bryan Besnyi, Tarana Chapple, Yoseph Demissie, Paul Hankamp, Steven Lehigh, Joe Mangan, Teresa Morris, Erica Reynolds, Jasmine Robinson, Jing Wu

Action on Agenda:

Approved meeting agenda.

Action on Meeting Summary:

Approved previous meeting summary.

Issues Discussed:

- Review and approve DEETC Committee functions
  1. Help shape a college vision of distance education through recommended policies for quality online instruction and course design of all distance education courses;
     - Sue asked if we have requirements for teaching hybrid or online. Paul stated it is up to deans, whereas at Skyline it is institutionalized.
     - Tarana explained that DEETC recommends to IPC, which is a further screening committee for Cabinet/President.
     - Teresa stated that recommendations and policies should be brought to Academic Senate, where a clear process can be defined and enforced. Tarana asked then what is IPC role? It was explained that IPC can help to take a recommendation and present it as an institutional goal or initiative. For example, accessibility must be an institutional goal where everyone, not just faculty. Faculty, staff, and administrators must meet 508 and 504 compliance standards.
  2. Promote equity, accessibility, and universal design principles as part of distance education courses;

- Teresa would like a stronger word than promote. Accessibility is a legal requirement, so language should be stronger. Or perhaps split language so accessibility is it's own bullet since equity and universal design fall under instructional purview.
- Yoseph asked where does the buck stop in terms of DE courses. Who has the final say about whether a course is accessible? Teresa suggested that we look at the course outline as the contract. Then the course outline is the enforcing body.

3. Communicate to and collect feedback from departments, faculty, and staff towards an efficient, effective, and consistent use of educational technology;
   - Erica asked what has been the process in the past for distributing information form DEETC back to divisions and departments. How have adjunct faculty been kept in the loop since they teach many of our online courses but may not be present at division meetings? Tania stated that DEETC updates have been provided at the Math/Science division meetings, but part of the challenge is communicating feedback. Erica recommended that we incorporate feedback from division/department into our agenda as a recurring item. Tania said it would be helpful for co-chairs to point out action items for items that need to be brought back to the division for feedback. Communication with Division meetings needs to be both face-to-face and via email for faculty not in attendance. Sue asked what if the division doesn't have a large DE course offering, then what is the best way to collect feedback. Paul encouraged sharing DEETC meeting with all faculty as many discussions address online learning (F2F courses using Canvas) and not just distance education courses.

4. Provide direction to faculty for integrating educational technology into programs and all courses, both online and on-campus;
   - Tarana asked how does DEETC operationalize direction and recommendations to faculty. Tania said that Erica's visits to the division meetings with updates was helpful and recommends that the Erica and Paul continue to make rounds at division meetings. Erica explained that we were able to operationalize best practices through Canvas training and we hope to use the updated DE handbook as another vehicle. Jaz asked if are we using the OEI rubric and if we are evaluating DE courses against rubric? Erica explained that in the past, we incorporated the rubric into the Canvas training and used it to build the course template. Paul explained that are building the course review process with our new training cohort.

5. Make recommendations for online support services for both prospective and current distance education students.

- Jaz asked if we are still getting student feedback about course design. Erica explained that we have mid-semester and final-semester survey in the course template that is available for faculty to use and then evaluate for their own instructional purposes.
- Joe asked if we get feedback from the support tickets to observe general trends of student issues. Jaz receives quarterly feedback on student tickets.
- Paul also mentioned that we can get feedback from the online withdraw survey, which we recently requested.

6. Advise the college community about the appropriate use of proprietary applications (e.g. textbook publishers' online resources) that support teaching and learning;

7. Make recommendations to support professional development for all faculty and staff in the area of educational technology; and

8. Develop procedures and guidelines for education technology and online instruction in consultation with the Accreditation Liaison Officer and Vice President of Instruction regarding compliance with external mandates, including specifications articulated by Title 5, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), and Section 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act.

- Recommended language for program review regarding gaps in DE for accreditation evidence.

    1. Previous program review used to ask, "Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to Delivery Mode Course Comparison."

    2. Subsequently, there are gaps in terms of evidence needed for accreditation for the following:
        - Evidence that students are achieving stated learning outcomes developed for the DE/CE programs
        - Evidence of assessment of student achievement data for students enrolled in DE/CE programs
        - Evidence that the institution considers how instruction is delivered and how it assesses that delivery of DE/CE programs is both appropriate and current
        - Evidence that data has been analyzed for DE/CE and face-to-face students in order to compare student achievement and attainment of expected learning outcomes

    3. The question we would like to answer is "In order to fill these gaps, we recommend that…"
        - Erica explained that the VPI and Deans compare DE to f2f and provide an evaluation for courses that have a more than 10% discrepancy in success rates. However, should there be a deeper analysis at the department and

instructional level, so recommendations can be made for addressing the gaps?

- Tania stated that some instructors do this through in the Student Success Indicators section of the prior program review. She also noted that the Online Student Withdrawal survey provides some insight as the discrepancy is from student's life issues, or is it the course itself?
- It was noted that with the program review update, DE is not called out, it would be up to the person writing the updated program review to know to include the DE analysis under 2C: Student Success and Equity. If you were new to program review, you may not know about the DE comparison data and how to discuss it as part of the program review. It was recommended that Deans should send out a reminder to their faculty to remind them that if they do offer DE courses, to include this analysis in program review.
- Tania suggested that in addition to the disaggregated data that faculty receive in the "Delivery Mode Course Comparison" document, information about full-time/part-time status should be included. In addition, the data from the "Online Student Withdrawal Survey," could be provided along with the course to add qualitative data to the analysis.

- Agenda Items for Next Meeting
    - Share-out from Committee Members
    - Changes to Program Review
    - Committee Membership and Rotation Schedule
    - Title V Changes

Next Meeting:

- Tuesday, October 2nd, 12:30-1:30 PM

Summary Prepared by:

Erica Reynolds on September 4, 2018