



Distance Education Advisory Council

June 26, 2012

Unapproved Minutes

- Present:** Jenni Abbott (Co-Chair), Kimberly Bailey, James Clarke, Yoseph Demissie, Lorena Dorn, James Fay (Co-Chair), Laura Maki, Shirley Miranda, Eva Mo, Joshua Sigman, Mary Silva, Michael Smedshammer (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquist
- Guests:** John Zamora
- Absent:** Moises Aguilar, Bruce Anders, Iris Carroll, Cheryl Chavez, Leslie Collins, Deanne Dalrymple, Carol Ellis, Kim Gyuran, Jennifer Hamilton, Chad Redwing, Lawrence Scheg, Brenda Thames, Nadia Vartan
- Recorder:** Amy Bethel

Jenni Abbott opened the meeting with a review of the agenda and by announcing changes to the Distance Ed Administrative Unit. Jim Clarke, former Faculty Coordinator for Distance Education, has retired, but is working over the summer as a consultant in this transitional time. Jenni has been named the Interim Director of Distance Education. Mike Smedshammer has been selected to fill the new fulltime position of Instructional Design Coordinator and will begin in August.

Jenni then distributed information from the ACCJC website describing the areas of Distance Ed where the commission may look and what evidence would be appropriate to show that we are in compliance with the standards. Jenni will send the information electronically to the members of the committee. The standard says that we will create and implement a Distance Ed plan. MJC created a plan that was approved by College Council in March of this year. The second part of the Accreditation Recommendation is implementing the plan and will be the charge of this group.

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott

What: Send electronic versions of ACCJC information to committee members

STANDING ITEMS

1. Review of Minutes

The May 17 minutes received unanimous thumbs up approval from the members in attendance after noting a correction to the spelling of Dr. Fay's last name. It was agreed that consensus, noted by thumbs up or down would continue to be the standard used to gauge agreement on subject matter.

2. Standards Regarding Publisher Content

Mike Smedshammer led a discussion of publisher content relative to faculty using it to enrich their online course content. Faculty sometimes use their Blackboard (Bb) shells to link to publisher content to enhance the content of their courses. A drawback to using publisher content is that it can only be accessed via a link rather than being able to bring it into the Bb shells. Because of this, the College may be giving up some of its control and



Distance Education Advisory Council

June 26, 2012

Unapproved Minutes

potentially, confidentiality. There may be a tendency for publishers to be less responsive to our students or for MJC faculty to be less engaged. It was decided that publisher content could be used to supplement an online course, but that minimum standards must be met within Blackboard itself.

The contract with Bb expires in April 2013. MJC is looking at various LMS systems and may change from Bb. Columbia College will have to be on board with any change. Jim Fay stated that by having all online courses under one umbrella, we have more access and it will be easier to standardize the online class experience so that students do not have to learn each time how to take a class. The use of current online courses being taught using an LMS other than Bb was discussed.

Laura Maki noted that during the recent review that courses may not have met the standards of the rubric because previously, there were no defined standards. John Zamora asked what the minimum standards are. He talked about the difference between ACCJC and U. S. Dept of Ed (for federal Financial Aid) requirements. He does not believe there is enough detail in the rubric to know how the courses were evaluated. A question arose as to whether or not we were talking about minimum standards to satisfy ACCJC or to satisfy the DE committee. There was long discussion concerning minimum standards for MJC's DE offerings and how those will be determined and articulated to faculty. **It was decided that courses need to be looked at on a case by case basis to demonstrate minimum standard.** Laura Maki also noted that the rubric is not clear as to what is expected. She is one of the mentors and is unclear on what she needs to advise the other faculty members. There was further discussion of the course review itself and concern was expressed that in some cases the wrong shell might have been evaluated or that content was housed in a publisher other than Bb. Jim Clarke stated that roughly 30% of the courses needed substantial work, but many of the courses only need to add the "Start Here" module. **A generic "Start Here" module will be developed for faculty to incorporate into their courses, and providing they do a little tweaking to personalize the module to their particular course, they will have met the minimum standard as long as they received a score of 3 in all other areas of the rubric.**

Eva Mo asked that several examples of courses that meet the standard be shared with faculty. She asked that the examples differ from each other to demonstrate that design and content can be varied. Joshua Sigman suggested that a rubric be developed so that faculty can evaluate their own courses. It was determined that the original rubric could be used by faculty as a self-evaluative tool. Jenni Abbott added that other resources by way of the Instructional Technologist and the @One cohort will be available to faculty and the deans.



Distance Education Advisory Council

June 26, 2012

Unapproved Minutes

3. Second Review of Online Courses

- a. Who should review the revised courses?
- b. Process for review (appeal process)
- c. **Timeline: When a course is completed, what does the faculty member do?**

It was decided that the deans and Dr. Fay would conduct the second review of the online courses as they have the right of assignment. They may consult a member of the @One cohort. Deans would need to only review the areas that had been graded at less than 3. Faculty members wishing to appeal the findings of the online review may appeal to the faculty cohort for an additional review. The deans will still have the final decision regarding the right of assignment. There will be no appeal of minimum standards, only the findings of the review. Deans will receive training prior to the final review. A training session should be held at IAC by members of the @One cohort. When sending out the boiler plate, instructions for next steps should be included. Courses should be sent to the deans after changes are ready for review. Jim Fay will confirm the deans participation in the second review. The role of the cohort was discussed. Mike Smedshammer will set up a discussion board on the Facebook page to discuss what the cohort needs to do to help. Laura Maki and Mike Smedshammer will create the "Start Here" module. Mike Smedshammer will check in with cohort to see who is available to assist.

Action Item:

Who: L. Maki and Mike Smedshammer
What: Create a "Start Here" module

Action Item:

Who: J. Fay
What: Check with deans regarding review of courses after improvements are complete

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott/M. Smedshammer
What: Contact A. Bethel to add Training from @One cohort to a future IAC agenda

4. Templates/Boiler Plates

- a. Both minimum standards and best practices
- b. "Start Here" Module
 - i. In module and syllabus

Laura Maki learned how to create and upload boiler plates. This will make it easier for faculty to create their "Start Here" modules. It was generally agreed that it would be most useful to give faculty as much detail as possible in the boiler plate from which they can pick and choose content.



Distance Education Advisory Council

June 26, 2012

Unapproved Minutes

5. Canvas Pilot

a. Identify instructors

b. Rubric

Mike Smedshammer has been teaching a class in Canvas. It has a feature for communicating with students and allows you to track student contacts. It took approximately two weeks to load his content. There are slots for approximately 10 faculty to test Canvas in the fall and Mike invited the faculty serving on DEAC to try it. Columbia College must be included in the test as any changes will affect them as well. Laura Maki suggested we include Moodle as an option for review. Our contract with Bb will expire in April and we need to decide if we will stay with them or change. YCCD needs to begin negotiating a new contract in the spring. A rubric will be developed to compare each system. Jenni will send out an email to online and hybrid faculty to ask if they want to be testers for Moodle or Canvas. Students should be surveyed as users as well.

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott

What: Send email to faculty requesting testers for Moodle or Canvas LMS

Action Item:

Who: Canvas Pilot Group

What: Develop rubric for comparing LMSs

6. Authenticity/Testing Group

a. Academic Senate will identify faculty

The Academic Senate has approved a motion to support the Distance Education Committee's formation of a taskforce to look into the authenticity issues surrounding distance education, and to also formally request that members of the Senate be members of the taskforce. Once the work is complete, it will need to go back to Senate for review. John Zamora will find members for the committee. Eva Mo will work to identify someone who can take the lead.

Action Item:

Who: J. Zamora

What: Identify members of Authenticity/Testing Group

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott/M. Smedshammer

What: Add to next agenda



Distance Education Advisory Council

June 26, 2012

Unapproved Minutes

7. Online Student Services

- a. Joshua Sigman, Kim Bailey, Jim Clarke, Mike Smedshammer, Brenda Thames, and Iris Carroll
- b. HelpDesk services
- c. Student module
- d. Complaint process

Jenni Abbott is still waiting for a response from Portland Community College. Lorena Dorn agreed to lead this group and schedule a meeting.

Action Item:

Who: L. Dorn

What: Schedule meeting of the group

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott/M. Smedshammer

What: Add item to next agenda

8. DE Plan Implementation

- a. Identify priorities

The Committee was asked to review the DE Plan and identify priorities keeping in mind the timeline on page 22. Some activities have already begun.

Action Item:

Who: All

What: Review DE Plan and identify priorities

Action Item:

Who: J. Abbott/M. Smedshammer

What: Add item to next agenda

Next Meeting: Tentatively, July 9