LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2013
10:00 AM, Room 2410 and CCC CONFER
MINUTES

LPC Members Present:
Scott Vigallon (TLC-Classified; co-chair)
Richard Dry (ALSS; co-chair)
Frances Hui (ALSS; Library)
Chris Lee (Student Services)
Jane McCoy (ALSS)
Marilyn Flores (Dean)
Howard Blumenfeld (STEMPS)
Stephanie Suarez (ASLPC)

LPC Members Absent:
Vicky Austin (Adjunct Faculty)
Janice Cantua (Admissions & Records)
Gina Webster (BSBA)
Deanna Horvath (ALSS)
Bobby August (STEMPS)

Guests:

AGENDA:

I. Call to order: The meeting was called to order by co-chair Richard Dry at 10:06 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from Nov. 30 meeting: Jane motioned to approve the minutes, Chris seconded. Minutes approved with one abstension.

III. Updates

- **Recent online learning developments in California:** Several developments have occurred over the past few weeks.
  - A one-day conference took place Jan. 8 at UCLA called “Rebooting CA Higher Education: Leveraging innovations in online education to improve cost effectiveness and increase quality”. The purpose was to raise the awareness and discuss key issues regarding the potential for online education to lower the costs for, and increase access to, higher education in California. Speaking were representatives from the various innovation movements at universities and educational technology companies (including MOOCs) in the U.S., politicians, and reps from faculty unions, academic senates, college presidents, and students from the 3 systems in California. Lots of ideas were given, but no solutions were reached.
  - On Jan. 10, Gov. Brown released his proposed budget, which calls for $16.9 million to the community colleges “to increase the number of courses available to matriculated undergraduates through the use of technology. The focus should be on the courses that have the highest demand, fill quickly, and are prerequisites for many different degrees. Priority will be given to development of courses that can serve greater numbers of students while providing equal or better learning experiences, but only if those courses are aimed at advanced students who are likely to succeed in these types of courses. This initiative will include three key elements: (1) the creation of a "virtual campus" to increase statewide student access to 250 new courses delivered through technology, (2) the creation of a single, common, and centralized delivery and support infrastructure for all courses delivered through technology and for all colleges, and (3) the expansion of options for students to access instruction in other environments and earn college credit for demonstrated knowledge and skills through credit by exam.”

The next steps include an analysis from the Legislative Analyst's Office (usually in February), a review of the proposal by legislative budget subcommittees (March through May), and then a revision on or around May 15 when the governor will update the revenue forecast and potentially alter some of his proposals. The chancellor's office is supposed to submit an expenditure plan and rationale to the Department of Finance by July 1.

- On Jan. 15, San Jose State and MOOC provider Udacity, announced an agreement to develop a pilot program that will offer college classes for credit to not only waitlisted SJSU students, but also to high school students, waitlisted California Community Colleges students, members of the armed forces, and veterans. This marks the first time that a broad range of students, not just matriculated students, will have access to online college classes for credit from an accredited university. The 3 courses in the pilot -- Pre-Algebra, College Algebra, and Elementary Statistics -- will cost students $150 per course. Enrollment will be limited to 100 students per course, with 50 SJSU students and 50 non-SJSU students. SJSU faculty members worked with Udacity to design and create all three classes to include video instruction interspersed with quizzes and other interactive elements. Each course will be enriched with support provided by Udacity staff members and course mentors, who will track, encourage and monitor students. Mentoring will be available via chat rooms, a helpline, instructor-facilitated peer meetings and outreach when a student is falling behind and needs more encouragement and support.

- **MOU on DE evaluation:** At our October meeting, we sought clarity on the provision that says: "Specifically, the meeting shall include a three hour "tour" of the course site wherein the evaluator shall be able to observe the class with the division of time between the tour and the observation to be agreed to by the evaluator and the evaluee." Jane reported that she clarified the language through the FA executive board.

IV. **Substantive Change Proposal:** A draft of the proposal was finished and given to VP Noble for feedback. That feedback was incorporated before the draft was sent to the ACCJC for a preliminary review. The ACCJC asked for clarification in some areas and additional data on success, retention and completion comparing DE to face-to-face within the programs in the proposal. Scott added the clarification into the document and asked Rajinder Samra for the necessary data. The committee agreed to review the proposal and send feedback to Scott by Feb. 1. An email vote will then occur on Feb. 4. The plan is to get the proposal to the Curriculum Committee and Senate for their meetings the week of Feb. 11. Also, because the accreditors ask for DE information that is supposed to be included in program reviews, the committee tasked Scott to determine what question(s) might be inputted into the program review update form and send it to Teri Henson.

V. **Board policies/statements on DE:** The district will soon embark on a year-long process to review and revise all Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. This should give us and Chabot a chance to draft policies that meet the accreditation requirements that we have: 1. Evidence that the board has taken the quality of the institution's DE/CE into consideration in the development of the relevant policies and 2. Examples of board statements on DE/CE program quality and integrity. Scott will draft separate policies to bring back to the committee for review.

VI. **Online tutoring:** During Fall 2012, only 3 students utilized synchronous tutoring for Writing. However, 29 utilized asynchronous tutoring for Writing. Only 3 students utilized synchronous

tutoring for Math, and only 3 utilized asynchronous tutoring. Because of this, synchronous online tutoring will be reduced from 4 hours a week to 2 hours, but according to Pauline Trummel, an extra hour can be added in later if needed. Ben MacDonald will provide Math tutoring from 5:30-6:30 p.m. Mondays and 5-6 p.m. Wednesdays, and Brenna Gomer will provide Writing tutoring from 2:30-4:30 on Mondays. Online tutoring will begin Feb. 4, giving us next week to do some marketing.

VII. **Computer proficiency requirements for DE students:** Scott sent an email to district ITS on Jan. 15 asking about the possibility of programming a popup screen or page into Class Web that is presented to students when they try to register for DE classes. The popup screen (or page) would have the necessary info and a button that allows students to Agree. If they do not Agree, they can't register for the class. Info would include: computer proficiency recommendations, a sentence that says the student registering for the course is the one doing the work, students must abide by the colleges' honor codes, maybe some faq's, etc. According to CTO Jeannine Methe, programming a popup screen or page for students during the registration process is an impossibility. However, Jeannine provide some alternatives: 1. Use targeted announcements in the Zone to convey the same info to DE students; 2. Send a mass email to DE students with the info; 3. Add the info to the registration status page that students see after they register for a DE course; or 4. Create a page that students see after registration that gives them the info tells them to click here to acknowledge reading this page. Statistics would then be generated to determine how many students acknowledged reading the page. The latter two options would require programming, which would not begin before this Summer due to other ITS priorities. Scott asked if the committee would like to invite Eric Stricklen to our February meeting to discuss these options further. The committee, instead, to put together some text, send it to ITS, and ask Eric to create a model to show.

VIII. **Guidelines for installing building blocks to Bb:** The committee's revisions were shared with Chabot, which was fine with the revisions and added just one modification. After the subpoint that reads "Typical testing periods are two weeks", Chabot added: "and would include instructors testing their course site(s)." The committee was shown the final draft and asked to vote on it. Jane moved, Chris seconded, and the draft was approved unanimously. It will now be brought to the Academic Senate.

IX. **Student survey results:** The committee reviewed the results. Scott asked what, if any, action needs to be taken as a result of the results. Aside from highlighting more positive open-ended answers from students, the committee felt that faculty should be reminded how to give disabled students more time on exams, more training can be offered on how to optimize content for mobile delivery, and a short video on forwarding Zonemail to personal email accounts can be made and shared with instructors to add a link in their courses. A suggestion was made to show the survey results at a Convocation Day workshop and have faculty share their tips for meeting students' needs.

Scott described and shared a new student satisfaction survey that the state chancellor's office wants to conduct on Fall 2012 students. The survey focus on interaction: learner-content, learner-instructor, learner-learner, learner-technology, and general interactions. It is optional, and the committee was asked if LPC should participate. The committee felt that since we have our own survey, since students from Fall 2012 have already been surveyed, and since the chancellor's office survey is rather lengthy, we would forgo the opportunity to participate. However, we can look at the survey's questions to see if there are any we can use on our survey in the future.

X. **Summer upgrade and Snapshot:** Scott is awaiting word from ITS on whether or not it will contract with Blackboard to provide training and other services so we can use Bb's new method of moving data from Banner to Bb. Snapshot, which currently does this function, is being phased out by Bb. We are still planning to upgrade to version 9.1 Service Pack 9 prior to the start of the Summer 2013 session.

XI. **DE drop policy and Summer term:** During the Summer, Curriculum Chair Jeremiah Bodnar asked if we could provide a translation for our DE drop policy to cover 6- and 8-week terms. We originally told DE instructors that they would have to translate “DE instructors may drop students if they have not submitted work and/or accessed the class for two consecutive weeks” into the corresponding time period for their classes. The committee settled on a time of one week for both 6- and 8-week terms summer terms. Jeremiah will be notified, and if he is OK with this, the committee will vote on it at our February meeting. If approved, it will go to the Senate.

XII. **Academic honesty addition:** At the August meeting, Jane mentioned a scenario of possible student cheating during one of her Summer courses and wanted the committee to discuss adding further language to the Academic Honesty Statement. After viewing the honesty statement, it was decided that the language already in the statement is sufficient.

XIII. **Other issues:** Richard stated that he would like the automated email sent to waitlisted students in DE classes to be clarified. The problem, he said, is that students send an email to the instructor believing that their instructor will reply and add them to the class or reply at all, instead of believing this is just a reminder that if there is an opening, they are still interested. It was decided that the issue would be discussed further at our February meeting.

XIV. **Next meeting:** Friday, Feb. 22, 2013. This meeting will be held from 10-12 in Room 2410 and on Confer.

XV. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.