LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2012
10:00 AM, Room 2410 and CCC CONFER
MINUTES

LPC Members Present:
Scott Vigallon (TLC-Classified; co-chair)
Richard Dry (ALSS; co-chair)
Gina Webster (BSBA)
Javi Pinedo (ASLPC)
Deanna Horvath (ALSS)
Frances Hui (ALSS; Library)
Chris Lee (Student Services)
Jane McCoy (ALSS)

LPC Members Absent:
Vicky Austin (Adjunct Faculty)
Bobby August (STEMPS)
Howard Blumenfeld (STEMPS)
Marilyn Flores (Dean)
Janice Cantua (Admissions & Records)

Guests:

AGENDA:

I. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order by co-chair Scott Vigallon at 10:09 a.m.

II. **Approval of minutes from Oct. 26 meeting:** Frances motioned to approve the minutes, Gina seconded. Minutes approved.

III. **Updates**

- **DE presentation at town meeting:** During the 10-minute presentation, a video of Richard's students was shown that extols the virtues of DE. Scott presented the latest success and retention rates, along with student satisfaction survey results. Richard reported that he received some positive feedback on the presentation.

- **Quality DE Program webinar:** The state chancellor's office is hosting this webinar from 9-noon on Dec. 10. It will address established DE standards, quality components, and things that districts should have in place to have a quality DE program. It will also cover the technical attendance accounting side of DE and potential annual audit implications. The webinar will feature presentations by four colleges that speak first-hand to best practices and DE quality control processes. Scott asked if anyone wanted to participate, let him know.

- **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." It was suggested the sentence should begin: "Specifically, the meeting plus observation shall include…" Jane will bring this suggestion to the FA executive board at a meeting later today.

- **Courses spanning semesters:** District ITS programmed Banner to apparently allow the input of students into Blackboard on a course-by-course basis, while still having the option to Select All to globally activate the process. Scott did some testing but didn't get the results he wanted, but this could have been because testing was done before students registered for classes. However, prior to additional testing, Chris informed Scott that her plans had changed and that

the online portion of her PSCN 25 hybrid courses would begin in January, thereby forgoing the need for this procedure. Scott informed District ITS. Jane added that the FA objected to Chris' original plan since this would alter a faculty member's work obligation. This must be a subject of negotiation.

- **Substantive Change Proposal:** Scott is aiming to complete the proposal by the end of the Fall semester. It will be sent to this committee in January. Please read it and be prepared to vote on its approval at our Jan. 25 meeting. It will then go to the Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate and College Council before going to the Board. It is due to the ACCJC on April 1.

IV. **DE vs. Correspondence courses – Regular effective contact policy:** Scott presented the policy again to the Academic Senate on Nov. 14. At that meeting, the Senate moved to approve the policy but decided to hold off voting on it until the FA reviewed it. The FA identified items in the policy, such as Frequency of contact, that it considered subjects of negotiation and recommended that the policy be revised. Scott amended the items, changed the word “policy” to “guidelines” then sent it back to the FA. On Nov. 19, Jane sent the revised document to the voting members on this committee with an explanation of the situation. The voting members voted unanimously to approve it. At the Nov. 28 Senate meeting, the Senate voted to approve it. Since the Curriculum Committee approved the original document, it was sent to the Curriculum chair, asking him to put the guidelines on the Dec. 12 Curriculum agenda as an information item. Scott will send the document to all DE instructors, post it on the committee’s Grapevine site, reference it in the Substantive Change Proposal, and reference it in many faculty training and DE informational documents.

V. **DE faculty survey results:** The survey was launched Nov. 5 and had an excellent return rate of 71 percent (37 respondents). Frances was able to procure prizes. John Gonder won the grand prize, a choice of either an LPC t-shirt or sweatshirt from the bookstore. Steve Navarro won the second prize, an LPC t-shirt from the President’s office, and adjuncts Amy Chovnick and Mary Lauffer both won LPC aluminum water bottles, also from the President’s office. Results will be posted to the committee’s Grapevine site.

The committee reviewed the results, and Scott asked if any action needs to be taken based on any results. The satisfaction questions on the survey had generally positive results, so the committee decided that no action on those were necessary. Those instructors who inputted their names to receive training on specific topics have been contacted, and training has been or will be set up. It was suggested that a DE instructor who has successfully used Blackboard’s upgraded rubrics tool present her usage of that tool to other DE instructors. It was also suggested that training be conducted on some of the more popular topics that instructors identified on the survey. Perhaps workshops can be offered at Convocation Day if the program of that day is similar to the program last August. In the meantime, Scott offers individual training on any of those topics at instructors’ requests.

Not only was the 71 percent return rate on the faculty survey a result of the incentives that were offered, but the committee also felt it was buoyed by Scott sending individual emails to instructors as opposed to sending a mass email. Because of that, Richard said it might help increase the number of student responses to the survey that is launched as part of the DE evaluation of instruction process. This would probably have to be done by District ITS and would definitely need to be approved by the FA. Jane will ask the FA about this before any action is taken.

The annual student survey will be launched Monday, Dec. 3. An email went to all DE faculty on Nov. 28. The committee requested that next year, the survey be launched before the last day to withdraw with a W in order to capture results from students who have dropped. Therefore, beginning in 2013, the survey will be launched at the beginning of November.

VI. **Student complaint process requirement:** The state chancellor's office is recommending that all colleges adhere to the state authorization stipulation that says: "The institution must also provide its students or prospective students with contact information for filing complaints with its accreditor and with its State approval or licensing entity and any other relevant State official or agency that would appropriately handle a student's complaint." Scott created a web page and linked it to the Online Learning site to meet this requirement.

VII. **Board policies/statements on DE:** The state chancellor's office is reiterating that for accreditation purposes, we must attempt to go beyond meeting the requirement of using password-protected logins into course management systems. According to the latest DE Institutional Survey, 23.4% of CCCs have policies at the Board of Trustees level, and 77.6% don't. Scott showed Cabrillo College's proposed board policy on authentication.

Two of the items in the DE guidelines for the ACCJC say we need: 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 showed an example board policy from the Grossmont Cuyamaca district.

The committee laid out 2 options for dealing with the issue. First, Chris said that since the board ultimately approves curriculum, which includes new DE courses, it is already making a statement on DE quality. That should be good enough to satisfy the requirement. Second, we could do a presentation to the board on quality and integrity, then have the board make a statement that we can use as evidence. For either option, we will have to join forces with Chabot since a board policy or statement is district-wide.

VIII. **Online tutoring:** A banner was created and put on the LPC home page as a way to advertise the service. It stayed on the page for nearly 2 weeks. However, it didn't help much as students don't seem to be signing up for synchronous online tutoring. Richard said that asynchronous tutoring for Reading and Writing is starting to pick up. Scott spoke to Tutoring Center coordinator Pauline Trummel about just offering asynchronous online tutoring in the future. He will check with Pauline about funding for synchronous tutoring this Spring. If funding is unavailable, we will plan to just offer asynchronous tutoring in the Spring and beyond.

IX. **Computer proficiency requirements for DE students:** At the October meeting, Marilyn said at her former college, a computer proficiency requirement was programmed into the student information systems, and students had to pass this requirement before registering. Scott queried the DE coordinators' listserv to find out if other colleges have such prerequisites. He shared the responses with the committee. He also said that on a DE subgroup call with Chabot on Nov. 27, it was questioned whether computer proficiency is as valid as it was a few years ago since many students are using mobile devices now. Jane asked about the possibility of having a popup page confront students when they try to register for an online course that lists proficiency requirements and academic honesty information, and the students have to click "I agree" before being allowed to register. Scott said he thought something similar was brought to District ITS years ago but went nowhere. Nevertheless, since this is a district-wide idea, it will be discussed with Chabot.

X. **Policy for installing building blocks to Bb:** Scott mentioned that Bb admins at LPC and Chabot struggle with whether or not to install building blocks each time an instructor requests one from a textbook publisher. We currently have no process. These building blocks are add-ons to Bb that allow for additional, specialized functionality. Any time something is added to the Bb system, there is a potential for harm. At the least, these can add lots of unnecessary items to menus within Bb. On the DE subgroup call Sept. 20, Chabot and LPC agreed that Scott would draft a policy surrounding the installation of building blocks from textbook publishers.

At its last Committee On Online Learning meeting, Chabot reportedly was fine with the draft policy but made one slight change. The LPC committee made a few modifications, including adding a time frame for a testing period. Scott also said we might want to consider replacing the

word “policy” with “guidelines.” The updated document will be shared with Chabot.

XI. **DE drop policy and Summer term:** Due to time considerations, this issue was tabled.

XII. **Academic honesty addition:** Due to time considerations, this issue was tabled.

XIII. **Next meeting:** Friday, Jan. 25, 2013. This meeting will be held from 10-12 in Room 2410 and on Confer.

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