



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE AGENDA**

November 9, 2010

3:30 p.m. – 4:30p.m. Room BE243

**The next and final meeting this semester will occur at the same time, same room on
November 23, 2010**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS**
- 3. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. October 26, 2010 DEC Meeting**
- 5. REPORT**
 - a. Accreditation Recommendations - Ms. Patricia Márquez**
- 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - a. Review revision of HD 1980: Orientation to College as online course – Rick Balogh**
 - b. Corrections/additions to SORT questionnaire – Dr. Nancy Bednar**
 - c. BCSED Academic Computing Concerns (was listed as CA 103, 107 lab concerns on last meeting’s agenda) – Dr. O’Neil**
 - d. Strata recommendation #3 “The establishment of two advisory committees...” – Rick Balogh**
 - e. Continue discussion of provision for faculty to download software – Rick Balogh**
- 7. OTHER**
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

November 9, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT		MEMBERS ABSENT	GUESTS
Rick Balogh	Mike Wilmes	Nancy Cholvin	Patricia Marquez
Bonnie Curry		Joseph West	
Dr. Nancy Bednar		Dr. Tom O'Neil	
Dr. Forte-Parnell		Priscilla Jenison	
Connie Moise		Dr. Youssef Ezzeddine	
Ken Shafer			
Ken Sawicki			
Greg Krynen			

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Rick Balogh, Distance Education Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:34 PM.

2. **COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS** – Dr. Parnell read the following to the members present: *Distance Education Report:* A new report by the LAO examines distance education at the state's three segments of public higher education. The report notes that most distance education in the public sector is done at community colleges where distance education accounted for approximately 10% of FTES last year. The report is another in the Analyst's series examining higher education in California as the Master Plan turns 50. The LAO concludes that distance education can offer an important alternative means to increase access for students as a compliment to traditional in-person education. The LAO makes a number of recommendations, including looking at ways to create on-line degree completion programs for those who started college, but never had a chance to complete.

Dr. Parnell felt that the college is right in line with what the report states with doing our new online orientation and adding additional online classes.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – none

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Mr. Balogh asked members if there were any corrections to be made to the October 26, 2010 minutes. Corrections were supplied by Ms. Moise through e-mail and Mr. Balogh explained them to the committee members. Mr. Balogh asked for a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. A motion was made and seconded to approve the corrected minutes and with no further discussion, the minutes were approved.

5. REPORTS

- a. **Accreditation Recommendations (Patricia Marquez)**– Ms. Marquez stated that it is sometimes hard to correlate from the exit review that was conducted on October 21 with what will actually appear on the report. She stated that a number of people, including

herself, had been interviewed by the committee members and her questioning centered on the STRATA Report with its recommendations and how it will keep faculty and the campus moving forward with its needs and demands. The recommendation that was verbally offered was to reconfigure the Information Technology Advisor Committee to set more equitable technology priorities to meet administration and instructional needs. Once we receive the draft, hopefully next week (which is confidential), we will review it and if it contains something that does not sound like what they appeared to have said, she will let Mr. Balogh and Dr. Parnell know. From there, it will go to the Commission and they may keep it as is or change it a number of ways. We will not know this until it comes back to us in February. She feels it would be a good idea to begin working on this before the report arrives. She is working on the Substantive Change Report that speaks to online instruction and so some of the concerns that we are trying to address need to be put into that report.

Mr. Balogh shared with the members the interview he had with Mr. Walton. This gentleman seemed to be a bit confused at first in regard to the past relationship between ITS and faculty. He was given some history in this regard. He asked a few more questions of Mr. Balogh about the current situation of how faculty deal with technology issues. He mentioned to Mr. Balogh that he came from a technology background and would be more than willing to help us or find someone who could help us with improving the negative perception that faculty currently have regarding technology. Ms. Moise did not say anything further to the interview.

Some of the issues addressed to Ms. Marquez was how were faculty trained to become online teachers and what resources did they have to stay current. They questioned what was the relationship of AP&P in regard to distance education, which comes into play when courses are approved to be taught online. They did not seem to question the security aspect if the student enrolled in the class was actually that person.

In referring back to the STRATA Report, it was recommended that we appoint a faculty to become the head of the advisory group for computing. Ms. Marquez relayed to the members the history within the CCC to determine what should be done in this regard. Since they could not come to a conclusion, it was recommended that STRATA be invited to come to review the situation and respond back with their recommendations from an impartial position. STRATA came back with recommending that we have an Advisory Committee for Academic and Instructional Computing. What CCC decided to do was have the DEC Committee look at the report and see what they could take on as well as determine what should be handled by the Information Technology Committee. Ms. Marquez stated that in response to one of the recommendations, we need to speak to the dialogue. What is it that you are conversing about and the different aspects and pieces of what evidence you are using to determine that these are the steps we should follow? In looking at the Substantive Change Report, we look at the courses taught, how successful are the students taking those courses and how many of them are being used to lead to that degree or certificate. The perspective of the student to determine if they are adequately prepared to take an online course and if the faculty is sufficiently trained to teach it are major factors in regard to the institution of creating this new committee. Should some of the responsibilities be turned over from the DEC to this new sub-committee, which must be approved by the Senate? If we go back to the Standards sections in our accreditation

report, we can see that it speaks to the need for this sub-committee and establishing its priorities, and hopefully the work it does meets or exceeds the recommendations from the accreditation team. We will not know exactly which standards to refer to until the final is returned to us next year. But if you refer to the prior recommendations section in our self-study and look at them for style and content, you will get an idea of which standards will refer back to what recommendations that are in the final document.

Ms. Marquez recommends that we become proactive on working on the recommendations that were relayed to us in the STRATA Report. Dr. Fisher was engaged in a private conversation with Dr. Kinsella just before the exit report. Their conversation centered around the recommendations received by us from the STRATA Report and it would be a very smart move on our part to proceed to enact them. The committee members who came to our campus are not going to tell us what to do procedurally, but they would strongly make a suggestion in regard to the report that we had commissioned. Ms. Moise referred back to the ITS Review Task Force that had been commissioned by the CCC. The task force was asked to recommend an organizational structure that would address some of the computing support concerns. While the ITS Review Task Force was not in agreement as a group in that particular thing, they were in agreement on a number of other recommendations which they did make prior to the STRATA consultant coming out. She wanted to set the record straight that the task force was not ineffective or could not come up with anything or agree on it, they did come up with quite a few recommendations that were then submitted to the CCC, at which point the college decided to employ the services of STRATA. Ms. Moise wanted to state that there had been quite a bit of agreement with the task force, but Ms. Marquez stated that after much review and discussion, it was decided that the best course at that time was to hire STRATA.

Ms. Marquez mentioned that once the report is returned to the college, it is considered confidential and can only be viewed by Dr. Fisher, Ms. Lowry and herself. They are allowed to challenge anything that's factual in the report, but are unable to change how it is written, the tone or the recommendations it contains. Once it gets to the Commission and they act on it, then it will have public access and can be distributed to the campus.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Review revision of HD 1980: Orientation to College as online course (Rick Balogh)–

Mr. Balogh stated that the committee has lost connectivity with AP&P on reviewing courses that would be taught online. Mr. Echeverria wants to make HD1980 a hybrid course. Dr. Bednar does not see that he is showing any evidence that since this is an orientation to college, he is not showing any difference between a hybrid, online or face-to-face course. A section should be written to address this. She would also like to have class etiquette encouraged (even a section), or as she calls it, netiquette. Also, the online student orientation should be included as a link. This appears to be a good course for the first time student. Mr. Balogh mentioned that it is already being taught online so the only change is to make it a hybrid. He will return these concerns to AP&P.

b. Corrections/additions to SORT questionnaire (Dr. Bednar) – Dr. Bednar has received no e-mails on the questionnaire since the last meeting. She still feels that we need to sit down with Priscilla Jenison to create a document on the correct vocabulary for the ESL student. They need to bring up each instance and make sure it is marked before sending it off to Mr. Burns for incorporation. We also need to make sure we are recommending

AVC classes, not Georgia classes, and adapt it to the AVC campus. We also need to coordinate with Mr. Krynen to make sure the online quizzes are fully functioning. Mr. Balogh will arrange this.

- c. **BCSED Academic Computing Concerns (was listed as CA103, 107 lab concerns on last meeting's agenda (Dr. O'Neil)**– Mr. Balogh inquired how many had read the white paper that had been included as an attachment for this meeting. He asked if any members wished him to request Dr. Beyer come to our meeting to answer any questions. Dr. Bednar stated that the paper contains two sections and you would need to read the first before addressing the second. Ms. Moise stated that all you need to do is go to the recommendations page and stated that a number of references in the first part of the document were 3- years old. Both Ms. Moise and Mr. Wilmes thought the report was not accurate or incomplete on some points. Dr. Bednar reiterated that we need to see what can be done to make those labs work and give the students the opportunity to become competent in the real world. But she was also knowledgeable that our budget may not make some of this possible.

Mr. Wilmes feels that this whole situation can be summed up in one word – communication, either from ITS to the division or back the other way. This whole situation evolved from an e-mail sent to the division by one of the ITS technicians to inform them that technology is changing. This is not to mean that ITS is changing, but that it was following the trends of technology in the world and trying to make them work better for the whole campus. The intent was to solicit input on recommended solutions, but instead sent back to ITS inflammatory statements on how they would do things. He states that what we need to have is an avenue of communication with faculty that would be on an intimate level for them to discuss with ITS their needs. ITS even has a dedicated lab technician for the division and they are not utilizing that person to relay their concerns. They have instead resorted to the situation we have now. Unfortunately, we are only able to supply this tech until 4:30 p.m. each day and labs are going until 10:00 p.m., but budget does not allow us to hire another person. It would be nice if faculty approached ITS in a cordial way to present their concerns and request help in solving them. One of the major issues that have come up is admin rights and why they cannot have them. They are very vague about what they want to install on campus computers and will not work with ITS to determine if this would be acceptable.

Dr. Bednar understands all of the concerns on both sides of the issue here but feels that we somehow need to relay the need to the board that money needs to be spent on supplying these items so we can bring the situation up to speed.

Ms. Moise requests that all members review all of the responses she has given to the recommendations that the division has stated and can show that ITS can find a solution to just about all of them. She would be more than willing to forward her paper to all members. She was requested by Mr. Balogh to go over each recommendation and solution in order on the list since he was present at the division discussion and could reply to each. On the first one, the concern came up about needing “fat clients” for the labs. Mr. Wilmes proceeded to explain to the members the difference between “thin clients” and “fat clients” so they would understand the concerns they were expressing. Unfortunately, the references that the division white paper refers to are more than four years old and ITS could solve the problem with much more up-to-date computers and

knowledge. One of the new technology solutions are what are called “pc blades”. Mr. Wilmes went into a description on these and apologized for the detail. But what should be understood is that ITS is already moving in that direction with its Open Campus Initiative and utilizing these “blades”, even using them for classes that will be taught at Palmdale.

Ms. Moise went through the rest of the recommendations from ITS including addressing their concerns again about admin rights. She stated that there would be no problem doing this as long as the faculty member would be held accountable for configuration problems that cause trouble for subsequent classes using that lab. Administrative rights should be revoked in such cases, as well as in any case that is found to be in violation of existing policies regarding district computer use. We also need to be aware that the Business Office will also have concerns about any software that we do not carry a license and purchase agreement before it is installed.

Mr. Balogh explained that the people who teach these courses are a very small minority of the campus faculty as a whole. They have valid concerns that must be addressed as stated at the end summary of the BCSED report because they know what they need to teach their classes. He stated that at least 2 labs be reserved for teaching only BCSED computer-related labs so that if an instructor reconfigures the lab in the course of a class, the other instructors can deal with returning the lab to its former condition much more easily than an instructor from outside the expertise of computer science; in other words, do not make those labs open labs but keep them only for BCSED. It was recommended by Mr. Wilmes that the lab tech that supports this division and the computer tech that supports him have a meeting with the concerned individuals and see if they can work out their differences. It was recommended that Mr. Balogh attend that meeting. Mr. Balogh re-emphasized the importance of configuring the labs exactly as the BCSED report describes because the instructors who teach classes in those labs must have them configured according to their needs so that instruction is not compromised.

- d. **STRATA recommendation #3 – “The establishment of two advisory committees. . .” (Rick Balogh)** – There is not enough time to discuss this item today so it has been decided by the committee that it will be postponed to the next and final meeting. It was recommended that the IT Committee be invited to join in.
- e. **Continue discussion of provision for faculty to download software (Rick Balogh)** – this item has been postponed.

8. OTHER - none

- 9. ADJOURNMENT** - A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the Distance Education Committee meeting at 4:40 PM. Motion carried.

pag