



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
March 22, 2011
3:45 p.m. – 4:45p.m. Room BE242**

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. 11/23/10
- b. 3/8/11

5) ACTION ITEMS

- a) Change the name of DEC
 - Distance Education and Technology Committee OR
 - Technology and Education Committee OR
 - Technology and Distance Education Committee OR
 - Technology in Education Committee
- b) Request that a member of the DEC also serve as IT Committee Rep
- c) Change the mission statement of newly renamed Distance Education Committee
 - The _____(name to be determined) Committee's mission is two-fold: first, to assist in the planning and implementation of Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) used by instructors and staff in the preparation and delivery of educational materials; and second, to provide guidance and recommendations in the pedagogical development of both traditional and distance education classrooms.

6) DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a) Evaluation instrument for screening of new distance education classes – Rick Balogh
- b) Courses asking for DEC review – Rick Balogh
- b) Concerns with Blackboard Managed Hosting Report Card – Rick Balogh

7) REPORTS

- a) Podcasting workgroup
- b) Accessibility workgroup

8) OTHER

9) 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

March 22, 2011

3:45 pm – 4:45 pm, Room BE242

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Rick Balogh, Distance Education Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:47 PM.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS – Mr. Balogh had no opening comments nor did Dr. Parnell.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – none

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

a. **11/23/10** – Mr. Balogh asked for a motion to approve these minutes. A motion was made and seconded. Discussion ensued by Mr. Wilmes that a correction should be made to Item 8b. He wished to inform the committee that, at the direction of Ms. Connie Moise, his work schedule would change to reflect a requirement that doing patches on the server would be handled on every third Sunday of the month between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Also, Ms. Moise stated this would be the most appropriate time schedule as each outage would only last between 5-10 minutes. With no further discussion or corrections, the motion was voted on. It was approved with three abstentions.

b. **3/8/11** – Mr. Balogh asked for a motion to approve these minutes. A motion was made and seconded. Discussion followed that Dr. Parnell would like to make a change to her comments under Action Item *a*. This refers to the Chancellor's Office might (not would) want distance education to remain in the name of our committee as committee name, correspondence, etc. still carries it. For this reason, she feels that we should maintain distance education in the change of our committee name. This change was made in the minutes. With no further discussion or corrections, the vote was approved with no abstentions.

5. ACTION ITEMS [DISCUSSION ITEMS]

a. Change the name of our committee to one of the following:

- Distance Education and Technology Committee OR
- Technology and Education Committee OR

- Technology and Distance Education Committee OR
- Technology in Education Committee

Mr. Balogh requested from the members if there were any more choices that they would like entertained by the committee. One member liked #4 but Mr. Balogh reminded those, as stated by Dr. Parnell, that the word “distance education” should remain. This eliminates #s 2 and 4. He then took a vote of those favoring which name. The vote was unanimous for choice #1. This will be in accordance with the STRATA Report directive. He requested a motion from the members to forward this choice to the Senate. A motion was made and seconded and with no further discussion, the vote was unanimous to forward this to the Senate.

b. Ask Senate to make one of the existing 2 Senate reps to IT Committee be a member of the DEC -

Mr. Wilmes explained that there needed to be clarification. Dr. Bednar felt it important that this be a faculty member for this position. Mr. Wilmes stated that the Senate currently has two faculty representatives on the IT Committee. The recommendation that he is putting forward is that one of the two IT Senate slots be reserved for someone also serving on the DETC Committee as well. Stated again, he wanted to be sure that one of the appointed members of the Senate to the IT Committee also be a member of the DETC Committee as well as being a faculty member. The members of IT that are on the DETC Committee right now are only looking at things from a technical standpoint and not from the standpoint of a faculty member who is teaching in a classroom. Mr. Korwin stated that the recommendation be as follows: request that the Senate assign a faculty committee member of the DETC to also serve as one of its two appointees to the IT Committee. A motion was made and seconded to approve this statement as the recommendation that will be forwarded to the Senate in accordance with the STRATA Report. The motion was approved unanimously.

c. Change to Mission Statement –

- The Distance Education and Technology Committee’s mission is two-fold: first, to assist in the planning and implementation of Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) used by instructors and staff in the preparation and delivery of educational materials; and second, to provide guidance and recommendations in the pedagogical development and technology in both traditional and distance education.

The new mission statement as it now reads came about from previous meeting discussions. With the new committee name installed, it reads as above. Mr. Balogh brought up the issue that, perhaps, the word “classrooms” should be removed. The members discussed this further and decided that the word “courses” should replace it. After further discussion, the members decided to eliminate that word and the sentence would end at education. At this point, Dr. Bednar moved to accept the above as the mission statement for the DETC. No second was made. Mr. Wilmes stated that we were not providing any clarifier that we deal with technology components and that we are trying to replace AP&P. He feels that with this statement, it charters us into any area where we are giving guidance and recommendations to “any” class, not with just technology issues. Dr. Bednar states that we do have the right to provide this guidance to any online class. Mr. Wilmes still wanted to be sure that we were not overstepping the bounds of the committee. It was now agreed that the wording for the second part would read: and second, to provide guidance and recommendations in the pedagogical development and technology in both traditional and distance education. Mr. Balogh wanted to be sure that we were not duplicating the first part into the second. Mr. Wilmes stated that the first part is the acquisition, installation and the institution providing technology for

instructional purposes and the second part is using it. Dr. Bednar substituted a new motion to accept the mission statement as it now reads. It was seconded and with no further discussion, the motion was approved.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Evaluation instrument for screening new distance education classes (Rick Balogh) – Mr. Balogh spoke to the committee about the need for new online courses being approved by DETC. He gave history on the old form that was used whereby the faculty filled it out, attached the COR and submitted it to AP&P. That committee would then request approval from DETC. If it was approved, it was forwarded back to AP&P for final approval. If not, comments would be forwarded to the faculty for either clarification or correction. As a point of discussion, he has forwarded copies to the members from a school in Georgia (permission given) of their form for approval of online courses. The courses are already in Blackboard and can be viewed by the committee members, making it much easier to visualize the course. Unfortunately, the three page form now for CurricUNET are for courses that are not in Blackboard yet and the members are being asked to understand the concept the faculty instructor is proposing. It makes it very difficult for us to proceed. Mr. Krynen asked why the course could not be put on the test server. Mr. Balogh relayed that he had spoken to Ms. Beverly Beyer who is on AP&P about this. She felt that it would be unfair to the instructor to go through all of the work to put it together. She felt that it was the responsibility of the DETC to answer the questions on the form from just the information provided by the instructor. Dr. Bednar stated that anyone can ascertain the format and content of what her online course will contain just from the information that she provides in her syllabus. She only knows of one college in Texas that goes through an elaborate process of creating a committee who creates a master course, then reviewed by others, then piloted and finally released to instructors to use. Since we do not have this type of system here, it makes it very unfair of us to try and determine a good course from a bad one.

Mr. Wilmes made the point that when a face-to-face COR is presented to AP&P, there is leeway in what the instructor plans to do and things are basically not set in stone. The same would hold true for an online course utilizing Blackboard. He wanted to point out that AP&P is not being given the actual test to look at. He mentioned that what is it that the DETC is supposed to be looking at that is beyond the extent of AP&P. If you are going to be teaching a course using technology of any sort, you are going to stipulate that and, to an extent, how you are going to use that technology to facilitate the class. It will be listed in the COR. So there seems no way for the DETC to evaluate a course beyond what is already provided. Mr. Balogh did mention, though, that the TMI form does ask specific questions about the online environment. They want our opinion, as distance education people, to see if there are any problems with a particular course. Dr. Bednar felt it would also create a problem in the fact the course would be in CurricUNET and not all of the members of DETC would be allowed to log on. She wondered if we would have to create a sub-committee that had permission in CurricUNET to review the course and report back to the main committee on their determination.

Mr. Korwin mentioned that when he was in New Mexico, an instructor would have the course already in Blackboard and then present a demo. The committee would then give an evaluation. Dr. Bednar again brought up Ms. Beyer's concern about an instructor going through all the work to produce an online course in Blackboard and then have the committee

disapprove it. She also stated that the whole course did not need to be put in Blackboard but could be placed in the test server with perhaps maybe a week or two or a unit which would give the committee something to look at. All other steps with AP&P would have been accomplished with the last step being a review by DETC within the test server. Mr. Balogh stated that the old TMI is what is now in CurricUNET. We could get the COR or just get the answers to the questions on the form and go over them. Dr. Bednar also stated her concerns about Question #2 in regard to having taken courses through the California Virtual University. AVC does not require this of our instructors if they wish to teach an online course. She feels, though, that it would be a good idea for us to inquire of those instructors if they have gone through training in how to do an online class, whether it is from training here on campus or from some other source. It would definitely been a good idea if they knew the ins and outs of Blackboard before taking on the challenge of teaching a class online.

Dr. Cholvin also mentioned that she felt we should be in a very “friendly” mode to any instructors who wish to teach online and do not have the training. We could help them secure that training here on campus and be much more prepared to teach the class. Another thing brought up was the difference between teaching students in a face-to-face class as opposed to an online one. A better way to rephrase the question in the form would be to ask if a person has ever taken courses in online teaching instead of demanding that they take certain ones. They could list the ones they have taken and let the committee determine if that would give them enough education to go forth. Dr. Bednar also relayed that an instructor needs to also be able to teach online as well as to develop that course from scratch. The instructor would also have to prepare a COR in order to change the course from face-to-face to either hybrid or totally online. In addition, a whole new management style would have to be learned but it should not be expected that they know everything. That would be one of the purposes of the DETC members to help those instructors. Mr. Balogh queried if we should make comments to the questions on the form and forward back to the AP&P right now. Most felt that they would need more time to evaluate each one and request that the form be forwarded to them by e-mail. Also, Dr. O’Neil suggested that Maria Clinton and/or Melissa Jauregui be invited to the next meeting. This will give us guidance so we can get an idea of what we are to expect and what they are looking for. Mr. Wilmes also suggested that we design a rubric that could be used to evaluate but Dr. Bednar mentioned that one probably already exists on the internet. This type of form can used for either the instructor to use as a guide as well as for DETC members to use for evaluation. Dr. Bednar wanted to be sure that we inform new instructors to online classes that what they use for in-class courses will not work for online courses. Mr. Shafer felt that AP&P is looking at the COR to see if it complies with requirements and DETC would be looking at a course to recommend or advise if the technical and delivery side will work.

Dr. Bednar has been to online conferences where they state that you can teach every course online but she feels that this is not feasible because some require that you do hands on such as aerospace fabrication and maintenance. Dr. O’Neil stated that the San Francisco Institute of Art is teaching such things as sculpture online, but he feels that it would involve developing simulations that would substitute for the hands on. It would take a lot of work but he feels that there is nothing than cannot be taught online. It just depends on the tools you have to be able to develop that class. But Dr. Bednar still feels that such things as athletics, symphony and dance must still be done face-to-face. There are also courses that utilize simulation, such

as medicine and space, that the student would accomplish before they ever stepped into the real world.

b. Courses asking for DEC review (Rick Balogh) - refer to above.

c. Concerns with Blackboard Managed Hosting Report Card (Rick Balogh) – Mr. Balogh brought up the issue that had been voiced previously concerning the Blackboard account of an incomplete student. It was stated that this shell needs to stay open for one year in the class they signed up for and not be moved to a new section. If this is done and if the student is doing an online class, instructors would find it almost difficult to integrate them in. This could also bring up issues of ethics. If the student did not complete the work in that time frame, they would receive an F grade. It was agreed that instructors would be notified that those students would be notified that the shell would remain open for that time period.

Mr. Korwin reported on the issue of our overage with Blackboard. He has procured copies of contracts from prior years and he has been trying to get in touch with the rep to see what options we would have in order to move up in usage and at what cost. He also mentioned that maybe we could wait for all of the incompletes to drop off and that might bring us back to our quota. Mr. Wilmes mentioned that any student in an active class will have a shell and the incompletes are added to this total. He did mention also that we carry two prior year's classes within Blackboard and at that point he will start archiving the oldest. Mr. Shafer wondered why a student would need access to Blackboard if they are now labeled incomplete. He feels that it could all be accomplished by face-to-face meetings with the instructor. Dr. Bednar disagrees in that she needs the student to have their Blackboard account for her online classes. They need this in order to go in and get the assignments they need to finish. The final question came up if the number of shells could be cut in response to the number of classes we must cut in regard to the budget issue. Only time will tell on this.

7. REPORTS

a. Podcasting workgroup – none

b. Accessibility workgroup – AP&P has stated they would like accessibility guidelines. Also, it was requested by deans and admin assistants that the Advanced Search option be placed back on Blackboard. Previously, this had caused the BANNER server to die but now that we have the new upgrades, we can add it back in.

8. OTHER - none

9. ADJOURNMENT - A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the Distance Education Committee meeting at 4:59 PM. Motion carried.

pag