



Distance Education and Technology Committee Agenda

Tuesday, May 8, 2018
 3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
 L-201

Type of Meeting: Regular
Please Review/Bring: Agenda Packet

Committee Members:
 Perry Jehlicka, Co-Chair
 Dr. Bonnie Suderman, Co-Chair
 Greg Bormann, VPAA Co-Chair Designee
 Dr. Tom O'Neil, Administrative Member
 Walter Briggs, Counseling Faculty Representative
 Dr. Scott Lee, AP&P Representative
 Jimmie Bowen, Faculty Member
 Rona Brynin – Faculty Member
 Mary Rose Toll, Faculty Member
 Kathy Osburn, Faculty Member
 Ken Sawicki, ITS Alternative Media Specialist
 John Toth, AVFCT Member
 Sheri Langaman, Classified Union Representative
 Dr. Ed Beyer, Instructional Designer
 Rick Shaw, ITS Management Member
 Greg Krynen, ITS Technical Trainer
 Mike Wilmes, Blackboard Administrator
 Darnell White, IMC Representative

Guests:

Items	Person	Action
I. Call to Order	Perry Jehlicka	
II. Approval of Agenda	Perry Jehlicka	
III. Opening Comments from Co-chairs	Perry Jehlicka	
IV. Open Comments from the Public		
V. Approval of Minutes	All	A. April 10, 2018 DETC Meeting
VI. Discussion Items	Perry Jehlicka Greg Bormann Dr. Ed Beyer Dr. Ed Beyer	A. Rubric & Course Design Review Process - Update B. Implementation Timeline C. Synchronous Online Classes D. Online Course Faculty Evaluation
VII. Action Items		
VIII. Adjournment		
NEXT MEETING: 5/22/18		



Distance Education and Technology Committee Minutes

Tuesday, April 24, 2018
 3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
 L-201

Type of Meeting: Regular
Please Review/Bring: Agenda Packet

Committee Members:

- Perry Jehlicka, Co-Chair
- Dr. Bonnie Suderman, Co-Chair
- Greg Bormann, VPAA Co-Chair Designee
- Dr. Tom O'Neil, Administrative Member - ABSENT
- Walter Briggs, Counseling Faculty Representative - ABSENT
- Dr. Scott Lee, AP&P Representative
- Jimmie Bowen, Faculty Member
- Rona Brynin – Faculty Member
- Mary Rose Toll, Faculty Member
- Kathy Osburn, Faculty Member
- Ken Sawicki, ITS Alternative Media Specialist
- John Toth, AVFCT Member
- Sheri Langaman, Classified Union Representative
- Dr. Ed Beyer, Instructional Designer
- Rick Shaw, ITS Management Member - ABSENT
- Greg Krynen, ITS Technical Trainer - ABSENT
- Mike Wilmes, Blackboard Administrator
- Darnell White, IMC Representative - ABSENT

Guests:

Items	Person	Action
I. Call to Order	Perry Jehlicka	
II. Approval of Agenda	Perry Jehlicka	<p><i>A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as presented.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item VI.E. added to the agenda – <i>Category Definitions</i>, Dr. Ed Beyer. <p><i>Motion carried unanimously.</i></p>
III. Opening Comments from Co-chairs	<p>Perry Jehlicka</p> <p>Greg Bormann</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perry asked for a proxy to attend the IT Tech Committee meeting on Thursday. Jimmy Bowen volunteered. • AVC is close to getting first course submitted for OEI. • Open registration for online convention in Anaheim (June) – see Perry if interested. • All supporting documents for meetings must be submitted at the proper time for inclusion in the agenda packet. Handouts are not be permitted during the meeting.
IV. Open Comments from the Public		
V. Approval of Minutes	All	A. April 10, 2018 DETC Meeting (attachment)



		<p><i>A motion was made and seconded to approve minutes of the April 10, 2018 DETC meeting. Motion carried with one (1) abstention.</i></p>
VI. Discussion Items	<p>Perry Jehlicka</p> <p>Greg Bormann</p> <p>Dr. Ed Beyer</p> <p>Dr. Ed Beyer</p> <p>Dr. Ed Beyer</p>	<p>A. Rubric & Course Design Review Process – Update Perry presented the Rubric at the April 19, 2018 Academic Senate meeting. Senators will provide feedback at the May 3, 2018 meeting. On schedule to present to campus.</p> <p>B. Implementation Timeline Unable to reach anyone at OEI. Dean Bormann has an upcoming meeting with OEI and hopes to address issues and get answers then. OEI is consumed with registration and financial aid issues, as well as technical issues - all need resolution in order to grow.</p> <p>C. Synchronous Online Classes Two faculty members teaching online require students to meet online from 6-9 p.m. on a weeknight. Students are unaware of the requirement when registering, and find themselves unable to take a campus class on a weeknight. Dr. Beyer suggested adding the term <i>asynchronous</i> to the DE online definitions. Perry noted faculty must disclose when students must meet so students are aware before enrollment.</p> <p>D. Online Course Faculty Evaluation <i>Item Removed</i></p> <p>E. Category Definitions Dr. Beyer reported the senate rejected the AP&P recommendation regarding DE online definitions. He distributed a handout to include his proposed revisions to the Distance Education Course Categories Definitions. Dr. Beyer will send the document to Dean Bormann, Melissa, Dr. Wiewall, Dr. Suderman and Deb Sullivan Ford. Dr. Scott Lee who serves as the DE Liaison for AP&P will add the item to the AP&P Agenda. Discussion tabled for AP&P Review and outcome.</p>
VII. Action Items		
VIII. Adjournment		<p>The Distance Education and Technology Committee meeting of April 24, 2018 was adjourned at 4:05 p.m. by Perry Jehlicka, Co-chair.</p>
NEXT MEETING: 5/8/18		

Proposed Revisions
to the
Distance Education Course
Categories Definitions

Ed Beyer, PhD
Computer Applications Professor
Antelope Valley College
April 21, 2018

Introduction

At Antelope Valley College, students have the option to take college courses through two basic delivery methods, either on campus in a traditional classroom, or through distance education using communication technologies. Students select courses using the college class schedule, which identifies classes by available sections, and if a section is offered online using communication technologies, it is given an OL designation. Recently, a HY designation was added to indicate that the course is delivered using a hybrid method in which 51 percent or more of the course instruction/communication occurs online throughout the semester, with a requirement for meeting on campus, as opposed to an OL designation, which indicates that the course is conducted completely online without any campus meetings. The typical, but not sole, use of the hybrid format is to provide students with an initial course orientation, to conduct in-person learning assessments, or for other instructional purposes where students might benefit from a face-to-face meeting.

Background

The amount of online instruction that takes place in a course is important for purposes of reporting distance education data through the Chancellor's Office Management Information System. According to Title 5 Section 55210, if instruction occurs through distance education "for at least 51 percent of the hours of instruction in the course or course section," regardless of whether the course is considered fully online or hybrid, the district is required to report specific and related data on the course as a distance education course. This suggests that when course instruction is more than 49% *on campus*, even though the class may be considered distance education because it uses communication technologies, according to the Title 5 definition, which states that distance education occurs when students and teachers are separated by distance and that interaction occurs using communication technologies, the data is not required to be reported as distance education as outlined in Title 5 Section 55210. As such, it may be the case that a course that meets on campus and online in alternating classes, which would mean that 50 percent of the instruction occurs online and 50 percent on campus, would not have to be reported as a distance education course. In such a case, the course would neither be an online course nor a hybrid course, yet it is still a distance education course.

How then should that distance education course be defined beyond being just a distance education course, which, by the label itself, does not clarify how data for the course should be reported? To clarify the delivery design of such a course, a third designation, blended, has been introduced, and used, in scheduling discussions. A proposed definition of a blended course was recommended by the Distance Education and Technology Committee (DETC) and subsequently submitted to the Academic Senate for Approval by the Academic Policies & Procedures (AP&P) committee.

Problem

In April 2016, four distance education category definitions were proposed, and approved, by the DETC and forwarded to AP&P. The recommendation to adopt the category definitions were then submitted as a recommendation to the Academic Senate by AP&P at the April 19, 2018 senate meeting. Through public comments at the meeting, objections were raised as to the use of the category definitions, and, after further discussion by senators during the agenda item motion, the proposed recommendation was rejected and sent back to AP&P for revision.

The concerns raised through the objection were two-fold; the definitions as proposed possessed a lack of clarity between hybrid and blended courses, and the hybrid course definition was prescriptive in its language on when and why a hybrid class would meet on campus.

For purposes of discussion, the Distance Education Course Categories definitions that were proposed are repeated here:

Online Course: a course designed for all instruction to take place online with no requirement for students to meet on campus at any time during the term.

Hybrid Course: a course designed for the majority of instruction to take place online. Students will be required to meet on campus for orientations, exams, quizzes or other non-instructional activities.

Blended Course: a course designed for instruction to take place both in the classroom and online. Students will be required to meet on campus and online during the term.

Remote Classroom Course: a course designed for instruction to take place in the classroom allowing students to remotely attend the course.

Addressing the first concern, and to illustrate the lack of clarity between hybrid and blended courses, let us examine a fictitious course that is scheduled to meet nine weeks online and required students to meet seven weeks on campus. Would this be considered a hybrid or a blended course?

Initially, it would easily appear to fall into the category of hybrid, as it should if we are to presume that all nine weeks online are used for instruction; the nine weeks exceeds the 51% online threshold and campus meetings are required. However, it also meets the criteria as a blended course since instruction presumably occurs both online and on campus and students are required to meet online and on campus during the term. So, in this case, there is no difference between the designation of hybrid course or blended course. So, which is it?

While the reason for needing the blended designation has not been clearly articulated campus-wide, for purposes of suggesting a solution to the definition ambiguities, let us presume that the need for a blended designation is to indicate that a course is a distance education course, but one that is designed to meet more than 49% *on campus* during the term. Such a presumption not only helps to clarify the reporting requirement of the course, it also let's students know that the campus meeting requirement is significant simply by the designation of BL in the class schedule. An example would be two courses scheduled at the same time and in the same classroom. By alternating classes between on campus and online, both classes will utilize the same instructional space at the same time. However, the amount of instruction online does not meet the 51 percent online threshold and thus the course would not be a hybrid or online course, rather it would be a blended course with different reporting requirements. In the case of the fictitious course previously discussed, the hybrid designation would be clearly identified as instruction on campus did not exceed 49% and the course had requirements to meet on campus.

As to the prescriptive nature of the hybrid definition, as written, students will be *required* to meet on campus for orientations, exams and quizzes. The definition language suggests that if a course has weekly quizzes or exams, they would be required to conduct the assessments on campus. Additionally, the blended course definition, by specifying that instruction takes place *both in the classroom and online*, suggests that instruction does not occur in a classroom meeting of a hybrid course. Both notions are, of course, ridiculous. However, the wording of the definitions can be interpreted to mean otherwise.

Along with the ambiguity discussed so far, the general meeting requirements of a distance education course may not always be easily discernable to a student simply from the course listing in the college schedule. It has been the case that students have enrolled in an OL designated course only to discover that there are 8 of 16 campus meetings required. This has been partially resolved through the addition of the HY designation for hybrid courses beginning with the Fall 18 semester.

Solution

To provide clarity for administrative reporting and student expectations, the following definitions are being proposed for discussion and consideration for adoption.

Online Course: a course designed for all instruction to take place online with no requirement for students to meet on campus at any time during the term.

Hybrid Course: a course designed for instruction to take place at least 51 percent online and includes a requirement for students to meet on campus one or more times during the term.

Blended Course: a course designed for instruction to take place more than 49% on campus and includes a requirement for students to participate online one or more times during the term.

Remote Classroom Course: a course designed for instruction to take place in the classroom allowing students to remotely attend the course.

Through the adoption of these proposed definitions, students will have a clear understanding of any requirement to meet on campus, and administration will have clear guidance on how the data for a course should be reported to the chancellor's office.

Additionally, by correctly designating applicable courses as blended, and thus not as an online course, it will help deans identify the load of faculty related to the restriction of not teaching more than 50 percent of load online.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion conducted at the Academic Senate meeting regarding the proposed definitions, it appears that the intent of the proposed definitions was for the good of the college,

but the translation into written form fell short. As such, it is essential to establish and adopt clear definitions that will enable the college to gather and report accurate data to the chancellor's office, and, at the same time, assist students in gaining an initial understanding of any meeting requirements that may be required for a particular distance education course.