

Distance Learning and Instructional Technology

Sierra College

Recollections

May 4, 2018

I. Opening:

A. Call to order

B. Establish Quorum

- Suzanne Davenport, Cyndie Birdsong, Autumn Cahoon , Anne Diamond, Jay Hester, Rob Lapkass, Jennifer Molina-Stidger, Mithia Mukutmoni, Sabrina Pape, Sayda Postiglione, Corinne Rowland, Tina Sixt, Amber Turner, Lynette Vrooman, Tom Benton, Lucas Moosman, Aimee Colvin

II. Recollections from April 6, 2018 approved

III. Visitor Presentation:

IV. Action Items: None

V. Discussion Items

D. Other

- Suzanne thanked IIT for their work done in the studio
- A discussion was had about the continuing technological issues in that room and how they will be dealt with in the future

A. SCFA resolution on Online College

- Suzanne explained that the form, which was handed out to the committee members, was composed by Johnny Terry. Signing would show support for the SCFA's decision to oppose the online college currently being proposed at the state level. DLIT was unable to vote on this resolution, because it was not included on the agenda for May 4, 2018. However a statement of support may be appreciated and would not require a formal vote
- The members discussed the proposed online college, the plans and funding associated with it and distance learning programs that currently exist

B. Departmental Creation of Online Course Content

- Suzanne explained that a recent request was made by a department to allow instructors to share content and course design, and making it unnecessary for multiple instructors to have the same course individually reviewed. She opened the topic up for discussion amongst the members
- Positive aspect: Instructors getting together and sharing effective practices.
- Negative aspect: Making a lack of options regarding course layout stifles academic freedom
- Concerns were expressed over course looking too much like “canned classes” if content is prescribed by departments for use by faculty. There could be issues with a lack of instructor presence in the predesigned courses
- There is an existing precedent regarding the department created course content. The committee decided at that time that it was an inappropriate practice. The committee continues to support that position
- Suzanne will contact the department that made the inquiry. The committee believes that sharing ideas and content within departments is acceptable, but that each instructor must bring their course through the review process individually

C. Pre-2009 Review Process Plan

- There are approximately 150 online courses that were not brought through the current course review process.
- It's anticipated that reviewing those courses may be a three to four year process
- Rob suggested that the “easy to deal with” courses be dealt with first. Those would be courses that are currently taught by instructors who have gone through the current review process, but with other courses. They would likely be close to meeting the current standards, as opposed to the more “calcified” courses, which would be more resistant to change
- Autumn suggested that only one course per semester be reviewed, for instructors who currently have more than one pre-2009 online course, to avoid overwhelming anyone
- Jay stated that he perceived the process as having two parts. First the easy to review courses need to be identified and separated from the more difficult to review. Then the actual review process could begin
- Concerns about older courses, which do not meet current standards, were expressed. The committee agreed that those courses needed to be reviewed before the upcoming accreditation process
- Suzanne stated that summer would be the ideal time to review these courses, after preparing faculty members in the spring

- Sabrina asked if the old review rubrics could be compared to the current rubric. She suggested that the current process, while thorough, is too time consuming
- Anne suggested reviewing “live” courses, instead of development shell versions
- This led to a discussion of conflicts that may occur in regards to the current evaluation process, how courses are currently approved, the possibility of having a course pulled from the schedule, who has the power to pull a course from that schedule, and what the Distance Learning department’s role is in regards to what course are made available online
- The proposed process for reviewing the pre-2009 courses, as suggested by Jay, is as follows
 - Examine all the pre-2009 courses
 - Determine what percentage are close to meeting the current standards
 - Make workshops available
 - Examine the remaining (calcified) courses, which would be a significantly smaller group
- Suzanne suggested that if instructors were to volunteer to be reviewed, a large portion of the pre-2009 course could be dealt with quickly. SCFA would have to be consulted and would need to give approval for access to the courses being reviewed. In the meantime, the current rubric could be sent out to all faculty, so they could see if their courses are meeting the current standards, and they could be made aware of upcoming workshops
- Some concerns were expressed regarding instructor presence and how that is quantified. The contract previously had reference to the number of days an instructor was required to be in the class. That wording is now gone, but still exists in the Los Rios contract
- Autumn suggested that more one-on-one helps was needed
- The idea of having whole departments come in for workshops that focused on their subject, was proposed
- There was an emphasis placed on distributing a rubric, designing workshops, and sending a reminder to faculty of the importance of updating their courses given that accreditation will be happening soon

The committee concluded with a short discussion about the Sierra Online Summit schedule and was dismissed at 1:45pm.