DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Adopted Minutes
February 24, 2014
Room 101
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE	The Distance Education Committee meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Coordinator Dale Crandall-Bear. Members present were Isabel Anderson (LA); Kathleen Callison (AT&B); Dale Crandall-Bear (DE Coordinator/Chair); Mary Gumlia (COUN); Laura Maghoney (AT&B); Scott Ota (IT); Svetlana Podkolzina (MS); Sandra Rotenberg (Lib); Robin Sytsma (HS); Lauren Taylor-Hill (SBS); and Carol Zadnik (Assistant) Absent/Excused: Roger Clague (CTO); Julia Kiss (Nurs) and Diana Reed (SBS)
1. Adoption of Minutes (01/27/14)	Adoption of January 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes: Motion to approve – Lauren; Seconded – Robin; Passed – unanimously.
2. Canvas Transition Status Report	The Transition Report is used to track and report who is in Canvas and who is not. This report is shared with the SCC Deans. There are currently 235 online sections in the DE Program. This figure does not include eCompanion shells. Approximately one-third of the online sections are approved for Canvas with two-thirds left to be approved. Dale stated the Deans and Vice President Diane White do not want to extend any Canvas course approval deadlines. The final fall semester schedule must be submitted by the Deans on March 24. Dale mentioned the Deans would send out the next email reminding faculty of the deadline dates. The Deans are planning to pull any courses not approved to teach online in Canvas by the deadline out of the schedule or convert them to campus face-to-face courses. Dale feels the committee will have several course shell reviews to look at during the DE Meeting on March 10. Isabel asked if instructors need

someone in their department to do his/her course shell review. Dale replied that there are no restrictions to doing a course shell review other than participants must be faculty.

Lauren asked how many instructors have not begun any training of the unapproved sections. Dale stated almost everyone has started the Canvas training process. He mentioned there are approximately 20 instructors that have not done anything.

Dale reiterated that he would look at the courses as the course shell reviews are submitted. He will add them to the list to submit to the Deans once a week if everything looks good. All course shell reviews in question will be looked at by the DE Committee Members.

Sandra asked what criteria must be met to receive the "in progress" status of a course shell review. Dale stated the "in progress" status indicates that he has been in direct communication with the instructor, and he knows the instructor is working on the course shell review.

Sandra asked under what criteria a course shell review would be denied. Dale gave the following examples as unacceptable:

If the course is not developed enough to merit a pilot approval, i.e., if key components are missing (SLOs, Instructor-Initiated contact, content in modules); if the reviewers approved the course without adequate examination of the course; if SLOs or course content do not match the Section K, etc.

Dale is hoping we will receive many more course shell reviews as we get closer to the deadline.

3. **Publisher's Materials Policy**

A Publisher's Materials Policy was discussed during a previous meeting, and Dale presented a draft that included the ideas brought up by DE Committee Members.

The idea of having a Publisher's Materials Policy was not to judge a Publisher's Material or limit an Instructor's discretion to use them, but to set some guidelines. Dale mentioned an SCC online course cannot be all inclusive on a Publisher's site. Dale stated there must be a record of instructor and student interaction in Canvas, student grades, as well as instructor comments.

DE Committee Members debated the issues involved with importing grades from a Publisher's site into the Canvas site. Kathleen asked why

there is a difference with making this information available for online classes verses the face-to-face classes. Dale reiterated that the college needs to be able to access and verify instructor/student interaction through instructor feedback for online student work. The college needs the accessibility to student grades in the event the Accreditation Commission requests to see the results.

Dale mentioned Canvas provides a personal folder that can be locked where instructors can store documents with student comments and feedback. Dale closed the topic stating he would prepare another draft with changes agreed on by committee members.

4. **Faculty Technology Group**

Dale explained that SCC does not have a group that faculty can express ideas to regarding classroom technology. Many campuses have a Faculty Technology Committee and/or an Instructional Design Position; however, SCC does not have either. Roger and Dale have been meeting to discuss these issues. The IT Department has no one to consult with regarding what is needed or what would be best for future smart classrooms. Dale and Roger feel it would be in the best interest of SCC to have faculty feedback through a formally organized group. Dale is in the process of setting up a pilot group of faculty who will test new classroom equipment and collaborate on equipment proposals.

Sandra volunteered to join the group to represent the Librarians. Carol volunteered to join the group as well. Carol felt the DE administrative assistant should be aware of any new equipment and its features. Dale welcomed both into the group.

Dale stated the smart classrooms are approximately 15 years old at SCC. Dale gave the following examples of new technology available for smart classrooms:

- Projectors that are interactive smart boards, which have screen capture and distribution capabilities

- Document cameras with HDMI input, which have capture and distribution capabilities

- Document cameras that attach to a microscope

- Revolving 360 degree chairs

- Lecture and content capture tool – Echo 360

Carol asked if Echo 360 could be used as a live conferencing tool as well. Dale replied that it could not; however, Voice Thread is a new interactive online conferencing tool similar to Big Blue Button. According to Dale, much of the new technology will link face-to-face and online classrooms.

Isabel asked about the status on Turnitin, because she knows of an over whelming number of SCC faculty who would like to have it. Dale reiterated that proposals to purchase products like Turnitin would fall under the scope of a technology group. Dale mentioned that we might need a petition, list, or documentation of names requesting a campus wide license for the product. We would need to show enough demand to warrant purchase. Dale suggested the documentation be put together so the technology group could come up with a proposal.

Isabel mentioned that problems with the Canvas media features were brought up at her divisional meeting. Dale validated that many computers are not up-to-date or are too old to accommodate all the media features in Canvas.

Carol asked if all Instructors need to include audio with his/her power point presentation in order to be ADA compliant. Mary and Kathleen stated they heard it is required, but other members were not aware of that being an ADA requirement. Carol agreed to contact Max Hartman for clarification on the ADA requirements.

5. Course Shell Reviews (faculty only)	Non-Faculty DE Members were excused from the remainder of the DE Meeting. Faculty who are DE Committee Members proceeded to go over course shell reviews. The CJ 002 (KK) course was evaluated and found to have appropriate course content and SLOs. Suggestions for improving the course were made by the committee and noted on the Course Shell Review Checklist that will be returned to the Instructor. It was decided the CJ 002 (KK) course would be approved as a pilot course.
Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 10 in Room 101 from 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.