



DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

Monday, November 30, 2009, 3:30–5pm, Room 1096, TLC

**ATTENDEES:** Ed Parrish, Francine Van Meter, Letitia Scott-Curtis, John Govsky, Jennifer Cass, Nancy Stucker, Johanna Bowen, Rachel Mayo, Dale Attias, Kip Nead, Georg Romero, Ray Kaupp, Veronica Lundquist, Rory O’Brien

**NEW MEMBERS**

Francine welcomed new committee members, Dale Attias, Kip Nead, Georg Romero. Nancy Brown is the new Dean Rep appointed by Instruction Council.

**FAREWELL JOHANNA**

Francine thanked Johanna for her many years of service on both the Distance Education Committee and the Staff Development Committee. Johanna retires at the end of this month. Congratulations, Johanna!

**COMMITTEE**

The Board description for the Distance Education Committee is listed below. Please do let me know if I left anyone off. It’s been a long time since we did a committee “roll call”; we all work so well together there’s not been a need to vote count.

Distance Education Director	Francine Van Meter
Vice President, Instruction or designee – Chair	Renée Kilmer
Faculty Senate representative	Letitia Scott-Curtis, John Govsky
Five faculty, one representing each Division	Ray Kaupp, Ed Parrish, Rory O’Brien/Rosemary Brogan, Shawn Houghton
Dean representative, appointed by Instruction Council	Nancy Brown
CCFT representative	Nancy Stucker
CCEU representative	Kip Nead/Dale Attias
Information Technology representative	John Mauceri
Library/Learning Resources Director	Georg Romero
Curriculum Committee Chair or designee	Jennifer Cass
Dean of Education Centers	Rachel Mayo

**ONLINE EVALUATION FORM**

Francine demonstrated the new *Student Evaluation Form for Online Instructors* created by Judy Cassada in Planning and Research and located at

[http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=bYbn\\_2fHQqxJOZaiNeX0D7AA\\_3d\\_3d\\_\\*](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=bYbn_2fHQqxJOZaiNeX0D7AA_3d_3d_*)

The form is consistent with Appendix M and Paul Harvell stated in late October we’re probably fine with going ahead and using the form this semester with the two evaluations scheduled. This is considered a test period for the online evaluation process.

Members expressed concern about the form in two areas: (1) students misspelling or not knowing their instructor’s name and the data being omitted from the total data collected, and (2) disgruntled students padding the data with multiple submissions of a negative evaluation. Judy has made the following changes to the online form:

1. Students will have only one opportunity to submit an evaluation per computer. They will be unable to submit multiple evaluations on the same computer. Francine thought it would be best to not advertise to students the “one computer” option. (Note: This configuration is similar to the online Retention Study conducted by the Chancellor’s Office last spring.)
2. The online evaluation form will have a unique URL per instructor and the name of the instructor will be included in the form. This addresses problems that may arise from students misspelling the name or not entering the name.
3. \* Please don’t use the URL listed in these minutes. The evaluation team leader will need to request the unique URL from PRO (Judy) for the instructor they plan to evaluate. jucassad [at] cabrillo.edu
4. The DE Committee, in collaboration with the CCFT Task Force will need to talk about the process of using the online form with students. The student’s identity is kept confidential, but specific instructions should accompany the request for the student to complete the form. If an instructor’s course uses Blackboard, an email to all students enrolled in the course is the most efficient way to get the message out.

### **EVALUATION PROCESS**

There was discussion about the differences between on-campus classroom visitations and online visitations. Members agreed the instructor should be a partner in the evaluation process and be available to explain the structure of their course and offer a week or module that demonstrated “typical” interaction and learning. Letitia stated the process is more constructive when the conversation is about teaching methods. This would include providing access to relevant materials such as the syllabus, handouts, discussion board postings, grading form, my grades tool, assignment, assessment, and possibly a chat archive. Rory stated it’s important to show the evaluator what’s going on in the course, and what you provide the students. Jennifer explained in her department it’s a two step process, first you sit with the instructor and look at the website together, and the evaluation is separate.

### **STANDARDS FOR ONLINE AND HYBRID COURSES**

The next step is to take what we learned from the discussion and integrate it into the *Review for DE Courses* and *Suggested Evaluation Questions for DE Instructors* document first reviewed in October. (See pages 3-4.)

The DE meeting schedule for spring is waiting on the CCFT meeting spring dates. Both meet on Mondays and we must have their schedule to plan off of. Stay tuned!

### **FUNDING FOR ONLINE LIBRARY INFORMATION RESOURCES**

Johanna stated all students, including DE students, use the online Library databases for their classes. Funding from the Chancellor’s Office for these online database resources has been completely eliminated. Cabrillo hosts 41 databases and they will not be funded after June 1, 2010. A resolution drafted by the Council of Chief Librarians, protesting the cut, was taken to the Board of Governors. This is a loss of approximately \$37,000/year in funding.

<http://libwww.cabrillo.edu/desti/>

Meeting adjourned.

# SUGGESTED PRELIMINARY REVIEW FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES

## DIAGNOSTIC STANDARDS FOR ONLINE AND HYBRID COURSES

### *Category 1: Accessibility*

1. Course provides access to plug-ins or other applications supporting course content
2. Provides instructor contact information
3. Course materials provide link to campus resources, including support for the learning management system (Blackboard)
4. Complies with Section 508 standards for accessibility

### *Category 2: Communication*

1. Course uses a variety of media to communicate course materials. (For example, text, graphics, audio, video, etc.)
2. Use of standard online communication tools. (Examples may include email, discussion boards, chat, announcements, etc.)
3. Evidence of provision for regular effective contact between instructor and students. (Examples may include expectations of availability of and turnaround time for contact with instructor.)

### *Category 3: Assessment*

1. Student learning outcomes are clearly identified; course objectives and completion requirements are present. Expectation of student's participation, honesty, etc. is clear.
2. Assignments and grading standards are clearly stated. (Examples may include sample assignments, clear directions, criteria used to evaluate discussion board participation or peer review.)
3. Feedback provided throughout the course; self-tests, written feedback, discussion board, email, etc.
4. Student knowledge, attitudes, and/or skills assessed in multiple ways.

### *Category 4: Navigation*

1. Syllabus or orientation (online and/or in person) provide course navigation guidance
2. Course is well organized and easy to navigate; navigation is clear, simple and friendly. Content is organized in a logical format.

### *Category 5: Design/Presentation*

1. Course is visually and functionally consistent
2. Font is easy to read and course pages are a comfortable length using white space
3. Sufficient contrast between text and background
4. Language of written material is friendly and supportive
5. Netiquette expectations are clearly stated

## SUGGESTED EVALUATION QUESTIONS FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS

Adopted from spring 2008 Academic Senate Paper "Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates" and the spring 2005 Academic Senate Rostrum, "Observing Online Classes."

**How does one visit an online class when the class exists only in cyberspace?**

### *Peer Evaluation*

1. An observer could simply choose a week to observe, and, over the course of the week, examine how the instructor delivers course content and interacts with the students. *Committee wants to rework this suggestion to protect privacy of student/instructor email.* The observer may also ask to see any email communications with students for that week and evaluate
  - 1.1. whether communication is indeed taking place, and
  - 1.2. if the instructor is responding to student emails in a timely manner.
2. The course observer should review the instructor's policies on communication. *This statement infers availability standard. Rewrite.* If an instructor waits 48 hours to respond to a student's email, or if the instructor completely neglects to do so over the weekend, it's not necessarily a bad thing. However, the observer should make sure the instructor has established this as a policy somewhere in the course. In an online course, the information typically found in a syllabus, including course organizational material, may appear in one place, or it may be distributed at key spots throughout the course.
3. The observer may want to review any start-up or welcome instructions for the course. If you, as an observer, can't figure out where the lecture materials, assignments and learning resources are in the course, it is likely the students can't either.
4. Determine whether the instructor creates effective communication with opportunities for student interaction, response and collaboration; effective student/teacher contact is required by Title 5. Observers should go to the online discussion board as part of the observation. Additional opportunities may include online office hours, scheduled chat times, and phone communication.
5. Determine whether the instructor uses a variety of instructional methods to accommodate different learning styles.