

Distance Education Standing Committee

Moorpark College's Mission Statement

With a "students first" philosophy, Moorpark College empowers its diverse community of learners to complete their goals for academic transfer, basic skills, and career technical education. Moorpark College integrates instruction and student services, collaborates with industry and educational partners, and promotes a global perspective.

Committee charter:

The Distance Education Committee makes recommendations on college-wide planning and accreditation issues related to distance education activities.

The specific tasks of this committee are:

- Review and evaluate campus-wide student success and equity data related to distance education
- Develop and promote best practices that contribute to the quality and growth of distance education at Moorpark College
 - Provide guidance on professional development activities related to distance education
- Monitor and document compliance with accreditation standards and state and national regulations

Minutes

October 24th, 2018

2:30 PM – 4:00 PM, A-138

Division/Position	Name	Present	Division/Position	Name	Present
Co-chairs	Jennifer Goetz	X	Dean	Karen Rothstein	X
	Rachel Messinger	X			
Student Health, Athletics, Kinesiology, ACCESS & Math	Claudia Gutierrez	X	Instructional Technologist/Designer	Tracie Bosket	X
			ACCESS	Matthew Spinneberg	
Social & Behavioral Sciences	Brian Herlocker Rex Edwards	X	Student Service Council	Dave Anter	
		X	Associated Students	Sonali Murugan	
			DE Coordinator	Anasheh Garabighi	x
Business, Child Development, & Student Engagement	Shannon Macias Daniel Aguilar Danita Redd (alternate)	X	GUESTS: Please Sign In		
		X			
		X			
EATM, Life & Health Sciences	Jana Johnson Ashley Vaughan	X			
		X			
Languages & Learning Resources	Diane Scrofano	X			
Physical Sciences & Career Ed					
Arts, Media & Communications	Becky Brister	X			

Meeting Calendar 17-18 4 th Wednesday 2:30 in A-138	Topic	Meeting Calendar 17-18 4 th Wednesday 2:30 in A-138	Topic
08/22/18	CVC-OEI, online enrollments	1/23/19	
09/26/18	CVC-OEI, initial goals	2/27/19	
10/24/18		3/20/19 (location TBA)	
11/28/18		4/24/19	

Distance Education Standing Committee

AGENDA

Topic	Discussion/Comments	Action
1. Welcome & approval of minutes		KR moves to approve. SM seconds. All vote aye except DA abstains.
2. DE Class Surveys	<p>Rachel brought up a couple issues and concerns regarding student evaluations for DE courses. Many students do not fill them out, and faculty are held responsible for the lack of responses even though faculty do not have access to the actual link and are unable to view the response rates.</p> <p>Jennifer asked if faculty were receiving a notification email from the district that the course evaluations were active. No one on the committee had gotten a notification email. Jennifer said that around week six of the semester HR should be notifying instructors of which class is being evaluated and the time frame of the evaluation. We can request that DCHR (The District Council on Human Resources) give faculty the ability to monitor the response rates. She and Karen also agreed that they should bring up the issue of holding faculty responsible for low response rates at Dean's Council.</p>	
2. Survey Results	<p>Nenagh explained how the survey was created. Lisa Branton revised a previous version, and then it went through Academic Council and the CTE workgroup.</p> <p>Jennifer mentioned that some of the responses may be due to the wording of the questions and different interpretations. One of the survey themes/recommendations is the need for increased communication and dissemination of information. Jennifer asked the committee if their divisions provide time for committees to report during meetings. Danita replied that yes, her division does. Rachel and Jana replied that their division does not generally give time for committees to provide reports. Rachel can bring this up with her division dean. Karen mentioned that she asks for written reports on committee work from faculty. Jennifer said that she would bring this issue up at Dean's Council as well and see what they can do to facilitate more regular communication.</p> <p>Nenagh commented that there are a lot of positive results from the survey. There was a high return rate and committees generally had high attendee rates.</p> <p>Rachel pointed out that the membership of this committee has turned over quite a bit, so the survey may not reflect the feelings of the people on the committee currently.</p> <p>Jana responded that she thought that some of the responses were indeed due to the wording of the questions. She stated that one of the reasons she did not attend the committee meetings was that she did not feel like her voice was being heard or valued; she did not feel like she was seen as helpful. Jennifer responded that she would take that into consideration and try to remedy it.</p>	
DE Program Plan	Jennifer explained that the program plan is filled out every year by the administrative assistant and the overseeing dean. Tracie (the Instructional Technologist) also tells the dean what faculty are requesting. Previously it was only the instructional technologist who wrote the plan. Jennifer stated that she would like to include faculty more in the process of writing the program plan. She asked what the committee would like to see included in the plan and how we would like faculty's voices to be included.	

Distance Education Standing Committee

Ashley asked if the document was the entire program plan and if there was a section for resource requests. Jennifer replied that the resources requests were not included in the circulated document. She stated that some of the resources requested were site licenses for Camtasia, Kahoot, and Socrative as well as webcams and headsets. Hiring a second instructional technologist is also included.

Rachel asked for the dollar amounts of the webcams and headsets. Tracie provided the dollar amounts: \$3,300 for 100 webcams and \$3,346 for 100 headsets with wired microphones. Ashley asked if the resource requests were only for equipment. Jennifer responded that requests can include equipment, software, personnel, travel, and speakers.

Rachel asked who decides what the resource needs are. Jennifer responded that she recognizes that faculty would like more input and discussion on the resources to be purchased. Diane mentioned that her department chair sends an email to the whole department asking if they need anything. Danita suggested that faculty make requests in the spring and that the committee discuss the requests during the first DE meeting of the fall.

Nenagh commented the group should also consider what our vision is. Rachel commented that she would like to see teachers training other teachers being brought back. Ashley asked if Rachel meant more faculty input in the Canvas training or bringing back Design-to-Align or both? Rachel replied both. Ashley said that she would like to see both as well. Jennifer responded that the OTCC (Online Teaching Certification in Canvas) training is the same across the district so that faculty do not need to go through more than one training if they teach at multiple campuses. She said that now that the training is limited to 10 hours (due to the new contract) the training will be on the agenda for the district meeting (to discuss whether it needs to be adjusted given this change).

Rachel suggested that we have a faculty member teach the Canvas training course. Brian asked if we would need the faculty member to also be trained in instructional design. Tracie responded yes.

Nenagh asked if Design-to-Align or some mentorship program could be started up again and if we would like for that to happen. Jana and Diane responded that they would like to see Design-to-Align continue. Jana said that is helpful to have two different points of view and the support of both other faculty and the instructional technologist. Shannon said that it would have been helpful to see someone else's shell. Tracie stated that she has added a showcase section that shows faculty's pages in the Canvas training shell.

Jennifer (or Anasheh?) mentioned that other campuses are paying people to serve on POCR (Peer Online Course Review). Tracie is doing the training right now to learn how to be a "POCR dealer."

Nenagh pointed out that the committee does not have to wait for the Program Plan to be finalized to revive the mentorship program/Design-to-Align. She asked if we want to put out a call for faculty who want to be mentors or if we want to form a workgroup.

Diane stated that she didn't think we needed a workgroup because we already had the

Distance Education Standing Committee

	<p>mentorship program in place last year. She stated that Design-to-Align just needs a new leader. She asked if we can just combine it with the OTCC training by bringing on faculty during the training. Rachel commented that we do not need to tear down or rebuild what we have already built.</p> <p>Ashley mentioned that having Design-to-Align is not just about participating in the exchange, but it is also for faculty who want to improve their courses and learn about how to employ best practices (without going through the process of joining the exchange).</p> <p>Tracie, Anasheh, and Ashley are willing to meet to discuss reviving Design-to-Align.</p>	
3. Goals and Accomplishments	Tabled	
4. CVC-OEI Next Steps	Anasheh reported that November 2 nd was the deadline for people to sign up for the design academy. There are two options. Option A is to work with Tracie first prior to submitting and Option B is just going ahead and submitting the course to the exchange to see if it is approved.	
5. Design-to-Align	See agenda item 2.	
6. Changes to Zoom recording options	Tabled	
7. Report from DDEAC/ITAC; ITAC Membership; Feedback for the Next Meeting	Tabled	
8. Professional Development Funds for DE	Tabled	
9. Comments: Adjournment at 4 p.m.	Tracie mentioned that Ally will kick off Friday October 26 th . There will also be a couple Can-Innovate webinars on Friday the 26 th and a webinar on Note Bowl on November 7 th .	