LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 2012
10:00 AM, ROOM 2410
MINUTES

LPC Members Present:
Scott Vigallon (TLC-Classified; co-chair)
Richard Dry (Arts & Comm.; co-chair)
Frances Hui (Arts & Comm.; Library)
Howard Blumenfeld (MSE&PS)
Vicky Austin (Adjunct Faculty)
Jane McCoy (BCATSS)

LPC Members Absent:
Deanna Horvath (Arts & Comm.)
Janice Cantua (Admissions & Records)
Breanna Krumins (ASLPC)
John Ruys (Deans)

Guests: Pauline Trummel

AGENDA:

I. Call to order: The meeting was called to order by co-chair Richard Dry at 10:05 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from Feb. 24 meeting: Howard made a motion to approve the minutes. Vicky seconded. Minutes approved.

III. DE Accreditation guidelines evidence: This item was tabled.

IV. Updates

i. **Fall 2011 retention and success rates:** The retention rate was 78 percent, which is the highest rate for a fall semester since we began recording rates in 1999. It also matched the highest rate for a non-summer term (Spring 2008 and Spring 2011). The success rate was 60 percent, which is the highest rate for a fall semester since 1999. Rates are posted at http://grapevine.laspositascollege.edu/distanceeducation/documents/Retention_and_Success_rates.pdf. Scott will create a line graph for the committee next month.

ii. **Online Materials Fees**: According to the state chancellor's office, the new language went to the Board of Governors on March 5, and there was spirited debate. Some members wanted stronger language added. The public has 45 days from March 5 to comment on the regulations. Publishers have requested a delay in the implementation of the regulations so they can be ready when the regulations go into effect. If substantive changes need to be made, the language will go back to the BOG for a first reading. Otherwise, the BOG will conduct a second reading in May.

iii. **Open Educational Resources:** SB 1052 would establish the California Open Education Resources Council (composed of 3 faculty senate members from each of the higher ed segments in California), which would determine a list of the 50 most popular courses. It would also require the Council to review and approve open source materials and promote strategies for their use. SB 1053 would establish the California Digital Open Source Library (under the joint administration of the 3 segments) to house open source materials and provide free or low-cost online access to these materials for students, faculty and staff. AB 2471 would require community college districts to adopt policies to prohibit the assignment of e-textbooks unless they: a) Were offered with pricing tiers that

included, at a minimum, a “rental price” and a “lifetime purchase” price; b) Were offered with cloud storage access; and c) Included a refund policy.

iv. **Online Evaluation Procedures:** Feedback on our recommendation was given by many of our DE instructors, and that feedback was forwarded to the committee. Most DE instructors agreed with our recommendation of: "Evaluators should have access for no more than 24 hours, and while they are in a course, they should have access to 1 week’s worth of work or 1 module." Chabot’s Committee On Online Learning has not come to a conclusion on the guidelines for conducting DE evaluations. Nothing has changed yet at the contract negotiating level, so until it does, we will operate under the original guidelines.

One clarification was made, though. Evaluators will have student access to a course for 1-2 hours, but they will notify Scott when they are finished instead of Scott taking them out of the course after 2 hours. Jane wasn’t so sure this is correct and will check with the FA about it.

VIII. **Waitlist and DE classes:** Last month, the DE Committee agreed that it would propose increasing the number of students on the waitlist for DE classes to 40. Two reasons: 1) Students can conceivably add every DE class on the schedule to their waitlists because there are no class time conflicts like there are in face-to-face classes; and 2) Students who really want a f2f section of a class will go the DE section’s waitlist for that course, and when they get in the f2f class, they remove themselves from the DE waitlist. Chabot’s Committee On Online Learning also wants 40 on the waitlist, too.

In an email Feb. 17, VP Noble said, “As a general statement, I believe the numbers should be the same for both face-to-face and online. They are different modes of delivery but that should not influence how many students are on the wait list….While the actual class participation may not exceed the standard for a face-to-face class, the pressure of twice as many students trying to enroll may place an added burden on the faculty. I believe IT did not want to have different caps for different courses as well, but I will wait for Jeannine (Methe) to weigh in for IT.”

Jane, who is on the Waitlist Committee for the district, said that the FA strongly urges that the number of students on the waitlist be the same for all classes. She added that it’s a contractual element that things shouldn’t be different between face-to-face and online classes. However, she added that the Waitlist Committee still meets and continues to refine processes.

V. **Online tutoring:** For the Fall 2011 semester, of the 13 students who received tutoring, 6 got A’s in their class, 3 got B’s, 2 got C’s, 1 got a D, and 1 got an F.

There has been an increase in students requesting online tutoring appointments the past week after Scott emailed all LPC students, letting them know the program’s availability. Scott made a change recently to the student appointment request process, creating a form that students fill out instead of sending an email. Based on feedback from Pauline, he also gave students the ability to request regular appointments, such as every Tuesday at 2 p.m. Pauline informed the committee of an instructional equipment request she recently submitted that would purchase online scheduling software.

Howard and Scott researched the possibility of applying for a Basic Skills grant to pay for Math online tutoring after the Fall 2012 semester. However, the instructors there felt math online tutoring should simply be a service offered within the Tutorial Center budget, like online tutoring currently is for Writing. Math would like to explore the idea of asynchronous tutoring, whereby students submit questions and get help via email at a later time. Richard said he would like to have asynchronous tutoring available for Writing, too.

Pauline gave the committee some background on tutoring funding and reiterated her support for online tutoring, both synchronous and asynchronous. But since Tutorial Center funding for the 2012-13 academic year is uncertain, she let the committee know that she can't guarantee anything, particularly for Spring 2013. However, she felt confident that asynchronous tutoring could be added, and we will work together to devise a system that can be successful. Since synchronous Math online tutoring has received no funding for Spring 2013 (it will be funded in Fall 2012 by a Foundation grant), but at least we should be able to offer it asynchronously. Pauline will try to offer synchronous online tutoring for Math in Spring 2013, depending on available funds.

VI. **Common Tool and the DE Committee:** The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is seeking feedback on how the Common Tool can help committees with planning, budgeting, and/or resource allocation. Since programs are currently in the process of updating their common tools, each committee will receive final results from the common tools at the beginning of Fall semester.

The committee first reviewed the Program Development Common Tool results, which included five items, three of which came from the TLC's Non-instructional Program Review. Those three were familiar to the committee since they were developed by the committee. No discussion was needed for those. One item came from the Tutorial Center, which, ironically, we discussed earlier in the meeting. All this led the committee to believe that since we're doing the work anyway, the Common Tool is a bit unnecessary.

The final item came from Counseling with an objective to "increase the number of students served with diminishing resources." The committee wasn't clear what role it would play with this objective. In other words, what exactly is Counseling asking of us? The committee felt that the item was vague and general and thought it would be helpful if more justification was given as to why the request came to us.

Another question raised: Who is the Common Tool supposed to help with planning, budgeting, and/or resource allocation, the requesting group or our DE Committee?

After viewing the Maintenance Common Tool, it took the committee a while to figure out why the request came to us. Coming from Economics, the need listed simply said "Blackboard". Frances surmised that since Blackboard is used for Econ classes, continued use of the software was needed. Of course, it's also needed for just about every other discipline.

VII. **Last day of attendance for DE classes:** At our February meeting, the committee agreed to add the following statement to our DE drop policy: "DE instructors may drop students if they have not submitted work and/or accessed the class for two consecutive weeks." The statement was sent to Chabot for discussion. Its COOL Committee met March 20 and decided not to pursue adopting our addition to DE drop policy. One argument was that this requirement is better off in the syllabus, which students should read. Incidentally, Chabot does not recognize our current DE drop policy. Its COOL approved it a few years ago, but its Academic Senate did not. Our policy has been approved by the LPC Academic Senate.

Richard discussed our policy addition with his division and reported that Jeremiah Bodnar, the Curriculum Committee chair, asked how it affects Summer courses since they are condensed. The committee discussed this and said that: 1) Our addition includes the word "may", so instructors have the option to drop students or not; and 2) DE instructors can translate the time period into the corresponding time during the Summer session in the same manner they can translate the current policy for face-to-face classes. Richard will inform Jeremiah of this, and once this issue is deemed satisfactory, we will take it to the Academic Senate for approval.

Also, as agreed upon at our last meeting, Scott informed DE instructors that they should archive their emails in case LPC ever gets audited. He sent an email March 2 explaining the issue and included a link to a web page that further explains it and also gives instructions on how to archive in GroupWise. That information is located at

http://lpc1.clpccd.cc.ca.us/lpc/blackboard/closing_course.htm#archive_emails.

VIII. **Bb 9.1 Service Pack 7 demo:** This item was tabled.

IX. **Other issues:** None broached.

X. **Next meeting:** April 27, 10-12 in Room 2410

XI. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.