DE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 11, 2021, via Zoom 1:00 – 2:30 pm

Member attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Andy Bloom</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Sarah Cooper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Jennifer Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Robin Kurotori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alison Kuehner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Teresa Massimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Liz Pannell</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Monica Cappiello</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>William Wong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others in attendance:
Ghada Al-Masri, Andrew LaManque, Mary Wilhelm-Chapin (Interpreters Aundrea Love and Gage Rodriguez)

Meeting called to order at 1:02 pm. Documents are available online on the Distance Education Committee website.

Agenda

1. Indigenous Peoples Day – Robin started the meeting with a recognition of the day.
2. Agenda Modifications - Robin added a proposal to Chair’s Update as informational. It must go through shared governance this semester.
3. Consent Agenda
   a. Minutes from September 20, 2021, DE Committee Meeting. Motion to approve the Minutes was made by Liz Pannell; seconded by Monica Cappiello. Motion carried.
   b. DE Addenda Approval Queue – Discussion regarding four courses (BA-931, BA-932, BA-933, NUR-315) with wording that would indicate synchronous delivery. The committee discussed whether wording used in the addendum could serve to inform how faculty wanted the course to be offered. Robin explained the history of emergency DE addenda regarding the term of synchronous. The Committee regularly removed the term because they have no control over the way a course is scheduled. Looking at a post-pandemic addendum, do we go back to approval for synchronous when faculty feel this is the only way to meet the criteria. Andy indicated that DE addendum should not dictate the way courses are scheduled. Dean Masri said that she uses the addendum in partnership with faculty to inform scheduling decisions. It was suggested that the form be changed to include synchronous and asynchronous categories. Questions were raised regarding whether synchronous format would continue to exist post pandemic. It was brought up that this format is popular among some students, especially those in DEAF studies, where they have seen enrollment gains as a result of offering classes via Zoom. Motion to approve all courses in the queue was made by Alison Kuehner; seconded by Andy Bloom. Motion carried.
4. Chair’s Report

a. **Learning College Week Debrief** – The Committee reviewed the Plusses and Deltas form created by Becky Ozoa to help inform decisions about future Learning College Week (LCW) scheduling. The Committee agreed that the student sessions should continue to be an integral part of LCW. It was stated that the breaks between sessions, particularly the longer lunch break, were much appreciated.

b. **POCR Update** – Robin shared that the POCR Handbook was close to completion with sections on benefits, process, reviewers, and badging. She asked for volunteers to proofread the handbook and provide feedback. The first POCR cohort is scheduled to begin in January with another being scheduled for summer. Part of the training includes a course in Canvas that includes details about each of the rubric criteria. Faculty will work to build or revise their courses to align with the rubric as they make their way through the POCR training course. The POCR course is almost complete. Robin asked for volunteers to review the course.

c. **VPAT Process** – Mary explained that VPAT stands for Voluntary Product Accessibility Template and is used by Ohlone to review products for accessibility prior to purchase. Wendy Lin (SAS) is a critical agent in the process as she runs products through a variety of tests. We do not purchase products without first ensuring accessibility. This was brought to the attention of the Committee to spread awareness of the importance of the process, especially when faculty are looking to purchase new software to use in their course.

d. **Recommendation for Course Approval Process Change** – The recommendation to approve both faculty and course for online delivery will need to move through shared governance so that it can be addressed in UFO negotiations in spring. The committee read the recommendation and discussed the pros and cons. It was mentioned that this is a unique time where all faculty have been teaching online and as such have some form of Canvas shell created which they can use to demonstrate competency and compliance with DE regulations. Currently, the addendum is created by a single departmental faculty member, presumably after consultation with the department, but whether the criteria are being met in all sections of the course is not clear. The DE Committee approves a course as being accessible based on check box item on addendum, but we do not actually see the courses. Courses are evaluated when a faculty member is up for evaluation, but it is not always clear if all online sections are reviewed by the Dean or the appointed faculty member. The recommendation establishes the continuation of the DE addendum with each course but adds a second approval step which is the approval of each section. This process would require faculty to submit at least 25% of a course they would like to teach online to the DE Committee for review. The recommendation outlines the criteria that must be met to be approved for online delivery. These are the same criteria used in the online course evaluation that was approved by the UFO and District in the past and is a demonstration of meeting the regular and substantive interaction, accessibility and instructor presence requirements mandated by Title IV, Title 5, and ACCJC. It was asked who would be reviewing the submitted courses Robin added the following to the Recommendation “The Distance Education Coordinator, or designee, will review the course submissions and will
complete a check off list of competencies as identified above in Step Two. If a competency is missing from a course shell, they or their designee will work with the faculty member until the competency can be documented. Once complete, the list of competencies will be placed on the DE Committee agenda for approval.” It was acknowledged that the review would not infringe on academic freedom since the items reviewed are necessary by law. It was mentioned that continuing education is required in many other fields, and it was good to see that piece included in this proposal. It was also mentioned that it was important that faculty feel supported in the process. Monica felt it was a wise and thoughtful move to support our students. She also shared that at other institutions you have to present 100% of your course and that 25% was quite generous. Robin explained that 25% would provide faculty the opportunity to demonstrate they know how to build a course. Post-pandemic faculty will have the choice to teach online or on site. It is prudent to require demonstrated quality online instruction. When asked if this will slow down the approval process, it was acknowledged that, yes, it would but it should level out over time. Andy mentioned that the person writing the DE addendum is usually a single person and that doesn’t always translate into what is happening in the course. It is time to start looking more closely at what faculty are doing. Teresa appreciated the comments but warned that we should be developing a process and can’t be the ones to evaluate and regulate. We can come up with a format for what evaluators look for to make a decision. Robin indicated that the criteria have been approved and are in the Online Course Evaluation form. She repeated that this is not an evaluation of the instructor, but rather confirmation that the DE criteria are being met. Andy related that we all have restrictions on our job roles. We’re talking about faculty having the proper training to teach distance education. Mentoring, talking, thinking about your classes will improve the student experience. Robin will send the Recommendation to the Committee for review this week and will follow up for they vote to approve or reject the week of October 18.

5. **Proposed New Policies / Procedures (Action)**
   a. **Merging Canvas Course Shells** – Guidance: All students in merged shells can see one another in the discussion unless they are manually placed into groups by class section. This item was tabled until further notice.
   b. **Deleting Canvas Course Shells** – Annual Process – Opt In: Student records are kept for 3 years. 4 years takes that into account. Robin is waiting for Chris dela Rosa to determine if Canvas shells are considered faculty records. This item was tabled until further notice.
   c. **Three-Year Post MQT Certification Renewal to Teach Online** - (Vote Needed): Robin shared a simplified version of the document from last meeting. It was requested that we include verbiage to identify the party responsible for reviewing the deliverables identified under Specific Requirements, item 2. Robin agreed to add the following: “Demonstration of proficiency will be submitted to the Distance Education Coordinator for review.” It was suggested we add verbiage to indicate that faculty up for renewal will be notified prior to expiration of certification. Robin agreed to add the following verbiage: “One year prior to expiration of certification to teach online, faculty will be notified. Another notification will be sent at the beginning of the semester in which
certification will expire.” Motion to approve with additional verbiage was made by Monica Cappiello; seconded by Andy Bloom. Motion carried.

6. **2021-2022 DE Committee Goals** (Action)- Motion to approve the Goals was made by Sarah Cooper; seconded by Monica Cappiello. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40pm.