



## Distance Education and Technology Committee Minutes

**Tuesday, March 28th, 2023**  
**3:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m., LH 106**  
**(Zoom link)**

**Type of Meeting:** Regular

**Please Review/Bring:** Agenda Packet

James Dorn, Faculty Co-chair  
 Greg Bormann, VPAA Designee - ABSENT  
 Nate Dillon – ADMIN Council  
 Alex Parisky, ITS Management  
 VACANT, ITS Alternative Media Specialist  
 Mike Wilmes, Learning Management Media Specialist (Ex-Officio) - ABSENT  
 Greg Krynen, IMC Representative  
 Gabrielle Poorman, AP&P  
 John Toth, Faculty Union  
 Sheri Langaman, Classified Union  
 Cynthia Kincaid, Arts & Humanities  
 Jim Bowen, Career Tech Ed  
 Walter Briggs III, Counseling - ABSENT  
 Mary Jacobs, Health & Safety Sciences  
 Barry Green, Kinesiology & Athletics  
 Linda Parker, Library  
 Kenan Shahla, Math, Science & Engineering - ABSENT  
 Ryan Rivas, Language & Communication Arts (Proxy – Norma Jones)  
 Kimberly Barker, Social & Behavioral Sciences  
 VACANT, Faculty At-Large  
 Kathy Osburn, Faculty At-Large  
 VACANT, ASO Representative

Items	Action
I. Call to Order	3:05 pm
II. Approval of Agenda	A. Approved, 2 abstentions
III. Opening Comments from Co-chairs	A. None
IV. Open Comments from the Public	A. None
V. Approval of Minutes	A. February 28th Minutes (attached) – Approved, 1 abstention
VI. Discussion Items	A. POCR Updates – The POCR team finished reviewing 3 courses, they now need to be submitted. Just need 1 of them to have their accessibility updated/fixed. They should all be submitted by the end of this week. We are on schedule to get the batch by the end of March/first week of April. We’ve received around 175 courses for submission, and the deadline has been extended to June 1 (window for submission opened on March 15, and classes can be submitted anytime between now and the deadline). We’re in really good shape right now. We will probably end up with more submissions than other colleges. The President’s initiative of 11-4 by 24 will be greatly helped by the DE’d classes we’ll be able to start offering. Things are looking really good for AVC right now. Huge kudos to our faculty that have worked on this

and made it happen. Can we track how many students we bring in with these new DE'd classes? Yes, we can. Right now we're not seeing much, but Summer should start showing improvement and increased numbers. What percentage should faculty be looking for with accessibility, because email addresses pop when checking using Panorama? Around 90-95%. Medium through Extreme issues should be taken care of/resolved. Emails should fall under Minor issues? We're mostly trying to make sure that there is as little work as possible for the POCR review committee.

- B. Online Modalities - The update on this topic is there is a work group that was created at the Academic Senate that will tackle the idea of online modalities. 4-5 people are in the group, and it's headed by Scott Lee. The bulk of this work will take place in this new committee, but we will forward our ideas also for consideration to this new committee. Some students have mentioned that our definitions listed online do not match up with what the classes actually do. These are definitely definitions that need to be revised. Other college websites all show different definitions, some are clearer than ours and others are either more confusing or about the same as what we currently use. Course modalities for other colleges seem to be all over the place, not sure why other colleges are not using the senate's recommendations, but that's probably because they're not required. Some definitions online say "Online" but they also say "attendance required." Is this something that we can change or make clearer? Some of that is due to "the limitations of Banner," which is the usual answer from ITS. The modality of "Live Online" is on the online schedule right now, even though it hasn't been fully approved yet. So this is a work in progress. Please send any questions or suggestions to J. Dorn for review/submission to the new work group.
- C. Online Course Quality / Evaluation - This document is just a suggestion, in the hopes to spark a conversation about this topic. This is not an official document, just some thoughts on trying to classify our role in class evaluation. Why isn't the viability of a course considered when deciding to allow a course to be taught online? Per the contract, we aren't allowed to require faculty to teach a class a certain way. (Hypothetically) if the Math department made a Canvas shell for Math 115 and every teacher used it but just changed out pictures, then we'll be able to ensure that it is compliant. Some of the topics mentioned in the attachment are governed by the contract, and cannot be changed without a new bargaining agreement. That would conflict with freedom to teach any way they want/freedom of expression. Evaluations are also strictly governed by the contract. Title V has also been brought up during the negotiations for the Evaluations piece of the faculty contract. This should just be for accessibility, not for content review. We are not trying to go against the contract at all, we just need a system in place that will help us confirm that a course is accessible before it is up on the online schedule. Maybe evaluations should include looking at the design of online courses. Items 1-3 should be apart/separate from the CBA, item 4 is definitely regarding the CBA. The POCR rubric would be a suggestion, not mandatory/required. There are biased evaluators too, based on their own opinions or preconceived notions. Maybe we should provide training for evaluators? Evaluations of online courses need to be



	<p>revisited, but that is a union issue. Not a DETC issue. Evaluations of online courses need to be done by an instructor who is certified to teach online, and understands online teaching. We will continue this conversation at the next meeting.</p> <p>D.</p>
VII. Action Items	A. None
VIII. Adjournment	4:02 pm
<b>NEXT MEETING:</b> 4/11/23	Spring Meeting dates 1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/14, 3/28, 4/11, 4/25