



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
May 24, 2011
3:45 p.m. – 4:45p.m. Room BE242**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

- 1) CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2) COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS**
- 3) OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 5/10/11**
- 5) DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - a) Policy statement from DETC to CCC regarding the Accreditation Team's recommendation of creating a separate network for academic computing - Rick Balogh
 - b) Blackboard Support Issues – Rick Balogh
 - c) Continue discussion regard SORT (SORT is online at <http://www.avc.edu/onlineorientation/sort/>- Rick Balogh
 - d) Respiratory Care computing concerns – Rick Balogh and Dr. Parnell
 - e) Open Lab PayPrint issues – Rick Balogh
- 6) REPORTS**
 - a) Podcasting workgroup
 - b) Accessibility workgroup
 - c) Online Orientation workgroup
- 7) OTHER**
- 8) ADJOURNMENT**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

DISTANCE EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING

May 24, 2011

3:45 pm – 4:45 pm

BE 242

MEMBERS PRESENT		MEMBERS ABSENT	
Rick Balogh	Ken Shafer	Dr. Youssef Ezzeddine	Mike Wilmes
Bonnie Curry	Dr. Tom O'Neil	Dr. Forte-Parnell	Joseph West
Dr. Nancy Bednar	Nancy Cholvin	Priscilla Jenison	
Tony Korwin	Ken Sawicki	Greg Krynen	

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mr. Balogh, Distance Education and Technology Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Comments from those present: Dr. Bednar stated that we must separate our network service from one into two – one for academic computing and one for administrative computing. We must also find an alternative to Blackboard. We must push this vigorously in the Senate and encourage that it be forwarded to the board. It was also recommended that Mr. Balogh give a report to the Senate that the committee is opposed to having a remotely hosted service. It should be something that we can do internally by using Moodle or Sakai. We could use the money from the cancellation of Blackboard to do this as we are experiencing an extreme amount of non-responsiveness to problems with Blackboard. Mr. Balogh agrees that this is the proper route that should be taken. He feels that we should pursue this through the Academic Senate then have it passed on to CCC. All members agreed that, if need be, all could communicate through e-mail or CCC Confer to discuss this further. It was also suggested that a survey monkey be sent out asking faculty what their concerns were. Mr. Balogh mentioned that he would take care of the other issues on the agenda during the summer and Dr. Bednar recommended that SORT be put into active status and all members check it out and report anything back at the first fall meeting.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Minutes from 5/10/11

Mr. Balogh requested comments from the members for any corrections to the minutes. With none forthcoming, he requested a motion to approve. A motion and a second were made and with no further discussion, the minutes were approved unanimously.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. **Policy statement from DETC to CCC regarding the Accreditation Team's recommendation of creating a separate network for academic computing - (Rick Balogh)**

Mr. Balogh stated that the Senate wishes for the DETC to actively look at the recommendations from the Accreditation Team and make a formal statement indicating what we wish to be done. This policy statement would then be forwarded to the CCC. What has been stated is that if we do not agree with the recommendations as stated by the Team, then our accreditation may be on the line. It is not a situation where we can have the luxury of picking it apart and making it completely to our desires, but putting together a clear, simple statement that we support those recommendations and wish to pursue them through the active channels within the college structure. Dr. Bednar feels that we have adequately satisfied 2D by changing the name of the committee to Distance Education and Computer Technology. In choosing this name, we are showing our intent to further include computer technology within the realm of academic distance education. It was stated by members present that administrative computing is the domain of IT Committee and is not something we wish to be involved in. The main issue that needs to be addressed outside of the name change of the committee involves the separation of the computing needs for academic as well as administrative. To go to two systems would solve an immense number of issues that we are now faced with. Dr. O'Neil stated that he feels a representative from Palmdale should be on the committee, whether it be Dr. Bell or Burton Arceneaux. Dr. Bednar definitely feels that we should cast the influence of the committee over Palmdale, even though they do not have any permanent faculty now, but to look toward the future to the time when Palmdale is in its own permanent campus. This puts us in the position of being involved in strategic planning, which would benefit both campuses.

Mr. Balogh reiterated the charge that has been given to DETC is to find ways to solve the problems that exist at this time involving faculty who are unable to move forward with software computing that they wish to use to teach their classes. Mr. Korwin does not feel that this committee should be addressing both sides of computing. It should come as a joint effort between IT Committee and the DETC. He also made comment that committees have been unable to make quorum which keeps decisions from being made and furthered on. Dr. Bednar also brought up the time in the past when "dead time" was instituted when committees could meet which did not interfere with class schedule. There would then be no excuse that you could not honor your obligation to a committee that you were a member of. Mr. Korwin felt there is a piece of the committee structure that is not addressing what accreditation is actually requesting. Accreditation is requesting that the college should adjust its technology advisory structure which cannot come from the committee structure. It needs to come from the resources that the college and the faculty are going to support ITS going forward to make it a reality.

Mr. Balogh made comment that the Senate does not care. They want a policy statement of what we want done, not can we do it, so that somewhere in the future through CCC it will become a reality. Dr. Bednar commented that our recommendations are the first stage to the Senate after which they go to CCC then to SPBC for budget recommendations. The idea is to come up with ideas that can be accomplished. Dr. Bednar feels that we need to go over the costs of Blackboard and see if that money could be better spent on open source ware using a combination of a technician and another server. Mr. Korwin wished to revisit the issue that he brought up in past meetings in regard to security of the IT Committee system. It needs to be understood that IT Committee has the ultimate responsibility of making sure all legal issues are handled and that we are not impacting the system with software that could cause problems. He feels that until faculty comes and sits down with IT Committee to discuss these legal issues and any ramifications, he stated that they can demand all they want but it is not going to happen unless proper procedures are put in place. He would like

to get to the point where this could happen and all entities are happy, but it still does not have anything to do with administrative computing. Mr. Balogh insisted that there are some legal issues that can take place without issue, but Mr. Korwin stated that all matters need to be thought out before any steps are taken before jumping right in, regardless of what the accreditation person knows and thinks what are college can and should do. Mr. Korwin is willing to go that route but he has not seen any effort on the part of faculty to engage. Mr. Balogh inquired what did this mean? Dr. O'Neil stated that it needed to come from the top which would buy into technology and distance education. Mr. Korwin commented that it needed to have long-term support, finances and resources. In order to make this happen, we need the equipment and it will not be cheap. Dr. Bednar mentioned that our budget compared to other community colleges which spends 7% on ITS whereas we only spend 1.5%. We need to have a commitment from the top in order for this to happen and no demands from the Senate will change this until that happens. Dr. O'Neil stated that it might be changing next year. Mr. Balogh stated that Mr. Valiotis of the Academic Senate wants something to send to the CCC for the future of academic computing, but Dr. Bednar feels that it needs to be a collaborative work between IT and DETC. It would involve faculty knowing what they need as far as computing goes and ITS having the ability to cost it out and let them know if it is feasible.

Dr. O'Neil felt that we should start to have combined meetings in the fall. Mr. Korwin stated that ITS is willing to go there but all parties must be aware of what can be done and what cannot, but it all hinges on the issue of achieving quorum at these meetings. Dr. Bednar felt that we needed to get this forwarded onto the Senate so it can make it to CCC, then to SPBC which will look at the budget to see what we can incorporate. Mr. Balogh asked if the committee would agree that changes in the future would allow administrative computing the freedom to have a different level of security than the academic side? He stated that the accreditation team sees the problems that exist for faculty who are having difficulty with the network and that it is not working as they would like. They are unable to do the things that they would like to do. Dr. Cholvin sees only a minority of faculty who are having difficulties but, overall, most are doing fine. Mr. Balogh stated that if she had been at the last Senate meeting and heard all of the problems that they encounter and wishing that they had more computing freedom to do the things that they would like to do she would understand. They need more software in their classes and want to get through what legal issues they may have. The accreditation team saw it as being solved with different levels of security between the two computing entities. They see it as a solution for us and all Mr. Balogh is asking is if we support that and make it a recommendation to the Senate. Dr. Bednar agrees that the administrative side of our college computing should have a much different level of security as it deals with the most intimate details of a person's life. A different security stance should be incorporated for the academic side in order to open up opportunities. To take, for instance, the ability of a faculty member to receive a book that utilizes a disk but it is not feasible right now to install that in a college computer on their own. They must request through ITS to have this done so they can make sure it is compliant, but even when that is done, they must wait forever before someone from ITS installs it because of the limited staff. Dr. Bednar and Dr. Cholvin stated that all faculty that she knows of are using their home computers in order to create their courses. And as the union rep, Dr. Bednar stated in the union contract that the college is to provide what they need in order to do their jobs and if they are not providing services where they can download test banks, course packs, etc., they are in violation of the union contract.

Mr. Balogh then questioned if the members were in agreement with what the accreditation team recommends. He requested a motion from the members. Mr. Shafer made a motion that the committee recommends forwarding to the Senate and then to CCC the accreditation team recommendations as listed in 2D and 3. Mr. Korwin wished to amend that it include a statement that a method be formulated by the Academic Senate to ensure that all committees achieve quorum in order to approve action items. Members agreed that this was a valid issue but the two items should be separate motions. A second came from Dr. Bednar to Mr. Shafer's motion. Further discussion came from Mr. Korwin to amend. He would like to separate the two recommendations, 2D and 3, into separate motions and add a supplemental to the 2D motion in regard to attendance at meetings be encouraged and promoted by the Academic Senate. At this point, it was determined that the original motion by Mr. Shafer either needed to be voted on and defeated or have him take the motion off the table. It was decided that Mr. Shafer would take his motion off the table.

At this point, Dr. Bednar understood that the members wished to have two motions that would go forward to the Senate and CCC. She then made a motion that accreditation team recommendation #3 as stated in the report be forwarded as it reads. The motion was seconded. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously to forward Recommendation #3 in its entirety and verbiage as a policy statement to the Senate. Dr. Bednar made a second motion that accreditation team recommendation #2D as stated in the accreditation team report be sent forward to the Senate and CCC. An addendum would be included that both Senate and CCC require all faculty and staff who are members of committees be required to attend in order to gain full quorum in order to create and vote on policy or create consequences if they do not attend. Dr. O'Neil gave a second. With no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

Dr. Bednar also recommended that starting in the fall, IT Committee and DETC meet once a term in order to coordinate the needs of distance education and computing technology and to follow the guidelines that IT Committee feels would be required to make it happen. She also recommended that with the departure of Dr. Fisher in 2012, a search committee be formulated that would look for someone who would further computer technology and make it a priority for AVC. Mr. Korwin wished that the meeting be a workshop and be longer than an hour in order to get more accomplished.

b. Blackboard Support Issues - (Rick Balogh)

Due to time constraints this discussion item will be brought up at a future meeting.

c. Continue discussion on SORT- (Rick Balogh)

Due to time constraints this discussion item will be brought up at a future meeting.

d. Respiratory Care computing concerns – (Rick Balogh and Dr. Parnell)

Due to time constraints this discussion item will be brought up at a future meeting.

e. Open Lab PayPrint issues – (Rick Balogh)

Due to time constraints this discussion item will be brought up at a future meeting.

7. REPORTS

a. Podcasting workgroup

Due to time constraints this report will be provided at a future DETC meeting.

b. Accessibility workgroup

Due to time constraints this report will be provided at a future DETC meeting.

c. Online Orientation Workgroup – no time for a report.

Due to time constraints this report will be provided at a future DETC meeting.

8. OTHER

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the Distance Education and Technology meeting at 5:00 p.m. Motion carried.

pag