

1-14-13

Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee

The fourth meeting of the Distance Education Learning Technology Committee for the 2012-2013 academic year was held Wednesday, November 28, 2012 at 3:30p.m in Brewster B104. Members present: Lida Cope, Karl Wuensch, Xiangming Fang, Elizabeth Hodge, Elmer Poe, Matt Reynolds, Ken Luterbach, Wendy Creasey, and Alice Anderson. Guest: Lori Lee. Absent: Nasseh Tabrizi, George Wang, Tom Ross, and Donna McDonald.

Order of Business

Agenda I –Approval of Minutes— Karl Wuensch moved to have the revised minutes accepted, 2nd by Angela Anderson. The minutes of the fourth meeting held on November 28, 2012 were unanimously accepted. Below is the revised statement with the strikethrough indicating what was removed.

A motion was made to remove Goal One: An analysis of the current ITCS Technology Support tickets to address the number of issues that arise and how they are handled if we agree that the current system is sufficiently effective. Dr. Ross would like to continue discussion the outcome of which would be a list of problems and corresponding solutions. At this point the motion was postponed pending further discussion.

Agenda II – Wendy Creasey – Addressing the current ITCS technology support

Opening discussion was based on email correspondence with the DELT committee.

Dr. Ross wrote: The goal I suggested in the first meeting was designed to improve distance education. My students, my colleagues, and I continue to experience a number of issues relating to IT support of distance education. As I stated in previous meetings there are continuing problems in Blackboard with lock-outs and attachment of and downloading of files, there was the Safeassign problem in December 2011, and there are on-going problems using Excel with Sympodium. In addition since the last meeting my colleagues and I have become aware of a Mediasite/hardware problem which prevented Mediasite from recording all the material presented. It is my opinion that a thorough review of the problems arising needs to be undertaken to improve the delivery of distance education. I believe the committee should adopt as one of its primary goal the recording of problems and pursuit of solutions to these problems.

Discussion: Dr. Creasey presented the current ITCS support process. She also added the following comments via email.

Dr. Wendy Creasey wrote:

- Test taking lock outs – There are numerous reasons that a student can experience issues with test taking. They include poor wireless connections that drop constantly, using the

wrong browser, using your phone as a hotspot, running multiple programs at the same time and overloading your computer, and accidentally shutting the window of the test. The longer the test and the fewer number of restarts allowed can exacerbate the issue.

Action: To help with this issue, we have purchased Lock Down Browser which prevents students from opening up multiple browsers and sites, as well as preventing students from shutting out their test. We educate users about test taking through our website, blogs, and email. We are exploring a Browser Check tool, where students can check their browser before logging into Blackboard.

- Attaching files – I believe this issue was in the spring and involved a Blackboard patch.
- Safe Assign – There was an issue last November and December with Safe Assign. Safe Assign is a free-hosted tool that is included with Blackboard. Last year, their infrastructure could not handle the usage. People across the nation experienced the same problem we did. Safe Assign majorly increased their capacity and we have not experienced problems since.

Action: Although we have not had issues since last year, there are more robust tools available that we should explore. Many in the UNC system are pursuing contracts with Turn It In which also integrates with Blackboard. We had a demo in November and will offer another in January. We are hoping to pursue a pilot to give the community a chance to use the tool.

- Media Site: I am attaching two emails that describe the Media Site issue and our course of action. Once we were made aware, we have been working with the college IT and MTS to resolve. It is an elusive problem, since we cannot replicate it but we are changing equipment and monitoring. Out of 700 recordings, it has occurred 9 times this semester making it difficult to determine if we have fixed the problem with the changes we have made.

Based on discussion during the meeting about the systematic approach ITCS uses for tracking issues, the committee believes that ITCS has a systematic process in place for faculty and student support. Therefore, based on email correspondence and in-depth discussions the committee moves to not pursue goal one as stated in minutes October 24th and instead adopt the following revised goal.

October 24th - Goal One: An analysis of the current ITCS Technology Support tickets to address the amount of issues that arise and how they are handled. Expected Outcome: Develop a list of problems and solutions

Revised Goal One: We request ITCS continue to monitor frequency of problems, usage of technology and new tool enhancement with DE technology and report their findings to the committee with ongoing and continuing processes. ITCS already has a monitoring system in place and believes it would benefit from the survey results.

Alice Anderson made a motion to accept revised goal. Dr.Poe 2nd the motion and the newly revised goal was passed unanimously.

Agenda III – New DELTC Charge in conjunction with OQC

Lida Cope proposed new charge formulated based on a meeting with Chair of Faculty and FS Officers on November 12, 2012.

- A. The committee reviews and recommends policies and procedures to enhance faculty teaching and student learning in distance education.
 - B. The committee reviews reports from the University Online Council relevant to the effectiveness of the University's distance education policies and procedures
- ...
- [& added]
- I. The chair or appointed representation serves as ex-officio member on the University Online Quality Council.

Elizabeth Hodges moved that we accept the new charge, Karl Wuensch 2nd the motion and the committee was in favor of the new charge.

Agenda IV – Statewide Online Quality Council

Dr. O'Hara developed a strategic plan for Distance Education for all universities in the system. The committee needs to review the strategic plan and provide input into Dr. O'Hara by Monday, December 3rd. The plan provides information on how to share resources, and streamline institution processes.

It was decided that the DELTC would provide the E-Learning Strategic Planning Process document to the entire ECU faculty to review and provide feedback to Dr. O'Hara who is in charge of the plan at GA. The DELTC encourages faculty to participate in this process.

(Feedback was submitted to the Chair of Faculty by 12/3. The final document submitted to Dr. O'Hara is attached.)

Agenda V – IRCC

Wendy Creasey provided the following information regarding topics discussed at the IRCC.

- Publisher tool topic keeps coming up in terms of the use of the tool and cloud guidelines. Click agreements are considered contracts. Currently ECU has guidelines in place to deal with the security issues with storing documents in the cloud.
- ITCS is trying to integrate specific tools that are approved to be used in Bb and have contracts already in place to cover faculty and students as opposed to faculty and students using non-contractual tools to store data. It has been requested that Angela Anderson send out information to make people aware of FERPA issues.

October 24th items that still need to be addressed:

Need DE SACS document from John Connelly.

Invite Len Rhodes and Greg Hodges to address new coding system for courses.

The Chair of the DELTC or committee representative will move forward with each of the action items listed. The next meeting date is January 23, 2013.

Remaining meeting dates: January 23, February 27th, March 27th, and April 24th.

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth M. Hodge Ph.D.

Associate Professor

College of Education

E-Learning Goals

Note: Comments and suggested changes of the ECU Distance Learning and Education Technology and the faculty officers are included in this document as tracked changes. Additional comments appear at the end of the document.

1. Use e-learning to increase access to educational and professional development opportunities for the citizens of North Carolina¹
 - a. Develop a plan to increase degree completion for that segment of the NC population that have some college education but no academic degree or certificate
 - i. Identify potential students and special groupspopulations (adults, military, minority etc.)
 - ii. Identify courses and programs for both degree and certificate purposes to meet needs of those identified in 1.a.i
 - iii. Contact potential students as mentioned in 1-a-i
 1. By Postcard
 2. By Telephone campaign
 3. By advertising in stateState-wide publicity

Comment [KL1]: Referring to "citizens of North Carolina" seems to invite the view of North Carolina as a nation (which may be appealing to some people); maybe consider replacing citizens with the more general term people

Comment [L2]: Somehow phrase the fact that out-of-state students are included as well?

Comment [MS3]:) Why limit? How are you going to find out who fits this category?

Comment [MS4]: Use public tv and radio instead of postcard.

Comment [MS5]: Is this realistic?

Comment [KL6]: Would this include social networking sites (e.g., Facebook, linkedIn)?

¹ Also the UNC E-learning system emphasizes the citizens of North Carolina, interested individual and groups from other states in the country are not excluded.

- iv. Ensure availability of coursescourse and programs (C&P)
 - 1. Fund development as needed
 - b. Develop a seamless and user-friendly websitesimple site for all student services which will be selectively open to public
 - i. UNC Online
 - c. Identify and evaluate current instructional technologies in use system-wide and new technology that may be adopted externally
 - i. Match best technologies to each C&P
 - ii. Create faculty development activities, workshop, webinar, for instance, for each technology
 - iii. Explore system-wide technology adoptions
 - d. Actively seek new funding and revenue sources
 - i. Involve Higher Education advocate to general assembly in e-learning initiatives
 - ii. Explore grants for funding access projects in state and federal levels
 - e. Support e-learning at the campuses
 - i. Incentivize specific initiatives
 - ii. Offer competitive mini-grants (\$3,000 – 5,000)
 - iii. Establish Board of Governor's Award for e-teaching
 - f. Increase partnering opportunities
 - i. Establish liaison with community college leadership
 - ii. Establish broad business and professional association connections
2. Create an environment that promotes and supports e-learning leadership, resources and best practices of (?) sharing, innovation, and creativity and thus helps ensure a quality educational experience for both faculty and students
- a. Create and support a system-wide faculty development agenda
 - i. Explore the creation of a shared-services model for instructional designers
 - ii. Establish a system-wide academy for e-teaching
 - iii. Create communities of practice as appropriate
 - 1. Faculty E-teaching development practitioners
 - 2. Instructional designers
 - 3. Faculty e-teaching
 - a. Subject area
 - b. Technologies
 - c. Regular interaction among faculty who teach the same courses in system-wide
 - d. Eliminate duplication of the same course teaching in the UNC system, and credits should be recognized within the system, eventually students can select courses in the system-wide
 - iv. Encourage campus faculty development centers to incorporate e-learning approaches in their offerings
 - v. Develop an e-learning expert database

Comment [MS7]: Define development because it is unclear.

Comment [KL8]: This bullet point is similar to (or the same as) 2B below. Goal 1 seeks to increase access to educational opportunities, but this bullet point addresses students rather than prospective students. Consider deleting this bullet point and merging it with 2B below.

Comment [KL9]: C&P?

Comment [KL10]: These seem to stray from Goal 1: Use eLearning to increase access to educational opportunities.

Comment [KL11]: These could pertain to Goal 1, but they seem to stray from it.

Comment [L12]: Why not also high schools that encourage top students to take college-level courses?

Comment [KL13]: Consider making this two goals: (1) A goal pertaining to eLearning leadership, innovation, and creativity; and (2) A goal for implementing eLearning best practices.

I regard resource sharing as a best practice.

Comment [MS14]: How is this different than 1,c, ii?

Comment [KL15]: Pursuit of these two items could lead to innovations and a leadership position.

- vi. Create a robust repository of exemplars
- vii. Establish a TLT-like entity to facilitate collaboration
- viii. Leverage central IT purchasing power
- ix. **Support research and development in e-learning**
- x. Provide quality professional development activities for campus leadership up to BOG level
- b. **Create and support a system-wide, integrated network of student services**
 - i. Establish consistent tuition and fee structure for e-learning
 - ii. Improve inter-institutional registration process
 - 1. UNC Online seamless and **simple**
 - iii. Benchmark against for-profit, private and public university recruiting, admitting, advising, retention and mentoring practices
 - iv. Adapt and integrate successful and practical best practices into online student services
 - v. Create student development activities that assess student readiness for e-learning
- c. **Assess and report outcomes**
 - i. Set goals and desired outcomes
 - 1. Benchmark against national standards
 - a. Degree attainment
 - b. Time to completion
 - c. Successful employment
 - d. Career advancement
 - 2. Survey employers (Are graduates meeting the needs?)
 - 3. Incorporate existing standards across UNC
 - a. SACS
 - b. Quality Matters
 - c. campuses
 - ii. Determine metrics to measure successful outcomes (local campuses and system-wide)
 - 1. Peer reviews
 - 2. Student surveys
 - 3. Employer **surveys**
 - 4. Professional body survey**
 - iii. Measure and report outcomes
 - 1. Board of Governors
 - 2. Chancellors
 - 3. Chief Academic officers
 - 4. Press releases

Comment [KL16]: This would contribute to the leadership goal.

Comment [KL17]: I regard this as a best practice.

Comment [L18]: If this is to be part of a promoting slogan, I would stay away from simple; I find “easy access” or “user-friendly” more appropriate.

Comment [KL19]: I regard this as a best practice.

Comment [L20]: No faculty /faculty satisfaction surveys?

Additional Comments

1. The ESSP document explicitly mentions the lack of ADA compliance but there is no explicit mention of developing a training mechanism or support program to address this in the goals document.
2. There is little mention of a body that would identify, institute, and support new learning technologies. The repeated mention of UNC Online and the establishment of a unified DE presence for the system to me implies a unity of course delivery systems, collaborative software, etc. but there is no mention of establishing a group that would maintain this unity and be responsible for the identification, implementation, maintenance, and training that such systems will require. The potential for fragmentation on the technical end is a serious pitfall that should be addressed.
3. I don't see much regarding the complexities of funding the proposed shared aspects of E-learning. By that I mean where will the money for all of this be coming from and what body will be deciding how and to whom it will be distributed?
4. Overall, I found the document supportive of resource sharing and collaboration, which seems entirely appropriate. Even though the current state of the document may serve the target audience well, I did insert some comments (included above).
5. While I don't have major problems with the document, I feel we are missing some of the issue here in the east. Many of the people we would like to reach have limited or no access to high speed Internet. These plans all seem to assume that E-learning will reach a broad audience that we don't currently access, I am less sure.