

## Distance Education and Learning Technology Committee

The fifth meeting of the Distance Education Learning Technology Committee for the 2012-2013 academic year was held Wednesday, February 27, 2013 at 3:30p.m. in Brewster B104. Members present: Wendy Creasy, Donna McDonald, Clayton Sessoms, Xiangming Fang, Ken Luderbach, Elmer Poe, George Wang, Matt Reynolds, Tom Ross, Nasseh Tabrizzi, Karl Wuensch, Brenda Killingsworth, Lida Cope, Elizabeth Hodge, Adam Caldwell (SGA), Guests: Rita Reaves, Alex Senior, and Len Rhodes, Absent: Alice Anderson

### Order of Business

Agenda I – Approval of Minutes—Elmer Poe moved to have the minutes accepted, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Tom Ross. The minutes of the fifth meeting held on January 30, 2013 were accepted.

Agenda II – New Coding System - Goal 3: “Determine a policy for how DE courses are coded”

- Questions committee is addressing include; 1)How will the SACS definition of the DE course impact coding?, 2)Update on the changes to the coding system since summer 2012, and 3)The issue of monitoring the consistency between the course code and the actual delivery.

Dr. Len Rhodes presented the following information on the new coding system. [Please see attached documents that were handed out during the meeting.](#)

Document One – Record of Layout Form is a document that goes to all external reporting entities. All universities in the UNC system develop the same report. Dr. Rhodes noted three attributes listed on the document that we should take particular interest in reviewing. Items # 10, #15, #17.

Those three attributes describes the bulk of what the students are provided. Instructional format is set at the catalog level whereas the other two elements are set at the department level.

#### #10 Method of Delivery

- 01 = Face to Face
- 02 = Interactive 2-way video
- 07 = Face to Face Remote Site
- 08 = Internet or World Wide Web
- 09 = Hybrid Primarily Web
- 10 = Hybrid Primarily Face to Face
- 11 = Storage Device or Non-Web Media

#### #15 Course Type

- 1 = Remedial
- 2 = Regular
- 3 = Honors
- 6 = AP High School Course
- 7 = Thesis or Dissertation

- 8 = Research

#### #17 Instructional Format

- 02 = Lab
- 03 = Studio
- 04 = Lecture
- 05 = Seminar
- 06 = Student Teaching
- 07 = Practicum
- 08 = Clinical
- 09 = Internship
- 11 = Colloquia
- 13 = Lecture and Lab
- 14 = Recital, Performance, or Ensemble
- 15 = Physical Activity
- 16 = Individual Study
- 17 = Recitation
- 18 = Administrative

The Record Layout form data is extracted from Banner, cleaned up and hand entered into the Record Layout form. It is the responsibility of departments/units to enter the data into banner. Every active course was reviewed last fall (2012) and input in bulk by registrar's office.

Three questions were posed by committee members:

- Why would you not have databases that communicate with each other as opposed to data entry?
- Is there any auditing process on campus to check what departments are providing? Answer is no...that is a lot of leg work.
- Are courses being coded properly for compliance? Answer: The new source codes allow us to track the courses properly.

For SACS compliance we don't look at 650 to determine an online course we should look at the Record Layout Form under #10 Method of Delivery (#08 Internet, WWW, or #09 Hybrid primarily Web) 650/008 is based on the funding code.

Do the students get the courses they sign up for? Answer: The issue is that students are registering in self service banner allows them to sign up but does not tell them if it is online or face to face course unless they drill down by clicking on a link in the document. Since students are required to click on a particular link to access what type of delivery the course is offered in it was suggested that access be placed on the main page face. **Action:** It was suggested that we contact Angela Anderson to ask if that can be changed so that students don't have to drill down to determine if the course is f2f or online.

#### Agenda III - Rita Reaves (SACS) & Lida Cope (FS committee chairs meeting, 2-19-13)

- Rita Reaves and Alex Senior attended the meeting to raise awareness of the SACs compliance crosswalk document and what areas the DELT Committee should pay particular attention to as we move forward. [See attached document.](#)
- Rita's team has outlined each senate committee and listed each standard for the Senate committees to address. The purpose is to raise awareness of SACs principles and standards. Rita stated that what we

told SACs about DE is extensive and listed on the document are the SACs principles. To help us ensure ongoing compliance, the committee wants to continuously address the principles. To view the full document you may access the following link <http://www.ecu.edu/sacs> It is important to understand the principles so that committees can address how our current DE procedures apply to the principle.

- The compliance document was submitted to SACs and provided a 10 year snapshot of how we meet the principles. What we don't want is for someone (namely a student) to raise concern and demonstrate somehow that ECU is out of compliance. This would cause an inquiry and put the university in jeopardy. So again the purpose of raising awareness is to keep the faculty apprised of the policies and what we want to continue to do to keep in compliance as well as for the reaffirmation of SACs. Do this with an eye toward meeting the expectations of SACs.

#### Questions:

- How many SACs representatives are coming and what is our requirement - Should faculty be in offices & how prepared? Answer: David and Rita will meet with the onsite team. They will also meet with the individuals to be interviewed. Most questions should be wrapped up prior to the onsite visit and the visitors would then focus on the QEP. Interviewed individuals will be notified within the next few weeks.

#### Agenda IV - Karl Wuensch & Elizabeth Hodge: Report from the OQC meeting (2-20-13)

- At the Online Quality Council meeting three committee charges were discussed. After an in-depth review of the policy, it was determined that the policy is clear, that unit administrators are responsible for reporting DE Modules, annual training, and peer review process. Lida said that Mark Sprague, Chair of the Faculty, has asked that we refine guidelines for the annual training requirement. **Action:** DELTC discussed asking committee members to collect unit procedures and/or DE Handbooks. DELTC can combine the material and submit/present material to the Faculty Senate. DELTC may want to provide information to the unit administrator and Deans by holding an open faculty forum to address DE policy. [*DE Professional Development* for review]  
<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/facultysenate/resolutions/11-86DErequirement.pdf>

#### Agenda V - Lida Cope, Wendy Creasey: Report from the IRCC meeting (2-27-13)

- We are moving to Blackboard 9.x service pack between spring and fall semester. We will consider version 10 in 13-14 academic year.
- Faculty web space for retirees will be available for scholarly activities.

#### Items Not Discussed at meeting, and moved for discussion at the March 27,2013 meeting

- **MOOCs** – discussion (and Wendy Creasey, Elmer Poe – PowerPoint pres – MOOCs – also attached)

[**Attached:** *Resolution on concerns with e-learning; The trouble with online college; & Green-AGB-Mission MOOCs*; please be **ready to discuss**]

Mark Sprague to DELTC: I want to make you aware of the fact that the academic deans are having an ongoing discussion of MOOCs. The ECU Board of Trustees is interested in the topic as well. As you may know, the UNC Strategic Plan calls for the system to develop one MOOC per year "that meet[s] the highest standards of instructional quality and student learning and meet lower-division general education requirements at all UNC campuses." This is included in the e-

learning section of the strategic plan found on pages 52-55 of the approved plan <[https://www.northcarolina.edu/strategic\\_direction/Strat\\_Plan\\_Feb\\_8\\_APPROVED.pdf](https://www.northcarolina.edu/strategic_direction/Strat_Plan_Feb_8_APPROVED.pdf)>. I have attached an article on MOOCs that Dean Alan White shared with the other deans. The News and Observer has an article about a new MOOC offered by UNC-Chapel Hill. <<http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/02/21/2695288/unc-ch-joins-effort-to-open-some.html>>. I know the DELT Committee has discussed MOOCs. Now may be the time to continue this discussion before ECU has decided what to do about them. It is important that we have faculty input on how we implement this aspect of the strategic plan.

Catherine Rigsby: You may find this message I received from Steve Leonard interesting. Steve is a UNC-CH Department of Political Science faculty member, teacher of both face-to-face and online courses, and the Faculty Assembly delegate to GA's e-Learning Committee. His message was prompted by a NYT editorial I forwarded to Maggie O'Hara (Director of e-Learning) and Steve. I do hope that the ECU faculty investigate this issue fully and do not hesitate to speak up strongly about it. It really is a matter of the tension between preserving academic quality and selling out to the highest bidder. And, of course, faculty must be the guardians of academic content, delivery, and quality.

P.S. For the benefit of any DELT Committee members who may not have seen it, I have also attached the Faculty Assembly's e-Learning resolution. It was prepared in response to the Strategic Plan. The complete response document can be found at [http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/19Jan2013\\_Faculty\\_Assembly\\_Response\\_to\\_the\\_Jan16\\_Draft\\_of\\_th.pdf](http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/19Jan2013_Faculty_Assembly_Response_to_the_Jan16_Draft_of_th.pdf) (also linked to the main page of the FA website: <http://www.northcarolina.edu/facultyassembly/index.htm>).

- DE modules review: consider the input and any updates that may need to be made to the modules in the future. [Results attached for review]. Consider distributing the survey more widely; link: [https://ecu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_a3OtJMeoUITfHZa](https://ecu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_a3OtJMeoUITfHZa). **Read results in detail to be ready to discuss.**
- The SACS compliance certification report on DE at ECU and Distance & Correspondence Education Policy Statement – attached -- **Please read to be ready to discuss.**
- Prioritizing future agenda items

Goal Two: Develop a list of experts for specific content knowledge, pedagogy, and technology. Include both EPA and SPA staff.

Goal Five: Build collaboration with faculty in determining standards for online courses, focusing on how quality is defined and how technology used effectively in both online courses as well as F2F.

Goal Six: Work collaboratively with both the campus and State-wide Online Quality Council

Goal Seven: Work collaboratively with Academic Awards Committee, Teaching Grants Committee, and Innovation Center representatives to support teaching awards and/or grants focused on technology innovation.

Goal Eight: Develop a resolution to present to the faculty senate that requires all (ECU-wide) faculty to complete a technology requirement. (9-26-12 Minutes)

