Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2019; 3:00 p.m. Rivers 208

Person Presiding: Timm Hackett (chair)

Regular Members in Attendance: Peng Xiao, Guyla Evans, Heidi Bonner, Yolanda Holt, Barbara Kellam, Kathleen Sitzman, Kathy Lohr (secy)

Ex-officio Members in Attendance: Diana Bond, Wendy Creasey, Regis Gilman, Steve Schmidt, Elizabeth Hodges, Melay Efrem

January meeting minutes were approved with edits.

Old Business
Online Integrity Subcommittee. Based on an article in the Chronicle on students hiring out their work, Provost Mitchelson requested the committee best practices or strategies the instructor could use to help ensure online integrity. A subcommittee of DELTC was formed in the January meeting to address this issue:
Develop an online best practices to help identify and avoid integrity violations such as cheating for faculty use. Timm shared the UNC-Chapel Hill code (see Best Practices for DE Integrity document in Teams).
Ensure students understand the meaning of academic integrity and its role in specific professional and vocational fields. Show examples. Address as preventative versus punitive. Each program/college could create value statements related to digital ethics that are discipline specific. Include this in every syllabus. There was much discussion on how discipline specific this issue is well as a difference in graduate versus undergraduate in how academic integrity is explained and examined. One suggestion was for new students to complete a module or other tool that explains academic integrity/plagiarism including students not using past papers for current or future assignments. Regis said that information could be sent to new students when they receive their distance education ID. Wendy said they could help develop modules not the content. Heidi recommended the library modules. COAD may also cover this.
Create assignments that require students to seek answers. Encourage exploration. Focus on student learning versus student behavior. Integrate reflective answers that connect topics to students' experiences and future applications.
Use plagiarism software. Use SafeAssign or TurnItIn report as preventative not punitive. Multiple submissions to such software allow students to address issues before final submission is made. Ensure students know work is being monitored in this software and what the plagiarism software results mean.
Use technology to curb violations such as lockdown of browsers to prohibit multiple open windows, using proctoring centers or software. There is cost involved with ProctorU ($25 per student). Wendy cautioned that lockdown only works in certain situations. Other considerations were identity authentication – mouse-based signature software, webcam proctoring, keystroke authentication.
Discussion moved to what is this committee's responsibility? Is it policy, prevention, or education? In summary, provide additional strategies that can be used; best practices by faculty in informing students about academic integrity and encouraging the university, disciplines, and departments to publicize ethical code.

Peer Review Instrument Subcommittee
Discussion by the subcommittee included Part 5 of the faculty manual. Some examples need to be updated, for instance Moodle, Centra Looked at it as review of course not instructor. Also, the scale needs to be consistent – three the top, one the lowest - with descriptors on every page. Content-wise nothing to add, it is still relevant. There is confusion between peer and course evaluation because different colleges handle these differently. The policy needs to be cleaned up. Also, the name Peer Review Instrument of Online Courses is somewhat

misleading. The form only refers to review of the course, not the instructor. Unlike with a face-to-face course where the instructor is observed in the classroom teaching, asynchronous teaching is difficult to observe. Quality Matters may help with this. Wendy stated that there is going to be workshops in May hosted by OFE. If there is something out there already, we might as well use it. The subcommittee suggested the peer review instrument be availability digitally. Yolanda asked about the learning management system metrics being used for evaluation. There was some cautioning about numbers not reflecting the uniqueness of instructors and how they teach their courses, it would be difficult to standardize. The metrics might be applicable to course evaluation versus instructor evaluation.

What next? Elizabeth suggesting making minor changes to the form (see Instrument in DTLC Recommendations in Teams) then waiting to see LMS choice and how it impacts this. It was decided that the subcommittee will make the minor edits and present the revised form at the next meeting for the whole committee to see.

PRR Subcommittee

The recommendations (see Subcommittee Comments on PRR document in Teams) included clarifying the intended audience for the document and developing a FAQ. Many of the terms regarding technology are not understood by the end-user. The document should help faculty understand technology better. How to make it relevant to their understanding. Why safeguards are important, what is expected of them when using technology through the university. It should include examples and the hierarchy of storage types. Will departments/colleges have liaisons to help understand the policies? Section 1.3 was discussed with concern to its restrictive nature to academic freedom (see 4 in document). Several FAQs were provided. The final point made by the subcommittee involved the rights of students and the protection of student information and faculty's obligation to inform students. Timm recommended that committee members review the subcommittee document as well as the other two subcommittee documents before the next meeting when we can then decide if we send them on to the appropriate next step.

New Business

New Learning Management System. All three demos have been completed. Lots of great questions from those who attended. Next step is to meet internally and compose memo on demos of courses and distribute. Then schedule an open forum to answer questions about the systems. Wendy shared that once all the feedback is considered there may be a clear leader, or there may be two options. Wendy reiterated that transparency and patience as well as governance is required to make this decision.

Elizabeth cautioned that we think through how it will be integrated, being strategic and thoughtful of the impact on our students and various systems. Melay, speaking for students, confirmed that mobile compatibility will be important.

Wendy said this committee needs to be prepared to give a recommendation to either pilot one system, which is actually adoption, or two pilots. ATAC will be meeting March 8th. Public forum will be around March 11. We'll discuss on March 27th for possible recommendation to the April Faculty Senate meeting.

Next Meeting:

Tim will post updated documents in Teams and send reminders. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35.
Next meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2019, **3:00 p.m.** in Rivers East 208