DEC Meeting Minutes – March 3rd 2021

Attendees

Dr. Tamara Powell, Stephen Bartlett, Laura Beth Davis, LeeAnn Lands, Sara Evans, Garrett Smith, Leslie Hankey, Renata Aloisi Creekmur, Nikki Hill, Dawn Baunach, Sam Lee, Uli Ingram, Charity Butcher, Laura Howard, Kathryn Morgan, Carlton Usher, Amanda Wolfe, Lauren Snider

Lauren Snider took the minutes.

The meeting began at 12pm

This meeting was more of a continuation of a discussion from the previous meeting, and as such, had only that discussion as the agenda item.

Tamara Powell opened the meeting with an update about the last meeting and bringing the ideas that were shared to the RCHSS.

Information was shared about how KSU is moving away from Collaborate Ultra in favor of Zoom instead. Collaborate Ultra will be available through the end of September. Nikki and Kathryn shared information about utilizing Zoom and how to integrate it into your classes over the summer and beyond. Several trainings will be available on changing to Zoom, and Nikki is working on a tutorial/training that will be available.

Tamara brought up concerns from the chairs and directors from the last session. There were concerns about how face to face classes were being treated differently than online classes and being addressed differently for the quality process. Another suggestion was to let the student evaluations be used for quality feedback, or updating how the students give feedback. Another option- -ensure that everybody in the college takes accessibility training.

Chat Questions-

Renata - Do hybrid fall into the category of online or f2f in this respect? They fall into the category for online classes.

LeeAnn - But students don't participate in evals at high rates.

Renata - Basing it on student evaluations alone seems dangerous

LeeAnn - Tammy . . . Could you get a \_general\_ sense of whether the chairs/supervisors were on-board with a substantive review process for online?

Tammy, there was not a lot of feedback so no. The biggest piece of feedback was that the chairs and directors were not on board for that idea [of a substantive review process for online].

Tamara shared the Miro for feedback from DEC Feb 2021. Attendees shared feedback from their departments.

**“Describe sufficient training for faculty teaching and developing online courses”**

Chat Comments/Questions

Laura Beth Daws - Is there any $$ available for a one-year mentoring commitment for some faculty?

LeeAnn Lands - I think cross-department might be useful. I always learn a lot from the ENGL faculty.

Laura Beth Daws - I really love the mentoring idea - doesn’t have to just be within depts though; I could see cross-dept mentoring too

Laura Howard - Do we not have Online Tech Coordinators in each department?

No, each department has different roles.

Amanda Wolfe - From the survey in Psych - one person wrote "Training should include how our classes need to flow, be built well, draw students in, have longevity, and not kill us in the process to create. I think we need training to make this magic happen."

Stephen brought up informing the deans more effectively about training and new hires, and how to find out if they have training and if so how to evaluate what types of training and if they meet RCHSS standards. Laura proposed a rubric or list for evaluating a new hire’s previous training.

Laura Howard “Could they have a quick meeting (15-30 minutes with) an instructional designer to confirm?”

Main ideas from this note.

* List of training courses available that would be for training
* Facilitate vs build vs emergency training
* Form for faculty who already meet training requirements, syllabus
* Mentoring program, could be something for some or all departments to participate in.

Stephen brought up asking trainees to build at least a start here module and a course map to show that they are capable.

LeeAnn Lands - “I like having a requirement to show achievement. A quarter of the course maybe (~4 modules). Agree -- a start here folder would be a good requirement. We might need models of what that course map would look like. I like the idea.”

Sara Evans - “And it wouldn't necessarily have to be at the interview point but after hire...if they are coming from somewhere else, theoretically they will have exported courses they could bring a few modules into a course shell in D2L to demonstrate their experience/competence.”\

**“Describe the approval mechanism that a course would go through to meet RCHSS quality standards”**

Possibly train student assistants to do course reviews or accessibility checks. IDs can do them as well.

Many people agree that a reviewed course quality checklist would be beneficial.

Charity Butcher brought up a concern about how the process of course review and approval/assessment would work out. Can they self-assess and then give it to their chair for approval or do they have to have an outside reviewer? Tamara clarified that this wouldn’t be a top down “this is what we decided” kind of event. They are looking for suggestions to help build the proposal of what they do, and the DEC is the representative of the college and departments. Stephen feels that the departments will be more open to it since the departments are having input into the process. Tamara doesn’t feel like leaving the review just to the faculty member is the best proposal. The chair is responsible for the courses meeting the guidelines, and the process should be helping the chair meet that goal.

Charity Butcher - “Is the most \*essential\* part here accessibility? That seems to be the case and only thing that is maybe required.” There are two parts. It is accessibility, and then the federal requirements.

LeeAnn Lands - “Would that require that we review a fully-built course, though?” To check for accessibility, wouldn’t a fully built course have to be submitted to be able to check everything for accessibility?

Laura Howard - “But could they submit the syllabus, a list of external tools, and certify that all videos are or will be captioned? As well as a start here module? Also, I know there are workload issues here, but honestly it's better for everyone (students and instructor) if courses are fully built before they go live...”

Sara Evans - “@Stephen - do you think that will be satisfactory for higher up admin? If the real worry is about potential lawsuits based on something not being accessible there is still the potential for something to be missed later in the course.” Stephen explained that most lawsuits seemed to be over institutions effort and whether they did or didn’t try to meet the needs of accessibility.

Charity brought up the idea of student help with checking accessibility, and the student workers can go through the ODE accessibility trainings.

**“Describe the course approval process. How would one determine if the course met the standards chosen?”**

Laura Howard - “1. Faculty completes mentoring/shadowing. 2. Faculty completes certification. 3. Developed course is assessed by instructional designers, GRAs, student assistants, or other departmentally designated representative (does SDS have someone who checks courses for accessibility or could a GRA also work on this there?). 4. Faculty gets green light from reviewer, chair signs off, faculty is added to list. 5. Re-review is every two years (reviewer and chair must sign off every two years).”

The general consensus was that reviews should be between 3-5 years. The idea of reviewing every 2 years seemed too soon again. The idea of faculty certifying their own courses came up again,

Renata - “Once the start here folder + one module have been assessed for accessibility, couldn’t faculty self-certify that the rest of the course is up to standards?”

The suggestion of putting the course review goals and updating being put into FPAs. Then the re-review process could be less formal without having a mandate and pressure.

LeeAnn Lands “I would prioritize the initial build and review. In lieu of re-review, perhaps we can encourage chairs to set FPA goals around online course improvement? For example, in my FPAs, I usually set measurable goals on improving specific courses re: accessibility.”

Charity Butcher - “I think everyone is looking for things to put on teaching in the FPA that is beyond just teaching their classes. This makes it easy for faculty”

The consensus was to do re-reviews every 5 years, which is consistent with how QM was working. And having less people involved in the re-review than QM did would help streamline things and faculty would resent the review less (hopefully).

Question - “Is there a way to add in how much of the course has changed since the last review?”

Tamara reviewed her notes for what was taken away from the meeting. None of this addresses hybrids, which needs to be addressed at some point. Synchronous also hadn't been brought up.

Stephen addressed synchronous courses, and how they differ from the online courses offered. Accessibility needs to be addressed, especially so professors don’t upload things that do not meet accessibility standards. Ensure that the professors aren’t only turning on a camera and lecturing with no further support.

The meeting ended at 1:30pm.