Distance Learning Committee - Minutes

September 24, 2024

# Attending

| **Y/N** | **Member Name** |
| --- | --- |
| Y | Josh Cabrera |
| Y | Sable Cantus |
| Y | Katie Datko |
| Y | Luis Echeverria Newberry |
| Y | L.E. Foisia |
| N | Mike Dowdle |
| Y | Hong Guo |
| Y | Mike Hood |
| Y | Carol Impara |
| Y | Dana Johnson |
| N | Tammy Knott-Silva |
| Y | Catherine McKee |
| Y | Sonia Ortega |
| Y | Romelia Salinas |
| Y | Eric Turner |
| Y | Ann Walker |
| Y | Sandra Weatherilt |

**Guests:** Andrea Gonzalez (present), Allie Frickert (absent) & Elizabeth Lobb (present)

| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION/COMMENTS** |
| --- | --- |
| Approval of DLC minutes:  September 10, 2024 | Approved |
| **Report:** Educational Design Committee (EDC) /Curriculum and Instruction Council (C&I) (Catherine) | AB1111 and ADT Degree courses are a priority and causing some urgency for DLC to approve courses. |
| **Report:** Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) Report | No new meeting. |
| **Report:** Office of Distance Learning & Instructional Technology Report & CVC Tech Integration Updates (Katie) | FCLT   * Supporting RSI Workshops in POD 9/27   + [**RSI Lab 3**](https://mtsac-edu.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMocOytqz4iGtT5Lr6AqaoiWZUxcfsk6oS7)   + [**RSI Lab 4**](https://mtsac-edu.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZcld-uoqDgoHdVUwaUx731uBhvPrg6ZQYuY) * RSI Forum 10/18 (Hyflex): All 4 workshops plus hands on help; register on POD   Instructional Technology   * [**Canvas Smart Search**](https://community.canvaslms.com/t5/Smart-Search-Feature-Preview/Smart-Search-FAQ/ta-p/604415) * Lucid Tools will be hidden from course navigation * Canvas [**KKR acquisition**](https://ir.instructure.com/news/news-details/2024/Instructure-to-be-Acquired-by-KKR/default.aspx) * K16 Scaffold (see below)   CVC, CCCO & AI Update   * Updated [**@ONE Website**](https://onlinenetworkofeducators.org/) & Branding (CVC@ONE) * New [**Digital Center for Innovation, Transformation & Equity**](https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Vision-2030/strategic-directions/GenAI-and-the-future-of-learning/digital-center-for-innovation-transformation-and-equity) * Note on cross-enrollment search: Courses past add deadline and/or that are full will not appear in searches; updating search engine to be easier for students. * 5Cs (ASCCC C&I Committee) made recommendation to update Title 5 to include definition of DL modalities. CCCO anticipates this going forward this fall. * [**NVIDIA Partnership**](https://www.gov.ca.gov/2024/08/09/california-nvidia-launch-first-of-its-kind-ai-collaboration/) with the CCC System for AI * Faculty-based [**AI group CCCAI**](http://cccaic.org/college-participation.html)with monthly meetings. Email [cccaic.org@gmail.com](mailto:cccaic.org@gmail.com) to attend meetings and see about joining. * [**Playlab**](https://web.cvent.com/event/d3190776-9925-4867-aa62-daf264f3cd99/regPage:c836c420-60dd-4695-ae29-da627b859765) opportunity (register to join waitlist) through [**California Learning Lab.**](https://calearninglab.org/) |
| **Report:** Education and Technology Committee (Sonia) | The committee mainly discussed what its structure would be going forward.   * The president asked for committees to be reviewed, and the college is working on reducing committee redundancies. There was discussion about how this committee has overlap with ITAC, DLC, and FCLT. There was concern that this committee was doing work that FCLT is already doing. For example, the committee selected an AI detection tool, but this should fall under the scope of FCLT. The committee should focus more on policy, such as recommending that the college purchase an AI detection tool, but the selection of that tool is an operational concern and should fall under FCLT’s purview. * We discussed what work the committee will focus on, and if a workgroup would be a better structure than a committee. Currently, the committee reports to SPEAC, but we discussed whether reporting to C&I, like DLC does, might be a better fit. Some people felt that neither SPEAC nor C&I really fit the topic of AI. The reason that it is currently under SPEAC is because it was seen as an equity issue. * If the committee continues as a committee, we will need to start meeting in person starting in spring. If we became a workgroup or task force, we could continue to meet virtually on Zoom. A workgroup would also be more flexible as far as meeting frequency; we could meet as needed rather than on a set schedule. * We also discussed whether the name of the committee/workgroup should change to better reflect its focus on AI. * It has been challenging to find enough committee members to fill the committee, so this was another consideration into changing the committee into a workgroup. * The committee did not make a decision, but we are leaning towards becoming a workgroup. There was discussion of this workgroup being under DLC, but the group was uncertain how that would work. I mentioned that DLC had subgroups focused on certain topics (equity, SPOT, etc.). Regarding the timeline, it sounds like we should decide at our next meeting in October.   Regarding the AI detection tool:   * The approval of K16 is expected to go through at the October board meeting. Once it’s approved, FCLT will begin the planning of the tool’s implementation. |
| **Report:** AssociatedStudents | * No student appointed. * Carol will work on finding an interested student and have them reach out to Associated students to express their interest in serving on our committee. |
| **Update:** Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) (Sheila Wright) | * There have been 150 that have signed up for RSI review as of this morning. Sheila has already delegated some of them to RSI mentors. * Catherine attended RSI lab on Friday. Michelle did a great job. * Tonya Anders is working on finding a replacement for Mike’s position. The goal is to appoint someone at Academic Senate on Thursday. * Presented and reviewed RSI Lab Proposal (attached). Committee approved RSI Lab 1, 2, 3, and 4 for SPOT Recertification. |
| **Update:** SPOT Recertification | * Catherine met with Michelle this morning- They established an automated system to inform faculty their SPOT Recertification is up for renewal and need to complete their re-certification. * They set up faculty notifications to go out on the dates below.   + October 1st   + First day of winter intersession.   + End of March   + June 1st   + July 1st * Catherine will review DL listserv and the messages sent out by Carol last year and resume sending messages out. * Encourage faculty to work on SPOT Recertification now to minimize last minute submittals. |
| **Update:** SPOT Equivalency (Hong Guo and Elizabeth Lobb) | [SPOT Equivalency Project -USE](https://mtsac0-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/personal/hguo_mtsac_edu/Documents/SPOT%20Equivalency%20Project%20-USE?csf=1&web=1&e=PAX8Tt)   * Summer 2024>Spot Equivalency Training Programs. You will see the information for each college. [Summer 2024](https://mtsac0-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/personal/hguo_mtsac_edu/Documents/SPOT%20Equivalency%20Project%20-USE/Summer%202024?csf=1&web=1&e=7yOOLX) * The SPOT Equivalency team reviewed “Recommended”, “Not recommended” and “Need more information” in the overall tab. * While working on this project Hong and Elizabeth discovered a Master List of Colleges. The CCC at the state level compiled a list of what colleges are doing with online teaching certification. The file was shared at a DECO meeting. * Presenters wonder how Mt. SAC’s information was entered; Carol confirms she entered the info about 4-5 years ago. It's editable so that all DL coordinators can add information as needed.   + Q: Are the names of the specific training programs included? Yes, they are included.   + Q: Is the SPOT Equivalency team comfortable and feel we should accept the certifications, or should we follow up? SPOT Equivalency team feels comfortable moving forward. * DL Team will review the data that was presented and will revisit at the next DCL committee meeting with hopes of approving it then. |
| **Update:** Accreditation and RSI (Allie Frickert) | * A concern was shared on the exception that was made to not make RSI required as a SPOT certification course. (Noncredit is not applicable to this concern) * Example: Credit Faculty/ DL faculty training didn’t do any RSI training during the SPOT Recertification, they can get recertificated and in the next four years they can teach any DL course because they were certified but never completed RSI training. From an accreditation standpoint it would make it a weakness. It would make our evidence stronger if all faculty who teach DL, go through RSI training and make it a requirement. * Q: Can a faculty member take the RSI without teaching an online class? We believe we can, in a Faculty Association side letter it was mentioned it could be an RSI plan or a course shell or past course, it does not have to be a current course. * RSI Review Vs. RSI Course Training   + Training – There’s a lot in SPOT already about RSI. We have our SPOT Recert Regs Update that focuses attention on RSI. FCLT is making it more robust with some of the ACCJC rubric.   + From an instructional design viewpoint there is a two-step process course design which is SPOT teaching and facilitation process which requires an active course or a past shell that has interactions.   + If RSI Review is a required part of Recertification, we will have stronger evidence for ACCJC. That could be lieu of in in addition to RSI review and Regs update as part of the four hours for SPOT Recertification. It’s recommended to keep Regulation Updates and 1 RSI training or review.   + It is suggested to remove the exception and complete the RSI Review with a past course in the event the faculty member is not teaching an online class at the time of the recertification.   + Member suggests addressing this on a case-by-case basis, with all 1500 faculty members it can be a heavy lift as we work out a workflow and workload. Additionally, we would need to include Faculty Association as this will impact hours or choices. It will also impact pay if faculty is not recertified. * 13.A.1.d. “Direct Instruction” is defined as instructional approaches that are structured, sequenced, designed, and presented specifically for students, and includes, but is not limited to, instructor created content, curated material, reading assignments, and other forms of instructional material created for students.” * This reflects previous direct instruction information; Faculty Association was informed, the president stated that for urgent matters a MOU is required as FA have already closed negotiations. * Hong seeks the committee’s approval to ask Faculty Association to change the contract to match the language from our DL handbook regarding direct instruction which also matches ACCJC and federal regulations.   + It’s a recommendation not a resolution- Sonia will get clarification. Romelia suggests making recommendations directly to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, as we are requesting to align the language and not proposing any new language. The language can be found in the spring 2024 DL handbook. Catherine will contact Tania and Hong will contact Allie regarding this recommendation. The DLC Committee approved this recommendation. * DL handbook version # 5- Hong is requesting for the committee to finalize it as it reflects as a draft and not a final version. Catherine and Carol will review it and finalize the handbook. |
| **Update:** AI detector embedded in Canvas: K16 (Katie) | * Due to go to October board * Implementation will be done by FCLT * Concerns with use   + ODLIT/FCLT is planning for professional development around best practices for using detectors |
| **Discussion:** IAOTL meeting SPOT requirement (Catherine, Katie, Ann) | * IAOTL @one course Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning.   + <https://onlinenetworkofeducators.org/course-cards/introduction-to-online-teaching-and-learning-2/> * We accept the four-week class offered through @ONE it in lieu of SPOT Certification (IAOTL). Once submitted and verified they don’t have to go through SPOT and placed on the SPOT certification faculty list. We believe it’s not accomplishing what we needed for our Mt SAC standards for SPOT Certified faculty. * Romelia completed IAOTL and said it is outdated, as it does not refer to RSI but instead REC. Unfortunately, there is no available staff at @ONE to update it. * Ann and Catherine have discussed possibly continuing to accept it with additional qualifications, completing Regs Update, submitting an RSI plan and putting together a two-module canvas course- orientation and content module. Before making a decision, we will need data. We would compare two groups of online courses taught by faculty who completed IAOTL vs online courses by those with SPOT certification comparing success and retention in the two groups. If there is a statistical difference, then it can be said that IAOTL shouldn’t be accepted anymore or add additional components before we accept it in lieu of SPOT Certification. * Carol states she tried this for POCR, it’s difficult to get statistically valid differentials, recommends taking common guideposts for good online teaching and post using a different metric with course design.   + What Kind of RSI do they do?   + Do they use a variety of materials?   + Do they allow students to interact with the course in a variety of ways? * RSI- build skeleton class and submit a plan. * Next steps: Create a work group and after the research is complete, we can present a formal recommendation. The following committee members will be part of this work group Ann, Katie, Carol, and Catherine. |
| **Discussion:** POCR (Romelia) | Romelia is working on securing funding to continue the work, hoping to begin in Spring 2025. |
| **Coming soon:**  New federal regulations may require faculty & institutions to keep more specific records regarding student participation in online courses (Katie) | * [**TLDR Slide Deck**](https://www.canva.com/design/DAGRsiw9fS0/zc-UGxvJWkfqjsSFLjK6mw/view?utm_content=DAGRsiw9fS0&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link&utm_source=editor)[**(Text Equivalent**](https://mtsac0-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/cdatko_mtsac_edu/EVFShOPwoedDiL3krL5gFhgBqxL3Cu7lzqSYJXL2puj4mA?e=bSQftg)**)**   + [**WCET: Overview of New Regulations**](https://wcet.wiche.edu/frontiers/2024/06/04/in-defense-of-distance-education-a-joint-letter-to-the-department-of-education-call-to-action/)Lists concerns for DL programs   + [**Phil Hill’s On EdTech Blog**](https://onedtech.philhillaa.com/p/it-cannot-be-automated-in-todays-environment)Overview of what reporting would look like for institutions   + [**CCC DECO Slides from WCET**](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1lsEJvaKq6fx6Q-ZQZmcaznfpAu41bo3lNgUTNMi_dd0/edit?usp=sharing) |
| **Review:** DL Amendment Forms  **Josh**  ARCH 147  ARCH 247  ASTR 11  FCS 51  HIST 36  HIST 40  JOUR 106  MUS 207  VOC ASC01  VOC ASC17  VOC ASC30  VOC BA07  VOC BA75  VOC BA76  VOC SC41  VOC NCLXP  **L.E.**  ANIM 100  ANIM 175  ARTC 100  BIOL 5  HIST 1  HIST 10  HIST 10H  HIST 31  HIST 3H  HIST 4  HIST 4H  HIST 7  HIST 7H  HIST 8  HIST 8H  PUBH 24  Sonia  ACCS ILPLS  ACCS ILSPC  ACCS ILSRR  ACCS ILSSS  HIST 11 - Question  HIST 11H  HIST 16  HIST 18  HIST 30  HIST 35  HIST 39  HIST 44  HIST 9 - Question  VOC ASC14  VOC BA72  VOC PHO10 | **Review:** DL Amendment Forms  ARCH 147-Approved  ARCH 247-Approved  ASTR 11-Approved  FCS 51-Approved  HIST 36-Approved  HIST 40-Approved  JOUR 106-Approved  MUS 207 – not approved at Dept. Mtg. nor previously DLC approved -Catherine will reach out to the music department for the minutes. **DONE. Approved.**  VOC Classes-Throughout – Dept. mtg. minutes approving courses for DL? L.E has the minutes and will email them to Catherine. **DONE. Approved.**  VOC ASC01-Approved  VOC ASC17-Approved  VOC ASC30-Approved  VOC BA07-Approved  VOC BA75-Approved  VOC BA76-Approved  VOC SC41-Approved  VOC NCLXP-Approved  ANIM 100 – selected no for in-person student interaction. Unsure if that is okay. - Catherine is to follow up with animation faculty about their form. **DONE. Approved.**  ANIM 175 - selected no for in-person student interaction. Unsure if that is okay. - Catherine is to follow up with animation faculty about their form. **DONE. Approved.**  ARTC 100 – Approved  BIOL 5 – **Approved** with edits to department name and added “units”  HIST 1 – Approved  HIST 10 – Approved  HIST 10H- Approved  HIST 31 – **Approved** with edits to course title, subject and added “units”  HIST 3H – Approved  HIST 4 – Approved  HIST 4H – Approved  HIST 7 – Approved  HIST 7H – Approved  HIST 8 – Approved  HIST 8H – Approved  PUBH 24 - **Approved** with edits to department name and added “units”  ACCS ILPLS – Approved  ACCS ILSPC – Approved  ACCS ILSRR - Approved  ACCS ILSSS - Approved  HIST 11: Catherine will follow up **DONE. Approved.**   * Says not approved for DL, but the last DL form was 2020. * Says that in-person version of course does not include student interaction   HIST 11H - Approved  HIST 16 - Approved  HIST 18 - Approved  HIST 30 - Approved  HIST 35 - Approved  HIST 39 - Approved  HIST 44 - Approved  HIST 9 - Question HIST 9: **DONE. Approved.**  Says not approved for DL, but the last DL form was 2020. Catherine will follow up  VOC ASC14 - Approved  VOC BA72 - Approved  VOC PHO10 - Approved  All Approved but Catherine is to follow up regarding History 9 and History 11, if they match up we will mark them approved. **DONE. Approved.**  HIST 11:   * Says not approved for DL, but the last DL form was 2020. * Says that in-person version of course does not include student interaction.   HIST 9:   * Says not approved for DL, but the last DL form was 2020. |

# RSI Labs for DL/SPOT Recertification

I’d like to offer recertification credit for 4 Regular Substantive Workshops, one on each major criterion related to online asynchronous courses (the direct live instruction does not have one, because having meetings is the start and end of that criteria, not much else to unpack). Here are the 4 workshops with their descriptions, learning activities and learning goals. Here are the titles in short, unfold accordion for full description.

## RSI Lab 1: Regular & Substantive Information & Responses

In this workshop, learn about how you can meet **RSI criterion 3: regularly and predictably creating or curating information and promptly responding to student questions** in your online courses. Find out how to review the content in your course for regular and substantive interaction. If you need more content, discover strategies for creating regular, substantive text and multimedia and how to substantively curate third-party content. Signal your RSI in your course and establish that you answer questions promptly by including policies in your syllabus and orientation.

#### W1 Information Learning Activities

1. Look at Overview and Summary pages
2. Using Announcements substantively
3. Review options for creating multimedia
4. Supplementing content
5. Encouraging responses and responding timely

#### W1 Learning Goals

1. Identify ways to meet RSI Criterion 3 through text content.
2. Identify ways to meet RSI Criterion 3 through video content
3. Identify ways to create substantive Announcements
4. Discuss best practices for encouraging responses and responding in a timely way
5. Review templates and policies you can use to support RSI Criterion 3

## RSI Lab 2: Regular & Substantive Feedback on Assessments

In this workshop, learn about meeting **RSI criteria 2: regularly and predictably offering assessments and providing personalized feedback.** Learn the various ways that you can offer formative assessments and personalize your feedback through comments, comment libraries, rubrics, group feedback, and examples. Feeback must provide actionable information that helps students improve performance, and must be provided regularly and predictably. Learn some strategies for offering feedback that meets RSI criteria and build evidence into your policies in your syllabus and orientation. Templates and tools will be discussed.

#### W2 Feedback Learning Activities

1. Discuss assessment types for asynchronous courses
2. Review options for providing feedback to students
3. Learn about tools that you can use to make feedback efficient
4. Review how to make and grade using substantive rubrics
5. Look at templates you can adopt and adapt to demonstrate this form of RSI

#### W2 Feedback Learning Goals

1. Identify ways to meet RSI Criterion 2 through Canvas feedback
2. Identify ways to meet RSI Criterion 2 through rubrics
3. Identify ways to make feedback substantive
4. Discuss best practices and useful tools for feedback that is efficient and substantive
5. Review templates and policies you can use to support RSI Criterion 2

## RSI Lab 3: Facilitating Regular & Substantive Discussions

In this workshop, learn about meeting **RSI criteria 4: discussion facilitation.** Review what constitutes substantive facilitation of a discussion. Learn the various ways that your course can incorporate discussion to meet regular and substantive interaction. Review the tools that you can use to generate student engagement in discussions (and what reviewers can see when they review). Learn and share strategies for creating different kinds of discussions, and how to establish that you facilitate discussion in your course policies (syllabus and orientation).

#### W3 Discussion Learning Activities

1. Look at Canvas discussions and the options for prompts and facilitation
2. Discuss the differences between facilitation and evaluation
3. Review how to structure an effective discussion facilitation plan
4. Consider other ways to provide and facilitate discussion
5. Share strategies you currently use in your courses with your colleagues.

#### W3 Discussion Learning Goals

1. Identify ways to meet RSI Criterion 4 through discussion facilitation
2. Define the difference between facilitation and evaluation.
3. Identify at least two ways you can prompt and facilitate a discussion.
4. Discuss facilitation plans for optimum engagement
5. Review templates and policies you can use to support RSI Criterion 4

## RSI Lab 4 : Monitoring Student Engagement & Success

In this workshop, learn about how to meet the **RSI criteria to regularly monitor student engagement and success and promptly responding as needed or by request.** Learn the various ways that Canvas allows you to monitor student engagement and success in your course so you can identify students who might need you to follow up. Discuss and share strategies for humanized follow-up with students. Discover some ways to make follow up a regular and efficient part of course management (and share your methods with others if you have suggestions). Learn how to document your method of monitoring and following up with students. Learn what accreditation reviewers will be able to see.

#### Learning Activities

1. Look at tools for monitoring student engagement and success.
2. Review tools you can use to respond to students when needed.
3. Review and share effective and humanized methods for responding to students.
4. Get questions answered about what accreditation reviewers can see.
5. Discuss how to document this part of your course RSI.

#### Learning Goals

1. Identify ways to meet RSI monitoring through various Canvas tools.
2. Discuss effective strategies and messaging when you reach out to students
3. Identify how to make monitoring efficient
4. Discuss how to document this information
5. Ask questions you have about the RSI and review processes.