AALT Leadership Meeting Minutes

August 29, 2013

In attendance: Bill Heineman, Sharon McDermott, Mark Reinhold, Pat Demers, Diane Zold-Gross, Ellen Wentland, Linda Shea, Nancy Garcia, Judy Zubrow, Janice Rogers, Shar Wolff, Grace Young, Donna Bertolino

Meeting minutes: Donna

Absent: Chuck Phair, Mary Farrell

Melba Acevedo was present to discuss Distance Education.

- Priority 3 under Classroom Experience on the 2012 – 2015 AMP is to “Develop a Strategic Plan for Distance Education.”
  - The Distance Education Strategic Plan was created for 2013 – 2016. Bill pointed out a couple of specific Goals and Objectives; Goal 1, Objective 1.1 which discusses integrating Distance Ed into college planning and operations and also placing the Director in Academic Affairs. The Director has not been placed in AA but we will work closely with the Director (Melba Acevedo). Melba and Shar Wolff will be co-leading the implementation of the DE Strategic Plan.
  - Goal 2, Objective 2.5, to eliminate the gap in completion rates between face to face and on-line courses was discussed as well as the overall quality of Distance Ed.
  - How do we improve the quality of Distance Ed? One way is to build it into the course design and training requirements for faculty under our local distance education agreement with the MCCC. We currently have an old agreement that is in process of being updated. The Distance Education Committee has worked over the past year on some updates. Bill and Shar Wolff will be stepping down from the committee but Janice Rogers and Chuck Phair will join the team.
  - Melba explained the Course Development Requirements/Compensation Structure (which are essentially course specs) part of our proposal to the MCCC for the revised local distance education agreement as well as the Quality Matters rubric. She explained that most current distance education courses are Level 2 on the Course Development Requirements. The rubric looks at the “design” of the course, not the teaching aspect. The rubric is also used in iTeach. Courses must meet 85% of the criteria to get approval Quality Matters approval. The important thing is the alignment of the course with the course objectives, assessment, quality and consistency.
  - Timeliness of course development and the review of courses (to make sure they stay updated) were discussed. There are instances of students being enrolled in a course but the course is not yet completely developed. Should there be a timeframe for this to happen? Faculty is paid to develop courses. Should they be
paid before or after? Regarding the maintenance (updating) of courses, should the faculty be responsible for this review as part of a stipend?

○ Improvements for on-line courses – Bill suggested observations. Each course/problem is different. Deans should make it a priority to observe distance education courses as part of the regular evaluation process and have conversations with faculty. Perhaps some courses should become hybrid to bring students in for some face-to-face.

• Ellen Wentland updated us on the core academic skill for Oral Communication. The term could be considered discriminatory. Ellen discussed this with Susan Martin and Luce Aubry who both agreed. As a result, the rubric, terminology and skill have been extensively edited. Susan and Luce will also participate on the national revision of this. It may be called Interpersonal Communication.

• Grace announced that new full-time faculty training for Spring would be on Thursdays from 1 – 4.

• Consistency of faculty office hours was discussed. Some faculty members are working 4 hours on campus, some are only working 3 hours on campus and 1 on-line as they teach on-line courses. It makes sense for some faculty to be here for 4 office hours but not for all faculty for various reasons. This should be worked out in a reasonable manner and an interaction plan should be submitted with the syllabus for each distance education course.

• Enrollment. At this point for Fall 2013, we have more students that last fall but they are signed up for less credits.