# Online Learning Committee Agenda

Meeting Date:  February 16, 2018, 10:30 AM
Room: Norfolk Campus, Martin Bldg, Room 2610

1. Welcome
2. Attendance: John Morea, Michele Marits, Jennifer Dixon-McKnight, Bill Connor, Marsha Jurewicz, Amanda Goldstein, Fred Stemple, Tim Brown, Forrest Crock, Iris Wang, Katie Robinson, Shannon Ponack
3. Approve of [November 2017 minutes](#)
4. Determine [vacancies](#) for 2018-2019 academic year
   a. There are potential vacancies for the following positions
      i. Chesapeake faculty - Donna Jurnigan expressed interest last year.
      ii. Dean - no candidates
      iii. Librarian - Bethany Wright was suggested by Michele. **Michele will contact her to see if she is willing.**
      iv. Student member - no candidates
   b. John brought up a question: Should faculty be represented by pathways rather than campus because of the new Pathways initiative? Since the bylaws still structure the membership by campus we will follow that but this should be considered when revising the bylaws.
5. Reports from [Subcommittees](#)
   a. Student Identity Verification (Forrest)
      i. The subcommittee is still working on the draft document and have a meeting next Thursday. The draft document will be published in the discussion boards and emailed and can be found at the following link:  Comments can be made in the discussion board. It can then be ready to vote on at the next meeting.
   b. Online Student Orientation (Siabhon)
      i. Due to technical difficulties, Siabhon was unable to attend the meeting. Siabhon emailed me the draft document but I did not read the email until after the meeting. The draft document will be published in the discussion boards and emailed and can be found at the following link:  Comments can be made in the discussion board. It can then be ready to vote on at the next meeting.
   c. Online Course Review & Quality Online Standards (Cameron & Bill)
      i. There was a long discussion about this subcommittee and it's charge considering the impasse in the online course review. Here are some discussion points.
         1. Matt - Should this subcommittee do something else? e.g. review bylaws, check Bb template for redundancies.

2. Marsha - No update on online course review, data is less than 50% with no new data for a while. There is little to gain from analysis of this data. There are no apparent patterns across the board but within a specific Dean's review there are blanket patterns - e.g. all using publisher materials. Needs to be a holistic review. We need to look at adjunct reviews. Right now there are no required reviews of adjunct classes and these make up a majority of the online courses. There are senior faculty who have not taken TOPs. Marsha will bring dates for a course to the next meeting.
3. Katie - Can the TCC standards for Quality Online Teaching be revised before an online course review is completed? Can student evaluations be used to locate issues without combing through all the adjunct classes.
4. Tim (Student member) - online courses provide flexibility and convenience for working students. The ability to access course materials online and almost anywhere provides learner autonomy. Instructors have responded well to email and course site communication. The course sites should be laid out in units with resources separated from assessments. Feedback is good quality but is often received too late to be used to improve in subsequent assignments.
5. Marsha - There is a 30 page report from Blackboard that Marsha and Iris can provide for any faculty member but the some of the indicators are not 100% accurate but there is a lot of information about the quantity of interaction.
6. Fred - Should we probe more about getting the rest of the results for the online course review? Should we start recommendations on an improved review process?
7. The validity of the review was questioned: half of the review was Bb template policy and the delivery follows from TOPs best practices.
8. Can we create a series of expectations for what all online courses should - checklist should be a form of the standards
9. **Marsha will enroll everyone in the QM replacement course.**
10. There is some agreement about starting with general guiding principles and from those developing requirements and an online review process.

      ii.    Finally a statement of intent was agreed upon "The online course review appears to be on hold indefinitely. Therefore, the Online Learning Committee will review the FDEP online course requirements in order to recommend a baseline of quality standards that will be applied to all Tidewater Community College online courses."

6. Other Business
   a. Professional Development Event for Online Faculty (Fred)
      i. The plans for an online teaching workshop have been drafted. The purpose is to get instructors to learn collaboratively. Format: 15 minute introduction on best practices followed by an hour of presentations from OLC members about their courses and experience. Followed by a wrap up with attendees finding ways to improve their courses. The event is planned for late april and will need volunteers.
      ii. We liked the idea of getting together as online instructors and have enjoyed similar activities in the past.
      iii. Marsha mentioned that the target audience might prefer a webinar format as opposed to f2f. Faculty seemed receptive to this format as well.
      iv. Michele suggested reaching out to quality instructors to take part in this.
      **v. Fred will send the outlined plan for this workshop to Matthew.**
   b. TCC Syllabus Builder Update (John)
      i. Smooth implementation in the spring. Some browsers causes issued so Chrome is recommended. 22% have used the syllabus builder. Notifications are disabled. Faculty self-designate when syllabus is complete. Next step is to open a browser form where you can have a repository for Deans to access created syllabi.
      ii. Repeated policies listed in syllabus should be sent to instruction committee.
   c. QM replacement course - can the OLC review the course and provide recommendations? This was not brought up at the meeting directly but Marsha did say that she would enroll everyone in the course.
   d. Mission and Vision statements (PAPC) Please review the Mission and Vision Statements with your constituencies. Two questions to be answered are "Does the mission statement need to be updated?" and "Should we utilize the same process for reviewing the vision statement that we used last year for reviewing the mission statement?"
      i. We did not get to this.

    e. Master Courses - Is there anything planned or happening with this initiative? Should this be a part of our charges for next year.
        i. We did not get to this but it was reiterated at the PAPC meeting.
7. Next Meeting - March 16, 2018
8. Adjourn