

Online Learning Advisory Council

Meeting Agenda & Minutes

April 7, 2021

Motions & action items are highlighted

1. Approval of March Minutes

Approved w/o discussion or opposition

2. Canvas updates

Ally rollout – currently available in production. Ally will be enabled at end of Spring semester in all courses. Training avail middle of May.

Question to committee from Ed: any concerns or questions about training between spring & summer?

No concerns expressed.

Holly Dressler: our team can support faculty too.

Comment: I've seen some of the training modules and they are good

Motion to turn Ally on at end of spring & offer trainings between spring & summer passes unanimously

3. Bylaws Amendment

Proposed amendment to bylaw section saying when committee will meet.

Barry shares screen: email showing old & proposed language. From the email: PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENT

It has been moved and second that:

The current language under Bylaws 1, Paragraph 1 shall be replaced by the following:

“The Online Learning Advisory Council shall meet once a month during the fall and spring semesters of every academic year. Each year the chair shall determine the time and room number.”

The current language under Paragraph 2 shall be replaced by the following:
“Subcommittees shall meet monthly during the fall and spring semesters of every academic year at a time and in a place to be determined by the subcommittee chair.”

Motion made and seconded.

Comment: It was useful to me when running for OLAC position knowing when meeting time was exactly, so having this set time is useful.

Comment: Also useful to Industrial Tech because our schedules are so packed Mon-Thu

Response: We can still agree on a meeting time for the following year w/o having it in the bylaws.

Comment: Might be helpful to decide on next year’s meeting time early in spring instead of late, since committee rep elections tend to happen before late spring.

Motion passes with one opposed.

4. Digital Proctoring Subcommittee Update

Ed shares doc send out by subcommittee. There’s no one tool that can handle all proctoring methods; recommendation pairs different methods w/ different tools.

Ed: this has been sent to administration & we’re awaiting a response.

Comment: There are HUGE ethical problems with electronic proctoring software and their companies, and instructors should look into them. There has been outcry from students about this, though not necessarily at JCCC.

5. Next Year’s Officer candidates

Barry encourages returning members to stand for office

Ed: If you’re in year 3/3 you should be working with your division to find a replacement.

6. Mastery Gradebook clarification

Barry: Shari Barrett told us that if it were turned on, it would be in faculty view, not student view.

Committee passes on entertaining the motion to turn on Mastery Gradebook by default.

7. Course definitions update

Hugh (subcom chair): lays out subcom's work: surveyed 10 other KS/KC institutions; spoke with student senate (students did not know that these course definitions even existed). Our recommendation is to basically keep the current definitions but slightly clarify language about proctored tests.

The survey told us that proctored exams seem to happen in all types of courses at most if not all institutions.

Subcomm's priority was to leave options open for faculty & not limit them in advance, while still providing guidelines to students that are clear and consistent with other local schools.

Barry: if we recommend these, ABC takes them up next, then IDC.

Comment: Mickey has the new definitions but not our reasoning, so a refusal seems premature.

Comment: We have a problem if admin is telling us what we can approve. This is a test for shared governance.

Motion to send this to ABC.

Comment expressing concerns about the new definitions. Students want ability to search for fully online classes, and to know what classes are fully online – meaning no in-person components.

Response: It's hard to tie definitions to class search, which is flawed. And we don't want definitions to lock teachers in.

Comment: Mickey doesn't want to change definitions till we can collect data, and these definitions aren't his making, we made them.

Response: What WAS from him was the expectation that online classes should be fully online.

Comment from subcommittee: There's a distinction between class meetings and in-person exams. We assume a certain amount of the latter is okay for online courses (partly because this is consistent with what other schools are doing).

Response: Students need to know about any in-person components when they enroll.

Comment: Math must have a certain number of exams to be accredited. We can't have "online" classes then by current definitions.

Comment (Hugh): maybe we need to collect more data about student perceptions of these definitions?

Response: I'd prefer not to delay this further.

Question: Can we differentiate online courses that do & don't have proctored exams?

Response: That would involve more of what we're doing: changing course definitions.

Motion to send to ABC passes, one abstains, one opposes.

(next ABC meeting is Mon at 3:00 – Hugh & Ed will attend)

8. Course Quality discussion

Vince Miller: (addressing concerns that the checklist is evaluative & beyond scope of OLAC) Chairs already do things in their regular duties that are equal to what the checklist asks for.

Comment: We talked before about getting FA input on whether this evaluative – is that something a subcomm would do?

Barry: I could do that at tomorrow's FA meeting.

Comment: The other aspect of this is the quality guidelines from Ed Tech office. And an additional problem here is that adjuncts are sometimes given courses at very last minute, so they don't always have time to create all checklist items before classes start.

Barry: Things to discuss with FA: whether or not this is evaluative; that we should know how many courses chairs will look at; and there should be advanced notice for faculty members whose classes are being looked at.

Question: is it a problem to have a list of best practices, then allow student feedback to be the initiating event for whether someone looks at a faculty member's course, rather than randomly picking?

Comment: There's a big difference between a list of people looked at in advance, and a course being looked at because of a student complaint.

Response (Vince Miller): Student-complaint route is basically what we do now.

Motion to create subcommittee on this topic made, seconded. Motion passes. Subcomm created.

Motion to adjourn made, seconded. Motion passes

Present

Ed Lovitt

Jeff Kosko

Barry Bailey (chair)

Dan Cryer (minutes)

Rebecca Anderson

Vin Clark

Vince Miller

Kevin Cannell

Samira Hussein

Aaron Gibbs

Akram Al-Rawi

Christopher Imm

Debbie Rulo

Farrell Jenab

Holly Dressler

Hugh Clark

J Lewis

Judith Guzzy

Kathi Lefert

Leslie Quinn

mad (???)

Rhonda Barlow

Ron Palcic

Susan Brown

Vince Miller