

Index of Evidence for Recommendation 6: Learning Support for Distance Education

Item 5: Program Review Data Analysis

Evidence 6.10: DE Committee minutes, September 9, 2013 2

Evidence 6.11: Comparable data, OL/FF, from the DE Program Review 5



DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Adopted Minutes

September 9, 2013

Room 101

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Dale called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Dale Crandall-Bear; Tim Boerner; Kathleen Callison; Roger Clague; Laura Maghoney; Scott Ota; Philip Petersen; Svetlana Podkolzina; Diana Reed; Sandra Rotenberg; Robin Sytsma; Lauren Taylor, Carol Zadnik

1. Introduction of New DE staff / ideas for staff support

Dale introduced Carol Zadnik, DE Administrative Assistant, and welcomed her to this new position. Carol will help students and faculty with technical issues and Dale will offer faculty instructional and design support. Administration agreed to Dale's request for a 20% reassign-time instructor position to help instructors transition out of eCollege and into Canvas. This position is only open to full-time faculty. Dale asked the Committee to forward ideas on ways Carol and Roger can offer support.

2. Clarification of Committee reps

The School of Health Sciences will have one rep and all other schools will have two. The current DE Committee roster:

Dale Crandall-Bear, Coordinator/Chair; Tim Boerner – Liberal Arts; Kathleen Callison – CTE/Bus; Roger Clague – Chief Technology Officer; Laura Maghoney – CTE/Business; Scott Ota – IT; Philip Petersen – Math/Science; Svetlana Podkolzina – Math/Science; Diana Reed – Social & Behavioral Sciences; Sandra Rotenberg – Library; Robin Sytsma – Human Performance & Development; Lauren Taylor – Social & Behavioral Sciences

One rep is currently needed from Counseling, Human Performance & Development, and Liberal Arts

3. Adoption of Minutes from 8/26 meeting. (see email from Connie Adams)

Sandy requested deletion of the third sentence, in paragraph 2 on page 2. Roger clarified that the computer system issues referred to are actually Banner issues.

Passed as amended – unanimously

4. Canvas Transition Issues

Dale emailed members the Canvas Transition Timeline yesterday and also sent another transition information email to faculty. He will keep this Canvas item on agendas this year for regular updates on how the transition is progressing. An instructor emailed Dale that she hasn't found a colleague to review her shell. Dale will know more when he speaks with her, but he does hope this doesn't become

an issue. Besides being a professional courtesy for colleagues, administration agreed that faculty members performing reviews will receive Flex Cal credit. If a faculty approved shell is unapproved by a dean, Dale needs to know that. Part of his job is to create an ongoing list of each section, not just the course shell, connected to the shell approval. Dale wants to create a timeline to start loading students into spring shells. If students drop in Banner, they are dropped from the shell. Dale clarified that the shells don't need to be complete for reviews but they do need to be built out enough so the reviewers can complete the checklist. Scott suggested, regarding transition, members visit SolanOnline and maybe some evaluation procedures and other information could be added. Dale responded that the link is currently set up to eCollege.

5. Review of the DE section of the Accreditation Report

Dale emailed members the latest version of the report draft and the Recommendation 6 ACCJC comments yesterday. During review at the meeting, Dale asked members for information on anything that was missing or needing editing, which he will send to the Accreditation Coordinator. The report is an update on what has been done in the areas listed since last year's report. The Accreditation team wants to know how the College is providing online students with support for maximized success that is comparable to face-to-face classes.

Dale suggested brainstorming what could be done for students during the first week of class. Members will forward information on what they do. One example of an embedded tutor is included in the report and Dale explained to members how they can incorporate them into their classes. Program Review is a DE project for this semester. Dale suggested it will be useful to take certain parts of program review at a time for discussion and analyzing at meetings. Dale concluded that recommendation 6 items have been completed.

6. Brainstorming on DE Data Comparisons-FF/OL

- Some items could be sent to Shemila Johnson to add to Facebook where there is quite a bit of participation from students. The site is also used for confidential student surveys and a survey could be included for the ten instructors who are piloting Canvas as well as their students. Facebook could also be used as a marketing tool.
- Reign in as many student online services and put in one place.
- The timing for the fill rate numbers was questioned at the last meeting. Sandy asked Dean Peter Cammish but there was still some confusion. Members agreed the fill rate should be from the beginning of the semester, but the numbers are apparently from after census and student drops. There is a 9-10% differential per census which reflects what is already known regarding loss of many online students right after classes start when they become more aware of work involved in online classes. The Committee can think in general terms on how to close that gap.
- The retention numbers are as expected. Issues to look at are why so many students are lost during the first week or so and what can be done about that, how can they be held through the semester. Place a quiz online that would be required before students register for an online class to confirm it is a good fit for them. One of the surveys coming out will be on retention and the results could be helpful. Surveying students who had dropped had been discussed in the past but the Committee never figured out technically how to do that. Roger confirmed that a survey could be sent to students right after they drop and that costs are reduced by bringing students back in as compared to bringing in new students.
- Identify students who aren't going to be successful and backfill with students who are.

- Make online orientation mandatory for all online students. Students could also register a couple days early if they complete the orientation. A lot of the problem is due to false student expectations.
- Online class syllabi should be available online.
- Many students complain they didn't get the guidance or clear instruction they needed. Following up on drops would help.
- Instructors could have courses ready to go a week before class starts. If students aren't in on the first day of class, a week can be lost.
- Block access to anything else until the student completes orientation, read syllabus and take quiz.
- Clarify expectations.
- Have a centralized online orientation or an online tutorial to give everyone the chance to play around with a program to find their way around the system.
- Time management, personal scheduling, idea of hours needed for the class.

7. Next steps to finish the Program Review

Dale emailed the Program Review DE form yesterday.

DE Committee Meeting Dates, Fall 2013:

Aug 26
Sept 9
Sept 23
Oct 14
Oct 28
Nov 18
Nov 25
Dec 9

DE Meeting Minutes 09.09.13/ca

Department	Ave Fill Rate @ Census F2F	Ave Fill Rate @ Census OL	EOS Retention F2F	EOS Retention Online	AVG Success Rate F2F	AVG Success Rate Online	Median GPA-F2F	Median GPA-OL	FTES F2F	FTES Online	% FTES OL	Unique Students F2F	Unique Students Online	Total Students	% f2f	% OL	Department
Accounting	94.9%	92.1%	89.63%	81.91%	75.9%	50.3%	2.77	2.32	156	98	62%	837	634	1,471	56.90%	43.10%	Accounting
Astronomy	105.1%	94.6%	95.07%	87.32%	84.2%	73.5%	2.83	2.68	89	62	69%	885	600	1,485	59.60%	40.40%	Astronomy
Banking and Finance		67.5%		81.48%		33.3%		1.50		3	100%		27	27	0.00%	100.00%	Banking and Finance
Biological Sciences	104.2%	94.2%	88.68%	80.74%	59.0%	41.8%	2.39	2.00	157	140	89%	1,300	1,094	2,394	54.30%	45.70%	Biological Sciences
Business	75.1%	67.6%	86.51%	87.35%	47.9%	54.6%	2.00	2.27	190	150	79%	1,607	1,148	2,755	58.33%	41.67%	Business
Cinema	93.8%	102.4%	91.05%	94.69%	68.5%	79.5%	2.67	3.04	98	62	63%	852	496	1,348	63.20%	36.80%	Cinema
Computer & Info Science	107.0%	95.5%	88.78%	84.21%	53.5%	57.7%	2.22	2.50	531	348	65%	2,300	1,459	3,759	61.19%	38.81%	Computer & Info Science
Counseling	84.4%	92.6%	94.23%	90.41%	63.6%	68.7%	2.50	2.78	90	125	139%	836	995	1,831	45.66%	54.34%	Counseling
Criminal Justice	93.4%	121.0%	92.80%	87.57%	66.5%	72.7%	2.43	3.00	253	153	61%	1,642	857	2,499	65.71%	34.29%	Criminal Justice
Drafting Technology	116.3%	56.0%	88.33%	73.03%	71.7%	49.4%	2.62	2.67	12	27	225%	60	115	175	34.29%	65.71%	Drafting Technology
Economics	102.1%	90.4%	87.01%	70.13%	59.9%	42.9%	2.50	2.00	200	98	49%	1,446	759	2,205	65.58%	34.42%	Economics
English	124.9%	82.0%	89.47%	80.80%	71.7%	58.5%	2.71	2.76	923	89	10%	6,000	708	6,708	89.45%	10.55%	English
Fire Technology	85.0%	72.1%	89.22%	93.98%	74.0%	71.1%	2.82	3.00	20	33	167%	171	182	353	48.44%	51.56%	Fire Technology
Geography	98.8%	63.3%	92.83%	86.50%	66.2%	62.6%	2.68	2.54	24	50	214%	231	478	709	32.58%	67.42%	Geography
Geology	99.0%	77.7%	91.10%	87.41%	73.8%	65.7%	2.75	2.50	63	41	66%	617	389	1,006	61.33%	38.67%	Geology
Health Education	88.0%	77.4%	90.53%	83.04%	76.1%	53.8%	2.50	2.21	26	213	812%	264	1,840	2,104	12.55%	87.45%	Health Education
History	112.6%	97.7%	87.73%	81.30%	58.4%	61.9%	2.43	2.69	492	146	30%	3,681	1,118	4,799	76.70%	23.30%	History
Human Development	96.9%	84.4%	88.92%	81.87%	67.9%	54.6%	2.60	2.55	211	50	24%	1,973	468	2,441	80.83%	19.17%	Human Development
Industrial Technology	50.0%	62.5%	100.00%	86.67%	66.7%	60.0%	2.50	3.00	1	2	125%	12	15	27	44.44%	55.56%	Industrial Technology
Learning Resources		101.5%		89.56%		60.6%		2.57		176	100%		4,830	4,830	0.00%	100.00%	Learning Resources
Management	54.3%	68.3%	97.37%	75.18%	68.4%	59.1%	2.52	2.50	4	27	721%	38	254	292	13.01%	86.99%	Management
Marketing		63.0%		77.78%		60.3%		2.38		13	100%		122	122	0.00%	100.00%	Marketing
Mathematics	166.6%	132.7%	82.86%	67.50%	50.9%	27.4%	2.26	2.00	2,628	232	9%	5,550	613	6,163	90.05%	9.95%	Mathematics
Music	88.3%	101.6%	89.72%	88.49%	70.8%	75.1%	2.67	3.00	188	158	84%	1,758	1,410	3,168	55.49%	44.51%	Music
Nursing	87.8%	100.0%	88.99%	92.77%	64.2%	80.4%	2.57	3.00	100	152	151%	843	1,208	2,051	41.10%	58.90%	Nursing
Nutrition	103.2%	83.1%	91.81%	85.37%	66.3%	67.6%	2.50	2.86	261	110	42%	2,535	1,089	3,624	69.95%	30.05%	Nutrition
Physical Education	88.9%	85.1%	91.93%	79.33%	77.5%	57.8%	2.54	2.44	21	45	212%	196	383	579	33.85%	66.15%	Physical Education
Physical Science		71.3%		93.86%		83.3%		2.88		27	100%		114	114	0.00%	100.00%	Physical Science
Physics		81.3%		88.46%		80.8%		3.24		8	100%		77	77	0.00%	100.00%	Physics
Political Science	94.6%	76.7%	91.90%	82.67%	69.1%	54.9%	2.63	2.70	227	65	29%	2,152	634	2,786	77.24%	22.76%	Political Science
Psychology	137.4%	78.0%	88.26%	71.79%	58.1%	60.3%	2.10	2.46	110	8	7%	1,088	78	1,166	93.31%	6.69%	Psychology
Real Estate		63.0%		83.33%		62.9%		2.50		47	100%		269	269	0.00%	100.00%	Real Estate
Social Science	103.8%	155.7%	93.33%	90.83%	79.0%	71.6%	2.67	3.00	56	11	20%	525	109	634	82.81%	17.19%	Social Science
Sociology	103.5%	94.9%	91.28%	84.54%	70.1%	64.5%	2.53	2.86	221	59	27%	2,094	560	2,654	78.90%	21.10%	Sociology
Television		62.5%		84.00%		64.0%		2.75		3	100%		25	25	0.00%	100.00%	Television
Theatre Arts		82.1%		77.83%		60.4%		2.76		22	100%		206	206	0.00%	100.00%	Theatre Arts

TOTALS	91.99%	83.57%	81.91%	77.27%	60.64%	56.50%	2.29	2.41	7,350	3,051	29.3%	41,493	25,363	66,856	62.06%	37.94%	TOTALS
---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Department	Ave Fill Rate F2F	Ave Fill Rate OL	EOS Retention F2F	EOS Retention Online	AVG Success Rate F2F	AVG Success Rate Online	Median GPA-F2F	Median GPA-OL	FTES F2F	FTES Online	% FTES OL	Unique Students F2F	Unique Students Online	Total Students	% f2f	% OL	Department
------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------	-------------	-----------	---------------------	------------------------	----------------	-------	------	------------

Unique CRNs Students

2012/13	297	8859
2011/12	292	8834
2010/11	387	9388

Online
Students
by county

2012/13	Solano County	2164	92%
	Napa County	64	3%
	Sacto	29	1%
	Contra Costa	27	1%
	Yolo	14	1%
	Other	44	2%
		2342	100%