Online Quality Council Meeting
Thursday, September 6, 2018
1:00 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Larry Bailey, VPAA; Patrick Davis, Jessica Reece, Kim Holland, FC Chair; Meisha Daniels, Sara Youngerman, Tom Pigg, Teri Messer, Renee Young , Candyce Sweet, Dr. Leslie West-Sands, Dr. Mechel Camp, Vivian Grooms,

Goal of session this date: Take the policies that we have and review the needs; mentioned that Kim Holland had taken this to faculty and gathered questions and suggestions.
Note: Everything policy-related has to be sent to Dr. Hamilton for review and approval

Agenda:

1.   Review of Policies for:

A.   New Online Course Development

B.   Online Course Redevelopment

C.   Online Course Revision

D.   Online Course Maintenance

E.   Online Course Assignments

F.   Online Course Development Contracts

G.   Course Redevelopment Cycle

H.   Course Review/Approval

2.   Faculty Compensation for Course Maintenance and Course Development

- Discussion began with Kim Holland from Faculty Council presenting questions and concerns from faculty related to current policy. The following two documents were distributed: The JSCC Online Course Development Guidelines (original date effective: July 1, 2013) and Faculty Concerns and Comments Regarding Online Policy (numbers below correspond to the handouts):

1. **Distance Education Committee**
   - Does this committee still exist? Discussion and answer: This committee name has been used interchangeably with the Online Quality Council; request was made to remove the wording from JWEB. From this moment forward, the minutes of

the "Online Quality Council" (OQC) will be on JWEB; it was noted that the addition of a Faculty Advisory Committee has been to the advantage of the OQC already this semester.

2. **Online course development**
   - Question: Is this only for development of new courses that do not exist yet? Answer: No
   - Define "major revision." Discussion related to the Deans making this decision. Point was made that there are faculty who are teaching online and already receive maintenance contracts for maintaining the course to update a course they were not teaching that semester. Question was asked: Is this happening regularly? Discussion of faculty as that person who is responsible for those courses for SACS; Online quality was reiterated; It was noted that there are expectations that the materials will be online pretty much for several programs, and perhaps all future courses will have some online element due to all of them having course shells. It was noted that this Council must first look where things might be out of date, and get fair across the board, especially as expectations have been changing in some of the AAS programs; Math involved and number of courses; anticipated new courses and how much money is available or needed to be increased; With enrollment up 5% FTE up 7.5 % , the question was asked: "Would we be where we are right now if we were not meeting the needs with these different course option hours? Would our enrollment be where it is? Do we even need the policy in this day and age? Has to do with the expected delivery methods. Need to look at what other schools are doing. We are seeing a dwindling amount of TAF funds. We are at the 90% of recurring funds at this time with TAF.
   - Question or Concern: Timeframe for courses are identified and when work begins (e.g., starting before the contract for example)—Current policy outlines timeframe; in the future the FLAC contract system will be engaged to used if contracts are issued.
   - Question: What is the process for identifying course developers—Answer: Deans have that responsibility and turn to the content specialists and make the decision; adjunct faculty can develop due to lack of content specialists.
   - Clarifying "as needed" basis for course redevelopment—longest you would ever say is every 5 years, and is really too long; keeping TBR standards and looking at other college practices is important—the Deans decide which courses to prioritize in developing, by working with the content specialists and looking at timeframes and need.
   - Who is checking the courses BEFORE it is taught? Or why are they not?—Deans have the responsibility to do so; this may or may not have been within the recent processes and is an area for improvement. Looking into an approval system.*
   - Formal online training process that focuses on the technical side of development is needed; Dr. Bailey noted his desire to move to increase the number of in-house hands-on faculty development opportunities. It was agreed that we need to have more supports and trainings to develop these faculty members.

Additional discussion points followed in this area:

- Discussion of online fees students are being charged is the lowest in the nation, in regard to increasing fees for course maintenance, etc. We are locked in with our fees by the board;
- Policy mentions rigor—ecampus has a policy and discussion of rubric and process before a course was released was discussed.
- *Flow of things need to follow the normal flow of approval; getting the process streamlined; the form needs to be accompanied by the rubric, preferably one that has signature lines; discussion of creating a dashboard for approval by contacting OIT. Patrick Davis will contact OIT to discuss the need.

3. Online course management: (Bullets below may not correspond to Faculty Council bullets here)

- Policy statements "…in some instances"—eliminate the passive voice and clarify that it is the Dean's responsibility
- What is the responsibility of any course developer?—Answer: We are looking at that.
- Remove verbiage RODP and once the policy is changed, we can do that.
- Summer semester payments for course re-development or development—it's not that we don't pay for summer revisions, but that it needs to be requested earlier due to budget needs; Hybrid –does not apply to Hybrid courses—should it? It was noted that we do not charge the online fee for hybrid courses.
- There was an office hour and teaching hour discussions as part of online zooming, etc.
- There is a TBR rule perhaps related to standards—verifying the identity of students at the other end of the online. Everything from TBR is now going to be a policy and this was actually a guideline; discussion of proctoring course testing and ability to do this;
- Discussion of number of courses that are using D2L and is it relevant for all students to be paying the online technology fee.

At the end of the meeting it was noted that there was a great discussion this date related specifically to "where we are in our instruction" and related policies and policy needs. Appreciation was expressed to Faculty Council for generating a very useful list of questions and concerns. Deans are to be thinking about the impact of the hybrid options; the impression is that the hybrid option will be actually increasing. The policies of sister schools that are more advanced will be brought to the next meeting. We will take up the discussion in 2 weeks regarding any changes.

Question was asked about the role of the Distance Education Task Force –"how do they fit into this process of policy?" Answer: Theirs is more of a technical role in terms of procedural and daily operational processes. Delivery and quality of what we are delivering and keeping in line with TBR expectations.