Distance Education Meeting  
Friday, October 29   11:00 – 12:10

Attending (based on sign-in sheet): Eric Paul Shaffer, Scott Rhode, Stefanie Sasaki, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Doug Madden, Kara Kam-Kalani, Lianne Nagano, Jon Blumhardt, Brenda Kwon, John DeLay, Mike Ferguson, Linda Laine, Marty Nikou, Gaynell Buxton, Rob Edmondson, Miles Nakanishi, Pat Patterson, Cynthia Smith, Mike Barros

Update on Schedule

Lianne announced that all DE classes scheduled for Spring 2011 are now posted on Banner. She asked *all* DE instructors to review their specific class information to ensure information provided for students is accurate. Notify Lianne of any updates or corrections identified.

Lianne also announced that she will be sending specific cable course programming schedule to all Cable DE faculty.

DE Handbook

Cynthia reminded the group that DE program monthly meetings were intended to go over broader program topics; other meetings held during the semester are intended for discussion of teaching issues, sharing what is going on in individual classes to learn from each other. Emphasis is on the need to work as a coordinated program to address key issues of support for faculty and ability to better serve students.

Attempting to bring closure to creation of a working draft of the DE handbook. Pat did much of the work culling information from other colleges and has incorporated feedback and suggested revisions/additions. Would like more review and feedback so again asking faculty and staff to review and let Pat know feedback. Goal is a working draft made public by mid-November. Updates still to be included include: DERB updates; best practices from sharing sessions; better cataloging of students support services for DE students; indication of faculty development resources e.g. Talent; EMC; Olelo development etc. Handbook will include best practices *and* established policies. Any needed additional policies based on new guidelines (just issued) from ACCJC-WASC will also be included.

Once the working document is posted and public, the long term intent is to have system for *continual* updating of this handbook esp. regarding technology. The document will be in use but also continually updated; one proposal was something like a Wiki document (with limited number of editors.) Some options for doing this kind of ongoing update were mentioned; Pat will follow up to investigate possible methods.
It was clarified that this is a faculty handbook. Once completed, can be the basis for a student handbook. Creating a student handbook is a goal for the spring. Pat was thanked for his efforts.

Assessment

Cynthia presented status report and future goals in terms of assessment. Carrying out program level assessment is important for the health and growth of program. It is also an explicit requirement of ACCJC-WASC. And, assessment results provide needed evidence for requests for resources (fiscal, human) necessary for program improvement in the future.

Program Review

In past years, HCC has periodically conducted survey of distance education as a whole, and asked all DE instructors to have students take it. Looking at past reports, a few observations were made:

- Not all instructors are asking students to take it; though student responses via distance to surveys is always limited, many instructors always have 0 responses—clearly not participating.
- Survey instrument is too long – too many kinds of questions including instructor performance as well as DE services provide.
- It was also observed that some questions on the survey are the same as on other end of semester surveys.

The goal in Spring is to conduct another program review survey; prior to that need to:

- Revise the instrument, shorten it. Will do revision of all DE faculty/staff via email and finalize at program meeting in spring.
- Focus on support services and develop more questions in these areas (get feedback from service folks for more questions). Instructor evaluation questions should be done as part of instructor evaluations.
- Need to ensure all instructors participate. It is their responsibility as DE instructors to help the program as a whole determine status and needs.
- Will look into possibilities for preventing students filling out several DE program surveys.

In reviewing outcomes of past surveys, students are generally happy with support services, rating them comparable or better than other campuses. Clearest finding is that the majority of students simply does not know about and are not using many services. Lack of visibility of support services for students is where improvement is most needed. DEAC has already identified as a goal the raising of visibility of support services available to DE students and is working on a webpage that lists student
support services, contacts etc.. Faculty can then incorporate this site into syllabi, link to their classes etc..

It was mentioned that there is a parallel effort underway to create a page for students to explicitly communicate technical requirements for classes. Need to make clear - before they enroll and certainly at the start of the class - what are needed technical abilities and access capabilities; direct them to support tutorials etc. Message has already been sent out to DE instructors to provide Jon Blumhardt with suggestions of topics to be covered. One goal in better ensuring students are aware of technical requirements is to reduce attrition in classes.

Program review of DE will also include looking at numbers and statistics.

Course SLO’s:
Cynthia discussed the parallel need to be assessing course slos. ACCJC-WASC is particularly concerned that faculty ensure course slos are the same as in face-to-face class (part of DERB review) and that assessment of slos is occurring; the key is to ensure comparable learning. Instructors do not need to report results, but College needs to be able to tell ACCJC-WASC that assessment is taking place, that all DE instructors are periodically evaluating student learning and responding to results to improve instruction as needed.

Question was raised regarding how to change/revise slos; response was - done through course modification process of CPC.

Question was raised regarding what SLOS should be based on: instructor? Transfer program needs (e.g college of ed tests). Response was – needs to be determined at department, discipline level. Was reiterated that slos should reflect articulation needs and agreements with other UH campuses.

Model of Course Creation
Jon Blumhardt presented a model of how to create and structure a course with an eye to instructional design and assessment activities (throughout) linked to clear slos. Emphasized that in developing distance education courses, instructors can take the opportunity to rethink course from a systemic perspective. He emphasized that there are lots of models of instructional design to choose from.

He showed sites from Art 101 to demonstrate how one can build ongoing assessment into instructional design. He presented the ADDIE model (those interested in finding out more can contact Jon). A basic idea is that instructional goals determine media used, strategies of presentation are based on desired demonstrated behaviors and assessment activities are integrated throughout. This is particular important in fields where must teach and assess student performance of skills and behavioral outcomes.

He addressed instructor concerns contemplating instructional redesign who fear it requires a major overhaul; can use models of instructional design and plug in existing
instructional materials. Determine methods of presentation based on learning goals. For example, if the desired goal is a process skill, should utilize animation; need to match the activity to the desired learning outcome. Emphasis was that instructors can use what are doing now in DE and *add* pieces, rather than having to do major overhaul at once. Can also build in activities where students do more preparation for learning, for example develop video resources to have them learn/practice skills prior to class sessions. They do more backwork, more preparation, more contemplation of concepts - prior to the class presentation or meeting (used FIRE skills as example).

He provided a quick overview of the Art class, demonstrating design decisions, how interface was determined, design of website frames/links and explained the bases for these decisions. Course design included *unit specific* slos, and specific examples of superior student work (making explicit expectations). This class relies on Dreamweaver. Laulima is access point but course jumps to outside site for complex graphics. Laulima is good for discussion threads; testing; storing pdfs, contacting people but Laulima has storage limits so problematic to rely solely on it for large files and complex graphics. Was noted that some elements of the course are very depended on high level technological expertise. Finished product in terms of graphics and layout cannot be readily changed or updated *by instructor*, however, Laulima site support components can.

Discussion followed about how others might use EMC as a resource. Creating the entire course took a semester of preparation, revisions etc. However, EMC (Jon, Elton) can create components, a particular multi-media presentation in days. Instructors seeking help do not have to be creating an entire course. Can convert different forms of media – or teach faculty how to accomplish this. It was reiterated that mission of educational media center is to help in development of specific lessons or presentations or creation of an entire course. Anyone interested in developing their course with Jon’s help should contact him. Will have a targeted session of what EMC can do to help and support development of online resources in Spring.

**Assessment Methods**

Cynthia finished with a quick overview of options to use in *assessing* student achievement of course slos. She reiterated the point that instructors are not expected to report results but need to indicate that they are undertaking periodic review and responding to findings. Need to undertake review of course slos – either all of them at once or cycle assessment of some slos each year/semester, covering all slos over time. Do not need to assess every semester but need to have in mind/develop a cycle of assessment. Needs to be done in a sustainable manner.

One option is Knowledge Surveys. Lots of information already out there on how to create / use knowledge surveys. There have been many workshops; information is available on the intranet. Passed out a handout summarizing some key KS information. Internet info: [http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/assessment/workshops/index.html](http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/assessment/workshops/index.html)
If have already done a KS and wish to update it for use in Fall, need to get in touch with David Fink asap. If have not already done one and wish to create a new survey, need to develop this in spring semester.

The group discussed some of the uses and benefits of knowledge surveys. Can be done as pre and post measures of student confidence, to use in reviewing and improving teaching of specific points; or critically - can be used to *compare* student learning in face to face courses versus DE classes. Cynthia showed sample of how she has used KS to compare student learning of same terms/topics/slos in face to face vs online offerings.

Another method is using **imbedded assessment**. This technique involves choosing a final exam question that directly reflects student grasp of a specific course slo. Read over student results to gain sense of class performance; then compare cumulative class performance between face to face and in-class versions. This is a low tech, time consuming method but can be revealing. It can also lead to more quantitative instructor based evaluation of student performance. Instructor determines what constitutes *adequate* range of student performance.

Those needing more guidance and help on how to carry out effective, meaningful assessment should contact Ross or Cynthia.