MINUTES
San Bernardino Valley College
Distance Education Committee Meeting
April 15, 2022 10:00 am—11:30 am
ConferZOOM

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/99740785176

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16699006833,99740785176# or +16468769923, 99740785176#

Or Telephone:

   Dial: +1 669 900 6833 (US Toll) or   +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll)   Meeting ID: 997 4078 5176

Members Present: Maha Al-Husseini, Michael Assumma, Davena Burns-Peters, Jennifer Bjerke, Cherishea Coats, Rania Hamdy, Leticia Hector, Lisa Henkle, Maria Notarangelo, Adam Pave, Soha Sobhanian, Nori Sogomonian, Teri Strong, Michael Torrez, and Margaret Worsley.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action Items
Call to Order:	10:03am	
Approval of Minutes:	Lisa/Jennifer-- approved	
ACCJC webinar on RSI feedback. Committee members were also provided this input form for written feedback if desired.	Lisa said there should be an established over-arching definition of what Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) is. Michael and Lisa brought up **Mentoring** to help assist in executing what that definition looks like. In Michael's department, mentoring is done optionally. He suggested organizing volunteers in each discipline that have good RSI. They could potentially make their Canvas shell available to the entire department. Maha suggested a **bulleted list** of what components the course should have. Maybe a percentage of the number of announcements, discussions, etc. furthered with each department requiring that standard. Rania suggested **expanding the SLO form** (student learning outcomes and assessments). A separate section could meet RSI components. This would involve our existing processes. Leticia likes the idea of **capturing data** through expanding SLO process, as well as Maha's approach. She said the more clear we can be (e.g. with a refined definition with examples), the easier it will be for faculty. Jen talked about tying together providing standards up front, and also leveraging resources that we have. Threw out the idea of check boxes, "What did you do for RSI?" Also **course design** as it's different from face-to-face... i.e. automatic feedback on quizzes, are we using authentic assessments? Instructor presence	

	within the design. Faculty could check those off on SLOs.	
	Davena stressed mentorship program, participation, etc. At some point (use rounds/phases?) it becomes more required/defined. She likes the organic approach of using systems we already have, but expanding it and making it better.	
	Michael suggested incorporating **student evaluation** questions about RSI. Questions like "are you able to reach your instructor within 24-48 hours?" "Do you feel you have access to the instructor?" "Is the instructor able to reach you effectively within 24-48 hours?" "How frequently did you interact online with your peers?" Questions representing RSI should/would include District and CTA in process for their feedback and implementation.	
	Maria asked, what are public things about our classes? The Syllabus. There are somethings that are required on the syllabus. Perhaps having a syllabus that aligns with the SLO and student question(s) would help. Maybe we could be required to tie in SLOs with how RSI is happening in the classroom. Also grades... is there a way to use rubric on grading to establish this? E.g. % of students passed RSI.	The DE Leads will continue to assess what is needed with implementing these ideas at the institution. The first step will be to coordinate with the SLO Faculty Lead.
	Adam thinks we're trying to kill two birds with one stone. We have training which helps faculty with RSI, the other part is the legal or "regulatory part." Margaret pointed out these are the same "bird," as the regulatory component leads the need/outcomes for training.	
	Davena reminded the committee that required training is under Academic Senate purview, not Union.	
End of year Senate Report	The committee discussed highlights and imperatives to include within the Academic Senate DE End of Year Report. What are our DE Goals? Challenges? Successes? This form was provided for written feedback if desired: https://forms.office.com/r/ZRqzL7uJWd	
	Maria liked the current discussion on RSI as far as definitions and institutional process. Improvement is 100% of the things that stands out.	
	Rania said it's not often that DE leads take such a leadership role with PD. She said it's worth noting in the report the evolution of Level 1 and Level 2, and a train the trainer situation, additional training, office hours, etc. This sets a good example for other Leads in Lead spaces. They need to be accessible and they need to be leaders. She encouraged the DE Leads to "Toot your horn in that report."	

	Maria said as for goals, she'd like to see the vision of our education not to slip back. She thinks where it should go is forward with technology. She wants to keep looking forward in how online instruction continues to change and change with it. Nori would like to incorporate more tools into her courses. This could be connected to future trainings in utilizing online tools. Books+ was talked about. It hasn't been announced but is evidently being carried through next year (yay).	DE Leads will compile this feedback in preparation of their report to Academic Senate.
Adjournment	11:15am	