

Chicago State University  
**DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes

February 26, 2013

I. Call to order. Present: Victor Alexander, Daniel Block, Miguel Fernandez, Chair; Theodis Garth, Janet Grange, Omar Headen, Debrah Jefferson, Michael Sukowski, and Stephanie Suttles.

II. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting, January 22, 2012. Mike Sukowski had a correction. Stephanie Sutter made a motion the minutes be accepted with the correction. Victor Alexander seconded. The minutes were approved with the correction.

III. Reports:

- A. Changes in CTRE Grant Process: Mike Sukowski discussed the changes in the CTRE grant process. He stated there were three reasons for the change:
- 1) Faculty appeal. Instead of making suggested changes to their grant, three faculty members appealed their denial of a CTRE grant to Drs. Watson, Moses, and Westbrooks. However, if the faculty members had made the suggested changes to their grant, there would not have been a need for an appeal.
  - 2) Chairs and Deans were unaware CTRE was approving travel authorizations. At the Provost Council's Meeting it came out the CTRE was approving travel authorization. The Deans and Chairs claimed they did not know about it, even though the faculty travel authorization form has to be signed by the Dean and the Chair.
  - 3) Changes made by the budget department as to how funds can be transferred.

Now, anyone applying for a CTRE grant must attend a training session. In the training session, the person is given a copy of the travel authorization form, vendor form, and authorization for travel form. Each training session attendee must sign stating they have received the information. Mike invited the Faculty Senate and the Union to the training session. Mike stated he would submit information to the Union as to the results of the training session.

Debrah Jefferson commented, the travel policies have been in place for decades. There are procedures for out-of-state travel and in-state travel. The state wants the form completed thirty days before travel. Reimbursements should be made two weeks upon return, not 6 months or the next fiscal year

Mike gave an example of a faculty member who submitted an incomplete form who was leaving for Mexico in a week. There was no submission of a travel authorization form. Debrah stated there are serious repercussions if the travel has not been authorized, such as, if the travel is not authorized, it is not sanctioned by the University. Thus, there is no liability to the University. No workmen's compensation or medical would apply because the travel was not sanctioned by the University.

Dates of the CTRE training are:

Monday, March 4, 2013

9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.  
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.  
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Tuesday, March 5, 2013

9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.  
2:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Friday, March 8, 2013

9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.  
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.  
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

So far Mike has five people who have signed up. Mike has several faculty who will Skype into the training session.

The next deadline for CTRE grant applications is March 15<sup>th</sup>.

- B. Online Education Policies by department. Miguel sent an email to all Deans and Chairs at the beginning of the school year regarding the department's Distance Education Policy. Miguel has received the Distance Education Policy from some of the departments. Posted on the DEC Moodle website are the policies that have been submitted. We are still waiting for several departments to submit their Distance Education Policy.

A question came up, if a department does not have any online courses do they still need to have a distance education policy? Miguel spoke with Mike and they agree - the department still needs to have a distance education policy.

Miguel liked the Criminal Justice, Philosophy and Political Science Department's Distance Education Policy. In addition, he liked the fact the policy was posted on the department's web site. Miguel believes it is a good idea to post the department's Distance Education policy on the department's website. The Criminal Justice, Philosophy, and Political Science Department list the courses it offers online. Miguel believes this is good practice. Debrah commented the Course Bulletin has a listing of online and hybrid courses.

#### IV. Unfinished Business

- A. Student Satisfaction Survey. A draft of the DEC student satisfaction survey (SSS) was distributed. Debrah informed the committee the University was preparing a student satisfaction survey (SSS). In addition, a survey had just been done for HLC. The survey needs to go through the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

There was discussion regarding the draft submitted. If the University is planning on doing a SSS, the name of the DEC SSS would need to be changed. A question arose whether the survey should be done every semester or every year. Debrah suggested the DEC SSS be consolidated with the University SSS. There was discussion regarding the University's SSS. It has not been determined whether the University will use Noel Lovitz or Survey Monkey to do their survey. Miguel asked how the University had done the SSS in the past. There was discussion regarding the University's SSS and the DEC SSS, having both surveys may cause student confusion and duplication.

The question was brought up whether the DEC student satisfaction survey should be done as part of the online faculty evaluation. The Committee discussed whether a separate DEC SSS should be done or whether the DEC should submit questions to the University for its SSS.

On the proposed DEC SSS there were only 9 questions specific to technology. Stephanie suggested there should be one survey – the University SSS. Possibly, the DEC would recommend five questions be added to the University SSS. The five questions should be stream-lined and then sent to the University. One survey would be best. The name of the University SSS Committee is: Student Satisfaction Survey – Bernie Rowan is on the Committee.

Daniel Block commented about the proposed DEC SSS and the answers being optional. There was discussion about correct survey question format.

Debrah suggested there should be questions regarding online chatrooms (discussion forums), the readability of the screen. Mike said they need to pick up the questions as to the device used such as a tablet or smart phone. Debrah stated a question on the survey as to how students access the online course would be helpful – whether students are using a smart phone or tablet to access

their online course(s). There should be a limit to the number of questions. Mike expressed concern about bombarding students with so many surveys and questions.

A question arose if the DEC could add specific questions to the online faculty evaluation form. Miguel commented that it might be difficult, but it could be explored. Mike said we need to again be aware of the surveys and number of questions on the surveys, students will be hit with.

- B. CSU Guidelines for Proctored Exams. There was discussion regarding the Contract (Appendix G). Debrah said there needs to be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Union. There was discussion that if a student must take a proctored exam, it should be stated in the course bulletin. There was discussion as to the definition of an “online class” and a “hybrid course”. The “hybrid course” should list the dates the class meets. Stephanie, who is an academic advisor, stated there are problems when the faculty member changes the class meeting days from what is posted in the course bulletin. If the faculty member changes the class meeting dates that are posted in the course bulletin, it is difficult and unfair to the student. The Chair must be informed and notify the Administration. This is an important problem – faculty changing the posted course meeting dates. The Administration needs to know. This should be discussed in the faculty (tenure-track and lecturer/adjunct) orientation.

Mike discussed with their vendor a “lock down browser” using Respondus. Theo discussed the details of the lock down browser. With the lock down browser the student cannot copy and paste while taking an online exam. A lock down browser would be a good option, in terms of online exams.

Dr. Headen, Director of the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), discussed exam proctoring (paper based tests and online exams) done by the Learning Assistance Center. Stephanie asked if the LAC will be charging a proctoring fee? Currently, no fee is being charged for this service. The LAC has desktop and laptop computers. Dr. Headen said the fourth floor of the library is having problems connecting to the internet. Victor responded and will inform Prashant Shinde (CIO). Dr. Headen did not have a problem with the guidelines.

The CSU Guidelines for Proctored Exam should be looked at and voted upon by the Academic Affairs Committee, and then the Senate. Motion was made to approve guidelines for proctored exams. It was seconded. All voted affirmatively to the motion.

Regarding drafting an online course definition for MOU, DEC Subcommittee – Miguel, Stephanie, and Janet. Debrah said this would be an audit finding, difference between the definition in the Contract (Appendix G) and the University practice. Janet said she would get Contract language (Eastern, Northeastern, Western, Governor’s State).

- C. Online Course Evaluations. Miguel discussed online course evaluations. Dr. Westbrook would like representation from all of the colleges to be on the committee. Miguel will coordinate the meeting to review online courses. All Chairs and Deans received the information regarding the evaluation process.

## V. New Business

- A. Problems with Remote Learner and Getting Timely Information Out to the Campus Community. Theo discussed the problems they have been having with remote learner. There needs to be a message sent out to inform the campus community. Theo asked that they (CTRE) have access to the listserv regarding Moodle outages. Theo stressed the importance that notification should be sent out timely. Daniel Block said his class disappeared. Thursdays issue with Moodle, Mike said he started getting phone calls from faculty and students. Once the Office of CTRE was informed about the problem, it was fixed within an hour. Victor said access to the listserv by CTRE would be a violation of the University policy. Victor said he would present this

issue to Prashant Shinde (CIO). On March 7<sup>th</sup>, Mike and Theo will be meeting with Dr. Moses, Prashant Shinde and Janet Oliver. One of the items Mike has on his list, to discuss at the meeting, is having access to the listserv. Victor said Dr. Scheinbuks (former Director of Distance Learning) had access to the listserv. Mike asked Liz if she had access to the listserv. She did not have access. Victor stated that there should be notification on cougar connect. Mike said he does receive a list of the faculty teaching online. Mike said they are putting a ticker on the CTRE home page and the library home page. A member discussed the problem with Moodle if it goes out. This is very frustrating to faculty.

Stephanie made a motion the meeting be adjourned. Her motion was seconded. All voted affirmatively to the motion.