***Present:*** *Andrea Coker-Anderson, Jane Compson, Lorraine Dinnel, Robin Evans-Agnew, Jeff Cohen, Lauren Montgomery, Patrick Pow, Jenny Quinn, Stephen Norman as substitute for Evelyn Shankus, Jenny Sheng, Eric Bugyis, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, Colleen Carmean.* ***Absent:*** *Omer Adam, Kathy Beaudoin.*

# Feedback from Students

Distance Learning Student Focus Group document passed out (see appendix A). General feedback from student groups:

DL doesn’t resonate with students; online makes more sense; the percentages are confusing to some students; others okay with them; “synchronous” is confusing; students want more online course offerings; need “class meets in person on \_\_\_\_\_”, Not percentages; Students want predictability; conversely, Some faculty want the advantages of flexibility with class meetings; If students see “online” they think that it doesn’t meet on campus; Students excited to have this information in the Time Schedule: to know when they are expected to be in class; Students see discrepancy in the quality of online vs. classroom instruction , Want more online, but want them to be quality; Some students need to reflect on if they are a good candidate for online learning; Students take online courses to help with work/life balance

# Consideration of Version 1 vs. Version 2 of policy (See appendix B)

# Discussion: Where does Hybrid/DL cut off belong?

The committee discussed the implications of various percentages, especially the implications for international students, military/veteran students, and faculty members’ academic freedoms. The overall goal is to communicate to students how much time they are required to be in a classroom seat, per Hybrid/DL class. The committee agreed that an important aspect of the policy would be to require that this information be explicitly written into the courses’ notes in the Time Schedule, i.e. “TIAS 201 will meet the following 5 Mondays from 3-4:15pm:\_\_\_.” The committee also discussed the possibility of adding a letter into the Time Schedule to indicate a hybrid course and prompt students to look within the course notes (like the “D” for Diversity Designation courses).

# Issue of funding iTech Fellows program

**Discussion:** EC and APCC can’t mandate how units appropriate funds**.** As is, the *suggestion* is that the unit pays half and that the Chancellor pays half.

# Statement about informed or voluntary DL/Hybrid teaching only

# Discussion: Within the policy, it would state that faculty can’t be forced to teach DL/Hybrid courses against their will unless they were told upon hiring that this was an expectation.

# Vote

# Motion to have the DL policy set at 100% online being DL; 40-99% online being Hybrid; 0%-39% online being a campus course; using a letter in the time schedule to indicate Hybrid, no Hybrid percentages, and detailed course schedule in the Time Schedule course notes; instructors must take iTech Fellows in order to teach DL & Hybrid courses; including statement about informed/voluntary DL/Hybrid teaching:

**5 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstain; 4 absent (or had to leave early); 9 eligible to vote (quorum is 5)**

**(See Appendix C for Version voted in)**

# Adjourn

**DISTANCE LEARNING STUDENT FOCUS GROUP**

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2016**

**ACADEMIC ADVISING CENTER**

**STUDENT PARTICIPANTS:**

Romana Antonchuk, Social Work and Criminal Justice

Sam Narlock, Milgard School of Business

Griffin Toyoda,Institute of Technology

**STUDENT RESPONSE:**

Students were asked to review the draft Distance Learning (DL) Policy. The following provides student feedback on the DL course designations and recommendations.

Students would like to see more online courses offered at UW Tacoma.

Initial views of students when presented with the qualifier,*campus course, hybrid course and DL course*

*-campus course:* expected to physically attend class on campus, understand there might be online course work submission; *hybrid course:* part online/part on campus, perhaps 50/50; *DL course:* fully online, not required to come to campus

'Distance Learning' does not resonate with students and they prefer *'online'-* "makes more sense".

The percentages were confusing to all three students. Students want to know when they are expected to be on campus in-person or in class online. Students felt that the H% in the Time Schedule would be confusing and suggested expectations to be on campus (i.e. specific day/time) be provided and clearly indicated.

The synchronous designation was confusing to students. However,they considered synchronous class time to be the same as in-person class time because they are expected to logon and be 'present' at a specific time.

One student explained he took an online course but was surprised when he was required to come to campus for his final project/review. Another student suggested more flipped classroom hybrid courses.

Students communicated they decide to take an online or DL course because it "works with their schedule". If they are expected to be on campus or online on a specific day/at a specific time, students need to know- denote in Time Schedule and Quick Search notes.

Students expressed desire to clearly and explicitly designate hybrid and DL courses in the Time Schedule and Quick Search. This denotation in the Time Schedule and Quick Search should provide information

including date/time, and any expectation to come to class and/or be available for synchronous online learning.

Students provided ideas for ways in which they would find the information helpful to locate. One student suggested a different color be used to signify hybrid and DL courses in the Time Schedule (e.g. hybrid and DL courses would be highlighted in a different color rather than the traditional white/grey). The Quick Search should include a filter for hybrid (H) courses.

1.27.16 LD

**Appendix B**

**VERSION 1:**

**Distance Learning Policy Recommendations for**

**UW Tacoma Executive Council**

**APCC – 1/19/16 - Draft**

*Policy for DL course designations*:

**Campus Course** - Courses where 39% or less of scheduled in-person class time may be replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content, or courses where *any* of online content **requires** a synchronous online presence of all students.

**Hybrid** **Course** - Courses where between 40-99% of scheduled in-person class time is replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content that *do not* require a synchronous online presence of all students. Also, there must be at least one in-person meeting. In other words, synchronous online time cannot entirely substitute for in-person class time.

**Distance Learning** **Course** - Courses where in-person interaction between students and professors is entirely replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content, that *do not* require a synchronous online presence of all students.

 *Further Recommendations*

1) That the Time Schedule have (as it does for online courses) a designation for Hybrid courses, as defined above, whereby the percentage of online class time is indicated. e.g. H50% means a hybrid course where 50% of the class time is replaced with online content and tools that do not require a synchronous online presence of students. H75% indicates one where 75% of the time is online, etc.

2) That Hybrid courses, as defined above, be subject to the same special curricular review as DL courses. (see below)

3) That a new, customized curricular review process be developed for DL and Hybrid designation, based on lessons learned from the current UW Tacoma Quality Matters-based peer review process, but with modifications to accommodate the needs and culture of UW Tacoma. (A subcommittee of APCC is working on this in Winter quarter, 2016).

*Rationale*: This policy takes into consideration the fact that the DL course designation poses problems for international students and veterans, by restricting the number of courses given that label to those with 100% online content. It also creates a second designation, “Hybrid”, to indicate courses with substantial but not total, online content (40-99%), and requires an online curricular review process for these as well as the DL courses. This policy is also more precise than previous ones, and excludes flipped courses, service learning courses, field courses and study abroad courses from the DL category. The idea here is to reduce confusion amid the many types of courses that depart from the traditional classroom format, and clarify the nature of those in the “Distance Learning” and the proposed new “Hybrid” designations.

**Recommendations for Review Process of**

**Hybrid and Distance Learning courses**

Prepared by the subcommittee on DL/Hybrid review:

(Jeff Cohen, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Lauren Montgomery, Colleen Carmean)

*New DL & Hybrid Review Policy:*

Every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course (as defined above) must be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may offer other DL or H courses without further review. Thus, the review process is shifted onto instructors, and away from courses.

In order for this policy to work, iTech Fellows must be offered on a regular basis. Toward this, we recommend that it occur as a three day training through the Office of Academic Technologies, funded jointly through the Chancellor’s Office and the Units, with stipends of $1000. Thus, for each iTech Fellow, the sponsoring unit and the Chancellor’s office will each pay $500. (In the past, the stipend was $3000 and the Chancellor’s office paid it in full.) Thus we are reducing the compensation for instructors and dividing the cost evenly between the two sources, in the interest of making the training mandatory for all online instructors and also affordable to the university. The iTech Fellows training itself will be nearly identical (see below), except it will be changed from four to three days in length.

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses begun in iTech Fellows.

Units will be responsible for overseeing the credential for assigning instructors of DL or Hybrid courses. The Office of Academic Technologies will continue to oversee the list of UW Tacoma qualified peer reviewers (see <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/teaching-learning-technology/uwt-qm-peer-reviewers> )

*Background & Rationale*:

Over the past five years, UW Tacoma has utilized the standardized assessment tool called Quality Matters (QM) for review of it’s DL courses. (DL courses were considered those with more than 50% of campus time replaced with online content). Our office of Academic Technologies also created and implemented an optional four day training called “iTech Fellows” for people wanting to learn about best practices. iTech Fellows was a competitive program paid for by the Chancellor’s office, and it provided a stipend of $3,000 for instructors who participated. The program occurred in two phases: 1) the four day intensive training, and 2) the development of an online course and it’s approval through a QM review process conducted by two other iTech Fellows. Not everyone who offered DL courses were required to have iTech Fellows training, but all new DL courses did need to pass a QM review by colleagues who had that training. However, some DL courses predated all of these and were being taught without the benefit of either of these reviews.

The new policy being recommended above shifts the focus of a review to instructors, and away from courses. This ensures that in the future, no DL or Hybrid course will be taught by an untrained person.

**VERSION 2:**

**Distance Learning Policy Recommendations for**

**UW Tacoma Executive Council**

**APCC – 1/19/16 - Draft**

*Policy for DL course designations*:

**Campus Course** - Courses where 39% or less of scheduled in-person class time may be replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content, or courses where *any* of online content **requires** a synchronous online presence of all students.

**Hybrid** **Course** - Courses where between 40-80% of scheduled in-person class time is replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content that *do not* require a synchronous online presence of all students.

**Distance Learning** **Course** - Courses where more than 80% of scheduled in-person class time is replaced with online (virtual) learning tools and content, that *do not* require a synchronous online presence of all students.

 *Further Recommendations*

1) That the Time Schedule have (as it does for online courses) a designation for Hybrid courses, as defined above, whereby the percentage of online class time is indicated. e.g. H50% means a hybrid course where 50% of the class time is replaced with online content and tools that do not require a synchronous online presence of students. H75% indicates one where 75% of the time is online, etc.

2) That Hybrid courses, as defined above, be subject to the same special curricular review as DL courses. (see below)

3) That a new, customized curricular review process be developed for DL and Hybrid designation, based on lessons learned from the current UW Tacoma Quality Matters-based peer review process, but with modifications to accommodate the needs and culture of UW Tacoma. (A subcommittee of APCC is working on this in Winter quarter, 2016).

*Rationale*: This policy takes into consideration the fact that the DL course designation poses problems for international students and veterans, by restricting the number of courses given that label to those with 100% online content. It also creates a second designation, “Hybrid”, to indicate courses with substantial online content (40-80%), and requires an online curricular review process for these as well as the DL courses. This policy is also more precise than previous ones, and excludes flipped courses, service learning courses, field courses and study abroad courses from the DL category. The idea here is to reduce confusion amid the many types of courses that depart from the traditional classroom format, and clarify the nature of those in the “Distance Learning” and the proposed new “Hybrid” designations.

**Recommendations for Review Process of**

**Hybrid and Distance Learning courses**

Prepared by the subcommittee on DL/Hybrid review:

(Jeff Cohen, Andrea Coker-Anderson, Lauren Montgomery, Colleen Carmean)

*New DL & Hybrid Review Policy:*

Every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course (as defined above) must be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may offer other DL or H courses without further review. Thus, the review process is shifted onto instructors, and away from courses.

In order for this policy to work, iTech Fellows must be offered on a regular basis. Toward this, we recommend that it occur as a three day training through the Office of Academic Technologies, funded jointly through the Chancellor’s Office and the academic units, with stipends of $1000. Thus, for each iTech Fellow, the sponsoring unit and the Chancellor’s office would each pay $500. (In the past, the stipend was $3000 and the Chancellor’s office paid it in full.) Thus we are reducing the compensation and dividing the cost evenly between the two sources, in the interest of making the training mandatory for all faculty teaching hybrid or DL courses and also affordable to the university. The iTech Fellows training itself will be nearly identical (see below), except it will be changed from four to three days in length.

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses begun in iTech Fellows.

Units will be responsible for overseeing the credential for assigning instructors of DL or Hybrid courses. The Office of Academic Technologies will continue to oversee the list of UW Tacoma qualified peer reviewers (see <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/teaching-learning-technology/uwt-qm-peer-reviewers> )

*Background & Rationale*:

Over the past five years, UW Tacoma has utilized the standardized assessment tool called Quality Matters (QM) for review of it’s DL courses. (DL courses were considered those with more than 50% of campus time replaced with online content). Our office of Academic Technologies also created and implemented an optional four day training called “iTech Fellows” for people wanting to learn about best practices. iTech Fellows was a competitive program paid for by the Chancellor’s office, and it provided a stipend of $3,000 for instructors who participated. The program occurred in two phases: 1) the four day intensive training, and 2) the development of an online course and it’s approval through a QM review process conducted by two other iTech Fellows. Not everyone who offered DL courses were required to have iTech Fellows training, but all new DL courses did need to pass a QM review by colleagues who had that training. However, some DL courses predated all of these and were being taught without the benefit of either of these reviews.

The new policy being recommended above shifts the focus of a review to instructors, and away from courses. This ensures that in the future, no DL or Hybrid course will be taught by an untrained person.

**VERSION 3:**

**Distance Learning Policy Recommendations for**

**UW Tacoma Executive Council**

**Approved by APCC – 1/27/16**

*Policy for DL course designations*:

**Campus Course** - Courses where up to 39% of scheduled in-person class time may be replaced with online learning tools and content. (Synchronous online content counts as campus time.)

**Hybrid** **Course** - Courses where between 40-99% of scheduled in-person class time is replaced with asynchronous online learning tools. Also, there must be at least one in-person class meeting. In other words, synchronous online time cannot entirely substitute for in-person class time.

**Distance Learning** **Course** - Courses where in-person interaction between students and professors is entirely replaced with online learning tools and content, that *do not* require a synchronous online presence of all students.

*Rationale*: This policy takes into consideration the problems that the DL course designation pose for international students and veterans, by restricting the number of courses given that label to those with 100% online content. It also creates a second designation, “Hybrid”, to indicate courses with substantial but not total, online content (40-99%). This policy is also more precise than previous ones, and excludes flipped courses, service learning courses, field courses and study abroad courses from the DL or Hybrid categories. The idea here is to reduce confusion amid the many types of courses that depart from the traditional classroom format, and clarify the nature of those in the “Distance Learning” and the proposed new “Hybrid” designations. It is also intended to be very clear to students that DL – means all online, and H means something more than 40% online and some campus time.

 *Further Recommendations*

1) That the Time Schedule have (as it does for online courses) a designation for Hybrid courses, as defined above, and **that all H courses include details of the time required to be on campus in the comments section of the Time Schedule**.

2) That every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course (as defined above) be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may offer other DL or H courses without further review. Thus, the review process is shifted onto instructors, and away from courses.

In order for this recommendation to work, iTech Fellows must be offered on a regular basis. Toward this, we recommend that it occur as a two-three day training through the Office of Academic Technologies, funded through the Chancellor’s Office. Thus, we have reduced the compensation for faculty who take iTech Fellows but also reduced the time required for the training.

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses developed in iTech Fellows.

3) That teaching of DL or Hybrid courses be either voluntary on the part of the faculty, or included in the written expectations or possibilities of the position at hiring.

4) That units be responsible for overseeing the credential for assigning instructors of DL or Hybrid courses. The Office of Academic Technologies will continue to oversee the list of UW Tacoma qualified peer reviewers (see <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/teaching-learning-technology/uwt-qm-peer-reviewers> )

*Background & Rationale of Changes in iTech Fellows & Review Process*:

Over the past five years, UW Tacoma has utilized the standardized assessment tool called Quality Matters (QM) for review of it’s DL courses. (DL courses were considered those with more than 50% of campus time replaced with online content). Our office of Academic Technologies also created and implemented an optional four day training called “iTech Fellows” for people wanting to learn about best practices. iTech Fellows was a competitive program paid for by the Chancellor’s office, and it provided a stipend of $3,000 for instructors who participated. The program occurred in two phases: 1) a four day intensive training, and 2) the subsequent development of an online course and it’s approval through a QM review process conducted by two other iTech Fellows. Not everyone who offered DL courses were required to have iTech Fellows training, but all new DL courses did need to pass a QM review by colleagues who had that training. However, some DL courses predated all of these and were being taught without the benefit of either of these reviews.

The new policy being recommended above shifts the focus of a review to instructors, and away from courses. This ensures that in the future, no DL or Hybrid course will be taught by an untrained person.