

DL Issues Matrix for Gap Analysis

| ISSUE | Standards/ guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| DATA COLLECTION | | | | | |
| Descriptive Demographics (who's taking what?) | IE's SSFH (Spreadsheet from Hell) and DL Credit Fact sheet | Regular and accessible updates | yes | None, but some questions below may need IE attention | Institutional Effectiveness |
| SUPPORT OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS | | | | | |
| Technical Help – “over the shoulder” or other? | 7 component issues are addressed in CENTSS study | Helpdesk on-campus | somewhat somewhat | See CENTSS Audit -- should be more effective to individual users | Distance Ed : New position Online Student coordinator established to address identified gaps in service. Starting Jan '09, will have the task of addressing many of these issues |
| Is tutoring available? | Pilot - Elluminate | Math tutors at Sylvania, drop in and scheduled; specific subject areas do not seem well presented (not a DL-specific issue) | Not sure | Need assessment of effectiveness; can practice be expanded? | |
| On-line writing assistance available | Pilot – Elluminate | Online writing lab (PT WR instructor paid to organize) – but how does this work? | Not sure | | |
| Drop-in sessions? | | Yes, see above | Not sure | | |
| Communication to students/faculty about DL support | | Website available | Not so much? Faculty and students are often not aware of what is available | “Push” info about available services to faculty and students ? | |
| Student Assessment: Testing Centers for authenticating students, make up exams | BIG GAP | Hours limited & vary by campus. DL department may be charged for make-up exams – that practice also varies by campus | No | Expand hours, improve room conditions Consistent practices for different kinds of testing is needed | DOI/DOS? |

| RETENTION | Standards/guide lines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|--|---|---|------------|---|-----------------------------|
| How does retention in DL compare with on-campus? | Should be same as for on-campus sections | Slightly higher in the IT areas Are there areas that have more issues with retention than others? | | Data suggests that retention is better in DL than on-campus – recommend continued data collection to identify problems arising and support continuous improvement | Institutional Effectiveness |
| Best (or problematic) practices? | Research identifies Faculty-student interaction as most important | Clearly impacted by the degree of active involvement from the instructor; i.e, timely response to emails and BB questions/postings | | What are successful instructors doing that can be added into the training. May need to find a “refresher “ strategy, to update veteran DL instructors on recently identified best practices. Maybe survey students earlier, or identify a focus group of non-completers to learn what might have helped them? | Instructional Support |
| How to contact “no-show” students? | | Call students on phone; email through MyPCC course tools. | | | |
| How to make sure that students new to DL get special help? | | There is an online orientation of sorts, but it is not obligatory. Automatic e-mail message about how to log into blackboard | Somewhat | Find a way to encourage students to complete orientation the first time they take a course Make it a direct link to blackboard? But that might short-circuit orientation. | On-line student coordinator |

| QUALITY CONTROL | Standards/guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| How are “shells” developed and used? | New course developments created from standard template. New courses, revised courses, and takeover courses taught by a new instructor are reviewed by IS consultant/Online Faculty Mentor, and then by div. dean. (Modified version of QM rubric is used.) | Takeover courses based on previously developed course shell, which can be specified in request. A few SACs require use of 1 master shell for each class. Given various possible shells, IS consultant/faculty mentor works with instructor to decide. New shells are carefully evaluated by DL and Deans (I think ☺) | Varies. Process can take time. Depends on good communication. Deans should be acquainted with the rubric, and have training to review courses | Discussion to streamline process. Discussion is needed on reviewing old courses and on providing feedback on course delivery in addition to design. | SAC, Distance Ed |
| Who “owns” a shell, and who can use it? | PCC owns shell if instructor was compensated for development. Joint ownership for PT instructor. (Could use the shell at different institution) In these cases, other PCC instructors can use the shell. Shells should be owned by PCC if development funding was involved. | Permission is sought before using a shell if there is a question. Also, some instructors have made it clear that they received no compensation and do not want to share their shell. (Even some instructors who have received compensation do not want to share the shell.) This is often handed informally by DL staff. Ideally a SAC agreement should be informed by knowledge of options and their various consequences. | Varies. This becomes an FTE issue, and in some cases could become a “Do I still have students & a job?” issue | Clarify the rules and contract (IP) issues. Intent is to tie funding to ownership. Discussion agreement about the impact of types of shell-sharing. Provide queries for SAC to consider – choices and related consequences | SAC, Distance Ed, Deans (DD and DOIs) ? Federation? |
| Course review | | Need to figure out how to review DL courses developed BEFORE any QM review process was in place. | | Should some sort of triennial review system be implemented? | |
| Is mentoring available? | | Current pilot test of “Online Faculty Mentors”. (But not all subjects are covered. Otherwise it falls to IS consultant & local ITS.) Mentoring arrangement available for late takeovers only. | Varies | More discussion in this area would be helpful. | SAC, Distance Ed |

| QUALITY CONTROL (continued) | Standards/guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| How is academic freedom impacted? | | Instructors in some subject areas prefer to develop a new course from scratch in their own style instead of using a previously developed shell. This costs the college more, but the request is usually honored. More often it comes in the form of a "revision". Instructors teaching from a designated "master shell" are only allowed to make minimal changes. Minimal impact if "best practices" are accepted as the norm | Varies. The "master shell" approach is more streamlined and more cost effective for the college, though loss of some academic freedom and personal creativity is the tradeoff. | More discussion on the best approach for SACs and for the college. | SAC, EAC? |
| Is academic integrity being maintained with online testing and on-campus proctoring of make-up exams? | | Individual faculty determine testing procedures | unknown | Discussion needed—issue may need to be addressed in the Academic Handbook | SACs, ASAP, EAC |
| SAC role in determining which courses will be offered in a DL modality | SAC recommends modality before course can be offered in DL modality, is supposed to check back after one year to assess how well DL version is working. | Unknown if this standard is consistently followed BA and CAS (both multi-campus SAC's) have worked out agreements on new DL sections but grandfathered sections are still contentious. | unknown | Need to be sure that SAC chair signature is obtained before a course is initially offered in DL modality | SACs, SAC Admin Support, Div Deans, DL Dept. |

| WORKLOAD | Standards/guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Are there consistent practices to ensure equity? | A DL subgroup (two division deans, faculty, and DL staff) met in 2007 to address maximum class size. Research showed average under-grad DL courses at 22. Higher sizes included the addition of teaching assistants or additional faculty. Based on this research the committee recommended a max DL class size of 25. SAC's could recommend higher or lower limits if they had rationale to support their recommendation. | Usually OK within a division, but often not from among division or campuses, even within a subject area | Depends. For some SACs have worked out strategies, but not without some pain. | Additional research: prior study was based on 2004 data, and the landscape for DL has changed | |
| <p>What kinds of class size differences exist/cause concern?</p> <p>Differences across disciplines?</p> <p>Campus-to-campus differences within a discipline?</p> <p>Expectations for equity vs .special considerations for DL vs. on campus</p> | <p>Some SAC's (or deans) chose to have higher limits. This causes some equity concerns among faculty</p> <p>Some divisions have attempted to raise the limit to 30 in order to account for attrition. If enrollment remains at 30 after week 3, the overage formula kicks in.</p> <p>There seem to be two distinct ways of looking at with regards to expectations for class size.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DL vs Face to Face for a given course or subject area (original notion was that DL should be treated no differently, but since DL is not limited by class seats, it's a target for overage 'abuse' Differences among disciplines drive specific class size norms and ideals. | <p>Rick sent the document out to DDs Nov 27, 2007</p> <p>Different practices suggest that we do not have a clear default position.</p> <p>CRN analysis is hard to interpret because of different course enrollment strategies (wait-lists, overages, overloads) and the way course data is reported. There are many different reason/stories that explain differences in the enrolment data.</p> | <p>Within divisions, mostly yes.</p> <p>In multi-campus SACs, it varies.</p> | <p>Discussion of rationale for class size limits should consider whether differences are appropriate and supportable.</p> <p>Discussion of financial impact, and how to deal with overages. Consider that there are savings and losses at different parts of the organization (instruction, facilities etc)</p> <p>Revisit some of the assumptions that drove decision making that may play differently now (better tools for course management, savvier students and instructors, larger pool of best practices).</p> <p>Clarify role of SAC and process for recommendations</p> <p>Consider: Is interdisciplinary consistency a value? Is intra-disciplinary consistency a value?</p> | <p>Recommend: Some sort of team or task force; include faculty, DDs, DOIs and DL support staff, other?</p> |

| WORKLOAD continued | Standards/guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | |
|---|--|-----------------|---|---|----|
| Do we have principles that can guide contract negotiations? | Directives for dealing with overages and overloads (but with respect to unspecified class size limits) are spelled out in the contract | | Contract was last negotiated two contracts ago, | How would action suggested above impact current contract negotiations. Is it timely? Is it necessary, since class size limits are unspecified | ?? |

| SCHEDULING | Standards/guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>How does FTE affect our conversations about DL course offerings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DL vs. DL sections of a course (campus to campus) DL vs on-campus sections Which campus gets a new section when enrollment allows (see below*) How can new DL courses be distributed equitably among the campuses (a value?) | FTE is a key driver for budgets and positions, both transfer and new initiatives) | <p>“heated & professional” conversations occur in SACs, w/Div Deans & Dept Chairs</p> <p>Default is that conversations take place and practices are adopted at each campus, unless there is a champion pushing a district-wide approach</p> <p>For BA, the 3 Dept Chairs and 3 Div Deans meet to work it out. Not everyone was thrilled. Willingness to cooperate is key</p> | <p>No</p> <p>Not everyone was thrilled with outcome but amenable</p> | <p>Discussion needed to acknowledge & explore this issue</p> <p>Figure out how to “define” equity (e.g., equal vs proportional, old vs. new)</p> <p>Recognize that fair access across the district is a philosophical position – one that is valued?</p> | Division Deans, Dept Chairs SAC Chairs and Faculty |

| SCHEDULING continued | Standards/ guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|---|--|--|------------|--|--|
| Priority for assignment of DL sections? (campus, full-time, part-time) | None that are uniform across the district. | Varies among programs. Existing CAS DL classes have been “grandfathered”. The norm is that the campus who originally developed the class “owns” it. Additional sections are only offered at other campuses after the grandfathered sections fill. New DL classes are shared or rotated depending on the situation. | Varies | Some coordination needed. Collegiality among the Div Deans is essential. Art can engage Deans Council in discussion of how to equitably manage DL sections. | Division Deans, Dept Chairs, Faculty |
| What opportunities for college-wide collaboration does DL present? | none | Varies BA and HE have adopted a practice in which any new course (incl revisions) must be co-developed, as a requirement for ability to offer sections. Encourages consistency across the district, which can be a problem. | | Possibilities include: -joint development of online classes -team-teaching -cross-disciplinary learning communities Adopt BA/HE strategy more generally? Tying cooperation to development funding may be increase motivation Identify models that are in use in other disciplines or other places, and make them known to our departments, SACs and deans | SACs, Division Deans, Dept Chairs, Faculty |
| Alternative model in which FTE rolls to a “Distance Learning Division” rather than the divisions on individual campuses | | Front Range community College in CO does this | | Is this worth looking into? | |

| IMPACT ON PCC COMMUNITY | Standards/ guidelines? | Practice | Effective? | Action Needed | Who/where? |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------|
| <p>Overall impact of DL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of shared norms and responsibility for the course • Enriched perspectives from shared dialogue on teaching, learning, outcomes, and assessing • Teaching values and life values integration into course material • Identification of cultural values we esteem, such as redemption, and how they inform DL procedures and practices. | | <p>Some programs are developing a common template shell. Some multi-campus programs have adopted a team development approach of a common shell</p> <p>We tend to operate from principles and values that are not consistently agreed upon, because they have not been called out</p> | <p>How do our practices support our values? Shouldn't our values drive the practices?</p> | <p>This group might suggest that a statement of mission, values and goals for Distance Learning would be useful to guide DL standards and practices</p> | <p>???</p> |
| <p>FT vs PT impact: FT faculty relationship and interaction with PT faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value of experience teaching, experience with DL • Degree of SAC engagement • Assignment rights | <p>Everyone gets training; mentoring may be part of that</p> | <p>FT mentoring of new PT faculty has worked for some programs.</p> <p>PT faculty who are very comfortable in DL environment may train/mentor FT faculty, as well</p> | | | |