

TLC Advisory Committee Meeting
January 27, 2010

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Baron | <input type="checkbox"/> Marie Maber |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bettejane Bolan-Kenney | <input type="checkbox"/> Bob McGovern |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Boyington | <input type="checkbox"/> Andrea Murowski |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Joe Boyle | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Murray |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen D'Agostino | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Qaissaunee |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denise DeMichael | <input type="checkbox"/> Mark Schmidt |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sue Desiderato | <input type="checkbox"/> Mohammad Shanehsaz |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carey Fox | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Toomey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pat Gallo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Topham |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Larry Hartzell | <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Varone |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Norah Kerr-McCurry | <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Wang |

Norah welcomed the members to the meeting.

Verification of Student Identity in Online Courses

Norah distributed copies of the *ACE Analysis of Higher Education Act Reauthorization* and noted that the regulation states that "...institutions that offer distance education to establish that a student registered for a distance education course is the same student who completes and receives credit for it." She also distributed and urged the committee to read the draft of a statement by the New Jersey Virtual Community College Consortium (NJVCCC) regarding student identity verification and academic integrity in online education.

A discussion followed:

- Kim noted that verification in face-to-face classes is not required and students are not required to have an id card. Larry agreed that he does not require identification in his face-to-face classes.
- Norah said the Student Conduct Code could be used to cover this issue. Interaction with the student through proctored testing and other interactions could sometimes verify the student's identification. The College will have to develop a regulation regarding this issue.
- Sue said that this issue can be addressed in the Alternate Delivery chapter of the ESMP and agreed that the policy must be defined. Norah will be sure this issue is brought to the committee.
- Larry noted that different methods would be used to identify face-to-face students and online students but the policy itself would be the same for both groups. It was agreed that Distance Education students should not be singled out.
- Ideas presented included eye or finger scanning, answering questions in a database to ensure authenticity, smart cards, rosters with student picture, and random selection of students to come to campus to verify id. Mike explained that the technology involved in some of these methods is expensive and some students wouldn't have the computer technology. Kim Toomey suggested Skype; but, in the end, there is no way to use current technology to positively identify students.

- Kim noted that students are not required to verify residence at registration if they had to it could be “mind boggling”; however, they are required to sign a statement as to the accuracy of their registration.

Norah summarized the discussion: What is or will the College do to assure authenticity of the student? The Committee recommends that any regulation be for both face-to-face and online students. Following good course design standards like Quality Matters is one important way to ensure interaction, which lessens the chance that someone else is taking the course.

Quality Matters

Mike explained that Quality Matters is the assessment rubric used for online courses. After meeting specific criteria a course can be QM certified. Some schools use the tool to “police” online courses and other schools use it in a more informal manner. Informally, a course can be reviewed using the rubric and recommendations made to improve the course.

Norah explained that QM has been adopted informally in the online certification course taught at Brookdale. The NJVCCC has a pool of online faculty that has successfully completed the certification. Norah and Larry will be taking the course to be certified. Larry said he would be happy to look at a course and give feedback. The course can be resubmitted for further review.

Barbara suggested that Brookdale could be a regional training place and host a training session and make the Brookdale faculty available to the campus for course assessment using QM.

Norah distributed the rubric and Larry explained that he has an annotated version for his personal use. This document cannot be shared widely because there is a payment issue. Larry said that it is difficult to meet the clear standards required. If the course does not meet the standards, it can still be a good course. Larry said his training in QM has improved his online courses. Norah said it would be a good way for faculty to assess their courses and it should be introduced to the College community. Karen D’Agostino reviewed a Computer Science course in Maryland as a non-content expert.

When asked about the benefits of QM, Sue explained that positive feedback was received from Middle States because of the use of QM and trained QM faculty can be an excellent resource.

Norah will be training the ADDs on QM. **It was stressed that QM is not an evaluation of teaching but an evaluation of course design.**

Two of the areas that have to be addressed in some of our existing courses:

1. Some faculty do not tell the students the time frame when they will reply to the student.
2. Compliance to the ADA regulations

Norah explained that deaf students need transcripts for any audio provided by the faculty. Karen D’Agostino asked if she was responsible for transcribing the audio. In a face-to-face class, a student with a disability has an aid or lip reads. The instructor is not responsible for making the arrangements. It was suggested that a student worker could be hired to transcribe the audio.

There is software, Dragon Naturally Speaking, that is used to provide a transcript. A recording is run through the software and returns a block of text. Someone is then required to listen, read and put in the appropriate punctuation needed.

College Anywhere is closed captioned. Captivate produces closed captioning and voice-over; the TLC will offer workshops in use of this software. Norah will distribute an article from the TLC newsletter relating to the issue of ADA compliance.

The Committee recommends that QM training be offered to Brookdale faculty on-site, with the goal of implementing a more formal QM process.

Learning Management System Update

The current contract for ANGEL expires in 2013. ANGEL has been purchased by Blackboard.

Norah gave a brief history regarding the switch to ANGEL and explained that the TLC is working with the statewide group, NJVCCC that is heavily invested in Blackboard/ANGEL.

Karen D'Agostino said that the selection of the Learning Management System must serve the needs of the college and the faculty must be given the opportunity to review the different packages available. Other areas of the College have been bringing in vendors; not all of the parties using the Learning Management System have attended these meetings.

There is a process in place to evaluate and recommend changes. This process was established and implemented by the TLC and faculty and was used in the selection of ANGEL. Sue suggested that the TLC should be proactive in the process because of the time frame with the ANGEL contract.

Norah will send the staff to the vendor demos and will develop a formal plan. Some of the demonstrations were for non-academic areas. E-portfolio was brought in for assessment purposes. Sue explained that the College is moving quickly in the technology department and good communication is needed. Norah explained that some of the areas that are being investigated by other departments may already be available in ANGEL. Therefore, there has to be communication and a unified approach when researching another system.

A question came up about the Monitoring System and Kim explained that the College was cited in an audit regarding attendance and Title IV funds. Faculty may be required to monitor on a weekly basis. Barbara explained that if this is done every week, it becomes routine.

The Committee recommends that the TLC move forward with the process for evaluation and selection of a Learning Management System.

In conclusion, Norah thanked everyone for attending. The next meeting will be held in March.