VALENCIA

Learning Leadership Council
West Campus – Special Events Center

July 28ᵗʰ, 2017
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Ledlow (Co-chair), Suzette Dohany (Co-chair), Kari Makepeace (Council Coordinator), Karen Borglum, Diana Ciesko, Julie Corderman (Guest), Terri Daniels, Wendi Dew, Dan Diehl, Michelle Foster, Jeff Goltz (Guest), Al Groccia, Nasser Hedayat, Courtney James, Page Jerzak (Guest), Stacey Johnson, Amy Kleeman, Linda Neal, John Niss (Guest), Andy Ray, Jeannie Rodriguez, Joyce Romano, Rise Sandrowitz, Laura Sessions, Vasudha Sharma, Landon Shephard, John Slot, Jill Szentmiklosi, Michelle Terrell, Mary Beth Thornton

ABSENT: Ruby Alvarez, Joe Battista, Nick Bekas, Kris Christian, Elvin Cruz-Vargas, Daryl Davis, Yaremis Fullana, Sonya Joseph, Maryam Khan, Neal Phillips, Kathleen Plinske, April Raneri, David Renteria, Kim Sepich, Falecia Williams

MEETING SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Member Questions and Introductions – *All*

Learning Leadership Council (LLC) members were asked to jot down any questions about the council that they would like to have answered by the co-chairs.

The members then introduced themselves and shared what area/group they are representing.

B. Overview of the Learning Leadership Council – *Susan Ledlow & Suzette Dohany*

Susan Ledlow provided a brief overview of the LLC including the charge, composition, and member expectations.

1. Charge

    The Learning Leadership Council (LLC) is responsible for leading the college's work towards achievement of the core mission - learning. The Council meets five times per year to consider the state of the college's progress in achieving its core mission, to discuss potential major initiatives to advance the work. The Learning Leadership Council bears chief responsibility for identifying a select number of major initiatives and commissioning collaborative work teams to design the implementation of these initiatives.

2. Composition

    Comprised of a broad cross-section of college leaders who work most closely with the core mission and strategy, the LLC is co-chaired by the VP of Academic Affairs & Planning and the immediate past-chair of the Faculty Council. The co-chairs for 2017-18 are Susan Ledlow and Neal Phillips.

3. Member Expectations

    - Attend all meetings
    - Take responsibility for the task
        - ✓ Come to the meetings prepared.
        - ✓ Adopt an evidence-based approach-go where the evidence takes you.
        - ✓ Ask hard questions.
        - ✓ Demand quality and integrity in methods, analysis of data, and interpretation of findings.

- ✓ Consider the costs and benefits to students and to the College.
- Take responsibility for the process
  - ✓ Be mindful of your own intentions, and your willingness to be influenced.
  - ✓ Balance advocacy with inquiry.
  - ✓ Encourage participation of all team members.
  - ✓ Build shared meaning.
  - ✓ Explore impasses.
- Work towards consensus on interpretation of findings and recommendations
  - ✓ Even if you think the final recommendations aren't exactly what you would recommend personally, are they reasonable? Can you explain them and the data used to support them? Can you stand behind the work?
- Communicate information back to the area/group you are representing.

4. Work Proposals/Plans

The work plan process, work in progress, and completed work plans can be accessed through the LLC website: http://valenciacollege.edu/governance/llc

It is important to note that anyone wishing to submit a work proposal must have an Executive Sponsor (a member of the Senior Team) for the work.

II. ACTION ITEMS

A. Online Student Preparedness Recommendations – *Wendi Dew, Page Jerzak & Julie Corderman*

Wendi Dew, Page Jerzak and Julie Corderman provided an overview, update, and recommendations from the Online Student Preparedness work.

1. Brief History

- Work began on Winter Park Campus with Michele McArdle and Shara Lee
- Online readiness video was created for students
- Group decided to create a preparedness module which could be piloted with students and faculty
- Research was conducted based on best practices, online readiness assessment, skill building, etc. to build a solid foundation for the work
- The group leadership was eventually moved to Julie Corderman and Page Jerzak

2. Nature of the Problem

- Online students are less successful then face-to-face students.
- Online students withdraw from courses 3-6 percent more than face-to-face students
- Faculty report spending more time to prepare online students and to deal with technical issues

3. Working Theory

Students who have the necessary information and skills can "start right" in online courses, and will be as successful as students in other modalities.

Creating a preparedness module would lead to greater student success, reduced withdrawals in online courses, and reduced time spent by faculty on technical issues.

4. Goals and Expected Outcomes

The goal of the preparedness module was to increase student success and learning in online courses. Students who complete the preparedness module would:

- Master the technical issues they will need to be successful in an online learning environment

- Identify the skills they need to acquire for this learning environment including study skills, academic integrity, and communication skills
- Make an informed decision about course modality enrollment choices
- Afford their faculty members the ability to focus on content knowledge acquisition as opposed to lack of student readiness for online learning

5. Online Student Preparedness Pilot Design

The team collaboratively created a preparedness module that was infused with best practices, technology tasks, and nationally recognized online readiness assessment.

The team also created an enrollment process to add students to preparedness module; hired and trained two part-time online advisors; and recruited faculty who taught two sections of the same online course.

6. Overall Readiness Score

After the SmarterMeasure online readiness test at the end of the module, students were required to speak with an advisor. Advisors reported a score ranging from 1-4 based on student performance in the module and their SmarterMeasure online readiness score.

- 1 - Student is not ready
- 2 - Student is marginally ready
- 3 - Student is moderately ready
- 4 - Student is ready

That data was then entered into Banner and students with a score of 1 were advised to try a different modality. Advisors noted that students did not follow advice when told to consider other modalities.

7. Pilot 1 Timeline

- Spring 2016 - Module construction and pilot planning
- Summer 2016 – Students took the module and provided feedback and faculty were trained on data collection
- Fall 2016 – Faculty collected data on student performance and gave feedback on the pilot. Grades were collected at the end of the pilot.

8. Pilot 2 Timeline

- Fall 2016 – Students took the module and provided feedback and faculty were trained on data collection.
- Spring 2017 – A data report was created for Pilot 1. Faculty collected data on students performance and gave feedback on the pilot. Grades were collected at the end of the pilot.
- Summer 2017 – A data report was created for Pilot 2. All personnel viewed data and provided feedback and the final report was created.

9. Pilot Implementation

- Students were required to complete module before the course began
- Students were dropped from courses if module was not complete
- Course sections on reserved status to prevent late-enrolling students
- Students provided feedback at the end of the module
- Faculty provided feedback at end of data collection

10. Budget Information

The total expenses during the entire pilot process, not including labor or systems such as Blackboard, Banner, etc., were $59,935.

11. Pilot Data Collected by Faculty

- Course background data
- Technical issues data:
  - ✓ Time spent each week on tech issues
  - ✓ Number of technological problems faculty had to solve
  - ✓ Number of general course questions (not about content)
- Percentage of work completed by students
- Faculty-initiated withdrawals
- Problematic behaviors
  - ✓ Number of academic integrity issues and number of netiquette issues
- Referrals to outside help

12. General Pilot Data Collected

- Faculty feedback on pilot training and experiences
- Determination of whether one section performed better than the other
- Student grades in all pilot sections
- Student withdrawal rates in all pilot sections
- SmarterMeasure scores
- Feedback from surveys drove small changes made to the initial faculty survey and the module

13. FTON (First Time Online) Students

At the beginning of the pilot, the work team did not factor in the percentage of students new to online courses. These students are generally less successful than non-FTON students are. Also, a new data definition was created which led to the discovery that most courses average ~25% FTON students and that FTON students have varying degrees of success.

14. Advising

- Advisors were trained in advising, Blackboard, and the online readiness test
- Advisors had to pursue students to get them to complete the module and the advising appointment
- Used the readiness assessment and student performance in the module to guide advising per moving to another modality
- Advisors noted that students did not follow advice

15. Data Sharing

All student and faculty data were shared from the pilots with:

- Online Student Preparedness work team
- Online Data and Evaluation work team
- COOL team
- Work team sponsors

Teams also provided feedback and recommendations.

16. Hypothesis and Conclusions

Survey findings indicate faculty and students felt the preparedness module was helpful, however the data does not show a statistically significant difference between students who complete the module and those who do not. The hypothesis and conclusions from the pilots are below.

Hypothesis	Conclusion
Increase student greater success.	There is no significant difference between groups.

Decrease student withdrawals.	Withdrawals were reduced but not significantly.
Reduce faculty time spent on technical issues.	Difference between groups average was less than 2 minutes per week.
	Most technical issues were about things outside of the pilot.
	Faculty said additional development is needed in areas tangential to the pilot.

17. Consensus Recommendations

After reviewing the results of the pilots, the team came to a consensus that the best way to move forward would be to discontinue the pilot and continue with other strategies already underway to help improve online student success including:

- Canvas migration
- LifeMap 2.0
- Quality Initiatives - Faculty Preparedness, Dean/Chair Preparedness
- OIT infrastructure

The team felt that even though the recommendation is to discontinue the pilot, it is still important to curate the pilot resources for the online orientation module used by faculty members in courses.

18. Future Research and Strategies

- Deeper analysis between FTON and non-FTON populations
- Qualitative investigation on how students make decisions about enrollment and withdrawal in online courses and programs
- Collect data on publisher materials to inform purchasing strategies

19. Small Group Discussions

The Council asked questions for clarification and then broke into small groups to discuss and provide feedback using the *We Learned, We Wonder, We Suggest* form. All feedback will be compiled and provided to Wendi, Page and Dori.

B. **Academic Integrity for Online Learning Work Team Proposal – *Wendi Dew***

Wendi Dew reviewed the Annually Appointed & PT Faculty Engagement Work Proposal and asked the Learning Leadership Council for feedback. The feedback from the LLC is incorporated in red below. The LLC endorsed this work proposal with the changes noted below. Updates will be provided to the LLC as the work progresses.

1. Background

Valencia began offering alternative delivery courses in the early 1990's, and as technology evolved and student demand grew, Valencia continued to increase the number of course and program offerings in both hybrid and online modalities (Meiller and Associates, 2013). Throughout the last decade, Valencia's online learning practices evolved organically amongst our academic community, while federal and state regulations and requirements increased as the national demand for distance learning escalated and concerns regarding the quality of online learning grew (Allen and Seaman, 2014).

In 2013, Valencia commissioned Diane Meiller and Associates to perform a current state assessment of online learning which was completed in June 2013. This report was intended to "provide us with a shared understanding of where we are today, and lay the foundation for our collaborative planning of how best to move forward in ways that are consistent with Valencia's learning-centered culture,

while embracing the elasticity for change that may be required" (Sandy Shugart, 2014). During the assessment, several recurring themes emerged through interviews, group sessions, survey results and data analysis (Meiller and Associates, 2013). These themes represent several areas where we have opportunities to improve, particularly in terms of providing a consistent experience to students and faculty. To explore these areas, the Learning Leadership Council has commissioned work teams to design and in many cases implement strategies, processes, practices and/or tools that will increase online student success, decrease the gap in success between instructional modalities, and improve the student experience in online and hybrid courses. The culmination of the approved work teams' recommendations and implementation plan is the 5-year Online Learning Plan.

During the planning and year-one implementation of the Online Learning Plan, as well as other work team discussions at the college, academic integrity has emerged as additional area in need of evaluation. Changes in the learning management system also require the change of academic integrity tools for use in monitoring plagiarism and cheating. In addition to these concerns, the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) states that accrediting agencies must require institutions that offer modes of distance education to have authentication processes to establish that the student who registers is the same student who participates in the course, completes it, and receives academic credit. Additional evaluation is needed for this process in order to ensure it is effective.

2. Charge and Work Products

The charge and work products of this team will be to produce recommendations in the following areas:

- Analyze Valencia's current practices to promote academic integrity in an online learning environment in order to recognize/expand effective strategies, identify areas of improvement, and explore new opportunities from the literature and other successful models.
- Examine current institutional practice(s) for the verification of student identity in an online learning environment to recognize effectiveness and identify areas of improvement, if necessary.
- Evaluate the need for remote proctoring in an online learning environment for the purposes of academic integrity.
- Collaborate with the Canvas Migration Advisory Team (CMAT) to recommend a new plagiarism prevention tool, commensurate with the current tool SafeAssign, utilizing data from the fall Canvas course pilot.
- Design an assessment plan for the collective initiative and individual strategies.

3. Known Constraints, Criteria, or Design Principles

- Function as a short-term design team.
- Focus on strategies, interventions or improvements that will increase online student success, decrease the gap in success between instructional modalities, and improve the student experience in online courses.
- Analyze Valencia's current processes, practices and tools in order to recognize effective models, strategies and identify areas of improvement; as well as explore new opportunities from the literature and other successful models.
- Build upon previous data collection and design work conducted through the online learning plan and other campus-based work teams.
- Evaluate the broader impact of findings and recommendations on all modalities, existing policies and procedures, etc.
- Examine the feasibility of recommendations in relation to budget, impact on costs for students, faculty/staff development, technology requirements, interactions with existing college systems, and legal/policy implications, including Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

- Refer to the [SACS Distance and Correspondence Education Policy Statement](#) and other regional and programmatic accreditation requirements.
- Work team members will be responsible to communicate regularly with representative groups such as Faculty Council, Instructional Affairs Committee, and Campus Leadership Teams.
- *Note: Other design principles will be determined by the team.*

4. Sponsor of the Work, Council Overseeing the Work, and Decision-making Authority

Susan Ledlow, Vice President of Academic Planning and Support and John Slot, Vice President of Information Technology, will be the Sponsors of this work and the Learning Leadership Council will oversee this work. The Faculty Council and Instructional Affairs Committee will endorse the recommendations and the Learning Leadership Council (LLC) will approve.

5. Internal Stakeholders

Tenured/tenure-track faculty, IAC/Deans, Student Affairs, Office for Information Technology, Online Teaching and Learning, Office of Institutional Effectiveness (SACS liaison), Office of Policy and General Counsel.

6. Preliminary List of Team Members

Co-chairs: Dean TBD (appointed by IAC), Tenured/tenure-track faculty member (appointed by Faculty Council)

Team members: 4 tenured/tenure-track faculty members (one per campus including the co-chair; mix of AA/AS; appointed by Faculty Council), 2 deans (one per campus cluster including co-chair; appointed by IAC), 2 student affairs representatives (appointed by Kim Sepich), 2 OIT representatives (appointed by John Slot), Darren Smith, Director, Institutional Effectiveness, Page Jerzak, Director, Online Teaching and Learning, Wendi Dew, AVP, Teaching and Learning, representative from Office of Policy and General Counsel, Continuing Education representative (appointed by Joe Battista)

7. Deadline for Work Products
- Convene work team (Fall 2017)
- Complete recommendations; seek feedback (Spring 2018)
- Complete recommendations for plagiarism prevention software with CMAT (late Fall 2017)
- Present recommendations to LLC (Spring 2018)
- Budget proposal to senior team, as necessary (Spring 2018)
- Develop and/or implement recommendations (Fall 2018)

III. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED

The Learning Leadership Council will meet again on September 20, 2017 at the Lake Nona Campus in Room 148 from 2:00-5:00 p.m.