VALENCIA

Learning Leadership Council   **March 22ᵗʰ, 2017**
Winter Park Campus – Room 225-226   **2:00 – 5:00 PM**

IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Ledlow (Co-chair), Suzette Dohany (Co-chair), Kari Makepeace (Council Coordinator), Ruby Alvarez, Susan Ambridge, Nick Bekas, Karen Borglum, Diana Ciesko, Diane Dalrymple, Michelle Foster, Nasser Hedayat, Linda Herlocker, Page Jerzak (Guest), Sonya Joseph, Celine Kavalec, Jennifer Lawhon (Guest), Molly McIntire (Guest), Linda Neal, Neal Phillips, Beth Renn, David Renteria (Guest), Joyce Romano, Liza Schellpfeffer (Guest), Nichole Segarra, Kim Sepich, Laura Sessions, Landon Shephard, John Slot, Jill Szentmiklosi

ABSENT: Joe Battista, Kris Christian, Rudy Darden, Daryl Davis, Wendi Dew, Stacey Johnson, Amy Kleeman, Kathleen Plinkse, Rise Sandrowitz, Falecia Williams

MEETING SUMMARY

I. ACTION ITEMS

A. Hybrid Design Team Recommendations – *Molly McIntire & Jennifer Lawhon*

Molly McIntire and Jennifer Lawhon shared the Hybrid Design Team process, findings, and recommendations.

1. Hybrid Design Team Process

   The Hybrid Design Team work process was a 2-part process.

   - Phase 1: The team looked at internal research/data, external research/data, best practices, and the hybrid definition.
   - Phase 2: The team focused on enrollment planning, technology & budget, communication, faculty & student preparedness, and best practices.

2. Problem/Issue

   The team then identified the following challenges with hybrid learning:

   - The definition of hybrid courses does not provide clarity. Valencia College currently defines a hybrid course as: "*a course that blends online and face-to-face delivery. A certain percentage of course instruction is delivered via electronic means and a certain percentage of instruction is conducted face-to-face (Some hours are spent in the classroom with the rest being completed online)*" (Valencia College Catalog, 2015-16).
   - Students are not familiar with the hybrid modality, therefore do not register for courses as a result.
   - There are Banner scheduling issues for hybrid courses.
   - Success gaps and withdrawal gaps between online, hybrid, and face-to-face courses.

3. Research

   A sub-committee reviewed practices and models of hybrid learning at UCF, Broward College, Miami-Dade College, College of Central Florida, ASU, Northern Virginia Community College, and Florida State College at Jacksonville. This review revealed that there is not a standard definition for hybrid in the college system, nor is there consistent verbiage from institution to institution. Some of the

colleges don't even use the term "hybrid", they refer to these courses as "mixed-mode", "blended", or "asynchronous".

4. Faculty and Student Surveys

In March 2016, a student survey that focused on hybrid learning was conducted that resulted in 202 student responses, with 126 of them having taken a hybrid course. Some of the information learned from the student survey was that students (n=22) described their hybrid learning experience as "hard" or "awful." Some comments suggested confusion between flex start and hybrid courses. Students also revealed that the largest reasons for enrolling in a hybrid course was lack of availability of other classes and the desire to try hybrid learning. Interestingly, 18% didn't even know they were registered for a hybrid course. Students' definition of hybrid learning was greatly varied as well. Some students thought that a hybrid course is part online and part in class, some thought the hybrid course was really just online, and others thought the hybrid course was mostly face-to-face.

In March 2016, a faculty survey was also conducted regarding hybrid learning and current practices. That survey yielded 139 responses. The findings of that survey revealed that hybrid courses were most successful when F2F time was truly used for learning. Faculty also reported that most online coursework included writing assignments, tests and quizzes; and classes were usually divided in 50/50 model. In addition, 60% of faculty reported their hybrid courses met F2F between 50% to 75% of the time during the semester, 73% of Faculty claimed to not have met with an Instructional Designer to develop their successful hybrid class, and 42% Faculty did not attend professional development to specifically prepare for hybrid instruction.

5. Proposed Solutions

Based on all of the data collected, the Hybrid Design Team created a set of proposed solutions:

- Create a new definition of hybrid modality that is adopted college-wide
- Change current verbiage from hybrid to "mixed-mode"
- Adopt "mixed-mode" model college-wide
- Create clear and effective communications systems
- Provide style guides and a required training for faculty
- Provide resources and videos for students
- Create a series of course design options
- Explore system options to effectively assign class locations that allow for greater room flexibility

6. Marketing and Outreach

- Develop a video that highlights successful student behaviors for mixed-mode courses
- Create a web page to clearly define all modalities of instruction
- Disseminate the website, videos, and other informational documents regarding online and mixed-mode learning
- Align language across all campuses

7. Modalities Definitions

The following definitions are being proposed:

- Face-to-Face: A course with face-to-face instruction which may be enhanced with technology.
- Mixed-Mode: A course that blends the delivery of instruction between online and face-to-face. (Some hours are spent in the class with the rest being completed online.) A minimum of 50% of the instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology where the student and instructor are separated by time, space, or both.

- Fully Online: All class meetings and coursework occur online using the college-approved course management system.

8. Hypothesis/Working Theory

We believe that….

- A clear and meaningful definition of mixed-mode learning will enhance, simplify and encourage consistent methods of mixed-mode delivery across the college.
- Creating an infrastructure of mixed-mode delivery will provide consistency of experience.
- Developing faculty teams and students on mixed-mode learning will provide a quality learning experience which will lead to greater student success.
- Providing student with different levels of access which are pedagogically structured for varying learning styles will increase student success.
- Explore system options to effectively assign class locations that allow for greater room flexibility.

9. Goals/Expected Outcomes

We expect to….

- Provide greater clarity for students and faculty in mixed-mode courses.
- Provide quality standards, guidelines, and resources for students and faculty.
- Enhance consistency of mixed-mode delivery for faculty and students.
- Have fewer withdrawals, increased student success rates, and increased satisfaction with mixed-mode delivery.
- Optimize room utilization and enrollment for mixed-mode courses.

10. Test and Metric

To verify we will….

- Survey faculty, students, and administrators regarding clarity and consistency of mixed-mode courses. (Goals 1 & 3)
- Analyze data from IR to compare student success and withdrawal rates in mixed-mode courses to previous years. (Goal 4)
- Re-evaluate and complete a preliminary review of data one year after implementation and present at council meetings for feedback. (Goals 1-5)
- Undergo an Academic Initiative Review (AIR) to determine if the new mixed-mode courses and definition are effective. (Goals 1-5)
- Validate room utilization and optimization. (Goal 5)Provide quality standards, guidelines, and resources for students and faculty.

And measure…

- Changes in faculty and administrator experience with mixed-mode definition, course enrollment, and course entry (Goals 1-3)
- Changes in student experience who enroll in mixed-mode modality (Goals 1-3)
- Changes in student success and withdrawal rates in for mixed-mode courses (Goal 4)
- Room utilization data (Goal 5)

11. Resources

Resources required will include:

- Faculty, staff, and administrators to help prepare standards and guidelines for mixed mode courses

- Website and LMS space to house materials
- Possible funds for advanced technologies
- Support of administrators, faculty, and staff to adopt new language of mixed-mode modality

12. Budget

- $1,000 to develop the new mixed mode faculty development course
- $3,000 per year to provide faculty stipends to facilitate the faculty development course
- $1000 for printing costs (flyers or posters to post in student areas)

13. Small Group Discussions

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

The following suggestions were shared by the Council for consideration moving forward:

- Further clarification on instructional models and assessment opportunities
- Examples or options of "proctored testing" (i.e. in person, on-site, online, testing center)
- Focus groups with faculty and students. Because of the complexity of the subject, focus groups can look deeper into the question.
- Talk to students about understanding definitions; also, look at the language through public schools – FLVS.
- Courses identified by model (A & B) and model is strictly adhered to and defined.
- Work with International students, Veterans Affairs, and IR to ensure the definition doesn't have a negative impact on the student's financial aid or state reporting.
- Add a functional tech from Linda Herlocker's team to the committee – will assist with the technology and communication.
- The recommendation on page 2 has mixed model A & B.
- Proctoring? Will it be incorporated into the system?
- Make it simpler – not so many options.
- Maybe a little "video" quiz for the students to see if the mixed-mode course is a good fit.
- Simulate this behavior change on room utilization; student momentum.
- Remove the word "fully" from the definition.

14. Endorsement

The Council unanimously endorsed the Hybrid Design Team Recommendations. Next steps for that team will be to review the feedback from LLC to determine if revisions need to be made and then to propose endorsement from the Faculty Council. Once endorsement is received from the Faculty Council, the budget will need to be approved and then the Implementation Team can begin their work. The goal for the Implementation Team will be for a start date in Fall 2018.

II. PROGRESS REPORTS

A. LMS Review/Migration Update – *John Slot and David Renteria*

John Slot and David Renteria provided an update on the LMS Review and Migration.

1. The Canvas Migration Advisory Team has met with various committees and representatives from key areas to gather feedback on the migration plan. The overall consensus is that the focus should be on the student experience. The Campus Presidents have stated that they do not want students operating in two different systems at the same time so they have requested that when Canvas

comes online, Blackboard be offline for all students, faculty, and staff. As a result of the feedback, the team is proposing a Destination track on Canvas where faculty can learn Canvas and test migration/teaching in Canvas to ensure system and integration reliability. In addition, the Rubric for Online Competencies (ROC) will be piloted. Feedback from the early adopters will be used to create a community of practice, refine support/training and improve the ROC.

In the Fall 2017 Term, there will be a small pilot with students (involving the early adopters group). Again, feedback from that pilot will be used to refine support/training. Then a governance review will take place and the ROC will be integrated into all Canvas training.

The goal is for Canvas to go live for all faculty, staff, and students in the Summer 2018 Term.

B. Faculty Preparedness/Course and Curriculum Team Update – *Liza Schellpfeffer*

Liza Schellpfeffer and Maryke Lee provided a brief update on the Faculty Preparedness/Course and Curriculum Team.

1. The Faculty Preparedness Work Team has been meeting every other week and is making progress in the Rubric for Online Competencies (ROC). So far, the team has reviewed 20 rubrics from various organizations and colleges to align criteria with the four lenses identified by the original work team: pedagogy, social, managerial, and technical lenses. Quality Matters was also kept in mind.

   There is a current draft of the ROC that is being reviewed and modified based on input from stakeholders. There are 6 faculty reviewers from multiple campuses and disciplines that did a double-blind review of the ROC, looking at the criteria, instructional pieces, etc. and provided feedback via a Qualtrics survey. The group also worked with TLA to align the ROC criteria and language with the Essential Competencies of a Valencia Educator and solicited input from the instructional designers since they are on the front lines working with faculty.

   Another critical piece will be the Destinations track this summer in which 60 faculty will pilot the rubric and use it in their review process. Then in the Fall, the team will bring the ROC back through the governance process for approval.

III. FOLLOW-UP ACTION NEEDED AND PERSON RESPONSIBLE

A. Kari Makepeace will compile the feedback from the Small Group Discussion on the Hybrid Design Team Recommendations and provide that information to Molly McIntire and Jennifer Lawhon.

B. The Hybrid Design Team recommendations were approved so that group will move forward with reviewing the feedback from LLC to determine if revisions need to be made and then they will bring the recommendations to the Faculty Council for endorsement.

IV. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED

The Learning Leadership Council will meet again on May 17, 2017 from 2:00-5:00 p.m. at the West Campus in Room 11-106.