

DEETAC Notes – October 4, 2017

In person, 1102 Q St.

CHARTER REVISIT

The group agreed to add a student representative and remove the “SSSP representative” since no one is quite sure what that means. SSSP does not have an official advisory body to get a representative from. The group wondered how it got on there in the first place. Approved.

TIMELINE FOR PROPOSED REGULATORY CHANGES

If revised Title 5 language gets drafted by January 15, it would be in an enough time to make an appearance at ASCCC spring plenary. It would get to the BOG in March with a second approval as early as mid-May. If it missed the January 15th deadline, then it would not get to BOG until May with a second approval not until July.

THIRD-PARTY PUBLISHER CONTENT

Should DEETAC consider a position or recommended action for guidance on requiring accessible materials? Turns out there is already an accessibility group that is advising OEI. Plus, a number of accessibility guidelines are already floating around out there. It would be nice to have a single document, though, and probably best if it came out of this group rather than OEI. Accessibility is not the purview of a budget-based program issue, but system-wide governance. One possibility is requiring publishers to get accessibility-certified by a third-party instead of dumping it on the college or on the faculty or relying on the publisher to do the right thing. Mostly, the CCCO needs to treat the concept of accessibility as the civil rights issue it is and put the kind of resources (fiscal and organizational) behind it that are fitting and needful.

POLICY CONCEPT TEAM REPORTS

- Regulations & FERPA. Already talked quite a bit about accessibility. FERPA issues, dangers, and best practices should be well covered for the field in a new version of the Distance Education Guidelines. Not necessary to render into Title 5 language.
- Accreditation. The group supports aligning Title 5 language with ACCJC, and through them the DOE, in using “regular and substantive interaction” instead of (the current) “regular and effective contact.” Simply clarifies the linkage all the way up.
- Curriculum. Long conversation about distance education addenda. Schools all doing it differently, no guidance from Title 5, which simply states that all courses with a DE component must be separately reviewed. But what does that mean? Some schools really bogged down by interpreting too restrictively.
- Definitions and SARA. A letter in support of SARA to be drafted up for the meeting was not completed. Will be finished and sent around to the group after the meeting for input.

RECOMMENDED TITLE 5 LANGUAGE CHANGES

It was determined by the committee that the next step was to begin drafting some revised Title 5 language. Drafting by committee is never good news. But it led to a variety of fruitful questions that we were encouraged to take back to our stakeholders:

- Adjust the language to more closely align with the federal definition of distance education by changing 'regular effective contact' to 'regular and substantive interaction.'
- Change any language that uses the term 'face to face' to 'in person.' The thinking there is that there are numerous options now for 'face to face' interaction through apps like Zoom.
- Dispense with the term "hybrid," which currently means different things to different people. Instead, use "all," "some," or "none" to designate courses from 100% online to 0% online.
- Question: Should a course that is all online except for onground testing be considered "all" online or "some" online? Would two different schools playing loose with that definition cause confusion for students?
- Add to Instructor Contact that instructors are to initiate regular effective contact (or regular and substantive interaction) since that is an accreditation expectation. Or is this better served being in the Guidelines?

Next Meeting: November 15, online

Corey's Takeaway

1. I would think we would like to get into Title 5 some clearer expectations about what is to be addressed in the distance ed addendum, but at a very macro level like T5.55002 already does with the course outline of record. Something like the DE addendum must address the following:
 - a. Range of DE (some and/or all)
 - b. Rigor
 - c. FERPA compliance
 - d. Accessibility compliance

Please feel free to give me some feedback on that. While we don't want more State in our business, the current language (55206) gives no help whatsoever.

Corey Marvin
Cerro Coso Community College