

TACC DLAC Meeting

November 8, 2005 – TACC Office

Attending:

Donnetta Suchon, Chair, Lee College	Lee Sloan, Del Mar College
John Ray, Vice-Chair, Brazosport College	Ann Morris, Panola College
Randy Schormann, McLennan Comm. College	Blaine Bennett, Southwest Texas Jr. College
Debbie Huffman, North Central Texas College	Rey Garcia, TACC
Pam Quinn, Dallas Co. Comm. Col. District	Ron Brey, SACS Review Consultant
Robert Bermea, Austin Comm. College	Ron Thomson, VCT
Richard Jolly, Midland College	Aleta Garcia, VCT

VCT Grant Award Recommendations

The DLAC accepted the proposal reading teams' recommendations, with a slight adjustment. The Dallas proposal for the Educational Personnel Degree Program was selected for award rather than Gerontology or Criminal Justice. A gerontology program (McLennan) was funded in the first round of grants, and the committee was aware of at least two Criminal Justice programs already being offered online. One committee member objected to awarding a grant to Dallas because of its current non-participation in VCT.

Current Status of Colleges' Participation in the SACS Review

Ron reported: 43 colleges (40 district/systems) are participating in the review; Houston dropped out; South Plains was leaning in that direction. Since the meeting, Houston has rejoined the review, and South Plains decided to stick with it. Several committee members expressed the opinion that going through the VCT review would be excellent preparation for their cyclical reaffirmation of accreditation. The committee emphasized that individuals coordinating the completion of the Abbreviated Compliance Certification should hold sufficiently high positions within the institution and need the support of the college president to enable them to solicit the broad, college-wide participation that is needed. This should be re-affirmed with the presidents.

Demo of Online Abbreviated Compliance Certification (ACC)

The committee concurred that the online ACC works fine. Responses to Phase 1 items that may serve as examples are needed, and members volunteered as indicated below to write sample responses.

Ann Morris: 3.2.7, 3.7.3

Donnetta Suchon: 3.8.3, 3.9.2, 3.4.11

John Ray: 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.4.6

Robert Bermea: 3.8.1, 3.8.2

Richard Jolly/Dale Beikirch 2.7.2, 2.7.3

SACS Clarifications

Tom Benberg provided three clarifications shown in attachment 1. The committee recommended that it be reiterated to presidents that participation in the VCT review substitutes for the required notification to SACS when distance learning delivery of a program reaches 25%. If it reaches 50% or higher, another notification is required, plus the approval of SACS.

Abbreviated Compliance Certification

Committee members, working in 3 groups, reviewed response frameworks for Phases 1-3 drafted by Ron Brey. Discussion focused primarily upon four items: 3.3.1 (outcomes of educational programs), 3.4.1 (program and learning outcomes), 3.7.2 (evaluation of faculty effectiveness), and 3.7.3 (faculty professional development). These four items present significant challenges to Host colleges.

3.3.1 (outcomes of educational programs)

3.4.1 (program and learning outcomes). The discussion on learning outcomes identified many issues and various thoughts on how to address them in the ACC, but no clear strategy was forthcoming. Highlights of the discussion are included in attachment 2. These concrete suggestions came from the discussion:

- Survey the DLAC and ask for specific things to do and what not to do.
- Use the learning outcomes challenge as an opportunity for constructive group work.
- Do another STARLINK teleconference specifically on program learning outcomes.
- Schedule ACC consultation audioconferences by region.

3.7.2 (evaluation of faculty effectiveness). The VCT Evaluation of Instruction will include specific items that apply to instructor effectiveness. Just collecting the data will not suffice, the committee concurred. No other strategy for assessing faculty effectiveness was proposed.

3.7.3 (faculty professional development). After considerable discussion, the committee recommended that providers' instructors self-report at the VCT website the types of professional development they have received. Instructors should annually update their professional development data. The committee also suggested that data from the Internet Teachers at Every College project be summarized for the Compliance Certification. Donnetta volunteered to develop a draft of the instructor's self-report of professional development and circulate it among DLAC members. The discussion on professional development revealed a number of issues, including: varying policies and requirements among colleges; the level of professional-development detail to be documented for VCT purposes; the importance of Hosts' applying the same standard to VCT faculty as they do to their locally hired faculty; the possibility of specifying a minimum professional development standard in the new VCT MOU.

Supporting College Efforts to Complete the ACC. Ron Brey volunteered to be available to respond to individual criterion-item responses of individual colleges. Ron T. will receive and forward them to Ron B., and his responses will be shared with all colleges participating in the review via the VCT-SACS listserv. Initially proposed regional meetings may not be necessary, committee members felt. Instead audioconferences may be arranged for specific groups of colleges, if appropriate.

Review of Current VCT MOU and Summary of Host and Provider Responsibilities

The previously mentioned ad hoc committee work groups also reviewed the current MOU and the Summary of Host and Provider Responsibilities. Everyone agreed that a new VCT MOU is needed. Members recommended that the MOU should consist of a short paragraph regarding college's participation in VCT and a reference to a revised Summary of Host and Provider Responsibilities. The new summary will include details currently included in the MOU plus the type of information included in the original Summary of Host and Provider Responsibilities, updated to meet present needs. The committee made a number of specific suggestions regarding Instructional Issues, Student Resource Issues, and Administrative Issues. Their suggestions will be incorporated into the new summary. Ron T. will compile a draft of the new summary, and Ann Morris, Richard Jolly, and one other to-be-designated committee member will review before it is released for review to the full DLAC.

VCT Evaluation of Instruction

Donnetta reported on the VCT Evaluation of Instruction (Survey Monkey), which she drafted and released for statewide review and comment via the VCT listserves (SACS and Coordinators). She received no substantive comments or suggestions. It was pointed out that Host colleges have the option of administering both the VCT evaluation and their colleges' own evaluations used for their locally delivered courses, though the VCT evaluation should be administered as minimum. The committee recommended that the evaluation should be released before Thanksgiving. (The VCT Office could not meet that date; the evaluation will be released by Dec 1. – RT). The committee made the following recommendations.

- The evaluation should be disseminated by Host colleges, not the VCT Office.
- Given typical low response rates to evaluations, Host colleges should make concerted efforts to get the highest response rate possible. It's their responsibility.
- Host colleges should inform instructors that the evaluation is being administered. Instructors will have a sample copy of the evaluation available to them via an on-line link separate from the live evaluation.
- In emails that give students the evaluation link and directions for completing it, Host colleges should use common wording (drafted by VCT Office, approved by DLAC). Data collected could be compromised if the evaluation were distributed with non-uniform instructions.
- Statewide results should be analyzed to discern any problematic areas/issues needing attention. This should be on the agenda for the DLAC's summer meeting.

Other SACS Review Issues

Online Credentials. Aleta identified the issues below related to credentials online. Committee members did not think the issues would cause any significant problems.

- Registrar's signature is not visible or is partly cut off when scanned.
- When printed on security paper, a transcript reads, "A black on white or a color copy should not be accepted." Or, "A black and white document is not official."
- The back sides of transcripts are being scanned inconsistently. The back side sometimes includes a key for identifying symbols or phrases on the transcript.

Implications of statewide review for VCT's future. Ron Brey share a perspective that, when implemented, LEARN will open up a wide range of new possibilities for inter-college collaboration through VCT, particularly in the realm of degree and certificate programs.

State Summative Compliance Certification. The committee discussed schedule issues related to completing the State Summative Compliance Certification. After the meeting, Ron B proposed the schedule in attachment 3.

Responding to SACS Peer Review Committee's Report. Ron T. observed that, per current plans, colleges will respond individually to any issues the peer review committee finds in part 1 of the VCT report, which addresses VCT overall structure, governance, etc. Varying responses in this area could create problems. The committee proposed that problems could be avoided through close coordination of colleges' responses.

Summary of Action Items

Grant Awards: Award grants to TSTC/Paris (Introduction to Technology Certificate), Wharton (Graphic Communications Certificate), Dallas (Educational Personnel Degree), Kilgore/Paris/Panola (AAT Teaching). Kilgore/Paris and Panola will submit and single, collaborative proposal. (VCT Office)

Phase 1 Example Responses. Develop responses to all Phase 1 criteria items to serve as examples. (DLAC members attending the meeting).

SACS Notification & Approval. Reiterate to presidents that SACS must be notified and their approval obtained if distance learning instruction reaches 50% or more of a program. The letter of VCT participation signed by presidents and sent to SACS will suffice as notification that 25% of the instruction for programs is available through distance learning. (Rey, Ron T.)

Learning Outcomes. Learning Outcomes. Compile a list of what to do and what not to do when addressing learning outcomes on the Abbreviated Compliance Certification. Also consider organizing/facilitating group work and producing a STARLINK teleconference on the issue. (VCT/DLAC)

VCT Evaluation of Instruction (Survey Monkey)

- Aim to release before Thanksgiving. (VCT Office)
- Compose wording for the email with evaluation instructions to be sent to students. It should be uniform at all colleges. (VCT Office, DLAC)
- Send email with evaluation instructions to students and to Provider college instructors. (Host colleges)
- Include on DLAC summer agenda any overall problem areas revealed in evaluation statewide. (Donnetta)

Instructors' Professional Development. Compile a checklist that instructors may use to self-report at the VCT website professional development that they have received. Donnetta will circulate a draft among DLAC members for comment and feedback. (Donnetta)

MOU and Host and Provider Responsibilities

- Rewrite the Summary of Host and Provider Responsibilities for Credit Courses, incorporating the DLAC's suggestions. (Ron T. will draft. Richard Jolly, Ann Morris, plus a to-be-appointed committee member will review the draft.)
- Draft a new MOU consisting of a brief paragraph that refers to the rewritten summary of Host and Provider responsibilities. (DLAC, Ron T.)

Filling Vacant DLAC Position. Ask Colleen Smith, Cisco College, to fill the vacant north-region position on the DLAC. (Ron T.)

Attachment 1

SACS Clarifications

(the three items included in the meeting handout)

Attachment 2

Highlights of Discussion on Learning Outcomes

- The SACS standard focuses upon program outcomes, not course outcomes.
- Faculty resist identifying programmatic level learning outcomes. But bottom line, SACS requires that faculty analyze the curriculum and establish programmatic learning outcomes. Faculty engagement is the issue.
- Utilizing a QEP to address learning outcomes doesn't work.
- What SACS is looking for is probably not available at most Host colleges. Bits and pieces are available, but what's lacking is comprehensiveness. All colleges have done assessment work, but the comprehensiveness that SACS wants is not there. SACS wants to know that colleges have been assessing learning outcomes for awhile—catch 22.
- For a program, the capstone experience is the emphasis.
- Learning outcomes are more easily established for Technical programs.
- Collectively, general ed is a program. General ed is the focus.
- Relying on state and federal guidelines doesn't work.
- There is too little time to educate everyone about what needs to be done and then do it.
- Learning outcomes has joined faculty credentials to become the two current major emphases of SACS.
- Describe the learning-outcomes process in responses, but don't include a timeline. Don't focus attention where you don't want it.
- An assessment methodology must be included in responses.
- Don't give excuses about why your college is not in compliance with learning outcome requirements.
- The process for selecting courses to host plays into the learning outcomes issue.
- Division minutes documenting curriculum changes may be useful.
- Learning outcomes are required for the core curriculum by 2009. Motivate those using the core curriculum to start moving.

Attachment 3

Proposed Schedule for Completion and Submission of Abbreviated Compliance Certification and State Summative Compliance Certification

- Sep 20:** Statewide teleconference - Comprehensive overview of the review process
- Sep 29:** VCT- SACS liaisons' meeting (VCT annotations prepared for at least the first set of Compliance Certification criteria plus, perhaps, a few other critical, high-priority ones)
- Dec 16:** 1st set of compliance items due VCT Office and online system locked
- Feb. 3:** Draft of Phase 1 summary available
- Mar 15:** 2nd set of compliance items due VCT Office and system locked
- Mar 13-24:** One-week spring break for all colleges (break dates vary)
- Mar 31:** Spring VCT data available to colleges
- March 31:** Draft of Phase 2 summary available
- April 11:** DLAC meeting to review and discuss drafts of Phase 1 and Phase 2 summaries
- May 1:** 3rd set of compliance items due VCT Office and system locked
- May15:** Full Draft of Summative Compliance Certification (SCC) ready for DLAC review – ACC requirements and VCT narrative.
- June 6:** DLAC reviews SCC *This date may need to be moved up as much as possible so that the June deadlines can be spread out more.]*
- June 7:** DLAC comments sent to staff and colleges
- June 7-19:** Online system opened for colleges to revise ACC narrative and documentation
- June 20-26:** SCC revised in response to college updates and DLAC review
- June 27- July 7:** Statewide review of SCC
- July 10 - 12:** SCC revised in response to statewide review
- July 13:** SCC presented to CEOs at TACC summer meeting.
- July 17 - Aug. 18 Final** revisions required by presentation to CEO's completed, functionality of all online links and features confirmed, approval pages signed by all CEOs received.
- August 31:** SCC due to SACS