

Distance and Blended Learning Committee

Meeting Minutes

September 20, 2024, 10:00 a.m.

Zoom meeting

In Attendance

Ping Yin (chair), Janie Lee (secretary), Emily Crosby, J.D. Swerzenski, Paul Boger (ex officio), Jerry Slezak (ex officio), Victoria Russell (ex officio)

New members were introduced and welcomed.

Updates on Chair Activity

1. Setting 2024-25 course designation deadlines and updating DBLC's web page
Prior to the beginning of Fall 2024, Ping coordinated with the chairs of SI, WI, DI, and Honors committees and set up deadlines for applications. He also updated the DBLC web page with correct deadlines and a current member list.
2. Emergency approval for Fall 2024 only (chair review by Ping Yin)
 - a. RELG 252 (Mehdi Aminrazavi)
 - b. EDSE 541 (Jennifer Walker on behalf of Nicole Myers)

Consideration of Applications for Spring 2025

1. NURS 330 (Janet Atarathi-Dugan)
2. NURS 350 (Janet Atarathi-Dugan)
3. NURS 360 (Janet Atarathi-Dugan)
4. NURS 410 (Janet Atarathi-Dugan)
5. NURS 440 (Janet Atarathi-Dugan)
6. EDSE 250 (Jennifer Walker)
7. EDSE 531 (Jennifer Walker)

All approved. Ping will share the committee's comments for improvements with submitters.

Discussion on DBLC's charge and service

(Action items assigned by the Handbook workgroup)

Ping opened it up for discussions based on the committee's previous conversations about the necessity of this committee.

Janie asked about SACSCOC regulations. Ping said that they are for online programs, not online courses.

Issue 1: Merge with DI?

As an ex-officio member of both committees, Jerry sees that DI and DBLC businesses are different from each other. If merged, it would add to the already-heavy workload of the DBLC. Also, we would need to work with two different sets of criteria for approvals.

As an instructor of a DI course, Ping agreed with Jerry. Emily also agreed that the two committees are separate. J.D. agreed that merging doesn't solve the DBLC workload issue.

Consensus: No.

Issue 2: Reconsider approval procedure

Ping laid out three models:

- a. Creating a checklist for AI policies, modality (synchronous, asynchronous), resources, etc., for submitters and the committee to use. This will save DBLC members time when we review applications.
- b. Not having every single member review proposals. For example, Ping informed us that honors capstone proposals are reviewed by only two members. If they disagree, a third member comes in and reviews it.
- c. Outsourcing approvals to chairs and program directors.

Jerry shared an example of a checklist from a nonprofit. Nothing we should use as is, but an example.

<https://www.qualitymatters.org/sites/default/files/PDFs/StandardsfromtheQMHigherEducationRubric.pdf>

Victoria commented that a checklist will help DBLC members to have a common language and assist applicants as well.

After weighing different options, the committee decided that we would use a checklist model, have emergency approvals continue to be done by the DBLC chair, and have regular proposals be reviewed by two committee members. When there's a disagreement, a third member will come in to review.

The meeting adjourned at 10:56 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Janie Lee