Attending: Ian Beckford (guest), Barbara Blake-Campbell, Dona Boccio, Sunil Dehipawala, Sara Rofofsky Marcus (Chair), Bruce Naples (President's Designee), David Sarno (Secretary)

Absent: John Gordon (Steering Committee Designee), Anissa Moody, Melanie Sehman, Jun Shin (COC Liaison), Nekesha St. Rose (Student Representative), Mangala Tawde (Alternate)

1. **Approval of Minutes**
   The minutes of the October 11, 2011 meeting were unanimously approved with minor changes.

2. **Chairperson's Report**
   a) Dr. Rofofsky Marcus described the process for submitting Resolutions and Recommendations to the Academic Senate. A Resolution must be properly worded with a thorough rationale. When voted upon by the committee, the ballots must be collected and given to the college Archivist. The outcome of the vote must be included in the minutes. The Resolution is included in the Chair's report which is then submitted to the Senate for consideration. A Recommendation is simply included as part of a report of the committee's activities which is submitted by the Chair to the Senate.

   b) The only item from the Academic Senate meeting was their request to encourage committee members to attend the Campus Conversations.

2. **President's Designee Report**
   a) The eLearning Luncheon / Showcase is scheduled for Wednesday, November 16, 12-2:30pm in the Oakland Building.

   b) A description of the 6 types of assessments was distributed to the committee.

   c) A list of faculty and courses from the last several cohorts of the eLearning Development Program was prepared and distributed. It is expected that the implementation of some sections will be delayed.

   d) Blackboard 9 is being reviewed and is expected to be fully available in summer 2012.

   e) ST-100 online was evaluated using the Quality Matters rubric. A report has been prepared and sent to the administration. The report indicates that ST-100 online is less successful than the face-to-face course and suggests redeveloping the online course to make better use of the features of Blackboard.

   f) Three videos were shot for the eLearning Readiness Program. E. Volchok and D. Bejar will review them, but it is unlikely that they will be used. An alternative approach may be to develop stronger scripts and animate them via Xtranormal.com. These could eventually be replaced with live videos.

3. **Old Business**
   a) **Use of TigerMail**
      D. Boccio has concluded that our efforts may be better spent encouraging the use of TigerMail rather than trying to change registration instructions for online courses. Using the digital signage around campus was suggested. It was generally agreed that a sustained campaign will be required and could include tactics such as being entered into raffles. B. Blake-Campbell will draft a statement and will contact N. St. Rose to get the student perspective.

   b) **Response to C. Dowlah's email regarding communication with students**

D. Sarno revised the response originally drafted by S. Dehipawala. It will be forwarded to S. Rofofsky Marcus with the attachments and she will forward it to C. Dowlah.

    c) Recommendation to the Registrar
        D. Boccio prepared a statement stating that online courses should be more clearly identified as such, and also that completion of the eLearning Readiness Program should be made a pre-requisite for registering in any online course. After further discussion, the point about the eLRP was struck from the recommendation. The first recommendation will be forwarded to the Senate.

    d) Blackboard Grade Center and ACC/CETL Workshops
        Ideas will be discussed via email and should also be brought to the next meeting.

4. New Business
    a) Introduction of Ian Beckford, Learning Outcomes Assessment Manager
        I. Beckford is available to work with faculty on all matters related to assessment, including, but not limited to student learning outcomes and peer evaluation. He reports to M Cuomo and Academic affairs. He came to the eLearning meeting to learn what our needs are and to determine what assistance he could offer. The committee reviewed the list 6 types of assessment, and with his input, came to the following conclusions:

1. Assessment of the quality of an online course by a mentor or faculty mentor has been/can be accomplished using Quality Matters. (Quality Matters has been used as a guide for developing PNET courses; to determine if the course is ready to deploy. It is used before students ever see the course. Some points of the rubric might be also be used in the students' evaluation of the online course.)

2. Assessment of an online program can be accomplished via the SLOAN-C Scorecard. However, QCC does not offer a fully online program. (SLOAN-C has been used to score the eLearning Development Institute.)

3. Assessment of the instructor of an online course by students is done via an online survey that students are asked to submit. The evaluation forms may not be distributed to the students by their instructors.

4. Assessment of an online course by students is done via online surveys activated by the instructor towards the end of the semester. Samples are available. They can be modified, but it is probably not necessary.

5. Assessment of learning outcomes in online courses (FNET or PNET) should be no different than in face-to-face courses. In other words, as suggested by D. Boccio and D. Sarno, these assessments should be designed and implemented by the instructor or course coordinator. Faculty teaching online courses may use the same campus resources and should consult with their Chairs about department protocols, as well as discuss assessment with I. Beckford. (The committee on eLearning will not make any specific recommendations on this aspect of assessment. The committee was reminded that the Committee on Assessment exists to ensure that assessment is being done by all departments/units.)

6. For the evaluation of instructors by their peers, it was suggested that the best resources are the eTeam and others who have mentored faculty who have developed online courses. B. Naples will provide a list of potential evaluators.

The committee was reminded that the next meeting will be on December 13. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm by unanimous decision.

Respectfully submitted,
David Sarno
Secretary, eLearning Committee