Meeting Minutes  
District Distance Education Committee Meeting  
December 18, 2012  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Location: Valley College, LARC 203  
Also accessible via CCC Confer (see reverse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>AGENDA TOPIC</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Call to order                         | Members Present: Wendy Bass, Mark Wood, Paul McKenna, Pauletta Daw, Eric Ichon, Pam Atkinson, Linda Delzeit  
Guests: Besty Regalado, Chris Nersisyan, Teresa Romney, Subodh Kumar |
| 2   | Approve minutes from 11/27/2012 and 12/7/2012 | Minutes were approved with slight amendments.                        |
| 3   | SIS Modernization Project             | (See attached pp presentation)  
PeopleSoft Campus Solutions is the new SIS that will be implemented at LACCD  
First decision making body – Functional User group, next in line if Functional group can not make a decision will go to Operational Steering Committee, SIS Policy Advisory Committee, Chancellor than LACCD BoT  
Decisions will be made by a quorum – 5 out of the 9 colleges will allow a decision to be made/changed.  
Beta campuses should be operational in fall 2015. Remaining campuses will be in full production fall 2016 (both in October so after the beginning on semester rush)  
Communication: monthly newsletters, SharePoint collaboration (hosted on district server) and on-going presentations at various district committees.  
There will be meetings with reps from DE Coordinators so that DE needs are being met with new SIS system. Need to come up with functional user for each campus – specific for DE.  
Subodh and Teresa will be meeting with a rep from our District DE Committee to process map our DE process. DDEC recommended a rep from Moodle and Etudes. Eric Ichon and Linda Delzeit will be the reps working with Subodh on process mapping. |
| 4   | District-wide E-Mail Address Project  | Our LMS’s will be using district email accounts. Eric voiced concern about having Etudes and Moodle using only district emails in spring may be too soon. That students have not necessarily adopted the district email yet. He asked about using two email addresses having their district and personal email addresses. |
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| **Campuses are not marketing the way they are supposed do, and there is little if no information on our campus websites.**  
Faculty should put info on their course syllabus –  
Need to address at individual campuses |
| **Board Approved Student Authentication Policy**  
Authentication – use of challenge questions is something that district is working on  
When Linda created draft – took info from board and DE ACCJC standards.  
This is meant to be vetted through the campuses, not to be pushed quickly through to board. Definitely want input from campuses.  
Eric brought up some concerns from his campus and when he brought it back to his senate president, was told they did not accept his recommendations.  
Paul had some concerns about state authorization – Yasmin is working on this so Paul was not sure if this should be part of our regulation now, we only have state authorization from one state (Maine) and he is concerned that if we adopt this policy, we are already out of compliance. |
| **DE Training Development for Accreditation Preparation**  
District is concerned about training for our LMS’s. Eric was consulted about the need to develop district wide DE training for accreditation preparation. |
| **Turnitin Contract**  
Pierce, West and maybe SW  
Valley, City, Mission, Trade and East cannot participate because of $$ |
| **Article 40 Changes**  
Concern about AFT and Senate making decisions without input from District DE members.  
ACCJC is requiring more from online courses than they are from F2F courses.  
DDEC can make recommendations to TPPC which can be discussed at next TPPC meeting so the chancellor can hear a different voice.  
In response to the Draft of Proposed Article 40 language which is being considered by the District Academic and the AFT. The District DE Committee: recommends B.2. be revised because we strongly feel that the wording “matters of mutual agreement” between the academic senate and the AFT is too limiting. DE committee’s discuss many issues related to distance education and limiting discussions to matters of mutual agreement between the academic senate and the AFT would hinder the committees ability to advise the college on it’s decision making regarding distance learning issues. We strongly contend that campus and district distance education committees are the best place for these discussions. |
In addition, we request that any other potential revisions to article 40 prior to the next contract negotiation be discussed with representatives from District DE Committee.

Will be sent to TPPC for notice for January meeting to be voted on at February meeting

This was unanimously voted on by District DE committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 Old Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 New Business from the Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>