

## ATC Minutes February 2022

The February meeting of the ATC was called to order and the minutes from the January were posted on Canvas for approval.

The February meeting of the ATC was held with faculty only since the main topic of the meeting was to discuss the present contract language and to propose any suggestions for changes in the new contract.

Ellie began the meeting by explaining how the bargaining process works. The committee then looked at the suggestions committee members made in response to a questionnaire sent out by the committee chair.

The first item examined was the definition of a master course. Our present language defines a master course as a “course the college has purchased for distribution.” The present contract states that a course is considered a Master Course if the following criteria are met:

A course is designated as a master course based on the following:

- Enrollment
- Number of instructors teaching the course
- Number of sections offered per year
- Role the course plays in program requirements.

Possible definitions were explored including the following:

- A master course is developed to be distributed to faculty, both adjunct and full time, and is **owned by the college.**
- A course that the college may distribute to other faculty for teaching use whose faculty developer **has been compensated and has released the course to the college.**
- An Online Master Course (OMC) is a designed and developed online or hybrid course that can be used by another instructor as a foundation or starting point for developing and teaching their assigned section of the offered course.
- A course set up to include all course items and core curriculum in a consistent format so that the content is easy to navigate by students and the course can be delivered consistently by multiple instructors.

- A master course is ready-to-teach based on a form of learning with pre-produced course materials that are developed and implemented to achieve economies of scale.

**Another topic discussed was the altering of a Master Course. Presently there is no language to address this issue. Do we want this in the contract? Here are some suggestions:**

- **No Changes Allowed**-In a master course, multiple faculty use the same QM Certified course. The only information that can be changed is the instructor information; **instructional content cannot be modified.**
- **Limited Changes**-The changes from the master course are limited to the following specific review Standards and are to the same level of rigor provided in the master course that was reviewed:

**Standard 1.4:** Regarding course and institutional policies with which the student is expected to comply includes any **instructor-specific policies, for instance, late submission of assignments policies.**

**Standard 1.8:** The **instructor introduction** corresponds to the new instructor and is appropriate.

**Standard 3.2:** If a different **grading policy** is in use by the unique instructor of the course, the grading policy is stated clearly

**Standard 3.3:** If different **evaluation criteria** are provided by the unique instructor, the evaluation criteria are specific, descriptive, and tied to the course grading policy. 11/30/20 © 2020 Quality Matters

**Standard 5.3:** Regarding **instructor turn-around times for email, discussion board involvement, and return of graded assignments.**

Sections of the master course that attained QM-certification may carry the QM Certification Seal provided the changes from the master course **do not substantially impact the following aspects of the originally certified course:**

- Course overview and introduction
- Alignment between course and module/unit learning outcomes
- Student engagement and active learning
- Grading policy and assessment criteria
- Provision of institutional policies
- Accessibility

Another issue for discussion was the process for designing a Master Course. Our present language is stated below:

The faculty, department chairs, and Academic Dean/Supervising Administrators share responsibility for collaboration in deciding which courses need to be developed as a master course (see definition).

Present contract language states the following:

- Selecting faculty for the redesign or development team is based on online certification, experience teaching an online course, development experience, and **interest**.
- Before a faculty member is selected for development of any online course, **he/she must successfully complete DEV 101**.
- Any faculty member who is creating an online course, either as a master course or their own course will receive the full support of the FSW instructional design team.
- If a faculty member develops a course without reassigned time/**stipend**, the course belongs to the faculty member and is not considered a master course to be shared, although the faculty member has the right to share the course with colleagues if he or she desires.
- Any master course for which the faculty member receives reassigned time/**stipend** belongs to the college and will be distributed accordingly.

**Some of the questions that have come up on this section of the contract are listed below:**

1. Should we remove “interest” from the faculty selection process since it can’t be measured?
2. Should we be more specific about how much experience the faculty member has with online teaching. Perhaps we could consider a minimum of 3 years?
3. Should faculty members who have previous experience with developing courses be given priority?
4. Should the application process for developing a course be more formal rather than just asking for volunteers?
5. How many people should be on the development team? Will they all be compensated the same?

Sharing a course is another issue that has been brought up. Presently, the contract does not address this at all. If a faculty member develops a course without compensation, he or she owns the course. Sharing the course is not required but some deans are pressuring faculty to share their courses even though they were not compensated for the work. Some questions that were brought up regarding the sharing of courses are listed below:

1. How much sharing should occur before the course is considered a master course?
2. Once designated as a master course, when should the faculty owner be compensated?
3. Can we clarify the use of “reassigned time” as compensation? Does the college “purchase” the course by offering reassigned time? Is this the only form of compensation?
4. How do we incorporate the course map into this process?
5. Should we clearly define editor roles for those that develop a Master course and have access to the Master shell after a development vs. an Instructor role who can edit the uploaded Master content only in their live section of a course during a semester?
6. Do we need to spell out what needs to be in the course map – Signatures of administration and coordinators, designations (faculty course or Master), OER status, etc?
7. Should we put the definition of a retroactive master in the CNA?

**Retroactive Master** is a term used to describe the option to adopt a course as a master after the development of a faculty owned course has been completed. This definition does not appear in the contract at the present time. However, the question of taking a course owned by a faculty member and distributing it to other faculty needs to be clarified.

**Course Updates and Re-development is another area where we need to consider changes or additions to the present language:**

**Present Language:** The faculty member who developed a master course will be responsible for minor updates for three (3) years. If substantial updates are required after three years, the development process will start over. After three (3) years, minor edits will be a collaborative effort of faculty using the master course.

## Suggestions and Concerns:

1. Define a course **update vs. re-development** and set compensation for each. Should this be based on the percent of changes needed? On other criteria?
2. All edits to the master course should be supervised by someone who is DEV101 certified and the course developer (if possible) during the implementation of that course revision.
3. Change **three years to five years** according to QM standards.
4. Can we come up with a process for keeping track of changes that need to be made in the master: wrong test answers, unclear instructions, missing rubrics, etc?
5. What happens when the original developer is no longer employed at the college?

These questions were placed on the ATC Canvas shell for faculty to think about until the April meeting when they can be discussed in more detail.