



**Report of the
On-Line Credit Delivery
Work Group**

[MAC 216-17]

Report of the On-Line Credit Delivery Work Group - MAC 216-17

MANDATE

At AMPA 2017, the following motion was passed:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT AMPA direct the Provincial Executive to create a work group to investigate the impact on Members and the public education system of on-line credit delivery. The scope shall include, but not be limited to:

- credit integrity,
- school-based funding,
- collective bargaining concerns,
- equity issues, and
- special education.

The work group shall include at least one member from each of the following groups: CPAC, CBC, ESC, and Human Rights. The work group shall report to AMPA 2018.

WORK GROUP

The MAC 216-17 Work Group is comprised of the following members:

CPAC – Seth Bernstein, District 12 - Toronto
CBC – Richard Seeley, District 6A – Thunder Bay
ESC – Jeff Barber, District 28 - Renfrew
Human Rights – Blair Middleton, District 11 – Thames Valley
Cathy Renfrew, Director, Educational Services, Provincial Office
Peter Bates, Secretariat, Provincial Office
Paul Caccamo, Provincial Executive Officer

The On-Line Credit Delivery Work Group met at Provincial Office to work on MAC 2162-17 on the following dates: Oct 12, 2017, Nov 28, 2017, Dec 6, 2017, Jan 11, 2018 and Jan. 24, 2018.

INTRODUCTION

On-line delivery of credit courses is expanding rapidly within Ontario's public school system. Canada has one of the highest per capita student enrollment in on-line courses and programs of any jurisdiction in the world and was one of the first countries to use the Internet to deliver distance learning courses to students. In Ontario, every school board has the ability to offer some form of on-line learning using the Ministry-sponsored learning management system combined with their own on-line curricular materials. Many school boards also participate in one or more consortia designed to allow school boards to work together to maximize their on-line offerings by sharing course offerings, resources and students. There are also a number of independent and/or private on-line learning programs being offered in Ontario.

The rapid growth of e-learning across the province has had an impact on not only the entire membership of OSSTF but on the public and society in general. Across the province, employer policies and local collective agreement language dealing with e-learning often have not been fully established. This lack of clear boundaries and direction has resulted in a wide variety of e-

learning incarnations. Some of these incarnations have significant impacts on members of the education community.

The work group met on several occasions. To provide some context in the early stages of our work, we made use of the document *Impact of Electronically Delivered Courses Report* that was delivered to AMPA 2015 as well as British Columbia Teachers' Federation's *State of the Nation: K-12 E-learning in Canada*. Additionally, we conducted a focus group session of Teacher and Occasional Teacher presidents based on a series of questions developed around e-learning. These same questions were distributed to all bargaining unit leaders, who provided written input. We collated and examined the data from the local leaders and combined it with the wide range of other resources consulted. This report outlines the background information on how e-learning is being delivered in Ontario and the impact and consequences that current e-learning practices could have on OSSTF members. Recommendations attempt to minimize the negative impact e-learning could have on members and to educate them on its inherent risks.

OVERVIEW OF ON-LINE CREDIT DELIVERY IN ONTARIO

The Ministry of Education's policy surrounding the implementation of e-learning is found in the document "Provincial E-Learning Strategy: Master User Agreement". This document lays out the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders connected to delivering e-learning, including the Ministry, boards, teachers, and students. At the outset, this document notes that an e-learning teacher must be "an Ontario qualified teacher as defined by *The Education Act*". This document also defines e-learning as existing "when there is a scheduled distance between the e-learning teacher and students and/or students and each other. Distance may be related to location ... or time."

Enrolment Trends

Data from more than 20 school board programs across Ontario collected over two years, starting in 2014, have indicated that e-learning programs have experienced 30% to 35% growth in enrollment. (*State of Nation, 2016*). Based on the information in the *State of the Nation* report, it is estimated that there were approximately 67,000 students taking e-learning courses during the 2015-16 school year. There is no cost to students enrolled in e-learning courses through their local school board.

The most recent data available regarding private system enrollment indicated there were approximately 7,500 students enrolled in private on-line schools during the 2015-16 school year. Students can take credits delivered by private institutions such as *Canada eSchool* and *Virtual High School* for as little as \$429 per credit.

How Boards are Managing E-learning

Students can register for an e-learning course delivered in their own board, from other boards in the province or from private e-learning schools. Some school boards have formed consortia that agree to work to maintain, as closely as possible, an equal number of students in and out (ie. if a board was sending 5 students out to other boards in a Consortium for their courses, that board would accept 5 back from consortium schools). For non-consortium boards the host board pays a fee to the receiving board, which is currently set at \$769. The student is not charged this fee.

While the host school board maintains all aspects of e-learning delivery within the board, including registering and tracking students, granting credits, hiring staff, setting program direction, and maintaining control over quality, the student's home school often takes on the task of student success and credit recovery.

An analysis of 12 boards from all different areas of the province shows a consistency in that they list e-learning as a 'program', and on their websites they provide information directed toward students and parents. The types of information typically include references to the courses available, expectations regarding what type of student is well suited to taking e-learning courses, and the technological requirements. There is a lack, however, of any formal policies governing e-learning in these boards, and the work group believes that they should move toward developing formal e-learning policies. Such a move would allow decisions connected to on-line credit delivery to be made within a framework that provides oversight and vetting. By utilizing such a process, boards could avoid making decisions that could potentially have adverse effects on members' working conditions and job security.

Of more significant concern is the increasing number of credits being generated during the summer months through continuing education (see Table 1). Some boards have taken a market-based approach to credit offerings -- if there is demand, they will run essentially limitless sections to fill it. Boards are incentivized to do this via continuing-education pay rates for teachers that result in pay that can be as little as 1/3 that of a regular day school teacher's rate, and the fact that the on-line learning environment doesn't require a physical plant within which to host students.

Table 1 Statistics from the Ontario eLearning Consortium (Which has 23 member Boards) for the last 5 years

SUMMER							
YEAR	Enrollment at Completion	No Mark Entered	Marks	Average	Median	Credits	Pass Rate
14-15	7866	1539	6327	77%	82%	5849	92%
15-16	9071	655	8416	75%	82%	7663	91%
16-17	8879	629	8250	76%	82%	7519	91%

REGULAR							
YEAR	Enrollment at Completion	No Mark Entered	Marks	Average	Median	Credits	Pass Rate
14-15	8658	960	7698	73%	79%	6910	90%
15-16	8775	539	8236	74%	80%	7510	91%
16-17	11354	1613	9741	74%	80%	8814	90%

* NOTE:

1. This data represents only those students and courses contained in the registration/tracking/reporting system. Since boards, such as Peel and Waterloo, only use this system for a portion of the e-learning courses they offer, the data is not complete.

2. The *No Mark Entered* column means that these students completed the course but their teacher did not enter their marks into the registration/tracking/reporting system. As such, they are not included in the calculations for *Average*, *Median*, *Credits*, or *Pass Rate*. This is not to say they did not pass. There is simply no data in the system indicating how well they did.

3. The Consortium does not have data on completion rate.

The following data was requested from the Ministry of Education but had not yet been received at the time this report was written. This data will be shared with OSSTF leaders once it is available:

- Completion rate of students who enroll in eLearning courses
- Frequency marks distribution eLearning courses
- Number of credits earned in eLearning courses during the regular school year
- Frequency distribution of course enrolment in eLearning courses
- Course enrolment in eLearning courses in publicly funded secondary schools v/s private schools

Student Choice

Students register for e-learning courses for a variety of reasons. On-line credit delivery allows secondary students to:

- select from a wider range of subjects/levels that may not be available in their schools;
- reduce time table conflicts
- take additional credits which may lead to completing graduation requirements sooner
- spread credits out through the year by taking on-line courses during the summer

In addition, there appear to be trends in the types of e-learning courses students choose. Provincially, ENG4U (Grade 12 University level English) is the most popular course followed by elective courses ENGWC4U (Writer's Craft), HSB (Challenge and Change in Society) and PPZ (Grade 11 Health for Life).

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATORS

Workload:

The most frequently raised issue affecting members engaged in on-line credit delivery was class size. In boards where there are no class size caps in the collective agreement, members have reported classes in excess of 50 or 60 students. The classes are often front-end loaded because the attrition rate can be so high. But the possible drop in student numbers can be offset by the fact that many on-line credit courses allow for continuous enrollment (i.e. students can enroll in an on-line course at any time, not just the start of a semester. The *Impact of Electronically Delivered the Courses Report (2015, OSSTF)* noted instances of students dropping e-learning courses and joining a class a month into the course, causing disruption for the teacher as they tried to have the students make up missed material.

Our leaders reported that in addition to the size, members struggle with multiple splits. In some cases members can be responsible for 4 or 5 courses within an assignment. Courses may or may not be related. One leader described the situation of a member who, because of reduced demand for particular courses was teaching Grade 10 applied and Grade 12 University math within the same section of the timetable.

Concerns about the length of the school day were also highlighted. There are often expectations that the teacher will be available if students are looking for support during evenings or weekends. Additional time is often required to deal with the technology requirements of on-line credit delivery and the administrative work involved in the courses including tracking attendance and non-participation.

In addition to the increased workload of the teachers assigned to teach the on-line credits, members have reported that there is often an expectation that teachers who are available in the students' home schools will provide assistance, and/or resources to the students taking on-line

credits. Support staff have also found increased demands related to supporting teachers and students who are teaching/taking on-line credits.

When courses are taught from home but credited to a school complement, there can be inequitable distribution of additional assignments and on-calls to cover absent colleagues. There are also examples where educators who teach e-learning courses in school settings lose their preparation time as e-learning students anticipate 24/7 access to their e-learning teachers.

Staffing

A number of staffing implications have been raised by members and local leaders. While in many cases, members volunteer to teach e-learning sections, in some cases they are time-tabled into these sections through the staffing process. In at least one case, a course that had been assigned as an in-class section was changed to on-line credit delivery when students from another school needed access to the course.

E-learning does allow for some schools to keep sections in a school/department and can help to maintain a more diverse course selection. However, staffing numbers have been affected by the proliferation of on-line credits being taken during the summer through continuing education. In addition to the decreased in the number of school year credits being offered, the summer on-line courses are being staffed by continuing education instructors who are paid significantly less than teachers on the grid.

Another staffing issue that has been seen in some school boards involves the lack of replacement of e-learning teachers with qualified occasional teachers. While some systems allow for supply coverage, others do not replace e-learning teachers/lines with occasional teachers, depriving the occasional teachers of work, and increasing the workload of teachers when they are absent.

Additional Implications

Some e-learning teachers teach from school sites, other e-learning teachers teach from their homes. There are significant WSIB implications for members who are working from home that often are not considered. Access to resources and technology for members teaching e-learning are also a concern. One example raised was the inconsistencies in terms of whether the employer or the employee is responsible for the cost of computers, telephone and internet access for those working from home. Other examples included inconsistencies in the levels of technology or bandwidth available and in assistive technologies, such as sit/stand desks, that are supplied for educators teaching e-learning credits in a school setting, but not for those working from home.

The lack of special education and guidance supports was identified as both a professional issue for members and an equity issue for their students. Teachers were often unaware or unable to access the IEPs of students enrolled in their e-learning classes.

Members also cited the lack of professional development and training to support on-line credit delivery. The start-up training for learning management systems like D2L is often seen to be ineffective to meet the needs of the teachers.

Throughout the discussions and analysis of the survey results it became clear that strong collective agreement language has helped to mitigate and/or protect members from the impact of these issues.

Privacy concerns.

Most staff and students are unaware of what kind of data is being collected by school boards or Google while they are engaged in e-learning. When a teacher uses a board computer, logs on to board wifi, or uses a board image, it should be clear to the teacher that whatever actions they perform can be logged and audited. The interaction between e-learning software and a teacher's personal devices is another matter. If a teacher installs Google Classroom on their personal phone or device, what data is being collected by Google and boards? If a teacher is logged into a board Gmail in their browser at home, what data is being collected by Google and boards? If a teacher funnels their board Gmail account through their phone's mail app, what data is being collected by Google and boards? Because boards tend not to supply devices/laptops to teachers in Ontario, teachers are often integrating their work apps with their own devices. Clarity around privacy is essential, as the work group expressed concern that teachers may be unknowingly exposed to personal data collection by their employer while working on their own devices, at home. There was also concern about how the data is used by Google for profit.

Concerns were also identified about the risks to teachers of having students' information including identifying information, marks, course work, emails etc. on their personal devices. Teachers are consistently advised not to engage students using their personal emails/devices and yet when they are assigned to teach an on-line credit they may be expected to use their own devices. Protecting this information then becomes the responsibility of the teacher and rarely are appropriate encryption processes in place to provide the appropriate level of security.

Competition Concerns/Credit Integrity

Teachers are competing with e-learning credits and this is changing the way they deliver their courses. From *Impact of Electronically Delivered the Courses Report (2015, OSSTF)*:

"I have frequently had students "shopping" between my course and the on-line 12 university course. They asked how "hard" my class was and if they could "get a 90%+" and then used that information to decide whether to take the on-line course instead of my course as they perceived the on-line course to be easier."

Anecdotally, teachers have begun to reshape how they structure their classroom courses -- if they hint that the course might be challenging, they fear that students will leave; some teachers are restructuring their courses to stem attrition.

To a certain extent, competition has always existed, especially within elective courses, be it in-school or with night/summer school offerings. The difference now is the scale of the competition. More and more students are choosing an on-line route, and teachers of in-school credits are feeling pressure to modify their courses in ways that might not reflect their professional preferences or their ideas of best practice.

Credit integrity was raised with respect to the lack of ability that teachers have to authenticate that the student enrolled in the course is in fact the person doing the work and submitting the assignments.

BROADER PUBLIC EDUCATION IMPACTS

On-line education is impacting public education in ways that can't easily be measured. At this juncture, Ontario-based research data is sparse. The acceleration of the shift is increasing and measurement tools are still being conceptualized.

Evaluation of on-line credit delivery systems in Ontario, if they occur at all, typically focus on narrow achievement considerations. Was the credit earned? How do marks compare? This narrow assessment does not consider the aspects of public school experience that enable students to both self-actualize and contribute to the public sphere as active participants in a healthy democracy. Nor does it capture the creative & critical collaborative learning, along with empathy development that occurs when students learn together in a shared context.

Recent polling conducted by a union group that includes OSSTF indicates that while there is general confidence in the current system, the public is supportive of an expansion of e-learning. According to a recent Vector Poll of public opinion on the state of education in Ontario (September, 2017):

- *Most Ontario residents have heard of “e-learning”, including 75% of Ontarians under age 30. The general trend appears to be that the younger the respondent the more likely they were to be aware of e-learning;*
- *Despite this trend, 65% of those over 65 years old are in favour of allowing students to complete some course credits towards their diploma on-line.*
- *8 in 10 Ontarians favour e-learning for a high school credit;*
- *71% of Ontarians said that the quality of education provided through e-learning is as good as or better than traditional instruction.*

OSSTF has not yet done polling that reflects why Ontarians are responding this way, but it is possible that broader outcomes are not being considered when assessing the way credits are delivered. One example of a broad outcome that doesn't easily get captured by a typical analysis is socio-emotional learning.

There is plenty of recent research (eg. Shonfeld, et al., 2015¹; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011²; Welsh, Parke, Widaman, & O'Neil, 2001³) that indicates the value of the “by-the-way” learning that happens when students learn together. Although trends in education have led to increased personalization of learning -- a theme that supporters of on-line education tout in promoting that mode to the logical end of a student alone in front of a computer -- there are intangible socio-emotional benefits to having students learn in ways that reflect a collective experience. These competencies include self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, interpersonal relationships, and decision-making.

Shanker (2014)⁴ conducted a meta-analysis of research, and one of his conclusions is that teachers (as opposed to outside professionals) are best suited to cultivate these competencies through good socio-emotional learning instruction and classroom practices. Shanker's analysis indicates that academic achievement improves, along with prosocial behaviour, better mental health, and improved attitudes towards school.

Often times in education, we hear buzzwords like "knowledge economy" and "innovation" driving more focus towards Science, Technology, Engineering and Math and content-based education, more easily delivered on-line, to meet workplace demands. Davidson (2017)⁵ writes about surprising revelations from Google as it conducted research into who constituted its most effective employees. Google used to hire based on algorithms that selected students with top marks from elite universities, but after Project Oxygen, quickly shifted gears, as Strauss (2017)⁶ writes in the Washington Post:

"Project Oxygen shocked everyone by concluding that, among the eight most important qualities of Google's top employees, STEM expertise comes in dead last. The seven top characteristics of success at Google are all soft skills: being a good coach; communicating and listening well; possessing insights into others (including others different values and points of view); having empathy toward and being supportive of one's colleagues; being a good critical thinker and problem solver; and being able to make connections across complex ideas.

Those traits sound more like what one gains as an English or theater major than as a programmer. Could it be that top Google employees were succeeding *despite* their technical training, not because of it? After bringing in anthropologists and ethnographers to dive even deeper into the data, the company enlarged its previous hiring practices to include humanities majors, artists, and even the MBAs that, initially, Brin and Page viewed with disdain."

There are other broad areas of impact, not easily measured, that should be part of the discussion about the e-learning and credit delivery, including staff & student engagement in the school community, and the ongoing conversation about creating schools as community hubs, with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives as a good resource. The Ontario advocacy group, People For Education, has an initiative called Measuring What Matters that establishes metrics for Citizenship education, Health, Creativity, Socio-emotional learning, and Quality learning environments.

Equity Issues

Consultation and research identified equity issues affecting both students and Education Workers. Issues cited that are common to both groups include, but are not limited to, equitable access to technologies and resources depending on location. Even in cases where all students can access e-learning, and any educator can apply to teach an e-learning course, not all parts of the province have access to consistent-high-speed internet access, employer supplied hardware and software, and sporadic access to student support services. Recent reports also reveal that those who may need the most help are at the greatest disadvantage and subject to the greatest harm by e-learning courses when adequate supports are not in place (New York

Times, Jan 2018⁷). Students who struggle in classroom settings are struggling the most without direct access to instruction and support.

Encroaching Privatization

There are a few ways in which on-line credit delivery is enabling privatization within the public school system:

a) via Learning Management Systems

- E-learning platforms in Ontario are typically provided by private corporations. Desire2Learn (D2L), a company that former Premier Dalton McGuinty now lobbies the Ontario government on behalf of, has an ongoing 11-year contract with the Ministry of Education to provide Brightspace, which they bill as a “learning management system” (LMS). Brightspace is used by many Boards as the primary on-line learning platform.
- When a LMS isn’t taking direct dollars from the Government, they are profiting via other pathways, such as data mining and brand exposure. Google offers Google Apps For Education, including Google Classroom, for free.
- Private sector interactions with public education are nothing new -- we buy computers, supplies, and textbooks made by private companies for profit. What needs to be monitored are the data implications, and the way in which expanding demand for e-learning and EdTech will be met willingly by for-profit corporations who might also lobby the Government, and create demand amongst the public, to accelerate this trend. In a zero-sum/austerity Provincial budget environment, funding for EdTech may be pulling away dollars from areas of need like decreasing class sizes and increasing support staff numbers.

b) via private e-learning companies

- On-line private credit granting schools do not have to deal with various obstacles like physical spaces and the health & safety concerns they bring, and unionized teachers.

Other Considerations

There are other impacts that were not explored in this report, but would warrant consideration for future efforts to engage our members and the public on the impact of on-line credit delivery to public education:

- schools as community hubs
- the connection between school environment and learning
- the impact that on-line credit delivery has on staff and student connection to the school community.

CONCLUSIONS

Assessing the holistic impact of on-line credit delivery on public education requires considering not just enrolment trends, funding consequences, worker impacts, and credit integrity, but also the aspects of the in-school learning experience for students that are not so easily measured. In today’s world, what is not measured is often not

considered or valued. This report provides an introductory overview of research that supports the value of in-school learning, and the impact of e-learning on students, staff and education in general. The MAC 216-17 Work group was unable to thoroughly examine all of the issues identified in the mandate. They were unable to obtain information about the impact on school-funding and have only taken a cursory look at the equity and special education issues. However, the work group believes that sufficient information was gathered to make some recommendations for next steps. These include recommendations for negotiating priorities and the need for collective agreement language, member education and public engagement around the impacts of on-line credit delivery and further research about privacy concerns and the corporatization of education. . This report provides a starting point for OSSTF to develop a compelling case for a public education system that reflects the goals of the educators working within it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OSSTF Policies

OSSTF already has a fairly robust set of policies related to the delivery of e-learning courses. These are found in the document *OSSTF Policies and Procedures 2017-2018*, in sections 5.2.12 (Timetabling), 5.2.15 (On-line Courses), and 7.20 (Electronic and Distance Education). However, it is clear that some of these policies need to be amended in order to better reflect the current state of technology. Further, now that e-learning has become more entrenched in the public education system, we can see more clearly some of the pitfalls our members may face individually, as well as the potential erosion of working conditions and job security that could occur as a byproduct of how some boards have operationalized their e-learning programs. Thus, we need to amend some of our policies to enable some protections for our members.

The following policies should be amended/adopted. These amendments will be brought to AMPA 2018 through a series of motions.

Policy and Suggested Amendment	Rationale
<p>Delete 5.2.12.10 and add new subsection to 5.2.12 as follows</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that collective agreements should include provisions to protect all educational workers from unreasonable workloads.</p>	<p>This is a workload issue. The original policy allowed for multi-grade/multi-level classes. We should resist such situations. While this is not specific to e-learning courses, it is clear that e-learning is becoming fertile ground for boards to attempt to offer several grades and levels within single courses.</p> <p>Also, a greater number of e-learning courses are becoming continuous intake courses (not just new students but addition of new courses) and thus adding to the workload of those instructors.</p>

<p>Add new subsection to 5.2.12 as follows:</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that the Ministry of Education should provide adequate funding to school boards to ensure that they are not required to schedule multi-grade/multi-level classes.</p>	<p>Connected to the change noted above, we acknowledge that multi-grade and multi-level courses sometimes have to be offered in order to maintain programming. We are saying here that the Ministry of Education should make sure that small schools and boards don't have to make hard choices of which courses to combine or cut; the funds should be there to offer programs that meet students' needs without creating an unreasonable burden on our members.</p>
<p>5.2.15.3</p> <p>Amend by insertion of “software and” before “equipment”.</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that employers should provide to members teaching on-line credit courses all the equipment necessary, including but not limited to high-speed internet access.</p>	<p>The original language does not capture all of the possible requirements needed to successfully teach on-line credit courses. Members should not be responsible for covering costs associated with devices and internet access, and they should not have to put their privacy at risk by having to use their personal devices.</p>
<p>Add new subsection to 5.2.15.</p> <p>“It is the policy of OSSTF that when a teacher responsible for delivering an on-line course is absent, that they are replaced by a qualified occasional teacher.”</p>	<p>It is common practice that when teachers delivering on-line courses are absent, they not replaced by an occasional teacher. So, occasional teachers are losing work opportunities. Further, on-line teachers are under greater pressure to continue to work while ill, when they should instead be focused on their health.</p>
<p>7.20.4</p> <p>Amend by the insertion of “, school support staff” after “counselling”.</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that any electronic or distance education program should encompass a full range of student services, such as student advising and guidance, counselling and appropriate technological training and support for both students and staff.</p>	<p>This change is to ensure that the entire educational team is part of the support system for students who have specific needs. This would allow for greater equity of access to e-learning courses and then success for all students who take such classes.</p>
<p>Delete 7.20.8</p>	<p>This language conflicts with to policy 7.20.7, which states,</p>

<p>It is the policy of OSSTF that no student should be offered electronic or distance education as the only way to obtain a secondary school credit course.</p>	<p>“it is the policy of OSSTF that electronic or distance education credit courses should only be offered to students for whom a comparable course is not available in the regular day school program.”</p> <p>If we are saying that e-learning shouldn't be the only way to get a credit, then saying that e-learning should only be available to students who can't get the course through traditional programming, we're essentially saying that there should be no e-learning.</p>
<p>7.20.13</p> <p>Amend by the deletion of “computers, modems” and the insertion of “hardware, software”.</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that the Ministry of Education should ensure that all students in publicly-funded schools should have equal access to on-line credit courses, including but not limited to covering the cost of on-line credit courses for low-income students and making available computers, modems and Internet access.</p>	<p>This change is merely updating language to reflect current technology. The suggested terms would capture all the necessary elements on a go-forward basis.</p>
<p>7.20.15</p> <p>Amend by the insertion of “elementary, secondary, and” before “post-secondary institutions”.</p> <p>It is the policy of OSSTF that electronic and distance education in post-secondary institutions should not have a negative impact on the workload, job security, or funding for OSSTF members.</p>	<p>This language should apply to all levels of education in Ontario, not just post-secondary.</p>
<p>Add new subsection to 7.20:</p> <p>“It is the policy of OSSTF that members should not have their personal data collected by the employer while using their own devices on non-employer networks.”</p>	<p>Members are being unknowingly exposed to personal data collection by their employer while working on their own devices, even while at home. This is occurring because members are utilizing board-provided software and in some cases, board servers.</p>

<p>Add new subsection to 7.20:</p> <p>“It is the policy of OSSTF that students should not be required to take eLearning courses.”</p>	<p>There have been discussions at the Ministry of Education that students should be required to take e-learning credits every year. Aside from the equity issues here, the potential for negative impacts on workload and job security are significant given how some boards have implemented e-learning.</p> <p>Further, courses that students enroll in should not be changed to e-learning delivery after enrollment.</p>
<p>Add new policy:</p> <p>“It is the policy of OSSTF that students in our public system enrolling in an e-learning class should not be placed in an electronically delivered course being delivered by a separate school board.”</p>	<p>In some areas of the province, counselors are placing public high school students into e-learning courses offered by separate school boards; should this practice go unchecked, it would have a detrimental effect on OSSTF teacher member jobs.</p>

2. Establish negotiating priorities and create/modify model language to address the following:
 - Maximum number of students in e-learning courses – need to be at the same level or lower than regular day school class maxima
 - Maximum number of distinct courses assigned to a member
 - Continuous intake of students
 - Working conditions/work location language for e-learning teachers – e-learning teachers should be working in schools
 - Funding of work devices – e-learning teachers should be provided with appropriate electronic devices and software
 - Limit on data collection on members
 - Absent e-learning teachers should be replaced with Occasional Teachers.

3. Develop a plan, which may include a guide to e-learning and/or advisory documents, to educate members and the public regarding the following:
 - Ideal educational experience occurs when students and staff are learning together in a school environment
 - Effect that competition with e-learning has on course design/delivery in regular classroom programming
 - Effects of e-learning on the workload of the e-learning teacher as well as other staff in the school
 - Impact of e-learning being delivered in summer on continuing education register vs. day school register
 - Privacy Issues, particularly what is being collected by technology companies and the Boards
 - Risks of using technology, including the increased corporatization of education.

References:

¹ Shonfeld, et al., 2015

² Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: a meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x.

³ Welsh, M., Parke, R. D., Widaman, K., & O'Neil, R. (2001). Linkages Between Children's Social and Academic Competence: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of School Psychology* 39(6):463-482 . DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4405(01)00084-X.

⁴ Shanker, Stuart. "Broader Measures of Success: Social/Emotional Learning." *Measuring What Matters*, People for Education. Toronto, 8 Nov. 2014. People for Education. Web.

⁵ Davidson (2017),

⁶ Strauss, *The Washington Post* (2017)

⁷ Dynarski, S., *The New York Times* (2018, Jan. 9) from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/19/business/online-courses-are-harming-the-students-who-need-the-most-help.html>