

Educational Technology Committee

February 25, 2016

Notes (approved 3/31/16)

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|----|-------------------------|-----|----|
| Sue Lorimer (Chair) | DO | Pr | Kandace Knudson (Chair) | SCC | Pr |
| Markus Geissler | CRC | Pr | Zack Dowell | FLC | Pr |
| Bill Miller | SCC | | Marsha Reske | ARC | Pr |
| Tak Auyeung | ARC | | Andi Adkins-Pogue | CRC | |
| Jena Bills | CRC | Pr | Jennifer Kraemer | FLC | |
| Caleb Fowler | FLC | | Sheley Little | SCC | Pr |
| Patricia Harris Jenkinson | SCC | Pr | Alice Dieli | ARC | Pr |
| Adam Karp | ARC | | Stephen McGloughlin | CRC | Pr |
| Gary Hartley | FLC | | Elaine Ader | SCC | Pr |
| Kirk Sosa | CRC | Pr | Doug Meline | DO | |
| Steve Bowles | DO | Pr | Others: Tim Hixon | CRC | Pr |
| Jon Santos | ARC | Pr | Andy Divanyan | | |
| Brian Pogue | SCC | Pr | | | |

Welcome

The meeting was called to order early at 3:40 by Co-chair Kandace Knudson following most the committee's attendance at an OEI presentation made by Jory Hadsell.

Approval of Notes from January 28, 2016

The draft notes of the January 28th meeting were approved with minor corrections by consensus.

Discussion Items

Update on Colleges' Review of Canvas LMS

ARC – Marsha noted that the survey went out to all DE faculty and they were asked to compare D2L to Canvas. The Canvas Explorers will meet soon. They are waiting to move forward with any training until a decision is made by the LMS workgroup.

FLC – Zack noted that he sent out the survey and asked for responses by February 26th. He doesn't expect a lot of feedback because he felt the survey only applied to those who are really deep into the platforms. He doesn't expect any student feedback. It's still a valuable exercise to ask for the feedback.

CRC – Jena noted that they emailed the survey to DE instructors and they have received only a few responses. They didn't email the survey to students but asked DE faculty to ask their students.

SCC – Kandace said that their email request to faculty has resulted in good response. She asked her faculty to ask appropriate students to do the survey. She said that some concern was raised about the different instances of Canvas at other campuses. Steve noted that it's different releases, and we will be on the latest release.

The Committee discussed when training on Canvas should begin. Do we wait till the LMS workgroup makes a recommendation or until the Academic Senate forwards its recommendation to the Board of Trustees? Jena noted that the @ONE classes are full. Sue suggested that once we decide to go with Canvas and which cohort to join, then we can begin to plan for training. Elaine noted that we should wait for the Academic Senate's recommendation before we begin training. Zack suggested that the OEI might be willing to make some custom training materials available to us since Los Rios would be such a large client. Marsha noted that there are already training

materials generated by other early adopter districts and we might be able to use them. Elaine suggested that we tap Greg Beyrer for training, but Stephen would like for him to return to CRC 😊.

Markus asked if we've decided on a cohort, and Zach noted that Cohort 3 or 4 is the goal. Elaine asked what instance of Canvas will be utilized, noted that there are about 200 products that could be integrated with it, and asked if we will go with the tie-ins that we already are using with D2L. Steve noted that we'd probably get the same add-ons that we currently have, but that decision hasn't been made yet. He also believes that there is more control of that at the faculty level. Jena noted that with 100s of "widgets" available, limiting the ability for add-ons might be good initially. Steve noted that there might be varying levels of control as to the addition of widgets. Markus asked if Canvas will have the ability to seamlessly interface with publishers. Steve noted that publishers have their own widgets for Canvas.

Sue noted that if the LMS group decides to forward the Canvas recommendation to the Academic Senate, then an implementation task force will need to be formed to deal with all the questions/issues raised. So, the colleges need to forward their needs and we will need end users with technical expertise.

The need for accessibility (508 compliance) training was mentioned.

Kandace noted that she spoke with Eddie Sampson, a Canvas representative, and was told that we don't need to be bound by OEI timelines for joining Canvas.

CampusWorks College Visits

Sue noted that we have contracted with CampusWorks to perform an information technology audit. They will be visiting the district the weeks of March 28 and April 11 to look at PeopleSoft, LMS (they know we are looking at possibly changing our LMS), general technology, wireless access and IT staffing. The assessment will result in a report that will be used in the technology plan.

Zack asked who coordinates this at the campus and Sue noted that she has informed the college presidents, and will either coordinate with them or the dean responsible for IT. Kandace asked if there will be open forums and Sue noted that CampusWorks will meet with smaller groups of faculty, administrators, and students.

Because there was time remaining, Kandace suggested the addition of an agenda item:

Informational Technology Updates

- SCC – Elaine noted that her campus is quiet. No report.
- FLC – Zack noted no report.
- CRC – Markus noted that he's serving as interim DEIT chair in Greg's absence. Things he's attempting to get answered are: who ensures students can complete their programs in two years, who will ensure support services for online students will be met if we do join the OEI, and how can CRC effectively implement technology BHAGs (Big, Hairy, Audacious Goals). He noted that in the past CRC received a large grant and multimedia stations were purchased, which were an important upgrade and are still being used. How do we do something similar with the current infrastructure – where would it be originated and how much is the DEIT involved with campus technology implementation. Sue noted that once we start to develop the technology plan, we will look at campus strategic plans and

technology plans. If any needs have already been identified that would be helpful. Markus noted that the campus has a PrOF (Program Review and Forecast) process for feedback on staffing/equipment needs and wondered if technology needs could feed into that process. Stephen added that their COB (Capital Outlay Budget) ITMB process (Instructional Technology Multimedia Budget) deadline is tomorrow, and that it's a two-year cycle. Tim noted that the IT Department works as a consultant, and they are trying to get better input so that individual departments work together to achieve efficiencies.

- ARC – Jonathan noted the timeline for upgrading their website has been established; and Office 365 was soft launched to their students, so there hasn't been much feedback.

The committee discussed Office 365. Tim noted that individual students can use Office 365, but it's not institutional. He said since there's no district support, there's no institutional backing for it. Sue noted that the district is looking into Office 365, but we hadn't reached the stage of collectively agreeing to use it. Alice remembered discussions between her IT staff and district where she thought DO indicated it was ok for student use. Kandace indicated she received an email indicating that it was available and it included instructions for logging in. PJ noted that all of her students are signed up for that. It was noted that key domain names have been taken, which is halting the district from moving forward on this. Kandace noted it's a powerful tool, and Tim wondered why we were using GoogleDocs when we use and teach the Microsoft Office suite of products.

It was noted that the emerging issue of 508 accessibility will be on the next agenda and was discussed briefly. Kandace noted that it will be important that we vet the software, especially the add-ons like we use in D2L. She asked who is responsible for vetting these to make sure that we meet our 508 responsibility and noted that DE Coordinators are not qualified to undertake this task. How will this be done in the District? Sue noted that we don't have that expertise at the District either. Markus noted we should contract out for this service or hire someone. Kandace and Alice noted that we should have an accessibility coordinator at DO and at every campus so that we are meeting our responsibility for each piece of technology that we use. Elaine noted that perhaps the plugins for D2L (and Canvas) already went through a vetting process. Alice noted that responsibility for compliance lies with the educational institutions by law so it doesn't matter if they have already vetted them. Steve noted that testing is separate from taking responsibility. Alice noted that a Compliance Officer would ensure our compliance with the law and Gaier Dietrich is putting together training materials for schools that have received notifications of being out of compliance. Sue noted that this topic will be discussed again but that colleges choose different web platforms and software and are therefore responsible for its content.

Adjourned at 4:20.

Future Items

- Update on Mobile Device Management Policies
- Demonstrations at each meeting (suggested by Sue Lorimer)
- Discussion on Goals (BHAGs - suggested by Markus Geissler)

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 31, 2016 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the LRCCD Main Conference Room.