

Educational Technology Committee

January 28, 2016

Notes (approved 2/25/16)

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

Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:03. Sue Lorimer welcomed members and reminded them that there currently isn't a co-chair for this committee. She is awaiting an appointment of a co-chair by the District Academic Senate and asked faculty members to bring back any concerns to Ginni May, District Academic Senate president. Introductions were made. A request to add to the agenda a report out from LMS Coordinators was received and approved. **NOTE: Kandace Knudson was selected to co-chair this committee following this meeting.**

Approval of Notes from November 19, 2015

The draft notes of the November 19, 2015 meeting were approved by consensus.

Informational Updates

College Technology Committees

- ARC: Jonathan Santos reported that they are moving on the website overhaul. They are looking for a vendor to help with this. He also noted that the wireless integrated access points are going well.
- CRC: Stephen noted that they have not met this year yet. CRC is researching virtual desktops along with the Chromebooks usage to increase the usability. It is an inexpensive way (under \$200 each) to outfit a lab.
- FLC: Gary discussed the Netlabs grant for \$.5 million and noted they are accepting requests for the use of that technology now. The grant began in March of last year; they are the host of the hardware for the grant. Caleb also noted that their Cyberleague Team received 1st place in a recent online cyber security tournament.
- SCC: Elaine noted that the campus is pretty quiet. They are doing their Unit Plan analysis and a lot of the discussion has focused on the LMS analysis.

- District IT: Doug noted that the DOIT and ARC are in the beginning stages of installing ARC's new wireless infrastructure and replacement of network technology. The district connectivity will go from 2 G to 10G and there will be a CENIC meeting tomorrow regarding expanding each college to 10G. There will be district-wide participation in creating a new district Technology Plan.
- LMS Coordinators:
 - District – Steve reviewed his handout covering D2L topics including Volume updates and improvements scheduled in the near future. The next maintenance is scheduled for June 2nd and then again on August 10th. He noted that there are 158 faculty in the sandbox testing out Canvas. Half of them have done the orientation course. Four faculty have actually done work in converting their courses. No concerns were voiced about the D2L update dates.
 - ARC – Marsha noted that they will hold an online institute – two sections – a hybrid and a fully online section. Both sections are full and only D2L will be taught. There will be a combination of participants – those who are new to D2L and experienced users. ARC is in the process of hiring a DE Dean.

Marsha noted that they had Gaier Dietrich provide an all-day accessibility workshop to assist faculty and encouraged others to take advantage of this free training. Currently, ARC doesn't have anyone to assist faculty with accessibility issues; she noted that DSPS is on campus to assist students not faculty. They will push for a faculty or staff position related to accessibility, but there isn't a classification in the classified job descriptions for an accessibility expert related to instruction. Jena noted there is a lot of interest in a position like this at CRC and wondered if there is any federal or state funding for this because of the mandate. Elaine discussed some of the history of the Educational Media Design Specialist, a position that was originally generated to help faculty with web design; it has morphed into a student support only in alternate media. However the funding ended. Alice noted that we need a focused job description because none of us are experts and it is a failing. Kandace noted that they tried to develop a job description for a similar position but did not yet find a similar one for comparison; SCC is also interested in having such a position.

- FLC – no report.
- CRC – Stephen – LMS Coordinator Update – Greg is on sabbatical, and he was working with two adjuncts who accepted full-time job offers elsewhere. He's not sure if there is enough time to advertise and hire and LTT for this position, so it may go unfilled. He noted that Markus is serving as chair of the DEIT committee and Mike Bittner is also picking up some of the tasks.
- SCC – Kandace noted that now they have filled their positions and they are restructuring their web pages to better meet faculty and student needs. They will hold an Intro to Online Teaching Institute in April and an advanced online Summer Institute in May. They are still testing the Canvas site.

Kandace noted that the ACCJC report on substantive changes is taking lots of time. Sue asked if it was because of the 50% mark DE for the programs. Kandace noted that they want to be sure that what's approved is what's offered and that it is marketed to students appropriately. Elaine questioned a possible ACCJC requirement that we account for what's offered instead of what's approved. Sue said this would be a logical next step. Elaine noted they don't pencil out: a program can be considered mostly online because all the GE courses could be online, but not any courses in the major. Kandace noted ACCJC is requesting in their report just courses that are being offered 100% online. A course may be approved at up to 100% but is only being taught at 70%. PJ noted that what one considers online might be different at another institution; instruction excludes testing and orientation. Sue agreed that it's messy because of all the different requirements. PJ wondered why we encourage faculty to input that a class can be taught up to 100% online when it may never be taught online. Sue noted that the District realizes this is a challenge for how colleges balance competing student/faculty interest for hybrid courses. Information is not well delineated in the class schedule for students to understand what type of course they are taking and what the requirements are. Faculty must decide how they want to teach their courses, but communicating that to students is a shared responsibility. Kandace asked what channels do we use to make this better. Sue suggested the Curriculum Committee have discussions within departments about the needs. Sue noted that we have a pattern in the district of stand-alone decisions about how a class is offered and that may need to change to meet student needs and to offer clear pathways in an increasingly competitive online education field; the OEI is both an opportunity and competition for us. Elaine agreed that we view it as a faculty or department decision. She noted that students almost always have to take a GE pattern that is outside their area of interest and we have entire departments that do not choose to offer online sections. We need to look programmatically, which forces a college-wide discussion which is lacking. She agreed that we are much too siloed to deal with this programmatically. Sue suggested the Academic Senate/DE Coordinators and Department Chairs hold a discussion on this and develop a task force.

Kandace noted that open classes are available and that we still use HTML coding in the schedule. Students must know the scheduling code for distance ed delivery method (e.g. 72 or 71) in PeopleSoft in order to see if online courses are still open. Doug remembered this was part of the mobility piece discussion held earlier. Elaine remembered that during the discussion of the DE Plan, the project that was ranked #1 was pretty comprehensive and believes it addressed DE in a bundled approach including identifying courses in the catalog. Sue will work with Doug to get the status.

Adam noted that it's challenge to find online classes. We need a comprehensive Education Plan and clear pathways and information from the Research Office for students to make informed decisions and for us to assist our students. Sue noted that there are DE subcommittees on each Curriculum Committee, and there's no reason you couldn't add a question in Socrates about the intention to add the course as a part of a program. Markus noted that we should also ask the industry what they need in terms of skills lacking in our students.

P.J. noted that she teaches in the communication department, which is traditionally against holding its courses in an online format, and that getting a course from traditional format to online takes more time. She asked if we could have our job descriptions include the desired skill of being able to teach online to attract faculty willing to teach online. Sue noted that the faculty job description could contain this skill request. Elaine noted that this would change the perspective of hiring discussions if we included a DE discussion. Alice felt we were behind the curve and our strategic planning should include DE. Sue noted that looking at technology is part of the strategic plan process and that at the college level, unit plans feed justification for positions. She suggested that the forms could be modified to include a question on DE, but that would be the college's responsibility. The District's current process doesn't give authority for us to prioritize a DE position higher than another position received from the campus. Jena suggested that DE is mission critical and it's not currently recognized that way. PJ noted there has to be an incentive for faculty to create DE courses, and it's not just monetary and also that the only place she hears about a push for DE is at this meeting; not at her campus. Elaine noted that at SCC DE courses are only tried after a "traditional" course has failed to make its enrollment minimum. Once the course is offered in DE format, it fills quickly.

Sue noted that to teach in DE format or not is the choice of the faculty per the LRCFT contract. Perhaps student demand for online courses would possibly force the transition because we need to adjust to those needs and ensure that we are providing enough support to transition the courses. We also need to make sure we are able to advertise these options to our students so that there are clear pathways for students and modality of courses is included.

Elaine asked if the LMS work group is the group to get this changed. Sue noted that the LMS work group will forward a recommendation to the Academic Senate that could include moving to Canvas and participating in the OEI. The Academic Senate will make their recommendation to the Chancellor for recommendation to the Board.

Discussion Items:

- Los Rios Strategic Plan Process Update – Sue provided an update on the strategic planning process and noted that the website is up. The Chancellor's Cabinet which has representation from all constituency groups is responsible for overseeing the district's strategic plan development process; and a smaller subset forms a steering committee to fine-tune the ideas that are generated. The town hall meetings will include environmental scan information and part of the work will be to review the draft vision, mission and goals. One of the results of the SWOT analysis was our need for better technology. We also expect an ACCJC recommendation to create a District Technology Plan. A final draft District Strategic Plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees for action in May or June. She noted that the town hall participants will also work on metrics for the goals that have been developed.
- LMS Work Group Update – Sue noted that Scott Crosier is the co-chair, and at the last meeting the group was still interested in going forward and exploring adopting Canvas and becoming a member of the OEI. Whether to join Cohort #3 or #4 is still not finalized. The group will meet

again in March to finalize a recommendation that will be sent to the District Academic Senate. Sue noted that if we go forward with Canvas and the OEI, it will be a big change for us.

Discussion was held after Jena asked the best way to enroll students in the test courses –either manually or make it public, which would allow everyone to see the content. Marsha noted that you could give them a code, and that we need to make sure that the surveys we generate for students to review the course, match the actual course so it's easy for the student to take the survey. Sue reminded the committee that the goal is to have input/information from users by the end of February so that an informed decision can be made. Alice suggested that we obtain data from students who are already using the OEI. Markus asked why we are hesitating and not going immediately with Canvas, since there is already so much information from other districts on its abilities, and the benefits of joining the OEI are so clear. Sue noted that we must follow our process so that everyone has buy-in and that resistant faculty have the data and reassurance they need to see that this is a good move. Sue noted that the state will only allow us to run the two platforms simultaneously for 18 months.

- Los Rios Technology Plan Update – Sue noted that she is confident that the ACCJC will recommend that the district needs a technology plan. She and Doug noted that we have contracted with CampusWorks to conduct a district wide assessment (from March through April) and meet with people at each campus to see how satisfied they are. Doug noted that over the past year, assessments have been done on infrastructure and connectivity. The result is that we need to spend a significant amount of funds in order to achieve a higher level and that we are way overdue on a district wide technology plan.

Sue noted that because these activities need to occur to “meet the accreditation standards,” we have a short time to get it done (12-18 months). We have a lot of incentives to get moving quickly, and we need participation in the focus groups in order to be successful. Adam noted that this is a district-led effort, but it affects the colleges because it's the individual colleges that get accredited. Doug noted that there is approximately \$6 million set aside for improving our technology, but more funds could be needed. Sue noted that some of this is from bond funds, funds from an increase in our base funding which the Vice Chancellor of Finance set aside, and future funds from the colleges as the needs are determined.

Elaine noted that we need to put infrastructure and DE pieces together and keep an integrated focus. Sue and Doug are working on a proposal for how the actual planning piece will be conducted after we get the input from CampusWorks. There will be a steering committee responsible for the overall plan and smaller section/stakeholder groups. Doug noted they are trying to identify all the stakeholder groups and will take the list to the steering committee. Possible stakeholders will be instruction, infrastructure, security, etc.

Alice asked if the strategic plan group be working with CampusWorks. Sue noted that it could be part of it, especially in the area of technology. Alice noted again that DE should be a driving force. Tim noted that each campus needs to do its own assessment of instructional technology needs. Elaine suggested the possibility of giving part of the funds to each campus for them to fund their critical item related to instructional technology needs. This could be an accessibility position or release time for faculty or extra trainers. Elaine noted that in the past, the funds have been kept at DO and are allocated only toward “hard” stuff leaving the responsibility of funding instructional technology to the campus where due to competition for scarce resources, it may not get funded. She felt we should make the funding for “soft” items part of the technology plan as well.

Sue noted that (1) if you have a plan ready, then working with the existing prioritization process you can make a compelling case for it with enrollment shortage as a key interest; (2) you need to get the college leaders to see this as a very important thing which can be a difficult task; (3) without good solid pathways including online instruction for our students, she doesn't see our enrollment increasing. Elaine noted that funds and/or FTE allocated for this purpose makes the discussion easier.

Sue asked why do we think that the same classes that are cancelled due to low enrollment one semester will fill in the next semester if they are offered in the same format. Our classes should meet the students' needs and get them to completion quickly. Adam suggested that we shift our thinking from "we are replacing face-to-face with online courses" to "we are offering them as they should be in this modern technology driven age." PJ noted that we think of face-to-face as default, but that might be because we still have Socrates defaulting to face-to-face. Adam also noted questions about academic rigor and the burden to prove regular effective contact. Concerns regarding test proctoring and academic integrity (proving student identity/reducing cheating, etc.) were raised. Marsha noted that Proctoria is included as part of the OEI. Jena noted that the campuses may have testing facility limitations and asked if there will be test proctoring facilities funding available. Sue noted that test proctoring for a DE offered class might be a small issue when compared to cancelling under-enrolled on ground classes, and that funding of facilities would be a campus discussion.

Elaine noted that the CCCCO offers an incredible package and the LMS work group is looking only at a small piece so all the other support aspects of the OEI are not as well known. Sue noted that she expects to get a recommendation from the LMS work group that we adopt Canvas and become members of the OEI due to the support features mentioned so that our students receive the same level of service whether online or on ground. She noted that the LMS work group will make a recommendation after assessing the capabilities of Canvas; and the Educational Technology Committee will work on the best way to implement it.

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 meeting was adjourned at 4:47. The next meeting is scheduled for February 25, 2016 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the LRCCD Main Conference Room. **Update: The meeting will be held from 4:00-5:00 following a presentation on the OEI in the Board Room at District Office.**