

## Educational Technology Committee

March 22, 2018

### Notes (approved 4/26/17)

Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	PR	Alice Dieli (Co-Chair)	ARC	PR
TBD	CRC		Zack Dowell	FLC	
Marsha Reske	ARC	PR	Kandace Knudson	SCC	PR
Grace Austin	SCC	PR	Gregory Beyrer	CRC	EX
Jena Trench	CRC	PR	Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	
Caleb Fowler	FLC		Sheley Little	SCC	
Patricia Harris Jenkinson	SCC	PR	Kirk Sosa	SCC	PR
Adam Karp	ARC	EX	Stephen McGloughlin	CRC	
Matt Wright	FLC	EX	Jeff Lewis	FLC	PR
Jonathan Santos	ARC	PR	Tom Danford, Interim CIO	DO	PR
Brian Pogue	SCC	PR	Daniel Gilbert-Valencia	ARC	
Pamela Bimbi	ARC	PR	Mike Day	DO	PR
Guest: Josh Hall	CRC		Guest: Emmie Oesterman	CRC	EX
Guest: Andy Divanyan	SCC	EX	Guest: Tim Hixon	CRC	PR

### Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:06p by Co-chair Alice Dieli and Jamey Nye, co-chairs. Introductions were made.

### Approval of Notes from February 2018 and the Agenda

The draft notes of the February meeting were approved by consensus. The agenda for today's meeting was approved by consensus.

### Campus IT Updates

- ARC – Jon reported on the IT updates occurring at ARC. They are working with FLC and the DO on their new website and hope to launch next year.
- CRC – Stephen noted that they received \$2million in requests in instructional technology funding. They work with CIPS (College Integrated Planning System) – an online system to submit requests, review, rank and approve requests for technology. There will be Canvas training during the summer. Tim noted that the ISO committee has approved the use of Citrix to offer additional resources to their distance education students.
- FLC – none
- SCC – Kirk noted that they are trying to bridge the gap for students to access the internet and are working with Tom Danford and the IT Deans to make it a district-wide project. Will do something similar to CRC's use of Citrix.
- DO IT – Tom noted that 125 people are now in the Office 365 pilot. He noted that a recommendation will be forthcoming on the Active Directory Assessment, but he doesn't expect any large issues. He noted that they are reviewing with Kirk at SCC Tmobile's program, which currently is offered to K-12 students to bridge the technology gap while students are enrolled in school by offering them a free device and a low monthly service cost. It was noted that College Buys has a similar program, but the device must be purchased and is often on back order. The device can be tethered to a computer to provide wifi for a desktop and/or laptop computer. The College Buys offer is open to staff, faculty and students, but many may not be aware of the program and possibly linking it our

Los Rios website might make students less wary of the program and informing them that the lower costs applies only while they are students.

### **College LMS/DE Update/OEI Course Exchange Application**

- ARC – Pam noted that they submitted their OEI application on March 5<sup>th</sup>. She's unsure of the timeline of when they might hear back. Jamey asked about the timeline and asked when we anticipate being able to offer our first courses. It was noted that the courses would still need to get approved and that our students cannot enroll in any OEI courses until their campus is admitted to the OEI. Mike noted that the development on the Peoplesoft side to support the OEI is lagging. Kandace noted that they are building the process as they go and 46 campuses applied for admittance during this round. Pam noted that about 30 percent of the traffic to ARC's website is from mobile devices. Marsha noted they have invited Angela Prelip to their campus on April 20<sup>th</sup> to discuss her 100% online speech course which she has been offering for the past four semesters. Angela will also speak at the Online Teaching Conference.
- CRC – Jena noted that their application has been submitted. They are working on getting a test proctoring center at CRC for CRC's students as well as students in the OEI.
- FLC – none
- SCC – none
- DO – Mike reviewed his LMS Update (see attached) and noted that there are about 3591 classes being taught online/hybrid & web-enhanced; 55346 students (duplicated count) are using Canvas, and 1771 faculty are involved. Mike will try to provide unduplicated counts at the next meeting. On April 3<sup>rd</sup> there will be a kickoff conference call about ARC, the video conferencing communication tool. Bridge, a PD tool that can be used to offer and track PD, is being piloted at SCC. Ally, a district-wide accessibility tool purchase has been approved and we'll need to offer training. Alice noted the training is very important and Tim noted that training of future employees is also needed. The pilot faculty training software is still being piloted, but has shown as much as a 71% response. Mike would prefer that the campuses to be responsible for managing this process, including the timing during a semester in which the evaluations are administered. Mike noted that Ken and Rawan do the training at the DO, but future trainings could be recorded and viewed by new employees.

### **Accessibility Task Force Update**

Tom noted the kickoff was in December and the most recent meeting was held on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Campusworks has been reviewing our websites and presented some of their findings at the last meeting which indicated we have a lot of exposure. There was disagreement amongst the webmasters as to the validity of the findings. He noted that there are trolls who are looking to find accessibility violations to enable a lawsuit and they are using the same tools the consultants use to discover areas of weakness. He noted we are lagging a bit due to difficulty gaining access to faculty course set ups in Canvas. JP is still working with the faculty union to allow access. Jamey noted that the consultants need to be able to see a student view of what is currently published but they also want to see everything that has already been published, but not items that are planned to be published in the future. Things that have been published have the possibility of being inaccessible, but future items could be modified to make them accessible. Student view would only provide access to things currently published. Giving the consultants instructor access poses a problem in that they could make changes to a course inadvertently, which has happened during accreditation visits when the team members are given access to instructor's courses. Jena noted that there is an observer mode, but it only works when you're following a student through a class. Alice noted

that the union should be part of this discussion, and Jamey noted they are discussing it with the union. Jamey noted that the information gained by the consultants about possible weaknesses will not be used in any punitive manner. However, due to the audit regarding regular effective contact which many felt resulted in an inaccurate picture, many are wary of this review. It was noted that the student view should give enough data to tell the status of our vulnerability, but the consultants are requesting deeper access. Marsha noted that Ally should be able to produce a really accurate and automated institutional report of our accessibility. Marsha noted that Ally will give us a rating score, but it won't indicate specific courses. Do we need that level of specificity? The LMS coordinators are already aware of how we are performing, but using Ally would produce an actual report. Jamey asked Tom to see whether the consultants could use the data from Ally rather than viewing each course through instructor mode. Tom reminded the committee that during the recent audit, we responded that we would have outside consultants review our courses and if we don't do that we might be in violation. Kandace asked if our response could be that we are purchasing and implementing the use of Ally. Jamey noted that for auditor purposes we have to be able to prove that we've done a self-assessment and who or how it's done is irrelevant. However, once we get the results, we will need to respond to the deficiencies. Jena and Kandace noted that training on mitigating deficiencies in regular effective contact and accessibility are equally challenging. Kandace asked if the consultants could work with the LMS Coordinators to find the least invasive way to obtain the information needed and Jamey will ask the General Counsel to review the language in the consultant's contract and the language we have with the auditor. Marsha, who was involved in the audit and the district's response, noted that the district didn't get a specific edict to review instructional materials, but ARC did. We were only tasked with reviewing our websites. So, she didn't feel like going into individual courses is at all necessary in response to the audit or recommendations. For ARC, business processes need to be improved as well as evaluating their instructional materials, but not at the district-level. It may be part of the accessibility task force, but not as responding to one of the recommendations. Tom noted it's not an audit (which looks for wrong doing); it's an assessment (when you look to see what's wrong). He noted that the work plan for the consultants included making training videos for faculty to help make their materials accessible. His understanding was they wanted to review the instructional material to determine the top issues regarding accessibility and ensure that the training materials focused on those items. The consultants are not doing an audit; they are trying to assess. Tom noted that JP's position on this is that we are doing it because it's the right thing to do; not to just comply with auditors. Jamey noted that we are also open to lawsuits right now, as well. The Ally product will inform the instructor of where they have weaknesses and how to fix them. Tom noted that he could ask JP if he would be ok with web and ERP being reviewed by the consultants and ALLY being used to assess instructional content.

Kandace asked what we will do with the instructors who discover that they are not in compliance. Do we give the instructor resources? Tom noted the original plan was to have training materials and have training sessions. Training is good, but requires a significant amount of time to even convert documents to accessible documents. Tom noted we have to show a good faith effort, but don't have to remedy it within 24 hours. Jamey noted that we will give them the time to remedy it, but it's a union conversation because it may involve the evaluation process. However, the goal is not to penalize the faculty member, but to offer them support and try to make it as accessible as possible. Jena noted it would be difficult to get feedback from other online instructors during an evaluation process. There's nothing in place in the contract that states that DE instructors are evaluated by those with DE experience. Jamey noted that the evaluation process won't be the only avenue to acquire feedback. If we have a tool that is identifying courses that are not in compliance in an automated way and contact the instructor to let them know there is an issue, that's another avenue and we would hope the instructor would take action. It's a complex conversation because

sometimes online courses are part of a faculty's overload and they are not regularly evaluated. Kandace noted that faculty should be held accountable, but this is a "heavy lift" and they need resources to help all faculty with accessibility. Alice noted that training/support could be built into the technology assessment taskforce plan. Jamey agreed. PJ noted that in a face to face class, things need to be accessible as well, but the district/college provides assistance for that. That doesn't happen with online teaching where the faculty must ensure accessibility - accommodation versus access. DSPS role and support levels were questioned and it was noted that they serve individual students and the student's individual needs. The committee felt that Ally would provide the means for both assessing the current state of our courses and supplying training materials to remedy any issues. It could be deployed by instructors without invasion from outside auditors – a remedy to the sensitivity still being felt after the accreditation "audit".

#### **Faculty DE Workgroup Update**

Pam noted they are designing the student survey and the ARC research office will review the questions to ensure we get the responses we need. Jamey and Alice suggested taking the survey through the District Research Council so that other campuses could use the same questions and the responses will be more uniform.

#### **Future Items**

Continuing support through the summer (Mike)  
Ad Astra Update  
AB705 funding Formulas

Adjourned at 4:35.

Next Meeting - The next meeting is scheduled for April 26<sup>th</sup>

**Learning Management Update  
Education Technology Committee Meeting  
March 22, 2018**

**1. Canvas Update**

- Canvas Counts for Spring '18 (as of 3/21/18)

	<u>Courses</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
ARC	1,390	694	20,277
CRC	806	334	11,734
FLC	520	245	7,164
SCC	<u>1,167</u>	<u>498</u>	<u>16,171</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,591**</b>	<b>1,771</b>	<b>55,346*</b>

*\*Total Students is the duplicated count*

*\*\*Courses with multiple sections count as 1 course*

- New External Apps or LTI Requests for Canvas ([www.losrios.edu/lrc/lti\\_request.php](http://www.losrios.edu/lrc/lti_request.php))
  - Status of latest faculty requests:
    - InQuisitive (W.W. Norton) – **In Review** (waiting on FERPA Compliance)
    - WebCOM (Great River Learning) – **In Review** (waiting on FERPA Compliance)
    - Top Hat – **In Review**
  
- Status of Requests for Other New/Added Canvas Functionality
  - ARC
    - Communication tool that allows instructors and students to actively post and collaborate through video and audio media; Agreement executed for districtwide use and PO has been issued; Project kickoff meeting scheduled for April 3rd.
  - Bridge
    - Professional Development and Project Management Software/Functionality; SCC pilot has been initiated.
    - Interest and use by other Colleges TBD.
  - Hosted Canvas Data
    - Service from Canvas that provides admins with optimized access to their data for reporting and queries; Currently evaluating demand, requirements, functionality and cost.
  - Ally
    - Recommend LMS Accessibility Checking Software; Agreement for districtwide use and PO are in process.
  
- Faculty and Staff Training and Support
  - Colleges continue to offer hands-on and online training through ITCs, DE/ LMS Coordinators, etc.; Recommendation from LMS Coordinators to continue allocation of funds from District designated for Summer '18 Canvas support at the Colleges.
  
- Faculty/Course Evaluations in Canvas (EvaluationKIT)
  - Successful completion of Pilot for Fall and decisions to continue for Spring ; Communication and training on tool was provided, with full DO-IT support available.; HR Webpage has been updated with Instructions and link to Request Form

- Statistics so far:
  - 1st 8wk courses: 9 have been completed, with 71% response rate.
  - 2nd 8wk courses: 5 have been completed, with 62% response rate.
  - Full Term courses: 55 are scheduled

- Student Orientation in Canvas
  - Successfully converted and rolled out on January 10, 2018
  - New (term activated) students are loaded into Canvas every 2 hours, shortly after student applications are uploaded and processed in PeopleSoft.

▪ Canvas 24/7 Helpdesk Statistics for Spring '18 (as of 3/21/18)

Email	20
Online Submission	449
Phone Calls	<u>1,589</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,058</b>

