

**Educational Technology Committee  
February 27, 2020  
Notes (approved 4/23/20)**

Name	Location	PR/EX	Name	Location	PR/EX
Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	PR	Alice Dieli (Co-Chair)	DAS	PR
Pamela Bimbi	ARC-DE	PR	TBD-ARC Faculty	ARC	
TDB – ARC Faculty	ARC		TBD-ARC Faculty	ARC	
Adam Karp	ARC-Adm	PR	TBD-ARC Faculty	ARC	
Kristen Borth	CRC		Jena Trench	CRC	PR
Patrick Crandley	CRC-DE	PR	Paolo Soriano	CRC	
TBD-CRC faculty	CRC		Stephen McGloughlin	CRC-Adm	
Zack Dowell	FLC/LRCFT	PR	Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	PR
Caleb Fowler	FLC	PR	Angela Prelip	FLC	PR
TBD-FLC DE	FLC		Matt Wright	FLC-Adm	PR
TBD-SCC faculty	SCC		Kandace Knudson	SCC	PR
P.J. Harris Jenkinson	SCC	PR	Brian Pogue	SCC	PR
Sheley Little	SCC	PR	Kirk Sosa	SCC-Adm	
Tamara Armstrong	DOIT		Mike Day	DOIT	PR
Tammy Montgomery	DO-Amin - NV		Nancy Wallace	Librarian	PR
Marsha Reske	ARC-NV	PR	Guest: Julie Oliver	DAS	PR

**\*NV indicates non voting member**

**Welcome**

The meeting was called to order at 3:04pm by the co-chairs.

**Approval of Notes from January and the Agenda**

The notes from the January meeting and the agenda for today’s meeting were approved by consensus.

**Discussion Items**

**Ally Statement of Support**

It was noted that at the last meeting the committee agreed to draft language for the Educational Technology Committee’s statement of support for Ally. This statement was presented to District Academic Senate at first reading at the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and they agreed with the statement and our assumptions. Academic Senate meets on March 3<sup>rd</sup>

where the statement will be read for a second time and approval is expected. If it is approved, then it is anticipated the feature will be implemented for Summer 2020/Fall 2020 after a communication is sent out to everyone about the features of Ally and informing them that it cannot/will not be used for evaluation purposes. It was noted that an MOU may be needed with the LRCFT to document further that ALLY will not be used for evaluations and that it's not a workload issue because no additional work is required of the faculty to turn on the feature nor is remediation being requested to make documents accessible. Since turning on ALLY is an academic and professional matter, the District Academic Senate's recommendation is enough to go forward. This item could be a SUJIC discussion in the future if LRCFT doesn't agree. Course level reports indicating how many documents need remediation will not be generated/requested even though they might give us a good idea of the scope of the need. It was noted that this is not a tool for 508 compliance.

### **Membership**

It was noted that the changes to the Board Regulation 3412 related to the membership of the Educational Technology Committee was approved at the last Chancellor's Cabinet meeting. The new membership is approved effective February 24. It was noted that the term of the chair is not determined. The section of the regulation edited for the new membership is as follows:

### **Committee Composition:**

- 2.1.1.1.1 The Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology is appointed by the Chancellor and serves as committee co-chair;
- 2.1.1.1.2 One (1) District Academic Senate representative appointed by the District Academic Senate President and serves as committee co-chair;
- ~~2.1.1.1.3 Four (4) College technology committee chairs or their designees, one (1) from each College;~~
- 2.1.1.1.4 ~~Eight (8)~~ **Twelve (12)** at-large faculty members, ~~two (2)~~ **three (3)** from each College, appointed by the District Academic Senate President;
- 2.1.1.1.5 Four (4) instructional development/distance education coordinators, one (1) from each College appointed by the District Academic Senate President;
- 2.1.1.1.6 Four (4) College administrators, one (1) from each College, appointed by the College President;
- 2.1.1.1.7 One (1) ~~College IT representative~~ **Librarian**, appointed by the Colleges in two-year rotation cycle (ARC, CRC, FLC, SCC); and

2.1.1.1.8 Two (2) District IT representatives, appointed by the Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology.

2.1.1.1.9 One (1) representative appointed by the Los Rios College Federation of Teachers.

2.1.1.2 Procedures for Reporting to the Representative Constituency Groups: Committee members are responsible for providing regular committee updates to their constituency groups and to soliciting input for use by the Educational Technology Committee as requested by the committee co-chairs. The co-chairs will post electronic committee notes or minutes on a regular basis.

### **District Online Education Project**

It was noted that the college presidents and academic senate leadership continue to meet to discuss Los Rios' future in the area of online education. They have two meetings scheduled for March and are working cooperatively toward a point where a call for membership on two workgroups will be made: Accessibility Implementation Committee and Online Coordinating Committee. It was suggested that members of Ed Tech consider joining these two workgroups when they are formed.

### **New Items**

#### **Proposed District Accessibility Implementation Committee (DAIC)**

A draft including background and need for the group, the proposed purpose and scope of the committee, and proposed membership was presented. This was shared with local senates and the district. Feedback to the document was requested to be submitted to individual campus academic senates. This will be a DAS workgroup; not an Educational Technology Committee workgroup. This document was read at first reading at DAS, and will be at second reading next week. It is hoped that the new workgroups will be formed at the end of March/beginning of April.

It was noted that a DE Workgroup and a Workload Workgroup were formed during this round of LRCFT Negotiations and the topic of accessibility comes up often. Would this group make recommendation about the implementation of the accessibility program plan that the DAIC comes up with? It was noted that we can still generate a MOU about accessibility with LRCFT after negotiations are completed and that the LRCFT will hold two seats on the proposed DAIC.

A question about the equality of the support given DSPS students in on ground versus online courses was posed. This needs to be on the DAIC's radar. Who is responsible to ensure equality when it comes to DSPS services and other services? Where do the requirements for 508 stop and 504 begin in an online environment? It was noted that the proposed membership to DAIC includes two representatives from DSPS.

Continuing technological issues of Canvas were raised. Examples of the issues should be brought forward to LMS coordinators so they can be addressed quickly. Issues with Grades/Uploading files were noted.

### **Online Training for Adjuncts**

It was noted that faculty are not required in the LRCFT contract to participate in any training before teaching online although it's mutual agreement with area dean as to who teaches online. We are not consistent across the district with regard to training: SCC and ARC have some requirements (best practices) and FLC and CRC have no training requirement before being able to teach online. There is an interest in having a consistent standard across the district and a minimum requirement that faculty have some requirement to demonstrate proficiency in teaching online. Training for adjunct faculty could be an impediment to them teaching in any given semester, especially if they have achieved preference and are offered an online class for which they are not prepared. This makes training for adjunct almost required and so the question of compensation should be considered. An agreement about who gets to teach online across the district should be reached along with minimum standards or SLOs that must be met before teaching online perhaps based on a minimum number of training hours (through @One or the Online Teaching Institute). This could apply to any faculty who is new to online teaching (including new and existing faculty who haven't taught online).

Title 5 requires that faculty who teach online should have some training but defers to collective bargaining agreements. An ASCCC paper also supports training as a Best practice. However, LRCFT contract currently does not require any training; so no training can be required. The DE Workgroup mentioned earlier is in support of online faculty having some kind of training but would want compensation for faculty undergoing training. How much training would be required to meet a minimal standard? Current focus could be on adjunct who don't have flex time to use to get training. It was noted that An OEI resource page lists resources including several courses they recommend faculty take before teaching online. There are several courses and a minimum might be @Ones's online teaching course that is 40 hours.

The current requirements for faculty to teach online at each campus was requested to be sent to the co-chairs. It was noted that SCC has an academic senate resolution/guidelines that they request deans to follow regarding who is allowed to teach online. CRC also has a senate recommendation and each college has some guidelines regarding online teaching. These documents could become the basis for Minimum Qualifications to teach online in the district. It was noted that Emergency Hires will continue to be challenging as well as the requirement that adjunct who have preference MUST be offered an assignment. It was noted there might be a resource that contains this information along with compensation models and it will be forwarded to the co-chairs. It was noted that if training is required, then it needs to be offered/be available and this could result in a need for more resources.

### **Educational Media Design Specialist**

Funding was granted to hire one Educational Media Design Specialist to be housed at ARC, but will serve all campuses. This position and any future Specialists who are hired will also assist with accessibility as the job position has been revised to include knowledge of accessibility and 508 issues. How the workload of this person will be prioritized is still to be determined and this position won't be able to handle all the accessibility projects we have as a district. The model at ARC of an online course designer who has five assistants who are doing the grunt work closely supervised by the course designers could be used for this position as well.

### **Informational Updates**

- IT/LMS – access to the CVC-OEI will be enabled this weekend with a soft rollout. The gender pronoun implications that were discussed at a previous meeting are being researched. “Similarity” is being researched to replace the anti-plagiarism tool. There are over 4000 courses that have at least a shell in Canvas.
- ODCD/Fast Track - there are 9 mentors who are working with 130 faculty. They hope to have 50 courses aligned with the rubric by June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- Library – Alma system has been fully integrated with Peoplesoft, but students can't yet pay online with their debit/credit cards. This will be resolved in June/July. SpringShare, the global chat, will go live tomorrow and there will be 24/7 help available to students.
- SCC – funds to caption videos have been exhausted and additional vendors/options are being sought. At least 85% of faculty have published at least one Canvas shell and DE retention is a just slightly lower than on ground with almost the same success rate.
- FLC – they are in the process of hiring an Instructional Design Coordinator
- CRC – there will be a DE Summit on May 1<sup>st</sup>. They are in full swing with the Online Accessibility Institute.
- ARC – they will hold an OTI this summer. Playposit, a free video interaction in Canvas is going to be piloted.

### **Future Agenda Items**

Adjourned at 4:25p.