

Educational Technology Committee

November 15, 2022

Name	Location	PR/ EX	Name	Location	PR/ EX
Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	EX	Morgan Murphy (Co-Chair)	DAS	x
Pamela Bimbi	ARC-DE	x	Shar McCarrol	ARC	
Alice Dieli	ARC	x	Lori Beccerelli	ARC	
BJ Snowden	ARC-Adm	x	Jena Trench	CRC	
Markus Geissler	CRC		Steve McDowell	CRC	x
Gregory Beyrer	CRC-DE	x	Tyler Rollins	CRC-Adm	x
Rebecca Mendell	FLC		Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	
TBA	FLC-DE		Angela Prelip	FLC	
Matt Wright	FLC-Adm		Deborah Saks	SCC-Adm	x
Charles Whipple	SCC		Kandace Knudson (Alt.)/DAPIC	SCC	x
Norman Lorenz	SCC		Brian Pogue	SCC-DE	x
Tak Auyeung	LRCFT		Patrick Crandley	SCC	x
Kate Williamson	Librarian		Manveer Bola	DO-AVCIT	x
Tammy Montgomery	DO-AVCI	X	Guest: Kevin Wong	DOIT	x

Welcome & Announcements

The zoom meeting was called to order by the faculty co-chair at 3:00p.

Approval of Notes from October and the Agenda

The agenda for today's meeting was approved and the notes from the October meeting were approved.

Discussion Items

- **Title 5** It was noted that Title 5 changes related to distance education were finally approved by the Secretary of State and could be considered mostly minor because they are copying the language from the Department of Ed's federal regulations related to regular and substantive interaction instead of regular effective contact and the next level is the expectation that there is regular and substantive interaction (RSI) between students that is now in the regulations listed as: "if designated in the course outline of record." Prior to this change, Ed Code stated that there must be RSI among students in every online class and/or in the online portion of every hybrid course. Curriculum committees are in the process of determine the changes that need to be made to CORs. In addition, how the course is being made accessible is now part of the COR requirements and it could be noted in the COR that DSPS would be providing support for students with disabilities in order to meet that requirement which may offer some flexibility in how those regulations are enforced. Also, the class schedule must show the location and time of every on-campus meeting scheduled and any synchronous meetings. Finally, the definition of accessibility changed to indicate that every student can achieve the outcomes of the course without citing the actual laws where it's required under 504/508.

Documents were shared showing the definition of accessible in 55200 and 55204,206 and 208, and then 55005, which is the piece about the information required in the schedule of classes. In terms of accessibility, it was suggested that we check with General Counsel how to best adapt the policy before we ask SAG (Socrates Advisory Group) to make their changes to ensure they are meaningful changes (not just legally mandated changes) that actually translate to providing an accessible environment. It was noted that the preference of the SAG is that we make everything boiler plate to make sure that we're meeting legal obligations, but it may not result in meaningful change. It was noted we might want to pay close attention to the changes to 55005 (related to the listing of the synchronous online class times) and how that information is going to be the actionable and consistent across the district. It will take work among curriculum committees, VPIs, DOIT, PIOs and the co-chairs of this committee. The definition of academic engagement should also be reviewed in terms of how we define for online classes what student engagement really is; it's not just being present for something it is actual engagement. Another complicating factor is that often the developer of the curriculum is not the only one teaching the class so boilerplate language that captures how multiple people might approach a course would be helpful as long as it's meaningful, especially when it comes to accessibility issues. How do we balance the boilerplate language that must be in Socrates with faculty individual freedom to help students achieve the individual course learning outcomes?

Can we re-look at this boiler plate language from an accessibility standpoint, through the lens of an EEAAP or equal access plan? Can we ask disciplinary faculty who are making these decisions about a course that they're proposing or updating to do a meaningful assessment (possibly including DSPS in a conversation) of where the accessibility problems might be and how those might be addressed? Should the DE Subcommittee of Curriculum Committees include members with expertise in accessibility? A desire to hear what General Counsel has to say about the district embracing this incremental capability maturity model, to beef up accessibility support, and the extent to which we can hedge a little by stating our possible shortcomings related to accessibility but also stating that when we do have gaps, we will make sure that we access 504 related accommodations for students who need it where we fall short in the 508.

Summary: discuss with Deputy Chancellor Section 55005 related to the course schedule/Socrates elements and inquire with General Counsel how we will merge the capability maturity model with legal requirements for ADA section in the Distance Ed area. Policies and Regulations may need to be updated as well as a result of the changes to Title 5. This is a future agenda item.

- **Proctorio** – June 30th 2023 is the soonest we could end our contract for Proctorio. A document detailing each of the features available for modification was shared so that the committee could have a discussion on what features to disengage now in order make the tool less invasive and more equitable for our students. The message that will be sent out to faculty will highlight that accessibility is critical to equity for our students and the steps that are being taken to disengage features are on the path to the elimination of Proctorio as a tool supported by the district. It was noted that some

faculty will no longer have a use for Proctorio once certain features are disengaged (such as room scanning, locking web browsing during testing periods, etc). Defining what authentic assessment is and providing training to faculty will be key.

It was noted that asking faculty who use Proctorio about their reasons for using it might be wise as well as asking DSPS which features are the most problematic. Academic Senates have discussed this so most faculty should be aware, but checking with DAS to see if they are any unknown issues. An attempt will be made to get a statement out to faculty by the end of the semester about the disengagement of features and ending of Proctorio by June 20, 2023.

- **Foundations 2.0 FAQ/Compensation Site** - work on a cohesive website similar to the page dedicated to Foundations of Canvas is in the works to inform faculty about the course, registration, course availability, and compensation options. The AVCI noted that she and the DE coordinators have met and will be generating a list of across the board outcomes and a list of alternative options (within the district and through @ONE) for those faculty who may have already taken an OTI in the district. It was noted that faculty will be paid for 40 hours of training by the district, and that extra sections of the Level I training (Foundations of Canvas) have been added so that faculty can take advantage of both levels of training and compensation. Compensation is still being negotiated for the Level II training since this adds 10 hours to the original MOU. The AVCI will be sending out the revised MOU before the semester ends. One committee member noted that the State Chancellor has worked out an agreement with ACUE (American Council of University Educators), which offers courses for online teachers similar to those offered by @ONE, to allow anyone in the system to take their courses for free next semester. This might be an option we want to offer to our faculty. Another member noted that the ACUE courses should be reviewed before offering it as their modeling is not that great, they have inaccessible documentation, and no required RSI. IT was noted that due to the goal of trying to get something set before the end of the semester, adding the ACUE courses may not be feasible.

Informational Updates

- IT/LMS – the Canvas Usage Data Report was shared. These reports will be shared 2x per semester or as requested. Suggestions for changes to the data presented were made.
- AVCI – no report
- DAPIC/IAC – a report that was presented to Academic Senate was shared in chat.
- CVC-OEI FastTrack – The OCDCs met with the AVCI and determined that a more assertive approach with the faculty who are in the queue should be taken so that their courses will not languish and be completed before the end of May when the OCDC positions will sunset. Should a POQR program be absorbed into the local colleges? No source of funds has been determined for continuing this work. A question was asked about the data for student success in courses where the instructor has gone through the

POCR process and if there was greater success than students in courses that did not go through the POCR process. It was noted that completing the OTI (now the Level II training) will help faculty more easily align their courses. It was noted that some data doesn't show a correlation/any improvement, but the sample set was very small. Data can be shared at the January meeting.

- Library – no report
- College/LMS/DE – all are preparing for Spring offerings

Future Agenda item:

Title 5 Changes/DE Regulations – report on conversations with Jamey/Jake

POCR continuation at college-level/ CVC-OEI data sharing

Adjourned @ 4:32p