

Educational Technology Committee

February 22, 2024 (approved)

Name	Location	PR/EX	Name	Location	PR/EX
Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	x	Morgan Murphy (Co-Chair)	DAS	x
Pamela Bimbi	ARC-DE		Shar McCarrol	ARC	x
Alice Dieli	ARC	x	Lori Hokerson	ARC	x
BJ Snowden	ARC-Adm		Jena Trench	CRC	x
TBA	CRC		Steve McDowell	CRC	
Gregory Beyrer	CRC-DE	x	Tyler Rollins	CRC-Adm	x
Rebecca Mendell	FLC	x	Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	
TBA	FLC-DE		Angela Prelip	FLC	x
Matt Wright	FLC-Adm		Deborah Saks	SCC-Adm	x
Charles Whipple	SCC		Kandace Knudson (Alt.)/IAC	SCC	x
Norman Lorenz	SCC	x	Brian Pogue	SCC-DE	x
Tak Auyeung	LRCFT		Patrick Crandley	SCC	x
Karen ???	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 at 3:00p

Approval of Agenda and January Notes:

The agenda for the day and notes from the January meeting were approved.

It was noted that the faculty co-chair was able to get “Impact” on the DAS agenda, it was approved, and it’s moving forward. LMS Coordinators will meet with the vendor in March to discuss implementation. It will be tested before final implementation, and messaging will be developed to inform faculty.

Discussion Items:

- Proctoring Product Search - DAS requested information on the usage statistics for Canvas, what browsers people are using, etc., so they can make an informed decision. They also wanted to know when the final date would be (July 1st is the renewal date for our current product). It would be good to forward 2-3 options to DAS with LMS’s recommendation. Fall, not summer, would be best for implementation so that faculty don’t have to duplicate work already in process for summer courses. Some were in favor of moving quickly to get the new product (if that’s what DAS decides) in place for Summer to avoid faculty duplication of work. Also, another option could be to remove Proctorio at the end of Spring, have no proctoring available during the summer, and start a new product for the fall. DOIT will see if is possible to go month-to-month or get a 6-month lease with Proctorio as options. A half year contract could bridge the time and allow for implementation in the Spring. If that’s not available, then keeping it another year is an option. If DAS doesn’t decide, then we continue status quo. April 16th DAS

meeting is target date to give them info on whether we keep Proctorio or go with another product. The faculty co-chair asked the group to review the options/vendors to obtain top 2 or 3 products for our next meeting in March? A Straw poll was held –

Status quo – keep Proctorio with current limitations (3)

Respondus Monitor (includes camera)

Ujua (4)

Honor Lock (2)

Get Rid of proctoring entirely. (6)

Respondus lockdown browser only (3) to honor students request to not have intrusive cameras in their living/work/studying spaces. It was noted that if all things are locked down in Proctorio, then it's the same thing as this product but Respondus is cheaper. It was noted we used Respondus in the past and it was problematic for students.

Next steps could be demos. DOIT will work with Ed Tech Committee members and DAS to develop screening criteria and to schedule vendor demos and invite DAS to the demos. Suggestion to include information on the decision-making process in the recommendation that we will make to DAS (related to why we want to replace current vendor in the first place, proctoring is an inequitable process, and Ed Tech's past efforts in this area.). Ease of use for students needs to be considered and we don't want to replace one product with another product that's similar to what we have now and have to go through this process again. The desire to include student input was noted. DAS is the group that will make the final decision and have tasked Ed Tech will narrowing down the vendor options. It was noted that DESCC committee might have some input into this decision, but Ed Tech's recommendation goes to DAS.

- LMS Coordinator Statement of Advocacy – determine who is responsible and who plays a role in determining new technology decisions. Discussion of this began in 2017 but hasn't been officially codified. The desire is to clarify where the decision-making process belongs. It was noted that 10+ one is different than contractual implications or workload implications. Those are separate conversations between the District and LRCFT. The LMS group and Ed Tech are heavily faculty weighted and faculty input is included in any recommendations made to DAS and other constituents. Should this be codified in a formal letter of recommendation or memo of understanding to DAS or to board regulations or a combination? A draft of a Statement of Advocacy to the senate could be shared at the next Ed Tech meeting.

Informational Updates

- DOIT/LMS - Automated Major Change Form was launched. Progress made on the ability of students to pay their fines online through Eservices.
- IAC (Instructional Accessibility Committee) – brief updates provided.
- Library – new library representative was introduced. Updated provided.
- College LMS - Colleges provided updates from their campuses.
- UDA Coordinators – updates were provided

Future Agenda Items:

Adjourn 4:20p