Educational Technology Committee
March 31, 2016
Notes (approved 4/28/16)

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

Welcome
The meeting was called to order at 3:03 by Co-chair Kandace Knudson and introductions were made. Kandace noted that we'll be adjusting the agenda to accommodate a visit by CampusWorks team leader, Joe Traino.

Approval of Notes from February 25, 2016
The draft notes of the February 25th meeting were approved by consensus.

Discussion Items

CampusWorks College Visits
Joe Traino from CampusWorks introduced himself, and asked Sue to describe the charge of this participatory governance committee. Doug noted that Joe met with the IT Deans earlier and that the CampusWorks visit is not accreditation focused, but does have accreditation implications related to having a districtwide technology plan and assessment. We have a three-year plan, and CampusWorks will validate whether we are on the right track and give us suggestions for improvement. Joe noted that because they can look at the big picture, they can more easily see where technology can be leveraged across the district. Sue noted that with the large amount of funding being allocated for technology and infrastructure, we want to make sure that we are headed in the right direction. Because we could be moving to the OEI and Canvas and because of the Common Assessment Initiative requirements, the information and perspective that CampusWorks can provide us is particularly relevant.

IT Prioritization Process
Sue noted that we need to fast-track the development of the District Technology Plan due to the October 2017 accreditation reporting timeline to the Commission. Our work needs to be completed by the end of December and a big piece will be the CampusWorks assessment as well as all of the technology documents already existing at each campus.

Doug reviewed a proposed structure (see attachment) to help explore establishing a district IT Strategy Committee to assist the district with its IT prioritization process by identifying the key

1

stakeholder groups and ensuring that we have appropriate representation so that ideas and feedback flow efficiently and that our IT agenda aligns with our goals. He echoed Sue's comments that we are not starting from scratch because each campus already has many documents (unit plans, self studies) and structures in place. He noted that the IT Strategy Committee (ITSC) would be a recommending body to the District Technology Executive Committee and would have representation from all of the areas/bubbles surrounding it in the diagram. He noted that the college IT Deans reviewed this document earlier today and that it's only a proposed structure which can be modified. Doug noted that the current IT Prioritization Process could use more structure, evaluative criteria, and alignment with our strategic goals. The CampusWorks assessment will provide critical information for this process. Sue noted that the document has not yet been shared with any academic senate presidents.

Elaine noted that students are not clearly identified as having input. She raised the questions: how are they accessing us; what are their capabilities; how can we support them? She suggested that we need a bubble that says "Student" as an area of emphasis so we can focus on who they are, where they are going, what technology they are using and what their expectations are. It's tangential and maybe assumed on the chart, but needs to be more explicit.

Markus stated that at CRC, one of the collegewide learning outcomes relates to the acculturation component of students and two ways we can assist with that is with certain technology and by expanding the student IT community. Doug asked for a statement from Markus to help them with where to place the request in the chart. Adam noted that research would interface in several areas and the idea that we are serving the larger institution and not just our own campus needs to be indicated.   A desire to show the overarching clear link between the district and college-level strategic planning processes and mission was noted. Markus noted that a superimposition of this idea to the whole structure is what is needed. Elaine noted that the tie of an IT Strategy Committee (ITSC) will be beneficial and lessen the tendency to operate in a vacuum.

Sue noted there is a short timeline to finalize the document and that initial work will occur over the summer and be shared widely with faculty in the fall when they return; we need to identify who will be on the ITSC so that we can get started before summer; and that some of the work that will inform this process is already occurring. Kandace suggested that there are enough faculty around to get some input before the summer break. Sue noted that we want the faculty input, but realizes that they are nearing the end of the semester and may not have much time to provide input.

Markus suggested distributing this to the faculty after we get the CampusWorks results. This committee meets next on April 28th and Markus is not sure if the CampusWorks results will be available by then. Sue noted that the information would go to the Chancellor first for his review, then be distributed as appropriate and that the report we get is not an accreditation report, so if the findings are not accurate, we can make corrections.

Doug noted that the ITSC will need to be formed within the next month so that it can (1) finalize the diagram and how all the pieces fit together; (2) come up with metrics and interpret information we receive from CampusworksCampusWorks; and (3) develop a timeline.

Campus IT Updates
- SCC – Elaine noted they are in the process of prioritizing their IT needs and have made recommendations to their budget committee.
- FLC – Gary reported that their Netlabs project has expended about $500K and is being utilized districtwide. They are receiving a lot of good feedback and there are a couple of

small glitches regarding firewall issues. Markus noted the staff on this project has been exemplary!

- CRC – Markus reported that the CRC deadline to submit items for prioritization is tomorrow. They are looking for strategic direction for making preparations for joining the OEI. Who will get things done is not known on his campus at this time. He also noted that internet connectivity is still an issue because they have only one line (they don't have a backup). They hope to focus on how they can ensure connectivity for their campus.
- ARC – Jon noted that they are still focused on the website overhaul. They have invited consultants from XP and Mcafee Creator Lab. They will also have Omnicampus come for a demonstration of their CMS system.
- DO – Doug noted that CampusWorks visits are occurring. He is working with Comcast (connectivity), Bestnet (PEG fiber backup) and CENIC (connectivity) to secure services to improve connectivity. He informed Markus that they hope that Bestnet will be able to quickly provide a secondary connection for CRC. He noted that DO would like for each college to have better connectivity with service level agreements on the connections so that outages are resolved in minutes instead of hours or days, and to have a backup connection in place until the primary service is restored. Markus asked about the timeline. Doug noted that the equipment and installation agreement for the PEG fiber is being vetted by purchasing – this could result in service within 30 days following the approval of the contract; Comcast services could start 60-90 days after a contract is signed; and he has been working with CENIC for the past 9 months to get their service implemented and has the DO and FLC's data centers turned on. There is not yet a connection to a non-data center college . Markus noted that they would be happy to have a temporary solution while the district-wide infrastructure is developed. Doug noted that CRC's system has been down 18 times over the past 10 years. Steve provided a handout (see attachment) and noted that there are 300 faculty in the Canvas sandbox. Updates to D2L are needed because the previous versions will soon no longer be supported. All integrations planned for Google Apps have been put on hold and will likely be part of the upgrades for Canvas; if Canvas is selected as the new LMS, the integrations will likely be part of the upgrades.

    Jena asked if the district version of Canvas will be the same as the OEI version. Steve noted we are testing on a different version than currently used in the OEI, but we will receive the most recent version when we join, and it will be consistent among all the members.

College LMS Update

- ARC – Marsha noted that their campus is still excited about Canvas and they will hold a workshop next week, which is full. They have a campus webpage with Canvas updates, and they are gently rolling out Canvas to the campus. Shannon Mendez will be doing a hands-on demo to their technology committee. Marsha and Alice will attend a Canvas workshop at Santa Rosa Junior College (which is one year ahead of us in the adoption of Canvas) in May. They plan to hold Canvas and accessibility workshops during flex. Alice noted the need for accessibility support at each campus and at district (Jena seconded) to provide support to faculty and to be proactive instead of reactive. Sue noted that she has been advocating for this at district because we have received some letters of warning. Elaine suggested that perhaps in the short-term, we could use a contractual person instead of a waiting for the approval of new permanent positions.
- CRC – Markus noted Liz Stevenson has been hired as the interim DE coordinator in Greg Beyrer's absence. Markus expressed his appreciation for the CRC staff who stepped in and filled the void while the hiring process progressed. Liz will work on MWF only and has lots

of experience. Faculty are getting excited and he hasn't heard anything negative. It is important that the proper support be in place.

- FLC – Zach noted that they are ready!
- SCC – Kandace noted that a tech conference will be held in partnership with FACC at Sac City on May 20th and some of the workshops will cover Google, Canvas and the OEI, accessibility, open educational resources, and @ONE. She'd also like to capture data on hybrid courses in a less labor intensive manner. Sue noted that it is a manual process.
- SCC – Brian noted that the feeling is positive on campus related to Canvas. Their DE Subcommittee went to the Academic Senate to present information on Canvas and to ask that they adopt the resolution regarding Canvas and the OEI. The second reading of that resolution will occur next week. They will have a summer training institute the last week of May and it will likely include training on Canvas.

Sue reminded everyone that the college academic senates are reviewing the recommendation and will forward that to the District Academic Senate, who will make a recommendation to the Chancellor. We hope to finalize before the end of the semester so that faculty will know whether or not we are moving forward with Canvas and the OEI.

Markus asked about Innovate, and Kandace noted that they put funding into their program plan for this. (But the official Innovate! Conference has not been scheduled since the last one was held at CRC). She also noted that she volunteered her campus as a location for the technology conference in the Fall so that they could tap into resources related to Innovate. The group would like to see district funding for this conference. Sue noted that there is no allocation of district funding for events such as this although the campuses could agree to take funds "off the top" of the overall district budget in the same way that they all agreed to fund IBA. Kandace suggested that the DE and LMS Coordinators might want to meet to discuss this topic and reach an agreement regarding the funding that could be forwarded to the budget committee. Sue noted that she has advocated in the past with the VPIs and VPSSs regarding Innovate so they know the importance. This topic was suggested as a future agenda item.

Kandace noted that the District Academic Senate will meet on May 3rd to make a decision regarding the recommendation to adopt Canvas and to participate in the OEI. If they support the recommendation, then it goes to the Chancellor on May 10th. She suggested forming an implementation team prior to that date to get a head start on the plan for the transition. She asked if there was data available on how many online courses we anticipate moving from D2L to Canvas and Jena noted that we have web enhanced courses that will need migration as well. Kandace would like to have an aggressive implementation plan in place at SCC that breaks faculty into groups for training purposes (early adopters, those that who might have major difficulties, those who have lots of quizzes, etc). Shelley wondered how difficult it is to import information into Canvas and how we could relieve anxiety of faculty (caused by the previous problems during the migration from Blackboard to D2L) regarding the extra work that they are going to need to do. It was noted that we can ask early adopters and other campuses where the work-intensive areas are.

Sue noted that there will most likely be one-time only funding for faculty to transition their courses. This will vary by faculty depending on what type of course they have and how labor intensive it is to transition the course.   Jena suggested contacting other campuses to ask where "potholes" might exist. Brian noted that the summer institute could focus on finding the potholes, and Elaine suggested running parallel tracks with an additional group focused on difficulties that students may encounter. Steve noted that the IT department plans to get the integration going during the Summer. Elaine wondered about the PeopleSoft interface, which is totally separate

from the training of faculty. Steve noted that our own IT department built the interface for D2L and the company that owns Canvas will be working on the interface for PeopleSoft that should be done in the Fall.

Kandace would like to get a contingency implementation group together before the official recommendation from the District Academic Senate. Sue noted that this group could be formed as long as everyone is clear that it is a contingency and knows that if the decision to go with Canvas is delayed then the work the group does will be delayed; and that it will be important to have faculty on the group. Steve suggested starting with the LMS and DE coordinators and getting together informally to plan the implementation. Sue noted that if the timeline to adopt Canvas is too aggressive and will cause too much chaos, we can decide to join a later cohort and/or keep D2L a little longer (past December 2017) to ensure that faculty and students have enough time to learn the new platform. Marsha said that we don't need to panic because we have plenty of time. Steve noted that we could use D2L another semester (Spring 2017) because he doesn't believe we can purchase a six month contract.

Shelley wanted to make sure that we publicize to students what platform they will be using for each class during the period of time that faculty could be utilizing both and that student training materials are available. Steve suggested an advertising campaign to let them know that Canvas will be the new platform and explaining the benefits and possibly using the campus clubs to get early adopters on board. Students are excited to use the platform at ARC per Alice. Andy noted that new students will only know Canvas, but continuing students will need to learn a new system. Marsha noted that the instructors will inform the students that courses are now in a different platform (she cited Moodle & D2L on her campus).

Elaine asked about help desk assistance and Steve noted it's available 24/7 through Canvas, but they will not be able to help with PeopleSoft issues. Sue noted that we need to be prepared for lots of questions once the District Academic Senate makes its recommendation and she suggested getting FAQs together including information on the implementation timeline.

Markus asked if we could tap the LMS WorkGroup for the implementation group. Sue indicated that not all the members of that group are technology savvy, and it's not in their official charge to be the on the implementation team. Markus suggested that it would be good to have non techies so they could help find the difficulties. Sue stated that appointments must come from the Senate.

Sue noted that the announcement of the District Academic Senate's recommendation to the Chancellor will be speedily publicized and the Board of Trustee does not need to approve the recommendation, but will approve the contract with Canvas.

Adjourned at 4:38.

Future Items
- Update on Mobile Device Management Policies
- Demonstrations at each meeting (suggested by Sue Lorimer)
- Discussion on Goals (BHAGs - suggested by Markus Geissler)
- Innovate Funding Options

Next Meeting
The next meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2016.

Learning Management Update
Education Technology Committee Meeting
March 31, 2016

1. **D2L Volume update (as of 3/29/16)**

	Spring'15 Final	**Spring'16 Current**	% of prior
▪ D2L Course Offerings	3,537	**3,709**	**104.9%**
▪ PS Graded Components	4,426	**4,597**	**103.9%**
▪ Faculty	1,403	**1,494**	**106.5%**
▪ Student Enrollments	121,762	**124,743**	**102.4%**
▪ Unduplicated Students	55,830	**56,056**	**100.4%**

2. **D2L Improvements & Other Status**
   - Setting up Films on Demand in the *development* environment for committee to test
   - ConferNow (Zoom) also in development
   - No mid-semester changes in production (as desired)
   - Next planned maintenance dates (D2L unavailable) – confirmed dates
     - **June 2**, 2016 (Grades due May 31st)
     - **August 10-11, 2016 (Grades due** August 8th) **– will upgrade to 10.6 release and require 2 days**

3. **Canvas Sandbox/Test environment**
   - Currently **302** faculty have been added (14% increase from last month)

4. **Google Apps Update**
   - No new updates
   - D2L-Google Apps integration put on hold

5. **Library System Update**
   - Vendor upgraded Sierra application to version 2.1 – completed 3/22/16