

## Educational Technology Committee

October 27, 2016

### Notes (approved 11/10/16)

Sue Lorimer (Co-Chair)	DO	PR	Kandace Knudson (Co-Chair)	SCC	PR
Markus Geissler	CRC	PR	Zack Dowell	FLC	
Grace Austin	SCC	PR	Marsha Reske	ARC	PR
Tak Auyeung	ARC	PR	Gregory Beyrer	CRC	PR
Jena Bills	CRC		Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	
Caleb Fowler	FLC		Sheley Little	SCC	PR
Patricia Harris Jenkinson	SCC		Alice Dieli	ARC	PR
Adam Karp	ARC	PR	Stephen McGloughlin	CRC	PR
Gary Hartley	FLC		Elaine Ader	SCC	PR
Kirk Sosa	CRC	PR	Doug Meline	DO	PR
Steve Bowles	DO	PR	Daniel Gilbert-Valencia	ARC	PR
Jon Santos	ARC	PR	Others: Tim Hixon	CRC	PR
Brian Pogue	SCC	PR	Andrew Brooks	DO	PR

### Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 by Co-chair Kandace Knudsen.

### Approval of Notes from September 29, 2016

The draft notes of the September 29<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved by consensus.

### Campus IT Updates

- ARC – Jon reported they have switched from “Ask ARC” to a Google search feature
- CRC – none
- FLC – none
- SCC – Elaine reported they are working on configurations and getting student support into place for Canvas.
- DO – Doug noted they are working on the District Technology Plan. The RFP for the 10G line was approved and the approval of the contract is underway, but there is a public information request pending. JP has reviewed the Office 365 agreements, and we are ok to move forward. They are working on which elements to turn on in Office 365 and there might be integration issues with unified messaging. No D2L Updates per Steve.

### College LMS/DE Update

- ARC –Canvas is their focus. They want to test Proctorio with a small group.
- CRC – Canvas is their focus.
- FLC – no report.
- SCC – Canvas is their focus.

### OEI/Canvas Updates

Steve noted they are working on the SIS migration and hope to release it on Monday. A template is being developed, and they want it in place before releasing access to the faculty. He noted that 80% of the LTI tools that were in D2L will also be in Canvas at launch, with the other 20% being installed once it is determined that they meet accessibility requirements and contracts are generated. Kandace estimated that 20-30% of faculty at SCC who are currently using D2L will choose to transfer their courses in the spring. Sue noted that negotiations are still ongoing with

LRCFT for faculty compensation for the D2L to Canvas transition. She hopes to have a letter out soon to faculty informing them of the important dates regarding the transition to Canvas, giving them campus LMS coordinator contact information, and letting them know of the compensation available for transitioning courses. Sue noted that she has requested from OEI documentation on their ADA accessibility and FERPA review processes for tools used in Canvas.

### **Canvas Demo**

Greg provided a quick demo on using Canvas to set up a course and also showed some of the views a student would have when using Canvas. He noted some of the advantages of using Canvas are the consistency of the platform for students because there is only one version and features in Canvas have uniform names that cannot be changed, the ease of notifying students, and the ease of organization of material by faculty. He also noted that Google docs is built in, but the “canned” feedback that was available with Turnitin is NOT available in Canvas. He noted there is a Guides section and a Group Help section where Los Rios has its own group (Los Rios CCG) that faculty and students can join to give and receive help.

### **Discussion Items**

- a. District Technology Plan Update – Sue noted that she is working with the District Technology Plan Steering Committee and will have a final document ready for the Board of Trustees to approve on February 8<sup>th</sup>. Resources (funding and staffing) may need to be identified at both the college level and district. By end of November, the document will be discussed at the campus before being sent to the board. This plan will undoubtedly need to be referenced in each college’s Accreditation Follow-up Report.
- b. Mobile Device Management Policies – Kandace opened up the discussion about issuance and support of personal mobile devices. Most felt that there is not enough staff to support student owned devices, we would be liable for damage, a possible warranty on work performed might be expected, and issues might arise as mandatory reporters if illegal materials are found on a personal device. Adam noted that ARC does have one IT staff person in the LRC available to support personal devices, but they are hesitant to physically handle equipment due to liability issues. Elaine noted that Equity Funds could be used to purchase loaner computers for students to use and she wondered how that will be managed/supported at the college and if we also need to provide funds for internet access for those devices. Stephen noted that at CRC they are purchasing 1000 loaner computers for students’ use on a semester-by-semester basis. They will not provide technology support for the computers, but will “reset” them at the end of each semester. Equity Funds are used to overcome digital divide issues of students who don’t have funds for computer equipment, and it was noted that \$20/mo. internet is available from CollegeBuys after an \$80 modem is purchased. It was felt that we can’t and shouldn’t control what students do with their equipment as it’s no different than a student’s personal phone or credit card. We don’t support those things for students so why would we provide support for their personal computers? Stephen noted that we are required to provide all students with the same level of support so issuing a personal computer to an economically disadvantaged student and still requiring them to service it does that. We don’t provide service to students currently in possession of their own devices, so we wouldn’t provide it to those to whom we loan equipment. It was felt that we don’t need to open our instructional network to them either; students don’t care if they can’t get into our instructional network; they just want to get to the internet.

What we support on our LAN and what is readily available on the internet, the security issues of our LAN and what must we house on our LAN (LMS, registration, etc.), versus

what students get to outside the network was discussed. It was noted that a student accessing the internet at CRC with a personal computers is no different than if they were accessing it while sitting at Starbucks or other place with free Wi-Fi. However, we need to have the bandwidth to support this, which is where the connectivity issue comes in. Once we get this in place, then we can discuss network access control. Tim noted that a data center on the edge of our network would be nice, but then where they are situated and who owns and supports them would need to be determined. Markus asked if we need to expand/replace our LANs, which were developed for situations that arose 35 years ago. Tak asked what are we attempting to manage. Peoplesoft should be protected, but the LMS may not need to be protected. Security, bandwidth, and technology divides are issues that Kandace feels are driving this. Should we do an assessment?

It was agreed that the district-provided resources to support personal mobile devices should be the same due to student encountered inequalities from campus-to-campus if it were at different support levels. Lending computers to students is no different than loaning a textbook to them (some of which cost more than the laptops being purchased). It was noted that by providing them with a laptop, the resources limitation is eliminated, but not the digital literacy. Since this is a local issue, there aren't any implications for the District Technology Plan other than getting the infrastructure in place to support our students.

Members were tasked with bringing this discussion to their campuses and then returning to the first spring Educational Technology Committee meeting with an informal report of what the local campuses were doing about mobile device management and what the district's role should be.

- c. BHAGs – Big, Hairy, and Audacious Goals Discussion – Markus initiated the discussion on where we'd like to go with technology and how we can get there. What mechanisms do we have in place that allow for forward-thinking ideas to be discussed and implemented? Would a think tank approach work? Doug noted that a lot of ideas could come from reading literature (such as the Chronical for High Education's technology section) and attending technology conferences. Brining in experts to see what's possible for us is also an idea. Adam noted that he reviews the "Horizon Report" to see what's coming. (He provided the site: [www.nmc.org/publication/nmc-horizon-report-2016-higher-education-edition/](http://www.nmc.org/publication/nmc-horizon-report-2016-higher-education-edition/).) Sue noted that our technology prioritization process doesn't work well for us because we tend to have too narrow of a focus. Elaine noted that TTIP funds in the past were used to send teams to conferences to gain information and bring it back to campus. It was decided to devote a bit of time at each meeting this year to discuss these BHAGs.

Adjourned at 4:40.

Items for Next Agenda

Jason Gregg Report out on EDUCAUSE Conference attendance – related to BHAGs discussion.

Future Items

- Innovate Funding Options

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2017