

**Educational Technology Committee  
January 24, 2019  
Notes (draft)**

Name	Location	present?	Name	Location	present?
Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	PR	Alice Dieli (Co-Chair)	ARC	PR
TBD	CRC		Zack Dowell	FLC	PR
Marsha Reske	ARC	PR	Kandace Knudson	SCC	PR
Grace Austin	SCC		Gregory Beyrer	CRC	PR
Jena Trench	CRC	EX	Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	PR
Caleb Fowler	FLC	PR	Sheley Little	SCC	
Patricia Harris Jenkinson	SCC	PR	Kirk Sosa	SCC	
Adam Karp	ARC	EX	Stephen McGloughlin	CRC	
Matt Wright	FLC		Jeff Lewis	FLC	PR
Jeff Bucher	ARC		Tom Danford	DO	PR
Brian Pogue	SCC	PR	Daniel Gilbert-Valencia	ARC	
Pamela Bimbi	ARC	PR	Mike Day	DO	PR
Guest: Andy Divanyan	SCC	PR			

**Welcome**

The meeting was called to order at 3:08PM by Alice Dieli and Jamey Nye, and the committee thanked the Interim CIO, whose contract with the district ends February 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Approval of Notes from October 2018 and the Agenda**

The committee approved the draft notes of the September meeting with minor changes and today's agenda meeting by consensus.

**DO IT Updates**

It was noted that the second level impression groups for the new Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology would take place on Friday. It is hoped the new AVC will start on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Almost everyone is migrated to Exchange Online and completion should be by mid March. Many upgrades are complete and in progress to network/firewalls, data center at DO and FLC, and cameras. A wireless assessment took place at SCC, and DOIT will hold a districtwide wireless assessment. Work on AB705 implications continues.

## College LMS/DE Update

### ARC

Their accessible course creation academy will begin on February 22<sup>nd</sup>. They are offering an online rubric academy, and they have a goal of getting more than 20% of the courses they currently offer online badged and accepted into the OEI by 2020. It was noted that they have discussed paying \$300 per course reviewed to a reviewer which is what the OEI pays its reviewers. They hope to offer faculty a \$650 stipend for the work involved in aligning with the OEI's rubric of the first course (3 units or more) and an additional \$100 per unit (up to \$300) after that. The course must have been taught online for at least one semester, and funds will come from ARC's PD funds. It was suggested that this amount be discussed district-wide to ensure that faculty are paid the same amount at each campus for the same work, and the district may be able to provide the funding to possibly get more courses approved more quickly. Currently it is first come first served to get courses reviewed, but should we focus on targeting specific courses reviewed especially those critical to ADT completion?

ARC Online 2.0 will identify courses missing from pathways in order to generate the courses and/or convert the courses to online. ATLAS is a development tool that will house the pathways that are available and will assist in building new pathways. ATLAS will be shared with other campuses in order to build out Los Rios Online. The platform will be Ingeniux and it will be .net. District-wide course inventory is being reviewed to see where holes can be filled by generating or converting courses to an online format. Students logging on will see their home campus options first, but then the inventory of the entire district will be displayed so that students can complete all courses required for a degree within Los Rios. It was noted that in order to obtain an ADT, twelve units must be taken at the "home" college for residency and the remaining 48 units can be taken anywhere in the district. Seventy percent of students need their program of study adjusted when they petition to graduate because they will begin one program, then change to another. A robust GE offering at each college might ensure that students would be able to meet the home residency requirement at their home school. The possibility of issuing a Los Rios degree was raised, but it was noted that the individual colleges, not the Los Rios district, are accredited. Aligning ADTs and making programs more similar at each campus will make it easier for students to navigate and complete their degree at any campus. It was noted that if we want our students to stay in Los Rios and not take courses at other campuses in the OEI, then we need to have enough courses available for them to finish their programs.

It was noted that ARC has been a leader in this area because they had a goal to increase their online presence, wanted to offer degrees 100% online, and wanted student support services available online. This topic was discussed at Exec meetings with the college presidents present, and the district as a whole wants to replicate what ARC is doing. The technical piece is needed. Other structures are in the process of being created. There is a stated goal that we would like to have our course inventory and some ADTs online by Fall 19, Spring 20 so students can search our inventory easier.

Student demand is driving toward more online options. Student completion is the goal, but

is only 20% of the funding formula. Eighty percent of the funding formula is based upon enrollment. It was noted that online courses meeting C-ID could replace courses that are missing from programs. The desire for some faculty to NOT teach a particular course online (i.e. Public Speaking) can be overcome by students taking the courses at another campus that does offer it online and/or through taking it through the OEI, so this is not a barrier for students.

It was noted that VPIs at each college currently shift FTE to meet offer the courses students demand; and this will continue in the future for both online and on ground courses. Growth is online, so it needs to be scaled. Historically, FTE has been allocated toward courses that are productive and can be filled, and this will most likely continue. New FTE is not allocated toward online courses; it is shifted from underperforming courses to those courses that are in demand. Teaching online is voluntary, but one possible barrier to more online courses is the limitation set forth in the LRCFT contract that a faculty may only teach up to 60% of their contract online unless there is a mutual agreement to teach 80%.

### **CRC**

Thanked the developer at ARC who shared the certificate for completion. CRC is using it with the online learning tutorials to help students complete courses successfully; it was noted that CCC Digital Learning Day is approaching and it will again conflict with the Ed Tech Committee meeting.

### **FLC**

It was noted that there was an equity focus for convocation and that many faculty attended workshops related to accessibility and the use of ALLY for courses.

### **SCC**

It was noted that they are using the local peer review process, and three courses have been submitted to the OEI and two are pending. Currently there are no incentives for faculty to get their courses reviewed for inclusion in the OEI, and it is estimated that it takes 80 hours to get a course ready, and the course may still require additional review once it is sent back from the OEI. The desire to set a uniform stipend for this work was noted as was ARC's use of an instructional designer to take part of the load from faculty. If an instructional designer is available to assist a faculty, then the stipend for faculty could be less and based upon their input of the instructional content. SCC has expanded its help desk services by using student help. The implications of having faculty reviewing other faculty's classes and potentially negatively impacting the approval of the course were noted.

### **DOIT**

(see attached report) – 52,000 unique students and 1800 faculty are using Canvas and there are over 4000 courses being taught in some way in Canvas. We are part of the original seven colleges in the OEI and are going through the pilot/proof of concept phases and it is a lot of work. They are now in the acceptance testing phase and are doing work before the OEI sends it out for wider testing. It was noted that the student response rate for course evaluations dropped to about 56 percent which is still higher than the old system. A quick search done at this meeting resulted in inaccurate course information. It

was noted that the information for the OEI is being retrieved through a data feed and could be inaccurate, but once the testing is done, the students will be directed to a site with the accurate information pulled directly from PeopleSoft. Faculty will be able to tell the difference between Los Rios students and students enrolled from other districts. The OEI cannot go live without our data, and the trust relationship is not yet established. Students should be able to see all courses including courses at different districts/campuses when the logon. Transferring of Promise, financial aid information and fee information is also being tested to ensure accurate information is being transferred in order to not negatively impact students.

The committee would like to see ALLY be turned on for all courses in Spring but any negative impacts on a faculty's evaluation must be eliminated, the workload implications of getting faculty to an acceptable level of accessible material must be recognized, and there must be a budget plan to support the additional work. It was noted that just turning on ALLY with existing documents generates the same document in alternate formats automatically without any additional work on the part of faculty, which is good for students. Faculty will also need to be informed that there are areas for improvement in their content and that training and assistance are available. It was noted that remediation information is already drafted from the accessibility audit and generating an MOU with the faculty can alleviate fears of ALLY negatively affecting their evaluation. It was suggested that demonstrations of ALLY be provided to alleviate faculty concerns and show the immediate gains for students. It would be good to have a decision on this before March for IT purposes. There was a recollection that the Technology Accessibility Task Force also recommended that this feature be enabled, but encountered collective bargaining issues.

## **Discussion Items**

### **Revisions to Ed Tech Committee Members**

Board Regulation 3412 related to Ed Tech Committee purpose, areas of responsibility, and committee composition was reviewed. The composition of the committee includes three faculty from each campus, but filling the positions has been difficult and there is not enough representation from student services. Attendance of faculty at Ed Tech meetings is critical. Suggestions for additional areas of responsibility were noted as were areas that the Educational Technology Committee should not be responsible. A shell could be created in Canvas to keep the committee updated.

### **Los Rios Online**

(topic was discussed above)

### **Adjourned at 4:55PM**

### **Next Meeting – February 28**

Learning Management Update

Education Technology Committee Meeting

January 24, 2019

1. Canvas Update

- Canvas Counts for Fall '18 (final)

Duplicated (Faculty/students counted multiple times if teaching/enrolled at more than one college)

	Courses	Faculty	Students
ARC	1,448	737	20,532
CRC	843	344	12,024
FLC	586	270	7,277
SCC	<u>1,217</u>	<u>541</u>	<u>16,835</u>
Total	4,094	1,865	56,668

Unduplicated (Faculty/students at more than one only counted once)

Total		1,814	52,050
-------	--	-------	--------

- Canvas Counts for Spring '19 (as of 1/23/19)

Duplicated (Faculty/students counted multiple times if teaching/enrolled at more than one college)

	Courses	Faculty	Students
ARC	952	527	18,641
CRC	644	290	11,666
FLC	424	210	6,907
SCC	<u>812</u>	<u>388</u>	<u>14,941</u>
Total	2,832	1,415	52,155

once) Unduplicated (Faculty/students at more than one college only counted

Total	1,383	47,453
-------	-------	--------

- CVC-OEI - Finish Faster Website [www.cvc.edu](http://www.cvc.edu)

Overview/Objectives - Allow students to easily cross-enroll in online classes and across the CCC system; Integration between all (3 major) Student Information Systems; Login with credentials (SSO) from HOME college; Class schedule, info, seat availability, and cost updated and displayed (real-time); Student from HOME College “automatically” applies & enrolls in TEACHING College; Ability to Seamlessly Enroll, Pay, and then Compete Class in LMS (Canvas)

Pilot/Proof of Concept (POC) - Includes 7 Colleges with 3 Different Student Information Systems: Cabrillo (1 College) – Colleague; Foothill -De Anza (2 Colleges) – Banner; Los Rios (4 Colleges) – PeopleSoft

#### Current Status

- Primary System and User Acceptance (UAT) currently being performed by DO-IT; Problems/issues are being identified and resolved as quickly as possible, with goal of resolving within next few weeks; College testing should commence within the next 2 weeks, with State CVC-OEI Team to communicate and coordinate with Colleges.
- Status of New/Added Canvas Functionality.
  - Hosted Canvas Data - Service from Instructure that provides admins with optimized access to real-time Canvas data for reporting and queries; Currently being rolled out to DO and College Research Teams for use.
  - Ally - LMS Accessibility Checking Software, fully integrated with Canvas; Pilot (Opt-In) has been extended through Spring '19; Pilot will inform the work of the District's Accessibility Taskforce;

Plan to discuss options for Faculty support later this semester as well.

- Pilot requests to activate for Spring '19 (so far): Fall '18 Course Activation Requests (final count): 94; Spring '19 Course Activation Requests (as of 1/23/19): 178

- Faculty/Course Evaluations in Canvas (EvaluationKIT)

- Successful completion of Pilot last academic year; full implementation started Fall '18; Fall '18 (final figures):

Courses			
1 <sup>st</sup> 8 week	8	2 <sup>nd</sup> 8 week	19
2 <sup>nd</sup> 5 week	2		
3 <sup>rd</sup> 5 week	4		
Full Term	<u>144</u>		
Total	177	(56% average, overall response rate)	

- Canvas 24/7 Helpdesk Statistics for Spring '19 (as of 1/23/19)

Email	9
Online Submission	136
Phone Calls	<u>590</u>
Total	735

