Educational Technology Committee
January 27, 2022
Notes (approved 2/24/22)

Name	Location	PR/EX	Name	Location	PR/EX
Jamey Nye (Co-Chair)	DO	EX	Jena Trench (Co-Chair)	DAS	x
Pamela Bimbi	ARC-DE	x	Shar McCarrol	ARC	x
Alice Dieli	ARC	x	TBD-faculty	ARC	
Kale Braden	ARC-Adm	x	TBD-faculty	CRC	
Markus Geissler	CRC	x	Lance Parks	CRC	
Gregory Beyrer	CRC-DE	x	Stephen McGloughlin	CRC-Adm	
Megan Ozeran	FLC	x	Jennifer Kraemer	FLC	x
Morgan Murphy	FLC-DE	x	Angela Prelip	FLC	x
Christa Oberth	FLC		Deborah Saks	SCC-Adm	
Matt Wright	FLC-Adm		Kandace Knudson (Alt.)	SCC	x
P.J. Harris Jenkinson	SCC	x	Brian Pogue	SCC	x
Sheley Little	SCC	**x**	Patrick Crandley	SCC	x
Tamara Armstrong, AVC	DO	x	Manveer Bola	DOIT	
Tak Auyeung	LRCFT	x	Kate Williamson	Librarian	x
Torence Powell	DO	x	Guest: Julie Oliver	DAS-NV	x
Guest: John Aubert	ARC	X	Guest: Kevin Wong	DOIT	x

Welcome
The zoom meeting was called to order at 3:01p and it was noted that the AVC of IT was co-chairing for the deputy chancellor.

Approval of Notes from November and the Agenda
The agenda for today's meeting and the notes from November's meeting were approved.

Discussion Items
Academic Technologies Catalog - The AVC of IT introduced one of the Directors who gave an update on the development of the academic technologies catalog discussed at previous meetings. He shared the webpage where the information is stored https://hd.losrios.edu/hd/facstaff/canvas-lti/. It is hoped when people are looking for a tool they will utilize this list to see if something is already available within the district to meet their needs. They plan to continue to update the list as technologies are identified and acquired

HyFlex report. This Committee formed a workgroup with members of the DCCC to identify and explore flex modalities and their definitions and also to work on recognizing the implications of adopting these models including operational and instructional considerations, and then from the support perspective also identifying some potential needs and concerns. The initial report was presented to District Academic Senate in December and a link to the document was shared. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KvBfgVRxeMraNR5Ktl5RcHVmLjYw3AbG/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=114448972749908771519&rtpof=true&sd=true

Feedback from this group, DAS and the Union will be sought and adjustments may be made before moving forward. It was noted the two definitions are highflex and syncflex and they are in alignment with the definitions used at CSUS. Highflex is the traditional mode of flexible instruction that involves all three modalities: in person, synchronous online, and asynchronous online. Syncflex would essentially be in person and synchronous only (there would be no asynchronous.) It was noted that these would most likely be coded as distance education because there is a separation between the instructor and students. Instructional considerations were also identified including workload associated with teaching multiple modalities, and also training in the technology, hardware, and applications used, classroom management techniques, course design, equitable instruction, engagement, and how this information can be communicated to students so they know exactly which type of instruction they will be receiving. Another consideration is in the area of support both onsite and within the classroom (CRC's staffing requirement for its ITV model was noted). Other options and their implications were discussed by the committee. It was noted that students, faculty and deans need clarification on the jargon that we use. The desire to have clear icons for the types of modalities was noted to eliminate the need of the students to look in footnotes for what type of class they are taking. The possibility of using a calendar tool that populates based upon the courses a student selects to let the students know the parameters of time that a class will occupy was noted. It was requested that the committee members take the report back to their campus DE committees for discussion and return with feedback

It was noted that DOIT will also review the document and definitions to see the implications of the proposed modalities including how it's coded for accounting purposes and what it looks like in the system. The curriculum committees will also review the definitions to make sure that the courses are meeting all standards. It was also noted that this is a negotiation item with LRCFT.

Wait listing for online courses - A faculty member from ARC discussed the complexities of the current wait listing process for online courses which is time consuming for faculty and can be discouraging to students. He presented a proposal on how we might change this process involving adding a feature to rosters to easily allow instructors to send waitlisted students an invitation notice. Once the student receives the email they can accept and get added, be reminded to pay for the course, and then dropped from the waitlist (this step is currently a two-step process the student must complete). If a student declines the invitation, then the student would automatically get dropped from the waitlist, and the list would be updated. If a student does not respond after a certain number of days to the invitation, the student would get dropped from the waitlist and the permission to add the class would be rescinded. The committee supported this proposal and noted (1) that attendance accounting could be impacted by the date the student accepts the invitation, and (2) the ability for faculty to personalize the welcome message would be desirable.

The need for a formal process to bring to the forefront and prioritize ideas like this and others that save time for employees and confusion and frustration for students was noted. AVC DOIT noted that they would take a look at this suggestion and see how it lines up with our current system, then assign it a priority because they have a huge backlog of projects created as a result of going completely online during the pandemic. It was suggested that a discussion occur at ARC with the design hub team to work on an interim process

Test proctoring work group - A draft FAQ for students related to Proctorio, which used a model developed by Chico state was shared. The goal is to develop FAQs for both students and faculty so they have a better idea of what Proctorio does, what it does not do, and how to use it effectively. It was requested that the committee members review the document and add comments.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sqZrRg3YRB9pMyVy9bxefIINAXBJRv3_d5R4ZFN_IRg/edit?usp=sharing

It was noted that a new Title 5 requirement states:

§ 55005. PUBLICATION OF COURSE STANDARDS. For each course offered, a community college shall make available to students through college publications all of the following facts before they enroll in the course:(a) The designation of Whether the course is designated as a degree-applicable credit course, a nondegree-applicable credit course, a noncredit course, or a community services offering.(b) Whether the course is transferable to baccalaureate institutions.(c) Whether the course fulfills a major/area of emphasis or general education requirement.(d) Whether the course is offered on the "pass-no pass" basis.(e) Whether the course is offered in a distance education format, and if so, includes the following information:(1) All online and in-person synchronous meeting days/dates and times (2) Any required asynchronous in-person activities(3) Any required technology platforms, devices and applications (4) Any test or assessment proctoring requirements.

This new language will become official this spring sometime, and it is hoped that the CCCCO will provide guidance about this change.

As expected, each campus has a different way of getting this information to students and some standardized language and an icon might fulfill this purpose. It was noted that training on the effective use of Proctorio would be helpful, the possibility of adding an option for students to use an onsite proctoring process instead of online would be helpful, and students who were issued chrome books by the district are not able to add Proctorio to their Chromebook. As a work around it was suggested that we purchase a number of vouchers that students could use to take a test in a more convenient way. Examples of what has been tried before and what occurs with DSPS students with accommodations were noted. The faculty FAQs will include information to help faculty determine whether they should use Proctorio at all, how to communicate that with their students and what options could be used instead of Proctorio. Could centralizing test proctoring services be another option for serving our students? It was noted in the past the person proctoring an exam had to be a faculty with minimum qualifications, but Ed Code was changed related to this being considered supplemental instruction and about line of sight of certificated personnel.

The staffing needs of Los Rios Online were noted. With all the competition in the online instruction arena, making it easier for students makes us as a district more attractive but we still need to maintain academic integrity. The pedagogy versus technology dilemma was noted. Faculty need support to help them make the right decision in their curriculum development that favors authentic assessment versus proctored exams.

Informational updates

DOIT – a brief update was provided

LRCO - it was noted the Coordinating Council has been meeting since fall 2020 and are ready to submit a report to the executive sponsors on February 11. Plans for the zero textbook initiative are also moving forward and the committee will be reconvening within the next couple of weeks.

DAPIC - they have been meeting with a member of Tech Center (the accessibility center).

FastTrack – it was noted this program has been extended for another year

Library - A brief update was provided

College updates. It was noted at ARC, ARC Online had a separate website and virtual education center. And as part of that there was a separate directory that pulled content from the instructors' Canvas profiles. The virtual education center website is being sunset. They will now use a standard directory to pull the content, the links, and the profile information on the profile. So the faculty directory will become a kind of faculty website. When students search for classes in the class schedule, the list of instructors' names will include a hyperlink to that faculty's page in the directory so that students can get more information. It was noted this would be a good place to put information about classes for students to more easily find it. CRC noted they are piloting Pronto which is an add on for Canvas that allows students to have social media inside the class.

Future agenda items

- Discord
- Using tech connect inside canvas
- Starfish and how it's being used on campus, effectively using it, and training
- Continued updates on high flex
- Continued updates on proctoring
- Update on student services hub possibly in March

Adjourned at 4:33

-

Next meeting February 24