Educational Technology Committee
November 30, 2023 (approved January 25, 2024)

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	
Alice Dieli	ARC	x	Lori Hokerson	ARC	
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	
Matt Wright	FLC-Adm		Deborah Saks	SCC-Adm	x
Charles Whipple	SCC		Kandace Knudson (Alt.)/DAPIC	SCC	x
Norman Lorenz	SCC	x	Brian Pogue	SCC-DE	x
Tak Auyeung	LRCFT		Patrick Crandley	SCC	x
Kate Williamson	Librarian	X	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 October Notes:

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

Discussion Items:

- SRES (Student Relationship Engagement System) – Ed Tech's Library representative shared with the committee a link to an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education about SRES which is a feedback and engagement tool, that integrates with Canvas. It may have similar features to what we had in Starfish (personalized automated messages/feedback from faculty for students), but also might be a custom fit for the university mentioned in the article. Canvas has some of these features. It was noted that Starfish is currently only used at FLC and custom applications usually require heavy IT involvement.

- CidiLabs Products Demo (see attachment) – as a recap, the strongest support was for Tidyup, which helps some instructional faculty removed duplicate items from Canvas courses, makes sure the best version of a particular item is used, and makes remediation for accessibility a lot more efficient. The accessibility (YouDoIT Advantage) tool was not as strongly supported but we may already get this service through Ally and

PopeTec. DesignPlus was the least supported of the three CidiLabs products - some appreciated it made it easier to design better courses from the start, but others mentioned this tool would not be widely used due to barriers to entry for faculty to use it. It was noted that the licenses are separable so perhaps we could start with a license for TidyUp and possibly incorporate the other tools later. It was the consensus of the committee that we pursue TidyUp and make a recommendation to move it forward.

It was noted that (1) Ed Tech is empowered to make recommendations, but we want to look at the business need that we're trying to meet and make sure we can make a good case for the tool (and that we don't have a tool that already meets the need), look at costs, and if it's a 10+ one related tool then obtain DAS input. (2) This topic (CidiLabs Demo) has been brought up several times to DAS; (3) If the purchase price is large, then an RFP process may be necessary; and (4) Ed Tech's recommendation would be sent to DOIT and put into the queue for DOIT to do some analysis and return to Ed Tech with the cost, how it might rollout might, and other possible tools that could satisfy the need.

It was noted related to the TidyUp tool and the accessibility part that Ally is the only tool that presents alternative formats to students so there isn't a reason to duplicate any of the other functions in there; that is the most important function that ALLY provides. UD Coordinators noticed that there was more functionality to Ally that wasn't turned on. Is there a sunset date in the addendum for the MOU or a process to re-evaluate a tool that has been implemented to make sure it's still the best tool to meet the needs? Ed Tech is empowered to make that recommendation by indicating they are looking at functional things and if there are any kind of workload implications (like in Starfish) then the union needs to be involved. Many times, the compromise is simply that it's just an opt in or an opt out. It was suggested that we emphasize the fact that this helps us remove duplicates and that's how it's different and unique from the other tools.

It was the consensus of the Ed Tech committee that we forward to DOIT the recommendation for the implementation of TidyUp.

- Okta MFA Update – the communications campaign began this week, and an informational session will take place next week. The first information session was postponed because of concerns about student impact of student MFA being applied to Canvas, so we are delaying the implementation of student MFA in Canvas but going forward with employee MFA in Canvas. It was noted that Duo is only multifactor authentication; Okta is sign-sign on, application hub, password reset, etc.

  Discussion of Duo and Okta implications were discussed. Is funding multiple tools preventing the District from getting other things/tools that would benefit instruction? The plan is to move everyone over to Okta (students and employees) and end the use of Duo, which has a 30-day renewal. DUO is being continued because concerns were expressed that Canvas shouldn't be behind MFA for students. Annual funding is from October to October for this product. Students will be using MFA for things like Gmail and Google Drive, but not Canvas.

- District Technology Plan - The Faculty co-chair noted that he has not heard from DAS regarding faculty nominations to the DOIT Technology Plan work group which will meet on December 4th. It was noted that ARC's academic senate president is in the process of appointing someone, but we still need someone from CRC.

- TurnItIn AI Detection Tool – it was noted that at the last DAS they voted and they recommended pursuing the tool after January 1, 2024. DOIT has been notified of this recommendation and they are obtaining a quote. Some of the tool's strengths and weaknesses were discussed. It was noted that this is a college-specific issue and should be discussed at the college level to determine whether the use of generative AI by students is in fact of violation of academic integrity when Grammarly, which is a type of generative AI, is apparently OK to use. Who will do the training? Are there best practices? There are FAQs available at the vendor's website.

Informational Updates

- DOIT/LMS - LMS coordinators didn't meet, but it's important to know that the discussion panel in Canvas is going to be having an enforced change in July 2024

- IAC - the "six documents per faculty cap" on accessibility team remediation has been lifted temporarily. The UD Coordinates are doing excellent work. Link to their website was provided.

- AVCI - no updates

- Library - the way the library authenticates is being changed (and moved to cloud-based) and is being funded by the Chancellor's Office. Resources for folks have been created about how to do it, and a tool has been created to automatically take the link with the old proxy and put the new proxy. They are working with DOIT to make sure this will work with single sign-on and work to get the links changed in Canvas for each individual campus because the ubiquitous link will no longer work; it has to be college specific. Adjuncts who teach at multiple colleges and students who take classes at multiple colleges will likely be the hardest impacted. Whether to send a district-wide or campus specific announcement was discussed. The Electronic Resource Management Librarians will be available to assist with questions and are working on sending emails to all the librarians so they know who the point person is for each campus

- College/LMS/DE updates – campuses provided updates. CRC/ARC – expressed appreciation for UD coordinators and salary advancement options for faculty taking offered courses; FLC is working on sending surveys out to students and some faculty related to revising their DE master plan; SCC -noted the captioning and the document remediation projects are officially handed over to the accessibility coordinators and the QUEST shell is being updated.

Adjourned @ 4:30p.