

**University of Alaska Southeast**  
**Teaching, Learning & Technology Roundtable (TLTR )**  
**Notes – December 17, 2020**

Members Present: Jonas Lamb, John Ingam, Robin Gilcrist, Cody Bennett, Kaia Henrickson, Paul Bahna, Susie Feero, Kimberly Massuura, Marnie Chapman, Katarzyna Polanska, Paulette Schirmer

1. Called to Order
2. Announcements/Additions to the Agenda
3. Review and approval of October & November meeting minutes were approved
4. Zoom Recommendation & Memo (Jonas)
  - a. Senate did not take action in the November meeting but did in the December meeting and approved the two documents. Charla Brown brought the Zoom enabled chat functionality to the attention of this group to consider adding some language for syllabus inclusion from the United Academics newsletter.
  - b. Cody requested that we clarify whether we are discussing the Zoom Chat functionality. Paulette clarified that she believed that Charla was discussing that the students would need to be informed that if they join a recorded session that their name/face will be used. Susie went on to further clarify that it would not be an issue with Blackboard Collaborate since the students are already logged into the course site to access it, that it would only be an issue for Zoom meetings outside of the Blackboard dealing with the FERPA concerns, which we had addressed in the guidance documents.
  - c. This may have more to do with if students rely on only the chat and the instructor does not see it, then the training issue may need to be a classroom management issue for instructors to make it clear that if students say something in the chat that is not picked up by the instructor that they (students) need to speak up. UNAC has obtained a legal opinion from Jermain, Dunnagan & Owens in Anchorage regarding the use of Zoom Chat in the classroom. Given the direct connection to faculty working conditions, the increase of web conferencing platforms in the COVID environment, and a lack of related case law, our attorney has suggested that faculty consider putting something like the following in course syllabi:
  - d. "Please be advised that during live video sessions, comments or questions in the chat may not be seen or responded to by the instructor. Students requiring assistance should contact the instructor directly via [member's preferred mode of contact]." from Charla Brown requested information. This is outside of the "general recommendations" and is probably better suited to a course management issue and course moderator issue under these different

technologies. Shift it over to CELT in the manner “how to engage students in an online classroom discussion” type of format.

- e. Next step after getting the endorsement, after the approval from the Faculty Senate the Provost would move forward to request the integration into Zoom to IT. This may have been a unique or one off situation since this would be a FERPA discussion. Bottom line is that IT only needs to know the Faculty Senate has approved it so they can integrate the LTI Zoom link.
  - f. Presentation of the Zoom LTI to the faculty: available behind the scenes or as a primary tool. We had a discussion on the priority of Zoom over Collaborate Ultra, since the Zoom recordings are housed with the instructor we still would have the issue that they would need to take extra steps with Zoom to move the recordings over and ensure that they are upholding the FERPA concerns. John will send out a communication on this topic and how to show/hide the tool, Zoom will be enabled but “hidden” within Blackboard. Zoom recordings are also only housed for two years while Collaborate Ultra are indefinitely.
5. UAA/Statewide Accessibility Software Memo update (John)
- a. Memo was approved via email by this group with notes/feelings. The note did go to the UA Accessibility and Inclusivity Group that will be part of the parent letter that will be going to John Boucher that we endorse the Read/Write and Equatio at statewide. We were the only group that wrote a letter from all of the other groups that looked at the big picture (thanked by Michael Ciri) with funding issues
  - b. The letter is written from the accessibility group is on hold now that the funding issue has also been raised. They will be looking at clarity of what it means statewide for how the costs will be disseminated through MAU. This letter will not be sent yet, as the group needs to research the same things that we discussed about funding and the big picture.
  - c. Cody noted that because we had put the note together, instead of just sending off the request there is a strategic discussion going on about how to get this in front of a group that may be able to furnish the funds for it. Monique will have a conversation with Mary Gower to see what the best method for bringing this tool forward is from an equity perspective.
6. Proctoring Service request for NatSciences-Respondus (Marnie)
- a. The last meeting with Natural Sciences is still very interested in getting an online tutoring tool put in place. The Juneau group was interested in Respondus going forward and it should be something that we should look at within this group.
  - b. We need to look at some of the articles and issues - AI software recognition that may disenfranchise certain groups - that we may need to look at. Cost is also an issue that we should look at, there was some discussion about the Testing Center’s proctoring. When we use a publisher’s book, some may have proctoring tools within there. When looking at open access information then this could also

be an issue. When using a publisher's tool, it is moving the cost onto the students to some extent. Paul agreed with Marnie that this is an important integration for the group. If we can pursue a scalable, in-house solution then this could be a good solution as more students need test proctoring.

- c. Cody noted that we may support tools, without the concern or focus on funding. Is it a matter of the executive cabinet or chairs to find room for these tools within their budgets so that if they want these important tools, that they would find the resources. We are not disputing this is a needed service, and outsourcing it may or may not be the best decision on this. There is some similarity between this discussion and the accessibility discussion.
  - d. The position of this body could be to research a few and see what types there are and then make a recommendation of specifics within a memo. Jonas noted that it is odd that deans are not pushing this around at the program level. We could work at enabling the discussion of the various technologies that are there and if we could provide a recommendation to the deans/faculty.
  - e. Kaia noted that someone may want to communicate with the Provost or Chancellor to see what the decision about not doing proctoring this semester and what the feeling is going forward. John believed that the decision was based upon primarily financially, where it seemed a bit unfair to have the students pay for their own proctoring. Marnie noted that paying for proctoring has been going on prior to COVID for many reasons, mostly from a "choice". Since online is the only method now, the choice is not really the option.
  - f. There have been a few communications that the proctoring for the 2021 academic year isn't going on but there were certain exceptions that could be requested. This communication came from the Provost office.
  - g. **Paul recommended a subcommittee** be formed so that the discussion on the proctoring decision and availability through the University. Kaia noted that statewide may be purchasing something in May so before we spend too much time on it, maybe find out what is going on with that. Marnie noted that RP Now was requiring a 6 day turn around for any tests (business day) so all students would have to take the final no later than the class before finals week to allow grades prior to getting the grades in before they are due. RP Now would be an institutional application with structural guidelines. Respondus is also less expensive of a fee structure. Recommendation going through Maren to see what is going on with this venue. **Jonas and Marnie to reach out to Maren.**
7. Blackboard SaaS Testing (John)
    - a. Go/no go decision made last Thursday - yes go - 12/19 was the last day of work in Blackboard, migration through 12/24, then Blackboard in the cloud. Memo will be released as a reminder.
  8. IT/Helpdesk Update (Cody)

- a. Once we get into the new environment, there will be a new WYSIWYG tool with minor differences because of the newer version.
  - b. It will not be a silver bullet that will solve everything like some of the communications that have been coming out.
  - c. Staffing is slim due to leave.
9. CELT (Kaia)
- a. Still looking at the instructional designer application review process. We will be offering a Blackboard drop in. We will also be doing some Alaska College of Education specific accessibility training at the end of that week.
  - b. More information and training that will be coming out for next semester.
10. Other Business
- a. Revisit TLTR Charge (Subcommittee) **Jonas will recruit an ad-hoc committee** to work on this in early 2021.
  - b. Cody thinks that this group could be some part of the Spring Startup