

University of Alaska Southeast
Teaching, Learning & Technology Roundtable (TLTR)
Minutes – January, 21 2021

Attendance: John Ingham Jr. (Co-chair), Jonas Lamb (Co-chair), Paul Bahna, Cody Bennett, Marne Chapman, Robin Gilcrist, Kaia Henrickson, Susie Feero, Kimberly Matsuura, Katarzyna Polanska, Paulette Schirmer

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements/Additions to the Agenda
 - a. Paul requested to add a review of the website as the last time it was updated as last year.
3. Review and approval of December meeting notes/minutes
 - a. Kaia provided some clarifications and corrections of typos in the December meeting notes. The correction of the information regarding the use of the term “library” instead of testing center in reference to test proctoring that the library. Marnie requested clarification of the final sentence in that paragraph, if we could do something within the university instead of outside. Paul clarified that the testing is being done in house instead of outsourcing to a third party. He was curious if we could pursue further expanding on the testing within Juneau’s testing center. Jonas provided the clarification that we are currently providing an in house testing but it may not be as robust or asynchronous. Marnie clarified at this time we are under the instruction of not providing proctoring. We decided that a scalable in house solution that would not represent an additional cost to the students. We will have more discussion on this in this meeting also. Paul moved to approve and Kaia seconded.
4. Revisit TLTR Charge (Subcommittee).
 - a. Jonas sent out a poll for scheduling the subcommittee meeting. Any recommendations would need to go through the Provost’s office. Requested that individuals that are interested in the subcommittee please take the poll so that we can get into scheduling it.
5. Update on RPNow Statewide Procurement (Jonas, possible Maren or Michael C)
 - a. Some input **from Maren**: UAA’s current contract with RPNow ends later this year and they plan to form a group to consider alternatives. Further, they have some concerns since it is not usable on tablets and Chromebooks, and there are also ADA concerns. UAA is exploring options, and I believe their Faculty Senate is looking into this.
 - b. **From Michael**: he is not aware of any current discussion about RP Now. He thought that UAF may have picked it up in 2018. Sitka campus may be using it – previously they were using ProctorU. (Update: Sitka Campus Testing Center is

currently only Proctoring “one on one” using Zoom. JI) John checked with Emmy and RP Now is not currently being used in Sitka and the only thing being offered is 1:1 zoom proctoring. Marnie noted that she is currently doing Zoom proctoring. Marnie said that she had tried to use RPNOW and it was not a simple process as was presented last spring, so she went on with just using the Zoom. The Sitka did a really good work on it. There wasn’t really a proctoring faculty on the committee. It would be a good idea to have someone who is proctoring as a faculty member on the committee. Matt Trafton was on the program but he wasn’t doing any proctoring and he is now the part time PCI and part time PI with Title III grant.

- c. There may be some advocacy for “strategic investment” under the deferred maintenance ask for the proctoring as well as the note from the three chancellors regarding increasing enrollment. Marnie noted that it makes a difference with having the online proctoring and the remote proctoring in most villages, so that students had the option of going into a testing center where some of the students needed the 24/7 access that online proctoring provided them. She believes that forcing the online proctoring is not really the right way to go. By offering the most flexibility for the students is having both the options available.
- d. Kaia said that if we are going to put forth the purchase of a software. For funding the support of this, is a significant upfront amount of work. If we are going to put forth the software, we should do all of the research first so that it would be taken seriously. She noted that there is an ask from the accessibility group for that text software and finding the funding is one of the bigger challenges that would need to be faced. Marnie is curious if we are going to lose our ability to do online testing for our students or will there be a shift back to what it was. There really wasn’t any out of pocket for Sitka because we were using ProctorU so it was just some coordination with ProctorU and the students paid the processing fees directly to ProctorU so it gave the students that wanted the online option, they would have to pay for it. I would hope that there would still be some type of online proctoring available to this. Kaia broached that the alternative method where the local proctoring was available and there could be a “fundraising” plan for a type of scholarship to pay for those students who were in need of the online but the financing was the issue.
- e. Marnie noted that we could look at paying because it may be a relatively small investment. For example, Respondus is spread out over a large number of students and the students get an unlimited number of tests, so it may be better to front end load this. Right now ProctorU is running about \$30 per test where Respondus comes down to about \$15. Cody asked if basically “all proctoring created equal”. Marnie noted that it is not all the same. ProctorU has an individual online watching the students. RPNOW has a recording and then the

recording needs to be reviewed. If RPNOW does the reviewing under contract, that would be an additional fee and more time since they only flag the suspicious behavior. The instructor would still need to review. The problem here is the turnaround time - especially during finals week. Neither ProctorU or RPNOW have a lockdown screen whereas Respondus does. Respondus also have a shorter turnaround time. This can also be less bandwidth. RPNOW also assumes that the faculty is reviewing the recording, there is sophisticated AI software recording so that flags when someone comes into the room or the student looks away. Marnie thinks a survey would be a good idea to see what faculty are looking for. The shorter turnaround time of Respondus now would be more beneficial since I would be reviewing the recordings anyway.

- f. Jonas noted that creating some type of decision matrix that compares the features, benefits, pricing structure and billing models so that, while we are not technically making a recommendation we are providing some of the information to instructors to have.
- g. Cody thinks that this would be something that could spawn from a partnership with CELT and Marnie as the SME to raise as an asset to the faculty. Marnie noted that we could raise the concerns of AI and implicit biases that could be part. Kaia said "sure" with the caveat that that CELT is pretty maxed with everyone trying to do a lot of things. **ACTION ITEM:**Cody, Susie, Kaia and Marnie to look at putting something together.
- h. Robin asked if there are currently anyone using the integrated RPNOW, at this point we are only aware that UAF are using it. Marnie noted that it was difficult to work on in the time permitted. Jill Dumesnil may have some information. She has a strong preference for Respondus. **ACTION ITEM:** Marnie stated she had a call out to Jill but had not heard back. Susie noted that the time for finals was the problem. UAF has moved their finals a week earlier to deal with the timing from RPNOW, it is a five business days. She noted that there was a large push with more being online and with so many people being online and doing online proctoring, that the turnaround time is probably longer. Paul noted that he had looked into RPNOW and the turnaround time for the final week was unattainable for using for the finals.
- i. Jonas noted that we may be hesitant about going forward since there is a current "no proctoring" from the Provost office at this point and if the faculty would be honest in the replay. It doesn't look like there is really a real consensus on what is the preference for proctoring. Would the request be a "nice to have" or "must have" survey. **ACTION ITEM:** Kaia and Jonas will reach out to Maren to see about reaching out in a survey method. And will reach out to Gabe in the Testing Center to see the load and the ability to scale up the testing for online. Marnie would like to play around with the wording to see. Kaia will return with the information

from Maren. Need and number of students that would be interested in proctoring or online proctoring options.

- j. **From Mona** - UAA, UAF and UAS all have RPN setups on Blackboard but she is unclear if we have been using them in actual courses.
6. IT/Helpdesk Update (Cody)
- a. Start of the semester and busy(ish) addressing what has been coming up from faculty and students. There was a burst either new students or returning students that took the fall off that had issues getting into ELMO.
 - b. Liam Dyer, a student employee is back from Anchorage and is set to work from home. His home is in Juneau so it is nice to have him back in the group.
 - c. IT as is everyone is grappling with budget challenges and keeping the purse strings tight and trying not to spend anything out of personal services. As many other departments are also noticing that many people are not taking leave, and the vacations come out of a different funding pool.
 - d. Background projects: phone upgrades, work the list of Windows 7 to Windows 10. We are not sure of how many are actually in use.
 - e. Susie gave Kudos to the helpdesk and the staff. The virtual machine is up and running for students who are running on Mac computers and who need something that only runs on a Windows environment. The virtual environment is something that is not broadly available. It may be an issue that would need to be addressed with licensing and access.
 - f. With the tools that we have, is there a need to look at our vendors that we are using for accessibility and the programs that we are using. The various areas that need to be reviewed for their services and what needs to be offered and what is the best fit for the organization. There is a move to looking at a broader perspective of review before going forward.
 - g. Paul asked about the working hours for IT Helpdesk. The hours are 7:30am - 7pm Monday through Friday and Sunday 11-5. They can leave a message, or email helpdesk and that will get through to them. With the reliance of the student help and fewer staff, they are moving this. When a call comes in after hours, the caller is presented with the option of selecting to be connected to someone at OIT or an on-call technician if something is down.
7. CELT (Kaia)
- a. Very successful accessibility training at the College of Education. Robin will be reaching out at the next Faculty Senate meeting to see if there are any other departments interested in the same training.
 - b. We are still putting the schedule of programming for this semester and it got a little complicated because of the direction from the Chancellor so we needed to scramble based on that directive. I will be finalizing the information before I send it out.

- c. The idea is for a lot of the pedagogical programming is to take advantage of the STEPS programming and Magna online seminars and 20 minute mentor where people would come, watch the 20 minute mentor and discuss as a group.
 - d. Robin is doing some video creation and editing program based on the faculty survey that went out last semester.
 - e. Joel Marcus is going to present on asynchronous course delivery and using the fisheries program on iPads as an example later in February.
 - f. Still do not have an instructional designer for Juneau. That recruitment continues. There is some consideration of reworking the position and advertising it again. Still in the process of reviewing the candidates that came in the last batch.
8. TLTR Web updates
- a. Membership needs to be updated, but looks good now. Jonas noted that call in information needs to be updated with some Zoom information link data.
 - b. ACTION ITEM:** Jonas will get together with Colin so that there could be an easy way to get the agenda and minutes uploaded to the website so that the links are to the shared drive.
 - c. Paul that it would be nice to have committee members and terms they are serving. Marnie noted that it is there around the bottom, Jonas also noted that it is in contacts. Jonas noted that updating it and making it easier to navigate.
 - d. Paul noted that linking it to the local TLTR, including our mission, what we are doing and why the regional TLTR is important.
 - e. Susie noted that some updates and a draft had already been done and we were waiting for something, but could not remember what. Cody is trying to figure see where the information is on one of the CSM test pages. Susie remembered that there had been a lot of work on it already. Jonus remembers that it does exist. Cody noted that it was something that he had started, reframing the website so that it was more clear the separation of local TLTR and regional TLTR.
 - f. Cody wanted to make sure local TLTR and their work is represented. Wants to make sure that the documents loaded are like a snapshot so that if a document were renamed or moved, than the website would have to be updated also
9. Adjourned