

University of Alaska Southeast
Teaching, Learning & Technology Roundtable (TLTR)
Agenda – February 18 2021

Attendance: John Ingham Jr. (Co-chair), Jonas Lamb (Co-chair), Cody Bennett, Marnie Chapman, Kaia Henrickson, Kimberly Matsuura, Katarzyna Polanska, Paulette Schirmer

Absent: Paul Bahna, Robin Gilcrist, Susie Feero

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements/Additions to the Agenda
3. Review and approval of January 2021 meeting notes/minutes [tabled to March]
4. Canvas Pilot (John)
 - a. Link to [Canvas Feedback Survey](#) (closing end of March) John plans to send it out to the faculty campus-wide so that individuals can provide feedback so that there is a wider sample size not only the individuals that like Canvas. John wanted to know if the note should be only from John or from TLTR. Katarzyna said that she has a friend that uses Canvas and feels that it is superior. She has heard really good things about it. John has corresponded with Bill Erkhart the most negatives relate to the extra time to learn how to use the platform and tools. There are only a handful of limitations and things that Blackboard does that Canvas won't and these are related to email options for announcements and a couple of minor ease of access gradebook layout options. Overall, the only user groups that would have better served by Blackboard versus Canvas are instructors that only use the platform for posting the syllabus and using announcements. Bill believes that Canvas is either equal to or better than Blackboard for most user groups depending on how much content the instructor is using. The instructional tools and layout are better and the one major pain point of moving the courses from Blackboard to Canvas is it is a manual process at this point. Bill stated that student reactions have been positive and most of his students have already used Canvas at either high school or another college.
 - b. A couple of big issues is the instructional design support since we do not have an instructional designer in Juneau so it would fall onto my plate and there would definitely be a cost impact which could sink the whole project since there would have to be some overlap time where we are paying for both platforms to get the classes moved over. That would include contractual obligations and logistics. Cody pointed out that there will always be pros and cons of every platform and looking at the needs assessment. The LMS feature set is part of what we need as a university. We are committed to maintaining courses indefinitely, integration of the rating system, mechanism for syllabus management, directives from the Faculty Senate and Provost's office. There are definitely some more in-depth questions that need to be addressed. The way that UAS encounters the world, a UAF sponsored pilot of the product may not be holistically capturing what is needed. While not against new tools, Cody wanted to point out that deploying tools requires more careful planning and effort. For example what about the

historic information that a student or faculty could use for a portfolio. Cody knows that technology is malleable and a shim may be able to be created to find a way to bring the Blackboard information into Canvas.

- c. John clarified that the purpose of this conversation is getting information out. It is probably a great idea since the environment is so heavily focused on pro-Canvas and getting the word in edgewise so faculty have the opportunity to say something since UAS isn't really represented in this pilot.
- d. Our environment here plays well into saying 'hey, hold up we need to really think about this because we have some historical policies and practices in place that we would have to change on our campus in a major way' so that we have an essential tool to sort of slow the process, because our institution is oriented towards a strategic deployment.
- e. UAA is also in the same place as UAS is and since there was no needs assessment done on this and they also think that there needs to be some review done on this. Some information was shared that a number of individuals on the pilot may have already been in Canvas and therefore a bit biased toward going that direction.
- f. This was started up in Fairbanks mostly and went through an eLearning group with all three MAUs. The pilot is mostly UAF faculty, Bill Erkhart is the UAS representative. Due to accreditation issues, one other UAS faculty was unable to participate and another had a class dropped due to enrollment. There was some conversation at the Alaska Library Association Roundtable regarding the pilot and the announcement of a recommendation to move our LMS from Blackboard to Canvas in April. Jen Peterson is the point person for this project and stated that it is a report that is coming out regarding the pilot and what everyone is saying about it. This will come out as a result of the survey (see point a above).
- g. Cody recommended that we put a position statement in with the request for individual faculty to respond to the survey. Jonas mentioned that it would be good that we could get the message out frequently on this, John can send out the initial heads up about the survey and then a historical context information afterward. Marnie recommended that we place a historical perspective on this - give the facts and let the faculty make up their own mind. We can discuss at later meetings regarding preparing a white paper or opinion from the TLTR as it is in the scope of the group. Cody did mention some caution about listing out some of the depth of what goes into the changing of a LMS and the leveraging of that information.
- h. John talked to the point person from Oregon State University who did make the change from Blackboard to Canvas. She stated that you can leverage the faculty with the needs survey (which we do not have) however she said that there is so little difference and if she had to do it all over again it was enough trouble getting it moved over that she would have stayed with Blackboard.
- i. Kaia thinks that the statement with context should go out from TLTR because the way the questions are worded can imply the incorrect position. This is going to affect not only the faculty but the students as well. I want the faculty to be informed before they answer the survey, but also want them to answer the survey. Everyone is under an immense cognitive load and that needs to be taken into consideration.

- j. Katarzyna noted from a faculty perspective she has heard that grading is easier in Canvas and that is a bulk of what she does every week. She mentioned that Blackboard also is working on streamlining and updating the platform.
 - k. John pointed out that the Blackboard update is called Blackboard Ultra (not Collaborate Ultra) and it will eventually overtake the Blackboard that we currently use.
 - l. As Katarzyna noted, if we can point out single areas where that point is better. The creation of a needs assessment and pointed specific areas of improvement or needs that are not being met by our current LMS. Cody mentioned we have often done this in the past - for example there was a need for a portfolio system and TLTR pushed on IT to get the work done and the features set up. This group does have the influence that we can have a say in the tools that need to be implemented.
 - m. Marnie stated that this group is in a good position that can create a list of frustrations, workarounds, best practices, and efficiencies either through CELT or another tool.
 - n. UAF may be looking at trying to implement in a year. Most of the universities that have made the switch, John states have taken more than two years. While there is or is not a clear recommendation that is going to come out of this pilot, the message about the survey should come from TLTR with some information about the pilot and pros/cons.
 - o. **ACTION ITEM:** John will be sending a note out so that we can review and comment so that the email can go out.
 - p. [Upcoming opportunities](#) for demonstrations, training and listening sessions (beginning Feb 23) of Canvas. These are for individuals to get more information on the LMS.
5. Proctoring Update (Marnie & Kim): eLearning Council has created review committee to explore online test proctoring options UA-wide
- a. The eLearning group was disbanded in 2019 but reformed under Karen Carey because she saw the advantages of having the three instructional design teams from the MAUs.
 - b. From Provost's Report at Faculty Senate (Feb 2021): The eLearning subcommittee of the Academic Council are reviewing SW solutions to online exam proctoring and **will be making a recommendation by March 5 (moved to 3/12)**. K. Matsuura, G. Wechter, and M. Chapman are working on that project. The time frame seems rather tight and rushed.
 - c. There is good representation from UAS on the committee as there are 9 people headed by Raymond Webber, there are faculty members and testing center individuals. It is charged with making a recommendation for possible statewide approach to online proctoring. The meetings are held weekly and have had two so far.
 - d. We are talking about there has not been a needs assessment from the committee. At this point they are creating a spreadsheet that compares up to 8 different products and putting together some information on those products.
 - e. Compares Products from: RPNOW, ProctorU (several different iterations/levels), Respondus, Proctorio, Top Hat, Examinty, WiseProctor, Proctor Track and several others. The idea is to review them and get to a list of three.
 - f. Get a smaller group that will attend an orientation with the vendors on the top list. There seemed to be a lot of push back regarding having some sort of online Zoom type of tool and how it would not really fit the needs of the testing centers.
 - g. The one list is pretty straight from Respondus and the list of tools needs to be flushed out so that it includes several product features from other tools.

- h. There has been a request that the proctoring tools work with ChromeBooks, whether there is support for a web camera, microphone, what operating systems are being used, screen recording or screen capture, minimum bandwidth, authentication, LMS integration, tech support (live, 24/7), restrictive capabilities (lockdown-limit browser screens or open files), cost, accessibility (disability services perspective started however also moving to socio-economic), student-centeredness. Currently there are no students on the committee. There is a desire to have a student join the meeting to have this perspective. The spreadsheet should be out next week and the committee will rate the spreadsheet and get to fewer products then move from there.
 - i. Paulette also requested that Apple was also considered. Marnie stated that they were considering tablets. Cody clarified that iPads are a lockdown and may have something on the app store for the various platforms. Marnie said that one of the campuses had several Chromebooks deployed. Cody clarified that that OIT had purchased all of these at the start of the pandemic. There is a virtual environment that the Chromebooks can have a license access to the tools that would normally be available on a computer.
- 6. Revisit TLTR Charge Subcommittee (Jonas): Jonas shared a summary of the committee's first meeting.
 - a. **Summary:** The subcommittee met 2/3/21 to review the current charge, discuss potential clarifications of our role and consider different directions for Regional and Local TLTR groups. Discussions fell into several broad categories; **organization of local/regional TLTR, role/service/value of Regional TLTR and CELT collaboration**. Complete [notes](#) are available in the TLTR Drive for anyone interested. No actions were taken and the group intends to meet again soon. It was also acknowledged that whatever recommendations are reached by this body any action would require approval by full TLTR membership and then Faculty Senate & Provost.
 - b. There had been a recommendation for a flow chart or guidance document that TLTR could provide to faculty who are interested in trying different technology and options for adopting that technology.
- 7. CELT (Kaia)
 - a. At the accessibility work group meeting, the instructional design technology director for UAA has an accessibility vetting checklist that she will be sharing with the group and they will be opening some of their accessibility training to our faculty and staff.
- 8. IT/Helpdesk Update (Cody)
 - a. There will be more discussion later on about the desktop technology service review that was posted at the start of this meeting and he will talk about it more later.
- 9. TLTR Web updates - nothing done at this time
- 10. Other Business