

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

Attendance: John Ingam Jr. (Co-chair); Paul Bahna, Cody Bennett, Marnie Chapman, Susie Feero, Virgil Fredenberg, Robin Gilcrist, Kaia Henrickson, Kasia Polanska; Paulette Schirmer

Absent: Jonas Lamb, Kimberly Matsuura

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements/Additions to the Agenda
 - a. Paulette will be moving over to undergraduate committee and Colleen Campbell will be taking her place
3. Review and approval of [January/February](#) 2021 meeting notes/minutes
 - a. Approved both (moved by Robin and seconded by Susie)
4. Canvas Pilot Update (John)
 - a. [Canvas Feedback Survey](#) for anyone who has taught or been a student in Canvas in the last two years. The note to all faculty was sent with the concerns was sent on 3/18/2021.
 - b. At the Instructional Design Alliance (the group of instructional designers from all three campuses under the MAU) and someone from UAA was asking what they should tell faculty about this going forward - spring and fall semesters. Jen Peterson was in the meeting and is the point person for Canvas and said Canvas is off the table for any UA adoption, it was not really on the table. The question was asked if UAF would be going to Canvas, Jen Peterson said she could not speak to that. It does sound like the eCampus will be moving to Canvas. UAA and UAS will not have any courses on Canvas. Robin asked if she had a class listed through eCampus, would there be an expectation that she would be teaching in Canvas. Cody clarified that just because it is listed in eCampus, it means it is a distance course taught through UAS so the expectation would not be that Canvas would be the learning platform. Robin clarified the question that if the students were dual enrollment and Canvas was being used in the school system, then there would be an expectation that we would need to teach on it. John thinks that this is more of a question for Owen Guthrie with the eCampus group. He can speculate, but you teach for UAS and that would take precedence and you would teach the course in Blackboard. Cody clarified that you would be beholden to the UAS Faculty handbook and that outlines what LMS would be used. Cody is curious why eLearning is such a small portion of the overall campus and wondering why they are trying to branch out in this direction. There is speculation that this pilot was just a quick way to get Canvas integrated into the

University, not really a pilot to test it out. Cody is wondering if eCampus is a segment of the UAF experience, and one department was to use a different platform than it should not apply to the remaining departments. That may be the next step is faculty gets together and says they need to have one learning platform. Marnie says we need to make sure that this should not fall off our radar since UAF is one of our major competitors. It seems like a really poor decision for the distance students to have to learn two LMS when we have been working so hard to integrate our distance offerings to make it easier for students to pick from multiple campuses for their distance education courses. It seems really counter to that effort. Virgil thinks that UAF may be doing this exactly for that reason, so that the students would be less likely to migrate to other LMS. It could also be that they are just trying to justify their existence. Canvas is not the be all and end all that they expected. Cody Fairbanks has a challenge at leadership and some of the guardrails for safety have been dismantled at this point. Allowing people to run off the path and find other tools and other deployments that don't make sense for an enterprise solution. Cody also believes that keeping this on the radar is a good idea. Marnie thinks that it may be a good idea to register a statewide concern that if we are truly moving toward the goal of better unity between the three campuses for our students, then one group unilaterally moving to a different LMS isn't keeping in the good faith with that goal. She believes it is important that this gets on early on. **ACTION ITEM:** Virgil will get this on to someone at Faculty Alliance recommending that someone should be held accountable for throwing barriers into the ease of coordination. Marnie continued that this really pushes interstate competition since the students may go out of state if they already have to shift from one LMS to another. She thinks that we can be far more competitive as a statewide entity that is cohesive. John mentioned that Bill Erkhart said that the students were incredibly resilient with the use of Canvas and many knew more than he did since they had used it in their high schools over the past year. He did get a note from a faculty member saying that the K-12 Canvas system that is being used is "total garbage". A cohesive system across UA especially since students are going across MAUs to take their courses and get their degrees, it is a funny thing that one group is pushing to not have that unity.

- c. **ACTION ITEM:** John's part is now coming up with what the pilot did not have - a needs assessment. As an instructional designer, he thinks that UAS should have a needs assessment for a learning management system. There is some writing on the wall that Blackboard Learn (what we are using now) is not going to be around forever. They already have another LMS (Blackboard Ultra) so a needs assessment is something that is vital at this point. Cody believes that that is a charge of TLTR . When we see an area lacking in the tools that we have, we can put forth. Robin is wondering why a needs assessment would be needed. John

clarified that this would be more of a big picture. Susie believes that it has never been captured, the mandate to go to Blackboard was there and we just did it. I think it is important to actually do a periodic needs assessment instead of reactively. Seeing what we need, what gaps exist, and a needs assessment helps to focus that. John did a lot of communicating with Oregon State and the point person that moved to Canvas. The big way to get faculty onboard with moving to the new LMS was to show the needs assessment to the faculty. Especially to those individuals that do not want to change. Canvas and Blackboard are two big time programs and when you get to the nitty gritty is there really that big of a difference? The point person at Oregon State said that there was not really a big difference between the two, her recommendation with all of the costs and trouble in the shift that she would not recommend doing it. With the cost and the budget situation, running two LMS simultaneously would be rather expensive and it would get really complicated. While moving now is probably not on the forefront, at some point it may be. Having that needs assessment will be useful.

5. Proctoring Update (Marnie & Kim): eLearning Council has created a review committee to explore online test proctoring options UA-wide. Report from Marnie
 - a. Proctoring recommendation delayed until Monday. K. Matsuura, G. Wechter, and M. Chapman are working on that project. Individual review with demos of four different proctoring systems. We reviewed: Honor Lock, ProctorU, REspondus, and RPNow. There was one more that we were supposed to have a review on but it is one she is not familiar with, but it is probably not going to make it to the final stage. The chair did a quick survey of the members that were present at the last meeting. The majority were leaning towards favoring Respondus, but the demo had not happened yet on Honor Lock or RPNow so people may have changed their mind. The recommendation is not binding in any way. The most interesting thing that has happened from looking into this is that there is an opportunity to do this at no cost whatsoever to the university with a \$16 student fee that would cover all the tests for a year (unlimited access) and this is through Honor Lock. Respondus offers a similar pricing strategy of \$15 for students but there is a university fee of somewhere around \$5,000 for a lockdown browser. There are a lot of different pricing strategies. Since there are so many pricing strategies, the implications of how this would be used and if we do a per test fee and there becomes an administrative concern. However, if there is a flat fee and the students are subscribing to a service for a full year, there is a freedom of pedagogy that if you want to do little proctored quizzes which might be beneficial for some subjects instead of trying to jam more into the bigger exams. Cody believes that the Honor Lock was \$16 per student if the university paid in bulk for the pool of students. There is still some question of the administration of that fee. For example, in Robin's course Microsoft Project is being used. So how do we determine the need and make sure that the students attending have

access to it. If we could pre-identify the classes that needed proctoring, the students that would be in that class, see if other faculty would lean into it, we could get a really good estimate in advance and hopefully assume that there would be some form of pass-through charges in the course fees to cover the proctoring. That may be just another wrinkle in the process. Respondus seems to have the better way to handle that since students would pay for the proctoring with their credit card. This would seem less administratively intense. The other thing that Marnie has learned, is that the lockdown browser would be available across the state. This would make the testing centers accessible since they could use the lockdown browser and would not have to keep watching the students. It would also make Zoom proctoring available - having come full circle - since the browser would be locked down. Respondus is the only one that has a lock down browser that is capable in Zoom. You can have all of your students in the lock down Zoom proctoring during the test. Cody and Virgil mentioned that there is not really a needs assessment and it does need to determine what are the key driving points of what are important, dollar rate, feature set???. Marnie noted that this has been so fast tracked and everyone is just trying to keep up. She thinks that she can put something in review that she is preparing. There really hasn't been a discussion of the needs. Concerns that Kaia pointed out regarding AI during proctoring. Marnie would like to work with Kaia to put something in her review to bring this to surface. Marnie is trying to get Respondus pinned down on turnaround time for getting results back. They believe that it would be the Monday of finals week to get the results by the following Monday. Their turnaround time is long and that is concerning. As Susie had pointed out in the conversation, we are supposed to be doing valid instructional assessment things during finals week. If we do not have that opportunity due to the proctoring and the turnaround time, it puts a lot of pressure on the students to make them take the exam prior to finals week. Cody thinks that we can lean into the vendor that they commit to a turnaround time into the contract. We need to articulate what our needs are. We need to make sure that they have a proven track record of completing. If they are willing to put it into the contract, we can put their feet to the fire and make them. Cody liked the presentation of Honor Lock. Robin said that if the students had a one time fee that they could fit into their budgeting and if that is one of the offerings. Kaia would second that approach, it makes it potentially more fair for the students. It could be potentially unfair if it is in student fees and a student never takes a course that requires proctoring. Also Kaia is uncertain if it could be paid for by scholarship or other financial aid. Another thing that Kaia is concerned about is if the lockdown browser would affect accessibility tools within their computer. This should be something that is considered in the terms of accessibility. Cody clarified that some of the lockdown functionality can allow exemptions for certain tools - for example if you need to

leverage a calculator you can unlock the calculator APP on the computer. Same thing is that you can unlock the accessibility tools, the list is long. Cody thinks that it would be beneficial to have it on the student bill instead of having it as another charge later on. Marnie said that before COVID came along, students could go online and pay a one-time testing fee for the test because they were using ProctorU or they could go to the testing centers and have their proctored test done there. If they are offering the maximum flexibility of both options and if you are upfront in your syllabus about the fee for online proctoring or using a testing center for no fee, than students could get the money for the online proctoring back in the gas they would pay or the baby sitting that may need to pay. Susie noted that some testing centers would charge a fee for proctoring the test. The person at UAA paid \$75,000 to cover all of the proctoring needs - pay by test basis - for all of their students. At some point, there may be some point where the shift of funds from the proctoring centers to the online proctoring.

ACTION ITEM: Marnie will get with Kaia and Cody to go over concerns and technology requirements to add to her feedback for the proctoring. John asked what the timeline is for choosing one of these tools, Marnie clarified that the only timeline she is aware of is the due date of the report is probably Monday.

6. Blackboard syllabus review (Marnie/Susie)
 - a. Susie said that there is not a lot of discussion about this. They have reached out to Mona because we want to know what the technological ways are to reach out with a program to find the syllabus that is uploaded in the course for reporting purposes. Once there is feedback from Mona then they will reach out to administrators to find out their reporting requirements are. The idea is that there is a button that says UAS Syllabus, in addition to that faculty may have their syllabus posted in a "Start Here" area. We need to know what the needs are and from here we are only in the exploration phase. Cody would like a clarification on the syllabus review. Susie believes that the system is clunky and not everyone wants to use the UAS Syllabus and not all faculty want to use it. Robin clarified that there is no way to change or get rid of the UAS Syllabus title. They are really doing a needs assessment of trying to get the syllabus in one location. Susie clarified that UAS Syllabus is redundant since you are taking a UAS course, so this would be something that could just be called Syllabus. Cody said that it could be something that would go to the Blackboard Implementation workgroup for consideration and Susie clarified that it actually came out of that workgroup.
 - b. This really has two parts of this - the technology part and the CELT aspect (what is in a syllabus) draft template to provide to faculty. Marnie thinks that this could be expanded and there could be a button for all of the repeated/required elements. Susie clarified that for programs that have accreditation need to have it in the syllabus.
7. Revisit TLTR Charge Subcommittee (Jonas): Group has not met since our last TLTR meeting

8. CELT (Kaia)

- a. They are still trying to hire an instructional designer for Juneau. She is not sure what is going on right now as the job was in the reclassification process to change it to an instructional designer 2 and repost it.
- b. There are two more Blackboard drop in help sessions scheduled. There may be one or two more teaching strategy type programs left this semester and we are starting to think about next year.

9. IT/Helpdesk Update (Cody)

- a. To add to the Proverbial radar: multi factor verification being available broadly for items that have restricted access (like Banner). How that gets deployed and that is in a pilot and one off, by request and very manual process. They are trying to systemize it and make it more cohesive.
- b. There's conversation afoot about employee computer accounts. There is so much conjoined across their username account. If an employee was also a student, the two are together and so if an employee leaves we don't want to interrupt the student's access to stuff. They're trying to set up clarifications and classifications of how accounts work in the manual so that there are separated accounts for employee versus student so that there can be a lockdown if the employee is fired with cause. Susie requested that there be an email confirmation of changes that happen (address changes, changes of other information) for example her student address change happened and it only came light because someone in the distance group was trying to send her something and wondered why she had an address in Florida. Cody believes that this is something that would be a good idea to push on. Susie clarified that this was an identity theft situation where her transcripts were requested but fortunately not sent. **ACTION ITEM:** Susie will send information to Cody about what happened in this situation and Cody will see who to send this type of information and request for email notification of changes to.

10. TLTR Web updates

- a. Nothing has changed. The short version is that Cody has access to a test site that is revamping some of the information. **ACTION ITEM:** John is to push on Cody to get something done. Cody will keep working on it.

11. Other Business

- a. Virgil is requesting some accessibility information be added to our next agenda. For all students to access our information that we post on our courses. For example we have been talking about Alley in the Blackboard Implementation workgroup but he has found that the UA system isn't really doing much. Not as much as they could. If we had a student who felt their needs were not being addressed, a lawsuit could be rather expensive. He doesn't know if it is a TLTR issue. We seem to not bring it up until the student asks, at we patch something together. He wonders if we could be more proactive. Susie agrees but it is such a

huge topic and area for discussion. Robin said from the CELT perspective there have been various training to show “how to make it more accessible”. Virgil wonders if UAS does everything that we can do to meet their needs. There really isn’t a magic bullet that is going to meet all of the needs. **ACTION ITEM:** Virgil will talk with the Faculty Meeting tomorrow to determine what they are specifically looking for and then we can see if we need to add it to the agenda. Like was noted, what is the needs assessment? We could have all of the tools in place for blind students and have zero blind students but have a lot of hearing impaired students. There is a principle workflow where a student needs to put a request in so that we can make the needs. These needs are tracked and supported through Disability Student Services (DSS). Susie added that there are some strategies that faculty can put in place when creating materials to make sure they are as accessible as possible at that point in time. Then when a student comes into DSS, then we can address the other portions of the student's request. We can discuss this further with the needs assessment.