

DRAFT

Ed Tech Shared Governance Committee February 26, 2018

Present: Jollean Sinclair, Gina Hogue, Kris Biodolillo, Yeonsang Hwang, Dawn Archibold, Thilla Sivakumaran, TommyShawn Long, Henry Torres

Meeting began at 3 pm in College of Business Room 105

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jollean Sinclair jsinclair@astate.edu
Diana Williams dwilliam@astate.edu
Gina Hogue ghogue@astate.edu
Kris Biodolillo kdbiondo@astate.edu
Yeonsang Hwang yhwang@astate.edu
~~Patricia Wilkerson pwilkerson@astate.edu~~
Henry Torres htorres@astate.edu
Kevin Downum kdownum@astate.edu
Erika Tuck erika.tuck@smail.astate.edu
Anna Raffo anna.raffo@smail.astate.edu
~~Qian Yu qian.yu@smail.astate.edu~~

- Have three sets of minute notes to review
- Changes to minutes from last meeting?
- January 31st meeting notes, can they be approved?

- ProctorU
 - Thilla mentioned that AOS has completed research on student authentication and offered demos through BioSig ID and Examity.
 - AOS recommends that utilize BioSig ID for student authentication and provide option of either ProctorU Live proctoring ore Respondus Lockdown Browser with Monitor for exam monitoring.
 - AOS has a proposal at Academic Affairs which is being reviewed by Dr. Cooksey
 - It was advised to AOS that the proposal would need to go through Shared Governance and advised to obtain the template for the proposal on shared Governance website.
 - Henry stated that because BioSig ID was a viable option for student authentication only, that the campus could piggy back of of AOS
 - For ProctorU, provide options at the departmental level
 - What about the details of the contract with ProctorU?
 - There are different proposals and causing confusion and frustration
 - Dr. Sinclair stated she would like faculty to have a third party option for live-exam monitoring and as long as options allow for ProctorU and retaining the option for live proctoring.
 - Dr. Hogue asked what viable solutions outside of ProcotrU are available and what could Kevin Research?
 - Dawn Archibold advised that AOS faculty support had started researching options for authentication and live exam monitoring beginning in August. AOS Faculty Support scheduled demos with BioSig ID and Examity the previous week. Examity is a solution, however, their base price is \$5,000 per month for unlimited authentication and up to \$15 per hour for exam monitoring. Did come with live monitoring and auto-monitoring which is similar to Respondus with Monitor except that an audit is conducted by a proctor to verify if there are issues and if there are the event is flagged for faculty to review. There is Proctor Free, Proctorio, and HonorLock (which is only available through Google Chrome) which AOS team spoke with all at the OLC Conference in Orlando this past November. Out of all the solutions for student authentication, BioSig was the best option for ease of use and implementation.

- Academic Integrity Workgroup
 - Looked to university website and the student handbook for guidance
 - Individual departments may have details in their individual handbooks, but nothing related to online academic integrity addressed
 - Not sure how to address the issue?
- What is an online course, web-assisted course, etc?
 - Under the impression that web-assisted course was one where the course coverage was online but the exams are proctored in person.
 - Multiple definitions and views on the definition of a web-assisted course?
 - Can the university provide a clear definition?
 - Can this committee come up with a definition?
 - Not the responsibility of this committee to define this
 - AOS different entity than entire institution, AOS team has their own admission, financial, aide, technical support, etc
 - Difference cause confusion for faculty who may teach through AOS programs but also teach through traditional face-to-face and traditional courses that are offered online.
 - Henry Torres's suggested that AOS be included as part of the Ed Tech Committee
 - Kris proposes that add a member to tech committee from AOS faculty member who teaches AOS courses, will submit request to faculty senate
- Canvas LMS
 - Email from Kevin regarding test driving canvas from March to July
 - Committee Chair would like for Ed Tech Committee to take a position on canvas LMS Test
 - Soft pilot currently taking place with Dr. Damphouse, Kris Biondolillo, and Nicole Covey
 - Small scale pilot:12-14 users
 - Suggested that ITS and ITTC Takeover, however Henry's team was advised to step back and let shared governance make decisions.
 - Dr. Sinclair proposes that the committee take a position either not supporting the the change in LMS, deferring the management and pilot testing and training to ITTC, or deciding at this time will not submit a proposal in favor of or in opposition to a change in LMS and defers LMS review activities to ITTC and ITS.
 - Kris Biondolillo stated that she cannot vote until done with the soft challenge, Dr. Sinclair stated she challenged her to fill out LMS review
 - The change in LMS was initially proposed to save money, but these are direct costs. What about the indirect costs?
 - What about the plan for training? HHow many people use Blackboard? What will this plan look like?
 - Moving forward, concerns about the makeup of the committee being qualified to actually make an informed decision about the LMS and discussion has been ongoing for three years.
 - Thilla advised that AOS has a plan for migrating to Canvas which is 18-24 month timeline and can send to committee.

- Canvas"18-24 month timeline
 - Henry, we were told to back off
 - Dr. Sinclair: Not this committees job to choose if the LMS Changes. This group has been an active partner in LMS review
 - Dr. Hwang: University is composed of most diverse group in the world. Faculty need guidance. Need to know if change is made. Is there date to compare and look at? So we can safely say. Feel this committee needs to turn off the discussion and for Henry's team to submit a clear comparison. We are comparing two moving pieces. The more we wait, more confusion. I have feel to turn off discussion. Turn over to Henry for guidance.
 - Kris feels Henry's team should do research
 - What should our role be?
 - What is the fourth option from Kris for the straw vote on last page of agenda
 - Defer decision until after soft-pilot on weather to support or oppose the LMS change
 - Plan is to test-drive from March-July
 - Thilla suggested that a plan be sent to faculty, if they see the plan and see where the costs savings would be, may be more supportive.
 - Kris: Henry, can you send the plan to faculty?
 - Is option to moves decision to people who are putting plan/implementing training
 - Dr. Sinclair: There were 381 merged courses, 1,700 available courses, and over 300 people who have to change, change management can include huge resistance.
 - Kris: Want language to reflect that we want to take a breath
 - Dr. Sinclair: Will hold vote until we have a quorum, it has become burdensome on faculty.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4 pm
Submitted by Dawn Archibold

Education and Technology Committee
February 26, 2018
Consideration of Canvas to replace Blackboard
as A-State's Learning Management System
submitted by Jollean Sinclair

In the spring of 2016, Information and Technology Services (ITS) in cooperation with the Faculty Senate Education and Technology Committee, began a review of Learning Management Systems (LMS). The ongoing review included faculty surveys and several live demonstrations of potential LMS solutions. At this time, the AState Faculty Center is conducting a "soft-pilot" of Canvas and plans are underway to conduct a small-scale pilot test in the fall 2018 semester. Additionally, ITTC will host "test drives" for all faculty who may be interested in learning more about Canvas. Test drive sessions will start in March and continue through July.

According to ITS, it is thought the university may save as much as \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year by adopting the Canvas LMS (E&T minutes of 11/14/16). We understand the cost savings cited above to be "direct costs." According to the LMS review website, in 2016 the technology fee expenditures for Blackboard were \$284,103.

In the fall of 2017, individuals in favor of replacing Blackboard with Canvas cited "benefits to students" as a reason to switch LMS vendors. Those benefits were described as improved course content access on mobile devices. Information on Blackboard's new mobile app (released December 2017) suggest that Blackboard's mobile capabilities are comparable to those of Canvas.

The indirect costs of a change in LMS include course content transition as well as user training and user support. Data from ITS indicate 381 merged courses and 1,742 available courses on Blackboard in fall 2017. Given the information we have at this time, we expect Blackboard users may need to recreate courses rather than migrate course content from Blackboard to Canvas. Some faculty report having significant investments in course materials on Blackboard.

To our knowledge, ITS has not evaluated and quantified the expected indirect costs of replacing Blackboard with Canvas.

The committee continues to hear about the benefits of Canvas vs. Blackboard, but we have not been provided with information on how the university plans to address the need for training resources and technical support resources should the university decide to replace Blackboard with Canvas.

COMMITTEE OPTIONS

_____ At this time, the committee respectfully declines to support a change in LMS.

_____ At this time, the committee supports a change in LMS and respectfully defers the management of pilot testing and training to ITTC.

_____ At this time, the committee does not wish to submit a proposal in favor of or in opposition to a change in LMS and respectfully defers future LMS review activities to ITTC and ITS.