District Online Committee

Santa Rosa Junior College

Wednesday, February 12, 2025　　　　CETL (3rd Floor Doyle Library)
1:00-3:00 p.m.　　　　Zoom Meeting ID:
2nd Wednesday of each month　　　　878 7086 5576

Members:	Andrea Alvarado (F)	Jurgen Kremer (F)	Mary-Catherine Oxford (A)
	Lisa Beach (A-Co-Chair)	Kerry Loewen (A)	Mike Roth (Ex)
	Jordan Bell (F)	Dawn Lukas (F-AFA)	Kim Starke (Ex-officio)
	Paul DeMartini (C)	Michael McKeever (F)	Kyle Wallstrom (C)
	Dave Harden (F)	Lauren Mitchell Nahas (C)	Ethan Wilde (F)
	Tara Jacobson (F-Co-Chair)	Mai Nazif (F)	

Agenda Items	Activities and Outcome
Committee Business	☐ Approve minutes from December ☐ Notetaker today is Jurgen
Topics From previous meeting	☐ Report on Academic Senate discussion re: Online Instructor Certification: 　o Senate [insert action from 1/15) (https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Online%20Special%20Certification%20Research.pdf); 　o ☐ HyFlex Student survey results 　o Why are they taking these; what do they like; what formats are they taking them in; goal is to better understand their experience. 　o <mark>Lauren will report results at February meeting.</mark> ☐ AI Resolution – Academic Senate taskforce update 　o [Insert Senate action from 1/15] 　o https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Senate%20AI%20Task%20Force%20Recommendations%20for%20Academic%20Senate%20Fall%202024%20%281%29.pdf 　o Will come back as a discussion item in Senate 　o
EdTEch Update	☐ Report back re: procurement process review by College Council 　o <mark>Ask if John Stover can report on this at February meeting.</mark> ☐ Recommendations for renewals or obsolescence ☐ Any new software recommendations from member areas? 　o Honorlock – faculty preference between this new software and our current online proctoring software (Proctorio) ☐ Current Events in EdTech Licenses

	☐ Additional Information or updates o Changes to Turnitin – Lauren reports

New business	☐ Potential new HyFlex option
	    o Scheduling Office considering new Online Flexible option
	
	☐ AI translation in Canvas Inbox
	    o Michael McKeever to report findings today
	
	☐ Accessibility team changes
	    o No cycle reviews until Corrine returns

Future business	☐

Note-takers for 2024/2025:
September: Lauren| **October**: Kerry| **November**: Dawn| **December**: Andrea| **February**: Jurgen| **March**: Mai | **April**: Tara| **May**: Dave

---

Committee Function [CF]: 1) Promote the knowledge and understanding of Distance Education across the District. 2) Provide a forum for the discussion of and assisting with online issues related to curriculum development, faculty training, and faculty support. 3) Conduct regular assessment to determine online learning needs. 4) Develop and recommend District policy and procedures in the area of online learning. 5) Maintain a set of best practice recommendations for online instruction. 6) Provide input on the Online Learning website. 7) Provide advice as requested on matters related to online instruction. 8) Consult with the Educational Planning & Coordinating Council (EPCC) on matters related to online instruction.

Suggested Software Adoption/Renewals Process

The following process would ensure faculty primacy in decision making, as well as appropriate vetting and funding. This would most likely need to be done twice a year (fall and spring).

a. The DOC (or a subgroup) reviews all software titles currently being funded.
b. DOC members are asked if they know whether there is other software (perhaps new) not listed that would be important for faculty to have (DOC faculty would be asked to reach out to their constituency groups for input).
c. Requests for software made directly to DE would be added to the list.
d. DE would provide current pricing models for each title, as well as usage data if available (acquisition of Canvas Insights would make this easy to obtain for all software used within Canvas).
e. DE would review the final list for potential overlap with existing tools, issues with accessibility, problems with equity, known bugs, LTI integration issues, etc.
f. IT would review the list for potential security issues.
g. The DOC would be given all the supplementary information gathered above, then asked to rank all requests from most to least important for faculty. They could include commentary about why particular resources might be critical in certain programs, might conflict with faculty values, or any other issues they might want to comment on.
h. The final DOC ranking (including supplementary information) would be sent to the Academic Senate for discussion/approval.
i. The results from the Academic Senate would be sent to Robert and Kate for funding consideration.
j. Approved funding would be added to the ITG budget for processing as part of that committee's Tech Plan.