



# District Online Committee Notes

Wednesday, February 12, 2025  
 1:00-3:00 p.m.  
 2nd Wednesday of each month

CETL (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Doyle Library)  
 Zoom Meeting ID:  
 878 7086 5576

<b>Members:</b>	Andrea Alvarado (F) YES Lisa Beach (A-Co-Chair) YES Jordan Bell (F) YES Paul DeMartini (C) YES Dave Harden (F) YES Tara Jacobson (F-Co-Chair) YES	Jurgen Kremer (F) YES Kerry Loewen (A) YES Dawn Lukas (F-AFA) YES Michael McKeever (F) YES Lauren Mitchell Nahas (C) YES Mai Nazif (F) YES	Mary-Catherine Oxford (A) NO Mike Roth (Ex) NO Kim Starke (Ex-officio) YES Kyle Wallstrom (C) YES Ethan Wilde (F) NO Matt Pearson YES
<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Activities and Outcome</b>		
<b>Committee Business</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Minutes from December approved <input type="checkbox"/> Notetaker today is Jurgen		
<b>Topics From previous meeting</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Report on Academic Senate discussion re: Online Instructor Certification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Senate  <a href="https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Online%20Special%20Certification%20Research.pdf">https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Online%20Special%20Certification%20Research.pdf</a>;</li> <li>○ Work group on online certification will be formed, primary concern about renewal, comparison with other colleges, what makes sense for us. Ongoing learning requirement central, work on manageable recommendation.</li> <li>○ Faculty have discussed the need to have a separate evaluation for online classes versus in-person since the current student questions and observation process doesn't work well for online courses.</li> <li>○ Concerns about faculty workload and district responsibility for meeting federal accessibility guidelines. These are within the AFA purview.</li> </ul> <input type="checkbox"/> HyFlex Student survey results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why are they taking these; what do they like; what formats are they taking them in; goal is to better understand their experience.</li> <li>○ Lauren Mitchell report. Find results of n=91 here:  <a href="https://forms.office.com/Pages/AnalysisPage.aspx?AnalyzerToken=QzA1td7Ph5uQxG4iQPoCyNAiV6WBxC2u&amp;id=cP6egamtUyzxmAE38ndZRxY866tRS9DoywGtgt55OVUMIYRVIENkNGTEpYVkJYMEhNUTVCUEpBUyQIQCN0PWcu">https://forms.office.com/Pages/AnalysisPage.aspx?AnalyzerToken=QzA1td7Ph5uQxG4iQPoCyNAiV6WBxC2u&amp;id=cP6egamtUyzxmAE38ndZRxY866tRS9DoywGtgt55OVUMIYRVIENkNGTEpYVkJYMEhNUTVCUEpBUyQIQCN0PWcu</a></li> <li>○ <a href="https://srjc.sharepoint.com/:x/s/HyFlex/Ed4IO-SqfDIEkWaFuH244YUBpHjbofm6jMxWf9mWARMHbg?e=ha6bbm">https://srjc.sharepoint.com/:x/s/HyFlex/Ed4IO-SqfDIEkWaFuH244YUBpHjbofm6jMxWf9mWARMHbg?e=ha6bbm</a></li> <li>○ Surprising in preferences: Hyflex #1, completely in person #2, completely asynchronous is #3.</li> <li>○ Stood out: instructor 2nd most popular answer to why students picked HyFlex; blurred line between liking instructor, liking class, and liking topic.</li> </ul> <input type="checkbox"/> AI Resolution – Academic Senate taskforce update		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Senate action from 1/15: proposed task force recommendations were voted down, some pieces didn't sit right with some senators, library had submitted edits to the recommendations, good Senate discussion:</li> <li>○ <a href="https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Senate%20AI%20Task%20Force%20Recommendations%20for%20Academic%20Senate%20Fall%202024%20%281%29.pdf">https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Senate%20AI%20Task%20Force%20Recommendations%20for%20Academic%20Senate%20Fall%202024%20%281%29.pdf</a></li> <li>○ Will come back as a discussion item in Senate, presumably broken down into chunks.</li> <li>○ This will be a district-wide policy (departments don't have policies).</li> <li>○ Primary concerns: institution-wide direction; instructor opt-in vs. opt-out of rules for AI use, are instructors educated enough to make that decision.</li> <li>○ Lisa reported on ASCCC AI presentation.</li> <li>○ It was noted that the infrastructure at SRJC is not set up to address the issue for students. What can the institution provide? Suggestion that we may need to revisit this issue on a regular basis.</li> <li>○ Senate will possibly set up permanent committee responsive to changes.</li> <li>○ We currently have two AI feedback tools for students, students may not be aware that they are turned on (Microsoft Word and Google docs can trigger false positives).</li> </ul>
<b>EdTEch Update</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Report back re: procurement process review by College Council delayed until College Council is caught up.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations for renewals or obsolescence will continue to be brought to DOC, then taken forward</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Any new software recommendations from member areas?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lauren recommends to turn on Khanmigo in Canvas (faculty facing): you can take instructions for an assignment, put them in Khanmigo to simplify. Also helps with: Assignment enhancements, e.g., allows students to turn in assignments multiple times, emphasis on process for getting to final draft.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lisa noted that there is lots of discussion on listservs regarding problems with Khanmigo (particularly accessibility). More information is needed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Report on Canvas Discussion Checkpoint feature, which broke Speedgrader; feature is currently not turned on.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Matt: report on current events in EdTech Licenses; Proctorio renewal is in negotiation. Currently still turned on even though license has expired. Honorlock question: faculty preference between this new software and our current online proctoring software (Proctorio) – <b>result of discussion?</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Discussion about future licenses, who should be involved, importance of user evaluation of pilots was stressed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lauren reported on Turnitin updates, plagiarism framework will be turned on over Spring Break. Discussion of flagging of use of Grammarly. It was noted that it is important how we talk to students about flagged assignment submissions. Possible option for students to see if their assignment will be flagged before submission.</li> </ul>
<b>New business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Potential new HyFlex option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scheduling Office considering new Online Flexible option, faculty not really interested in creating new HyFlex option.</li> <li>○ Request that coding decisions be discussed with some DOC members (Michael, Tara)</li> <li>○ Faculty student user perspective is important in addition to coder / administrative perspective.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AI translation in Canvas: more discussion next time.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Accessibility team changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No cycle reviews until Corrine returns</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**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.