

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday June 9, 2017
Zoom Online Meeting

Voting Members: Andrew LaManque, Cheryl Aschenbach, Christina Gold, Conan McKay, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Fabiola Torres, Gregory Beyrer, Joseph Perret, Kathie Welch, Michelle Musacchia, Tabitha Villalba, and Thomas Greene

Non-voting Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Marc Beam, Monica Matousek, Russell Grant, and Steve Klein

Welcome and Attendance:

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:33 am and welcomed everyone.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

Dan Crump provided minor edits to the minutes for the May 12, 2017 meeting. *Greg Beyrer moved to approve the minutes as amended and Conor McKay seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.*

Approval of Revisions to the Bylaws:

Action

The committee looked over suggested revisions to the bylaws. Dan suggested spelling out all of the names of the appointing organizations to avoid confusion in the future and everyone agreed. The name of the financial aid organization, the California Community College Student Financial Aid Administrators Association (CCCSFAAA) was added to the document. Under the seventh appointment it had listed CISOA as the appointee and the appointing body, that was changed to reflect the need for a Chief Information Systems Officer (CISO) or Chief Technology Officer (CTO) appointed by the Chief Information System Officer Association (CISOA).

The group discussed the addition of a second classified staff representative who was an instructional assistant either in a computer lab or from a library, to the existing classified representative, from educational technology. Dave Stephens thought it would be more appropriate to have the Classified Senate determine who the specific appointees should be rather than specifying a particular title or area of expertise since those vary by college across the state and represent all classified staff across the state. The committee agreed they wanted to have, "Classified staff (2), to be appointed by the Classified Senate."

The reference to a SACC Liaison should be changed to a 5C Liaison. SSSPAC should be spelled out as Student Services and Support Programs Advisory Committee.

Under item “g,” Dan clarified that visitors were not intended to be barred from attendance if they didn’t give 48 hour notice. The reason for the request for advance notice is to have enough food, and there is always plenty of food. LeBaron confirmed there was no desire to bar anyone from attending.

Who is responsible for reaching out for new appointments when terms are up for representatives? The Chairs and Monica reach out to the Chancellor’s Office and appropriate organizations. However, currently the roster doesn’t track when people are assigned to the committee. Cheryl suggested it might be good to note in the future when people are assigned, and to stagger new appointments so there is some consistency with turnover instead of having a whole new slate of representatives at one time.

Dave Stephens moved to adopt the Charter Bylaws as revised. Dan Crump seconded the motion. The committee approved the revisions to the Charter.

Discussion of Bottleneck Suggestions:

It takes too long for courses to get through the review process and the project is looking for ways to speed up and streamline it. The project was just starting reviews two years ago with courses offered both in and outside of Canvas. Now courses are in Canvas. When Autumn became the Chief Professional Development Officer she worked on revising the rubric and tried to speed up the process. However, it is still taking too long. Barbara and Autumn are actively working with SPOCs this summer to try out ideas and will report results in the fall.

Some ideas that have come up since the last meeting are: having monthly Design to Align webinars and being a little more stringent on the self-check with the rubric prior to beginning. Suggestions are being made to think about different types of incentives by addressing the question of “What’s in it for me?” (WIIFM) They will look at putting more emphasis on WIIFM with strong marketing. For example, some faculty is motivated by the desire to improve their courses and having free professional development and resources to improve them. Other faculty would like either financial or equipment incentives. Vice Presidents and Presidents might be motivated by increased FTEs and instructional designers by equipment.

Greg suggested contacting schools that had or have thriving Distance Education programs to ask how they incentivize faculty participation. They will probably have additional ideas not considered yet. Those successful colleges likely had systems for getting co-pilots and the rest of the crew on the plane.

Dave suggested providing incentive packages before faculty start to develop the course, or even while they are developing the course. He has heard faculty don’t have tools to build courses and the college won’t buy them. There is a big return on investment with putting tools in front of people with the willingness and

motivation to use them. People who have the tools will also feel more obligated to follow through and finish what they start.

Fabiola reiterated the importance of teaching and curriculum design; it is all about androgogy. No matter how many tools there are, faculty still has to develop an effective class for learning and the project wants to remember that focus.

The team is also working with SPOCs on handling courses that were previously approved, when the instructor changes. How will that process work as opposed to starting totally from the beginning and going all the way through? This would come into play not in OEI or the Management Team having any involvement in reassigning a class, but instead in those cases where a SPOC or college comes to OEI after a course has been reassigned based on illness, retirement, etc. This is not intended to and will not interfere with college decision making, but instead could expedite the process for courses already in the Exchange and scheduled. It is important that colleges understand OEI is not getting involved in local college processes.

Barbara has summarized the ideas submitted so far in a document and thread on Basecamp and encourage members to continue to provide suggestions. The conversation can continue in Basecamp, through email to Barbara, and at the next meeting. She and Autumn hope to have more to present in September or October after they try out ideas during the summer.

Proctorio Demonstration:

Logan is now a permanent member of OEI in the Project Analyst position.

There seems to be a lot of general apprehension from faculty about the audio and video recording features of Proctorio since it introduces an unknown element. At a CSU a student who didn't read the video disclaimer engaged in inappropriate behavior which was recorded and later viewed by the instructor when Proctorio flagged it. This resulted in a sticky situation.

Dave's goal with the demonstration today is to show features that may be used aside from video and audio recording, since Proctorio seems to be the product with the most cryptic mission and the one faculty has the least familiarity with. The intent is to demystify what the tool can do. There are a number of useful features beyond audio and video recording. Greater use of the tool can help the project maximize its return on investment.

Dave demonstrated how to find the "Secure Exam" link in the menu after the Proctorio LTI is installed by a system administrator. This link presents a faculty member with a screen that walks them through installing the Proctorio Chrome extension. That link only exists with a Canvas course; it is not visible in the Chrome store. Currently that extension has a bug that doesn't automatically refresh after installation, so the user has to click on it a second time to open the

next page. Proctorio cannot be used in incognito mode; Chrome has to be set to accept cookies and the link has to come from within the Canvas course the LTI has been installed in. Once it has been installed, the user won't be prompted to install it again. Dave encouraged Steering Committee members to try out Proctorio and provide feedback on it.

Enabling Proctorio for a quiz is done through the "Enable Secure Exam Proctor Link" which is about half way through the list of quiz settings and can be easy to miss if the user doesn't know where it is. Unlike VeraCite or Ally it needs to be set up but once the checkbox has been checked there will be a link at the very top of the quiz edit screen. This is a one-time step that never has to be done again.

There are a number of features and tools including state profiles, exam settings, and behavior settings. State profiles allow users to save configuration choices and do a fast track using the same settings on future quizzes. Some faculty have expressed apprehension about recording their students, despite the vendor's wonderful job of complying with FERPA in Ed Code, but there are other useful features within exam settings even if recording audio and recording video are bypassed. "Screen grab" is only available if the instructor chooses to review recorded material. Aside from recording, Dave suggested faculty look further at features that can provide deeper test integrity like: force full screen, locking down exams to only one screen or only allowing links that have been provided in the quiz question, and forcing closing of existing open tabs.

Disabling features can be useful as well. Disable printing prevents saving as a pdf, screen grabs, or screen shots. However, it wouldn't disable taking a picture with a phone, which would require identification through use of a video recording. Disabling the clipboard and clearing the cache erases material so the student can't make a copy of the page or questions to circulate to other students. Disabling right click prevents copy/paste.

Some of the lock down settings conflict with some native quiz or exam settings. For example, if the instructor wants to allow the student the ability to come back into a test, "prevent re-entry" wouldn't allow a student to come back into a test. However, that is made clear because the instructor has to watch a video before enabling that feature. Each feature also has a question mark in the corner, which immediately launches a new tab with an instructional video from the vendor it. Features can all be mixed and matched and the instructor can set up Proctorio to use some recording features as well as some lock down features. Many of the verification options only make sense if recording options are being used, because otherwise the student could complete the verification and swap places with someone else completing the exam.

Behavior settings are in categories like: recommended, lenient and moderate. These settings impact algorithms used by the Proctorio software to check

“suspicious behavior.” For example, “group exam” allows for increased audio activity and multiple faces in the window. “Open notes” allows students to have new tabs open and would allow for shuffling of papers.

This is an awesome tool and has many features that faculty might find useful, whether or not they are uncomfortable with audio and video recording. The lock down features will help cut down on a lot of fraud. Recording options and lock down options set limitations for the student experience while they are taking the exam by enabling or disabling certain activities or functionality. Behavior settings impact how the software detects and measures suspicious behavior. Behavior settings don't limit or disable activities or behaviors they just change how they are measured.

Greg warned they had a problem with old computers in their library freezing up and preventing students from being able to finish exams in time. They finally decided to take Proctorio off their library computers until they can upgrade this summer. It wasn't Proctorio's fault, but it was a frustrating experience. Dave did note that Proctorio is exceptionally CPU intense. Currently it doesn't work on ipads or with Firefox, it must be used on a desktop browser with Chrome.

Anytime an instructor has enabled Proctorio in a quiz it will append the quiz title with “secure browser or secure exam” or something to that effect.

Dave briefly demonstrated the student view and the level of disclaimers shown. He encouraged faculty to have students use it on their syllabi exams, to get a feel for it in a non-punitive way. Dave and Logan felt demonstrations were better accepted when done by peers rather than advertisement oriented presentations by vendors. There was an instructor whose mind was opened about the potential for assessing student learning using Proctorio after viewing the real time experience of his students taking a quiz. There is potential for this tool to have an impact on teaching beyond what is happening during the exam. Dan thought it was great to hear from a peer about the impact this tool had upon his teaching.

Proctoring Network Update:

There will be a webinar with the Foundation in the fall both on Proctorio and the proctoring network. Nicole Wooley, a librarian at Sacramento City College is working with OEI part time and she did the work on starting the proctoring network. The MOU is posted on the OEI website.

Barbara explained the proctoring network is open to all community colleges, not just Consortium colleges. The idea is for any college that wants to be in it to allow students to take an exam on a Chrome book at another institution. This is something that is often needed for science and mathematics classes where students need to be able to use a scientific calculator, and Proctorio doesn't have the scientific calculator embedded in the lock down menu. Unfortunately that means that a student glancing down to use a calculator (or notes for an open

note exam) would be flagged in Proctorio because the software would detect the eye movement of repeatedly looking down from the screen. Instead a student would be able to go to a proctoring center with instructions approving their use of a calculator, notes, and/or ESL dictionary, and so on and not have that flagged as suspicious. Students would be able to go to the closest network college.

Originally the invitation to join the Proctoring Network was sent to Consortium colleges and others that expressed interest. So far Columbia College is the only one that has signed the MOU. Barbara will send the invitation out next week on three Listservs: CIO, CSSO, and DE Coordinators. She asked members to email her with any other suggestions for sending it out. Each college deals differently with proctoring; some have it in assessment, some in the library, etc.

Barbara thanked Nicole Wooley for all her hard work. They are hoping to get the Proctoring Network up and running for the fall term.

Online Teaching Conference:

The OTC is coming up in two weeks.

Next Meetings:

August 11th 2017 Online from 9:30am- 11:30am

September 15th 2017 Face-to-face in Sacramento from 9:30am-3:00pm

October 13th 2017 Online from 9:30 – 11:30 am

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 am.