



District Online Committee

Wednesday, March 12, 2025

1:00-3:00 p.m.

2nd Wednesday of each month

CETL (3rd Floor Doyle Library)

Zoom Meeting ID:

878 7086 5576

Members:	Andrea Alvarado (F) Lisa Beach (A-Co-Chair) Jordan Bell (F) Paul DeMartini (C) Dave Harden (F) Tara Jacobson (F-Co-Chair)	Jurgen Kremer (F) Kerry Loewen (A) Dawn Lukas (F-AFA) Michael McKeever (F) Lauren Mitchell Nahas (C) Mai Nazif (F)	Mary-Catherine Oxford (A) Mike Roth (Ex) Kim Starke (Ex-officio) Kyle Wallstrom (C) Ethan Wilde (F)
Agenda Items	Activities and Outcome		
Committee Business	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve minutes from February <input type="checkbox"/> Notetaker today is Mai		
Topics From previous meeting	<input type="checkbox"/> AI Resolution – Academic Senate taskforce update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ https://academicsenate.santarosa.edu/sites/academicsenate.santarosa.edu/files/documents/Senate%20AI%20Task%20Force%20Recommendations%20for%20Academic%20Senate%20Fall%202024%20%281%29.pdf ○ Ongoing discussion item at Senate 		
EdTEch Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations for renewals or obsolescence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Name Coach – Linda Collister <input type="checkbox"/> DE sending survey to Proctorio users about their preference in adopting new proctoring software or staying with Proctorio. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Honorlock and Verity are the other two options <input type="checkbox"/> DE Staffing <input type="checkbox"/> Current Events in EdTech Licenses <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Information or updates		
New business	<input type="checkbox"/> AI translation in Canvas Inbox <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Michael McKeever to report findings today <input type="checkbox"/> DEETAC Report - Datamart, RSI, Definitions <input type="checkbox"/> Online Teaching Conference June 16-18, 2025 Long Beach Convention and Entertainment Center <input type="checkbox"/> InstructureCon July 22-24, 2025 in Spokane, Washington		
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.