

REVISED

Meeting Date: Wednesday, November 28, 2018; 3:30 p.m. Rivers 208

Person Presiding: Timm Hackett (chair)

Regular Members in Attendance: Barbara Kellam, Kathleen Sitzman, Guiseppe Getto, Yolanda Holt, Peng Xiao, Guyla Evans, Heidi Bonner, Kathy Lohr (secy)

Ex-officio Members in Attendance: Diana Bond, Holly Wei, Wendy Creasey, Regis Gilman, Steve Schmidt

October meeting minutes were approved with a minor edit, which has been corrected for the record.

Old Business:

Item 1: Interim Software and Data Services Acquisition and Regulation PRR

The committee was tasked with reviewing the PRR and decided faculty need a FAQ vs. the Online Guidance of Instructional Tools, to go along with the PRR. The current FAQ conflicts with the PRR. The committee was tasked with sending questions to Timm Hackett for the PRR creators to answer.

Yolanda questioned (via Teams conversation) if Scenario 1 in the Draft of Guidance on Online Instructional Tools distributed by Wendy last month is in direct conflict with Section 1.3 of the PRR. Wendy said no. For non-ECU-negotiated software, students should have the option to opt out and be provided an alternative assignment. (The committee decided to replace the Online Guidance of Instructional Tools with a FAQ.)

Another scenario is placing student data in the cloud without their consent to terms. Only ECU reviewed cloud storage should be used. A related issue is plagiarism software like Safe Assign where student work should submitted to the cloud permanently without their consent to the terms.

It was suggested that cloud approved technologies be listed and readily available to faculty. Many faculty just do not know what is approved and what is not. Kathleen asked about NIH trainings (certification courses requiring an email address) where students go to a separate site to attend certification courses. In addition, what about open-source materials that we as instructors have vetted? Clarification between software and websites was discussed.

Wendy confirmed that a student has the option of not agreeing to the terms and conditions of a hosted system and per previous guidance by the attorney's office they should be given an alternative assignment . Before using a social media application for instruction, review the social media regulation. Any cloud application used with FERPA data requires it be approved by the data stewards and have a security review. If there are issues with a tool, then a risk acceptance may be required by someone who is an authority. All of these items are outlined in the PRR the committee is tasked to review.

Wendy clarified that this committee is tasked with reviewing the PRR. Her suggestion was to write out questions and let the committee which is made up of a variety of people including auditing, the attorney's office, and security answer the questions. Kathleen shared her concern about giving another committee authority to decide what faculty use in their courses. It needs to be clear but not restrictive. Wendy assured her that these regulations are about protected student data and that our questions will help clarify this.

Timm asked that we submit our questions for him to compile.

Item 2: Peer Review Instrument

One concern from last year was that it did not include evaluation of the instructor, it evaluates the course. Should course design and delivery be in separate sections? Nursing has discussed Quality Matters, which is where some of this work came from. One issue is having access to distance education peer reviewers to perform these observations. Regis is working with designers across campus and OFE and looking to create “sandboxes” to play, experiment, and practice online instruction and tools.

Timm will place the peer observation document in Teams so members can make suggestions. After break, a subcommittee can compose a final copy for presentation at the Faculty Senate’s April meeting.

New Business:

Update from Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC)

Wendy shared her powerpoint presentation to the Academic Technology Advisory Committee meant to educate on the LMS choice to be made in the next 18 to 24 months. The question is, What LMS best fits our needs now? Included in the slideshow was the LMS choice of North Carolina schools. Many have gone to Canvas. Gartner, an IT research firm, is helping with analysis. February 4th will be Gartner Day in which they share research information. Still needed are pilot decisions, there will be 2, two-day demos in the Spring. The basic process will then be to collect feedback so ATAC can make a recommendation to DELTC that will proceed then to the Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs.

IRCC

To meet November 29th with Wendy giving a shortened version of the aforementioned powerpoint.

IT Accessibility

Met the 27nd and went over training and funding as well as marketing Blackboard Ally as Universal Design tool with multimodal instructional options versus an accessibility tool that faculty might not see the need for. Also discussed Wordpress websites and closed-captioning on the Jumbotron.

New Business:

In regard to concerns about design freedom in how Bb looks, the next Bb upgrade will not allow text change on the left menu. Changing the themes, however, will still not be possible but not advisable due to the impact.

Tim will post updated documents in Teams and send reminders. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50
Next meeting is scheduled for January 23, 2019, 3:30 p.m. in Rivers East 208