



To:	Keith Nainby, Speaker of the Faculty
From:	Tom Carter, Chair, Academic Technology and Learning Committee, 2020-2021
Date:	May 7, 2021
RE:	Annual Report of the Academic Technology & Learning Committee, 2020-2021

The members of the Academic Technology and Learning Committee were:

Thomas Carter, Chair
Steven Filling, Chair Elect
Jose Diaz-Garayua CAHSS Representative
Andrew Hinrichs, CBA Representative
Curtis Pro, COS Representative
Laura Rocco, Library Representative
Cassandra Drake, COEKSW Representative
Lynda Wynn, At-Large Representative
Joshua Costello, ASI

Jase Teoh, Academic Technology Director
Rafael Espinosa, Chief Information Officer
Amanda Theis, Executive Secretary
Glenn Pillsbury, Instructional Designer

This was a very strong and proactive committee. We made good progress on a range of issues. In only its second year of existence as a full Academic Senate committee, we were confronted with a broad range of concerns related to the COVID pandemic, which kept almost our entire academic program in virtual modalities throughout the year. I want to thank the members of the committee for their commitment and efforts. I particularly want to thank Joshua Costello for his valuable contributions and coordination with ASI, and Minerva Perez for excellent support of the work of the committee!

Major topics the committee addressed included:

Support for faculty during remote learning conditions – This was a primary topic during each ATLC meeting throughout the year. Some primary tasks were:

- Work with OAT and OIT to provide important technology, including internet access, for faculty and students.
- Coordinate with OAT and FCETL for instructional training opportunities.

Web conferencing camera policy – developed temporary policies, which were passed in Senate. The temporary policy will continue through Fall 2021. Related to this, we also had extensive discussion of the use of proctoring systems / software.

Revision of the Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs (OTM) – workgroup made revisions, but this is still on agenda for next year. (See note below)

Update of the campus Academic Technology Plan (ATP) – There is an old Plan, needing to be updated. This includes issues such as regular refreshing of faculty computers and related technology, and support for student lab access. This remains on the agenda for next year. (See note below)



Zoom recording storage -- Zoom has a limited capacity of. To alleviate the storage issue OIT purchased Panopto video platform which has unlimited storage. There is training underway on how to store videos on Panopto and how to download or upload. The connection to Canvas is straightforward, and the committee wants to make sure it is the same for other LMS options.

ATI – General work on Accessible Technology Initiative, including recommendations concerning Ally, an external tool integrated into LMSs such as Canvas which scans content for accessibility, that will become available for general faculty to use in the Fall.

Multifactor authentication – Discussion of various issues related to this topic.

Copyrighted Materials -- Standards, policies, conversion, etc.

Faculty and student surveys, with particular focus on classroom technology and upgrades – and work with OAT / OIT on recommendations and processes for classroom technology upgrades.

Computer lab and study spaces – we had a variety of discussions about closed and open computer labs, and related topics concerning student study spaces.

Intellectual Property – Discussion of various topics related to IP, e.g., material for online classes.

Network/System Outages – Worked with OIT concerning handling of, communication concerning, and response to network or system outages.

DRS concerns – related to online/virtual classes.

Blackboard Updates – discussion of issues related to the end of Blackboard contract.

Costs of LMSs and range of support -- we had broad discussion of these topics, with particular focus on how Moodle and other LMS options fit into our broad approach to LMS support.

Makerspace/Digital Lab – discussion of support for Makerspace/Digital Lab; provide letter of support for the project.

As chair, I again want to thank all members of the Committee for their excellent work this year under what continued to be trying conditions.

Additionally, the chair would like to reiterate the recommendation of last year's chair, that assigned-time support for the ATLC chair be standardized to comport with that of other Senate committee chairs, who also serve on the Senate Executive Committee. As noted, the work required of the ATLC chair is, and will continue to be, at least on par with that required of other standing committee chairs.



Notes for reference:

With respect to the ongoing project of revising and updating the Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs (OTM) and the Academic Technology Plan (ATP), the committee did not make as much progress as we might have wished, but conditions related to the pandemic occupied vast amounts of committee time and effort, and brought new issues and concerns related to these policies to the forefront. With new insight, I am hopeful that next year's committee can make substantial progress on these revisions and updates.

For a summary of important issues, I cannot do better than copying here the recommendations from last year's ATLC (2019-2020), as summarized by Mark Thompson in his annual report:

The discussion of the OTM and AT policies was intended to lay the groundwork for the committee to review, revise, and recommend on those policies in AY 2020/2021. The discussion of the OTM policy included the purpose for the policy, how it has and will be used, and what the necessary inclusions in such a policy statement might be. The policy review also should include review of WASC and CSU system information related to the policy, including definitions, and the policy revisions should provide information about best practices, available support and professional development while honoring academic freedom in course design and delivery as well as requirements such as technology accessibility.

The review of the 2003 AT policy began with a review of the campus Strategic Plan, highlighting those areas where the plan refers to academic technology. The committee should address to what degree the "plan" is a policy statement and an implementation plan and should consult the technical plan currently being drafted by the OIT steering committee. Additionally, taking into consideration that there is now an Office of Academic Technology that is in a different division from OIT, the plan should address roles, interactions and separations of each office. Other points of discussion for inclusion in the plan were: a specific plan for the Stockton campus; replacement cycles for faculty computers; a broader statement on how the process of academic technology selection will proceed highlighting the current LMS selection process; a sub group to review classroom technology, the LMS, and support staff on a regular basis; and the relationship and interaction of ATLC with other committees (e.g. UEPC) and organizations (e.g. CFA) to address questions.