DE COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 22, 2023| 9:30 a.m. | Room 2410 and Zoom

DE Committee   Quorum: 4

Members Present (voting):
Scott Vigallon (TLC, co-chair)
Barbara Zingg (faculty-at-large, co-chair)
Bobby August (STEM)
Lyndale Garner (BSSL)
Richard Dry (A&H)
Thanh Thao Nguyen (adjunct faculty)

Members present (non-voting):
None

Members Absent:
Jeff Lawes/Barbara Chavez (A&R)
Stuart McElderry (Dean)
Angelo Bummer (A&H)
Nan Ho (VP, Academic Services)
Vacant (PATH)
Vacant (Library)
Vacant (Counseling)
Vacant (ASLPC)

Guests:
None

Meeting Minutes

1. **Call to Order**
   a. The meeting began at 9:34 a.m.

2. **Approval of August minutes**
   a. Bobby motioned, Barbara seconded. Minutes approved unanimously

3. **Updates**
   a. Scott submitted a proposal to conduct a session on Turnitin's AI detector on Flex Day. He wanted to work with faculty who would do a session on teaching with AI, but the two who were interested backed out. Additionally, the Teaching Institute, whose program September 27 is titled Teaching in the Age of Artificial Intelligence, did not want to present at Flex Day, either, according to David Powers.
   b. With @ONE being funded for another three years, the CVC announced September 15 its areas of focus for that duration. Among the areas is an analysis of Peer Online Course Review, or POCR. Don't be surprised to see changes in the OEI-CVC rubric within a year or so. Its goals include:
      1) Conduct and write an analysis of the online course review frameworks within our system and nationally.
      2) Provide an assessment of POCR in light of the system's equity agenda.

      The committee was reminded that LPC still does not have a POCR lead.

4. **Course review**
   a. On August 28, Scott emailed all of the instructors needing a course review, asking them if they wanted the review, or if they would complete the OCDP or apply for equivalency instead. Three of the 14 instructors replied, and one will do the review, one will do the OCDP, and one will apply for equivalency. Review assignments were made, and each faculty member on the committee will conduct two reviews. For those new to course review, Scott will work with them so they understand the process.

5. **Turnitin**
   a. Scott wanted to make it clear that instructors who undergo AI detection training in Turnitin are told that they have to determine how acceptable AI writing is by students even if the report shows 100% AI generated. Instructors should have

a conversation with students about their writing submission instead of simply flunking the students. Currently, there is no official LPC process for dealing with AI-generated writing.

b. In order to continue offering faculty AI detection capabilities, the district had to upgrade the Turnitin license from Turnitin Feedback Studio to a product called Turnitin Originality. With the upgrade comes a tool called Authorship for Investigators that allows designated employees access to automate tasks in the process of trying to determine if a student contracted with a third-party "to produce their academic work and then submitted that work as their own, original creation." This is what Turnitin calls contract cheating. It has to do with plagiarism and not AI. According to Turnitin, the employees who gain access to Authorship are typically those involved when a student plagiarism case gets escalated, like deans and maybe vice presidents. Richard suggested that English faculty be given this level of access, too, because they deal more with plagiarism issues than most everyone else on campus. Scott will bring this suggestion to VP Ho.

c. Also with the upgrade, LPC, Chabot, and the district, have to choose one of three paths toward implementation of Originality. The key issue is whether instructors at one college should be able to see the full text of papers that match to the other college. Because the decision affects both colleges, the ultimate decision will be made at the district TCC. It is on the agenda for the October 13 TCC meeting. The three paths were shared with the committee, which decided to recommend Path #1. That choice allows instructors and those with access in Authorship to see papers at both colleges. It also means that there will be no changes to Canvas, such as forcing instructors at both colleges to re-enable Turnitin for every assignment. The committee's recommendation will be relayed to the TCC.

6. **Canvas**

a. As promised last month, Scott created a Canvas site for AI resources and began adding some resources. He shared the site with the committee. It is rudimentary so far, and the committee was asked for ideas about the site and to send resources to him.

b. In response to the committee's discussion last month about allowing students to have certain Teacher roles in non-instructional courses, Scott created a new role in Canvas to test what happens when a student is allowed to post announcements, create pages, and create discussions. When

given these privileges, students can still do the following: enable feature options, add apps, export course content, create a wiki page, share the course to Commons, change the course image, and let the other students attach files to discussions, create discussion topics, and edit or delete their own discussion replies.

The topic was brought to the district Technology Coordinating Committee on September 8, and that committee wants a position paper on it that can be discussed at its October 13 meeting before making a recommendation to the Chancellor.

The committee was asked if it wanted to make a recommendation to be included in a position paper, but the committee was split on whether to disallow students from getting Teacher access altogether and only allowing the three aforementioned privileges.

c. The district TCC, also at its September 8 meeting, discussed the possible integration of Impact into Canvas. At our meeting last month, we recommended to purchase and integrate Impact, but not the feature that allows popup messages to be visible to faculty and students because there's no way to opt out of those messages. That recommendation was relayed to the TCC. At its October 13 meeting, the TCC will decide whether to heed that recommendation and Impact's cost or not.

7. **2023-24 goals**
    a. The committee discussed possible goals for this academic year and that were presented last month and discussed two new goals: a) Create a Canvas site to populate with AI resources for faculty; and b) Create, and post, a matrix that lists all HyFlex classes for a semester and denotes the student participation choices for each of those classes.

        1) Institutionalize ongoing, voluntary web accessibility course reviews.
        2) Oversee the creation of a self-paced HyFlex faculty training course.
        3) Research Instructure Impact, and make a recommendation on whether or not it should be purchased.
        4) If Impact is purchased, oversee its implementation.

5) Make recommendation(s) on the implementation of Turnitin Originality and Authorship.

The committee wanted the two new goals to be added, along with one that says: Complete DE Committee course reviews. Bobby made a motion to implement the eight goals, Thao seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

8. **HyFlex**
   a. Jeff Lawes brought up the time overlap issue with Tamica during their last A&R meeting. She indicated that A&R is only the processor and not the decision maker. Her advice to the DE Committee was to bring this up directly to the Academic Deans and/or VP Ho. Scott will broach the issue with Nan.
   b. On September 5, Scott emailed all faculty to solicit participants in the fall edition of HyFlex training. The deadline to register was Thursday. Only one instructor signed up. That instructor will be placed into the new self-paced HyFlex training course. Scott presented the course to the committee.
   c. Nan would like to proceed with the idea of creating a matrix for all HyFlex classes, placing it onto the Online Learning web site and linking to it from the notes of HyFlex classes in the schedule of classes. For spring 2024, schedule production ends October 16, and registration begins November 3. Therefore, HyFlex instructors should get their student participation mode choices to Scott by the end of October so he has time to create the matrix and post it. He drafted a revised note for all HyFlex classes for the class schedule and shared it with the committee for feedback. It will include a link to the page with the matrix. The new note has to go to Andrea by September 29. It will need to be approved by Nan.
      1) *This is hybrid-flexible course, referred to as HyFlex. Students may choose to attend class on campus at the times, days, and building location noted, or they can participate online. To determine if the instructor allows synchronous online participation via Zoom and/or asynchronous online participation via Canvas, view the Instructor Participation Choices page at laspositascollege.edu/onlinelearning/xxxx.php.*
      2) Scott asked the committee if the matrix should include mandatory on-campus meetings. The committee said yes. Since the decision to allow mandatory on-campus meetings for major exams in HyFlex classes was made by the previous VP, the

committee wants to find out if the current VP is good with that decision.

9. **Web accessibility**
   a. Wanda Butterly emailed all faculty September 12 to solicit voluntary fall 2023 web accessibility checks in Canvas. So far, seven instructors have submitted courses.

10. **DE Student Survey**
    a. The committee discussed the annual DE student satisfaction survey, which is scheduled to be deployed December 4. Last year, the committee wanted a satisfaction item on online office hours be added. It was added to question 5. Scott suggested adding AI to the tools in question 9 that asks about tasks students what helps them learn best in DE classes. He also asked if question 10 about tasks on mobile devices can be removed. The committee agreed to both of these. It also agreed to Richard's suggestion of adding a question about the clarity of their instructors' policy on the use of AI.

11. **Other issues**
    a. None broached

12. **Adjournment**
    a. The meeting was adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

13. **Next meeting**
    a. October 27, 9:30 a.m. in room 2410 and Zoom