**District’s Educational Services Software Workgroup**

**November 18, 2021**

**11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Notes**

**Members:**

Aaron Detty, Aaron Iffland, Andrew MacNeill, Anne Gloag, Brian Weston (Chair,) Cara Smulevitz, Charlie Lieu, Cheryl Reed, Claudia Tornsaufer, Darius Spearman, Denise Munoz, Elizabeth Barrington, Ingrid Greenberg, Isabel O'Connor, Jay Pope, Jill ODea, John Bromma, Katie Palacios, Laura Murphy, Ljubisa Kostic, Manuel Velez, Matilda Chavez, Matthew Rivaldi, Maureen Curry, Michelle Fischthal, Monica Romero, Nancy Wichmann, Paul H. Alexander, Peter Haro, Peter Hester, Peter Maharaj, Poppy Fitch, Rechelle Mojica , Robbi Ewell, Russ English, Star Rivera-Lacey Stephanie Lewis, and Stephanie Major.

**Welcome**

Brian reminded the group that the State’s STAC Collaborative will reopen in April. Unfortunately, it is not sooner, but we will be tracking it and keep bringing updates so that everyone can make timely funding decisions.

**Institutional Effectiveness – Guest Speakers**

Bridget Herrin and Mona King from the office of Institutional Effectiveness at San Diego Mesa College were invited to give an update on the *Task Stream* replacement process. They provided information about what prompted this process, who's been involved, and share their proposed timeline.

They have commissioned a districtwide oversight group and have invited all of the Program Review Outcomes Coordinators and Deans of Institutional Effectiveness from each campus to attend. It is important to have districtwide input as any outcome will require district support and implementation. Originally they discussed the idea of using Canvas for outcomes. That initial focus transitioned into the larger conversation of coming up with a replacement system for Task Stream. The Task Stream contract was set to end December 2021, but has been extended to December 2022. During this year they will review different platforms to see which one is going to match our needs for our different campuses. Many issues have been submitted for consideration both from faculty and admin staff users. The main focus is to be able to extract meaningful program review and outcome assessment data from a system with data that can provide a usable report and used to implement improvements to our programs. Every year we need to collect data on programs and training that users can actually understand. What we have now is not user friendly. There is no freedom to adjust results or to roll over the previous year’s data. There is no connection with the other platforms so that we can use student data or interact with a different part of program reviews or resource allocations. Bridget reported that they had reached out to several vendors and held a series of demonstrations this fall. They do have one more vendor slated for a presentation in December. They hope to compile their observations and research and come up with the best vendor option and present it to the District early 2022. She noted that time will be needed after a decision of a new platform is made, to allow for implementation and training. Also, regarding a contract that ends in December, it really means that we need a new system by August, because the system has to be running prior to the academic year beginning. She said that it is critical for us to get something new in place prior to the 2023 academic year.

Mona displayed the ‘system requirement list’ which was used to review the presentations to date. The group reviewed systems based on basic features that are needed and also the requirements regarding functionality and administrative functions. They added some software systems compatibility requirements and then also some nice-to-haves, but not critical features. She provided a link to all of the recorded demonstrations and then briefly reviewed what the interfaces look like.

Bridget explained that the credit institution’s program review has a six-year cycle, we are collecting data throughout that entire cycle, but each year we have an annual update process. Our process is to go through program review and program planning, where outcomes and data are used to study and reflect on each program during the fall of each academic year. We are trying to meet the needs of multiple campuses with each having their own different timeline. Mona mentioned that our current system is very disconnected from all of our other software. Ideally the new system will be able to interact with both Canvas and Campus Solutions, so that we can pull outcomes data into usable reports. She added that program reviewers from individual programs reflect on their practices using their data and write *outcomes assessment* results where they identify goals and action plans, and then they request resources. The group is hoping for a potential workflow product that exists within the system that could

allow those *resource requests* to make their way through the appropriate bodies on campuses.

One of the subjects we need to consider is whether or not we can maintain access to the old data. Possibly creating an archive of previous program reviews and outcomes reports, or if any of that can be migrated. Migration of old data at this point has not been on the top of our priority list. It may be a discussion on whether to maintain access to Stream or if the institutions have some other storage plan already in place. We will have a six-month grace period after our contract ends where we will have access to all data for either downloading or migration. The IT department asked to be a part of the selection group because part of the strategy is to interface with Campus Solutions and possibly a historical migration of data.

We have requested budget proposals from each of the first three vendors, but have not received any of them; most of them are subscription FTS based. Moving into the future we can all come to a consensus on which software works best for the entire district. A suggestion was to include CIC whenever possible. Bridget thanked Brian and advised the group if they are interested in participating in future meetings, to reach out to the campus contact and have them invite you to the meeting.

**Accessibility and Usability Design Project Update**

Brian thanked Poppy and this group for their support on the Accessibility and Usability Design Project. We have a new webpage at sdccd.edu/accessibility which explains how to make instructional materials more accessible. We have been working to onboard four Accessibility Mentors; CCE-Iris Lowe, Mesa-Sarah Dunn, City-Tucker Grimshaw, and Miramar-Denise Maduli-Williams. The mentors will be offering core workshops and trainings starting this Spring.

**Plagiarism and Media Engagement Software Update**

Trenton Tidwell, SDOLP Instructional Design Coordinator, is helping facilitate a review our plagiarism

detection software that's used in Canvas. The software checks student’s submissions for academic misconduct. We currently use an anti-plagiarism product called Unicheck. Unicheck was recently bought out by another Corporation called TurnItIn. TurnItIn is very expensive and is the reigning kingpin of all plagiarism software out there. So we are looking for options. TurnItIn provided us with a demonstration on a couple of options, one called Originality and one call Similarity. Similarity is most applicable for our purposes. Our faculty review group is 15 members strong so we had a lot of good questions answered. Trenton offered the link to a recording of the demonstration. He added that

next week they will hold a demo from a company called Compilatio with the product called Magister. We are evaluating products with a rubric we've created and will be making a recommendation for a new plagiarism detection software by the end of this term. Chris Rodgers reported that he contacted all 15 members yesterday to schedule a kickoff meeting to establish the objective, go over the rubric and then come up with a meeting schedule and plans for first evaluation. The group will start off reviewing Canvas Studio using the rubric for evaluation. And then, we have two other competing products to schedule.

**Next Meeting:** **Thursday, February 17, 2022**

*Respectfully submitted by: Mary Kingsley*