

DE Committee Minutes

October 17, 2025 | 9:30 a.m. | Room 2410 + Zoom

Meeting Minutes



1. Call to order

- a. Meeting called to order at 9:31 am

2. Review and approval of agenda

- a. Stacie motion to approve: Bobby seconds. Agenda approved.

3. Approval of minutes

- a. Mike F. motion to approve September minutes; Stacie seconds; September minutes approved.

4. Public comments (3 minutes):

- a. No public comment.

5. Reports

- a. Angelo provided updates on the Peer Online Course Review (POCR) Program, which has finished up weekly workshops on each section of the CVC-OEI Online Course Design Rubric for our Fall 2025 cohort participants. Instructors are working on finalizing their course alignment before turning their courses over to reviewers next month. Bobby suggested hosting a refresher workshop for POCR Reviewers who may not have completed course reviews in some time.
- b. Kat provided an update from the Technology Committee/Technology Coordinating Committee. Efforts continue to transition our technology from Banner 8/Class-Web to Banner 9/MyPortal. District IT will be doing a demo of the new registration experience for students in MyPortal today at 1 pm if people are interested in understanding how students will register in MyPortal. More changes will be coming as they begin transitioning faculty content.

6. Old business

a. Course Review + DE Trainings

- i. Kat shared that 11 instructors are in-progress in OCDP, 6 are in progress in HyFlex training, and 5 are in progress in POCR. No requests for DE Course Reviews at this time.

b. CVC Teaching College Project

- i. District IT has resumed work on the project and is working to configure our technology to sync with the CVC Exchange. Bi-weekly meetings have resumed to track progress and conduct trainings for employees on new workflows, like A+R/Counseling team members clearing pre-requisites for students registering through the Exchange.
- ii. Goal is a “go live” date at the end of November, hoping to take advantage of enrollments in Winter

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students’ transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision-making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities.
- ❖ Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus.

DE Committee

Quorum: 5

Members Present (voting):

Kat King (TLC, Co-chair)

Angelo Bummer (Faculty, A&H)

Mike Frith (Faculty, PATH)

Bobby August (Faculty, STEM)

Stacie Granada (Faculty, Adjunct)

Members present (non-voting):

Mike McQuiston (Dean)

Tania Torres (A&R Rep)

Tyler Prellwitz (ASLPC)

Members Absent:

Nan Ho (VP, Academic Services)

Michelle Simotas (BSSL Dean/VP Rep)

Wanda Butterly (Classified, TLC)

Vacant (Faculty, BSSL)

Vacant (Faculty, Student Services)

Vacant (Library)

Vacant (Faculty, At-Large)

Intercession/Spring. We're finalizing campus communications and student welcome letters and will send out info as we get clarity on our launch date.

7. New business

a. Accessibility in Canvas Data Review

- i. Kat and Wanda pulled data about accessibility errors on Canvas this fall, resuming our practice from last year so that we can better understand how we are meeting accessibility mandates. In good news, color contrast and empty links errors continue to go down, reflecting progress from all our training efforts last year. In less good news, our total errors are higher than they were at the end of Spring 2025.
- ii. Committee members discussed potential reasons – including that faculty may have fixed their Spring courses during our awareness campaigning, but now be teaching courses in the fall that they typically only teach in fall. We also discussed challenges to improving our practices, like a general sentiment of “job creep.” Accessibility remediation is important, but takes time and can feel like a new, additional workload for instructors, since even on-campus faculty members typically use Canvas to share resources with students.
- iii. Members discussed potential strategies to improve – including hosting more accessibility workshops, offering pre-term Accessibility “Hack-a-thon” days to help support incoming part-time instructors, and coordinating with the FA to make sure accessibility review is a clearer part of the training faculty members complete before conducting peer evaluations. We want to make sure instructors/evaluators know how to use the PopeTech Dashboard to assess accessibility compliance and know how to get support when errors are identified, like through one-on-one appointments with Wanda. We'll continue to offer workshops on tools like PopeTech and the AI tools Wanda developed - ComplyBot and DesignerBot – to streamline accessibility remediation and ADA-compliant course design features.

b. Academic Software Process

- i. Kat shared that she, Bruce Griffin (CTO), and Christy Davis-Rosa (Chabot's Instructional Technology Coordinator) presented at both LPC and Chabot's Academic Senates to review a new process for vetting academic software. The process is needed as new LTI (Learning Tools Interoperability) standards emerge in Canvas.
- ii. The original method of integrating third-party tools like publisher software was managed through an “LTI 1.1” process, which instructors could typically manage themselves at the course level. There has been a shift to “LTI 1.3” standards for a more secure process, but this involves installation at the district-level and impacts our entire Canvas instance, so additional vetting is necessary.
- iii. In higher ed, there are strict data security/privacy and accessibility standards. These are typically documented in a company's “HECVAT” (Higher Ed Community Vendor Assessment Toolkit) and “VPAT” (Voluntary Product Accessibility Template).
- iv. We need a process – which will be especially helpful for accreditation - showing how we're reviewing/evaluating technology to ensure it adheres to these standards; TCC members worked to create an updated draft [Academic Software Integration Request Form](#) that employees will submit when requesting a new academic software. The person requesting the technology will be asked to share information about the technology requested and help gather the HECVAT/VPAT from their ed tech rep to expedite the review process. Teams will then review requests to determine if software/app meets standards for Higher Ed.
- v. The review process takes time, so if you get a message from your textbook rep saying they are going to transition to LTI 1.3, you'll want to submit the form/start the review process as soon as possible. It's typically necessary to transition from 1.1 to 1.3 integrations between terms, not in the middle of a semester, to reduce technical errors.
- vi. Committee members shared feedback, like a desire for a list of technologies that have already been implemented with the LTI 1.3 process and a clear turnaround time, since

requests may be time-sensitive. Kat will bring this back to TCC and help support. She'll provide future updates as we get clarity on the submission process, review team, and notification process.

c. Artificial Intelligence

i. Professional Development: Work Groups + Upcoming Webinars

1. Kat shared webinars recently added to our [PD calendar](#) – including webinars about best practices in pedagogy in light of advancements in AI, workshops about new tools like PlayLab and Nectir that continue to be piloted through the CCCCO, and courses offered by industry partners like Khanmigo and Google. Our AI Resources webpage includes information to help people understand AI tools, develop AI Course Policies, and engage in these opportunities to learn more.
2. Kat shared information about LPC's participation in a **Regional PD AI Community of Practice** coordinated by the CCCCO to support the Vision 2030 PD Plan. The goal is to develop community among participants that ultimately supports AI literacy for faculty in each region. LPC reps are Kat King, David Powers, and Frances Hui, as part of the Bay Area Community College Consortium. Sessions are scheduled in October and December, with new dates coming in Spring. Committee members shared hopes that this group will help in our development of policies and create opportunities for discipline-specific trainings.
3. Angelo provided updates about the first meeting of our **District AI Workgroup**, facilitated by an external partner, Our Media. LPC reps include Angelo Bummer (Eng), Ashley Young(Math/AS), Chris Lee (Couns/FA), Dan Clearley (Music), David Powers (Math/FA), Drew Patterson (Bus), Heike Gecox (Counseling/FA), Jared Howard (Counseling), Jeff Judd (Bio), Jennie Graham (Math), Kat King (Eng/WRKX). The initial meeting took place 10/2, where participants reviewed student-centered listening sessions that aimed to surface student insights into AI, like what tools are they using? What skills do they need support building to stay resilient in the face of AI automation? How are they navigating their transition into career given AI disruption? A survey has been sent out to group to help co-design an in-person session in November to further the work. There is a little confusion about the purpose/goal of the workgroup. Tyler shared that he participated in the student workshop, which included students with a wide range of familiarity about AI. Students are interested in how AI is being used in industries they plan to go into. Committee members discussed ideas that might guide the work of this group, including the development of workshops for students and discipline-specific AI workshops for faculty.
4. Kat reviewed the [Developing AI Literacy in the CCC](#) guidance she emailed to the campus on 9/30, outlining the CCCCO's mission for fundamental AI Literacy for all and including actionable suggestions for instructors, students, deans, administrators, Classified professionals, and managers.
5. She also shared the [Evolving Instructional Technology Tools in Canvas](#) Memo detailing upcoming AI options in Canvas, like AI Discussion Summaries and AI Inbox translations. Additional features in the works are LLM assignment types and AI-assisted grading. The rapid development of AI tools in Canvas and AI industry tools becoming available to educational institutions, like Gemini and Notebook LM, are posing challenges for campuses across our system. One question campuses are grappling with is purview – who makes decisions about these technologies? The DE Committee Charge includes "To explore, recommend, and provide support implementing policies, procedures, and tools that enhance student learning and services in the delivery of distance education at Las Positas College." So historically, the DEC has vetted and made decisions on Canvas upgrades, like enabling

“Discussion Checkpoints.” But many of the available or soon available AI tools have more potential impact not only online instructors, but instructors in all modalities. Another challenge is capacity; the surge in new tools has made it hard to have time to evaluate tools within our existing committee meeting structure and complete our other responsibilities. Committee members shared that they still want to be involved in demos and decisions, but discussed the need for further discussion with our partners across our campus and district – including Academic Senate, Technology Committee, and the district Technology Coordinating Committee. Kat will bring this forward with these groups.

d. DE Survey

- i. Committee members began an initial discussion of the annual DE satisfaction survey the Committee historically launched for students near the end of the fall term. Last year, we skipped the survey because the CCCC launched a more robust, system-wide survey that gave us data to review, and we didn’t want to duplicate efforts or contribute to “survey fatigue.” Kat checked in with our counterparts at Chabot and they do not do a yearly DE student survey, but incorporate questions in to the institutional survey run the Research Office every 2 years. Kat has reached out to Rajinder, who said we can likely incorporate some but not all of the questions we typically ask into LPC’s 2-year institutional survey. Committee members will reflect and return to discussion of this at the next meeting.

8. Information items

- a. Members were encouraged to attend and promote upcoming events on our [Workshop Calendar](#) and DE-related workshops scheduled for Fall Flex Day: a workshop for faculty teaching in winter intersession, an “AI in Action” showcase, and a workshop dedicated to helping faculty remediate accessibility errors on Canvas with PopeTech and the AI tools Wanda has developed.

9. Adjournment

- a. Stacie moved to adjourn the meeting; Angelo seconded. Meeting adjourned at 11:27 am

10. Next meeting: November 21, 9:30-11:30 am, Room 2410 and Zoom