

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM: 5.H

DATE: June 11, 2014

SUBJECT: Respondus Monitor & D2L Video Note

In late 2013, the Desire2Learn (D2L) Management Committee viewed a demo of a tool called Monitor, by Respondus. Respondus also provides a host of other tools the BOR uses including: 1) LockDown Browser (LDB): used for securing exams; 2) Respondus: used for managing/building quizzes; and 3) StudyMate: used for building interactive study tools, games, and simulations. The management committee was familiar with the company, and has been satisfied by both their offerings, and their level of support. Specifically, monitor is an enhancement to the LDB that can be used by instructors to require students to take an exam while being recorded with a video camera (webcam) and microphone. This has a number of benefits:

- It helps with identity verification: is the person taking the exam the student who should be taking the exam?
- It is a deterrent to cheating: the student is recorded—audio and video—during the entire exam taking process.
- It can help lessen the load on the testing centers by providing an environment similar to the proctored environment at the student’s location.
- It is convenient: students can test anytime/anywhere, whereas the testing centers and other proctors are only available at certain locations during certain times.

One of the concerns that the committee had was how much burden this would place on instructors. It is one thing to record the students, but it is a whole other issue to review those recordings. Some vendors address this by having people review and flag the recordings as part of their service agreement, but this tends to be very expensive—often imposing a per student/per assessment fee for such a service, which can quickly add up. Respondus attempts to strike a balance here, by providing instructors with snapshot view of the student’s exam session. Monitor takes periodic pictures during the exam, and presents them to the instructor for quicker review. As a result, if an instructor notices that a student is not in the frame in one of the snapshots, is looking down, or is otherwise behaving in a suspicion fashion, they can jump right to that point in the exam and review the recording.
















(Continued)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Discussion & Recommendation.

	First ▲	Last	Date	Duration	Webcam or Lab	Rev
[+]	Amber	Swenson	29 Jul 2013 @ 6:06PM	(Not Finished)	Webcam	No
[+]	Anne	Fennelly	24 Jul 2013 @ 9:28AM	6.6 minutes	Webcam	No
[-]	Bob	Roberts	3 Jul 2013 @ 12:34PM	15.2 minutes	Webcam	No

Bob Roberts

Image not available Photo on File	 Student Photo	 Student ID	 Environment Video
 Time 00:00:00 (Pre-Exam)	 Time 00:00:20 (Exam Start)	 Time 00:01:12	 Time 00:02:24
 Time 00:03:36	 Time 00:04:48	 Time 00:06:00	 Time 00:07:12
 Time 00:08:24	 Time 00:09:36	 Time 00:10:48	 Time 00:12:00

The cost for Respondus Monitor seemed very reasonable to the committee. Usage can be tracked by course—ergo, by institution as well—so institutions could be billed for actual usage. The projected costs for the pilot and the first and second year are outlined below.

- **pilot:** no cost
- **first year:** \$3,950 for unlimited seats
 - a seat is counted as the number of students in a course that uses Monitor
 - if a student is in two courses using Monitor for multiple exams, that student counts as two (2) seats, regardless of the number of exams
- **second year:** pricing is based on actual first year seat usage, with the first 1,000 seats costing \$3,950, and each additional block of 1,000 costing \$1,950
 - if the system used 2,500 seats the first year, the second year cost would be \$7,850
 - \$3,950 (first 1000 seats) + \$1,950 (second 1000 seats) + \$1,950 (third 1000 seats)

After viewing the demo and comparing the costs to other solutions, the committee felt that Monitor's capabilities were significant enough to warrant a small-scale pilot of the tool. That said, due to a variety of issues—the need to integrate this into D2L, the fact that the videos are stored in Amazon's Cloud Services (with whom we do not have FERPA coverage, etc.), RIS was advised to establish a committee—D2L Video Tool Subcommittee—to further investigate Respondus Monitor and make a recommendation to TAC. Ultimately, that committee also recommended pursuing a pilot of Monitor, and presented its recommendation to TAC at their April 17, 2014 meeting (see attached TAC agenda item). Around the same, the D2L Management Committee also recommended implementing another tool by D2L called the Video Note Tool. This tool allows users to record short videos—limited to three minutes, by default—in D2L. These can be used for a variety of functions, from allowing instructors to provide personal feedback to students, to having students record short speeches, or demonstrate techniques visually. There is no cost for the Video Note Tool, unless the system goes over the total allocation of 50 MB / FTE (around 1.5 TB). The cost of going over the allocated space is \$2/GB/year. Like Respondus Monitor, usage can be broken down per course (i.e., overages can be charged back to a single institution.)

Because there was no cost involved for the tool, and usage can be monitored, the D2L Management Committee recommended moving forward with the tool; however, similar to Respondus Monitor, D2L also uses the Amazon Cloud Services to store the videos. For this reason, the D2L Video Tool Subcommittee also reviewed this tool. They too recommended moving forward with the Video Note Tool, and presented this to TAC at their April 17, 2014 meeting (see Attachment I for TAC agenda item).

As part of larger funding concerns, TAC and BAC decided to not move forward with the recommendations of the D2L committees, at least until AAC had a chance to review them. Should AAC approve the recommendations, TAC and BAC agreed to have further conversations about the tools. AAC representatives should review the two recommendations from the D2L committee and provide a recommendation to TAC for moving forward with adoption of these two tools.

TECHNOLOGY AFFAIRS COUNCIL**AGENDA ITEM: 4****DATE: April 17, 2014**

SUBJECT: Desire2Learn (D2L) Video Tools
PREPARED BY: Dave Hansen

The D2L Management Committee had been working together to identify tools to better manage video opportunities used with D2L. University personnel are finding it difficult to store and manage these files in an ad hoc manner. The committee has evaluated ShareStream, Kaltura, and Capture (the D2L product) as potential options to better support those identified needs. In addition, D2L provides integration to the Amazon Cloud Video Note Tool (VNT) to support additional features/capabilities for integrating short videos into the learning environment.

Additionally, there are integrated tools from Respondus, called Respondus Monitor, that allow a faculty member or proctor to monitor a student's activities when they are performing work remotely. More recently, the D2L committee has prioritized the VNT and Respondus Monitor to be tools they would like to move forward within the near term. In doing so, a cross functional team comprised of members of the learning management group and technical representatives was formed to review the tools to determine the feasibility and impact in deploying these tools in our environment. The group identified March 14th as the date to complete their review so items that need approval can be included in the early April Council meetings. At this point, the D2L Video Tool (DVT) Subcommittee has completed their review of the VNT and Respondus Monitor products and is making the following recommendations:

1. The recommendation is to proceed with the Respondus Monitor Trial for the 2014 summer term. To move forward with the trial, a contract needs to be signed with Respondus to ensure security of the data stored on the Amazon Cloud. Respondus does not charge for the trial period. The DVT subcommittee and the D2L Management committee will monitor the tool during the trial. A recommendation will be made to implement the tool for fall term after the trial period.
2. The subcommittee's recommendation on the VNT is to have it installed in the D2L test environment for further evaluation. D2L requires a contract to be signed before installing into Test as there are overage fees after the minimum space is used. The subcommittee would like to evaluate the reporting tools used to manage usage and storage space before considering an implementation to production.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only.