

OEI Consortium Meeting

December 11, 2015 11:30 am – 5:30 pm

Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza, Sacramento

DRAFT MINUTES

Call to Order: December 11, 2015 11:30 a.m.

Moderators: Phil Hill and John Makevich

Attendees: See Attachment A

Handouts: Meeting agenda, DRAFT MOU for the Full Launch Colleges, Draft Consortium of the Online Education Initiative Charter submitted by the OEI Consortium Charter Work Group.

AGENDA

I. Introductions and Announcements

John Makevich welcomed the meeting participants which included faculty and SPOC representatives from 21 of the 24 pilot colleges, members of the OEI management team, the RP Group representative, and esteemed members of the Chancellor's office.

As a reminder, the OEI Consortium of the 24 pilot colleges provides a voice for OEI efforts at the pilot colleges, and eventually for all participating colleges. The Consortium is an ongoing self-governing advisory body that is composed of representatives from the campuses. The OEI Steering Committee provides an advisory role on policy and statewide matters.

John Makevich, the OEI Director of Strategic Planning and Operations, announced that he will be leaving the OEI in early January. He will be based at the College of the Canyons and will be working on the Doing What Matters Initiative, possibly helping to develop an

Entrepreneurship Center at the college, and developing a Z Degree (zero cost OER degree) program. He anticipates connections and synergies with OEI in his future work. The group thanked John for his valuable contribution to the OEI and wished him well.

II. Co-Chair Nominations and Voting

Motion (passed by show of hands with no objections): For this initial election, the membership will choose two Co-Chairs plus a Co-Chair in Waiting. The person with the most votes will become the Co-Chair with a two-year term and the other with a one-year term. Each Consortium representative will vote for one Co-Chair. The Co-Chair in Waiting position will be filled for this first one-year term and will not be codified in the Charter.

Roles of Co-chairs:

- Provide leadership for this group
- Create and support work groups, especially the Consortium Agreement for the 24 pilot colleges
- Solicit committee agenda items and design the meetings
- Lead the meetings
- Ensure that participant's needs are heard
- Solicit feedback on topic areas and identify areas that need further discussion

Nominations offered prior to the meeting included:

- Dr. Wendy Bass, Distance Education Coordinator at Pierce College
- Autumn Bell, Director of Distance Education at Fresno City College
- Will Breitbach, Dean of Library Services and Educational Technology at Shasta College

There were no additional nominations from the floor. Autumn Bell asked to be considered for the co-chair in waiting position prior to voting.

The results from the vote by paper ballot were:

Two-year term as Co-Chair: Dr. Wendy Bass

One-year term as Co-Chair: Will Breitbach

Co-Chair in Waiting: Autumn Bell

III. OEI Pilot Consortium Charter

During the previous Consortium meeting, a draft Pilot Consortium Charter from the OEI Steering Committee was presented and a Charter Work Group was formed to refine the document. The Work Group participants included Autumn Bell (lead), Dan Barnett, Jaye Luke, Bob Nash, Ray Sanchez, and Carol Lashman (OEI). The Work Group held two virtual meetings to work through the document and posted the updated version on Basecamp on November 18 for the Consortium representatives to review.

A number of changes were suggested including requests for clarification and rewording. The group also agreed that:

- Representative vacancies are to be addressed by the respective colleges and the local Academic Senates should be involved.
- Representatives who are inactive are not considered vacancies but should not affect quorum. The colleges should be informed of inactive participation.
- Co-Chairs represent the Consortium leadership and do not need to be selected based on geographic location or faculty/administrator roles.
- The Charter will not require Co-Chairs to vote separately from the rest of the membership.
- First this first iteration of the Charter, a virtual option will not be provided for face-to-face meetings. For at least the first six months, the group anticipates that all meetings will be in person, however, the Co-Chairs should have the flexibility to call virtual meetings if they believe this is needed.

During the break-out session later in the day, the Charter Work Group updated the document to reflect the group input and Autumn Bell reviewed the updates with the group.

Motion (Approved unanimously with a show of hands – 1st Wendy Bass, 2nd Lindsey Bertomen): Accept the Charter as updated based on changes described by Autumn Bell.

IV. Draft MOU Discussion

As historical context, the draft Full Launch College MOU (MOU) contained in the meeting handout is now close to completion and applies to the Course Exchange that is expected to

launch in Fall 2016 with the eight Full Launch Colleges. The Consortium will focus on the formation of a Consortium Agreement for the Course Exchange when it expands to include all 24 pilot colleges. This document is expected to evolve as we move past the Full Launch Colleges pilot.

Technology should not drive what we want to make happen but the technology has to make it work. Some things we can do now. As the technology evolves, we may be able to do more. Colleges with differing Student Information Systems, different term start/end dates, and a history of working separately provide challenges for this work. The Tech Center is to be commended for what they are doing for us. We are very hopeful that it is going to work. This will not be the perfect vision out of the box. Instead, the first implementation will focus on producing a minimum viable product. Faculty who develop and deliver the courses are what will make the Course Exchange successful.

As we move forward, our systems will need to get closer and closer together. We will want to ask what we want to change to fit this new idea about being more connected and sharing. The CCCCO is on board about working with us on this. The Course Exchange is what Dr. Brice Harris is calling an “Herculean task”.

The Consortium Agreements that we will be creating together will need to be signed by the 24 pilot colleges by around March/April 2016. Some topics under consideration are small items. Some are agenda items that the Consortium might want to focus on in depth. Class size is one of these larger topics.

Phil Hill led a discussion regarding initial feedback on the draft MOU for the eight Full Launch Colleges as a starting point for the creation of a Consortium Agreement for the 24 pilot colleges. Key points raised during the discussion included:

- What information is shared with whom? For example, what information will enrollment managers see and how will it be provided? Additional information will help put them at ease as they make decisions.
- How are Course Exchange courses chosen? What does “courses that are critical but not readily available at their home college” mean?
- Exchange courses are already in high demand and are needed to graduate. They fill quickly at local colleges. How with students get into them from the Exchange?

- What flexibility will home colleges have in determining how the Exchange course is displayed in the home college transcript?
- Colleges need to be assured that the benefits outweigh the added workload.
- We need more communications about what else is going on that may impact us such as the Financial Aid work group, tech center development, and any other activities.

If your campus was asked to participate in the Exchange today, what concerns might your college raise?

- Faculty may question why an online course must use online tutoring and online proctoring since, for example, proctoring is not appropriate for some courses.
- We are not sure that our college can do some of these things, particularly with regard to reconciliation. It would be helpful to see examples of how the Full Launch Colleges have addressed these. My registrar is especially concerned.
- The reaction tends to be “We can’t legally do that” when topics are first addressed.
- What about the student’s perspective? Will the OEI be providing information for us to share with our students? Often students don’t even know what questions to ask.
- What rights do home colleges have with regard to not offering a course in the Exchange?
- A categorized FAQ would be very helpful. It should be dated and found in a central location. It is fun to list the myths but perhaps not helpful since it leads to falsehoods.
- Faculty will want us to address intellectual property and mention that the OEI course review does not impact local evaluation.
- The OEI Steering Committee is also reviewing the MOU and has raised topics that they can share. It is very important to share the MOU with your local campuses, especially the local Academic Senates. And we also have to consider Ed Code and the Academic Senate legal purview.
- We want to make sure that restrictions on prerequisites are viewed as a temporary issue due to technology limitations. C-ID is not a cap on prerequisites but a floor. All sections at a college must have the same prerequisites; this is the law. OEI should not be a means to remove prerequisites. If the technology cannot be made to handle this later then we need to find a work-around.

In summary, Phil Hill noted that it appears that this MOU document is not terribly far off but some items need to be discussed more thoroughly. The big takeaway is that the group wants

to hear more from the eight Full Launch Colleges so we can better understand the impact to the larger group.

- Bonnie Peters will provide a Q&A that begins with an overall summary for those new to this topic and will continuously update the document to address questions such as the ones brought up today. This will all be in a single document so you do not need to hunt for the information.
- There was general agreement that it is now a good time to start hearing about Tech Center progress and start seeing early demos.
- The OEI staff is now working on communications materials for colleges, including for students. We look forward to guidance from the Communications work group.
- The OEI management team would be happy to visit your campus to have a more detailed discussion of the agreements with your leadership team.

V. Communications

Alyssa Nguyen, Associate Director of Research and Evaluation at RP Group, has developed a brief survey (4 questions) to gather information about what is working and not working. This survey responds to a request at the first Consortium meeting. She has posted the link to the short survey on Basecamp. Please take the time to fill it out.

VI. Work Group Breakouts

The following work groups convened and reported back to the entire group:

Communications Work Group: to recommend communications strategies and ideas for the OEI and the Consortium

- Work Group Chair: Will Breitbach
- Work Group members: Barbara Tull, Carol Hobson, Gaylla Finnell, Jon Knolle, Will Breitbach
- Takeaways from initial discussions:
 - Suggest creating a comprehensive checklist for the OEI/Canvas implementation that identifies what each college needs to do.
 - Although accessibility is addressed in the rubric, we need more information on what is needed.
 - Suggest creating a website that is a one-stop shop for all information that people need, including what SPOCs care about.
 - Basecamp is not adequate and is not easily shareable with others.

- Bob Nash suggested that a Canvas-related video targeted to students would be very helpful for his campus.

Evaluation Work Group: to help develop the evaluation plan for the Spring pilots

- Work Group members: Andrea Horigan-Ventura, Zulma Calderon - Rio Hondo, Rebecca Green - Rio Hondo, Joseph Ryan –Columbia, Del Helms- Mt San Jacinto, Charlotte Forte-Parnell -Antelope Valley, Alyssa Nguyen - RP Group
- Takeaways from initial discussions:
 - There are a lot of logistics to consider. For example, how do we handle colleges with different start/end dates?
 - There is interest in collecting early input from faculty, administrators, and student services so we can address issues before the Exchange goes live.

Consortium Agreement (MOU) Work Group: to evolve the MOU document into a Consortium Agreement for all 24 colleges and identify the ingredients that are needed to be successful.

- Members: Jim Julius, Eric Ichon, Wendy Bass, Lindsey Bertomen, and Meredith Randall
- Takeaways from initial discussions:
 - Difficulty and importance of more information on campus
 - Online counseling support
 - Full Launch colleges can expedite the process by sharing things such as methods they used to get signatures/approvals

Charter Work Group – The Charter work group that was formed at the last meeting incorporated the comments from today’s meeting as the last action for this work group.

VII. Calendar

January 29: Consortium meeting to be held in Sacramento starting around 9:30am

January 15: Full Launch Colleges will receive the final MOU for signatures

March/April: Target date for Consortium Agreement for all 24 pilot colleges to be ready for signatures

VIII. Building the Next Agenda

Suggestions for the next meeting:

- An update from the Tech Center, including a demonstration of how a student will interact with the Exchange
- Discussion: The right to not offer courses that a home college does not need

- Discussion: Should we continue to be paid less for condensed online courses than for face-to-face courses? Recommendation to instead forward this to CCCDECO, the new online coordinators advocacy group.
- Website feedback and needs for specific audiences
- Hear from Full Launch Colleges regarding their progress so far
- Results of the RP Group readiness & tutoring comprehensive reports

IX. Closing

Bonnie Peters encouraged everyone to go back to their colleges and their Reciprocity Summit participants to begin MOU conversations. The eight Full Launch Colleges need to work on obtaining MOU approvals as soon as possible. OEI management team can work with your colleges on this.

Additional online Office Hours to discuss the MOU will be announced soon. This is a good forum for colleges to have their questions answered and for more of your college leadership to participate. Colleges can also send questions in advance and get answers at the meeting.

Adjourned: 5:18 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Carol Lashman, OEI Operations Project Liaison

John Makevich, OEI Director of Strategic Planning and Operations

Pat James, OEI Executive Director

Attachment A: List of Attendees

Name	Title	Organization
Dr. John Freitas	Area C Representative	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Dr. Charlotte Forte-Parnell	Dean of Language Arts, OEI Campus Contact	Antelope Valley College
Mr. Dan Barnett	Distance Learning Coordinator	Butte College
Dr. Luozhu Cen	Dean for Student Learning	Butte College
Mrs. Francine Van Meter	Distance Education Director	Cabrillo College
Mr. Dave Stephens	Member, OEI Steering Committee	California Community College Classified Senate (4CS)
Mr. Gary Bird	Technology Director	California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Mr. Steve Klein	Statewide Program Director	CCC - Technology Center - OEI
Ms. Amy Carbonaro	Statewide Project Manager-OEI	CCC Tech Center
Mr. John Sills	Product Manager	CCC Tech Center
Ms. Alice Van Ommeren	Interim VC of TRIS	CCCCO
Dr. Eric L. Nelson	Grant monitor	Chancellor's Office
Mr. Bob Nash	Associate Dean, Distance Learning & Professional Development	Coastline Community College
Mr. Brian Weston	Director, Distance and Accelerated Learning	College of the Canyons
Mrs. Melissa Colon	Distance Education Coordinator	Columbia College
Dr. Joe Ryan	Dean, Arts & Sciences	Columbia College

Dr. Judy Baker	Dean, Technology and Innovation	Foothill College
Mrs. Autumn Bell	Director of Distance Education	Fresno City College
Mr. Wendell Stephenson	Philosophy Instructor	Fresno City College
Mr. Lindsey Bertomen	Instructor	Hartnell College
Ms. Carol Hobson	DE Specialist/BUS Faculty	Hartnell College
Ms. Gaylla Finnell	DE Coordinator	Imperial Valley College
Dr. Wendy Bass	Distance Education Coordinator	LA Pierce College
Ms. Treva Thomas	DE Coordinator/Faculty	Lake Tahoe Community College
Dr. Jim Julius	Faculty Director, Online Education	MiraCosta College
Dr. Jon Knolle	Associate Dean of Instructional Technology	Monterey Peninsula College
Dr. Jaye Luke	Distance Education Coordinator	Monterey Peninsula College
Dr. Del Helms	Distance Education Coordinator	Mt. San Jacinto College
Mr. Micah Orloff	Dean of Academic Computing, Technology, and Distance Education	Mt. San Jacinto College
Mrs. Barbara Tull	Professor, English and D.E. committee chair	Ohlone College
Mr. Kevin Albee	Program Support Coordinator	Online Education Initiative
Ms. Anita Crawley	Student Support Services Director	Online Education Initiative
Dr. Jory Hadsell	Chief Academic Affairs Officer	Online Education Initiative
Ms. Patricia James	Executive Director	Online Education Initiative
Mr. Jayme Johnson	Director of Accessibility and User Experience	Online Education Initiative

Ms. Carol Lashman	Operations Project Liaison	Online Education Initiative
Mr. John Makevich	Director of Strategic Planning & Operations	Online Education Initiative
Ms. Bonnie Peters	Chief Student Services Officer	Online Education Initiative
Dr. Michelle Pilati	Chief Professional Development Officer	Online Education Initiative
Dr. Fred Sherman	CTO	Online Education Initiative
Mrs. Rebecca Green	Dean, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Administration	Rio Hondo College
Ms. Zulma Calderon	Instructional Assistant	Rio Hondo Community College
Mr. Will Breitbach	Dean	Shasta College
Miss Alyssa Nguyen	Associate Director of Research and Evaluation	The Research and Planning Group
Ms. Andrea Horigan	Professor	Ventura College
Dr. Gwendolyn Lewis Huddleston	Dean of Distance Education	Ventura College
Dr. Rolando Regino	Dean of Instruction	Victor Valley College
Mr. Eric Ichon	Dean	West Los Angeles College

Attachment B: Meeting Presentations

A copy of meeting presentations can be found on the Consortium Basecamp.