Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday March 10, 2017
Embassy Suites Sacramento

<u>Voting Members for the OEI SC:</u> Cheryl Aschenbach, Christina Gold, Conan McKay, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Fabiola Torres, Joe Perret, Jodie Steeley, and Lisa Beach

<u>Non-voting Attendees:</u> Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Caryn Albrecht, Debra Connick, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, Joe Moreau, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Martha Rubin, Mia Keeley, Monica Matousek, and Steve Klein

<u>Welcome and Attendance:</u>
Cheryl and Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:40 am and welcomed everyone.

<u>Approval of Minutes:</u>   Action
Christina Gold moved to approve the minutes for February 10, 2017, and Lisa Beach seconded the motion. Dan Crump clarified at the bottom of page three there was a reference to a "Research" course which should be changed to "Research Methods" course. He also provided minor typo corrections which were made to the minutes. The committee approved the minutes as revised.

<u>Vital Updates:</u>
<u>Management Team Update:</u>
The project celebrated having five colleges live with the Course Exchange: Fresno, Lake Tahoe, Ventura, Butte, and Coastline. Jory thanked the Tech Center team, and Kate Jordahl and her team, for working closely with colleges to get everything turned on. This phase is focused on testing technology to make sure workflows have no unintended consequences. There was an issue with C-ID matching between colleges, not really software related, but with two pieces of the same course being combined using a different C-ID designator. Currently students in the Exchange have mostly been enrolled locally because of timing when colleges have become live. It does provide an opportunity to check that everything is working locally and cross campus even with a relatively small number of students involved. There are good data coming through the RP Group regarding outcomes and success rates in OEI pilot courses. Those impacts speak to Professional Development, support services, and the learning environment created. Data will be shared at an upcoming meeting.

There is a lot happening in the project and further details can be found regarding budget requests, implementations, and development timelines in written updates posted on Basecamp.

<u>Technology Center:</u>
The Technology Center is working to support colleges with any anomalies coming up with the Course Exchange, whether user or tech support concerns. The team is also working with the next group of sixteen colleges to begin implementation of the SIS Adaptor, called Project Glue; this includes three Common Assessment colleges. Kate Jordahl is working on larger implementation planning for colleges. John Sills is guiding the development team in additional requirements including Financial Aid, which is the second block of business process to implement into the Course Exchange.

Canvas implementation continues with 103 colleges committed to transitioning. The project is anticipating five or six more colleges adopting this spring which will bring the system close to working at full-scale. The CCMS Committee continues to meet monthly and is working with Instructure on the outcomes tool within Canvas; that group is chaired by Joe Perret. Amy coordinates meetings and works closely with committee members and the staff of Instructure to move requirements forward.

The CVC Catalog has undergone work under Amy's guidance with developers with the Student Services Portal. The CVC Catalog will be an embedded web application within the portal. There will be opportunities for customization and student authentication within the portal, and eventually down the pathway, for students to find courses in the Exchange.

There is a Canvas Community for the CCC system within the larger Canvas Community. Right now there are almost 500 members working with DECO to expand awareness of the community as a place for faculty in the system to have conversations relative their needs in the use of Canvas. The project also gets data back on support phone calls and messaging to Instructure from students and faculty looking for help. The team meets weekly with Canvas and on a monthly or bi-monthly basis talks about support and looks at call logs. All colleges have access to their own call logs and the project has access to all of them which are used to track issues to address them with Instructure. Steve explained there are Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in the Canvas contract with metrics in: first call response (how quickly the issue is resolved), wait time (how long waiting before the call is answered), and performance (uptime on the system). Canvas has done well on all of the metrics with the exception of two weeks ago when AWS (which promises and normally delivers on 99.99% uptime) went down.

Of 103 colleges committed to transitioning to Canvas, about 60 have students in Canvas now. Another twenty have implemented Canvas, for a total of 80 now doing course migrations, and another twenty which are signing IPAs. Of the 60 colleges with students in Canvas, less than ten of the new ones are running Canvas at 100%. It is still early in that phase of implementation. Surveys are planned for end of term, and Alyssa will go over the Evaluation Plan on the next

agenda and how to gather satisfaction data. OEI needs to have language to communicate with faculty that the product is being tested, satisfaction is being looked at, and there is full transparency to ensure the best product.

Steve, Jory, Joe Moreau, Amy, Tim Calhoon, and Lou Delzompo recently had their annual onsite visit with Instructure leadership. The teams sat down and shared visions and roadmaps with each other. Then they talked about areas of overlap, support, partnership, and aspects of updating contract terms. It was a productive meeting, providing an opportunity to discuss and solve problems. The Chief Operations Officer (COO), is now the senior executive in charge of daily operations, and was in the meeting almost the full day. Joe Moreau felt that reflected how seriously Instructure takes their work with OEI and the CCC system. They also had conversations about CCC data, the vision for data, and having access to data across the initiatives.

The unprecedented Amazon outage happened while the team was at Instructure, and everyone there seemed measured, calm, and thoughtful while handling the situation. They sent out six emails within a few hours to keep everyone informed about what was going on. The outage was a result of a failure on the Amazon side in one part of Virginia. The next day Instructure explained how they are addressing moving data across multiple Amazon Web Services (AWS) centers to mitigate this in the future. Currently they have a single hosting site and will look at moving to multiple sites and improving their own process to prevent this happening again.

Members discussed how to address potential concerns about Canvas that sometimes come up from faculty. DE Coordinators could address them locally if they are aware of them. Sometimes concerns come up due to lack of full information about what Canvas can do. Alyssa noted surveys asking about experiences with technical assistance indicated a high number of students and faculty didn't know about support features in Canvas. It might be helpful to have awareness sessions at each campus to let people know where they can get help when they have an issue. Autumn Bell has also been developing a great repository of support tools and resources for faculty. One campus implemented a weekly email to faculty with a tip about something in Canvas and a prominent notice about what to do if they are having a problem in Canvas; that seems to be helping.

There have been an impressive number of adoptions, but the project is still in an early phase of implementation. In a year the project will be at a point of having over half the colleges fully on Canvas. At this point most colleges are still running two systems. This is an early phase with transition discomfort that is normal.

OEI Funding Requests:
OEI has committed to fully cover the funding of Canvas through 2018-2019 with existing funding and they will do so. However, since the project can't sustain full

funding at 100% beyond 2018-2019, the team worked with the Chancellor's Office to prepare a Board of Governors (BOG) funding request which was approved. That became a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for $10M in ongoing funding, which was included in the Governor's budget in January. This is good news at this early stage of the process. The next step was inquiries from the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) whose job is academic in nature and fiscally conservative in mindset. That perspective is not unique to OEI; it is normal. The project team had a follow up meeting with the analyst and committee staffers on Tuesday. They were very supportive once aware of the critical importance of a common CMS to the collaborative work being done in the CCCs and how instruction is delivered. The budget process will continue throughout the spring, and the management team is confident of a successful outcome of $10M in ongoing funding in the final budget in July. In a worst case, if funding is not included in the July budget, the project would make another request for funding in FY2019. OEI has existing funding to cover Canvas through 2018-2019. The project is also working with Instructure regarding the rapid pace of adoption which exceeded the initial projected rate. It is important to emphasize the common CMS as critical infrastructure for the CCC system.

Exchange Residency:
OEI is now 85% of the way to seamless registration; they still have Financial Aid and some other pieces to complete. In January, the project started working through the Distance Education and Educational Technology Advisory Committee (DEETAC) researching ways to address residency challenges. Currently students in the Exchange have to get residency validated at the teaching college which requires additional steps. A second application is pre-populated which simplifies the process somewhat, but it is not ideal. The second application and teaching college verification of residency causes a delay.

Through research existing law was discovered that applies to CCCs and the UCs and CSUs, which allows students to cross-enroll and have their residency, health fee and a couple of other items certified through their home college. A CCC student can then take a course at a CSU or UC without also needing to verify residency at the CSU or UC. This is what OEI would like to piggyback. Language was drafted at DEETAC, but is not yet finalized. The home college would certify residency and student information could be shared with the teaching college. This is similar to what is done with cross-enrollment at sister campuses. Next week when DEETAC meets, it will look at and hopefully approve updated language. DEETAC advises the Chancellor's Office on educational policy in this area. Several OEI members are on DEETAC and can help provide input. There are also internal discussions about the language in Student Services and Legal divisions to determine what a package and associated timeline might look like. The goal is to get the package in front of the May Board of Governors meeting, which would require an April consultation meeting.

The language is not within Ed Code but in Title 5, which means it does not need to go before the legislature. The projected timeline would be to get through Legal and have a Board of Governors first reading in May, with a second reading in July. If approved by the Board of Governors in July, it could then go to the Department of Finance for review on unfunded mandates and budget cost pressure issues. Once the Department of Finance reviews and approves, it would go to the Secretary of State for thirty days, then it would be enforced. If all goes as planned it would be applied beginning in September, but if there is any slippage, it would be held up at least two months, since the Board only meets every other month.

This is broader than just OEI; it is about cross-enrollment of students in Distance Education. The Title 5 process gives the Chancellor authority to develop procedures which can be put in place in the Audit Manual. This has been a stumbling block for colleges, because the Audit Manual currently requires colleges to provide first hand verification of residency. Once there is a regulatory change in Title 5, the Audit Manual can be changed to use Residency Reciprocity to admit and enroll students. This would reduce technical complexity and allow the Exchange to work with a student in real time, instead of the student being required to wait on residency processing at the teaching college.

Professional Development:
Autumn reported on Canvas updates in Professional Development including new pages on the website in an area called "Teaching with the OEI", including Canvas resources. There are links to migration guides (How to go from Blackboard to Canvas, How to go from Moodle to Canvas, etc.), a section on help which includes the support number and the Canvas community, and tutorial videos available on YouTube.

The team is working on more focused Canvas training, coming soon. They recognize the need faculty has for brief modularized training "just in time" when working on Canvas. Some calls have been rebranded as "Canvas Course Design Calls," with the instructional designers. The focus is on a particular tool or action that can be done in Canvas and then the calls are opened to any questions participants have on using Canvas. The team has been keeping the calls available for the pilot colleges, but recognizes need with the popularity of Canvas, so will now open to them to all colleges. This is a one hour webinar each week.

Autumn encouraged faculty to think about designing courses around the rubric in general and not just for OEI courses. The rubric is based in and designed around Canvas and helps faculty use the tools. There is also a new workshop called "Design to Align," for individual faculty, who do not need to be interested in course review or in the Exchange. They can attend and learn to use the rubric to build courses in Canvas. Autumn will send out links for a couple of other online resources and post them in Basecamp.

The team just hired a new program coordinator to manage the course review process which has moved from @ONE to OEI. Also in January, they hired two Canvas course design specialists to provide direct, hands-on support to faculty after their courses are reviewed and changes are needed. It is working well. Finally, two cohorts just went through the Peer Online Course Review Training. There had not been training for new course reviewers while waiting on rubric redesign. Now that is done, and two new cohorts have graduated. The review process is a little outdated and may need changes, so Autumn will be working with Cheryl and Fabiola on how to get course reviewers approved and contracted with OEI to actually do those reviews.

Jodie's campus has an appointment for the "Design to Align" training and will be using it to train their own faculty to be reviewers for courses not being submitted to the Exchange. They worked with the Title 5 grant to train their own faculty. Faculty members will also be certified using the @ONE training modules along with some Atomic Learning. Eighteen faculty members are developing their own course based on the OEI rubric, which will then be reviewed on their own campus. When those courses come up for acceptance in the Exchange, hopefully they will be ready to go. In the meantime, they will be offering quality courses with student services addressed.

A video with screen shots of a student enrolling in the Exchange helps tremendously in answering repeated questions about how the Exchange works. It clearly shows that, "No, the student doesn't need to do the orientation again." The video was sent out to SPOCs but is also available on YouTube. The quality Guide for Counselors also saves time.

Only ten to twelve colleges have used the discounted subscription training directly from Canvas. A couple of members reported their campuses didn't find it useful for their needs. Members also discussed Lynda.com resources and Atomic Learning training, as well as the issue of having the ADA training at the end of the @ONE certification course, being a hindrance to use. It would be great to be able to embed video content from Lynda.com into Canvas. A lot of the Professional Development is currently focused on use of the tool, but Fabiola also emphasized the importance of research and use of androgogical modifications in a distance education environment.

Utilization:
Jory provided an overview of OEI resource usage now that the project is in year four of the grant. His presentation is in Basecamp. There are now 103 colleges that have committed to Canvas migration within the last twenty months and Canvas is at the core of OEI resources. Online support resources are:
- Quest for Success student online readiness program including multi-media modules. From the beginning of the project up to now there have been 173,000 sessions, with a session defined as accessing a module.

- NetTutor online tutoring which includes 24 pilot and 40 non-pilot colleges (which have implemented at their own cost). It is now up to 5000 hours, with one hour equating to about three tutoring sessions. The scheduling is a beta feature in NetTutor being developed at CCC request; right now appointments are not in Pacific Standard Time.
- Cranium Café and online counseling network, with 40 college using Cranium Café and 56 colleges participating in the network
- Proctorio has been used for proctoring 224 exams by 1,218 students in pilot schools. Exams have mostly not been in mathematics because there is a need for an integrated calculator. Proctorio has been responsive in developing that and it is in final beta testing.
- VeraCite for plagiarism detection has been used by nine pilot colleges in 460 courses, on 1,301 assignments. Some colleges wanted to wait for native VeraCite integration with Canvas. There is an issue encountered with multi-college districts where not every college is using VeraCite; it still works, but the LTI is not quite as deeply integrated into Canvas. Part of the contract with VeraCite is that college data belongs to the college.

Ecosystem Discussion:
Phil Hill, a partner with MindWires, will be looking at the OEI ecosystem and providing a representation of tools in use. OEI has been up and running for the last few years, with quicker adoption of Canvas than originally anticipated and a lot going on all at once. The intention of this work is to take a step back, get a project overview, and do an independent analysis of the OEI Educational Technology ecosystem now, a few years in. The goal is to look at where OEI is, what adoption is like, where there are gaps, potential future directions, and comparisons to national trends. The plan is to do some preliminary analysis in April, report initial results in May, and then later with more time, to get into more depth where desired.

An example of MindWire's work with UCSF was presented including a colorful graphic showing the use of educational technology systems in the library, various colleges, and the graduate division. This provided a way to visualize shared systems, as well as duplicate applications purchases separately, applications not in common, and places there might be gaps. This kind of work could be used by OEI to spawn ideas, for example, to look at face to face versus online usage.

The group was asked to provide input into useful analysis and key questions they would like answered. With the quick turnaround, the May presentation will focus on areas where information can be gathered quickly, and other items might wait for a later pass. Suggestions and comments:
- Cost benefit analysis for resources (how many people are using the tool versus cost/usage)
- Adoption rate by time
- Problems students and faculty are having locally (Alyssa can help with this from RP Group surveys)

- College size versus Canvas usage on a more global level rather than campus level. (Phil and Steve thought system wide metrics on tool utilization could come from Instructure on request.)
- How many Canvas shells are being used on each campus
- Success and retention rates in Distance Education that are not based on averages. It would be good to look at use of Canvas and use of particular tools in Canvas (like courses using discussion boards a lot, or something else) that are correlating with higher levels of success and retention (Phil could do commentary on those sorts of reports regarding what is known nationally. However some work might need to be in consultation with the RP Group, and will not be done by May)
- Tool utilization that is not native but LTI, and return on investment for the LTIs, in addition to specific tools in Canvas
- Scatterplot of the current distribution of services in the landscape
- Where are there gaps in OEI goals from the RFA?

The presentation in May is meant to be a 10,000 foot level view on where services are landing. Phil asked if members wanted a scatterplot separated into: pilot versus non-pilot schools, maybe another with individual schools, or maybe groupings of small versus large, rural versus urban. Suggestions for segmentation were:
- By demographics rather than by districts
- A map of California with dots for each college
- Groupings by small, medium, and large colleges. For example, small schools may have gaps in resources and need support. That will be important as the project scales out. It would also be part of the approach to equity, since not all colleges are resourced similarly.

Phil suggested initially representing which colleges are using which tools and then having a secondary one broken down by small, medium, and large colleges. At this point the focus is on organizing by use, with commentary added.

Members were also interested in PPIC data on gender, first and second Generation college students, race, and ethnicity. Bonnie and the Student Equity work group are working with the Public Policy Institute, the RP Group, and the Center for Urban Education from USC around those kinds of issues. That is a long research process which will probably take around a year. The analysis Phil will do around how the OEI ecosystem is built will help inform that work group on areas they should look at. The Equity group will slice data by demographics and look at impacts. They are looking at different categories, services, and which programs and success strategies have beneficial impacts. The RP Group is also looking at impacts by demographics. That kind of information will be coming. Jory thought the Steering Committee might need a better idea of how different pieces fit together along with integrated sequencing: what Phil is doing, what RP Group is doing, what the Student Equity work group and PPIC are doing. He will look at

providing an overview of the process and context. Bonnie will post the Equity framework overview on Basecamp.

Course Expansion: **Information**

Last month the Steering Committee voted to allow for course expansion if certain criteria were met including: C-ID designated, part of ADT paths, GE paths, transfer level, etc. A survey was sent to SPOCs to get a feel for priorities for next courses in the Exchange. They were asked which courses they would be able to offer, and which they wish other colleges would offer. For example, Finite Math is a course one campus wishes another college would offer, since it doesn't have enough students to offer a section, but does have students who need it. The survey closes this afternoon.

Barbara, Autumn, and the Executive team are looking at ways to speed up the process of getting courses through rubric review. Before grant renewal, the project is hoping to get to a point where most rubric assessment review is done on the home campus, since it is easier working with faculty and reviewers on the same campus. Some larger campuses will also be able to do their own accessibility support, but others will not. Barbara thinks it would be reasonable to get four or five courses for each of the twenty-four colleges in the Exchange this fall, which would be about 100 courses. Once the project gets through the C-ID courses, they will move on to others, perhaps career pathways courses, but C-ID courses are first priority.

More colleges want to come into the Exchange, so the Consortium is working on developing a charter for introducing new colleges. The hope is that eventually all CCC will be in the Consortium. Barbara encouraged DE Coordinators, especially for colleges not in the Exchange, to use the self-assessment rubric to go through their own courses. If faculty members are able to reach even one or two additional students by adding elements to make their courses more effective for student learning it would be a win for all. Fabiola felt it was also great for empowering part-time faculty and getting a new wave of faculty involved. Barbara agreed and suggested adjunct faculty be mentored in creating courses online that are ready to go.

The project team is working with Arnita Porter and the Equity work group under Bonnie, on designing "model courses" that have also been looked at through an "equity lens," for the Canvas course, textbook, and videos. It is in process, but has not been completed yet. Autumn is working with the Canvas course design specialists on pieces of "sample courses," model home pages, syllabi, etc. The work was started, but with the rubric change they needed to be revisited. The goal is to support faculty in designing their courses and providing assistance. Barbara also encouraged faculty members to open their courses in Canvas to other faculty to provide ideas to improve courses and learn from.

There have been questions about a selection process for courses to be offered, and Jory explained the project is learning as it goes. The approach at this point is to facilitate conversations within the Consortium and at the Steering Committee about what courses may need to be added; that will evolve as the Consortium grows. Those conversations will be convened in the open; there will be no "dark backroom dealing." Right now the Exchange needs enrollment managers to have conversations and the project wants to facilitate those. The team wants to start where there is obvious broad interest and applicability. The project will not judge campus needs or whether a campus is "doing enrollment management right." The project wants courses ready that: are C-ID designated, in IGETC and ADT patterns, taught in Canvas for one semester, have services in NetTutor, counseling, readiness, etc. The project team is facilitating colleges offering courses, not judging the college.

There are some concerns about managing enrollment, without flooding the market or having certain colleges "be the Exchange," while the rest are left out. There is a role that will need to be played in making sure there is equitable access in both the opportunity to offer, but also get students the course they need. At some point, it might be necessary to stagger which colleges offer courses in the Exchange, if for example, everyone wants to offer English Composition. However, right now that is not the case; a lot of the colleges are begging faculty to open online courses. Members should remind administrators this is not meant to be an FTES grab; it is meant to increase access for students. People on campus should be mindful of communicating accurately that, if done correctly, this becomes a retention strategy for all colleges by keeping students the college wouldn't have retained otherwise. That language needs to drive the Course Exchange. Additionally, a college that has a "wish list" course in the Exchange might be worried about losing students, but they might also consider offering the course in the Exchange, and picking up extra students from colleges in a similar position. Members also noted that since students can't participate in the Exchange unless they are already enrolled in their home college, this will keep students in school. The Exchange will help students get to completion or transfer which is a benefit to the home college. For example, Jodie explained that Fresno has a very low transfer/graduation and would benefit from a student taking a needed course in the Exchange. If student takes an Exchange course, the Teaching College gets the FTES, but the graduation/transfer credit goes back to the Home College. The goal is to increase access for students.

Barbara added a few items on the calendar for the Steering Committee in Basecamp including a message about a webinar OEI is offering on March 24th with the Foundation, on VeraCite. Turnitin just increased prices for next year, so colleges may want to consider participation in the webinar. The webinar will be recorded with captioning.

Nicole Wooley is a librarian and wrote most of the guidelines for the proctoring network. She will reach out on the Librarian's listserv to colleges interested in

working on the next step for the network. Every college will decide their own location for proctoring; it will not necessarily be the library. Members discussed potential issues about minimum proctoring qualifications. There is a statewide rule from the Academic Senate about teaching in a face to face class requiring proctoring from a faculty member. Perhaps that rule does not apply in an online course because proctoring is outside of the instructional period. There was some disagreement and Barbara felt it would be a discussion for the schools that want to be in the proctoring network.

Logan and Martha are getting all of the agendas, minutes, and membership lists for the OEI Steering Committee and Consortium onto the website.

Bylaws Review:
In December, the committee discussed annual review of the bylaws, but it has been hard to find a current set of approved bylaws. The committee will affirm or make changes to the bylaws in the next meetings. Cheryl will send out the most current ones she can find, so everyone is working from the same set. Suggested revisions can be made at the next online meeting, and then acted on at the face to face meeting in May. There is a need to clarify when new appointees officially become members, since it can impact making quorum.

Meeting Frequency and Schedule:
The group discussed whether there should be changes to the meeting schedule for next year. There was a question about whether the project is now at a point with implementations underway that there might be a need for a change in meeting frequency moving forward. LeBaron felt as the project evolved the group might not need to meet as frequently.

After discussion, members agreed to continue with face to face meetings as scheduled for now. They also agreed to leave online meetings as scheduled unless there were not enough discussion items to warrant a meeting in a particular month. In that case, the meeting could be cancelled with an appropriate amount of notice (perhaps a week), but written monthly updates would still occur.

Dave, Cheryl, and Jodie volunteered to help reorganize the Basecamp online document repository so it is easier to find items.

Other:
Data Governance:
The Chancellor's Office is working with TTAC to get a handle on robust data governance. The span of data governance is anything system wide, which isn't every single thing from every single college, but is still massive. Debra wants to make sure every repository is in order, with both data and system architecture documented appropriately. It would also make sense to look at how terms are defined, since there is potential to create chaos if the same or similar terms are

used with different definitions. Data governance will be an ongoing complex issue and this is the start of looking at ideas for it system wide.

It is important to understand where different data components exist and the intended and unintended consequences of comingling data. Debra will look at alignment with a Guided Pathways model and what makes sense in that regard. The Chancellor's Office and TTAC will also be looking at ways to leverage what has been done project by project, initiative by initiative, taking the best ideas. As always, they will start with the least common denominator, and then clean and build up from there. More information about system wide data governance will be coming out, hopefully by July 1st, with updates as available.

Marketing Plan:
There is a need to revisit publicizing the Exchange once the pilot has concluded. Lead time is necessary and the student population is different from even three years ago in how they engage in the mobile space and with social media; a pdf and link to a website is not going to be enough to meet their needs. At the the next face to face meeting the Management Team will have a brief report on plans. The project is now staffed for components like an organized Basecamp and documentation on the website. Beyond this the heart is a larger branding and communication strategy about the Course Exchange and other elements discussed today. The project is fully committed to resourcing communications, outreach, and marketing for the initiative. In the meantime, the project is engaged with Sandoval at the Technology Center to provide interim support around marketing, and there are contractors doing some pieces. The team knows further marketing development is very important. It isn't enough to have a great program if no one knows about it.

Integrated Library System:
Another Budget Change Proposal went forward from the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL) for $6M in one-time funding for an Integrated Library System (ILS) for the CCC, along with about $2.5M in ongoing funding. This is a serious need and the management team enthusiastically supports that BCP. Expanding the digital environment aligns nicely with the goals of OEI and other projects. This product will hopefully provide another piece of infrastructure for collaboration and integration with all of the student success initiatives.

The document "The Library Presence on Campus" is wonderful and should be widely shared. It not only tells how to work with the ILS but also provides step by step integration between Canvas and library systems. The document is in Basecamp and on the public website.

DEETAC Report:
Lisa Beach reported on the first meeting, in January, of the renewed DEETAC. Jory and Bonnie did a presentation on the Title 5 change that would make residency transferable. There was also information about three surveys put out

by the Chancellor's Office: the Institutional survey that is out and due on the 27th, the student survey which is closed to adding customized questions which went out Monday at midnight, and the faculty survey which will go out at the end of the spring semester in June. That first meeting was a lot about process and the steps needed in making a change to Title 5. Overall it was a good meeting.

The next DEETAC agenda includes election of a chair and co-chair. They will also be looking at whether to support the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). They may also look at the 2008 Omnibus for Distance Education to look at clarity, updates, and potential Title 5 changes overall.

Lebaron noted responses are starting to come in on the student survey. As of today, they have 1,000 responses from 21,000 student surveys sent out. There were about twenty-one colleges that sent in correct information and fifty-nine said they would participate. There are still a few that will need to go back out to redo samples and a few that have not yet responded. Some results will be shared at DEETAC next week.

Jodie suggested having a standing DEETAC report on every other OEI agenda.

Next Steering Committee Meetings:
The next Zoom online meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2017.
The next face to face meeting is on May 12, 2017.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.