



Consortium Minutes - March 17, 2017
Virtual Meeting 10:30-11:55

Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen - RG Group, Amy Carbonaro - Tech Center, Anita Crawley - OEI
Autumn Bell - OEI, Barbara Illowsky - OEI, Bob Nash - Coastline, Bonnie Peters - OEI
Brett Myhren - Saddleback, Brian Weston - COC, Carol Hobson - Hartnell, Carol Lashman - OEI
Cheryl Aschenbach - (Steering Committee), Cheryl Chapman, Coastline, Chloe McGinley
Dan Barnett - Butte, Erin Larson CCCC, Francine Van Meter - Cabrillo, Heidi Kolen, Foothill
Jayme Johnson- OEI, Jayme Luke - OEI, Jessica Hurtado - OEI, Jodie Steeley Fresno
Joe Ryan - Columbia, John Sills - TechCenter, Jory Hadsell - OEI, Judy Baker - Foothill
Kate Jordahl - OEI, Logan Murray - OEI, Martha Rubin - OEI, Melissa Colon, Columbia
Micah Orloff - MSJC, Michelle Pilati - Rio Hondo, Renata Funke - Hartnell
Shasta Anderson - Fresno, Steve Klein - Tech Center, Tom Martin - Shasta College
Treva Thomas - LTCC, Wendy Bass - Pierce, Xochitl Tirado - Imperial

Opening Statement

Wendy called the meeting to order, asked for approval of the agenda and minutes from January and February. Judy Baker made a motion to approve; Joe Ryan seconded the approval. The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

Update - Jory Hadsell

Budget

The request was made for ten million dollars. Eight million for the on going 100% support for Canvas beyond 2018-19 and two million to scale up support services to maintain counseling, professional development, authenticity and integrity.

This is a lengthy process. The request has made it through the first phase.

The 2nd phase consists of a report written by the Legislative Analysis Group. The report released in mid- February was positive regarding OEI, mentioning the progress we have made (ahead of schedule). However, they feel the colleges should be funding themselves. The Chancellor's Office seems this action is the norm for the LAO.

The 3rd phase is advisory. There was a meeting on March 13th with OEI (Jory Hadsell and Joe Moreau) the LAO, the Chancellor's Office, the Assembly and staff members. This was a positive meeting. Although the LAO did not recommend the funding, they did offer support for the initiative and possibly the funding.

The 4th phase will be a meeting with the Department of Finance and the Governor's Office. We expect strong support at that meeting.

The 5th phase will be Assembly/Senate hearings. We are hopeful that the May Revise will include the request and be included in the final budget.

OEI is working with Prop 98 funds, which is different than the other initiatives. They will have to allocate the funds to OEI, so we are feeling pretty optimistic.

OEI knows that some colleges have concerns regarding the report. We are fully committed to funding through 2018-19. If there will be a change in funding, OEI will make certain to disclose this, as we know colleges will need to prepare their budgets.

Exchange

Five colleges are LIVE to date. Fresno City, Lake Tahoe, Coastline, Ventura and Butte.

Foothill is ready to go.

Butte begins registration for Fall, so make sure all courses are entered into inventory.

Kate will be having conversations about 2.0 software, fall courses, priority for spring registration, Implementation teams and tracking progress. She will be setting up meeting to be as helpful and proactive as possible.

A concern was voiced regarding Implementation in the Fall and timeline of readiness, asking if these issues will affect other colleges with registration.

The response was that each college will go live when it is ready, as each has specific details that must be addressed by its technology department. The expectation is when ready, the college will go live. Kate will be reaching out to the colleges and is staffing up to focus on Implementation.

Instructure Site Visit - Steve Klein

Steve reported on the second visit with Instructure. Steve, Tim Calhoon, Lou Delzompo, Amy Carbonaro, Jory Hadsell and Joe Moreau met with Instructure's leadership team to discuss the contract, sharing of roadmaps and alignment for the future, and the state of work to date.

There were touch points around data collection. Data from Canvas will be available system wide as they are benefiting from Project Glue which is also supporting data availability from CAI. In a parallel conversation with the Chancellor's office, the CCCCO is creating a Data Governance group, in an advisory capacity.

The meeting was very positive. OEI is Instructure's largest customer and they have been and plan to be responsive to our needs. The CCMS Committee meets monthly to prioritize features for Instructure. For instance, the development of an interface to allow manual creation of accounts was created to support @ONE and colleges. There have been some bugs to work out which have now been resolved. Members of the CCMS Committee participate in an "outcomes" focus group which provides feedback to Instructure on the Outcomes features.

VeriCite - Barbara Illowsky

10 of the 24 colleges have indicated they would like to use VeriCite in 2017-18:

Butte, Cabrillo, College of the Canyons, Columbia, Fresno, Imperial, Pierce, MSJC, Rio Hondo and West LA. Others are waiting until after the March 24th webinar to decide.

We are hoping to cover the full cost for use. OEI will get a quote after we know how many colleges are committed.

OEI will not fund the use of both VeriCite and TurnItIn. The whole college will be able to utilize the services of VeriCite. (This will help to negotiate the price).

There is a trial FTE usage license available for 60 days. Colleges could try in April through May, but must decide by June 1 to contract or not.

Questions regarding colleges sharing a common server or migrating to VeriCite should contact Logan. He will be able to work with the individual colleges to work through any issues. Email him at lmurray@cccolineed.org.

Background information was provided regarding TurnItIn's lack of interest in responding to the RFP. They were contacted and declined. OEI also understands they are raising their rates.

Jory suggested to attend the webinar as VeriCite has new usability and a more accessible design. The agreement under the RFP is to purchase at a volume rate for a 5-year agreement. We have had good experiences working with them. They have a native Canvas integration system embedded; papers are stored in Canvas. Work submitted remains property of the college. With all the upgrades, this should feel like a more "normal" experience.

Logan added the webinar will address the process, steps and overcoming challenges while migrating to VeriCite.

Questions arose from the group:

What are the colleges doing with the funds they are saving by being part of the pilot?

Where have these funds been redirected?

The following suggestions were made.

Jory stated that the funds that OEI uses come from GE/General Operating funds.

- Discuss a policy paper addressing the issue come from the Steering committee
- Create a document asking the colleges to document what they are doing with the cost saving. Where do the redirect funds?
- Create a participation agreement?
- Will they use the funds for DE Infrastructure or coordinators?
- Should monies go to Faculty Release Time so they can be local "experts" for training on Vericite, Proctorio, etc.
- Data should be collected from both pilot and non-pilot colleges as to cost saving and expenditures

Jodie commented that at Fresno, the Academic Senate handles these resolutions. Their Vice Chancellor has redirected funds to Professional Development. Jory added one piece regarding funds on the non-instructional side. 50% of existing funds do not need to be matched as OEI is grant-funded.

Workgroup Reports - Kate Jordahl

There were not enough people to form an Evaluation and Data group

Charter - Michelle Pilati and Wendy Bass

Michelle reported. They group will focus on the future structure of the Consortium and bring in new colleges

- What does decision making look like for the future
- Set by-laws for how the Consortium operates
- Discuss how decision making happen
- Establish what we want the future to look like

Communications - Xochitl Tirado, Kim Young, Melissa Colon, Judy Baker, Kate Jordahl

Xochitl reported. The group will focus on updating the materials and language

- Increased Implementation communication
- Updating OEI brochure
- Sharing material with colleges
- Creating a consistent language for representation (what we call things) of OEI
- Increasing SPOC communication - especially regarding course review additions and the Exchange

Enrollment - Micah Orloff, dan Barnett, Tim Martin, Michelle Pilati, Jodie Steeley, Kate Jordahl and Barbara Illowsky

Micah reported. This is the scope of many ideas

- Type of classes
- Number of seats (# of seats vs # of sections)
- Strategies to select courses
- Lab vs no lab courses
- Making sure # of units are the same on campuses
- Involve Enrollment Managers early on in the process to set guidelines and practice.

Discussion ensued as to whether there was enough interest to continue the groups. Kate will organize the next round of meetings as interest was expressed.

Action

Doodle polls will be sent with varied times as many people have differing commitments. Kate will try to arrange meeting mid to end of April to have reports ready for the May 5th meeting. (Everyone thanked Kate for her lead on this project)

Student Services - Bonnie Peters

Bonnie stated that her group is progressing and set with trainings.

She asked for any questions or issues.

There was a question about Cranium Cafe.

Twelve of the twenty four pilot colleges have Implemented Cranium Cafe, as well as many non pilot colleges. We are moving beyond to include training general counselors (EOPS). The

technical part at each college has moved along on their own timeline, which has taken longer than anticipated. In the meantime, the training is moving ahead. We fill in the lag time with training non-pilot colleges.

Marilyn Harvey is in charge of Public Relations and Outreach.
Jessica Hurtado is in charge of training.

Expanding the Course Exchange - Barbara Illowsky

The list below contains the courses submitted by SPOCs, along with the number of colleges that submitted that course. These courses are ones that the SPOCs replied that they are interested in adding to the Exchange from their college. The list is non-binding. The information was collected to have a starting point for discussion in adding courses.

course	# submissions
BUS 110	5
ECON 201	5
ECON 202	5
PHIL 100	5
HIST 130	4
ITIS 120	4
ACCT 110	3
ACCT 120	3
ANTH 120	3
BUS 140	3
CDEV 110	3
ENGL 105	3
HIST 140	3
MUS 100	3
PSY 110	3
PSY 150	3
AJ 160	2
ARTH 110	2
ARTH 120	2
ENGL 100	2
ENGL 120	2
HIST 150	2

HIST 170	2
KIN 100	2
NUTR 110	2
POLS 130	2
PSY 120	2
PSY 170	2
PSY 180	2
PSY 200	2
PSY 205B	2
SOCI 115	2
SOCI 125	2
SPAN 100	2
THTR 111	2
AJ 110	1
AJ 120	1
AJ 200	1
ANTH 110	1
ANTH 150	1
ARTH 100	1
ARTS 110	1
ARTS 250	1
BUS 115	1
BUS 125	1
COMM 140	1
COMM 150	1
COMP 152	1
ECE 120	1
ECE 130	1
ECE 220	1
EDUC 200	1
ENGL 160	1

GEOG 110	1
GEOG 120	1
GEOG 125	1
GEOL 100	1
HIST 160	1
JOUR 110	1
KIN 135	1
MATH 130	1
MATH 250	1
MOA 101	1
NUTF 1	1
PET 104	1
PHIL 110	1
PHYS 105	1
POLS 110	1
POLS 120	1
POLS 140	1
POLS 150	1
SOC 101	1
SOCI 110	1
SOCI 140	1
SOCI 150	1
SPAN 101	1
SPAN 110	1

Autumn has also emailed a request for submission of courses into the Exchange. There is no priority set yet because we have the capacity to review all courses at this time. OEI will set a welcome meeting, self assessment, course review and meeting to discuss your course. Please submit all courses as you or faculty will receive professional development to align your course. When we have the need to prioritize, based on the courses colleges submit, that will be based on what you decide we need to offer. Some colleges felt they did not want to submit more courses, which is acceptable, but students will only be able to go out for courses, it will not be a true Exchange. Some are worried about FTES, but to make it an Exchange, colleges offer courses to receive students and FTES.

OEI is staffed with accessibility experts to complete the review.

As of now, for courses in the Exchange courses must have CID #, be taught in Canvas for one semester. The focus now is on course that have broad agreement as to universal acceptance cross campuses. They may be reorganized to ADTs, the spirit is to help the student complete their degree. We need more faculty to submit courses.

Autumn spoke about the welcome orientation, self check located on the OEI webpage, assistance with accessibility and Canvas course design specialist, all to help the faculty be successful.

Questions, Answers, Concerns, Ideas

What if a course uses 3rd party software? The rubric addresses that. You must provide evidence of contact and interaction. There must be teaching. You must provide all login information.

Section E - Institutional accessibility concerns. A member of the A-Team works on the course to make it align with the rubric.

To be in the Exchange the college must be in the Consortium and must use Canvas.

OEI is not judging the course, we are maintaining the standard of the Rubric.

We do not have enough courses. Students are finding course on their own.

We need to publicize the resources that come with being part of OEI; Quest, NetTutor, Cranium Cafe. We must sell the benefits of the Exchange, College cannot block courses offered.

Needs discussed

OEI needs a track record. With more courses there will be a greater benefit and then a greater need.

The Full launch colleges will report their success. Then we will have data.

We need to create public facing promotion. We need to do more to share with our students.

Action - Bob Nash will share his promotion when it is complete.

The next meeting is in Sacramento on May 5th.