**Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting**
Friday May 12, 2017
Embassy Suites Sacramento

**Voting Members:** Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Fabiola Torres, Joe Perret, Jodie Steeley, Lisa Beach, and Lisa Wang

**Non-voting Attendees:** Alyssa Nguyen, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jorge JC Sales, Jory Hadsell, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Monica Matousek, O'Neal Spicer, Russell Grant, Steve Klein, and Wendy Bass

**Welcome and Attendance:**
Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:37 am and welcomed everyone.

**Approval of Minutes:**                                               **Action**
There were no corrections or additions to the minutes for the March 10, 2017 meeting. Jodie Steeley moved to approve the minutes and Conan McKay seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Evaluation Update**                                                  **Action**
Alyssa Nguyen provided a progress update on evaluation activities for fall 2016 and those planned for spring 2017. This included themes of: OEI processes, marketing and communication, the Canvas online learning environment, and support tools. Marketing and communication elements fell under the implementation survey sent out to members via Basecamp which covered only program planning processes and internal and external communications. Since a communications director had not yet been hired and there isn't a formal marketing plan that piece wasn't covered fully. In the fall, the RP Group: wrapped up the 2015-16 Annual Report, completed the OEI Governance Survey, completed the implementation site survey, completed pre-term Quest for Success surveys, end of term Canvas and support service surveys for students and faculty, 2015-16 OEI Course Outcomes report, and embedded OEI specific questions in the Chancellor's Office Distance Education survey for DE coordinators.

Communication is perceived to be effective, but it can be improved. Many respondents felt a timeline needed to be better communicated to be better prepared for implementing the various products and services OEI was rolling out throughout the year. Students and faculty are generally satisfied with Canvas and the support services and tools. Implementation site visits were helpful but could benefit from targeted meetings with key departments, for example the Financial Aid group wanted more time with the management team to flesh out details specific to their department. There are still opportunities to increase awareness of OEI support services and tools for students and faculty.

Course success rates are higher in OEI pilot course sections than both overall online success rates for OEI pilot colleges and online courses statewide. The current overall 2015-16 student success rate for online courses is 64.9%, but online success rates based on the last three years have been slowly increasing; in 2013/14 the success rate was 62.7%. Overall, there has also been an increase in online success rates seen in special populations. In the OEI pilot courses success rates have been higher in all three terms than statewide success rates:

Summer      OEI 76.1%     Statewide 70.6%
Fall            OEI 67.2%     Statewide 62.4%
Spring       OEI 67.4%     Statewide 63%

These are just preliminary results based on overall online courses. The next step will be to look at comparable OEI courses based on C-ID. LeBaron noted that several years ago there was an 8-9% gap in success rates between face to face and online courses. Showing a success rate that is 6% higher in OEI courses than statewide is significant. Committee members suggested when results are communicated, rather than discussing percentages, the numbers be translated to students impacted. Online course success rates by ethnic groups are trending up as well.

Currently data doesn't show comparisons of faculty members teaching the same course in pilot section and non-pilot sections. However, the RP Group will look at online courses by C-ID, and then at OEI specific sections. Faculty comparison might be tricky since the data isn't in MIS that way, so it would rely on the college providing the information.

For the spring Alyssa will be working on: revising and modifying the course review process survey, working with Jayme to develop an Ally evaluation of how the tool is helping to improve accessibility in online courses, and working with the management team on evaluation of counseling components on ConexEd (formerly Cranium Café) training and online counseling sessions. In mid-May the CCMS Canvas end of term survey will be administered and information about perceptions of Canvas and support tools will be collected, including Quest for Success, NetTutor, and academic integrity tools. Questions related to the faculty experience with plagiarism detection tool as well as the proctoring network will be held until next year. At the end of the spring semester the team will reach out to the IRs and SPOCs to collect student level record data to study outcomes.

The completed 2017 summary reports will be available in Basecamp next week.

**Ecosystem Analysis:**
O'Neal Spicer provided initial findings, observations, and recommendations on OEI's work and products. The current inventory includes: the common CMS platform, Canvas; applications and/or services NetTutor, Proctorio, VeriCite, and Cranium Café (now ConexEd); diagnostic, Smarter Measure; and training, @ONE courses, Quest Online Learning readiness, and Canvas training modules.

There are also quality guidelines in the course design rubric and a library best practices document developed by and contributed to the OEI website by the Council of Chief Librarians.

Feedback regarding rollout and updates indicated it was too fast for some colleges; just making the migration to Canvas was using up any spare capacity and stretched IT resources. Once Canvas was up and running there was more willingness to evaluate other applications. There was limited local expertise to provide training on proper use of some OEI applications, like NetTutor and Proctorio, which slowed uptake. Other colleges that already had similar services in place found the costs of switching from Turnitin to VeriCite to be too high and without clear gains. There were glitches which caused challenges in initial rollouts for Cranium Café, but were resolved and had minimal impact.

Possible gaps were identified with: Ally and its potential to address accessibility concerns, need to increase efforts to drive equity particularly with regard to understanding reasons for lower performance by certain groups, and the need for a video platform like ARC (Instructure). MindWire suggested looking at larger trends in educational technology like personalized learning which is of interest but probably in the early stages, and data analytics which could be valuable, but may also be premature right now.

MindWire found local autonomy and decision making to be critical, but training resources needed to be provided centrally. Professional development services have been warmly received, but the course design rubric a little less so since it is perceived to be a bit controlling. Messaging and word choice is critical to driving buy-in. Central IT resources and technical support would lower some barriers to moving faster, but not all since shared governance at the local level is process driven. SIS integration can offer challenges. Additionally, LTI in theory is "plug and play," but there are often glitches requiring IT support. A campus with advanced educational technology and IT infrastructure had few problems, but other campuses that were not as fluent had a much harder time. OEI does a good job sharing lessons and documenting items, with more colleges sharing experiences to reduce the learning curve. OEI has provided lots of new applications and services. However, now there should be focus on execution and getting more students on the Course Exchange.

Preliminary recommendations:
-Provide as much support, training, and IT resources as possible
-Continue to allow colleges to use existing systems if they meet local needs
-Soft pedal innovation and pushing initiatives and focus on execution around existing platforms and services
-Focus on incremental improvement like upgrades to Proctorio, etc. without rolling out new systems
-Exceptions to incremental improvement would be behind the scenes data collection efforts, a tool like Ally, and a video platform that empowers faculty

There can be a lot of confusion about LMS administration and how LTI is configured. The project should be issuing best practice guidelines. Dave Stephens explained there is often awful LTI documentation; vendors don't take down out of date videos, tutorials, or completely incorrect LTI configuration information. He suggested OEI do more to put pressure on vendors to check and update documentation. Dave and Logan could work with the six existing vendors to make sure their documentation is up to date.

There is a lot of confusion between CCC Confer, ConferNow and Zoom for video conferencing. TTIP South is its own grant but OEI tries to inform product choices including a pretty big impetus behind Zoom. Rico and his team have been pretty receptive about feedback and around 3CMedia as a hosting platform with a good captioning workflow as well. Going forward, OEI will continue to work closely with them, but doesn't have direct control over the platforms TTIP South selects.

Colleges need to work together rather than acting in silos. Each campus is not the only one dealing with VeriCite, Proctorio, etc. LTI issues shouldn't be something campuses are dealing with alone. OEI should provide effective practices. This effort is about to be bigger and Fabiola explained faculty is going to want to play with these tools. Canvas is just a tool, but work needs to happen in the areas of personalized learning and androgogical training to provide the best learning environment. LeBaron noted the RFA intentionally set out the need for collaboration and integration with other statewide projects. The Chancellor's Office knows it is not efficient to have silos that don't talk to each other. They are encouraging collaboration to leverage effectiveness for state dollars.

**OEI Reports:**
Executive Director:
Full management team update reports are posted in Basecamp.

The $10M OEI budget augmentation request was still included yesterday in the May revise. The state budget process still needs to play out, and there is an overall shortfall statewide, but OEI is optimistic about that funding. The $10M augmentation includes $8M in additional funding on top of the OEI base funding to continue paying 100% of the Canvas subscription costs with expansion to 113 colleges in the system along with some additional funding for implementation and support services. There have been rumors that without this augmentation, colleges would have to pay 100% of the costs for Canvas, which is incorrect. Even in the absence of this augmentation in the budget, colleges would not have to pay 100% the project would still be paying a major portion of the cost for Canvas. This augmentation allows OEI to continue paying the full cost. In addition, if the project can show a good process that is successful with a good product, OEI is as close to guaranteed for renewal as it can be. Course delivery is no longer seen as an add-on to student services support it is seen as an essential part of college infrastructure like CENIC. Erik Skinner, LeBaron, and others who speak for the project have successfully made that point in speaking to

legislators and statewide decision makers. Members also discussed the importance of capturing the number of courses being offered face to face in Canvas, as well as those being offered online; the common CMS is not specifically for Distance Education, it is being used campus wide.

There are now 105 colleges committed to Canvas migration within twenty months. Saddleback and Fullerton colleges are the most recent college adoptions. As new colleges are being added, the colleges from a year or a year and a half ago are phasing out use of their old LMS. In some cases colleges are paying for old archives in order to meet federal audit requirements or for accreditation purposes, but students are accessing new courses only in Canvas.

OEI is preparing for recruitment of a Director of Communications and Partnership Development. The project also brought on Jorge (JC) Sales as Strategic Outreach Consultant until the full recruitment and hiring process can be completed. Jorge has been working in a business capacity through the Foundation for the last two years with RFPs for OEI. He will be working on pushing information out effectively and efficiently, capturing the widest college audience, and keeping the website up to date.

The CCC Canvas User's Group is having its first event. CanInnovate will focus on professional development with support from Instructure, but allowed OEI to really set the agenda. The User's Group is open to all administrators, staff and faculty. The plan is to have two per year with locations rotated throughout the state. This one is set for August 14th at Los Rios' American River College; registration opens May 15th with seats limited at 275. There is a nominal $20 registration fee.

The Course Exchange is in production at Butte, Coastline, Fresno, Lake Tahoe, and Ventura. Version 1.0 went out in January 2017 and the project is working with additional colleges to activate the Course Exchange and on bug fixes and code updates. Key milestones include students piloting priority registration workflows for fall 2017 and finalizing work on the next major release. Version 2.0 in September will include financial aid automation and feature flags. The automation of financial aid is a big step forward will help with concerns about manual financial aid processes. The Course Exchange release cycle will be annual, but feature flags will allow colleges to turn a feature on or off before a new release comes out.

The Consortium currently has twenty-four colleges and is planning for expansion with formalization of a comprehensive OEI Consortium agreement including operating rules, member responsibilities, benefits, and reciprocity agreements targeted for August/September. Development of an onboarding guide for interested colleges to identify timelines for local implementation activities is also underway. The intent is to solicit interest applications from new colleges in early fall 2017 for live courses in fall 2018. The project is now still very early in the

launch process with the first twenty-four colleges. More work is anticipated in the fall with the eight full launch colleges and implementation with the remaining sixteen, leading to piloting largely in the spring. There will be a good opportunity to get a more comprehensive debriefing to the Steering Committee about what has been learned from the current process after fall. Fabiola noted there would be lessons to be learned about teaching students from other communities even with the current small group. There are lots of benefits in hearing those stories and encouraging buy-in. Jory thought it could be possible to have a webinar in the fall to talk about experiences so far as colleges and having enough students to talk about might require a secondary conversation at the end of fall.

Academic Affairs Update:
An Academic Affairs work group is starting up which includes Jodie, Dan, and Conan. Others from the Steering Committee are welcome to join and faculty members already have Academic Senate approval for participation.

The first item the group will be looking at is CritiqueIt which is an annotation tool that has been recommended to OEI as working with VeriCite. The need for an annotation tool has been a complaint about VeriCite versus Turnitin. The team keeps reminding people that Turnitin, did not submit a response the academic integrity RFP despite being asked twice. The CVC catalog is another item that will eventually come to that group. The work group will just provide information, not decisions; they will just give advisory information to the Steering Committee.

Dave was concerned because NetTutor reached out to individual campuses regarding their Refer Tutor Report (RTR) tool, and he wanted to make sure functional requirements for ADA compliance, costs, etc. for all tools are addressed. He is concerned about vendors contacting SPOCs directly. Barbara explained tutors from the twenty-four pilot colleges met with her and asked for volunteers from the colleges' tutoring centers interested in learning more about the RTR and piloting. Cabrillo has been doing it and Butte expressed interest, so the project approved contacting the school. The same information was put out regarding the scheduling tool and Ventura College is piloting it. RTR is a tutor referral tool that allows faculty to refer a student directly to tutoring. It was a feature that was developed and added to the overall NetTutor package with OEI. It is part of piloting and not a new RFP. The scheduling tool was something OEI asked for in the RFP and after developing it the vendor asked for piloting and providing additional feedback. Both components are being piloted under the regular OEI package through the Foundation.

Jory and Barbara have been in discussions with LSI, along with Jayme and Sean Keegan regarding accessibility. LSI will get an evaluation from a third party reviewer, Tech4All, which is on the Technology Center approved list, and will also provide its roadmap to be 100% WCAG 2.0 AA standard by January 2018. OEI will be getting that roadmap by mid-to-late June. In good faith the project has

agreed to do the renewal for one year and will purchase enough minutes to go through the end of December.

OEI's RFP for academic integrity was specifically looking to meet a project need and the functional requirements were specific to plagiarism detection. Turnitin pricing bundles their products together: plagiarism detection, annotation tool, writing pieces, etc. It isn't possible to purchase only plagiarism detection, which is part of the reason it was unaffordable. VeriCite had a much more fixed scope, and the project has now come across a company called CritiqueIt which provides an annotation tool that integrates with VeriCite. Therefore this is an add-on to something that exists. The student could submit a paper, video, etc. and have it checked for plagiarism or source matching and the students and teacher could also have annotation capability. The Academic Affairs work group will provide advice and filter possible tools to determine what might be worth pursuing. Dave encouraged more and deeper communication to avoid confusion. It is important to communicate this was a missing piece from an original RFP. He also asked if Crocodoc was on the table for VeriCite to work with because it does annotation and is already part of the Canvas feature platform.

Jory explained challenges with implementation can depend on when colleges implemented with respect to LTI or native integration of VeriCite. Those that implemented later got the benefit of issues being worked out and having native integration. User interface updates are coming about what changes to expect. There are also complications with multi-college districts because the tool integrates at the root level. A district has to decide whether to use another product or all go with VeriCite. The project has been working with VeriCite and Instructure on how to have that integration. It has been a bit of a challenge because of patch code coming in and Instructure hasn't released information about their technology changes for August 1st so VeriCite hasn't been able to jump in and get them. The Academic Affairs work group will look into Crocodoc.

Basic skills pre-assessment review is in the OEI work plan with the goal of reducing time for students to get from basic skills through transfer level courses. Since the Course Exchange doesn't include basic skills courses that item was going to be moved over to be part of Common Assessment. However, at the April meeting Tim Calhoon and Jennifer Coleman made the decision to send that back into OEI. Barbara is working on it and strongly believes there will be an opportunity, especially in math, to reach students who just need a review or refresher of content they had in high school.

Veterans Academic Path is also in the OEI work plan with a requirement to support veterans in Credit for Prior Learning. Many veterans have a variety of skills that could apply to courses. EMT work done in the field for example might mean a veteran knows two-thirds to three-fourths of a basic EMT course. How the faculty could work to fill a gap in a course is totally under faculty purview. So OEI is instead looking at majors veterans are taking when they come back. They

are partnering to look at the top ten districts with veterans and study the top ten majors. They are looking at Associate degrees majors, terminal degrees and also ADT. Then they will work with the Academic Senate on what can be done.

Exchange Residency Update:
A lot happened between the last meeting and now regarding the residency issue. Originally DEETAC was going to try to work with LeBaron and the Chancellor's Office on changing Title 5 to make it easier for teaching colleges to verify residency for students who already had it verified at their home college. This would have removed a barrier to seamless registration and improved and expedited the process. At the time of the last meeting, they had looked at Ed Code language regarding CCC students cross enrolling with CSUs and UCs and allowing the teaching college to accept the home college's residency verification. However, Legal recommended going through Ed Code instead of Title 5. Fortunately, it now looks like it will be able to be attached to a bill and with some additional steps that may happen by fall, have a possible effective date of January 1, 2018.

This solution creates two new sections in Ed Code, one on residency determination and another on cross enrollment of community colleges. This new intra-segmental section is modeled on but does not exactly replicate the CSU piece. This idea was very positively received by a potential author who is gutting and amending an existing bill. By next week LeBaron should be able to share more details publically.

This will be a tremendous benefit for students in real time registration. It will overcome a policy roadblock. Title 5 is based on statutory authorizations and universal residency was created decades ago based on district boundaries and the fact that the CCC was originally created as an extension of the K-12 system with residency rules that mirrored those of K-12 schools. This change in Ed Code will be more of a system approach. It has to get through the California Senate and Assembly and be vetted and signed by the Governor by September 30th. If it is approved through that process it will have an official bill of statute to become effective January 1, 2018. John Sills and the Technology Center would then have October through December to set up the technology behind the scenes without the residency issue being a roadblock.

**Discussions:**
CCMS Advisory Committee Charter Modifications:
The CCMS Committee was formed to develop the requirements for the CCMS RFP. They guided and led the evaluation and selection process and were maintained as a body to interface with the vendor on prioritizing product recommendations. All nine Academic Senate members from the OEI Steering Committee were invited to be on the CCMS Committee, the ones that did not were supplemented by the Academic Senate so the group would have a total of

nine Academic Senate members. There is also equal representation from pilot colleges.

Now it is time to set up a Charter identifying roles, responsibilities, and to help the Academic Senate understand its purpose when making appointments. A Charter subcommittee of the CCMS Committee was formed to work on a draft charter made up of Cheryl Chapman from Coastline, Dave Stephens, Deborah Barrett from Solano, Greg Beyrer, and Joe Perret as Chair. The charter posted to Basecamp went through multiple revisions, from subcommittee to the larger committee and back to the subcommittee multiple times until it was approved by the larger CCMS Committee during their last meeting. One of the key purposes of that group was to make recommendations to the CCMS vendor on behalf of statewide faculty and to prioritize those. The vehicle for that is the Canvas Community Group which now has about six hundred faculty and staff members who talk about Canvas. Instructure also takes input on product recommendations through various sources and channels. The CCC is the largest customer of Canvas and is actively involved in conversations about their product roadmap. Instructure/Canvas is very responsive to the CCC system about ideas for features to meet the needs of Canvas campuses.

The CCMS Advisory Committee Charter came from the template of the OEI Steering Committee Charter. Members discussed the timing of membership changes and how that was articulated in the charter. Steve explained the CCMS group is evolving in its membership. It was a place for the eight full launch pilot colleges to have a voice in selection of the CCMS, but now that the platform has been selected, there has been discussion of what the future makeup should be. The charter wording is an artifact of timing and recognizes current versus future membership. The intent was to capture the vision as the group moves forward and on an annual basis make necessary edits. There will be up to twenty-nine people in the CCMS Committee, and up to ten will be appointed by the Academic Senate. The first nine Academic Senate members come from OEI if they desire and then if any are not, they are replaced by other Canvas using Academic Senate appointees. Dave explained that Classified Senate appointees should be LMS administrators since the purpose of this committee is to prioritize future requests for the vendor. Those classified staff are the ones with "their hand on the mouse" so their representation is "up to" equal representation.This item is an informational item. The CCMS Committee reports to the OEI Steering Committee for review.

Lisa Beach asked for clarification in the membership area, since members will serve two year terms, will half of existing members step out and half come in? Steve felt that would probably be the case in this evolving environment; this group came together to meet one need and now the conversation is opening up about how the transition will go. In section two regarding leadership, everyone has a vote for Chair. However, only faculty members may be nominated from the existing committee.

Regarding transition based on the conclusion of the OEI pilot, there was some discussion of various ways to interpret that and LeBaron suggested wording be changed to reflect the end of the existing grant on June 30, 2018. He noted that the new grant might be awarded to the same or to a new college; it is a reality of the five year grant process and an incentive to do a good job in the application.

The CCMS Committee is currently involved in ongoing discussion with Instructure around the redesign of the outcomes tool, so there is an Outcomes subcommittee of the CCMS Committee and Greg Beyrer is helping to lead that. There is also a conversation with the Canvas data team to identify some of the data components. The goal is to have five new features to bring to Canvas for discussion. The Outcomes work group is focused on learning outcomes and supporting whatever SLO repository the college has and making the SLOs more visible in the course structure.

Jory thought it might make sense to be more formal in the charter about the linkage between the OEI Steering Committee and the priorities for the CCMS Advisory Committee. The charter is currently kind of one directional. Steve noted that was related to the conversation and question of what the relationship would be with the vendor. Should the OEI Steering Committee have a say in what Proctorio, or other vendors do in their development? The idea is to capture how conversations with vendors should go in order to be nimble in communication and free of approval processes with another body. Jory thought that made sense but after the conversations this morning thought it was important to have two-way communication and not to work at cross purposes. He didn't think everything the CCMS Committee did should come to the OEI SC but didn't think the current document was clear enough about the relationship is between the two bodies.

Feedback will go to the CCMS Committee and the revised document will come back for further input and comment. Cheryl will plan on putting it on the agenda in June and will move it to August if necessary.

**Action Item:**
Comments and suggestions on the CCMS Charter should be sent to Amy Carbonaro. Revisions will return at the June or August OEI meeting.

ASCCC Resolution re: OEI Expansion:
Cheryl explained that in December/January she got a number of calls of concern probably as a result of communications when Pat and Jory were transitioning. In her role as Academic Senate representative she tried to craft a resolution to reinforce support for OEI. After feedback, she realized her original wording came across badly and by the Senate Plenary in April it was worded more smoothly. There was good feedback especially from Area C. More feedback came in and other minor revisions were suggested to reflect those conversations. Ultimately,

the resolution was supported unanimously. She emphasized her intent was to be supportive and not to be critical at all. There were four resolve statements:

1) Reinforcement of academic professional matters, this was intended to reassure people outside of OEI who might not be aware of that emphasis
2) Concerns about academic standards and expediting or overlooking the peer review process and the fact that the Steering Committee and Consortium would both consult and have input.
3) Continue to reinforce the use of trained faculty reviewers
4) Ensuring that Academic Senate appointed faculty participated in development of criteria for managing course offerings. That happens at the OEI Steering Committee where there is Senate representation.

Jodie expressed concern about "faculty being involved in the review process." She noted that a faculty member is already part of the process when they submit a course. She wondered why faculty has to specifically be part of the review process, and noted changes are being made in the process. It is not a union issue; it is a peer review member process. Cheryl explained that since it impacts students and faculty statewide, there was a need for faculty to be involved. Jodie felt this resolution would add an additional burden to her campus to have to pay to train reviewers and has the potential to slow down their certification process. The person who taught the course was an instructional designer. Jory didn't think this should be roadblock to a local process. Jodie's concerns were about cost and adding to the workload of faculty who already do SLO, program review, etc. She felt the resolution wording might limit their campus to having faculty doing the final review when it is really just a review for level of alignment with the rubric.

Lisa Beach appreciated the active involvement of the Academic Senate in the OEI community and what is being done. She really liked having these items added to the website so people who ask questions can be referred to exactly "where it says that." People can see the Academic Senate is deeply involved.

Course Exchange Expansion:
The $20M the legislature allocated was not to have theoretical discussions; they want to see a whooping number of courses in the Exchange and lots of people in them. Courses are developed by faculty and are approved by campuses. Careful, thoughtful, and respectful consideration of the work done at other colleges was encouraged. It is important not to insinuate that other faculty and colleges in our system are not trusted. These are not new purchased courses; they are being offered locally and have been developed by our colleagues in the system. The goal is to increase the expansion of OEI. Instructional design support is for ADA and accessibility not for faculty evaluation.

Consortium colleges can submit any C-ID designated transfer level course but for now speech communication and lab science courses are being excluded. The goal is to look at scaling up the process for all of the other courses in the system.

Autumn provided an overview of the current review process. Right now the process is for twenty-four colleges, but although they have been doing reviews under the current system since fall 2015, there are still only twenty-eight courses. In December they streamlined the course review rubric and the process. Previously faculty had to work on the course on their own and then submit for re-review and that is no longer the case, but there still aren't a lot of courses coming through the pipeline; there needs to be more input. A single iteration of the review process includes three different information meetings in the weeks leading up to the start. During that week of information meetings, the team talks to SPOCs, and sends out emails to faculty about OEI, an overview of the process, and gives them instructions for the self-assessment. Then there are about two weeks for instructors to do the self-check rubric and put in comments for anything they want reviewers to know about their course. After two weeks, the self-check rubric and a review ready checklist are due. The course review is then assigned to a review team. There is about one week for two peer reviewers and one accessibility reviewer look at the course. Then one week for the lead review to resolve any discrepancies and consolidate all three reviews into a final review document. All of the reviewers are faculty who have completed the three week online POCR training from @ONE and have received approval from their local and state Academic Senates to be reviewers before being given a contract to do reviews. Results are shared with the instructor during an hour long meeting and at the end of the call an instructional designer works with the instructor to help them resolve all check marks and achieve alignment with the rubric.

At this point, there are two areas where the review process slows down: in the beginning with getting courses submitted and at the end in following up with the instructional designers. Jodie felt the Academic Senate was protecting the workload of the reviewer who is paid, and the instructional designer who is paid, but the faculty member has no incentive to do all the work that two paid and protected people in the cycle are paid to do. If the bottleneck is before and after the review, why are the reviewers being paid, but not faculty to compensate for their time, who are the ones which do all the work on the courses?

The Management team wanted to gather ideas for getting faculty to put courses in and get more courses Exchange ready. The goal is to scale up the number of courses. Rather than brainstorming in small groups, the committee decided it would rather hear feedback from the two or three members who had personal experience with the current processes and issues at the pilot schools. Currently there are slowdowns in the initial faculty submissions and then faculty taking actions after review. If there were many more courses coming in there could also potentially be a bottleneck in the review process itself.

As a SPOC, Wendy had three faculty members drop out: one didn't like the feedback and thought it was biased, one dropped out since initially they didn't want to move to Canvas, and the third felt the process was too disorganized. She thought she would be able to revisit the idea with the third person now the

process has been improved. On her side, Wendy loved the process of changing and improving her classes; she felt it was a great growth experience. Now that all of their classes are moving to Canvas, she submitted again. She thought a lot was also in flux with revisions as faculty members were switching to Canvas. Since the process has been improved and streamlined, Jory suggested having faculty members who have gone through the process recently be the ones talking how the process works.

Suggestions on getting faculty to want to submit courses:
-Paying faculty to submit courses
-Local release time or other locally negotiated incentives (Flex time, class sizes)
-Local stipends
-Provide a total amount of money for each course and allow the college to decide how to divide it up
-Mini-grants of $300 (the value is in representing validation and respect)
-Templates to help faculty set up courses (but some faculty won't use them)
-Perhaps a need for a rebranding effort and reset regarding the review process and the Course Exchange
- Having an accessibility specialist and instructional designer at the Professional Development Summit was really valuable. Faculty members could see the resources that would be available to them if they submitted courses for the Exchange

To get work done after review:
-Hire "Canvas ninjas" who are adjunct faculty paid to go in and do the repetitive pieces: do this to all the quizzes, fix all the links, or put the SLOs at the beginning of each section. Maybe each campus could have people help with that.

Jory cautioned about the need to be mindful of local cultures. Some colleges have groups working that are not being compensated and they might find some suggestions to be offensive. There should be local decision making about how any funding might be distributed. There is also a reality that those who do more tend to be the people on campus who are willing to do even more professionally to work on their craft.

Barbara asked members to email her with further ideas for serving students with the Course Exchange.

Overview of Plans for @ONE Transition:
@ONE grant is transitioning from MSJC to Foothill-DeAnza as of July 1st. So they are now in the process of having regular meetings to move all project pieces over. They are also hiring and staffing up for @ONE; right now they have two faculty coordinator positions that are posted, one that is focused on technology training for the system and the other one for faculty professional development around online teaching.  They are also hiring a program coordinator and two instructional designers.

OEI had made a significant investment in MSJC for @ONE training for OEI related pieces: course review, training around Canvas, etc. This transition will allow OEI to be more effective in reaching out and providing training directly to the field. @ONE will retain the name and be the professional development unit not singularly for OEI, but that team will be doing course review training, Canvas training, and all training on other technology related items. That will be the identity of the professional development unit and Autumn will lead that unit. Additionally they are looking at ways to leverage a more scalable approach to professional development for the system. They will be continuing face to face, and regional, and will be looking at other innovative ideas to make professional development more accessible to more people.

**Bylaws Annual Review:**
Cheryl attempted to make minor revisions to the bylaws, but thought the language could be improved even more. She is looking for other comments, questions, or suggestions and then to bring it back to the Zoom call in June.

There have been conversations about changing the title from "Steering Committee" to "Advisory Committee" since it better represents the decision making role of the groups in all of the initiatives relative to the Chancellor's Office. LeBaron agreed "Advisory Committee" probably better reflected the role. The advice coming out of these groups is always taken seriously, but it would be more consistent with the intent if it was called an Advisory Committee. Several members agreed; Cheryl will put in that revision for consideration in June.

Jodie suggested new members coming on would find it useful to have an onboarding process to catch them up to speed for active participation. It would also be helpful to have an orientation to Basecamp.

**Action Item:**
Members were asked to review bylaws and provide Cheryl with suggested revisions. They will be reviewed in June, or extended for an additional month if there are extensive changes.

**OEI Meeting Calendar for 2017-2018:**
The committee reviewed proposed meeting dates for the coming year. Conan McKay moved to approve the calendar as proposed while also setting meeting dates for Thursday November 9th, and in May on the 18th. Lisa Beach seconded the motion. The committee approved the motion. The June 8th meeting was left as an online meeting with a possible joint gathering with the Consortium at the OTC.

August 11th 2017 Online from 9:30am- 11:30am
September 15th 2017 Face-to-face in Sacramento from 9:30am-3:00pm
October 13th 2017 Online from 9:30 – 11:30 am
November 9th 2017 Online from 9:30 – 11:30 am

December 8<sup>th</sup> 2017 Face-to-face in Sacramento

January 12<sup>th</sup> 2018 Online from 9:30 - 11:30am
February 9<sup>th</sup> 2018 Online from 9:3o - 11:30am
March 9<sup>th</sup> 2018 Face-to-face in Sacramento 9:30am- 3:30pm
April 13<sup>th</sup> 2018 Online 9:30 - 11:30am
May 18<sup>th</sup> 2018 Face-to-face in Sacramento 9:30am- 3:30pm
June 8<sup>th</sup> 2018 Online 9:30 - 11:30am
No meetings in July or August

**Other:**
Conan reminded members that spring 2017 resolution 11.01 on the Academic Senate website urges local senates to talk to their administration about using cost savings for going to Canvas for professional development. That could possibly include money to pay faculty for development of courses.

Barbara reported that Jayme has an Ally pilot with Fresno and the Coastline district. There hasn't been enough use yet to evaluate it, so the project would like to extend the pilot through the fall and come up with metrics to evaluate it and to look at what both faculty and administration say about the tool. Dave noted the need for faculty to have access to the Ally tool prior to the semester; access over the summer is critical. Lisa Beach said if it might be possible to have a non-pilot school provide input, she has someone on her campus that could help.

Student Services Steering Committee positions need to be filled.

Dave proposed two agenda items: a short demonstration of Proctorio and an update on problems that colleges are having with seeding anti-plagiarism programs, and getting help with LTI integration. So far one vendor has not provided data. The recommended approach at this point is to grab past submissions at the database level in the LMS to populate systems.

Joe Perret suggested continued agenda focus on how to populate the Exchange.

Cheryl also asked members to be looking forward to the Chair election at the September face to face meeting. Members also applauded and acknowledged Fabiola's leadership.

**Adjournment:**
The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 pm.