

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday September 15, 2017
Embassy Suites Sacramento

Voting Members: Andreea Serban, Cheryl Aschenbach, Claire Lopez, Conan McKay, Corey Marvin, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Geoffrey Dyer, Greg Beyrer, Joe Perret, Jodie Steeley, Lisa Beach, Star Rivera-Lacey

Non-voting Attendees: Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Joe Moreau, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Mark Beam, Steve Klein, and Wendy Bass

Welcome and Attendance:

Cheryl Aschenbach opened the meeting at 9:37 am and welcomed everyone.

Approval of the Agenda:

Conan McKay moved to approve the agenda and Jodie Steeley seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes for the August 11, 2017 meeting. Conan McKay moved to approve the minutes and Jodie Steeley seconded the motion. The minutes were approved. Dave Stephens abstained.

Co-Chair Appointment:

Action

Since the project isn't sure all new appointees have been seated on the committee yet, Cheryl asked if members were willing to delay the new Co-Chair appointment until the next in person meeting in December. Fabiola is willing to continue to fill. This will also give new members a chance to get their bearings.

Andreea Serban moved to hold the Co-Chair election in December and Jodie Steeley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Management Team Update

Action

The full management team update was posted on Basecamp. Autumn Bell is at the IEPI meeting today. As the head of @ONE she will need to alternate attendance at meetings for OEI and @ONE. There are exciting things happening in Professional Development with the move of @ONE to Foothill-DeAnza. They were able to recruit a new team and are reimagining how to do everything. Reach out to Autumn if there are questions about the update.

The Technology Center has identified a lead and seven pilot colleges for data warehouse development. They will be working with researchers at those colleges to inform development of a tool to help with reporting. Data sources will be Canvas, MyPath, CCCApply and a couple others. The initial effort will be by OEI

although it will eventually be larger. The goal is to have a prototype in place at the end of June.

LeBaron will be presenting the Distance Education report to the Board of Governors in November. It was planned for Monday, but the DACA decision bumped the report. Erin Larson will be taking data from the survey in that report and disaggregating it by college into three reports: a high level report to share with senior administration, a summary report for the system, and all of the CSD data for each survey response. Requests are being prepared for forty-two colleges to participate in a series of workshops. Erin will also be working with Russell to put out the OEI RFP renewal; the new grant starts July 1st.

Existing law says each college must obtain its own residency documentation. AB 637, a bill that will enable OEI Consortium teaching colleges to accept the residency determination from home colleges without getting additional information, received 100% support from the Assembly and Senate and is now on the Governor's desk. The project wants to try it out first with the twenty-four Consortium colleges and to engage with the rest of the community college Admissions and Records community prior to including the whole CCC system. The Governor has until October 15th to sign the legislation; if he does, it will become law January 2019. This will remove the regulatory hurdle to a teaching college instantly accepting a student from another college; there will be no legal policy barrier. Development work will still need to be done by John Sills' team to build it. Work is being planned and requirements are being identified. However, Steve cautioned the colleges need to agree on what information they need and want to identify each student before this can be built. The business process requirement is the heavy lift in what remains. Bonnie explained they have begun some of that work starting with three colleges that touch the three systems. They need some kind of enrollment record.

Barbara reported on accessibility work with Ally, which is a tool that helps to remedy files and pages so they are accessible. There are eight colleges interested in participating in this pilot which will begin after the Foundation finishes contracting. Dave Stephens is the Chair of the workgroup. The project isn't working with UDOIT because it requires a lot more technical support both by the college and the Technology Center. Depending upon when the contract is finalized the pilot may run through December or through June. After the pilot the tool will be evaluated and the project can decide whether to continue with it, go to RFP, or if there is a desire to piggyback on an existing contract. The goal is to find out if the tool is as valuable as the company says it is. Dave explained the new version is due to be released in December and will do both files and pages, so it may make sense to wait until December and do a spring semester pilot.

There was a small scale use of Ally with no formal evaluation with an existing contract that ended in June, but this will be a full pilot with participating colleges being able to use it in all of their classes, not just their OEI Consortium classes.

There will also be a more formal evaluation to see if it is really helping faculty. It is supposed to be easier for faculty to use.

The project will be recruiting a new permanent administrative assistant. In the meantime, emails should be directed to: OEIadmin@ccconlineed.org. There will also be an announcement soon of the new Director of Communication.

There have been some recent changes in the Chancellor's Office structure. OEI was initially funded out of TRIS in partnership with Academic Affairs. That partnership is still in place but the TRIS Division has been moved under Executive Vice Chancellor Van Ton-Quinlivan who was formerly the Vice Chancellor of Workforce and Economic Development. That division is now Workforce and Digital Futures. Debra Connick who was the Vice Chancellor of TRIS is no longer with the Chancellor's Office. The management team is renewing focus on ensuring OEI work is doing connects with EPI, CAI, CalPASS, etc., to create as seamless an experience for students as possible.

Student Services Update:

The Quest Online Readiness program helps students learn about strengths and weakness in skills that will help them in online education. It is still available to the entire CCC system, including the SmarterMeasure diagnostic component. The project has been working with @ONE to add webinars teaching stakeholders how to best make use of those modules. Last semester they helped faculty learn how to incorporate the modules into their courses. Now they are developing webinars for counselors to help students benefit from the Online Readiness program and resources. Those webinars are recorded and/or archived and Bonnie will provide a link to them. The project encourages instructors to get students to sign up to do Quest before starting their online courses and for students who have challenges to use it while taking their online course. There are two pathways in Quest, one for students who are new to online courses and another for experienced online students. Bonnie will put the link to the multimedia resources on Basecamp; they are available to all 114 colleges. Quest can now be offered as an open course prior to students signing up for an online course. At Fresno they auto-enroll all online students in Quest for Success and provide a badge when the course is complete. The badge means students don't have to retake the course for Clovis and Reedley after finishing it at Fresno. One instructor forces students to take Quest and complete modules prior to moving on to any other work in her course. Fresno sends every student who enrolls in an online course an email with a link to the Quest course. Dan suggested Jodie's example from Fresno be included in the newsletter. LeBaron praised this great program for improving retention and success in online learning.

New colleges are being added for online counseling and the project team is getting them on with the vendor. Online counseling courses started September 11th and a mental health module was added as well. The course has been updated with video components added. Colleges that have Cranium Café and

want ConexEd should contact Bonnie to get the training. Information has gone out to the counselors through the Listserv, the pilot colleges, and the CSSOs.

Arnita Porter is collaborating with Bonnie on student services and equity. They are looking at sample courses and working with Larry Green (Lake Tahoe CC) to see what can be added to his math course and hope to have a demo at the next face to face meeting. They are looking at recommendations to equitize websites and campuses.

Proctoring Network Update:

Nicole Woolley is overseeing the Proctoring Network for faculty/courses that require face to face proctoring. For example, in Barbara's statistics class, students need to use graphing calculators and are allowed use of a dictionary and a page of notes. All of those elements would set off triggers in Proctorio. There are now almost twenty colleges signed up with more interested but waiting until next year to start. Eight colleges belong to the Consortium and the other ten to twelve do not.

Students from around the state may need proctoring and the network will allow them to take a test where it is convenient for them. Each college in the network will get a couple of Chromebooks to use for testing. Logan is going to make a geo-map site that will link to testing centers and their hours. This is intended for all online courses, not just Exchange courses. They were hoping to have everything set up to start September 1st, but a couple more colleges signed up so they waited to launch the program. Barbara acknowledged there might be an imbalance between schools that get heavy use and others with only a few students. They plan to keep an eye on it and some places might end up needing to set appointment times, but that isn't an issue at this point. There will be a webinar on September 29th. The first part will be about using Proctorio and the second part on starting the proctoring network.

Approval to Pursue Contracts:

Action

Within Academic Affairs there is interest in looking at services and features that could help equitize online learning for students across the state. Barbara explained many vendors want to meet with OEI, and generally they allow only a first meeting to talk about potential services, but not a second unless the vendor has accessibility approval from a list of nine vendors that provide certification of WCAG 2.0 AA accessibility. There are three features the work group was unanimous about being interested in looking at further: a search engine feature, a name pronunciation tool (one company they know of is "Name Coach"), and a place to input preferred name and gender. Barbara thought Instructure did not have plans to include a search engine feature, at least not in the next year. Very few schools have a place in the SIS for a nickname or preferred name and preferred gender. Today she is looking for direction on whether to pursue further information on these three features. This does not commit OEI to purchase of these tools, just to gathering more information about what might be available.

Dave thought the search engine feature was already on Instructure's product radar and noted it made the top twelve features requested. He thought it was close to being in development and was concerned about introducing a vendor and potentially less than twelve months later having Instructure develop the feature. Barbara was told at Instructure Con that it is not on next year's plan. Dave would want a search feature to avoid showing items that are not available to a particular user and/or to have a feature for "available now" or to check by date lock. Dan thought it possible to tag items "what must be done for access."

The workgroup provided some initial vetting with this recommendation. Jory reminded the Advisory Committee it is being asked if it believes these features are worth further exploration. They would later come back with recommendations for or against proceeding. At that point this body would get into whether or not to provide a full endorsement of the tool or product. Steve expressed concern the work being done might be more appropriate for the Canvas Users group which prioritizes top concerns for the community college system. Are these core ideas the project needs to be focused on for the next year, and are they driven by the work plan?

Bonnie explained a couple of these items (name pronunciation and preferred name and/or gender) came up through equity work and had long been concerns. Additionally, these items were not necessarily related to Canvas. This is a new process for Academic Affairs to draw attention to effective practices, especially related to equity. Jory emphasized approval to "take the next step" would involve investigating tools and addressing questions: is there more than one vendor, can the cost be leveraged through CSU or UC, and would it be OEI funded or piggybacked on another contract? After those questions were answered and vetted through constituent groups, a final decision could be made.

Dave moved that each of the three suggestions be considered and voted on separately. Andreea seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Andreea thought it would be helpful to know exactly when Canvas is looking toward the release of a search engine feature. It would be important to have a more precise timeline from Instructure; if it is only going to be two years she thought it wouldn't be worth the effort and time. Steve encouraged engaging Instructure on their firm roadmap; what a vendor said three months ago has probably changed. Dave agreed; often items for Instructure have been implemented in half the time estimated. Dan moved to explore a third party option for a search engine. The motion was seconded by Conan. The motion carried.

Name pronunciation is an equity piece; it is about students feeling comfortable interacting in an online environment. Jodie moved to pursue name pronunciation and Clair Lopez seconded the motion. The motion passes with abstentions from Greg Beyrer and Joe Perret.

Members felt name and gender preference might already be included in the SIS. Wendy cautioned name preference has to be recorded in the SIS otherwise the student isn't recognized by the system. The student ID is the only true identifier. The Technology Center rolled out a Canvas to SIS integration with Project Glue that auto-populates from Canvas to SIS and from SIS to Canvas; this will allow name discrepancies to be resolved. The solution may already exist. Bonnie explained the idea was to gather information, if it already exists in Canvas or the SIS, money wouldn't be put into it.

Clair moved to pursue further information about allowing the option for students and staff to have a preference for gender and name stored or recorded so it could be used. Jodie seconded the motion. The motion passed with Greg Beyrer and Joe Perret abstaining.

Course Exchange Update:

Kate Jordahl has been working on implementation of the Course Exchange. The mission is completion of transfer degrees by increasing access to courses, quality and completion. The Course Exchange is now in use at six colleges with students for fall and the recent legislative changes will allow it to work more smoothly. The Course Exchange was launched in January 2016 and other colleges are getting ready. Version 2 with Financial Aid is coming in October. Access to the Course Exchange is only available after a student has registered for a minimum of one course at their home college, then they are offered the option of looking at Course Exchange courses. There are multiple paths into the Course Exchange, but students must meet that baseline of at least one course at the home college.

Kate will post links to short videos about the Course Exchange in Basecamp. Greg felt one with a stick figure which he showed at his local Academic Senate was really good marketing.

The project is looking at expanding the Consortium. It began as the twenty-four colleges that were in the pilot for Course Exchange: eight full launch colleges, eight tutoring colleges, and eight online readiness colleges. Most of those colleges are planning to go into the Course Exchange. The Consortium is meeting monthly to share their knowledge about the Course Exchange and how to improve. The discussion has moved to expanding the Consortium. The project team will be putting out a call to colleges and holding webinars soliciting colleges interested in preparing to join.

There will be both programmatic and technical requirements that must be met before new colleges will be able to join and priority will be given to colleges most ready. Technical readiness includes elements that let the Course Exchange happen including space and time in IT. On the programmatic side, readiness involves courses that are ready and support of people on campus that need to be involved: IT, A&R, Financial Aid, Distance Education, faculty and staff.

LeBaron emphasized the six colleges currently in the Course Exchange need to be increased. All of the colleges in the Consortium need to come on sooner rather than later. The number one priority of the legislature which put tens of millions of dollars into this project is the number of students, courses, and colleges in the Course Exchange. OEI needs to demand more of the colleges that are sitting on the side line, or they need to be put out of the project. The project can't wait around any longer for people to tiptoe around and carefully wade in. Colleges need to dive in or the project needs to identify new colleges that will. The project is keenly aware of the need to grow the Exchange. Part of the effort has been the programmatic lift and the technical lift to build these things. Jory felt the project was now hitting an acceleration point. Of the twenty-four colleges that started, one exited and another six are in varying phases of idle based on different technical situations like a custom SIS. Moving forward he believes seventeen of the initial twenty-four will be fully viable. Kate agreed it is really important to make this scale in the next six to eight months.

There is now a sixteen to twenty week implementation plan to get colleges which are programmatically and technologically ready up in the Course Exchange. There are consolidated agreements and the project will be able to tell potential new colleges what they are signing up for. There will be a solicitation of interest, followed up with an informational meeting and then maybe fifteen to twenty colleges that are serious will come out. Colleges will be required to form an implementation team before starting this process. The project needs to work with the colleges that are most ready to do this. Joe Perret explained this is a sales and sales management problem; the project needs to be out beating the bushes soon in order to do what LeBaron wants. There are wonderful tools but there need to be many more courses and there isn't much time.

Jodie thought it was important to have regular reports on where all of the twenty-four colleges are in the process with the technology. If there are IT problems there should be an IT report on what is happening. At the same time, limiting the seats in the Course Exchange to five doesn't seem to be working to get enough students in. If more seats are needed, that needs to be done. Jodie felt strongly that for all of the resources that are being provided and used, there should be more to show for it. She wants to know what is happening with everyone else.

Jory explained the process has evolved and also acknowledged the pressure has increased. A September release date was projected, but because of issues with Financial Aid there are still some technical issues with version 2.0. The plan had been to get the full launch colleges live and then move them and the new colleges live with 2.0. However, not every college is in the same place and there are some technical issues to get the colleges live in 2.0 while bringing others up at the same time. They are working to streamline the process of how the project engages colleges from the beginning. The process is now streamlined to somewhere in the sixteen to twenty week range. They are also using the

Technology Center Enabling Services model. It may appear stuck, but every college has its own set of issues with going live. The charge will occur when version 2 is fully tested and those implementations can happen with little drama and unanticipated consequences. It is also probably true that the colleges that started this project from the beginning and have been at it for a very long time are feeling some fatigue. Bringing on new colleges brings an opportunity for new enthusiasm.

Joe Perret thought the Advisory Committee would like a clear diagram of the sales cycle and sales forecast and number of courses at the December meeting. Jory said they would work on that.

Enrollment Management Workgroup:

In the Consortium there has been concern about managing enrollment. The management team thought this would get resolved in the Exchange, but it hasn't happened yet. Jory would like to form an enrollment management workgroup with some appointees from the Consortium and some from this Advisory Committee.

The Course Exchange started with an initial gentle person's agreement not to put a lot of students at risk, and because there were concerns about too many seats being put in, the number of seats was initially set at five per course. The time has come to move beyond that, the project needs to hit certain targets to have success. The hope is that by bringing a body of people together, there will be an ability to get 90% of the way before hitting contentious issues. So far there haven't been the right people in the room. Perhaps colleges with excess capacity could be connected with colleges that need access. Jory would like a couple of people to be identified from the OEI Advisory Committee to provide representation to this new workgroup. The desire is to lead into a discussion of how to move beyond the single course model and how to work with the Guided Pathways model. The group would primarily meet remotely.

Andreea supports the concept of a workgroup in this area. She also volunteered to participate. She thought the existing agreement had significant holes with respect to Financial Aid that cannot be taken lightly. Andreea thought the Enrollment Management Workgroup could be a good place to get those and other issues ironed out. Greg thought having combined representation from the Advisory Committee and the Consortium was a good idea; both perspectives are important. He asked to be considered as a representative.

2017-2018 OEI Evaluation Plan:

Alyssa Nguyen, RP Group evaluator for OEI shared the evaluation plan for the coming year. Her Powerpoint deck will be shared later on Basecamp. The philosophy of the RP Group is to promote an inside-outside partnership rather than a traditional auditor's role. They work on identifying what is working and

what can be improved. The goal is to enable ongoing dialogue about evaluation results and to communicate OEI's values internally and externally. Alyssa provided an overview of evaluation methods including reviewing OEI documents (minutes and planning documents), surveys to collect information about end users and initiative participants, and interviews when relevant. The evaluation will look at OEI activities with short term outcomes and more intermediate outcomes, like the number of quality online courses, course success rates over time, and the number of CCCs participating. Finally she will look at long term outcomes like effectiveness, increasing the number of students completing certificates or degree and transfer programs, identifying and streamlining efficient course development, and cost savings system wide.

There will be three evaluation themes for 2017-2018: OEI processes, online teaching and learning environment (teacher and student experience of platform and support tools), and Professional Development activities provided and funded by OEI (peer online course review process and the training provided). Specific research questions around OEI processes include determining if OEI is engaging with key stakeholders, disseminating information to ensure goals are being met, and determining how effective communication efforts are to stakeholders. Questions around the online teaching and learning environment will focus on whether faculty and students feel supported, trying to understand the impact of services in the platform or Course Exchange, and determining if the suite of support tools are adequate. Additionally, the RP Group will try to determine if OEI is addressing disproportionate impacts.

Evaluation activities include surveys to collect feedback at pilot colleges. Ultimately, the intent is to determine what is useful for OEI and the CCC system. Alyssa will analyze the information gathered and give it back to the management team. She will identify steps OEI might take to improve and will share that information with the larger stakeholder community in the Advisory Committee. The purpose is to continue the cycle of continuous improvement. Formative reports are typically shared at the end of the year with a report out sometime in December.

Although Professional Development efforts include both OEI and @ONE there will be separate RP Group evaluations of their work. Alyssa will be working closely with Tim Nguyen who is the evaluator for TTIP South/@ONE to make sure those efforts do not overlap. TTIP has its own priorities for outcomes and Alyssa and Tim want to make sure there is coordination but the evaluations are kept separate. The majority of what Alyssa will look at regarding Professional Development for OEI will come from the faculty and staff perspective of the course design experience. There will be a couple of questions asking students if they perceive a difference in things done to improve their experience.

Consortium Expansion:

The project is preparing to expand the Consortium. They will be making announcements through normal channels, an article in TechEDge and through webinars. As the team gets names of interested colleges they will be looking at those colleges through lists of desirable and required characteristics in order to make the best use of project time to get colleges that are most ready on board. There will be application workbooks including elements that other colleges and SPOCs helped develop which break elements down into doable steps. Those required and desirable characteristics came from brainstorming lists generated by the Consortium and the Advisory Committee early last spring. Some of the technical requirements are: Canvas implementation, SSO, Federated ID, e-transcript, and no accreditation issues. There are many desirable elements including having a strong DE program, using OEI support services or others that are comparable, having a significant number of courses that meet the course design rubric and are C-ID transfer level courses. These are not the only desirable characteristics; but just a sample of items that will be taken into consideration. Preference would also likely be given to colleges that already have the Adaptor, are in a district with another college in the Course Exchange, and those that met a geographic gap.

They will also be looking for a strong team of perhaps eight people with two or even three key leaders, as an implementation committee. Jodie strongly recommended there be a requirement for a full time Distance Education coordinator. This is an opportunity to have a positive impact on the system and critical to a strong committee. It is important to have all those elements and when bringing people from silos together it is essential colleges have a full time DE coordinator on the team. Jodie also felt strongly the Advisory Committee should see the full list of all the information not just a bullet list of some. Other members also thought requiring a fulltime DE coordinator was an appropriate way to roll some of the cost savings from the LMS back into distance education resources. John Sills suggested having an executive level sponsor on the team because the work crosses so many departments from DE to IT. The management team assured the committee this presentation was just an overview and they would bring back the application workbook and complete package so the Advisory Committee had opportunity to provide further input.

Members asked whether the current Consortium structure with two members per college would scale. The management team acknowledged it might not, but noted the Consortium will address that when it gets to that point. Wendy explained the Consortium has discussed it, but still finds great strength in having both a faculty member or SPOC and an administrator. Her Dean is able to really advocate for the Consortium needs back on campus. Additionally, at the next Consortium meeting they will be starting to have representatives from other departments participate by webinar in the early part of the meeting. Next month is A&R and the month after that will be Financial Aid staff.

Flexible Learning Options for Workers (FLOW):

Jory provided a brief update on what he and a few OEI members learned from the first FLOW workgroup meeting they attended three weeks ago. There was a wide array of people there representing a variety of constituent groups, some in attendance in addition to Jory were: Cheryl Aschenbach, Joe Moreau, Anthony Culpepper, Michelle Pilati, and LeBaron along with others. Prior to the meeting the Governor sent out a letter about the desire to create a college with fully online degrees and there was some concern and confusion in the system about what that might mean. The work group is under the direction of Executive Vice Chancellor Van Ton-Quinlivan. The Chancellor's Office has contracted with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS).

A lot of data was presented to demonstrate there is a whole population of Californians the higher education system isn't reaching. FLOW is aimed at targeting that working population; this program is not being designed to cannibalize other programs. There is a need for certification of skills training for a population of around 600,000 students. The goal is to do something innovative around Workforce and competency based education. The Department of Finance was there from the Governor's team as well as the Legislative Analyst. Members were asked to think creatively about ways to reach this population including with non-traditional schedules and programs. The group was told the Governor is making no assumptions and asked attendees not to make any assumptions about statutes or funding and instead think about this an opportunity to innovate. This may become a different model or a combination of them.

The first meeting was August 28th and 29th and there will be a follow up meeting on October where a draft of three to five proposals will be reviewed and then forwarded to the Governor. The final proposal would probably be brought back several weeks after the October meeting. Joe Moreau suggested it would be logical for the Governor to use this timing to come up with something for some kind of seed funding in January. LeBaron agreed that was likely.

Jory emphasized that OEI seems to be highly thought of and this new program is not intended to undermine or take away in any way from what OEI is doing.

Jodie expressed frustration about being at a non-Consortium college and therefore feeling "out of the loop" on communications. She did not want to get bullet points but instead wanted to get complete and full information about Distance Education whenever possible. She expressed hope that the hiring of the new communications person would help with feeling more involved in ground level conversations.

Next Meetings:

October 13th 2017 Online from 9:30 – 11:30 am

November 9th 2017 Online from 9:30 – 11:30 am

December 8th 2017 Face-to-face in Sacramento

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 pm.