

## Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Monday April 9, 2018

Zoom

**Voting Members:** Adriana Martinez, Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Dave Stephens, Geoffrey Dyer, Jodie Steeley, Joe Perret, Juan Camacho, Julie Clark, Kathie Welch, Lisa Beach, Stephanie Curry, Tabitha Villalba, and Thomas Greene

**Non-voting Attendees:** Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Andrea Hanstein, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Caryn Albrecht, Erin Larson, Jay Field, Joe Moreau, John Sills, Justin Schultz, Kate Jordahl, Lou Delzompo, Marilyn Harvey, Naomi Caietti, Tim Calhoon, Vivian Varela, and Wendy Bass

### Welcome and Attendance:

Jodie Steeley opened the meeting at 3:31 pm and welcomed everyone.

### Approval of Minutes:

### Action

There were a few corrections to the minutes for the March 9, 2017 meeting. *Conan McKay moved to approve the minutes and Lisa Beach seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with Stephanie Curry abstaining.*

### Management Team Updates:

Jory provided information about the VeriCite contract since its acquisition by Turnitin brought many questions. The RFP was done a couple of years ago and OEI went with VeriCite in a standalone implementation. That has rolled out to about twenty colleges which have been growing an institutional repository. Key features of the contract were a significant cost reduction and maintaining ownership and management by the CCC system of the data generated through use of the tool.

The CCLLeague has had a pricing agreement with Turnitin for some time and many colleges make use of it but other larger ones cannot, since it goes over the bid limit. Additionally, colleges didn't want to be forced to buy a bundle when they only wanted one tool. The Foundation has a contract through June 30<sup>th</sup> for VeriCite. The OEI management team has been in conversations with Turnitin to provide continuity for colleges who are looking at budgeting and contracting cycles. OEI had an option with VeriCite to provide a one year extension of the contract. Although they don't yet have a signed contract, Turnitin has assured OEI they will be maintaining the VeriCite product at least through June 30, 2019. The goal was to give colleges time for decision making. OEI intends to renew that contract for one year along with funding it for colleges that did not have access to another system. However, that is a cost OEI anticipates shifting back

to colleges after this year. Turnitin had proposed about a 5% cost increase from about \$1.05 to \$1.10. Dave urged members to subscribe to the Turnitin downtime notifications; he felt the frequency and duration of downtime was telling. Jodie agreed that was important since one of the downtimes was when grades were due last semester.

Between July and December, OEI generated upwards of 400,000 submissions to the database; it is not a billion, but it is a pretty good repository. The project is looking at bringing value to the colleges in this area, even if it can't continue funding. Barbara noted at this point the only plagiarism tool that is still accessible is the old version of VeriCite; new versions have not yet had outside accessibility review. That and the database, was why the contract extension was important.

At the last Advisory Committee, the concept for a local course review process was presented which set guidelines for developing a unique local process which could still fit into the OEI workflow and meet the requirements set forth by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate has been very supportive of the proposal. A three week course was created and campuses were encouraged to send a team of no fewer than three, to go through it together. The course opened today and 105 people signed up, which is a great level of interest. It will provide tips and guidelines and give groups assignments to create teams of stakeholders on their campuses to support the process. Guest speakers from different schools are signed up to share what they did that worked in developing a local review process. Once teams have completed this three week course, their campus will get registrations to send their actual reviewers and instructional designers, if they have them, through the existing POCR course. The team is excited about the interest in using the rubric and embracing a process to ensure online course quality. Autumn thanked the Academic Senate for their support.

Finally, Jory announced the project is pausing further development and implementation of the current cross-enrollment platform and financial aid technology mechanism. When the project began the decision to "build our own" product made sense based on a gap in the commercial marketplace. In February, the Chancellor's Office directed the project to explore potential commercial solutions that have been developed.

The project will continue to maintain use of the platform through the spring term for colleges currently in production with Course Exchange software. This will allow continuity for students. Meanwhile, the project team understands a lot of work has been done to make the online course exchange successful. This is a trajectory change for the project and is not a decision entered into lightly but the team believes the technology has now evolved to where there is a path to a stable, robust user experience, with shorter deployment timelines to achieve scale more quickly.

This is an announcement of a pretty significant change in the infrastructure of the last three years of work. Dave asked if it was something the Advisory Committee had no real input into, other than feedback. Jory explained a lot will be brought to the Committee but it is complicated right now because the project is winding down the pilot phase and moving into a renewal process so some information needs to be held close. He emphasized the Chancellor's Office has been clear about they're level of patience with the pace of implementations. Jory cannot say more because they are literally in the middle of implementing the decision. He brought the announcement to the Advisory Committee today to be as transparent as possible and to respect the role of the group.

Jodie thought the announcement meant this should be at the forefront of the next Consortium meeting. She suggested while there was not an advising role for the OEI Advisory Committee today, the group should advise on making the transition to a new system. The need to schedule courses further out than colleges are used to is extremely relevant, for example in the Guided Pathways discussion.

Joe Perret expressed a concern about the possibility of ending up in a worse position if the project ended up with a low bidder. Jory appreciated the concern but noted that same concern may have existed with the selection of the common CMS at the beginning. The project has been able to stay true to its values and to stay focused on what is best for students. Jory felt the project had to act and would still need input going forward regarding various policy positions.

The Course Exchange technology is just one portion of the ecosystem and Jodie felt that pioneering work should not be dismissed. It can be easy to look at all of the work involved in just registering your own students and wonder why you are doing it, but the numbers have all gone up and Canvas is wonderful. This is a good time to reevaluate and probably on the tools as well. For example, NetTutor is not currently scalable unless the price comes down quite a bit. She respects that this was a hard decision and knows the challenges in the small number of students involved.

Joe Moreau emphasized all the project has learned which will help as it moves forward. The project also learned a lot about the process, policy, or regulatory based factors that are making it conceptually more complicated than it really needs to be. That is where Advisory Committee is going to need to weigh in to remove friction for students. This group may need to make recommendations to the Chancellor's Office. It may also be necessary to go back to Consortium schools with recommendations for revisions to the MOU in order for it to be a more viable process. The ways colleges have implemented SSSP regulations and are storing data about how students meet or don't meet matriculation requirements has become a nightmare. A couple of weeks ago the project pulled the matriculation check out of the process because they weren't going to be able to move forward. Colleges need to be able to track matriculation factors but the

role that plays in the overall Course Exchange relationship is something the project may need to reconsider.

Kate noted application is a big piece and even with regulatory relief, the process for pushing registrations back and forth is going to take a lot more development. They may also need to look at which students to allow in the Course Exchange, and which may need to be blocked. For example they may not be able to handle International students in the Exchange. Additionally, with the scaling being asked for, they know they need to ask colleges to commit to a higher number of course sections in the MOUs. Dave asked if it would be a good time to look at using a common ERP platform. Joe Moreau noted there was interest in the field for the concept of a common ERP and some preliminary work that might eventually have momentum in that direction. However, Lou noted that is not a short term proposition. Joe agreed it was not really an option to wait on a common ERP. It would be at least five to seven years to get to some kind of common ERP.

Jodie recommended bringing this to the Consortium to see their recommendations for the transition.

### **Subcommittee, Workgroup or Project Reports:**

Joe Perret reported the CCMS group hasn't met since the last meeting; they will be meeting at the end of this week.

The Accessibility Workgroup was not able to present at the CCMS because of Canvas Con. They want to look at how Canvas might assist with accessibility solutions and key factors relevant to what OEI needs those tools to do.

Cheryl reported on the resolution from the Senate. The Senate Executive Committee supported the idea of online lab science and online public speaking. There are now resolutions from the Senate going forward at Plenary this week. There may be some opposition, but Cheryl thought they would pass. She would like the Senate to be able to say the entire body supports that movement forward and thought it was hard to argue with it given CSU clarification in the last week.

Geoffrey explained the document looking at CSU breadth showed all of the courses currently offered in the Exchange and gaps for Oral Communication and Lab Science. It was really helpful. That started conversations in different places which led to writing resolutions 9.03 and 9.04 that will be voted on next Saturday. He thought they might need something to convince people, but in the existing CVC he found colleges already doing it. As of this morning, on CVC searching Speech and Public Speaking, there are twenty-seven different California Community Colleges are offering those courses online.

To clarify, 9.03 is looking for effective and promising practices to teaching Oral Communication courses online, while 9.04 for online lab science courses directs identifying appropriate courses and then those effective and promising practices.

Additionally, resolution 11.01 from the committee Conan chairs for online education, is also updating the paper on online education more generally.

Autumn explained @ONE is going to be doing something different with their webinars. Rather than doing a webinar each week, “First Fridays” each month will include two webinars back to back, both on the same theme. The first one scheduled for May 4th, will have the theme, “Can you do that online?”

## **Policy Recommendation- 20 Seat Requirement for Course Exchange Courses:**

Geoffrey agreed with the need for more students to be able to enroll in the Course Exchange however he would like the Advisory Committee to discuss some concerns. The new RFA requiring twenty-seats in Course Exchange courses came out on March 8th, the day before the extended deadline for colleges to apply to join the OEI Consortium. The colleges applying may have been operating under their understanding of the status quo arrangement of five seats. Although endorsement of a twenty-seat requirement was suggested by Jodie Steeley at the March 9<sup>th</sup> OEI Advisory Committee meeting, no action was taken. Geoffrey noted class sizes and numbers of sections offered vary by district, but small districts that are at cap and/or lack staffing in certain disciplines may be imposing a barrier to their local students’ degree completion by joining the Consortium if the twenty seat requirement is implemented, especially if limited numbers of certain courses are offered, and if teaching colleges’ students are in competition with students from all 114 colleges for the seats. Districts that are at cap and don’t have large economies of scale simply may not be able to offer additional sections, and if their class size is small, twenty seats could be as much as two-thirds of the only section of an online course at a small or rural college.

Jory explained the RFA was written by the Chancellor’s Office team and emphasized OEI had no advance notice about what was going to be in it. They didn’t see it until it was released. One of the roles the Advisory Committee can make is to provide its guidance back to the Chancellor’s Office and the project team. Hopefully anyone applying to continue with the grant in the next year will prepare a proposal that is reflective of what this body has created.

Geoffrey suggested looking at setting aside a percentage of the seats instead of the number twenty. Twenty seats might not represent a challenge to other community colleges with far more online seats than his college. But taking twenty seats out of thirty in the one online course his college offers makes it hard to serve their local population. If the percentage was set even as high as 50%, it would only take fifteen seats, instead of twenty. Raising the number to 50% could create more seats while also allowing room for colleges with smaller class sizes to allow their native students to easily enroll in courses without competing against 114 colleges’ students. Geoffrey also thought it would be helpful to have more information published in advance about which courses would be available in the

Exchange. It would be helpful to counselors and advisors at colleges trying to build education plans through the Guided Pathways framework. He asked the OEI Advisory Committee to recommend to the Chancellor's Office and project staff that appropriate mechanisms be identified to ensure participation in the Consortium does not impede degree or certificate completion for students at teaching colleges. A member suggested a recommendation consistent with the RFA request for twenty, but at the same time setting a maximum of 50% of the seats available.

Erin explained twenty seats was just one of the objectives to be addressed. How to meet that objective could be discussed at a later date; but it was the goal set forth. The intent is to make twenty seats available to students participating in the Exchange from other colleges. There isn't currently a requirement precluding students from the teaching college from enrolling in a course offered, in the event it is not yet filled. Lisa asked if there was a timeline for how long seats have to remain open to other students before home students could enroll. Erin explained there is no set policy in the RFA and she didn't know what the policy was in the past. It might make sense for a Workgroup of the Consortium to look at that.

Jodie explained up to now those decisions were local ones based on what made sense there. For example, as one of the first colleges, they had to figure out in Colleague how to even reserve those seats for the Exchange. They set up alternative locations for "Fresno Online, Fresno Hybrid, and Fresno XCH." Priority registration was the student demographic they were supposed to be shooting for in the Exchange, but until the recent time, those seats didn't get opened up for priority registration students. That caused some problems, including for the professors when they ended up with first semester students, for example, instead of more mature ones. Her campus child sections closed after the first day and the professor had to physically add students into those sections. It wasn't automatic or seamless for the student. Only under Exchange 2.0 were they able to even see clearly that a student was from another college. Jodie felt the hard number was included in the RFA because the project hasn't been able to deliver many students up to this point. The Chancellor's Office is saying OEI needs catch up. This is to help make up for colleges that haven't lived up to their agreement to offer courses in the Exchange. Currently there isn't any sort of accountability or turning in of numbers regarding how many Exchange students are actually a college's own students.

Jodie liked the recommendation of twenty seats or 50% whichever is smaller. She also thought consideration should be given to of best practices regarding caps for online courses. It would also be a good idea to look at scalable percentages. The project started out with five since they were intending to test the environment.

The committee felt these were important questions, but did not want to make a recommendation today. They agreed to have further discussion at the face to face meeting next month when LeBaron and Erin will probably both be present.

## **Evaluation Update:**

Alyssa provided a brief update on evaluation activities to date, including: an update on 2016/17 evaluation activities, fall 2017 activities, and plans for spring 2018.

Evaluation activities for 2016/17 included student and faculty satisfaction surveys, information from the statewide DE Coordinators about awareness of OEI tools and activities, and course success outcome comparisons. Information on use of Canvas has now been gathered from students at the end of four terms. Over those four terms a larger percentage of students, now up to 70.5%, report Canvas is a better platform than other online learning platforms. Usage and participation with OEI support services is still relatively low. This is a marketing opportunity. It is not surprising to see lower participation in the tools that were more recently rolled out. About 113 DE Coordinators responded to the OEI Awareness and Usage survey. A large majority of DE coordinators felt Canvas was useful, and the Course Design Rubric was another tool respondents felt was highly useful; only a small percentage, about one-third, were participating in the Exchange. With respect to the project and services, 43.5% of 300 plus faculty was aware of and had some level of engagement with OEI products and services, while 12.8% had never heard of OEI.

Outcomes on course success for fall 2016 and spring 2017 looked at OEI pilot specific sections, OEI pilot colleges overall, and online courses statewide overall. The online courses were matched based on the same TOP code. OEI pilot sections had a success rate of 67.4% which was 3% higher than the overall OEI pilot colleges, and 5% higher than statewide courses matched on the same TOP code. This provides some support for the idea that support OEI is providing is helping. Alyssa has comparisons by gender, ethnicity, and perhaps age, for those results, but doesn't believe she has anything on make-up by special populations. The full report will be available by the end of the month and there will be another evaluation update at the May meeting.

Fall 2017 Alyssa administered a revised end of term survey to 141 students. Highlights of those results include: 90% were enrolled in an online course because it fit in their schedule, 98% were satisfied with opportunities to communicate with faculty in those courses, and 96% agreed the course effectively used technology tools to support their learning online. Students were also surveyed on awareness and usage of support tools and were able to provide responses on any answers that applied. Over half of the students had used Quest for Success, but not surprisingly for the other tools that are based on whether the faculty is using them, like Proctorio, a large majority of students had not used them. NetTutor had not been used by 73% of responding students, and

the largest majority of those hadn't used it because they didn't feel they needed it. There are still some marketing and communication opportunities in this area since 36% didn't know about NetTutor. It may be that students are not aware of the name of the tool, or faculty may not be communicating about it.

Sixty-eight faculty members participated in end of term surveys in fall 2017. Results included: 100% felt students were engaged in their online learning, 65% made NetTutor available, and only 19% made Proctorio available to their students. Jodie noted some questions were embedded in the Chancellor's Office survey and will go into an annual collection process. Alyssa explained she will have a separate report for OEI results to share and upload after the Management Team approves it. She will also have the end of term surveys available for upload after they are reviewed and finalized.

Evaluation activities planned for spring 2018 include interviewing Exchange deployment team leads at the colleges, collecting fall 2017 student level records to examine course outcomes, and completing the 2016/17 dissemination brief.

Jodie asked what could be done to get greater college participation in the use of products and services. Based on the survey, Alyssa felt some faculty may not be aware of some products and services. Additionally, some are not being paid for to all colleges, some are just being offered at a lower cost. Jory agreed, also noted that for example, ConExEd (Cranium Café) is largely a counseling tool, so teaching faculty may not be as aware of it. Additionally, at the beginning of the project with the three pilot sections students were found and surveyed based upon participation. That may have an impact on those results. When the project started there were separate surveys; those are now integrated.

Barbara explained it isn't necessarily negative for a student not to be familiar with Proctorio, if for example, their teacher doesn't offer proctored exams. She also noted use of tutoring is actually higher online than for face to face classes. Kate added that a main point is that OEI can say the 4.9% is an exciting start, even if there is much more that can be done to reach out.

Alyssa's PowerPoint slides will be available in Basecamp.

## **Chancellor's Office Update:**

Erin Larson announced the Chancellor's Office realized the CVC/OEI RFA response deadline was a holiday. So the deadline has been moved to Tuesday, May 29<sup>th</sup>. They are still accepting questions that will be addressed at the webinar at the end of this month, but the deadline for those questions is April 10<sup>th</sup>, which is tomorrow.

Erin acknowledged the twenty seat number for courses in the Course Exchange is daunting, but was written into the RFA because the Chancellor's Office really



wants to see more students get the courses they need. They don't have fine details on how to get to twenty seats across the board.

The Distance Education revision to the Title 5 section has been out for stakeholders to review and provide feedback. The deadline for responses was Friday, so the Chancellor's Office will now summarize the forty-four or so comments and bring those back to DEETAC. A big response people wanted to see was doing more with the funding formula. That is not currently on their list, but maybe it will be considered in the next round since it would require quite a bit of research and is fiscal.

Wendy noted a question arising from her faculty relates to how Distance Education instructors are being held to a different standard than the face to face instructors in new added wording. It seems to be asking instructors online to do more than face to face instructors. Erin noted that will be taken into consideration in putting together the webinar response at the end of the month.

### **Closing and Next Meetings:**

The form to request future agenda items is in Basecamp.  
Friday May 18<sup>th</sup> Sacramento 9:30 am - 3:30pm  
Friday June 8<sup>th</sup> Zoom Online 9:30-11:30 am

### **Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 pm.