

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday April 4, 2014
Courtyard Marriot, Los Angeles Airport
Los Angeles California

OEISC Members Present: Terry Gleason, Bob Pachecho, Tom Bilbruck, John Makevich, Ray Sanchez, Arnita Porter, Joe Perret, Dave DeGroot, Marie Boyd, Dan Crump, John Freitas, Tom Burke, Dave Stevens, Meridith Randall, Kelly Fowler, Elizabeth Fernandez, Maria Gonzalez, Brian Keliher, Lorena Dorn, Stacey Cook, JoAnna Quejada, Fabiola Torres, Gregory Beyrer (by Confer), Patricia Banday (by Confer), Cherry Li-Bugg (by Confer).

Guests: Vince Rodriguez (substituting for Lori Adrian)

Chancellor's Office Staff: Bonnie Edwards, Gary Bird, Tim Calhoon, Joe Moreau, LeBaron Woodyard, Debbie Sheldon, Pat James, Fred Sherman, Jayme Johnson, Anita Crawley, Ric Matthews, Henry Burnett, Priyadarshini Chaplot, Carol Lashman, John Ittelson, Steve Klein, Sandoval Chagoya, Bruce Racheter.

Opening and Introductions:

Joe called the meeting to order at 10:02am. The launch team for the Online Education Initiative (OEI) has been working diligently to spread information and motivate interest in participation in the OEI Steering Committee. Bonnie thanked everyone for donating time and expertise about what is needed for this project. The process will be served well by having members who dream and dream big while working seriously to move the project onward. The Governor and the legislature are watching closely and want to see progress. There need to be honest conversations and we need to be always looking forward, so that improvement can be made. LeBaron impressed upon everyone that this project is a partnership and will involve the efforts of all three initiatives working collaboratively and effectively. Tim noted that the Technology Center tries to operate on the "Field of Dreams" model, if a wonderful application is built, everyone will want to use it. Therefore stakeholder input is critical, the project needs the direction from those in the field who will be using the products developed or selected by these grant initiatives. Many members expressed excitement about the potential for this project. Brian also expressed concern that OEI might be morphing into a whole new institution within the CCC system, and that it might disrupt enrollment strategies for the existing institutions. Committee members introduced themselves and explained which stakeholder groups they represent.

Overview of the Online Education Initiative:

Joe provided a brief overview of the OEI and also noted that the information is available on the public website at CCCOnlineEd.org. A year or so ago, the Governor called Jack Scott to express an interest in the possibility of using MOOCs in the community college system to help more students have access to courses. Although MOOCs are not necessarily something that will work well for the community college system, this interest did lead to a proposal to expand online education and then eventually to the OEI with the purpose of helping to restore capacity to the community college system. The OEI provides \$16.9M dollars this fiscal year, and is currently scheduled to provide another \$10M for next year as well. The project is being watched carefully and that scrutiny means that the project team really needs to be able to report progress is advancing swiftly in order to avoid any interruption in the funding. There is also an additional \$10M for an additional 3 years, for a total of \$57M over the course of 55 months beginning on December 1, 2013.

The process began with the release of a competitive application. This was not a Request for a Proposal (RFP) this was an RFA with specific components that are required by the Chancellor's Office. OEI is a comprehensive program supporting online education with emphasis on

supporting courses for the degrees for transfer program. It also incorporates existing programs: CVC, C-ID and others; in ways that do not reinvent, but augment those programs. There was also very specific direction in the grant to integrate and collaborate with the Common Assessment (CAI) and Education Planning (EPI) Initiatives.

Some of the main components of the RFA:

- 1) Establish a consortium of colleges that will ultimately help all community colleges to **collaborate and cooperate** in ways that help all of the students, but not create enrollment management problems.
- 2) Establish policies and procedures that might include reciprocity and articulation processes and procedures for the consortium to use. No rules have been created yet, the Steering Committee will provide guidance for what is needed.
- 3) Provide extensive centrally funded resources, including a common course management system (CMS), while addressing the technical, management, functional aspects of it.
- 4) Support the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) courses by developing quality standards for those courses and providing a course repository for ADT courses. There is also secondary consideration of some capacity to help with courses that are not ADT.
- 5) Support for basic skills, not necessarily through specific courses, but perhaps through diagnostic tools. (This provides a crossover point with the CAI). Perhaps provide tutorial resources.
- 6) Improve student retention and success in online courses. The research shows that both retention and success are lower and often significantly lower in online courses. This assistance may involve real time data analytics for faculty and counselors to use to help identify students who are having trouble sooner.
- 7) Work on closing the achievement gap for underserved and under-represented students.
- 8) Facilitate Credit by Exam. The Academic Senate is working on ways to do this that have appropriate rigor and integrity. This is especially important for students who are Veterans.
- 9) Professional Development to better support faculty in course design, intervention, and support strategies. There are good resources available that can also be integrated.
- 10) Online student support tools which will also involve counselors and will intersect with the EPI. This may involve support for tutoring, writing centers, proctoring services, and financial aid.
- 11) All elements will be completely accessible to all students.

The project does require robust reporting to the Governor, legislature and others, regarding the progress that is made each year. The goal is to improve the overall student experience and provide a seamless integration of multiple systems into a program that works smoothly.

Governance:

The Technology Center has been working with the Chancellor's Office to build a governance structure for the three initiatives that is cohesive and does not duplicate efforts. **The project directors for all of the grants will report out to the Telecommunication and Technology Advisory Committee (TTAC)** which is an existing committee that will be the main overarching body for all three grants. Underneath TTAC will be the Directors Educational Collaborative, (made up of the directors of EPI, CAI and OEI, in addition to existing project directors) which will make sure that work is not being duplicated between the grants, communication is effective and resources are used efficiently especially with respect to overlapping areas of need. For example, recently the Collaborative discussed sharing of data analytics between the three initiatives. Underneath TTAC and the Directors Collaborative are the EPI, CAI, and OEI Steering Committees which will have representation from constituent groups throughout the CCC system. Each steering committee will have several work groups that complete some of the work that needs to be done in different categories, and in some cases may involve piloting groups which eventually might become steering committees for elements in the projects. Workgroups for the OEI Steering Committee will include: Consortium, Common Course Management System, and others.

There are also several committees that will have work that crosses over between the three initiatives: Student Services and Portal Steering Committee, to ensure continuity and ease of use for all of the elements that the student will come in contact with through the college or system wide portal; Professional Development Committee for overlapping areas of professional development, training and information to faculty and staff in the system; and the Technical Advisory Committee, which will oversee the technical aspects of all three projects. There will be a single platform that will support all three projects and the goal is to integrate parts and make use of existing committees and structures within the system where possible. The goal is to build applications as portlets which are shareable and can be delivered on the college's portal. The purpose of the student services portal is to develop and guide students on pathways that will help them to reach their goals by reminding them of the next step in the process as they move through a degree or transfer path. Currently there are 2 million applications coming in through CCCApply, but even though a student is identified as a Veteran, or in need of childcare, that information is not currently used in any useful way. Having these various student service support elements for all three initiatives available in one place will improve the ability of students to access information easily and efficiently. Each area will get input from stakeholders on the Steering Committees, and from other input gathered by the three initiatives. The emphasis is on coordinating, sequencing and optimizing efforts without duplicating them. There is even a common project evaluation contract with the Research Group in order to lower costs to all three projects. The organization is not intended as a filter, but rather to improve the ability for everyone to remain informed about progress and to keep from duplicating efforts. **Some workgroups will do their work and be eliminated as the work is finished, while others will change into steering committees as pilots are developed. The CMS workgroup, for example, will probably become an ongoing steering committee.**

The goal of all three initiatives is to develop and enhance elements that are impossible to do on a local level. Having one student identification number enables ease of use for students across the system; while having a common assessment, and a common course management system would allow for the leveraging of the size of the system into the strength to request and require elements that are useful for all colleges, in a way that a single small college does not have the power to do alone.

The OEI Steering Committee will decide on the criteria for membership in the OE Consortium (what will be asked of colleges and what they will get in return) and help to develop a plan for a representative pilot group.

The launch team members are friends and colleagues who agreed to help with getting the project started and assist in hiring their permanent replacements. This process is beginning with the Executive Director position which is closing on April 8th. John Ittelson and a team of 11 colleagues will review the applications and conduct interviews.

There will be a Town Hall meeting in Long Beach on April 9th that will also be simulcast so that information can be shared with the community college system.

The launch team is working on a number of environmental scans, so that the work of this project will be well informed by what is already being done throughout the country.

Joe and Tim encouraged all committee members to review the websites for all three projects and share them with colleagues and constituent groups:

CCOnlineEd.org

CCCEdPlan.org

CCCAssess.org

The project teams will be posting current information on these public websites to inform all stakeholders in the system about progress that is being made.

Debbie asked about what distinction there is between public information and work that is, “in progress”, where discussion is occurring but no final decisions have been made. Sandoval and Tim encouraged members to have “in-process” discussions via Dropbox, while approved minutes and public information would be posted on the website. Brian was uncomfortable with the idea of information that he could or should not share with his constituents. Joe clarified that while the process is open, the intent is to discourage spreading of rumors about actions or items that were suggested, but have not been discussed fully or voted upon by the members. Information should not be publically shared that implies that a decision has been made, when it is an item that is simply being discussed. Others clarified that a similar process is used by the Academic Senate to make a distinction between a draft version of a work in progress and a finished product that has been voted upon by the membership. The desire is for disclosure and responsible reporting in order to gather accurate input from constituents, while not encouraging the dissemination of misinformation. The information is not secret, but discussion about work that is still in progress will not be posted on the website.

Approval of the Charter and Election of Officers:

Fred handed out a copy of the draft Charter for the committee to discuss.

The purpose of the committee is to advise and make recommendations to the OEI Program Office on the development and deployment of OEI Grant for the California Community Colleges.

The committee shall:

- Work towards achieving the goals of the OEI Program to promote improved access and quality of online education
- Solicit input from respective constituent groups to inform the committee
- Communicate program status to respective constituent groups and colleges
- Review progress and provide input on program planning
- Provide recommendations to the OEI program staff and CCCCO on best practices, user requirements, and other program activities as requested
- Provide input in an annual program review process, to be conducted by an independent review organization (the PR Group) and submitted to the OEI Program Office with a copy to the CCCCO.

The project team will develop the meeting agenda with the Chair, and Bruce will organize the logistics of the meetings. Committee members suggested changing the wording in the Charter from “program office,” and “program staff,” to “project staff,” for clarity of meaning.

The Governance Structure is such that advice comes down from TTAC to the Steering Committee and decisions go up to the Director’s Educational Collaborative and TTAC from the OEISC. Since the grant is under an RFA, it is a contract between the project and the Chancellor’s Office, with the Chancellor’s Office as the Grantor. This grant reports to Technology, Academic Affairs and Student Services which ultimately report to the Governor and the legislature.

Members asked about whether or not the Chair and Vice Chair could serve for two years, and Tim noted that if the Steering Committee is pleased with their work, they can be asked to continue after the first year. Other members were concerned that representatives for constituent groups not be appointed without consultation with those groups. Wording will be added to clarify that representatives will be selected “in consultation with” the constituent group. Elizabeth asked about having two student members and Joe responded that they would love to have two student representatives.

The workgroups will be chaired by a member of the OEISC and may have other members from the OEISC, in addition to extra people called in from the field, but ultimately the governance will

be rooted in the Steering Committee membership. Tim clarified that at the point where the workgroup becomes an independent entity it should also develop its own leadership.

Is it necessary to add wording regarding appointing a proxy? Joe felt that was not necessary, what is important is having a consistent voice from the stakeholder group (therefore a proxy should be from the constituent group that is being represented by the member who is absent). Is there any need to say anything about public access to documents? No, because all of the work done by the committee falls under public access rules.

A motion was made by Joe Perret to approve the Charter for the OEI Steering Committee with the suggested changes. The motion was seconded by Marie Boyd, and approved by the committee.

John Makevich volunteered to be Chair, and Fabiola Torres and Joe Perret volunteered to be candidates for Vice Chair. The committee unanimously voted to elect John Makevich as Chair. After some discussion about the possibility of having Co-Chairs and the possible need to change the Charter that was just approved to make that possible, the committee elected **Fabiola Torres**, Vice Chair.

Initial Work of Project Workgroups:

Pat explained that today members would have an opportunity to do initial work within one of four workgroups: Course Management System and Academic Affairs with Ric and Fred; OEI Consortium with Henry; Student Services with Anita; or Professional Development with Pat. The groups will set the tasks and goals for the workgroup, determine other people in the community college system that should be recruited to help, elect a Chair, and discuss a timeframe for tasks and goals.

Henry explained that the **Consortium workgroup** will work on the significant task of moving forward on creating good working relationships and developing the group that will work on the bylaws, the **organizational structure**, and how the pilot colleges will be chosen.

Ric will be working with members of the **Academic Affairs and Course Management System workgroup** on the roadmap for ADT and the courses to get there. Evaluating what is in the system already and what needs to be brought on board. The goal is to have a list of quality standards for online courses, without taking anything away from the local campus approval process. (The content of the courses will still belong to the local campus, but the goal is to determine the standards that are needed to effectively deliver those courses online.) This workgroup will also look at extending the range of online courses, whether for basic skills or the needs of special populations, as well as awarding non-traditional credit. Proctoring will also be an element of interest to this workgroup. Finally, Fred explained that the Common CMS will be available to colleges if they desire to use it. This group will define the functional requirements that are needed for an excellent CMS. There is a survey being sent out regarding opinions of existing CMSs. This workgroup will look at what is out there and where the gaps are.

Anita will be working with the **Student Services** workgroup to determine how to deliver and streamline effective online student services. The goal is to support student success and retention through the use of tutoring, test proctoring, and online orientation. This group will also work closely with the EPI group to improve the student's portal experience.

Finally, Pat explained that the **Professional Development workgroup** would focus on excellent design, effective teaching skills, continuous improvement and access to resources. Some areas of focus will be determining who needs training and who doesn't, since there may be certain levels of experience with online teaching that do not need training. This workgroup will also be working on an orientation for everyone in the OEI, so that everyone shares a common knowledge of all of the resources. Professional Development will also need to work with counselors, with all of the other groups, and with @ONE.

Tim highlighted the importance of remembering that as pilot colleges for the consortium come on board, faculty and staff at those colleges will need to be incorporated into the workgroups.

Reporting Out from the Workgroups:

Pat asked groups to report on the highlights of their discussions, the name of the Chair and any tasks or next steps that have been determined at this point.

Consortium Workgroup:

Arnita is the Chair. She noted that membership in the consortium would be optional. Some of the main tasks of the workgroup will be to determine bylaws, reciprocity agreements (State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement, for example), look at the criteria for pilot colleges (which might be 20-25 colleges that are representative of the diversity of the CCC system), develop a list of ADT courses, and develop an application process for the pilot colleges. They felt that Academic Senate participation would be important. There will be two sub working groups; one for the bylaws and one for the pilots.

Academic Affairs and CMS Workgroup:

Joe Perret is the Chair and _____ is the Co-Chair. The focus is on dreaming big and building an excellent system. The two groups will work together now, and at the right time in the future will split into two groups. There are a lot of elements about the CMS that aren't determined yet. It is important to make sure that the survey broadens the discussion not just with DE coordinators but also with working faculty. It is important to look at building the system so that it will be able to be scaled for the entire 112 colleges and all courses in the future if desired. **One big issue that will need to be solved is that of who will pay for the integration with the SIS.** A small goal is to get the functional requirements underway, and a preliminary task to accomplish that is to get the survey results and begin working on that. The Academic Senate is currently looking at Credit by Examination, so it may be possible to build off of that. For the ADT, a reasonable goal is to have 5 on by year two. Additionally, it may be important to look at which courses cannot be done on line (for example, Organic Chemistry). Finally, how and where do basic skills get incorporated?

Student Services Workgroup:

Chair Tom Bilbruck reported that a goal is to investigate and recommend student support tools and services. The intent is to be critical and not reinvent what has already been developed, so they will begin with environmental scans and surveys to determine which schools already have excellent ideas, and then work on ways to incorporate those good strategies. There are many aspects of student support and success, and many knowledgeable people in the community college system, so one of the first tasks of the workgroup is to go back to constituent groups and bring in others who can help. The emphasis will be on how to help students, and how students of the new generation will interact with the online experience.

Professional Development Workgroup:

Chair Dan Crump highlighted three main tasks: figure out who will need fundamental professional development; identify standards for course design (not content), that is what should be in all courses, and what should be flexible based upon the type of course; and trying to identify training criteria for teachers and counselors. Some of this work will relate back to Quality Matters, and other rubrics that already exist, as well as work that has been done by @ONE. Since this workgroup is beginning with only six members, a major emphasis will be on recruitment of other potential members and giving names to Dan and Pat within a week. This group will also need to collaborate with others because much work will relate to that done in other subgroups.

Questions:

Will Student Support services be only for online students, or is it intended to address online services for all students? This is a larger issue that won't be resolved today, but it probably makes sense to think about the services that are developed being ones that will eventually scale out. Tim mentioned that the Student Services Portal is where the focus will be on orientation for online students, and tutoring for online students. It is also where EP is looking at financial aid and BOG. Additionally, the CAI piece will be tied into it. There might end up being 20 stakeholders from OEI and EPI and perhaps 5 from CAI because it doesn't have the same level of student services. Regardless of which students the services are developed for, once they are available

online, all students will gravitate there. However, the issue is a big one that will continue to be addressed over the course of many meetings.

Bonnie was concerned about filling the workgroup committees when consortium pilot colleges have not yet been selected. Pilot colleges will want to participate in the workgroups and will want to have input. Tim suggested that OEI Student Services members start working with EPI Student Services to discuss the mission.

Partner Engagement- Visioning:

Joe highlighted ideas regarding partner engagement, in order to begin crafting a broader vision of what constitutes excellence in this next generation of applications that are being developed. He thought that it might be useful to have a couple of discovery sessions/partner visioning dialogues with groups of educational practitioners and technology providers. The idea would be to have providers listen to best practices from the practitioners, and then invite the technology providers to present short videos or other presentations of future visions. These would not be sales presentations, but visions. Jayme noted that it could be set up as a kind of online contest to determine which sites were the most interesting or informative. There would be a rather ambitious schedule to fit this into the academic cycle, with the thought to have time over the summer to visit sites and then look at the analytics in the fall to determine who has "the right stuff." Joe felt the process should start with partners and the OEISC members digitally, then in a face-to-face event; afterward there would be broader visioning group with everyone. Bonnie and Tim were concerned about getting pilots defined, having focused guidelines, and not being perceived as giving an unfair advantage to some vendors through this visioning process if some were invited to participate and others were not. Debbie was concerned that although private companies have sales teams, she was not sure that open source groups would have the same ability to develop a presentation in this format. Joe noted that he is aware that when an RFI or RFP is released, it would need to be wide open to everyone. Bonnie wanted to make sure that the basic requirements and dreams are set out by faculty and colleges without information overload from vendors. Tom noted that there is flexibility in the contract processes; timing is not an issue, whereas exclusion would be.

Scheduling and Next Meetings:

John Makevich, as the new Chair, suggested that the OEISC would need to get the process moving pretty quickly. He thought that meeting at least once a month in person, if feasible, with another online meeting halfway in between, might be needed. It might not be necessary to maintain that schedule, but it would be useful to start off the process. Additionally, the in-person meetings should probably alternate between northern and southern California. Bruce will send out a meeting poll Monday morning to find meeting dates. Some members noted that Fridays might be better for accommodating travel. It would be helpful to have a fairly comprehensive meeting schedule for the next year so that members can plan ahead. It would also be useful to have the online meetings at a regularly scheduled time. In person meetings would be for the full day and involve deeper planning, and online meetings would be for about 1 ½ hours to allow for fairly quick updates on the progress of workgroups.

Wrap up and Adjournment:

DropBox will be used for documents; there is one for the launch group and another can be set up for the workgroups so that members can see what the other workgroups are doing as well.

Joe noted that all of the workgroups will need to keep moving forward, and when the consortium pilot colleges are established, they can bring representatives into the workgroups. The leadership team members will work with their respective workgroup Chairs to get the pilots defined because all of the workgroups will need pilot input. Discussion can also happen on the OEISC Listserv.

The meeting was adjourned at 3pm.