

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday December 5, 2014

Los Angeles (LAX)

Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley (online), Arnita Porter, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Brian Keliher (online), Carol Lashman, Clinton Slaughter (online), Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Dave DeGroot, Dave Stephens (online), Debbie Sheldon, Dolores Davison (guest), Fabiola Torres, Fred Sherman, Gary Bird, Gregory Beyrer, Ireri Valenzuela, Jayme Johnson, JoAnna Quejada, Joe Perret, John Freitas, John Ittelson (online), John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Joseph Moreau, Kale Braden (guest), Larry Lambert, Maria Gonzalez (online), Marie Boyd (online), Michelle Pilati, Pat James, Ray Sanchez, Sandoval Chagoya (online), Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Opening and Introductions:

John Freitas called the meeting to order at 9:40am and took attendance. He introduced two guests, Kale Braden and Dolores Davison.

Minutes:

Corrections to the minutes for the meeting on November 7th, 2014: Arnita Porter attended the meeting online, and Dan Crump provided corrections for typos on page 6 and 7. (The minutes were actually approved after lunch, when a quorum was present.)

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Greg Beyrer and seconded by Larry Lambert. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Executive Director Report:

Pat James recently went with Barbara Illowsky to a town hall meeting at Las Positas and found it to be great opportunity to answer questions and to think about the kinds of questions that are being asked about OEI. There is a lot of confusion and fear about the Exchange. Therefore, when members are asked about the project, it is important to clearly articulate that no one will be forced to be part of the Exchange; colleges will become part of the Exchange only if they choose to. The many resources that are being developed by the project: the standards, the criteria for course review, the readiness modules, and anything else developed under the Creative Commons license will be made available to everyone in the system. We are providing resources to colleges so that our online programs are good, so that students stay in courses, and succeed at reaching their goals. One question Pat was asked at the town hall was, "what if the class size is 400?" We need to make it clear to people we interact with, that is not our goal; high quality courses that meet the standards and regulations can't be taught with 400 students. It would even be challenging to meet the standards in a course of 50 students without a lot of resources even as a really good instructor. We are not at all interested in having those kinds of numbers in courses. It would be useful to look at research and pull together numbers about what is currently happening in the system with respect to swirling students; how many are taking classes at other schools, what are they taking, and where are they taking those classes? The Exchange is a mechanism we can put in play, but it is not the whole project.

Congratulations to Sandoval Chagoya who was just promoted to Director of PR and Marketing for the Technology Center. JoAnna Quejada is retiring and we want to thank her for being a great student service resource for this project and the entire community college system; she has done excellent work with this project.

Management Team/Work Group Updates:

CCMS:

Joe Perret explained that the group is on schedule, they received the CCMS RFPs and are getting ready to start 4-5 days of scoring before moving into the next step. Steve Klein noted that they asked the Academic Senate to help them fill positions in the work group for members that decided to step down as well as some from the field. Kale Braden, Richard Mahon, Rich Cameron (since resigned), and Vernon Martin are new members who will join the work group together with the pilot college representatives which constitute the CCMS Committee that is meeting every Friday. The CCMS Committee recommendation will come back to the Steering Committee in February. The notice to the final vendors is going out December 19th, which will invite three finalists to Sacramento the first week of February for vendor demonstrations and interviews. Those will be observed, evaluated, and scored by the CCMS Committee, a student group from the pilot colleges, and some SAC representatives to provide input on the technical elements. They will put forth a recommendation for selection after February 5th, and currently February 6th is on the timeline as the date for the final recommendation to come to this Steering Committee. At that time the committee will have a full conversation about it, review it, and vote on a recommendation to the management team. If the date of the OEI SC meeting in February is changed from the 6th, there might need to be some discussion about how to provide an opportunity for that discussion prior to the Butte Board of Trustees meeting later in February.

Academic Affairs Work Group:

Jory Hadsell and John Makevich had an opportunity at a recent IGETC conference to discuss the progress of the parallel projects to OEI within the CSU and UC systems. It was an opportunity for a productive discussion and a chance to get some good ideas. They plan to follow up, especially with the UC representative, and then hopefully report back to the Steering Committee on the results of those conversations. Michelle Pilati will report on the progress of the course reviews in the Professional Development update, but work continues in gearing up for the first pilots beginning in January in both the tutoring and readiness schools.

Student Services:

Bonnie Peters sent out the link this week to the readiness modules. She expressed her appreciation for all of the hard work done by Anita Crawley and Lisa Storm in getting the modules to this point. She reminded members to be conscious that this is the initial look at these modules. There are some immediate changes that she has already noted that will be made and she is taking down all of the feedback received. There will also be feedback from the RP Group into evaluation. Currently some of the modules do not have a “check on learning,” but that will come. There is enough done on the modules to be able to use them to get significant information from the pilot. Substantial changes will be made to the modules at the end of the spring pilot.

The Smarter Measures Assessment will recommend which modules students would benefit the most from; that will occur for both the pilot and later on as well. However, during this first pilot Bonnie is expecting and hoping that students will complete all of the modules in spite of their assessment results, so that the work group can get feedback. Greg Beyrer volunteered to have his spring course students in “How to be a successful online student” look at the modules and provide feedback. His college uses Desire2Learn as their LMS and he thought it would not be a problem to integrate the modules into his course. Bonnie agreed that it would be useful to have that feedback outside of the pilot group, especially since Greg would have control over how the students used the modules. She encouraged committee members to review the modules and provide feedback through Basecamp or by sending it to her directly; she will compile all the feedback and make the changes when the timing makes sense.

Professional Development Work Group:

Michelle Pilati explained that the course review process has taken longer than expected for a variety of reasons on both ends; as a result the pilot colleges for tutoring and readiness for the spring term are not expected to have all of their courses approved. Currently just 6 of the full launch colleges, 10 readiness, and 9 of the tutoring colleges are completed. The spring pilot courses are ones that

are being offered to existing students at their own colleges and would have been offered anyway. Approval may be completed on some before classes start, but support will also be offered in modifying their courses to align with the standards during the term if desired. There will also be a Creative Summit or Professional Development Summit, to bring the faculty together for professional development, to get assistance in making changes, and get some feedback on the process. They are also going through secondary review for accessibility checks as well. Most of the courses are someplace in the review process, but there were a group of colleges that came to it kind of late and those are not yet under review. The spring pilots will proceed even if the courses are not fully reviewed, because of the short time frame and the fact that they are teaching courses that would have been taught to their own students. The full launch courses will be different, they must align to the standard before they become part of the pilot and there is still time for them to be reviewed and revised as needed.

Professional Development is in a position now to look at figuring out staging of resources and long term planning. They also need appropriate representation and will need to provide some direction to @ONE regarding what can be done to help OEI.

Planning Work Group:

John Makevich has just begun work with the group with one initial meeting since the last Steering Committee meeting. Other items will be reported later in other agenda items.

Accessibility:

Jayme Johnson is still working away on accessibility issues.

Proctoring Network:

JoAnna Quejada is working with DE Coordinators to survey and find out what they are using for proctoring. The focus is on setting up a network first, and trying to get that done by the time of the full launch. Dan Crump did a literature search on proctoring and academic dishonesty and he will share those results with JoAnna.

Action Items:

Proctoring is an Academic Affairs subgroup, so Basecamp should be updated to reflect that fact. Pat James called for the formation of a Library Services Work Group sometime in the future as OEI moves into the pilot phase.

Basic Skills:

Barbara Illowsky provided her update via an excellent report in Basecamp.

Tutoring Intent to Award:

Action Item

Jory Hadsell provided an overview of the plan for online tutoring and the timeline for the tutoring RFP. He also went over the vendor selection process, key characteristics of the vendor and the next steps in the process.

Eight colleges will be participating in the tutoring pilot: Barstow, Columbia, Imperial Valley, Mt San Antonio, Ohlone, Pierce, Saddleback and Victor Valley. They represent a diverse group of colleges and they will be offering 12 courses piloting tutoring support in the spring semester starting January 12, 2015.

The tutoring group was looking for both synchronous and asynchronous tutoring in the RFP; including the ability for student essay review (not correction, but review through a tutorial process). They also knew that they would need to gather data for a single set of variables, and that they needed to be able to offer full service tutoring for the pilot and to have it as an option going forward. There was also good feedback that the ability to offer a blended model would be helpful for tutoring going forward; that is the ability to use both vendor tutors and local tutors on a vendor tutoring

platform. This would enable colleges to provide local tutors during certain hours or in certain subjects if they wanted to. For the RFP it was important to have the option of up to 24x7 tutoring; not all courses would have the same level of demand for tutoring services, but some would have a higher level of need for services and they wanted to allow the flexibility to provide up to 24x7, if needed. Finally, they decided to partner with the Foundation in order to leverage the strength and size of the system to offer good pricing to all colleges which might later decide to buy-in to services, either for non-OEI courses at pilot schools, or for courses at colleges that are not in the pilot but want to purchase tutoring services.

Along with flexibility, comes complexity, and there were concerns expressed about the process at the OEI meeting in November. Jory praised highly the hard work of the members of the tutoring work group in countless hours of amazing work as they tried to incorporate all of the feedback from the group and the field. The Tutoring RFP included all of the elements above, in addition to a desire for excellent service for our students; they wanted short wait times and fast turnaround with up to 24x7 service, in a blended model allowing for a mix of local control and vendor tutors with a mechanism to provide the flexibility to have anywhere from a 1 to a 99% blend. They sought a partnership with a vendor that would understand a vision and help to implement it. The vendor would also need to understand the complexity of working with many different colleges all with slightly different needs. They were able to find a vendor that met that vision!

The buy-in piece for colleges to purchase additional tutoring for non-OEI courses at pilot colleges or any courses at non-pilot colleges will be at the same rate that OEI gets pays for them. Additionally, OEI will be able to fund the tutoring platform itself for all 112 colleges, (not initially during the spring pilot, but soon after that) at no cost to the colleges.

In the spring 2015, the 8 pilot colleges will introduce tutoring and will be evaluated by Barbara Illowsky and Ileri Valenzuela, in conjunction with the RP Group. They are working with tutoring coordinators to put an evaluation plan in place before the pilot begins to gather baseline data, information during the pilot, and then complete a final evaluation at the end. After the spring, they anticipate adding the tutoring component to the readiness colleges at the same time as the other 8 colleges. The blended tutoring model should be available in the summer 2015 after allowing the spring semester to iron things out and for colleges to decide what subjects and what hours they might want to have tutoring. The platform would also be available for all community colleges in the summer along with buy-in for colleges that want to purchase vendor provided tutoring services. The Technology Center and technical development team are now looking at the integration of service with the CCMS as well.

Right now, OEI will be funding the online tutoring services for the students and the courses that are part of the Exchange and the pilots for the initial 18 month window (spring 2015 through the end of spring 2016). After the pilot period, if OEI chooses to continue with the same vendor, services will be funded for the duration of the grant. Within the next two weeks or so, Jory would feel more comfortable about making a more formal announcement about the coming availability of the platform and the tutoring option. This will allow colleges to align with the direction we are going, if they decide to. It might also enable colleges to negotiate a buy-back at the Foundation negotiated rate if the vendor is one that colleges are contracting with right now. The vendor has also agreed to allow for roll-over of unused hours, so that if a college purchases 100 hours of tutoring and only uses 50, the unused hours can be rolled over for use in the next semester.

Joe Moreau anticipates that OEI will continue to fund tutoring for as long as funding holds out. Brian Keliher expressed the view that although colleges will not be forced to be part of OEI, the more incentives there are, the more it will encourage students to participate. Pat and Joe both noted that was their hope, they are shooting for making OEI the best, so that everyone will want to participate. They also noted that the Board of Governors seemed very receptive to the work that OEI is doing and how important it is to students. Brian appreciated the importance of continuing funding, but was

concerned about where the additional funds would come from. John Freitas noted that is outside the purview of OEI.

Jory thanked everyone in the work group and the committee that put in so many hours of work, as well as the tutoring experts from several colleges that came on to help with the efforts to develop the RFP in conjunction with the Foundation. There were many meetings and many drafts of the RFP that went back and forth between the technical team and the foundation to have it ready by October 9th. After the document was finalized, it had to be published in two major newspapers a week apart on October 10th and 17th. Ultimately they received 12 letters of intent from vendors. The deadline to submit proposals was November 12th followed by review to determine which proposals were responsive, that is, they met the baseline criteria. There were 4 which were found to meet the baseline criteria (the others were primarily K-12 providers without the breadth of subject matter expertise needed, and so on). The committee evaluated the 4 which met the baseline criteria during the review period from November 14th-20th. That evaluation committee consisted mostly of people who were highly informed on the service requirements along with Fred Sherman and Jayme Johnson on the technical pieces. The tutoring experts drove the decision making during a full day on ZOOM involving really good debate to work through all the proposals. A notice of intent to award was posted on November 20th, followed by a 5 day protest period during which the group could not talk to the vendor or begin negotiations. (That ended on the day before Thanksgiving, which created a dead week).

The group is here today with an award, and they have between now and January 12th to have tutoring up and running for the first pilot classes. They are aware that there is not a lot of utilization during the first week or so of classes, but they really want to be up as soon as possible. The rubric required an 80% minimum passing score. There were two that passed the 80% threshold, and the one that was selected was Link-Systems International.

Link-Systems International is the provider of the World Wide Whiteboard platform and partners with NetTutor Online Tutoring. They were by far the most aware of what happens in the community colleges and very interested in a partnership. They provided competitive pricing and a strong willingness to innovate. They have worked with larger systems, like SUNY in New York and have several community college partners outside of California, as well as working with tutoring centers and populations in California. There is diversity in the way that they have created their services, and a desire to be an innovative partner.

There was strong feedback about wanting to find a way to keep our own tutors and jobs for our tutors. Link-Systems has a direct partnership with the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium (CTDLC) using eTutoring.org, which in California is the Western Tutoring Consortium. We asked how they would help us to define a pathway to help leverage the existing pool of community college tutors and they said, in essence, “we don’t like to poach tutors from our clients, but it might really be in your long term best interest to create a CCC Tutoring Consortium which would lower the cost for you and allow you to have jobs for tutors at their own colleges.” It was really exciting to see that linkage actively promoted within their response. They also have a strategic partnership with ACTLA to provide an array of tutor training and understood how we train tutors in California. Finally, they have the ability to provide the platform and do a single license for the system, where everyone will have access to the World Wide Whiteboard platform at no cost to the colleges, which is a tremendous benefit to all community colleges that could be available and realized very soon.

Jory asked that the committee recognize the work that has taken place to date in working through the procurement process. He asked the Steering Committee to make a recommendation to proceed with the vendor, Link-Systems International for the tutoring pilot. This would enable completion of contract negotiations with the vendor and to quickly engage with the tutoring coordinators at the pilot colleges.

Greg asked about the distinction between the Foundation's involvement in the tutoring RFP and not in the CCMS RFP. Steve noted that the CCMS being issued through Butte-Glenn CCD means that Butte-Glenn assumes the responsibility for the contract and all the processes for that contract. Joe Moreau explained that Foothill-DeAnza wanted the Foundation to help because they had labor and the core competency to build the RFP and provide the labor to hopefully support 112 colleges once the contract was in place, and Foothill-DeAnza could act as the primary driver and customer.

Joe Perret moved to approve the recommendation of the tutoring work group to go with the selected vendor, Link-Systems International. The motion was seconded by Larry Lambert.

Larry thanked Jory for the thorough presentation and description of the process and expressed hope that the same level of detail would be provided when the CCMS recommendation is brought forward, so that the process will be documented and on the record. Ray was pleased to see and commend the heavy involvement of the tutoring coordinators in the process, and he looked forward to more discussion about the idea of setting up a tutoring consortium. Finally, he highlighted the willingness of Link-Systems to partner and exceed the vision set forth; they were head and shoulders above the rest. Brian explained that despite his tremendous respect for the committee and the work that they did, his vote would reflect his concerns about the process.

The motion carried with 16 votes for, 1 vote against, and none abstaining.

Relationship Between the Management Team and the Steering Committee:

Fabiola Torres and Michelle Pilati worked collaboratively on an infographic defining policy versus operations/procedures. They looked at the corporate, educational, and legal world to come up with their definitions and settled on the following ideas. If the policy is "what" the institution does operationally, then, its operations and procedures are the "how."

There is some overlap between the concepts so some distinguishing characteristics are:

- Policy is a guiding principle used to set direction in an organization
- Procedure is a series of steps to be followed in a consistent and repetitive approach to accomplish an end result

An example might be that the policy is "a cake must be made to ensure a festive occasion," while the procedure might include the idea "we will follow the steps to make the cake, but it must be gluten free, so that folks with celiac disease can enjoy the cake."

It is important to remember that Foothill-DeAnza has the fiduciary responsibility for administration of the grant; they are ultimately responsible for achieving the objectives and goals that are the components of the grant. In order to guide that process, a Steering Committee was formed and a Management Team was hired. The Steering Committee determined that criteria should be developed to review courses for inclusion in OEI. The Professional Development Work Group created the criteria, then the criteria was brought to the Steering Committee. The criteria are the steps taken that make up the procedure to reflect the policy, and the Management Team implements the criteria to implement the policy. The vision from the Steering Committee is developed by the Work Group and then comes back to the Steering Committee to be implemented by the Management Team.

Fabiola emphasized that this was not intended to answer the question of the relationship between the Management Team and the Steering Committee; rather it was intended to provide an example defining "what" versus "how."

Pat thought it was a clear definition of how the criteria provide the standard which could be shared with other groups struggling with the question. Brian also appreciated the infographic and

examples; he noted that his concern in the past was the missing piece of bringing the work from the Work Group back to the Steering Committee, that piece is very important to him.

John Freitas and John Makevich suggested leaving the infographic on Basecamp for any additional feedback or revisions.

Work Group/Steering Committee Document:

John Makevich suggested using the document he provided at the previous meeting as context for a discussion activity in groups. He asked groups to look at the organizational structure diagram of how the Work Groups might fit into the dynamic with the OEI Steering Committee and going forward with the OEI Pilot Consortium, while thinking of the Steering Committee being focused on policy matters and the Consortium on operational matters. He felt it would be important to look at this and gain clarity as the Consortium is developed in early 2015. Ultimately, the Work Groups under the umbrella of the Consortium will be dealing with issues for the pilot colleges going forward including continued conversations about matriculation matters for the pilot colleges.

John Makevich asked that group members look at three primary concerns, issues, or considerations regarding the relationship between the Steering Committee and Work Groups and Management Team looking for issues that still need clarity. After lunch John will collect the results of the discussions from the groups, get some input online, and then bring it back as a discussion item in January.

What is a Home College?

Bonnie Peters explained that while it is still a work in progress, a preliminary definition seems oriented around the concept that students access courses after they put in an application. Therefore a logical first place to start is with the home college being defined as where the student completed the matriculation piece. There still may be things that will come up in the discussions within the Consortium of the full launch colleges about what will work or not work. It is not ready to be put into the FAQs until after the Consortium colleges have a chance to have those discussions, because the definition will need to be rooted in choices made by the colleges that will be participating, not in choices made by the Steering Committee. The brainstorming will probably start with looking at matriculation and residency requirements.

Greg was concerned that students be told about residency requirements. JoAnna suggested that there might be funding considerations that should be taken into account since colleges are funded by matriculation plus the course. Debra thought that since SSSP services would only be taken at the home college, how to deal with priority enrollment at the teaching college would need to be addressed. Bonnie noted that the group is aware of those issues and has some ideas about how to make it all work, but they are waiting on Consortium input. They are working on it and meeting every week. She will come back with more information after they have a chance to address those larger pieces.

Meeting Calendar and Locations:

John Makevich provided the fairly equal results from the Survey Monkey poll on meeting calendar and locations for the coming year. After today he will be working with the chairs, John Sills and Amy to put that information together with the cost for hotel accommodations associated with the different meeting locations to determine what will be best for the coming year. It was not a vote, but an informational poll to be combined with the financial information to inform the schedule for 2015. Today he asked members to participate in informational polls regarding the best Friday of the month for meetings and whether members would be open to having quarterly face-to-face meetings and monthly online meetings instead of meeting face-to-face every month.

Members noted that the early February meeting will be when the CCMS vendor presentation will be presented to the committee, so they asked whether it was possible to cancel the January meeting, or reschedule it to February. Members also noted that there had previously been a decision not to

have action items with votes during online meetings, but others noted that could be changed if the committee chose to do so, and it might be easier now that ZOOM was being used. Others suggested that if face-to-face meetings were scheduled quarterly, they might be scheduled to coincide with action items.

Fabiola suggested that when the agenda is sent out it include notations about action items so that members could make a point to attend if discussion of those items was important to them. Fred noted that the Charter says that “the committee shall determine the time and place of meetings, provided that they are at least quarterly” so there is no conflict with the Charter.

John Freitas and Dan Crump are not available to meet on February 6th in Sacramento. Several committee members had conflicts with February 13th and 16th. John Freitas noted that there probably won't be a date when everyone can meet, it is impossible to avoid all conflicts. The management team in collaboration with the Steering Committee chairs will try to piece together the scheduling puzzle.

Action Item:

Steve and Amy will check on the possibility of rescheduling the January 16th meeting in Sacramento, receiving the vendor recommendation in February in Sacramento. (Pat might have an idea for using the scheduled January 16th reservation if it cannot be rescheduled.)

OEI Resource iBook:

Fabiola presented to the committee an OEI Resource iBook that she put together containing all of the original documents. It contains a copy of the grant, the Steering Committee Charter, and the Consortium Charter. She also added some entries from Pat's blog and the FAQs from the website. This provides a set of resources all in one location which can be downloaded to your reader, phone, or computer.

Pat also encouraged members to make use of the information in a variety of PowerPoint presentations that she has been using. She will upload them into Basecamp. Joe Moreau thought that it would be nice for everyone on the Steering Committee to have a short 5 slide presentation to use when talking to stakeholders and answering questions from the field.

Marketing OEI:

Sandoval Chagoya thanked Fabiola for putting together the iBook of resources and including Pat's blog updates. He also noted the importance of the “road show” information that Pat, Joe and other members of the Management Team have been providing to others on the progress of the project.

Sandoval recently produced talking points and a one page overview for the California League Conference for all three initiatives. He felt that formalizing a 1 page summary of OEI efforts would be really valuable and will work on going through a review process for that overview to make sure he is supporting the effort and representing the project in a proper manner. He also hopes to continue collaboration on collecting fact documents. He noted that the information in the iBook is from May and he encouraged members to look toward how the message is evolving as the project moves forward; it is important to have common documents and messaging.

Sandoval is working on infographics and structural representations of the work of the project. He is also working on a graphical and structural redesign of the website. There will be an OEI Town Hall Meeting on April 8th in partnership with the Campus Technology Forum in Long Beach, which will also be simultaneously broadcast from the Chancellor's Office. There will be presentations in three focus areas: online and blended learning, teaching and learning in the digital age, and IT management and networking. Further details about that Town Hall meeting will come out in next week's TechEdge Newsletter.

Pat is interested in providing more detailed presentations at the Town Hall meeting, so members should contact her if they are interested in providing those. It might also be useful to coordinate a presentation on tutoring. Another opportunity to provide information to the system would be June 17-19 in San Diego at the Online Teaching Conference. Solidified details regarding the location of that conference will be coming out next Thursday.

Sandoval is working on targeted stakeholder lists to go beyond the Listservs. He is also developing marketing plans for all three initiatives this month; they will involve Steering Committee and Management Team review in the near future.

Fabiola wanted to make sure that the redesign of the website takes into consideration making it both constituent and student friendly. In this age of Google, students are doing more and more on their own without counselors, so it is important to be aware that OEI can market to them as well. If OEI has great courses, it still won't work if students don't enroll.

Greg encouraged using faculty members involved in the pilots in marketing efforts so that they become part of the story. Faculty is more likely to hear the message when it comes from other faculty members.

“Not to Forget Items”:

Have a discussion of the small group exercise regarding Steering Committee identity and the relationship to the Work Groups and the Management Team; focus would be on concerns and solutions.

Continued discussion of the definition of “Home Colleges”

Having periodic budget updates

Update on the CCMS status and the recommendation

Meeting calendar and locations for the next year

How the committee determines who gets on a particular work group

Consortium Charter review and how the Steering Committee relates to the Consortium

CCC DECO update

Work Groups are strongly encouraged to submit their reports each month using the template posted on Basecamp.

Pat noted that Fred Sherman is going to be cutting back on his hours with OEI and wanted to express thanks for his immeasurable service to the committee.

Next Meeting:

The meeting for January is scheduled for January 16th at the Embassy Suites, Sacramento Riverfront but may be changed; watch for updates from John Sills and Amy Carbonaro.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15pm.

