

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday November 7, 2014

Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza

Sacramento

Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley (online), Arnita Porter (online), Barbara Illowsky, Barry Gribbons, Bonnie Peters, Brian Keliher, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Cheri Taylor, Clinton Slaughter, Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Dave DeGroot, Dave Stephens (online), Debbie Sheldon, Fabiola Torres, Fred Sherman, Gary Bird, Gregory Beyrer, Hasun Khan (online), Ileri Valenzuela, Jayme Johnson, Jerred Scheive, JoAnna Quejada, Joe Perret (online), John Freitas, John Ittelson (online), John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Joseph Moreau, Larry Lambert (online), LeBaron Woodyard, Lou DelZompo (online), Maria Gonzalez, Marie Boyd (online), Meridith Randall, Michelle Pilati, Pam Walker, Ray Sanchez, Sandoval Chagoya, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Opening and Introductions:

Fabiola Torres called the meeting to order at 9:51am.

John Freitas took roll of the voting members and noted that there is a quorum.

Minutes:

Action

There were no changes or updates to the minutes. Terry Gleason moved to approve the minutes, Jerred Scheive seconded the motion. Approval of the minutes passed unanimously.

Announcements:

The management team has been focused on collecting partner opportunities and recently Pat was contacted about the Digital Learning Research Network, a Gates funded project, for a nationwide network of online educators including: University of Texas in Arlington, Carnegie Mellon, University of Michigan, Stanford, SRI, Columbia, University of Arkansas, Georgia State, and the Smithsonian. The team will provide more information when it is available, but this could provide an opportunity to be a voice for the community colleges.

Evaluation Report:

Information

Ileri Valenzuela, the RP Group evaluator for OEI provided a presentation of the year one evaluation and highlights of the plan for year two. The role of the evaluator for the project is not that of an accrediting body, but instead a partner in the process helping to ensure the success of OEI by providing meaningful information to refine and strengthen the project so that it is still flourishing five years in the future. The agenda packet included the more detailed report prepared by Carol Lashman and the management team, that goes more deeply into individual objectives and sub-objectives.

Formative evaluation will provide information to inform decisions on components and processes moving forward, while summative evaluation elements will include compliance items and dissemination of findings to interested stakeholders and the broader CCC community.

The first year evaluation is an anomaly in that it covers only seven months, from December 2013 to June 2014, and was done by looking back at activities that took place, through a review of the project documents, the meeting minutes, and informal interviews with some launch team members. There is limited outcomes data in the first year; as a foundation year for the project the emphasis was on developing the organizational structure, the communication outreach plan, and kicking off the project plan.

Noteworthy accomplishments of this first year included getting the governance structure in place, including the steering committee, workgroups, and hiring the permanent management team.

During this process there have been some very important organizational principles at the foundation: a strong emphasis on a collaborative approach in getting input from a variety of stakeholders, a results oriented focus, an adaptive project framework, and use of an agile project management process. Time was spent to really build relationships and gather broad representation and input from CCC stakeholders throughout the system, but especially with the assistance of the Academic Senate and faculty, because they will be teaching the online classes. At this point, planning for implementation of the pilot components is underway, which includes: pilot consortium, online readiness modules, online tutoring, and CCMS procurement.

Recommendations: It would be useful to have a road map laying out how the project will be moving forward, with clear objectives to be met so that evaluation can be embedded into project implementation activities. Although it can be challenging in this busy process, the committee and management team should take time for reflection on the process and how it is working. It would be very useful to develop a good system of organization for project documents. Currently there are many documents in Basecamp, but it is very hard to find particular items within that environment. It would also be useful to consolidate relevant documents related to existing Federal, state, and local regulations and standards (from Ed Code and so on) in one location, for easier reference to ensure compliance. There should also be procedures put in place for review of policy and processes. Dan Crump suggested that the committee should also include a compilation of policies that are developed by this project.

In the area of communication, the OEI website needs to be revamped and updated. Processes and criteria for public information should be established and followed, and that information should be available to the general public on the website. Work should be done to establish consistency of language and terminology for the project. Currently there are various terms that are used for the same item and it is hard to understand. Finally, work should be done to assess understanding of the process and the project by the stakeholders.

The first seven months has provided a strong foundation for OEI success and the decision to scale back and slow down piloting on individual elements was a wise one.

Ileri will work with the management team, steering committee, and work groups to define outcome measures for pilot activities and then to implement evaluation activities using a mix of quantitative and qualitative data. She will also be working with RP Group evaluators on CAI and EPI regarding the Student Portal, which crosses all three initiatives. This work will provide information for data driven decision making program improvement efforts.

Dave Stephens noted that page 7 of the evaluation report indicates a different steering committee makeup from what is on the OEI website (the report does not include representatives from Educational Technology). Dave Stephens and Fabiola Torres have been representing Educational Technology since the committee was established. Sandoval Chagoya will work with the RP Group to correct that oversight.

Executive Director Report:

John Makevich (for Pat James)

Several members of the management team recently had a meeting with Ellucian to discuss a strategy for pulling together the matriculation pieces for the pilot colleges. Twenty- three of the twenty-four pilot colleges use Ellucian products for their SIS. This session was intended to be the beginning of a much larger process for integration of the matriculation pieces in the Exchange.

Joe Moreau explained that the goal was to begin defining the Exchange and how to provide more streamlined processes for students. It would be nice to automate as much as possible and to have it not cost a fortune. They wanted to talk to members of Ellucian's product development team about ways to accomplish OEI's goals, since, as one of the largest SISs in the state they

Information/Discussion

could help the project achieve those goals. The team wanted to generate ideas about facilitating streamlined matriculation seamlessly to students, while still allowing local institutions the ability to monitor and control elements in a way that makes sense for their campuses. This conversation was just the beginning of a larger process. Eventually we want a student to be able to register for courses without having to repeat the orientation process and developing an educational plan at each institution that participates in the Exchange.

With 112 colleges and 72 districts in the community college system, this will be very complex, especially because even colleges with the same ERP have them customized differently. If there are things that can be done to help build the capability into the core product, it will make it much easier. Joe Moreau also noted that there are currently 14 PeopleSoft campuses (and it may be up to 26 in the near future). This discussion with Ellucian is only a starting point, and does not at all mean that colleges with other ERP systems will be left out. On the contrary, part of the vision includes some integration through enhancement to CCCApply or the student Data Warehouse to make those processes equally accessible to all colleges regardless of local SIS. Beyond that, it would be wonderful to have the catalog functionality, administration, and some other areas streamlined in an automated way. The processes will definitely address other ERPs. Barry cautioned that the customization variability in colleges and districts in the matriculation registration process will make this an enormously daunting task. Fabiola highlighted this as one of the most important parts of the grant, more important than courses and everything else; students will not use OEI if it is necessary to repeat matriculation steps for each institution. Bonnie Peters agreed and highlighted that the discussion with Ellucian is only a starting point, because this complicated and daunting process must start somewhere, but the intent is to learn from the pilot colleges how to do the nuts and bolts, so that it can be expanded to the rest of the colleges in the system. Colleges that are not on Ellucian are not being ignored, the process will be to learn from working with the pilot colleges and then to modify and build out the rest.

Brian asked for a summary of the ideas that were generated from the meeting to be posted on Basecamp, along with also exploring Barry's concerns in a little more depth. John Makevich and Bonnie Peters agreed to post a summary.

CIO Conference

Several members of the project team attended the CIO Conference, presented information, and took the opportunity to address some misconceptions about the project. There was a panel that presented information across the three initiatives. There were good interactions and many campuses requested more presence from the management teams to address concerns and answer questions from faculty and administrators.

There have been concerns expressed by individual faculty members at some pilot colleges, and pilot colleges themselves, about the outcome of the course review process affecting evaluation of faculty members. That is not intended to happen, the course review process is a formative process, which is intended to bolster the faculty members that will be teaching these courses.

Management Report:

Director of Strategic Planning and Operations

John Makevich will be working with the eight full launch colleges to begin talking about reciprocity components and how they might impact the first pilot; he will be working closely with Bonnie Peters and the Admissions and Records departments to merge those conversations. John will also be trying to aggregate timelines and plans for the projects and he hopes to have a clearer sense of how the timeline with the Exchange will map out by the December meeting. At this point the plan for the Exchange component is to aim for January 2016 with a phased roll-out. This summer and/or fall the full launch colleges will pilot courses with tutoring and readiness in their existing CMS. Then as the CCMS becomes available, courses will be piloted in the CCMS but not the Exchange; then finally, the last step will include piloting the Exchange. This phased in roll-out will allow the project to see how each element is working and will also allow for easier

evaluation from a research perspective.

Earlier this week, John Makevich and John Ittelson were in Chicago to give presentations on OEI at the national level.

Chief Academic Officer

Tutoring and readiness pilots will have classes starting in January and the team is getting closer to having the offerings for those colleges. The prioritization process has been completed, and Jory will report on it this afternoon.

There have been several professional development clearinghouse summits this week and Jory noted the wonderful experience of seeing what is happening at those meetings with classified staff and faculty coming together throughout the state. LeBaron agreed, noting the high interest in professional development that is being re-envisioned and revitalized by the summits. There have been upwards of 600 people coming together in these six summits.

There are very preliminary conversations beginning with the Academic Senate and CIOs about Credit by Exam and Credit for Prior Learning; the intent is to build off of the work that has already been done by the Senate.

Chief Student Services Officer

Bonnie Peters explained that the developer is continuing the work on the modules which will be delivered by December 1st, at that point they will be available for the work group and the steering committee to review and provide feedback for about a week or so. The modules will need to be out to the pilot schools by the second week in December. The colleges are excited about the use of the readiness modules with the pilot courses and are hoping to expand their use in the future.

Bonnie is also looking at the next steps for student services for OEI; doing some networking and information gathering about online counseling. She will report back when she has more information. Currently she is connecting with contacts she has had over the years, but will also be looking to making connections throughout the state, in the Chancellor's Office, and through the Academic Senate when appropriate.

Director of Accessibility and Universal Design

Jayme Johnson reported that the accessibility requirements are in place in the RFPs that have gone out and everything seems to be going smoothly in that regard. It will be important to find a developer that can live up to what we are asking for, but at this point everything is moving forward smoothly. He has found it very helpful to be able to provide this input early on in the process in working with the technical side of the house at Butte and in cross-pollination with EPI and CAI.

Jayme continues working on training materials and raising awareness; recently at the CAPED Conference he got some insight into what is happening at the federal level with accessibility. It looks like there will be less deference given to educational institutions and assuming that they know what they are doing, but more focus on looking intelligently at what will support success for students. There will be some work ahead, but in general progress is looking positive for awareness of accessibility issues.

Director of Outreach and Communications

Sandoval Chagoya highlighted that he is focused on the messages in the RP Group Evaluation Report regarding communication. He is looking at early prototypes, logos and so on for the revamping of the OEI website, especially how to best represent the project to students in the pilot phase. He will be bringing those ideas back to the steering committee. Sandoval noted calls for infographics on the website and he will be working on doing a better job of telling the story of OEI; presenting our vision and where we are in the progress on the work, while not losing sight of the

student who will be served by the OEI. Fabiola noted that students already want to know where they can sign up for classes, and board members are looking at the webpage as well, so the target audience for that site needs to be friendly for both audiences. Sandoval noted that need, and mentioned that currently the website is targeted more to the board member audience and the focus will change with a revamp and branding process to get scientific about how to get the word out to students.

Currently the TechEdge Newsletter is going out monthly with news about the initiatives, and two weeks later an initiative specific newsletter is sent out, also on a monthly basis. The goal is to continue getting information out on how the projects are moving forward and adapting. Committee members should notice more and more communications from Sandoval and he requests that information be shared with stakeholders. He will also be sending out short surveys to gather the experience and expertise of steering committee members, and the results of those will be reported via Basecamp.

Sandoval will make sure to reconcile the information in the RP Evaluation Report and the website that Dave Stephens pointed out. He also encouraged committee members to contact him at the ccconlineed.org website regarding any other concerns or issues with the website or other communications.

Statewide Program Director

Steve Klein provided a status update on the CCMS timeline. The RFP went out a week ago, on October 27th, the document is posted on the project website. Vendors are responding online using RFP365, which is also where scoring and evaluation will occur. With the release of the RFP the committee is now in the quiet phase with respect to vendors; if members are contacted by any vendors on the topic of the RFP, they should refrain from conversation specifics. Information can be obtained from the publically accessible website, ccconlineed.org. The quiet period will continue until the contract is signed or a vendor is announced. The purpose of the quiet period is to ensure that all vendors have equal access to information, by having all communication related to the process through a single source for consistency and accuracy; the goal is to be efficient, diligent, and fair. Vendors can also be referred to Steve, he will be happy to respond.

There was an RFP pre-proposal conference for the vendors to ask questions on November 3rd. The questions and answers were compiled and posted on the public website. Some additional questions were submitted yesterday and responses to those will be posted in one week. RFPs for the Education Planning Tool and Common Assessment are planned for release in early December, so all three initiatives seem to be making similar consistent progress.

Amy Carbonaro led the effort of a group of student assistants to update the CVC online this summer. That work has been completed and involved updating more than 19,000 courses, from 160 institutions, around the state. Work on a site redesign with enhanced functionality especially with regard to search capability is slated for a first release in March.

Recommendations, Operational Matters and Flow of Information from Workgroups:

John Makevich presented a draft document outlining a more formal flow of information to and from the work groups. The intent is for this to be a starting point for discussion and revision, with the goal of defining the relationship between the work groups and the steering committee, since it is not formally set out in the steering committee charter. The document included an organizational chart with the CCCCCO at the top, the OEI management team underneath and then branches to the OEI Steering Committee and the Pilot OE Consortium. The Steering Committee is primarily responsible for policy related issues and the Consortium for operation issues. Underneath these two bodies would be the work groups which would report back to them depending upon whether they were dealing with policy or operational issues.

Brian commended the work of the steering committee in the last 8 months, especially with the efforts made back and forth between work groups and the steering committee on the draft Consortium Charter and the Course Ratings Rubric. However, he felt uncomfortable with some of the processes more recently with respect to the release of the Tutoring RFP, and the CCMS RFP. He noted that there was great work done by the work groups, but was concerned when that work was not brought back for a full vote by the steering committee before those RFPs were released. Brian said that for the tutoring RFP the steering committee was denied access to the work, and for the CCMS there were only 72 hours for comment, he was concerned that the Steering Committee was being marginalized.

John Makevich explained that one of the intents of this draft document was to establish the desire for the work groups to report back to the steering committee. Dave Stephens commended John and the rest of the management team for paying attention to the issue and trying to clarify the process. He also mentioned that TTAC and the Director's Collaborative were not included in the diagram. All three initiatives do report to TTAC. Joe Perret noted that so far the leadership of the work groups has come out of the Steering Committee, and he would hope that is still intended going forward.

John Freitas asked members to look over the draft document, and to discuss it with constituencies and come back with their thoughts and suggestions at the December face-to-face meeting.

There was some discussion about whether the group was really a Steering Committee or actually an Advisory Committee, and whether the committee advises or recommends. There was also discussion about whether work group members needed to be appointed by representative bodies, or whether they could be volunteers who were approved by the representative bodies.

John Makevich noted that the charter was pretty clear about the committee being a body that would be providing recommendations; additionally, there does need to be a good balance between being too formal and being adequately formal when working on a tight timeframe.

John Freitas explained that for faculty appointments, the default is the Board of Governor's standing order that those will be made by the Academic Senate. He also noted that in shared governance a committee that "reports" will also bring forward "recommendations." Report is a more broad term, which can just be information, but can also be a larger recommendation.

LeBaron clarified that the debate on whether the committee would be an "Advisory Committee" versus a "Steering Committee" was held early on in the process, and the Chancellor's Office is comfortable with what was chosen. All projects are ultimately run by the district that got the grant, and that is who is held accountable.

Fabiola recommended that everyone reread the grants and remember the reasons we are here. Don't let philosophy or ways of interpreting things get too much in the way. There are still guiding principles behind this grant, and that is most important, we need to stay focused on what we are building! This is a very important project, and working collaboratively is critical.

Brian asked if the committee could agree that work groups should report fully to the Steering Committee, so that the full Steering Committee could take a position and have a vote. John Makevich explained that rather than taking a vote on a position on the document today, he would like to give the committee a chance to digest and shape the document first. Clinton expressed concern that the draft document might be making the work groups a lasting part of the structure in a way that would not make sense over time. The work groups are sort of launch groups for the pilots, and at some point the work will be transitioned to those pilot colleges; therefore it might not be necessary to codify them in this way.

Barry suggested that the management team look at the structure of the reports from the work groups so that they provide the information that the Steering Committee needs.

As Ireri noted in the RP Group Evaluation Report, there needs to be a location where Ed Code, Title 5, and the grant requirements are kept for reference; and a common glossary or vocabulary of terms needs to be developed so that all are working from the same definitions. To that end, Fabiola and Michelle will work on a draft definition of what is “policy” versus “operation” so that it is clear what falls under the responsibility of the Steering Committee and what is under the Pilot Consortium.

Workgroup Report-out:

John Freitas asked if members wanted to continue to have time on the agenda for work groups to meet during the face-to-face meetings. Several members said they would prefer not to, because there was not enough time to really be useful, or because many of their group members were not available at the meeting. Some members suggested keeping the time or just meeting informally during the lunch break for those groups that desired to do so. Others suggested that work groups might choose to meet the night before the meeting, if they are in town early. For the time being, there will not be time set aside on the agenda for work groups to meet.

Professional Development

The professional development group has not met since the last meeting, but will be meeting soon to do some long term planning. Course review is going on and is going well, but is a bit more complicated and taking longer than expected. Reviewers are supposed to take a week and they are sticking to that, but the coordination of opening all necessary items prior to review and the third person pulling everything together after the two reviewers are finished is taking a bit more time. The first time through everything is new, and learning what those items are is being discovered and worked through. Michelle hopes and expects that the review process will go more smoothly next time. There were 33 courses that were started in the first batch, and there are now 14 that are being readied to begin. At the next meeting they will be able to update the committee on the status of all of those courses.

Fabiola noted the concern that has come up from some faculty members about the possibility of the course review being punitive; this is not at all intended to be the case. On the contrary, this is a great opportunity for both the reviewers and the faculty members to learn about the criteria for courses for OEI. The review is of the course and this should be an empowering opportunity for faculty members to learn about the standards and become advocates for excellent OEI courses.

Basic Skills

Barbara Illowsky noted that the group is waiting on the course review, so that they can talk to faculty for the selected courses about their basic skills support needs. Meanwhile, they have been gathering dozens of URLs for topics in: ESL, English, reading, math, library skills and so on. They are reviewing them to figure out which ones might be useful. They are also writing a document to be used with the CAI (Common Assessment) pre-assessment element. The team should have everything done on a template by Thanksgiving and will meet over CCCConfer the first part of December. They hope to have faculty to meet with around that time.

The work that they are doing is to support students in the online courses. For example, perhaps a student signs up for a history course that has a 3 page research paper as one of the assignments. The student may not know how to do research, may not have library skills, or may not be familiar with citation versus plagiarism. The basic skills work group is developing “just in time” resources to provide very specific targeted help right when students need it.

CCMS

Vendor responses to the RFP will come in by the end of November. Since site visits are scheduled for January, the work group is preparing for the RFP Response Review. They are doing some training, Sandbox testing, and setting up the demonstration scenarios that the vendors will be working with.

The work group is going to the Academic Senate to fill some vacancies on the CCMS selection committee so that all of the spots are filled going into the RFP selection process. There are 31 spots on that selection committee largely made up of work group members from this Steering Committee and representatives from the pilot colleges.

Academic Affairs: Course Selection and Online Tutoring

Jory Hadsell provided an overview of the course prioritization process, including a spreadsheet of the criteria that were used to select courses from the five that colleges submitted to have the right mix of courses within each group as well as across the project. For privacy concerns, each class was assigned a control number. Then work group members looked at which group the courses were in (tutoring, readiness, or full launch), the CID number, and the approval status (fully approved, conditionally approved, or not yet in the system). For the full launch, they wanted all of the courses to have full CID approval, while for the tutoring and readiness groups, which will begin with courses with their own students at first, the cross articulation piece was not as important. (The thought is that there will be time for them to get full approval by the time they are up to the Exchange portion of the pilot). For the readiness pilot, they wanted courses that would have students who were newer to the community college process, and so on. The work group wanted to have diverse courses as much as possible, for example, they wanted to avoid having three English classes submitted by three colleges in one group. One element that was included, but primarily as a tie-breaker, was the number of years the faculty member had taught online and the number of years teaching the course. However, the work group did not believe that teaching online longer was necessarily a better thing, and there was really only one case in which it was used, with a situation where one had taught 6 months versus another of 6 years, so it did seem informative there. The courses were divided into Priority A and B. There were 66 Priority A courses moved forward for immediate review, and B courses will be moved forward after the A course reviews are completed, if courses in Priority A don't make it through review, or if a faculty member decides that they do not want to teach the course. There are representative courses for all except the Psych Research Methods course.

Jory presented the results as of October 28th in an aggregate and somewhat anonymized format because the courses are still in the review process. Fabiola noted that there are faculty members who are fearful that this process might affect them negatively in some way. Michelle and Jory both confirmed that the process is intended to be a formative one that provides faculty the opportunity to make revisions to "courses that do not meet the standard." Courses that do not meet the standard could still be courses that are fabulous, engaging courses that students are succeeding in. The standard just identifies areas in which revisions would make it an even better course, this process is designed to get excellent courses for OEI, and it is a new process which can make it both exciting and scary, but it should not reflect badly on anyone participating in the process. Fabiola agreed and noted that voters still have something of a negative view of online courses, and this process will demonstrate the high standards being set for courses in the OEI, and hopefully as faculty members participate they will lose that sense of fear.

Michelle noted that the only courses that are not yet fully CID approved are ones where there is a backlog in the discipline. Courses will not be kept out of the tutoring and readiness pilot on that basis. Once the reviews are complete, Jory expects to bring back a more specific list of colleges, courses, and probably names. He wanted to wait to provide those details until the courses were reviewed.

The Academic Affairs and Professional Development work groups may now be able to draft an

“order of operations” for how the process of notifications to colleges and so on should work for the next round of courses, and perhaps eventually move into a rolling model of course review (although that might not be feasible).

Greg wanted to make sure that academic freedom and intellectual property were protected, so that courses that were reviewed were not simply transferred over to another instructor or another school. Michelle explained that could only happen if the college allowed it to happen. The courses that are being reviewed have been developed by particular faculty members for use with their students and are their intellectual property.

Ray expressed concern that there might not be enough STEM courses in the tutoring pilot; it is important to have enough students making use of the tutoring services. It will be important to partner with faculty and to get the word out to students so that those services are used in the pilot.

The Online Tutoring RFP is out and the submission deadline is November 12th. The proposal evaluation and review will occur November 14th-19th. The notice of Intent to Award will be posted November 20th, and that recommendation will be presented to the OEI Steering Committee at the meeting on December 5th, and the Foundation Board on December 10th. The anticipated contract execution will be on December 15th, which will make for a very short time between December 16th and January 12th for set-up, testing, and initial implementation. Fortunately, only two of the eight pilot colleges start classes on the 12th, and usually there is at least a little bit of a lag in the use of tutoring services. The evaluation plan is being developed and will be presented in the spring.

The evaluation committee in combination with the Foundation will be ranking the vendor proposals in the review process. Once the notice of Intent to Award is posted, conversations with the vendor can begin. The Steering Committee will have the opportunity to have a full up or down vote on the vendor recommendation, and that will occur on December 5th. The notice of intent is just a preliminary step, and the Steering Committee could make a recommendation not to endorse that decision if they chose.

Ray has been updating ACTLA, the statewide tutoring organization, about the timeline for this process all along, and the management team has also been working to get the word out everywhere they can. OEI will be funding tutoring for the courses in the pilot. Courses that are offered at pilot schools, but not pilot courses, and at colleges that are not participating in the pilot will not have tutoring funded, but the colleges can opt to buy-in to the services through the Foundation beginning in the fall. The pricing for the tutoring services will be negotiated by OEI as part of the RFP process.

Student Services: Student Readiness

Bonnie Peters is reconstituting the student services work group, since the readiness work has been taken care of and sent to developer. The intent is to get a combination of people involved who are interested in matriculation and student services. The group will also be looking at online counseling.

New Business:

“Who are the Home Colleges?”

Fabiola noted that currently the website does not define “home college,” it is listed as being “under construction.” This is a very important component that needs to be defined soon. As OEI moves into the development of the Exchange, it will be critically important. The “teaching college” is clearly the college that is offering the course that a student wants to take, but “home college” could be defined a number of different ways. It might be the college that is geographically closest to your house, or the college from which you want to receive your degree, or the first college that you took courses from. A student might be defined by where they are fully matriculated with an

education plan; however, since OEI is working to eliminate duplicated education plans and orientations, it also makes sense to look at defining “home college” clearly from the beginning.

Barbara Illowsky suggested it would make sense to look at where a student wants to transfer the units for the course they are taking.

Bonnie Peters felt that it would make sense to tie into the matriculation piece along with the three steps for SSSP. If the goal is to avoid the student having to do 5 education plans and 5 orientations, that process starts with the student defining where they are matriculating from the beginning. She asked that the committee give her a little time to work on some preliminary guidelines for the matriculation piece and then bring it back along with some possible rules. (For example, “How many units do we allow a student to take at a teaching college in a given semester?”) She will bring back those preliminary ideas for discussion at the next face-to-face meeting.

Pam suggested getting input from athletics people since there are many student athletes, and for them their home college is where they are competing. Debra also suggested getting input from financial aid, EOPS and other groups that have regulations related to “home college.”

Clinton expressed concern about whether or not students could become entirely online learners by having for example 15 units with five different institutions, or alternatively getting their degree from a college even though they had earned the majority of their units at another school.

LeBaron noted that where a student is able to graduate will depend upon the residency requirements for that particular college. DE courses are equivalent to face-to-face courses and are paid at the same rate. The reason that DE courses get less money has to do with how they are scheduled. The funding depends upon regular meeting times. There are over 55 colleges that have in excess of 500 degrees and certificates completely through DE. There are 2 or 3 colleges that have 50% of their courses offered online (Barstow, Victor Valley, and perhaps Cerro Coso).

Brian highlighted the importance of making the distinction between a fully online student, and a fully OEI student. A fully OEI student could make colleges irrelevant, especially for smaller schools.

Barbara explained that OEI is not offering a full degree online; OEI has identified 19 courses that do not even make up a full ADT. The goal of OEI is to deal with the backlog of courses that students are not able to get at their home campuses, not to try to replace or eliminate their home campus. Bonnie Peters agreed, the OEI student is a different student from the regular online student and we can set up the rules that define the requirements for OEI. For example, we might set rules that say that the student has to enroll in the first 6-9 units at the school they are matriculating. Those rules can be tied to the matriculation piece and include rules for athletes and so on. They will inform what we determine a home college to be. We can even put rules on the other side; maybe only allow 2 classes per semester for OEI.

Clinton expressed concern that if a student could be a 100% OEI student they become stateless actors, which brings more complexity to the conversation. Jory emphasized that OEI does not have students. The students belong to the colleges. There is a perception among some people that students are going to become OEI students and no longer be in the home college; that is incorrect, OEI does not have students! There is also a residency requirement in Title 5 which states that a student must take 12 of their units at the college granting the degree.

Bonnie Peters will bring back draft notes for a definition of “home college to the December meeting.

Proposal for a Planning Workgroup

John Makevich presented a draft document for the formation of a planning work group called the Research and Planning Work Group. The purposes of the work group would include but not be limited to:

- Providing input into the process of updating the original work plan
- Facilitating discussion with research efforts by RP Group and others
- Conducting forward thinking
- Assisting the management team and pilot consortium team
- Help with improving alignment of the timeline for OEI projects and tasks with Steering Committee communications and meetings.

He asked for a motion to lead to discussion and perhaps to lead to a vote on the formation of this proposed work group. Barry Gribbons made the motion and it was seconded by Cynthia Alexander.

Greg asked if the document needs to specify who the members should be, with particular numbers of faculty members and so on, but John Makevich noted that has not been past practice for work groups, so he didn't think it would be necessary. This group is also not intended to be populated by only RP Group members though they are welcome if interested. The intent is to have this group work a bit more in the weeds with timelines, due dates, and deadlines and then bring them back to the Steering Committee so all of the members are better informed about when things are happening.

Committee members did feel that it would be wise to change the name to something less likely to be confused with the RP Group. No immediate suggestions were embraced, so it was decided that if the new group was formed it could come up with a name later.

The motion to create the new work group passed unanimously.

Meeting Location Survey

John Makevich will be working with Amy Carbonero and will send out a short meeting location survey sometime next week. There will be an online meeting on November 21st and the December 5th meeting will be in Los Angeles since those meetings were already scheduled. The meeting in Los Angeles will be at LAX Embassy Suite South, El Segundo.

The survey will inform the meeting schedule for 2015. It is likely that all of the meetings will be in Sacramento, or that they will alternate between Sacramento and a southern California location. The survey information will help with that decision, but ultimately it will come down to cost and effectiveness.

Members noted that the first Friday of January is January 2nd, and the second Friday is January 9th, which is not a good day for the Vice-chair and at least one of the committee members.

ZOOM Training:

John Sills provided a short training (which will also be posted in Basecamp) on using ZOOM to:
Mute/unmute your microphone
Turn your camera on/off
Raise a hand (to be used for voting)

Jayne cautioned that there are some issues with the ZOOM platform in how it interacts with Windows 8, specifically mute and unmute can only be done by the moderator and use of some functions will knock a participant out of the session. He felt that more work needs to be done on

the platform to coordinate the ability to participate. ZOOM is also not compliant for accessibility purposes, so that will need to be addressed at some point.

John Sills will look into the knowledge base and see if he can identify ways to deal with the Windows 8 issues.

The committee discussed how to handle the issue of voting when some members were only on the phone and did not have the ability to show the raise hand icon, and did not want to talk over each other. Members decided that the best approach would be for those who were only able to phone in to contact the chair prior to the meeting. They could provide their phone number (which is what the chair will see in the ZOOM interface) so that the chair can ask for those votes separately after the hand icons are recorded.

John Sills also noted that there is an iPhone app as well as an Android version of ZOOM for smartphone users.

To have the best audio experience on ZOOM and to minimize echo, users should mute their audio when not speaking, phone users should use *6 to mute and unmute, and headsets/earbuds are highly recommended.

Committee members who would like to set up accounts with CCCConfer so that they can host their own meetings can send an email to: Clientservices@cccconfer.org
Attendees do not have to have an account to participate.

John Freitas noted that once the meeting schedule is set up, it will be possible to use the same meeting code over and over for meetings, rather than needing a new participant code each time.

California Community College Distance Education Coordinators Organization (CCCDECO):
CCCDECO will be an important ally for OEI in helping to communicate with the DE community.

Cynthia Alexander reported on the officer elections:

Larry Lambert is President

Cynthia Alexander is Vice-president

Alice Delayle is Recording Secretary

Lisa Beach is Corresponding Secretary

Lenore Simonson is the Public Information Officer

Election of the treasurer will be closing today.

LeBaron acknowledged the excellent work that John Makevich did to pull this new organization together and then to hand it off when he took on his new position on the management team. This has been something that has been discussed for 2-3 years, and is now moving forward. The CIOs also provided a startup loan to the group. It is important to acknowledge and recognize the importance and connection to instruction provided by all involved in the founding of this group.

Clean-up of Basecamp access

John Freitas was concerned that there are 72 active participants on Basecamp and thought that might represent too many people since there are 26 voting members on OEI, 5 ex officio members and then some management team and staff. In meetings, the phrase "the Steering Committee weighed in on Basecamp," seems to have been used as a substitute for discussion in a face-to-face meeting, and that is a concern for some committee members. John Freitas thought that the people participating on Basecamp did not necessarily represent the voting members.

Jayne looked over the list of participants on Basecamp and noted that it included voting members, management team, staff, launch team members, and others, but they all seemed to be

people who should still be included. John Freitas suggested that the launch team members didn't still need to be on the list. He also noted that he would be more comfortable if a decision was made to consider Basecamp input informal, and to officially recognize that the formal decision making process occurs at the Steering Committee meetings, and not simply consider that "comments on Basecamp mean that the Steering Committee has provided input."

Steve Klein agreed with the concept of having Basecamp input be considered informal. There are lurkers that like to stay informed and he would like to allow those to remain. Debra Sheldon noted that she does not like using Basecamp and would prefer that not be the only method of providing input to the process.

The committee agreed to consider Basecamp one channel of communication, but that it does not equate to official Steering Committee input.

Action Items for Next Meetings:

Fabiola thanked Caryn Albrecht for her great work in taking the minutes. Then she asked members to help generate the list of topics that need to be remembered for inclusion on the next meeting agendas.

Members should inform the chair when they are only on the phone for Zoom calls, so that they can be called on orally for votes.

The work group and Steering Committee document presented by John Makevich will be back for further discussion and action, so members should discuss it with their constituents and get feedback.

Bonnie Peters will put together a draft of brainstorming ideas on "home college" parameters after November 18th and will post those points for members to consider prior to the discussion of those ideas at the next face-to-face meeting.

John Makevich will send out a meeting survey soon, so the 2015 calendar and locations should be available at the next meeting.

A discussion of the Intent to Award the Tutoring contract will occur at the next face-to-face meeting on December 5th.

Meeting Housekeeping:

John Freitas reminded members that as representatives to the steering committee they represent a constituent group, and not their college. So, if for example, a faculty member decides to step down from the OEI SC, the Academic Senate will appoint the replacement; the member does not select their replacement. Additionally, members who are on the agenda for a meeting report or presentation are welcome to post those on Basecamp in addition to sending them to John Freitas, you do not need to wait for him to post them.

John Makevich requested that people who are interested in volunteering for the planning and research work group send an email to him.

Joseph Moreau noted that the CCC Board of Governors will be meeting at DeAnza College on November 17th and 18th, and the management team will be providing them with a short update report on OEI.

Dan Crump requested that the management team provide written copies of the work group

reports so that members could share them with their constituent groups. John Makevich thought that shouldn't be a problem, but requested it wait until Pat returns to make sure that she has no problem with it.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be online on November 21st.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 pm.