

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday June 12, 2015

Zoom Online Meeting

Attendees: Alice Van Ommeren, Amy Carbonaro, Arnita Porter, Barbara Illowsky, Bob Nash, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman, Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Gary Bird, Gregory Beyrer, Jayme Johnson, Joe Moreau, John Freitas, John Ittelson, John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kelly Fowler, LeBaron Woodyard, Lisa Beach, Lisa Wang, Meridith Randall, Michelle Pilati, Morris Rodrigue, Pat James, Sandoval Chagoya, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Opening and Introductions:

John Makevich informally started the meeting at 9:40 am, and John Freitas formally took over when he came on at 9:50 am. (Fabiola had an emergency and was not able to attend.)

Alice Van Ommeren the Interim Vice Chancellor of Technology introduced herself. She has been with the Chancellor's Office and TRIS for ten years but in research rather than in the technology area. She has been in her regular position as Director of Research for 3-4 years. She volunteered to cover the interim position while the search for the permanent person takes place.

Executive Director Report:

Pat discussed the great press OEI has been receiving based on the CVC catalog refresh, and the report put out yesterday by the Public Policy Institute. Overall the report was very positive and bipartisan with a supportive position for online education and the work of OEI. It acknowledged the challenges faced and the important role OEI is playing in setting a standard. There was one area that mistakenly quoted Ed Code or regulation as putting restrictions on the use of non-faculty instructional design people. LeBaron confirmed that there is nothing in regulation that would prevent instructional designers from being assigned; that does need to be clarified. Various committee members confirmed that instructional designers play an important role in providing assistance in moving into the online environment. Faculty are good at what they do, teaching their courses and the content, and they appreciate the help in transferring that craft and those skills into the online realm. Another member noted that on their campus instructional designers are faculty members.

Dan noted that the report recognized some negatives with respect to success rates in online courses, and felt that fit in well with Pat's ongoing mantra about one of the goals of OEI being "to improve the delivery of online courses." Lisa also felt that the Canvas conversion would provide an impetus to encourage faculty to improve their course design; on her campus they are hoping to have an instructional designer helping faculty to be more intentional about their course design. LeBaron emphasized that the online course rubric standards are so good at pulling from the best of the best that people on campuses outside of the twenty-four pilots want to access that design.

There were concerns expressed in the report that the project wouldn't be able to roll out within the five year cycle, and wouldn't be able to get people involved. Pat explained that it has gone completely the other way; people are very excited and involved. Importantly, the report suggested reframing conversations to stop the comparisons between face-to-face and online courses. It also hit the nail on the head when it spoke of "the piecemeal idiosyncratic online education system that has evolved over time, which has not narrowed the gaps." That is what OEI is working together to address, so that we can look at the increases that we have in successes for students over time. It is also true that students who take online classes tend to transfer or graduate quicker than those who don't. The report also noted that courses that have been taught longer have less success than those that have been taught for less time, which might encourage people to redesign their courses. Dan reiterated that the definition of what constitutes a successful online course versus a non-successful course comes down to the individual instructor. Finally, near the conclusion of the report comes the final message about OEI, "The

CCC Online Education Initiative is an important start. If it is successful, it will be a model that other states can follow to build their online education programs.”

Pat asked members attending the Online Teaching Conference to attend: a session on Thursday morning that will be with a panel of six students, and another OEI panel session in the afternoon to answer questions. If members are not able to attend, many of the sessions will be webcast.

Action Item:

Sandoval will post a list of links to all of the press OEI has been getting the last few days in Basecamp.

Minutes:

Action

There were no corrections or changes to the minutes for the meeting on May 8, 2015. Gregory Beyrer moved to approve the minutes, Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Ad hoc Subcommittee to Start Reviewing/Revising the Charter:

John Freitas explained that it is time for the annual review of the OEI steering committee charter and he would like to find 5-6 volunteers to help with the review and suggesting needed revisions. The Academic Senate has a few items that need slight revisions regarding their membership and there are suggestions regarding defining a quorum as well. The plan is to review and bring back suggested revisions at the August meeting for action. Dan Crump and Greg Beyrer volunteered to participate with Fabiola and John Freitas. Other members, especially representatives of CEOs, CIOs, DE Coordinators, and Student Services should contact John Freitas to participate. He will then send out announcements of meeting times.

Management Team Reports:

Planning Update:

John Makevich reported that he, Michael Agostini, and Carol Lashman have been working at threading together the work plan with the activities of the project. There is a lot of deep planning going on and work to identify elements that have yet to occur. There is also working going on to continue to bolster the teamwork site with apps and activities. The integration of the planning includes tying together the history of what happened last year at the beginning of the project, with what is happening now, and finally with what will be happening in the future. They are also working closely with Alyssa Nguyen, the RP Group evaluator, to integrate efforts with what is going to happen with evaluation. The revised, updated plan should be brought to the next face-to-face meeting in August.

CCMS Contract Update:

Steve Klein explained that the contract negotiation team has for all intents and purposes successful completed the contracting process. The team of Steve, Pat, Joe Moreau, Joe Perret, and some consultants from the Technology Center have been working diligently for the last three months and today the signatures are on the contracts. (For payment purposes, the district isn't allowed to issue any money until the contract is ratified by the board in July and OEI remains under a non-disclosure agreement for the purposes of the details of the process.) The information is very new and fresh and Pat, Steve and others have discussed the best way to share it with the field. They decided that it works well to share it at the Online Teaching Conference and during the DE Coordinators meetings Wednesday of next week. They will get feedback on questions and concerns that may arise so that those can be addressed. The plan is to explain the specifics of what this means for colleges that want to implement Canvas campus wide, it will be done through a Google Form being developed that colleges will be asked to complete with contact information which will provide an overview of what it is and what it does. That Google Form will trigger a message to Instructure to send the Institution Participation Agreement (IPA) which is the legal contract between Instructure and the college and relates back to the Master Agreement. The IPA is a fairly innocuous agreement that describes the services that are available and so on, though colleges may find that boards may want to review it. The DE

Coordinators feedback will help to shape a more formal announcement that will go out the following week system-wide when that Google Form is completed and available. The team intends to make that happen as quickly as possible. Instructure is under an agreement with OEI to not initiate the IPA until after the Google Form to collect the information is completed. Steve asked for a little more patience for the week or so that it takes for the team to ramp up the process to handle this, while continuing to support the work with the pilot. The management team is very excited that the contracting process is done, and the project can move into the process of getting colleges connected. Throughout the contracting process they have found that the vendor is very responsive and they are excited to bring colleges that want to transition on and to get their students and faculty connected.

Pat asked members to hold off on sharing pricing information shared with the Steering Committee today until a draft of the whole document is put together and the formal announcement is made to the DE Coordinators, and is sent out to pilot colleges at the same time. This will hopefully prevent rumors and myths from coming back. Colleges that move to Canvas will be able to really think about, reallocate, and reinvest savings from their existing LMS ; perhaps for accessibility, DSPS, course design support, instructional design support, or many other areas. Steve acknowledged Pat's efforts to look holistically at the total grant and the project needs providing visionary support.

Instructure currently has tools for Blackboard, Moodle, and Desire2Learn, but not Etudes; there is a separate contract being worked on to develop a migration tool for Etudes. The development team with Instructure has been working on that for a number of weeks and June 22nd is planned to be the start of that contract. They will then take two weeks to analyze current content mapping from Etudes to Canvas, then determine the scope of work. Steve believes that tool will be functional and available to colleges in the fall. The project has been talking to Micah Orloff at @ONE and they are ramping up the training for the trainers on the migration process and using the migration tools from existing platforms to Canvas. The service that OEI has contracted for is the Guided Implementation Service, which is their standard service and should be a foundational and sufficient package. If a college wishes to they can contract at their cost for additional services for: onsite training, onsite implementation, onsite migration, and so on. For the colleges that are not currently offering after school hours and weekend support, the contract is for 24/7 phone support. If a college is currently supporting its students during the day, the team expects that will not change; the support model will follow what is currently being done. The team is very happy with the contract package they have secured, and there are services available for extra contract, if colleges wish to secure them. The entire contracting process provided a touchpoint of verification for the excellent decision to partner with Instructure; they have proven to be communicative and understanding of what the project is trying to do. "Our success is your success," has really proven to be the case.

CCMS Committee Update:

The CCMS Committee met and will continue being the advisory group to Canvas of the voice of the CCC in what we would like to see prioritized in terms of features and functions in the product roadmap moving forward.

CVC Update:

Steve commended Amy Carbonaro on her outstanding work as the Project Manager of the CVC catalog refresh and for the accolades that came afterward at a press conference on May 8th with Chancellor Harris. The CVC will help to be one vehicle that will drive students to find courses that connect to what OEI is doing.

Amy explained that the main focus of the recent update was ADT courses and getting information to students about them. Those ADT courses are now highlighted with a green indicator to make them very obvious to users. Another option added was to allow students to search for courses by geographic location. A serious effort was made to improve the user experience and user interface (UX/UI) by updating imagery, general functionality, and layout of programs. Identifiers for courses, programs, and schools were also added. The new version is mobile responsive

which is a major benefit for students. Finally, the administrative aspect has also been completely redesigned and is now more intuitive for users. The overall reception has been very positive. Requests have already been received from colleges to update courses, and two colleges want to be added to the database. Amy is starting to plan the next round of revisions and looking at the roadmap for the integration of OEI courses. Another idea is to look at moving the codes for CSU and UC programs and crosswalk integration. Currently everything is updated manually on an annual basis by employing 10-12 student assistants. The student assistants are provided with data in Excel files and they are asked to go in and search for the courses and update the spreadsheet accordingly. It is a pretty simple process, but it is better for users, students, and college representatives if active updating happens more frequently. The summer update cycle means that often spring courses aren't included since they aren't listed in the class schedules.

Pat clarified that although the resource page says "Coming Fall 2016- The Course Exchange," that does not mean that a student who is not part of the Consortium colleges will be able to participate. There must be reciprocity agreements between home and teaching colleges for students to participate in the Exchange. By fall 2016 there will be a mechanism to list the courses and the colleges that are participating in the Exchange whether as home or teaching colleges; Pat dreams that eventually there will be a statewide agreement. At this point she does not envision students registering from the CVC website, but the exact mechanism hasn't been worked out yet. OEI is absolutely not becoming the CVC.

Steve explained that all three initiatives are at a similar phase of procuring services, and the next phase will involve integration of those services. The CVC catalog is a good example of a service being integrated; in phase two it will move into a portlet on the colleges' website or within the Student Services Portal (SSP) which is being developed by the Education Planning Initiative (EPI). The system wide architecture and how that feeds into the Exchange on the back end has yet to be determined, but the goal is for students to seamlessly be able to access information about what courses are available to them. SSP is now getting to a place where OEI can start talking to them more concretely about how to integrate some of these ideas; the Director's Collaborative is one of the places that can occur. The original RFA called for a separate OEI portal, but that has evolved out of the picture, to a vision of a more integrated and seamless experience for students rather than a separate portals in multiple places for different projects. Instead, students will be able to do a single sign-on with federated identity like what students have with OpenCCC for CCCApply. The services will be delivered through Amazon like smart tools. The projects are currently a year down the road of a visionary transformative effort. The CVC catalog is included as part of the OEI delivery of services and in phase two development the beta version and its development will be shared with this committee.

Professional Development Update:

Action

Michelle explained that all faculty members who had their courses reviewed are now being contacted and connected with instructional designers to address their needs; in some cases those needs are related to the migration to Canvas. Most of the full launch colleges have already done migration to some extent and training was provided to faculty at those colleges. The work group is also trying to find the best way to connect faculty to ongoing support as well as gathering information around the migration and what works well and what doesn't work well, so that we can really learn from the colleges and each course's migration. Additionally, there is a review of courses coming up starting in early July and the applications need to be in from faculty by Monday. It will not be a huge group, but they will be reviewing some courses that haven't been through the review before which will be exciting.

A proposal for creating a new professional development work group subcommittee that is a small more clearly defined group was posted on Basecamp and presented by Michelle. She explained that she inherited a large group of amazing people but without a clear structure ensuring that all of the appropriate voices were at the table; it is also difficult to get meetings together. There is no intention to not continue to get input from everyone who wants to provide input, but the idea is to have a smaller subcommittee to do the brainstorming, the planning, and to take ideas and figure

out what needs to happen next. The proposal is for a subcommittee of about 10 to do the preliminary work and then every effort would be made to continue to keep everyone in the loop and get all perspectives. Proposed members would include six faculty members, one of whom would be a librarian, one a counselor, and one a DE coordinator. There would also be either a VP of Instruction or a DE Dean, a CSSO or Social Services Dean, and an accessibility specialist. She would like to get the formalized subcommittee in place as soon as possible in order to have some long term planning more fully developed before the next steering committee meeting.

Action:

John Freitas asked if there were any objections to forming the subcommittee, and there were none. Since Chairs and Vice-Chairs can create subcommittees as they see the need, John Freitas approved the formation of the subcommittee, so that Michelle can move forward and put out a call to the Academic Senate and other groups for participants.

Final Comments:

Joe Moreau thanked Steve, Pat, and all who worked on the Canvas contracting and budgeting. As the project moves forward there may be some anxiety about the future and he wanted everyone to be aware that they are in the preliminary stages of talking to the Chancellor's Office about an ongoing budget change proposal to increase the ongoing funding for OEI. It is not time yet to take action on that, it will probably be at least two years before it is time to work seriously on that, but they did have a very productive and positive conversation with Erik Skinner and others at the Chancellor's Office. When the time comes, OEI wants to make sure to have the funding to keep this as a sustained and successful project.

Pat also spoke about a really positive meeting with members of the Governor's team, including several from finance, Lockhart (the higher education person), and also Jason McCandless. She found their questions to be good and insightful; they had some questions about data that we don't have and she took note of that. They were impressed with what OEI has been doing, including the two page list of accomplishments. They appreciated the common sense approach that the project has taken and they want it to succeed.

Next Meetings:

The next online meeting will be on Friday July 10th.

The next in person meeting will be in Orange County, near John Wayne Airport on Friday August 28th.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.