

## Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday March 6, 2015  
Embassy Suites Ontario Airport  
Ontario California

**Attendees:** Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley (online), Arnita Porter, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman (online), Christina Gold, Cynthia Alexander, Dave Stephens, Donna Hajj (on phone), Fabiola Torres, Gary Bird, Gregory Beyrer, Ireri Valenzuela, Jasmine Ruys, Joe Perret, John Freitas, John Ittelson (online), John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Joseph Moreau, Kelly Fowler, Larry Lambert, Lisa Beach, Lori Adrian (online), Meridith Randall, Michael Agostini, Michelle Pilati, Morris Rodrigue, Pat James, Ray Sanchez, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

### **Opening and Introductions:**

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:00 am and attendance was taken.

### **Minutes:**

There were a few corrections to the minutes of February 6, 2015, including correcting the spelling of Jasmine Ruys last name. Joe Perret moved to approve the minutes with the changes, Larry Lambert seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with one abstention, by a member who did not attend that meeting.

### **Updated Course Design Standards:**

### **Action**

Michelle Pilati explained that now that the course design rubric has been used once, and feedback on it has been received, the Professional Development work group has been working on incorporating suggested revisions. The changes are non-substantive, but should reorganize and streamline the rubric. Forty of the faculty members who had courses reviewed, as well as many course reviewers provided feedback on areas of the rubric that some people found unclear or confusing. Some sections that seemed redundant, contradictory, or not standardized have been revised to remove redundancy, ensure clarity, and reorganize slightly. There were also minor additions to the scoring to increase clarity, with 3-4 being labeled "satisfactory to accomplished" and 5-6 "distinguished to exemplary". The focus in reviewer training will continue to be on providing constructive feedback for making improvements in the courses submitted. The tone of feedback is encouraging; "This is a wonderful course, but if you did this too it would be even better." The feedback will continue to be just as thorough. Anita Crawley praised the efforts of the Professional Development work group in making revisions and improvements as needed.

The expert review of course accessibility standards will also be incorporated into a single review process, rather than as a separate step, so that all course feedback will be received simultaneously. Cynthia Alexander praised the inclusion of the accessibility elements so that faculty members will see them and realize their importance from the beginning of the process. Pat and Michelle are also planning an Accessibility Week, with perhaps two different webinars each day, on making courses accessible.

A member asked if course reviews would continue to be sent only to the faculty member who submitted the course; their pilot college is concerned about effective communication regarding the status of courses that have been submitted for review. Michelle confirmed that the report will continue to go to the faculty member. However, she will work on getting a report out to the DE Coordinators in the next couple of weeks with information about the number of courses that have been reviewed and where they are in the process. Pat also noted that it would be possible to "fast track" review if there are courses that need to be changed out due to the change in timing of the full launch from summer to fall.

Since this was a pilot rubric, there was an expectation that it would be changed and improved for future reviews, this timing seems to be appropriate. The Professional Development work group would like the Steering Committee today to approve their work on finishing those revisions so that the refined rubric can be used with the next group of course submissions, as well as in the next training cycle, both planned for the near future.

**Action:**

Joe Perret moved to allow and recommend the Professional Development work group to continue to work on and perfect the course design rubric until there was a clear consensus and then move forward with those revisions for the next phase of course reviews. Those revisions, once final, will be posted in the general Steering Committee area of Basecamp. Larry Lambert seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous support.

**Mythbusting:**

Pat reviewed some common questions that have come up with regard to OEI and the work that is being done, and encouraged members to share them with constituencies, as well as to encourage use of the FAQs on the website.

- 1) Is the OEI a community college? Absolutely not! All of the courses coming into the Exchange (which is just one component of OEI) will be offered by and coming from individual colleges.
- 2) Will all colleges be required to participate? No. Participation is strictly voluntary for all components. We hope that colleges will want to participate because of the great services being provided and included, but participation is not required.
- 3) Can a college adopt Canvas as a CMS and not participate in the Exchange as a college? Yes, you can adopt Canvas as a CMS, and choose not to participate in the Exchange.
- 4) Is the OEI intended to support very large class sizes? No, the intention is not to build MOOCs. Class size is a discussion that still needs to happen in the Consortium and that will come from the eight pilot colleges that will come up with a standard for the Exchange. Class size should be reasonable and not gigantic; the bigger the class size, the harder it is to support students in success. Class size is a local decision, and the decision about whether or not to participate in the Exchange will also be a local decision. It will be possible to look at class size data once the pilot begins.
- 5) Is the OEI using a course review process to insure the quality of courses that will be offered in the Exchange? Yes.
- 6) Will course review results remain private? Yes, course reviews results remain the property of the faculty member. Additionally, at any point in time a faculty member can choose not to continue. They can choose not to change their course, and instead may withdraw it from the process.
- 7) Will the courses become the property of OEI? No.
- 8) Will faculty be required to offer courses that meet course standards? Only if they want to offer courses in the Exchange will they be required to meet the course standards. This is so that students from all over the state taking courses in the Exchange will know what to expect and will know that they meet a particular level of quality.
- 9) Will the college be required to use the CMS used by OEI? No. Colleges will be offered materials and videos to help them decide whether or not they choose to upgrade to Canvas and factors that should be considered in making that decision. That information can be shared with faculty, staff, and administration, which all have a stake in the decision. However, the decision about CMS is one that should be weighted heavily as a faculty decision.

Steve Klein explained that a CCMS FAQ page was added to the general page on the website to address some of the more CMS specific questions that have been raised by DE Coordinators. Pat

and Steve encouraged members to contact the Management Team with further questions that come up.

**Sharing of Brainstorming Comments from 12/5 Meeting:**

John Makevich shared comments regarding the relationships between the Steering Committee, Management Team and work group subcommittees, as a precursor to further group work today. The idea is to narrow down and clarify the processes that are desired.

General Suggestions:

- 1) Need more guiding principles and documentation of policies and procedures.
- 2) More brainstorming and less report out in Steering Committee meetings
- 3) Consider reduced meeting frequency
- 4) Presentations should follow the style of highlighting the history, the timeline, and what will be going on in the future
- 5) Moving the operational components to the Consortium
- 6) Clarifying the relations between the Management Team and the Steering Committee, while at the same time keeping enough flexibility to adapt to needs

Work Group Specific Suggestions:

- 1) Need a better definition of work group membership
- 2) Should work groups exist for a finite time with a specific task or be ongoing?
- 3) Clear responsibility to parent group

Communications:

- 1) Need talking points for Steering Committee members to use in colleges (Mythbusters, FAQ, etc. will help)
- 2) Form a communication work group with the Management Team
- 3) Communications need to be continuous, Steering Committee members should more regularly be engaged to assist in communications (the Management Team is looking at getting a communications coordinator)

Attendance:

- 1) Revisit committee size
- 2) Try to figure out why folks aren't attending: is it scheduling, or meeting times and dates?
- 3) Clarifying member roles and responsibilities to help boost involvement

Now that OEI has some breathing space to look at the structure, the Steering Committee and the Management Team can look at what things worked and didn't work, so that revisions can be made.

**Brainstorming Group Report Outs:**

Group 1:

The first group looked at structure between the various bodies: Steering Committee, Management Team, Chancellor's Office, work groups, Consortium, and pilot colleges. The Steering Committee was created by the Chancellor's Office and is a Chancellor's Office body. The OEI Steering Committee reports up to the Project Collaborative, TTAC, Chancellor's Office, and so on. The Steering Committee should be advisory and inform the work of the Management Team, that role needs to be clear. The role of the external evaluator, the RP group in bringing recommendations and how those come to the Steering Committee and Management Team needs to be defined. How will those recommendations be implemented?

What changes and revisions will need to be made in the work plan and priorities, with the emerging work of the pilot colleges, the Consortium, and later with the Exchange? What adjustments need to be made in the timeline? The Steering Committee should see an updated work plan and timeline as soon as possible.

For the work groups, again, part of the struggle is trying to figure out what the anticipated needs are into the future. A timeline needs to be created so that it is possible to see what needs to be addressed in 3 months, 6 months, and so on. Order and organization need to be studied, so that project needs can be anticipated several months out.

With respect to the Chancellor's Office: The Steering Committee should see the annual reports prepared by the Management Team for the Chancellor's Office. One of the roles of the Chancellor's Office is to let the Steering Committee know what is going on at the state policy level: what the legislature says, what the Chancellor's Office says, etc. Move input is needed from the Chancellor's Office on the state perspective and priorities with respect to policy.

#### Group 2:

The second group tried to make the mission more explicit with a historical analogy for the Steering Committee, the Management Team, and Consortium. The Steering Committee is the shareholders, the Management Team is responsible for buying supplies and doing work, while the Consortium is the colonists. All three groups are really important in the decision making for the company. The Steering Committee might set a policy to go find a particular item, the Management Team is aware of the limits of the resources and the feasibility of getting that item. The Consortium will help to revise the vision of what is actually needed in practice. The experience of the Consortium will result in suggestions back to the Steering Committee for changes in policy. The goal is to make a successful system for students.

The work groups are separate due to a lower level of permanence. The subcommittees should always have representation from the Steering Committee and the Consortium. They are formed on an ad hoc basis, and sometimes additional expertise will need to be added in to accomplish particular tasks. The work groups report back to the Steering Committee and the Steering Committee makes recommendations back to the Management Team. None of the three permanent bodies should ever be surprised by any recommendations from the work groups, because they should always have representation in those subcommittees.

As OEI moves into setting up the Consortium, we will be transitioning into a more permanent governance structure with the representation those in the Consortium.

#### Group 3:

This group looked at specifics important for good relationships between the bodies. The Steering Committee and Consortium should have cross-over in membership of chairs; the chairs of the Steering Committee should be in the Consortium and the chairs of the Consortium should be on the Steering Committee. The pilot Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) currently form a work group that is sort of a pre-Consortium group, which is evolving into the Consortium, so at least one of those SPOCs needs to be part of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee membership also needs to evolve, and a strong effort needs to be made to look into who is actively participating and who is not. It is important that all constituencies have representatives who are actively participating.

#### Group 4:

Regarding the role of the Steering Committee: Is it an advisory group or is it a steering group? Is the group too big as a Steering Committee? This group also suggested looking at the terms of members and the mechanism for making transitions in membership. John Freitas suggested that there be a draft of responsibilities, so that when the various constituent bodies vote for replacements, those expectations are clear and set in advance regarding what will be done and what the requirements are for reporting back to those organizations.

Should work groups be defined around specific project issues with a limited life span and for a particular purpose?

There are common logistical issues with Basecamp. Version control is difficult. Some members know their way around Basecamp, but others do not, and it is important to be specific when directing someone to “find it in Basecamp,” so that they are able to find the document that you are actually referencing. Arnita Porter suggested that communication should also help set the context regarding the history of where we started, where we are now, and where we are headed. It is not easy to find anything on Basecamp; there are tons of documents there, but it is not easy to find what you are looking for. Another member agreed, noting that as a Steering Committee member she could not find information on the work groups: work group chairs, meeting times and so on. There is a lot of information in Basecamp, but it is difficult to navigate. John Makevich explained that some work is going on to look at other possibilities such as GoogleApps for Education; hopefully soon there will be a better solution.

Steering Committee members are all here because they want to be here, but they should be challenged to provide meaningful input and participation. It is not sufficient to chime in and agree; instead members should make sure that they are providing substantive participation. Barbara Illowsky emphasized the need for stronger communication between all of the groups: Steering Committee to Management Team, Management Team to Steering Committee, work groups to Steering Committee, Chancellor’s Office to Steering Committee, etc.

John Makevich will take today’s input from the groups and synthesize it to bring back at the next meeting.

**Overview of the Pilot Consortium:**

John Makevich reminded the committee of Arnita Porter’s excellent leadership in developing the initial Charter for the Pilot Consortium. The Consortium will have representation from all twenty-four pilot colleges. The initial representation will be selected by the college CEO’s in partnership with the Academic Senate.

Currently, OEI is in the pre-Consortium stage, with Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) at all twenty-four pilot colleges. In Phase One, the Management Team split up to work with the three separate pilot groups: eight tutoring pilots, eight online readiness pilots, and eight full launch pilots. The SPOCs are working and helping to make elements operational; moving forward all twenty-four SPOCs will be meeting to some degree for a variety of implementation elements, for phases coming as early as this summer. Those twenty-four SPOCs are likely to be starting to get engaged in communications with the group that is the precursor for what will evolve into the formal Consortium organization.

By the middle of this year, OEI should be at the point of being ready for commencement of the official Consortium; which will make official the body of the twenty-four SPOCs with perhaps a few different people also involved. Prior to the first Consortium meeting, there will be an effort to build communications, especially with the college presidents, Chancellors, etc. from the pilot colleges, through a CEO Summit. The goal is to engage in further conversation around OEI. There have been some presentations to college presidents at the CCCLC Conference, but the CEO Summit will be an opportunity for rich discussion. When there are more details set up for the CEO Summit, John will update the Steering Committee with a more formal presentation.

This summer, all of the pilot colleges will be piloting to their own students in their existing CMS. The online readiness and tutoring pilots will start piloting both programs in their sixteen colleges. The full launch colleges have been offered the opportunity to pilot online readiness and tutoring as well, if they choose to. They will offer courses in the CCMS, Canvas, in the fall, but the Exchange will not

happen until the spring. The business practices and so on for the Exchange will need to be worked out before that is up and running. Marketing to students for OEI is not happening yet, because those necessary Exchange elements have not been worked out.

Pat reminded the committee that the timeline was revised when the decision was made to push back the selection of the CCMS until after Christmas. That decision resulted in a well-thought out CCMS selection process with involvement of all necessary constituencies, but it also resulted in the need to push back the timeline on the Exchange until after the CCMS implementation could be completed, otherwise we would be asking too much of the pilot colleges at the same time; focusing on the technology transition for the fall will be enough. For the same reason, Pat noted that additional colleges cannot be added to the full launch pilot at this point, but that it would be possible to add more courses to the pilot offerings once we make sure that the review process is timely and working well. Originally, the pilot colleges submitted three courses for review, and the next review should address an additional two courses for each college, so that there will be 40 courses offered in the CCMS for the full launch pilot.

Pat explained that in addition to having the courses meet the standard, we want the data for the resources to be working; there are a whole chain of elements that are being put into place. She asked administrators to make sure that the course review standards be put out to the faculty so that they can see what is included and start getting their courses ready before they submit them. It would be great to look toward meeting the standard for more and more online courses.

**Calendar of Future Meetings:**

**Action**

The committee discussed meeting dates and frequency in order to try to accommodate the needs of the Steering Committee while also providing sufficient oversight for OEI.

Since the Academic Senate Executive meetings are on the first Friday of the month and DE Coordinators meet the third Friday of the month, Larry Lambert moved to set meetings on the second Friday of the month regardless of meeting frequency. Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion. The committee passed the motion.

The committee felt that meeting less frequently in person would now be possible since more work is happening operationally and less procedurally. Ray Sanchez moved to meet quarterly face-to-face, with monthly meetings online in between the quarterly meetings. Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion. The committee passed the motion.

The committee decided not to have a meeting in April because of the turnaround time that would be required to get facilities. Greg Beyrer moved to have the quarterly meetings in the months of August, November, March and May, inclusive of 2015 with online meetings on the months in between. Ray Sanchez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

There will be no April meeting; the next meeting will be May 8<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento.

Steering Committee members are equally distributed between northern and southern California. Southwest decreased their flights out of Ontario, with no flights leaving between 3 pm and 7 pm which makes Ontario inconvenient to fly out of. Members agreed that Los Angeles traffic should be avoided.

The Management Team will look at options for the best southern California location for the August meeting, perhaps focusing on the best options for San Diego or Orange County. (Previously Orange County seemed to be an option that was at the top of the list being the cheapest location for southern California.) They will bring that information back to the May meeting and there will be time to schedule the August meeting after that.

### **OEI Project Assessment:**

Ileri Valenzuela presented information on some of the metrics that she has been or will be collecting for OEI project assessment. Some areas have baseline metrics available and others do not.

#### Online Education Delivery:

- The number of online courses that meet rigorous standards for quality online courses will increase.
- The number of community college faculty prepared to teach in an online environment will increase.
- The number of available transfer applicable online courses for students in an Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) pathway will increase.
- The number of online degree applicable courses and sections offered statewide will increase.

#### Student Success Outcomes:

- The time to degree completion and/or transfer to four-year institutions among online students will be reduced.
- Term-to-term retention rates among online students enrolled in credit, degree applicable, and transfer courses will increase.
- Successful course completion rates (earning a grade of C or higher) for students in online courses using support tools will be higher than the rates of students not using these tools.
- The gap between online and traditional face-to-face course success rates will be narrowed.
- The success rate gap in online courses among students of differing ethnicities will decrease.
- The success rate gap among students in online courses classified in special populations will decrease.
- The number of colleges that offer online tutoring and online course readiness orientations as well as other student supports geared towards their online student population will increase.
- The number of students taking online courses who access online supports will increase.

#### Institutional Efficiencies:

- The Common Course Management System (CCMS) will allow for streamlined data transfer between colleges allowing students from one college to take a course online and get credit at another college, improve communication and collaboration among faculty, and help streamline the deployment of resources.
- Leveraging the collective purchasing power for different technologies such as the CCMS, common user licenses and vendor services, such as a shared tutoring platform, will result in cost savings to both individual colleges and the CCC system.

Since this is a pilot, we don't know how it will turn out, but the RP Group hopes this will provide actual data to show changes in different work plan areas for the project.

Pat mentioned that when looking at the metrics for the classes that OEI pilots, it would also be interesting to know if anything that we are doing is affecting other online classes as well.

Ileri noted that some of the metrics may change; this is just the first shot at information that might be useful and/or important. The bottom line is that we want to gather information that will help students be more successful in online courses.

### **Management Team Reports:**

#### Executive Director:

Pat reminded members that the Online Teaching Conference will be happening June 17-19<sup>th</sup> and a call for proposals is out right now; she put in a proposal for OEI to present a panel "Up Close and Personal with OEI" that will probably be accepted. There will be at least one course reviewer on the panel, Steering Committee members who would like to participate should contact Pat. She will also do a general session and will probably focus on working with online students as a system and trying to inspire people to think about ways that the system can help students.

The Management Team will be having a communications discussion as soon as possible, and the website redesign should be underway soon. The design work is happening right now, and development will be happening as soon as they figure out who will be hired to develop it. OEI will probably hire someone to start development right away; otherwise, it will have to wait until June.

The team is working on the report for the legislature which will be shared with the Steering Committee when it is complete.

#### Professional Development:

The Professional Development group along with @ONE had a creative summit in San Diego a couple of weeks ago. There were close to 100 people there, and 40 faculty members had an opportunity to work one-on-one with an instructional designer, a reviewer, or an accessibility specialist to talk about their review.

For faculty members who need support and were not able to attend the summit, @ONE can put them in touch with someone to provide that support, and if there is local support available, it would be even better to be able to use that, which is why the group is working hard to put out information regarding accessibility.

The next round of training will be offered in two parts, in person and online, but a change has been made to increase information to the field. The in person component has been changed to also act as a standalone training for anyone to attend. It will allow staff members to learn how to more effectively help faculty members. The online portion will continue to be only for reviewers, who have to be faculty members.

#### Statewide Program Director:

Steve Klein explained that the team is in the middle of contract negotiations and the conversations are going very well. Canvas's entire team met with OEI's entire team about a week ago, and follow-up meetings are now set up for smaller focus areas: one around implementation details versus technical and tech support, and another around marketing and communication. They are very engaged in what OEI is trying to do and the complexities of the project. There are several things that are being discussed right now, and one of them is providing sandbox space for faculty members to access course shells. Right now, any faculty member can go the Canvas website and ask for a trial. Whatever is created within those course shells will be migrated over when Canvas is deployed. It is not set up yet, but they are beginning to set it up and hope to have that in place next week. They also want to set up a CCC faculty user group for discussion on topics in various areas as well as for sandbox exploration. Canvas has a new user group platform that they will be deploying in April, so our user group should come on at that time. For CCMS committee members who had sandbox environments, those will continue to remain open and when the time comes for those faculty members' campuses to be deployed, they will be able to migrate those over to their campus systems. Steve noted that they are shooting for contract signing at the end of March.

Pat reminded Steve to ask for a course shell for the readiness modules. The Management Team will also be sending out a questionnaire to the DE Coordinators at all of the colleges asking for the terms of their current contract and how much they paid for it. They will also ask about a few other areas that OEI is looking at procurement in. Members are asked to make sure that their DE

Coordinators get that survey and turn it around by Friday so that the Management Team can come up with a deployment plan for the colleges that are ready to come on board.

Pat also emphasized that Canvas should not be contacting campuses directly, and colleges are asked not to contact Canvas. There were two colleges that were contacted by the Canvas sales team, they have been asked not to do that, it undermines the contracting process and defeats the purpose of doing a statewide purchase. There is also a specific choreography for communications and marketing, soon the website will provide a package of testimonials and marketing regarding how colleges can make the decision about whether to upgrade to Canvas.

#### Basic Skills:

Barbara Illowsky reported that it is working well to have faculty involved in basic skills support. They are excited to be embedding the resources in courses. One faculty member at Saddleback is creating a whole series of cartoon videos on grammar: “their vs there vs they’re”; “too vs to vs two”; and “your vs you’re.” OEI is working with him on a Creative Commons license. Faculty members are coming back with great things to share with others. They are hoping to build a strong repository for the website.

#### Chief Academic Affairs Officer:

Jory Hadsell reported that all of the pilot colleges have done their implementation of tutoring including onboarding and initial contact with faculty and are providing resources, mostly with Link Systems. There have been no major technical obstacles in integration with all of the campus systems. There has also been a tremendous amount of interest in the system in purchasing tutoring services for online classes outside of OEI pilots, and it is great to be able to push out the announcement with terms and pricing for tutoring for any course. OEI also purchased a system-wide license funding the same tutoring platform used by Net Tutor for the entire CCC system.

The Management Team is working on logistics for combining the two spring pilots into one larger summer pilot group. The spring pilots included 16 colleges, 42 faculty members, and 49 class sections. Once a course is approved based on course design and the instructor, pilot colleges can offer more than one section of that course if desired, and there were seven courses where that happened in the spring. Based on the maximum capacity for classes, there is a capacity of 1921 students in the spring pilot classes, with an average maximum class size of 39. Actual census data will be gathered later (currently the online readiness pilot has more students with around 700). Even though the CCMS is not yet launched, OEI is already impacting students.

Tutoring start dates were extended with a couple of later start courses at one college that will be starting soon. Barbara explained that they have been working on more direct efforts to clarify expectations with faculty members since some didn’t completely understand ways to implement services into their courses. For example, one faculty member had the tutoring services as a link on her site and on her assignments, while another just put “we have Net Tutoring” on the syllabus. The team is learning from the pilot how to better communicate expectations in the next piloting phase. Pat noted that developing an orientation for faculty on how to use OEI services is an item in the RFA, but it wasn’t possible to do an orientation previously for something that hadn’t been used before.

The Academic Affairs group will start meeting again soon and will be building on their conversations about providing online proctoring services

#### Chief Student Services Officer:

Bonnie Peters explained that online readiness has a similar implementation to that for tutoring with eight pilot colleges. They are also finding it important to communicate with instructors to let them know how to implement the readiness modules into their courses. Some faculty members had good ideas, others needed more guidance. As they move into the next phase modifications are being made and more suggestions are being given. They have already had feedback from students who like the modules reporting, "This is great, I wish I had this when I had online classes before." The assessment component will continue to be available only to the pilots as the project moves into the summer, but the online readiness modules themselves will be made available to any colleges who want to use them.

The Student Services group will also be moving forward with establishing a plan for providing online counseling; both students and faculty recognize the importance of these services.

**Director of Strategic Planning and Operations:**

John Makevich has been working with John Ittelson setting up Google Drive for content curation, storage, and delivery and will let the committee know when that is available. The team is working on assembling all of the data with timelines, deadlines, and history. John Makevich will provide a full presentation on the timeline at the next face-to-face meeting, he will post it a few weeks ahead of that meeting.

In the summer of 2015 the eight full launch colleges will have the opportunity to pilot tutoring and readiness, but do not have to. Some will pilot in the summer and others will not because they will be focusing time and effort on preparing to use the CCMS for fall. All the pilots for full launch colleges for the summer will teach their own students in their own CMS. In the fall, the eight full launch colleges will be using Canvas, and then later the readiness and tutoring pilots will be integrated into the Canvas CMS when possible. All of the courses delivered in the fall will be delivered to the colleges' own students, not within the Exchange. In spring 2016, the Exchange will be piloted and the eight full launch colleges will begin exchanging students amongst themselves.

A member asked if the eight full launch colleges using Canvas in the fall would be able to it for all their online courses, or just the OEI courses. Pat explained that might be possible, and that the negotiation should address that issue.

When dates are available for the website rebuild, and so on, John will post them on Basecamp, and will indicate whether items posted can be shared.

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be an in person meeting in Sacramento on May 8th.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm.

