

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday May 8, 2015
Embassy Suites
Sacramento California

Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley (online), Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Bruce Racheter, Carol Lashman (online), Christina Gold, Clinton Slaughter, Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Dana Hipchen, Dave Stephens, Delores Davison, Fabiola Torres, Gregory Beyrer, Ileri Valenzuela, Jayme Johnson, Joe Perret, John Freitas, John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Lisa Beach, Lisa Wang, Marie Boyd (online), Meridith Randall, Michael Agostini, Pat James, Ray Sanchez, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Opening and Introductions:

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:30 am and attendance was taken.

Minutes:

There were no corrections or changes to the minutes for the meeting on March 6, 2015. Terry Gleason moved to approve the minutes, Joe Perret seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Executive Director Report:

Pat welcomed Dana Hipchen who will be helping Bruce with processing paperwork for OEI. She also welcomed Alyssa Nguyen who is taking over for Ileri as the RP Group evaluator; Ileri is moving to EPI. The survey regarding tutoring and evaluation is being worked on and will be presented at a future meeting.

The Reciprocity Summit was very successful with about fifty people in attendance from admissions and records, financial aid, and instruction. These traditionally rules bound staff members from our system were asked to think of a time that they thought to themselves, "I wish I didn't have Title 5, so that I could really help this student," and to use that as the basis for the work to be done over the two day summit. Participants were asked to put aside the usual rules and systems and instead to create or recreate the rules that could govern a reciprocal process. Pat praised their willingness to embrace that opportunity to be designers, and the amazing work that was accomplished.

The Online Teaching Conference is coming up in June, and OEI will pay for registration for any Steering Committee members who would like to attend. If you are interested and haven't yet registered, go to onlineteachingconference.org and register. If you have already registered, talk to John Makevich after you attend and he will work out the details for reimbursement. There are also some spots set aside for representatives from the twenty-four pilot colleges.

Steve and Pat have been working on the Canvas contract costs. They recently sat down and went through the budget and looked at the budget carryover and everything is looking promising, they hope to have an announcement after the numbers are independently verified by the financial personnel. Pat also clarified that people are concerned that the money for OEI will stop in three years, but what will be happening in three years is the renewal of Foothill and Butte as the holders of that grant. The money from the legislature is ongoing. Pat strongly suggested that as campus think about coming on board with Canvas, that they pay attention to any money that is saved, to make sure that it is not just lost in the General Fund.

Management Team Reports:

Proctoring Update:

Jory reported that the project is taking a multi-pronged approach to academic integrity. As the project moves closer to the rollout of Canvas and eventually the Exchange we would like to

incorporate online proctoring to ensure academic integrity in our courses. Current methods that come out of accreditation and federal regulations are: secure log in, pass code, or proctored exams, and current standards allow for new standards or practices. There are changes that are potentially on the horizon surrounding student authentication whether from financial aid law or accreditation which may be more stringent. As a result, it becomes even more important to ensure that students enrolled in the class are the same ones that do the work and get credit for the class.

The project will be looking at implementing a couple of options. As we move toward a common CMS we will be looking at identifying a plagiarism detection solution (a lot of Blackboard colleges use SafeAssign, and others have TurnItIn). In addition, the DE Coordinators have been talking about developing an onsite proctoring network across the CCC system. There have been some questions regarding whether colleges can charge to proctor other community college students, and the definitive answer is that we cannot charge; there are some details to it, but that is essentially it. So we are looking to develop a network where we agree to proctor each other's students. In preparing for that colleges are being surveyed to find out: Who is your contact? Do you proctor? Do you proctor online? The idea is to have resources within a reasonable distance of our students so that if they need to take a proctored test, we would have pre-identified proctors for them. In addition, we are looking at online proctoring in the CCMS. Therefore the idea is to have some face-to-face solutions, as well as a solution identified and integrated into the CCMS. As soon as the network agreements are in place, we should be able to start the proctoring network; it is already happening as colleges proctor for neighboring schools, this is just expanding a little beyond that. The proctoring network would be open to all of the colleges in the community college system.

There are conversations happening with several vendors regarding TurnItIn or some other plagiarism detection package, and that would likely be done with either the CCLLeague or the Foundation so that special pricing could be extended to all of the colleges in the CCC system. Jory noted that we do not know yet what that will look like and those conversations are very preliminary at this point.

It is important to have online proctoring services in place, so the team is working out the timeline for an anticipated RFP process for Online Proctoring Services. The intent would be similar to what was done with Online Tutoring, to partner with College Buys so interested colleges outside of OEI would be able to contract for those services at the same price as OEI. At this point they are starting conversations with the Academic Affairs work group regarding academic integrity and what the structure of the RFP group should be; in addition to academic affairs group members, experience will also be needed from learning centers, librarians, and others with hands-on experience with proctoring. This is an important issue, colleges can lose financial aid funding if they are caught up in a fraud investigation. Pat explained that online courses currently handle the proctoring issue a lot of ways, some have students come into campus for exams, or make arrangements for them.

Jory is proposing that the RFP Proctoring task group/sub-committee be formed. At some point the NDA issue will need to be addressed. With the CCMS the entire Steering Committee did the NDA, and for tutoring just the work group did; he is open to the will of the Steering Committee on how that should occur for this RFP. After the task group is formed, they will need to develop the requirements for the Online Proctoring RFP; specifying the services, the service requirements, the technology requirements and any other pieces. After weeks of work, once the RFP is refined it will be launched and advertised to vendors. When the proposals come back they will be evaluated and a recommendation will be made back to the Steering Committee prior to posting the Notice of Intent to Award. After the Notice of Intent, the contract negotiating piece will begin.

The rough timeline at this point includes forming the task group in the next couple of weeks (mid-May to mid-June), writing requirements, publishing out to vendors in early August, and sometime around October he would like to be bringing something back to the Steering Committee (although the calendar may need to be juggled a bit because the next in person Steering Committee

meeting would be in November), ideally Jory would like to have a contract in November to have time to work on integration issues and do some professional development work.

Online courses are not currently required to have proctored tests, but as part of OEI as a quality issue, we want to include proctoring as a component offered to colleges. A lot of colleges just haven't had access to proctoring and this would remove an obstacle. Pat noted that currently teachers in online courses are encouraged to do multiple measures assessment pieces and to be very present in their courses so they can more effectively find those people who aren't in the class. In all of the cases where fraud has been discovered, it was faculty who noticed patterns that led to that discovery. Pat also explained that there is no definition of a hybrid course in the regulations, it might be useful to develop a definition, but it would at least be useful to let students know when they'll need to come to campus. The online proctoring will be a service that all colleges will be able to buy into if they choose. Barbara explained that in some courses the articulation agreements require on campus proctored exams, so it is not always up to the faculty member. In mathematics for example, statistics will not transfer to UCs unless 50% of the points are completed in person. The other 50% can be other multiple measures for labs, homework, discussion, etc.

Greg thought that this RFP process could be a great opportunity for colleges that aren't yet aware of how awesome the OEI is going to be to be involved. Would it be possible to bring in that expertise that is not yet connected to OEI? Jory thought that expertise should first come from the Steering Committee, but also noted that the committee should be heavily weighted to faculty since academic integrity is an important issue for them. If anyone is interested in serving, please talk to Jory.

Jory has been gathering a list of companies with interesting solutions for authentication that may be included depending upon how we define the scope of the RFP. There are a lot of service providers and a lot of innovation going on, the technology is changing quickly. There are interesting approaches from key stroke analytics to gesture based things at log in, challenge based questions and so on. Steve noted that Federated Identity authentication was direction that came from the Chancellor's Office, so any changes might be beyond the project level of decision making. Jory also noted that they have been talking to the CSUs who are also looking at academic integrity, so there might be a possibility for alignment and synergy there.

Action: Joe Perret moved to create the Academic Integrity Work Group, Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Professional Development Update:

Pat provided the update since Michelle is representing OEI at TTAC today. Michelle wanted the committee to know that the Course Design Rubric trainings have been well attended. There were approximately forty in attendance at the two that have already happened at Foothill and Cerritos. Those one day sessions served as an introduction to OEI as well as to learning about the Course Design Rubric. The next session will be May 15th at Mt. San Antonio, and then another will be at the Online Teaching Conference (that one is already filled). Faculty attendees who want to be reviewers and receive the necessary recommendations from their local Senate and the statewide Senate can apply to participate in the course reviewer training which is one week online. That online training component will be June 1 through 12. Afterward, those reviewers will review courses in the next review cycle.

Twenty courses that are being reviewed using the rubric are almost complete, and then the reviewers will catch up on others that are in process. @ONE has revamped the Introduction to Online Teaching Course to be inclusive of the information from all five courses. That course should be available in July and will have modular components. @ONE is working on supporting faculty in various ways; there is a site being developed by @ONE for connecting our instructional designers

with faculty. A step by step process for applying to have a course reviewed with all the information needed by faculty should be available pretty soon.

The accessibility webinars with Jayme Johnson were well attended; in excess of 200 signed up and about 100 attended the webinars. Those webinars have been archived and can be used as training materials with your college going forward. There has been lots of interest at TTAC in supporting local accessibility efforts.

The management team is visiting colleges, and Anita and Barbara are going out to help with an implementation meeting at Fresno next Friday, and Cabrillo and NPC during their faculty flex days in August. There are other colleges who are in the midst of confirming their dates. Pat is going to San Jose, Mission, Evergreen, and Santa Barbara in the near future. The Management Team will put those visits on the Steering Committee calendar so that members know when and where they will be. The project is getting a lot of interest and the team is trying to get to as many colleges as they can.

Reports on Student Readiness and Tutoring Pilots:

Bonnie explained that the team has been working with Anita and Barbara in working with faculty to effectively incorporate tutoring and online readiness components into systems and their courses. Faculty members are interested in utilizing the modules in their classes and creating assignments around them. The readiness modules are being reviewed for accessibility and being made compliant with the full standards of accessibility for the fall. They hope to make the modules (but not the diagnostic piece) available to all 112 colleges when the accessibility upgrades are completed. The diagnostic component will be included with readiness modules and tutoring as the Quest for Success program that will be extended to all 24 pilot schools in the fall. Unfortunately, since the accessibility review and upgrade is occurring this summer, the readiness modules will not be included in the summer pilot.

Jory noted that the implementation work with the eight tutoring pilots in the spring involved a lot of work to overcome technical issues with eight different CMSs, and they learned a lot. Ireri did a pre-tutoring survey, and there will be a post tutoring survey as well. Reports on both the tutoring and readiness pilots will be shared as soon as they are available including what students' experiences were and if they saw them as valuable.

They are preparing to roll out the summer pilot, which will include tutoring and embedded Basic Skills (but not readiness), for a mash up of fifteen colleges from all three groups: Butte, Cabrillo, College of the Canyons, Columbia College, Fresno, Hartnell, Imperial Valley, Pierce, MiraCosta, Monterey, Mt SAC, Saddleback, Shasta, Ventura, and Victor Valley. These colleges cover the state for what will really be an expanded pilot. The team anticipates using this short summer pilot to overcome a lot of the technical issues that were experienced in the spring. One of the challenges they had in the spring was the late deployment because of when the contract was signed, so the team was playing catch-up throughout January and early February. Technical issues with implementing the tutoring had to do with things like mapping course IDs. Some of the colleges hosted by Blackboard didn't realize that the course ID they see on their side, is not the real course ID inside the master system so there were some broken links that impacted utilization. The biggest challenge for the tutoring pilot, and it holds true for students on campus too, is getting students to recognize the value of the services and to use them. Barbara and Anita will be helping with outreach to faculty and doing hand-on preparation and QA checks to make sure that everything works. The project team is very close to having all the implementation calls and the initial integrations done. The WorldWideWhiteboard is being offered to all 112 colleges for free as part of OEI's contract with Link-Systems and there has been a lot of interest. Link-Systems will be providing a report on the number of colleges that are using or plan to use that product. NetTutor is also being made available to the system at the OEI negotiated rate. Finally, OEI is working in an

innovative development partnership with Link-Systems managing the development of some features that were desired in the RFP that weren't quite there yet, such as the ability for students to form study groups without a tutor, and to launch automated surveys.

Pat expressed enthusiasm about how the results of the pilots are really helping the project to figure things out and make adjustments and corrections for the course design rubric, readiness tools, and tutoring. It is wonderful to be able to make the refinements that we knew would be needed. Jory also explained that a handbook has been put together and is on the OEI website, it includes a description of the pilot and the participating colleges. It also provides a lot of information that colleges need for the onboarding process. Barbara pulled together information on tutoring and basic skills, and posted it on Basecamp, she is asking members to assist by providing feedback especially in areas that need to be corrected or improved. They want to keep adding to it and making it more practical. Basic skills can be used by anyone whether or not in OEI, and the tutoring components can be used by anyone contracting with NetTutor.

Google Apps Update:

The Management Team is participating in a Google Apps implementation. The key benefit is to have a singular place to work from; with Management Team members from Foothill, Butte, and others who are contractors it has been challenging to keep everyone together on different accounts and calendars. They will have a workshop next week to get everyone on board. Lou Delzompo is letting the team tie onto a pilot of Google Apps for the Technology Center. The Management Team hopes to pilot, learn from it, and figure out how to use it to work effectively. Eventually, it may be a tool to carry down to the Steering Committee, however, for now, Basecamp will still be the main tool for the Steering Committee. Email addresses for the Management Team will be changing to "ccconlineed.org" over varying lengths of time depending upon the comfort level of the team members, but they will be set up to forward, so the old email addresses will still work and messages will get to them.

Reciprocity Summit Report:

On April 22-23 there was a summit for pilot colleges to start talking about reciprocity agreements. Pilot schools' "Single Points of Contact" were asked to bring a team of five including: A&R, CSSOs, and CIOs. The representation also included enrollment management from the instructional point of view. Those people would be the experts in the room for the discussions about getting the Exchange started. The Management Team has been talking about this for a while and had its own ideas about what would be needed, and it seemed overwhelming.

Pat set the scene and asked participants to think about this with an open mind and to bring creative ideas. By doing so everyone was able to think about what they would like to see not just limited to their college, but on a broader level. The result was that the team was able to walk away with 90% of the information needed for an agreement. The agreements are not signed, and there is still a lot of work to be done, but colleges were saying, "I think that we can do this for the Exchange." Participants came up with ideas and connected the dots regarding the agreements and guidelines that might work, and possible ways to work around state laws. This is a pilot and the agreements that are being developed would be piloted by the eight full launch colleges. The Exchange will be rolled out in phases and at each phase there will be an opportunity to come to agreement on the growing and evolving process.

The participants looked at about twelve different broad areas from application to registration to what would happen when a student completed courses in the Exchange. Some of the areas were: use of C-IDs and course numbers related to prerequisites (the minimum prior to registration), residency issues, state residency, matriculation, SSSP, financial aid, and transcripts. They discussed what would happen as the student goes through the process, what needs to be addressed, what are the steps, what are the rules, what are the guidelines, and what does each college do differently? The

twelve topics were put on the table and each mixed expertise participant group (not all A&R together, for example) was asked to focus on one particular topic. They had a brainstorming session so that everyone could think about and hear all of the issues and the Chancellor's Office weighed in on rules and guidelines. At the end of the day the focus was narrowed, and the second day it was narrowed further, and the room gave feedback. At the end of the second day they were able to articulate the agreements that were being proposed. They could say, "We agree to this about priority registration," and so on. Then the Management team was able to look everything over and find where there are gaps that will need to be filled.

Pat explained that the next steps are to flesh out the details in what agreements were made, and put together a document to get out to people. Then the pilot colleges can give feedback and once those agreements are solid, they will go to the developers at the Butte Technology Center who work with Ellucian and CCCApply to implement the processes. Pat notes that there will be places where some restrictions may be needed in the pilot, and she is skeptical about the ability to find a smooth way to handle financial aid because there are so many federal issues; that may not be ready by spring, but she thinks everything else can be. If this can be done for the pilot, it can be widened out to the other schools coming into the Exchange and they can keep working on it as they come in. They do know that the home college will be verifying the matriculation piece, so the developers can start working on putting together some use case scenarios. The process will involve working from both sides, rather than in a linear way, to complete this.

John Freitas noted that it was an interesting two days, and he emphasized the importance of how the representatives from the pilot colleges interact and take this back to their campuses especially with financial aid and prerequisites. He is concerned that colleges can have higher level prerequisites, and he is not sure how those curriculum committee and Senate level issues will be addressed. Those are serious issues that need discussion, and might be complicated by multi-college districts and the addition of district level agreements. Assessments, cut scores and other local issues will also need to be worked out and reciprocated as well. This will really require CIOs at the pilot colleges to facilitate those important conversations.

Fabiola thought that it was a great opportunity as a Steering Committee member to see how the different components of an institution are important to ensure student success and how experts in those areas communicate with one another to contribute to that success. She was very impressed that the pilot colleges were getting into it, pulling their sleeves up, and getting dirty; they are doing the real work. They need to form the unambiguous language that the developers can use to create code. Those conversations are so important, and we as a Steering Committee need to ensure that the pilots can do that work and that the next phase gets better.

Clinton felt that the summit was a huge success, but noted there is still a need to address some DSPS service issues. Is it the home campus or the teaching campus that provides closed captioning, or putting into Braille, and so on?

Members thanked Carol for the extensive great notes taken at the summit. The team is working on pulling those together, streamlining them into a storyboard like document in terms of a pathway, and filling in the gaps. They will share that streamlined document with a smaller group of representatives from the campuses to get their feedback, then will very quickly share that with everyone who was at the summit. Once that is complete, they will go at it again to streamline it even further. Pat noted that because these are largely agreements about things that colleges already do and how they can approve each other's agreements, there is not much policy decision there for the Steering Committee to approve, it is more of a technical component. An exception to that is the issue of prerequisites which is more of a policy decision. All of the agreements will come back to the Steering Committee to review, know about, and make recommendations on, but the policy issues in particular have to come back, and those are starting to become clear. Other issues

will have to be mitigated by the Chancellor's Office, for example on the residency piece, if there is an audit, who gets audited, and whether the Chancellor's Office can help with that so that no one falls prey to someone else's audit.

Meridith suggested that Pat come to the CIO representatives meeting on May 20th at the Chancellor's Office to talk about some of the big issues. Pat agreed and noted that one of the big issues is how the courses are going to be revealed to students in an individual college's schedule, and what restrictions there are going to be on when the course is open to the students; for example, whether there will be controls so that students can't enroll in Exchange course sections before their local sections are filled, and how many courses a student should be able to take per semester. We do know that we want students to register for the Exchange courses through their home college, not from outside; the agreements are between the colleges, and students can't just come from anywhere in the state and enroll in the courses, they have to be within the college's registration system.

Bonnie will send out the complete long set of non-streamlined notes for members to look at, but she asked that they only make comments and suggestions on the streamlined storyboard notes, because the unedited notes are lengthy with items that were condensed and clarified in the streamlined storyboard.

Canvas Update:

Steve Klein provided an update on the contracting process with Canvas on all fronts. This has been an extensive and involved effort and he especially thanked John Sills, and Amy Carbonaro for all of their extraordinary work and support in the management of activities, he also thanked Bruce and Dana for their front office support.

The letter of Intent to Award was released on February 12th and since then there have been ongoing contracting conversations, on which finalization is now near. There were three areas of focus in contracting: pricing, implementation for pilots and beyond, and communication and marketing. The pricing framework was established early on and looks favorable for our colleges. The Butte Board of Trustees approved the contract amount on April 22nd. The details of pricing and other elements of the contract are not public information yet because the complete contract has not been signed and approved. The team is nearing completion, but is not there yet, so those details are still closed due to the rules of the RFP/Contracting process. It is a good sign that the end of contracting is near, because the lawyers are involved in checking the details.

The Canvas team has shown themselves to be willing and eager partners in supporting the success of the initiative. They have been willing to try to understand our project and we have been willing to understand the fact that they are a business; a vendor offering a product. Moving on to the implementation piece, the team has been working on multiple fronts to deploy an instance of Canvas at each of the 8 full launch pilot colleges. They have been dealing with issues of authentication, helping the instance be established at each campus, and allowing admins to create accounts. The process is moving forward; SIS migrations are occurring, course migrations are occurring, and local branding is happening as well. We will offer a script for a footer that will acknowledge the Chancellor's Office logo, and the local branding will occur in the header.

The next step is support set up and trainings. The team is working with campuses' individual Tier 1 support centers, Canvas currently works with ZenDesk ticketing, but they are transitioning to another ticketing system. They are doing trainings in areas of implementation; there has been one administrator training and three faculty trainings just for the pilots to get the three course offerings and faculty for those courses set up. (There will be an equal number of trainings when other courses and faculty come onto Canvas later.)

Finally will be the important areas of communications and marketing. We are not only working with and supporting eight pilot colleges; we also need to put in place a process to communicate out to the remaining 104 colleges in the system. One of the first steps with Canvas involved collaboration on an outgoing message so that community colleges that tried to contact Canvas would have an understanding of the roles that OEI and Canvas have, instead of just the standard Canvas marketing message. The integrated and thoughtful message now provides a single consistent explanation that OEI is working to support the provision of Canvas on community college campuses.

CMS consideration resources are being provided to support campus conversations around whether or not to consider moving to another LMS, which is no small task. Some resources were provided by Canvas, others were scraped from what is available in the system. Access to the resources is in a Canvas shell. Every attempt has been made to be intentional and not to just provide a static page of resources, but instead to give familiarity and context when looking for resources about Canvas. That resource page can be accessed from the project website at CCOnlineed.org. The resources include everything that can be disclosed about the CCMS selection process (since we are still in the non-disclosure time of the RFP process), prior to that how the system was engaged in the development of the RFP, the basis for selection, the selection process page, and the fact that the support for the decision was overwhelming; it was a nearly unanimous decision, and the student decision was unanimous in support of Canvas. The resources page also includes the timeline for selection, information about Canvas, and case studies from San Jose State's story, along with other testimonials. Canvas also worked with the Management Team to produce a promotional video that Steve played for the committee. That video will be a great resource for the system after Canvas gets releases from two students who appeared in it, and after it is captioned. Members thought that the video was really well done, but that it should include the 112 college scope of the project, and future videos should show the diversity of students, faculty, and leaders.

Canvas is also sharing contact sheets with the Management Team. Since many colleges are contacting Canvas for demos, the team gets information on a weekly basis on contacts they have with CCC campuses and the level of those conversations. Those will help to inform the rollout. Canvas also has a large online community around matters of help, technical matters, professional development, best practices, effective teaching and so on. They are setting up a new version of their community and there will be a CCC space within that community. @ONE is involved in discussions with Canvas also since they will be playing a significant role in professional development and instructional designers at @ONE will be helping people migrate their courses. This week the project will be talking to Canvas' accessibility folks to clarify the accessibility components.

Work is also happening around authentication and single sign-on. Additionally, there are discussions with data engineers to figure out the data analytics piece; we know their API is available to pull use data. There are also bigger visions and dreams about the integration of data sets across the initiatives, to better inform faculty and campuses on areas of support for their students academically and socially. There is a desire for better on-time support based on the data we collect. This week the Technology Center hired on a data engineer to work on those efforts.

Work is also happening on an Etudes migration tool, which is a big thing for Etudes colleges because it is a customized system. Currently it is not an easy extract, but they are trying to develop a migration tool for those colleges. Canvas already has migration tools for the other course management systems in the community college system. John Makevich is taking a key role in talking to colleges about what kind of support they need now to make sure that the rollout will be successful. A survey has been sent out to get an idea of when colleges might be interested in transitioning to Canvas.

Steve explained that the plan for colleges making the transition is over approximately a 15 month window: to set up an instance of Canvas for a 90 day implementation of their product in parallel with the existing LMS, then they anticipate that a campus would use the next semester or two to transition, bringing courses into the LMS, training, and so on. That would allow about a year for the transition and then the college could phase out the existing LMS. Canvas will provide those services; they know how to do that kind of parallel integration and transition.

The Management Team will be running the numbers by the CBO at Foothill and the accountant to confirm how much money the project has to confirm that the plans they have developed will work. There is a number that they think they can handle, but they still need to verify it. After the contract is signed (they believe in the next two weeks or so) they will be able to share all of that information with the Steering Committee.

The pilot college needs will be met first, but after that no matter when a college comes on in the next five years, the intent is for OEI's coverage of the cost and resources that the college will receive to be the same. Colleges should come on in the manner that their contracts and the nature of the process at their campus make most logical. @One is ramping up for professional development support, and Canvas is always available to support all of these fronts. The implementation timeline is based on what they think is a reasonable amount of time for the transition, colleges can spend six months in transition instead of one year, but the project is planning for three months of implementation and one year of transition time.

The project will be surveying colleges to find out about when their contracts will be ending, and when they would like to implement Canvas so that the team can coordinate support services. OEI will not take resources away from the pilot colleges, because they are the first priority, but they would like to be able to schedule and coordinate timelines so that the project can provide resources and support to the other colleges. The project will not tell a college that they cannot do something, but there are times when the project will be able to deliver more resources and assistance with the migration; that is what they are trying to coordinate so that they can provide the best support across the system with migration and implementation. If colleges have the resources and want to do their implementation and transition sooner they can, but there is no reason for a college to quickly push to try to be first onboard; instead they should have the thoughtful conversations about whether or not they want to make the transition. Colleges that already have Canvas will be able to come over to the OEI pricing on their anniversary date, they will not have to wait to come in when their contract renews; five colleges will come under the contract right away.

Coastline and Shasta are among the few colleges to already have had the campus conversations about whether or not they want to make a transition. Those conversations should be starting now, because the project team will ask who has been involved. The project is highly recommending that the Academic Senate be in a leadership role in that decision making, because that is what will make it successful. The decision should not be based on cost, it should be based on whether the faculty wants to come on board; otherwise, it will not be successful.

Steve noted that the original scale model was based on gradual implementation increasing to high implementation over five years. The team now knows that the implementation will probably proceed more quickly than that, with the highest number of colleges coming on in the first three years (probably up to about 80%) and the project is ready for that. The only time period that resources are tightly stretched is the first six months when pilots are coming on.

CCMS Work Group Update:

Joe Perret reported that the CCMS work group was a great group of people who were willing to work hard, he is proposing that group be turned into a guidance group to help with: configuration, add ins, documentation, and support. They will be meeting for the first time May 21st. Steve

explained that Canvas is looking to California for a voice of prioritizing features and product development for their roadmap, and this work group from the Steering Committee and pilot colleges would be a good group to prioritize desirable functions and to provide feedback to Canvas.

Suggested steps document

“How to have a conversation about changing to Canvas”:

Action

The committee reviewed a document and infographic related to suggested steps for colleges to take when looking at engaging stakeholders in the decision making process related to a possible change to Canvas and the time factor for mitigating the transition. Each college has its own governance process, but regardless, it is important for faculty to play a central role in that decision making process because it is their purview and affects their ability to teach classes.

The document originated with suggestions based on Pat’s experiences. She noted that DSPS should be added to the list of stakeholders. There were many elements listed that might be important to different groups, but ease of use would be an important consideration for most of the groups. Faculty would also be concerned about functionality among other things. Administrators would be more concerned about effective usage across courses, compliance issues, cost, and whether or not faculty were happy with it and could use it effectively.

Each college would need to bring in their own governance process, but as a Steering Committee it is strongly suggest that there be a college-wide conversation with the local Academic Senate in a key role in those conversations. The suggestions were intended to help provide guidance, especially for colleges that have not done this before. John Freitas asked for a change in the suggestions regarding who starts the conversation and how that is engaged. The infographic focused on the steps: lead, meet, review, and engage.

Chris suggested including local unions in the list of participants, but Pat preferred that local campus culture and governance determine whether and how the union would be involved. These suggestions are targeted to teaching and learning, it is up to the local culture of the college to determine other involvement.

Members suggested that the link to the Academic Senate position paper be included, because it is important that the Senate has taken that position, and the wording should specify that the Steering Committee asserts the importance of faculty input and involvement in the decision. A suggestion was made to clarify the wording in the first paragraph so that it was clear that faculty was also committed to ease of use.

Terry noted that Fullerton college courses could not be put on any CMS that you want because of FERPA issues when a course is put on an “outside LMS.” Pat noted that issue was addressed on another page; she will put it here as well. She also agreed with rewording the first paragraph to assert the role of faculty as the primary voice. In the original wording she was trying to note that students should also have a say in the process, and in our CMS selection process students were invaluable in making that choice. She will clarify the wording and add asterisks where other college interests may intersect depending upon local culture and governance.

Action: Joe Perret moved adoption of the document containing OEI’s advice to the field on engaging CMS discussions locally with suggested edits. Cynthia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Once the edits are made the document will be posted on the resources site to be shared with the system.

OEI Planning Overview:

John Makevich and Michael Agostini provided an overview of OEI planning so that members could give input or suggestions for changes, then it will be posted on Basecamp. The current plan represents a planning snapshot, because the project continues to change by necessity as we move forward. They provided a high level overview of fifteen different areas of the project, not an exhaustive list, but one that represents key areas of project parts and programs. Planning will fall into three phases: collecting data including developing timelines and Gant charts, aggregating the data into a project management tool called Teamwork, and developing sustainability plans that integrate the original work plan, active planning of details and projects, and the intersection of evaluation and planning with the sustainability plans for building, evaluating, and testing. In order to sustain the project we need to look at the kinds of resources that are needed in terms of time and finances.

The original grant was awarded fall 2013 and OEI formation occurred. In the middle of summer 2014 key aspects of the program were planned out. Design testing and piloting began in 2015 and we are moving into full deployment in 2016. There will also be a mixture of planning, deployment, and piloting of other project elements that will be occurring throughout 2016. On the timeline, elements in green will be continuing on in the future and planning for sustainability as we move from building to testing and evaluation will need to occur so that we can determine what it takes to manage this in the long run while adding new elements to it.

Some of the timeline element reviewed were: OEI formation, CCMS implementation timeline, Exchange timeline, tutoring services, tutoring integrated into Canvas, proctoring, course selection process, library services implementation, Credit by Exam planning, online readiness, online counseling, Early Alert, student equity support services, Basic Skills, professional development, and accessibility.

The next step is for the timeline data to be uploaded into Teamwork, the new project management tool and John Makevich and Michael will work on sustainability components that happen on regular cycles. For example, in professional development there will be certain things that will need to happen every semester.

Action Item:

Pat and John Makevich will edit and refine the first slide from today's presentation so that it is accurate and can be used as a quick summary of the scope of OEI.

Library Component:

Over the summer the project will be working on adding a library piece to the project. Recently Pat met with some representatives of the Council of Chief Librarians to discuss possibilities. The focus will probably be on coordinating existing services, because there is a lot of work being done, but it is being done in silos. The goal would be to partner with CCL to coordinate statewide organizations to coordinate services. Essentially, OEI will be part of a conversation about resources that might be shared. Dan explained that there are statewide purchases and consortia for purchasing ebooks and electronic databases and we are looking at incorporating those types of aspects, along with perhaps electronic reference chat.

Basic Skills:

Ray suggested changing the wording from "Basic skills" to "foundational skills and study skills" or something else. Pat explained that the project is tied to that wording due to the language in the RFA. Barbara noted that a clarifying sentence can be added if needed. The kinds of skills that are needed include: how to attach a file, embedded help on developmental skills in math, English, and ESL for C-ID courses, active reading skills, and finding and appropriately using references. Much of the work that is being done is in the area of academic support for transfer level courses where students still need some review.

Recap:

Defining relationship between Steering Committee, Consortium and Management Team

At the last meeting, members worked on developing diagrams and descriptions of the relationship and roles of the Steering Committee, Consortium, and Management Team. John Makevich took that input and consolidated it into the summary for today. The Steering Committee and Consortium operate independently and each group interfaces with the Management Team directly. There should be some overlap in membership between the Steering Committee and the Consortium, and that is very beneficial, but otherwise the two groups do not usually interact directly. The Management Team operates as a vehicle working between those two entities. Most groups proposed a triangular structure but that didn't include the Chancellor's Office, so John included a view that has been used before as the simplest, cleanest version that represents the overlap. The Steering Committee is the advisory body providing guidance on policy, the Consortium is a formal group of operational stakeholders from colleges. Both groups interface with the Management Team. Additionally, there may also be Consortium issues that affect the Steering Committee. The OEI Management Team is responsible to and accountable to districts, the Chancellor's Office, and the legislature in a variety of ways. Pat emphasized how helpful it was to have Steering Committee members participating in Consortium activities like the Reciprocity Summit; it was a great asset to have the chairs there.

When work in OEI needs to be accomplished, it can happen in several ways:

- The Management Team might begin work or contract with outside entities
- The Management Team might ask the Steering Committee to form a work group for a specific task, especially related to policy
- The Steering Committee might decide on its own to start a work group to develop policy
- The Management Team could come forward with a recommended draft policy for the Steering Committee to review
- Policies and recommendations approved by the Steering Committee are given to the Management Team for implementation (the MT agrees to hold in highest consideration the recommendations, but might have to act in contrast if there was a serious threat to the project)
- There is an excellent relationship between the Management Team and the Steering Committee, and draft policies are a joint effort wherever possible from collaborative interaction

When there has been a need to make a change outside of the meeting structure, the Management Team whenever possible consults with the chairs of the Steering Committee so that they know and can get the message out if needed. Additionally, the chairs are frequently invited to Management Team meetings.

An area that the project might improve on is tying the Steering Committee more directly into input in the annual program review process. The Charter is technically a one year charter, so we are at the time frame that amendments could be made if desired. Members felt that it would be a good idea to formalize interfacing with the Consortium through joint membership, having Steering Committee members at Consortium meetings, and Consortium members at Steering Committee meetings. That will help connect the bridge between the two groups.

Fabiola reminded members that they can ask the Management Team for things that represent their constituencies; it is an appropriate thing for the Steering Committee to do. John Freitas suggested summarizing the presentation into a document of operating principles.

Creation of Accessibility Work Group:

Action

Jayne asked the Steering Committee to codify and formalize an Accessibility work group. The idea is to ensure that the ability to benefit from online education is available to all of the OEI Exchange

students. Its purpose is to promote the best practices and resources for accessible online education throughout our system, provide leadership in that regard, and provide a means of participatory governance to represent the needs of the community. A lot of the accessibility specialists are classified staff and often they are not free to participate. The formation of this work group will make it an official shared governance venue that will make it easier for Jayme to get approval from supervisors across the state for classified staff participation. He is hoping to invite classified staff and faculty from the Academic Senate. It will be important to get the breadth of the DSPS community more actively involved: DSPS faculty, counseling, directors, LD specialists, alternate media specialists, assistive technology specialists, and interested parties from the Steering Committee. The group will develop a master accessibility plan for OEI and through that process will probably identify many other projects.

Action: Joe Perret moved to create the Accessibility work group. Greg Beyrer seconded the motion. The motion to create the Accessibility work group passed unanimously.

Why SC members aren't attending meetings:

Fabiola led a discussion about why some members are not attending meetings, and ways to encourage attendance and participation. The chairs do their best to get out information regarding the agenda so that members are aware of issues that are especially important to them. It can be difficult to do that because planning can be fairly fluid from one week to the next, but they will do their best to get that information out even earlier. This committee is part of an historic event that is happening for the state of California, so perhaps members need to be reminded of the excitement that existed at the first meeting when there weren't enough chairs for everyone in attendance!

It can be difficult to participate in breakout sessions if a member is participating online, so if the chairs know that there will be a breakout session, they will try to put that on the agenda earlier. The team would like to encourage people to attend the meetings face to face whenever possible and will do their part to keep the meetings exciting. John Freitas emphasized that now that a calendar for the year has been established with quarterly face to face meetings with monthly meetings in between online, hopefully that will help members to reengage and have more involvement and information exchange. Several members noted that they didn't need meetings to be particularly exciting, but appreciated having ones that are meaty like today's, with opportunity to provide input and have discussions. Relationships are fostered by in person meetings, and they are helpful opportunities to "clear the air."

Ray suggested keeping an eye on who is attending, and to report back to appointing organizations if a new representative might be needed. Terry suggested that the process of finding a replacement member be formalized if a Steering Committee member finds that it isn't working for them. John Freitas clarified that members should notify the leadership body of the constituent group so that they can appoint a new member; he agreed it would be good to add that to the operating principles for the Steering Committee so that the process is clear. The Management Team will go through the attendance and contact those affected organizations about finding replacement members. They will also work on getting information into the operating principles document about workload expectations.

Pat noted the importance of the attendance and contributions of Steering Committee members at the Reciprocity Summit and the Online Teaching Conference to be able to "chime in" when appropriate on discussions about what is being done with OEI.

Communication: Basecamp:

There has been some confusion/concern about when it is appropriate to disseminate Steering Committee documents and information from Basecamp with constituent groups. Some members thought that documents on Basecamp were considered internal unless otherwise noted, and others

thought that it was okay to share documents unless they were marked as not being for the public. Steve reminded members that agendas, minutes, and any related public artifacts as appropriate that were presented at the meeting are posted to the website once those minutes are approved, and at that point they are available for public consumption.

Steering Committee members will at times want and need to share draft documents with their constituent groups to get feedback and input from those groups, however, it is very important that when draft documents are shared that some discretion is used and it is made very clear that those are “draft documents for internal use only” that have not been approved or finalized. As items are posted on Basecamp they should be tagged as items that are “to be shared,” or “draft for input,” or “draft for internal use.” If something is not tagged, please check with the author of the document, so that there are no misunderstandings. Barbara explained that she considers draft items in Basecamp to be in a safe place for review and revision, and cautioned that those documents are not ADA compliant. She suggested that the default for documents that are not tagged will be “don’t share.” John Freitas suggested that issue be laid out in the Operating Principles for clarity.

Steering Committee Meeting Calendar:

At the March meeting the committee decided that in person meetings for the coming year will occur the second Friday in August, November, March, and May, with online meetings monthly in between those quarterly meetings on the second Friday of the month. That decision was moved, seconded, and approved. The next two meetings, June 12, and July 10, will be occurring online. However, there is a potential issue with the August 14th in person meeting; John Freitas and Fabiola will both be gone and therefore unavailable to run the meeting. Members discussed conflicts with DE Coordinators meetings on the third Friday, the possibility of skipping the August meeting, the possibility of moving the in-person meeting to September, the possibility of holding the meeting another day of the week since it will be during the summer and there shouldn’t be any class conflicts, the possibility of waiting to see if there will be a need for the August meeting, and changing the date to another Friday in August.

Bonnie asked that if there were no in person meeting during the summer, that members pay close attention to what is posted in Basecamp, because she will be looking for feedback on revisions being made to the readiness modules during the summer. John Freitas asked if there were concerns about the in person meeting schedule as it related to the Proctoring RFP timeline, but Jory felt there was enough flexibility to make it work with the meetings that are currently scheduled. Several members felt that the summer in person meeting would be important for getting updates on the progress of the summer pilots and the transition into the fall.

Action: Meridith moved that the August meeting occur on either August 21 or 28th. The motion was seconded by a Cynthia. The motion carried. Since the DE Coordinator’s Meeting is on August 21st, the OEI meeting will be held on August 28th. That in person meeting is scheduled to take place in southern California.

Amy Carbonaro reported that there is a \$2000 difference in cost between meeting in Orange County (\$11,000) and San Diego (\$13,000). (She believes that the cost for Sacramento meetings is \$9,500.) The Management Team will look at the best use of project funds with respect to meeting locations.

Wrap Up/Action Items:

Bonnie mentioned the need for more student services representation on the Steering Committee. There were representatives to the Steering Committee from student services, but they have either dropped off of the committee, or are not attending very regularly. There are nine Academic Senate appointees in various specialty areas. There was a counselor who just dropped off, and there was one who attended previously, but did not participate. Recently an articulation officer dropped off as

well. Ray also felt that upcoming conversations related to the Reciprocity Agreements should have input and participation from student services representatives. Pat agreed, but also reminded members that the Exchange is only one element of the pilot. Members agreed that it is important for appointees to understand the commitment they are making and what is expected of them when they agree to be on the Steering Committee.

John Freitas will continue working with John Makevich on the Operating Principles Document and any suggested changes or revisions to the OEI Charter as well.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be online on Zoom on June 12th at 9:00 am.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.