

## Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday September 18, 2015

Zoom Online Meeting

**Voting Members:** Terry Gleason, Cynthia Alexander, Larry Lambert, Meridith Randall, Kelly Fowler, Christina Gold, Dan Crump, Joe Perret, Greg Beyrer, Morris Rodrigue, Fabiola Torres, and Dave Stephens.

**Non-voting Attendees:** Alyssa Nguyen, Anita Crawley, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Jayme Johnson, John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Michelle Pilati, Pat James, and Steve Klein.

### **Welcome:**

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:33 am and welcomed everyone.

The committee unanimously agreed to move the items related to the RFPs to the end of the agenda to allow those who have not signed the NDA to leave the meeting before that confidential presentation and discussion.

### **Minutes:**

Barbara Illowsky corrected the abbreviation for an organization mentioned in the minutes to WCET. Joe Perret moved to approve the minutes for August 28, 2015 with that modification, and Greg Beyrer seconded the motion. The motion passed almost unanimously, with Cynthia Alexander abstaining since she was not in attendance at that meeting.

### **OEI Update:**

The management team continues to work on the details for the Exchange and met with the Chancellor's Office and Technology Center a week or so ago. The technology has to be worked out for both the home college and the teaching college regarding how students will register for classes. Exchange colleges will have to sign the reciprocity agreement, and those details are still being worked out. Pat will post the draft document on Basecamp for Steering Committee review and comment when it is complete. Part of the process includes looking for definitions of how the Exchange works and what things are called. The meeting with the Chancellor's Office was really productive and it looks like everything that OEI wants to do with the Exchange is legal. That means that we can safely go ahead and put the Consortium together and have the Exchange work the way the project had hoped. The Chancellor's Office really wants the OEI to work, and Pat was impressed with their great support and willingness to help.

Regarding communications, the failed recruitment for a communications person set the team back a bit, and they are working on contracting for someone who will work for OEI but coordinate with Sandoval and help with marketing tools going forward. The team will let the project know when the contractor is in place. The issues with the original recruitment were really more about the job description than anything else. A job description from the college that was for more of a PIO position was used and the team realized that doesn't really fit with what the project needs, so they are starting over and moving forward. The website is really close and looking great, there was a hiatus on work over the summer, but now everyone is back to working on it.

Michelle met with @ONE yesterday at length to take a good look at what services they will provide and how that will happen. Right now they are providing a test offering of the 12 week course to people who will be teaching it; then there will be a full complement of people who can teach it when we offer it.

This afternoon John Makevich and Steve will be attending a meeting of the DE Coordinators, to do some updates and to stress the need to be intentional about carrying the message about OEI and what we are doing back to the colleges.

**OEI Policy Regarding Minimum CMS Use for Exchange Courses and the Use of Proprietary Materials:**

Action

The committee discussed a policy intended to provide guidance related to the issue of concerns about instances where the CMS was being used as a pass through and not being clearly used for course delivery as an integral part of the course. Michelle went back and pulled language from the rubric to pull out the pieces that should be in the CMS and that language is in the policy before the committee today. There is a secondary issue related to the policy on proprietary materials, and Michelle is still working on that, and will present it at the next meeting. The document regarding Minimum CMS Use for Exchange Courses presented today was shared with the Professional Development work group on Basecamp.

Christina asked whether the proprietary materials policy would address issues related to authentication, confidentiality, and FERPA guidelines, and Michelle clarified that it would look at regulation, legislation, accreditation standards, and the rubric, but the mechanism for authentication would probably not be addressed. She is looking at the issues around privacy and FERPA and finding some challenges regarding what kind of statement the project might want to make. Michelle is pulling language from different places and finding that while everyone has ideas about what is right and wrong, it is a balancing act to try to keep from overstepping. She is trying to focus on compliance, but it is challenging not to run afoul with so many different entities.

Greg thought that if grades could be exported from Canvas directly into the SISs on the various campuses, then we could say that every graded item and everything that contributes to the grade needs to be stored in Canvas. That would ease transfer, and the same requirement would help protect us with respect to FERPA, since a gray area regarding FERPA is when exactly grades on assignments become a student record. He also explained that through a long and exhaustive process his campus coordinated the LTI and LMS so that the vendor acknowledges their relationship as agent. Their legal counsel developed a one page contact addendum that vendors are asked to sign which then covers the college regarding educational records. Something similar could be done with integration with Canvas and publishers that have been “blessed” by statewide or OEI counsel. Michelle noted that the committee did not yet have a clear position on those two things. Joe Perret also explained that there are two suppositions in Greg’s idea: first, that it is easy to export grades and second, that perhaps instructors wouldn’t have the ability to directly enter grades into another SIS for a campus that they don’t normally teach at; both of those would need to be looked at closely. Greg explained that when integration is well designed an instructor can go into the publisher’s system and create assignments that will then appear in the gradebook in Canvas, Blackboard, D2L, etc. Michelle emphasized that the project would need to explore what those integrations look like, and if that kind of integration is possible, so that we aren’t in the problem area of the work being out unprotected, and not stored in the CMS. She is pretty confident that the ability to move grades into the SIS is not there yet.

Cynthia felt very strongly that the “Minimum Use of CMS Policy” should address the issue she has come across in reviewing courses where there is no lecture content from the instructor. The instructor is relying so much on the publisher’s materials that it is not the instructor’s course; it is the publisher’s course. An online course should be equivalent to a face-to-face course, or even better. However, she has seen courses that had nothing provided by the instructor; nothing that the instructor said or that the instructor created. The instructor is really just being a moderator for the publisher, the publisher is teaching the course. Michelle explained that she had heard that concern, but that administrators on the committee had previously expressed concern about overstepping bounds regarding what the instructor does in his/her course. Dave Stephens acknowledged that Cynthia’s concern is a prominent one in the DE community; the concern about “canned courses.” Michelle explained that while she personally agreed, the previous sense from the group was to be cautious about overstepping and interfering with faculty rights; if the committee agreed a recommendation could be made without making it a formal part of the policy. Dave felt that the committee would be remiss if it did not at least include in the policy language “strongly recommending” or “strongly encouraging” particular guidelines. He agreed with Meridith that enforcement would be difficult. Greg thought that the issue would be best handled through

peer review and accreditation. He noted that this committee has enough issues to worry about in terms of setting up reciprocity in the Exchange and so on; that should be where efforts are spent.

Pat explained that the goal was to create a set of guidelines on how to use publisher materials, but she also thought it could be done with the cooperation of the Academic Senate because they can back up OEI on it. She thought that encouraging the colleges to have a good policy with respect to regular and effective contact by working on setting up guidelines and also getting the backing of the Senate would be helpful. The Senate could actually write a resolution around it, which would be more effective than anything this committee could do alone.

Michelle will go back to the Professional Development work group to continue work on the document presented today, as well as the companion document regarding the use of proprietary materials. That work will happen in the work group Basecamp and she encouraged comments and input from others outside the PD work group as well. Michelle will also look at getting signoff from the Senate as to whether that is something they want to work with us on.

**Action:**

Michelle and the Professional Development work will continue work on the two companion policy documents regarding Minimum CMS Use for Exchange Courses and the Use of Proprietary Materials, and bring that work back to the Steering Committee at a future meeting.

**Planning Update:**

John Makevich explained that not having a communications director has put the project in the spot of having a number of things that need to be fixed and polished in the area of communications. The management team knows that Sandoval is involved in supporting all of the initiatives and could use some help, so OEI will be bringing on a contractor to bring some polish to the look and feel of the documentation for OEI. The website is almost complete, which should be a very positive change as well. Internally there is a handbook intended for use during the rollout of the tutoring pilots that was worked on by Jory, Barbara, Kevin and others. The plan now is to pull that together with Fabiola's iBook into a handbook that is a static document and will be a useful tool for elements that are unchanging. It will start small and grow as more elements are developed. The website will be the location for elements that are more fluid, including dates and timelines. The old website is a Word Press site set up by the Technology Center at ccconlineed.org. It is primarily a newsfeed and a list of documents. The new website will be organized and arranged to make it more user friendly. The goal is to make it easier for users to find readiness modules, or information on tutoring, and so on; it will have a better organizational structure. The new site will be our public facing website, and the existing one will change to point to the new one sometime in the next couple of weeks.

Dave Stephens had expressed some concern about the number of different documents with a wide variety of looks, some with the Chancellor's Office logo, some without, and so on. The new communications contractor will also work on making sure that there is a common look and feel to the documents that come out of the project. Some of those documents might also be routed to the handbook.

John Makevich explained the new plan for ongoing messaging to the twenty-four pilot colleges. The SPOCs get a lot of email and they are all busy people with varied responsibilities on campus, some are Deans, and some are faculty members teaching multiple courses and participating in a number of committees. As a result, it is easy for messaging to get lost in the river of email they receive. OEI will be shifting to a model of putting out a weekly digest communication to the SPOCs at the pilot colleges once a week, by email, on Friday. The intention is to simplify the messaging to the pilot colleges. Obviously there will still need to be some emails that will only go out to a few people, but the hope is that this will drastically reduce the volume, and that the bulk communication will go out weekly. This should benefit the colleges and SPOCs by providing clear consistent messaging on a predictable basis. It will also provide an opportunity to repeat messaging, to get the message out. It will also help the Steering Committee and the

management team because it will enable the Steering Committee to see the messaging that is going out, perhaps on Basecamp. Joe Perret suggested that the weekly digest go out the local Academic Senate Presidents at the pilot colleges, in addition to the SPOCs. John Makevich agreed to do that and emphasized that the process is not set in stone, he'll start with just the SPOCs and the pilot college Academic Senate Presidents, and then the project can look at whether or not any revisions need to be made. He asked members to keep him informed on how it seems to be going. Michelle suggested that eventually some form of regular communication about the OEI, go out monthly more broadly in the system.

The first Consortium meeting of the twenty-four pilot colleges will happen in October. The timing is perfect, because those twenty-four colleges started out in three pilots: full launch, tutoring, and readiness. Then the tutoring and readiness groups were folded together, and now in the spring semester, all twenty-four will be piloting the same thing. This is a golden opportunity to bring all twenty-four together, on October 21<sup>st</sup>. The Steering Committee chairs have been asked to be there along with two representatives from each college. The management team will carry the Draft Consortium Charter, which was developed by the Steering Committee, to that meeting. Just as the Steering Committee received a draft charter from the launch team, made amendments and voted on it, the same process will happen with the Consortium Charter. If the Steering Committee seeks to make any changes to the Draft Consortium Charter, John Makevich asked that those be made prior to the next OEI SC meeting, so the Charter can be brought forward to the Consortium on October 21<sup>st</sup>, when the Consortium group will be reviewing it to see if they feel any revisions or amendments are needed before they vote on it.

#### **Unifying Public Information:**

Dave Stephens expressed concerns about fragmentation of messaging, documents posted as pdfs on a variety of websites that were not connected, and varying amounts of information that get passed on by SPOCs to others on their campuses. He felt that differing logos and having documents posted in a variety of places would be helped by the new website pulling all the information together in one place. But rather than just having a pdf link to a website, putting information out in a digestible format, in a voice that makes sense to the majority of the constituents that the project is trying to reach is critical. One of his reasons for bringing up this concern had been that stakeholders in the field would bookmark one of these single documents, but not be able to find it when/if it was moved, especially if the site had no redirect capability. Pat explained that the single documents were items that were developed for a specific purpose some student facing and some not, so some would not be appropriate in a public facing website.

Dave applauded the weekly digest idea mentioned by John Makevich, but expressed a bit of concern that some SPOCs only pass along what they think others need to hear, as opposed to sharing everything. He noted that there are many moving parts in this project and perhaps the management team should take not just one step back, but two steps back to think about the ecosystem that OEI is supposed to be developing into, along with CAI and EPI. The project needs to be wary of compartmentalizing and should be communicating with the Chancellor's Office and those other initiatives; a single communications hire will not solve that problem. A long scale look at the scope and vision for the ecosystem and what it will look like online is very important. He reminded committee members of the mistakes made by the California State University system which were related to marketing and the lack of one voice messaging. OEI should not just worry about marketing "our brand" but also be concerned about sharing how OEI will fit into the whole ecosystem that is being delivered. He suggested having Tim Calhoun or Lou DelZompo provide a presentation on the larger ecosystem, and how OEI fits into it. Dave explained that the committee agreed early on that OEI is not trying to be the 114<sup>th</sup> college, we are trying to provide services to schools, and CAI and EPI are also trying to provide services, that messaging should be connected. Dave emphasized that he did not mean that all three initiatives should be one project, they are separate initiatives, with separate projects, and separate budgets, but the audiences are all the same. Critical information should be put out in the Chancellor's Office portal for the rest of the system. He is concerned that the approaches of the initiatives are in separate silos. Dave suggested thinking about providing all of the information and resources

through the more enterprise level software platform that we have access to, which is Canvas. Use that space and create as much that is public facing as possible. Pat explained using Canvas in that way is not an option right now because faculty log-on issues need to be resolved before that would be feasible. Dave suggested that the CCMS webpage that doesn't require a log-in might work; the information isn't private, it is for public consumption. He is worried that colleges are still playing telephone with email, pdfs, and so on; the message gets lost.

Pat also assured the committee that there is a lot of communication with the Chancellor's Office, and heavy involvement with the EPI which is developing the Student Success Portal (SSP) which is the appropriate place for OEI to connect with EPI. Pat agreed that providing links to the OEI website within the Chancellor's Office website should be done. She also explained that the communications contractor would be hired to work with Sandoval so there will be better communication and one point person to get messages to him. The project does not consider itself to be separate from the Chancellor's Office, quite the opposite, but it is completely different from the other two initiatives in its focus on teaching and learning. As a result the marketing and information processing for OEI will be different; EPI and CAI will come off of the portal, while the courses are going to be marketed in the Exchange.

John Makevich emphasized that this is an evolutionary process and there will be more communication with the Chancellor's Office. There will also be more updates on how and where the projects merge down the road. However, our first and foremost goal is to make sure that what we are doing here is communicated as clearly and in as polished a way as possible, while still being mindful of the other initiatives.

Dave acknowledged the hard and challenging work done by all of the management team members.

**RFP Updates:**

Presentation of Academic Integrity RFP:

Action

*A motion was made to approve the draft Academic Integrity RFP. Larry Lambert made the motion, and it was seconded by Cynthia Alexander.*

*The vote was almost unanimous in favor of the motion, Dave Stephens abstained.*

Online Counseling Platform RFP:

Action

*A motion was made to approve the draft Online Counseling Platform RFP. Larry Lambert made the motion, and it was seconded by Greg Beyrer.*

*The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.*

**Other Other:**

Committee members were told that publically they are allowed to say that OEI is in the process of preparing RFPs. There should be no conversations with vendors who might provide these services.

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be on Zoom on October 9<sup>th</sup>.

The next face-to-face meeting will be on November 13<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 am.