

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday February 9, 2018
Zoom Online Meeting

Voting Members: Adriana Martinez, Andreea Serban, Bradley Hughes, Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Dave Stephens, Geoffrey Dyer, Jodie Steeley, Juan Camacho, Kathie Welch, Lisa Beach, Marilyn Harvey, Tabitha Villalba, Thomas Greene, and Wendy Bass

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Andrea Hanstein, Anita Crawley, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Jake Kevari, Jayme Johnson, Jessica Hurtado, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Justin Schultz, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Naomi Caietti, and Steve Klein

Welcome and Attendance:

Cheryl Aschenbach opened the meeting at 9:30 am and welcomed everyone.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

There were no corrections to the minutes for the January 12, 2017 meeting. Conan McKay moved to approve the minutes and Lisa Beach seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with Dave Stephens abstaining.

Subcommittee, Workgroup, and Project Reports:

CCMS Advisory Committee:

The group met on January 26th and a Vice President from Instructure reported on the roadmap and three planned phases of development. The committee will use input from the CCMS User Community when they present to Instructure in May. Amy posted the link to the CCMS User Community.

The project still has needs around accessibility and a statewide tool now that the project is not working with Ally. The Accessibility Workgroup will assess system needs and would like to have the Accessibility Project Manager from Instructure join the meeting next month to review what Canvas is working on. They hope to come back with a prioritized list next month.

3CMedia also joined the CCMS Advisory Committee meeting to present on their LTI tool which is available to all 114 community colleges. They presented a nice video on uses and benefits. Jodie cautioned colleges to be aware of faculty considerations in how the tool is installed. Her campus decided to install it at the root, not sub-account level, with fair warning to faculty and advised them they could move it out if they decided to. It is more useful if it is visible, but there is also nothing in it unless videos have been placed there.

Finally, the CCMS Committee was notified the OEI Advisory Committee approved their charter and there will soon be a turnover in membership. Amy will reach out to constituent groups for representation in the next couple of months.

Barbara asked Amy to invite her to the CCMS Advisory Committee meeting since the Accessibility person with Canvas will be there. Jodie also asked for permission to release the roadmap grid Canvas presented to the CCMS group. Many of the items the CCMS Committee was asking for were already on the roadmap. It would be helpful to have that grid posted in the OEI Advisory Committee Basecamp to provide a focus for future conversation.

Academic Affairs Workgroup:

The Academic Affairs workgroup had the unanimous desire to investigate using search engines, gender preference specification, name pronunciation, and also annotation tools. That was brought up in the fall but since due to timing of grant renewal and budget concerns, staff decided not to run pilots of the tools now. However, they had already done some work with Canvas partners: NameCoach, Critique^It, and Atomic Jolt and saw some demonstrations. The workgroup suggested the vendors work with the Foundation to develop system wide contracts and those all are in process or done. The workgroup was only interested in partners that were accessible and had outside reviews for accessibility. This also applies to gender specification and other tools the Academic Affairs workgroup thought were essential. Jorge or JC from the Foundation will probably come out with an announcement and updated vendor list of Foundation partners and contracts available to colleges that choose to use them. Lisa thought the Foundation was working with Relay on an agreement for something similar to ARC. Jory explained that was a contract from the field and not through OEI.

Marilyn Harvey and Logan Murray compiled information from the twenty-three colleges in the Consortium now and courses in the Exchange related to CSU Pathways. The goal is for a student at a home college who just needs a course or two to complete their degree to be able to find them. They didn't do every ADT course, but did go through GE courses. They were hoping to show that for every GE requirement there was at least one course from a college in the Exchange that met the requirement. The chart shows where there are no course offerings and others where OEI does have courses. The Exchange has good coverage of courses outside CSU GE breadth and a lot of social science courses. However, areas A1, A3, B2, and B3 were highlighted because there isn't a single Exchange ready course in those areas. There are also gaps in B1 with only one course and B4 with a few schools all offering the same course. This is great information to help the project map to courses that are needed to meet its defined goals and purposes.

Autumn's review group accepts any CID course that is transfer level. CIDs for career courses that are not transfer may now have CIDs with other community

colleges but they don't correspond to a CSU CID for transfer since they are not offered at a CSU. Two years ago, the Advisory Committee agreed to accept any transfer level CID, but that did not include any lab, speech, or communication course. A1 and B3 are not currently on the path for what the course review group can accept. Jodie thought the Advisory Committee should discuss remedying that today because without it OEI cannot achieve the goals of reaching AAT, GE, and several fully online programs under discussion for the Course Exchange expansion. She agreed to have that discussion after Jory's update.

Accessibility Workgroup:

The Accessibility workgroup will be meeting on Tuesday. Barbara has been working with Jayme on an OEI Accessibility plan. That will be coming to the workgroup and she will put it into Basecamp for that group. The workgroup has also been looking at Accessibility tools. When the Ally contract negotiations ended they realized they needed requirements for OEI. They now have a spreadsheet of accessibility items and will discuss and prioritize that list on Tuesday. Barbara shared the list on the screen and thanked everyone in that group, and especially Jayme, for the work that has been done.

Management Team Updates: Information

The Executive Director Update is posted on Basecamp. Jory reviewed where the project is now, what has been accomplished, targets to set for the future, and strategies for how to get there. OEI has been building the online ecosystem with a suite of tools, services, and professional development with Canvas as CCMS. The project identified gaps at the colleges particularly around online services and is providing them in an integrated way. The original Canvas adoption projected having ninety colleges total by the end of this year; that was surpassed early and there are now 113 that have adopted Canvas. Of those colleges about eighty-nine have fully implemented Canvas; it has been a tremendous success.

Many colleges are taking advantage of support services OEI has in place. There are seventy-four colleges using the NetTutor contract either with OEI direct support or with local funds. Fifty-eight colleges implemented the counseling platform or have it in process. Thirty-three colleges have online proctoring and identity verification. Twenty-nine colleges have plagiarism detection with VeriCite and fifty colleges use the readiness modules and Smarter Measure diagnostic tools. It takes time to build awareness of tools and services. It took a good year and half to two years to get to solid utilization with tutoring and that plays out with the other tools as well. Support tools are helping close the gap in online success. OEI pilot courses are 3.9% above the statewide average for online success. For colleges where all courses haven't been through course review, even resourcing courses with student supports results in a 2.9% increase in student success.

Version 2.0 of the Course Exchange was launched in January to five of six pilot colleges. One college is still doing final testing; they do not yet have full financial aid integration, but it is on its way. Version 2.1 has been deployed to the pilot

environment in pre-release and includes additional features around reporting, changes to matriculation requirements, etc. Mt. SAC will be coming on very soon, then Cabrillo, Columbia, and Rio Hondo should follow soon after.

For courses in the spring 2018 with six colleges live, there are currently thirty-seven courses fully aligned to the rubric that have been certified through the review process. They yield forty-six sections for the current pilot. There is open enrollment with those six live colleges but unfortunately pilot upgrade timing didn't turn out to be ideal.

Using spring semester course numbers and projecting toward fall provides interesting numbers for consideration. If the project were live with every college in the pilot group, there would be twenty colleges. There are actually twenty-three colleges, but two have a custom SIS and the project is working on whether it can continue to support them with integration or they will need to be on a different path. There is also one college with an issue around data security agreements and indemnification. That leaves twenty colleges projected to be live with eighty-five courses and roughly 107 sections. That is significant growth, but not enough. The project needs to meet a higher target for fall. OEI needs to look at the investment being made in the pilot colleges and needs to not only "lift the boats" of all online courses at those colleges, but also needs participation from those colleges in alignment to the rubric and number of courses and sections in the Exchange. The projections do not include courses currently in the review process. OEI has been asked to meet a target of 300 course sections for fall. The gap is not insurmountable but the project needs to look at bringing in courses across multiple pathways.

Historically there has been debate about courses not traditionally taught online. Those have typically been lab courses in categories B2 and B3, especially with Life Science, also critical thinking, and oral communication courses. That was not resolved previously, but the direction from the Chancellor's Office is that OEI needs to move toward full online pathways students can access through the Course Exchange. That can't happen without meeting these requirements. There are colleges in the CCC system offering online courses in these areas and the project needs to chart a path forward and to move toward more buy-in for online lab courses, speech, communication, and critical thinking. Jory knows this area will concern some people, but given what OEI has been able to accomplish, he would trust no one more than those involved in OEI to protect the rigor and integrity of those disciplines. Jory hopes OEI can find early pioneers in those areas to develop courses. It is useful for the committee to see the direction OEI is moving and the challenge of getting to hundreds of sections and then up to thousands in the not too distant future. There is work ahead, but OEI has the talent to move there.

Dave Stephens asked what the team needs from OEI Advisory Committee members in conversations with onboarding colleges: pep talks, testimonials,

success stories? Jory felt most important was communication with representative constituencies in a way that is sober, clear, and not in panic. Also in bringing back legitimate questions and concerns. There is some amazing faculty in the Consortium and in the system; their experience needs to be leveraged. There are four colleges piloting online speech courses. OEI needs to share that out with communities of practice and more broadly, that is what members can do to help. The project doesn't need to have to nine sections of speech online tomorrow, but where they can be picked up and are already being offered would be beneficial in the Course Exchange expansion. Jory wanted to convey: 1) where the gaps are, 2) Chancellor's Office leadership and vision has changed significantly with respect to online pathways in the last year, and 3) where formerly the goal was to fill in the gaps, now it is also to help students finish online pathways.

Wendy asked about an Ocean 1 course being offered on her campus. It is not a CID course but it does count for a pathway, should she have the instructor submit that course for review? Currently the Exchange mechanism is designed around CID for the matching piece, so the immediate answer is no, because there is no way to pull that in. But OEI would like to set up collaborative pathways between two or more community colleges that could be built into matching for the Exchange and it is on the project roadmap. Lab courses are not just dissection in biology and labs in chemistry, but also science lab courses with a lower bar. Astronomy is another one. Dave asked whether efforts were being made with the state curriculum committees to look at concerns and disseminate the message. Cheryl explained disciplines are split on the issue. She has not been able to find a formal position taken by the Academic Senate historically on this issue. They probably can't just keep the status quo, it may be time to look at concerns in the field and have further conversations. The Academic Senate will be having a conversation before OEI meets again in March. Dave also suggested creating a track at the OTC specifically related to courses not traditionally offered online and marketed directly to colleges so issues and problems can generate discussion and possible solutions.

Tabitha asked the number of pilot colleges with CID courses in the approval process. It takes a while to get them through and it might be useful to have that information. Jodie also explained Fresno is currently analyzing potential course offerings. They have thirty-seven CID courses and will be asking faculty teaching them to submit for review in a batch. She would like to see more CID courses on track to be assessed and evaluated, since that is a roadblock. Not all disciplines have been vetted that could be.

In research on the 115th college and OEI's goal Jodie found the Governor's budget report mentioned how wonderful ASU online is. They have a Bachelor's in Communication and undergraduate degrees in Biology and Communication. Biology labs have been done through apprenticeships with Strong Workforce Development. Merced Community College is one where students can go to get hours needed for the biology lab. Just like OEI has collaboration for the

proctoring network, Jodie thought the project needed to collaborate on facilities and maybe proctoring for lab components. Organization and cooperation are needed. The talent is there and the project could push itself for options. Jory agreed and noted within current pilot colleges there are some science lab courses and online oral communication courses. Other colleges in the Consortium and in system can learn from how those courses are being taught. OEI can raise awareness of how to do that in a rigorous and effective way. Changing culture and giving people new ideas about ways to do things can be done in a way that is not threatening and the project has the talent in faculty to do it. Initially OEI can plug gaps in the short run; scaling up will be a challenge.

CCC Technology Center Updates: Information

Five colleges are currently live piloting on the Course Exchange; Ventura has asked to do some extra testing. Steve expects there will be a few more colleges by the end of the month. The Course Exchange 2.1 intermittent release will be available in the production environment in a couple of weeks. It has some really nice features with both global and college level admin reporting features, so colleges can understand the students in the Course Exchange, what they are taking, and where. There is a home college filter on the enrollment screen for better navigation of course listings. Another big piece is removing matriculation checks to support expedited course selections. There are also bug fixes in that release. The team is road mapping and prioritizing remaining items for this year.

The Canvas Glue Adaptor continues rolling forward, primarily with identifying colleges to set this up in their existing environments. Jane Linder is working with the Foothill team on identifying colleges. Some have been or will be contacted. Jane will be presenting the Canvas Glue Adaptor at the March 9th OEI meeting in Sacramento. She will do a demonstration or some screen captures of what is available when a college is set up with the Adaptor.

There is now a prototype of the Data Warehouse available. At the direction of the Chancellor's Office, the Data Warehouse team has gone back to four interested colleges to further communicate what data sets will look like and have more administrative and leadership approval around those becoming available. These reports are currently available from the report center with the addition of Canvas data being included for the local college instance. The bigger change is in the timeline for the next release into production that will include other colleges; that will come in June of this year. It was pushed out to get more information on the kind of data reporting to make available to the colleges. The roadmap for Data Warehouse 1.2 isn't done yet. That will be done after June, since there are a number of pieces in play with what the Chancellor's Office wants and how connected services may not be available in the reporting system. Alex Jackl will introduce and overview the Data Warehouse by Zoom at the March 9th meeting. John Sills and Alex will also be presenting on the Data Warehouse at the OTC.

New release 1.8 of the CCC Proxy Integration with Canvas went out last night. It fixed a few things and makes it easier for a student to get a CCCID if they do not have one when they hit a service that needs one, like Canvas or the Course Exchange. It helps students to enroll seamlessly across services through a single sign on. Additionally, part of the CCCID work being done in the next version of the Course Exchange is to write back those CCCIDs back to the SIS at the school. That has been a big request from IT departments from day one.

An update on the CVC was shared last month. The team is doing work to update information about the Course Exchange to redirect the numbers of colleges and courses available from the CCCOnlineEd website in a more dynamic way. There is also some work on admin level security fixes.

Jane Linder, Product Manager for Glue doing the Canvas integration, sent an email solicitation to the Canvas Admin Listserv. They need information from the field for prioritizing work. They are also looking for colleges interested in piloting some new features like a grade pass back or the ability for staff to be able to create their own Canvas course shells populated from the SIS.

Jodie appreciated the complete updates in the last two meetings that have provided significant information. Connecting those pieces to some relevance for SPOCs at the Consortium meeting might be helpful too as they look at the admin panels and see where students are getting stuck. That kind of background information can help SPOCs decipher what is going on from the student perspective. In addition, it would help campuses to know about the grade pass back. Her campus wants that and without the information today, they would continue looking for a workaround for their system. That will provide great capacity to speed up the grading process and how grades are submitted without a CSV file. Knowing those are coming is really helpful to colleges. Jodie encouraged the team to present that information at the SPOC meeting so colleges don't end up working in silos on redundant fixes. She thanked Steve for presenting information that end users can understand and convey to others.

Steve Klein will propose a Data Warehouse and a Canvas Glue session at the OTC relevant for faculty and DE leadership to understand.

Chancellor's Office Update:

The Chancellor's Office is in the final review stages of developing the RFA. LeBaron reported the team has been at it for about nine days and will be getting final edits to him for incorporating this weekend. He will get it to the Vice Chancellors on Monday so they have a clean version of the RFA for review. Those will be Laura Hope, Von Ton-Quinlivan, visiting Vice-Chancellor Omid Pourzanjani, and Alice Perez. The Chancellor's Office built in some buffer time, so the RFA will go out between February 20th and 28th. It will be in the field for ninety days with a due date of May 28th. It is scheduled for the Board meeting on July 15th and then technically the new grant would start the next day.

The Chancellor's Office is required by a Board of Governor's standing order put in place about twenty years ago, to rebid grants at least every five years. This opens grants up to competition by providing a consistent way to allow other entities to compete for grants so they don't come to be seen as endowments. LeBaron explained CalPASS is an example of what can happen with grant competition. It had been at one district for many years and that entity did not win the award. Complaints about that still come up. It is always a possibility when a grant is rebid that it may be awarded to a new district.

The new OEI grant sets hard numbers on expectations that need to be measured. LeBaron was pleased to see the gap analysis presented by Jory today. He felt OEI had the ability to meet new goals. There are many tens of thousands of course sections out in the system.

The budget language makes it very clear that courses have to be offered to all of the colleges. The current OEI design is more of a closed loop; that will change with the new grant. Essentially, the colleges in the Consortium are teaching colleges and the rest of the system is all home colleges with eligibility to take courses. The language is very clear OEI is not the new fully online college. The intent is for OEI to be for traditional online education students, which last year included about 860,000 students. The fully online college will be another project effort for another two plus million people not in the 860,000.

The Chancellor's Office will put out the RFA and there will be a period of time to ask questions with answers put out at a midpoint in the process. The perspective of the Chancellor's Office is the pilot period for OEI should end with the current grant in June. Under the new agreement there won't be any colleges in the Consortium that do not have courses in the Exchange; that will conclude with the end of the pilot phase. There is the opportunity for the twenty-three colleges currently in the Exchange to get courses in and to solve any technical issues or policy issues before the end of the current pilot.

LeBaron noted if there were thousands of course sections being offered now, Barbara's chart would be fully filled in. Based on 2016/17 data there are 60,000 course sections in the system, so the Chancellor's Office goals are quite modest. The goals move out into the thousands easily in three to four years and that will still just be 5-6% of what is in the system. The budget language clearly states OEI courses will be made available to all students. It is realistic to restrict the teaching part to colleges in Canvas. However, the budget act states a student at the college that is not using Canvas would not be prevented from taking a course in the Exchange. LeBaron emphasized the RFA is not finalized until the Vice Chancellor's review it. Today he is providing a broader framework from within the budget language. The RFA states that colleges need to be teaching to be in the Consortium, but do not need to be teaching to benefit from the Consortium or the Exchange.

Jodie asked about goals cited from the previous agreement for years one, two, three, and four. She asked what would happen to colleges not meeting those contract goals. LeBaron did not know. He knows the agreement with Foothill-DeAnza ends on June 30th this year. There could be extensions of that program based on unexpended funds and the shelf life of dollars, but that five year agreement is up and they will be competing for another five years. The Chancellor's Office won't know if other colleges are going to compete for the grant until they put the RFA out and see who responds. Technically the new agreement will start the day after the Board approves the grantee.

Operation/Implementation: Course Exchange and Consortium Expansion Updates:

Consortium schools continue preparing for deployment. Kate praised the diligent work of Justin Schultz and the entire Technology Center. CE 2.1 released in pilot in January and will release to production in February. There are now seven colleges in production with the Course Exchange; Mt SAC came on this morning. The team continues to work with the other colleges that are preparing for this.

The Consortium expansion focus for this group is on student equity. The Consortium is a collaboration of colleagues looking globally at online learning and while this year's cohort will focus on student equity it will also include current Consortium members. Forty-nine colleges submitted letters of interest. The webinars are done. The deadline is March 1st with rolling submissions. The project team used the word "resolution" but for some colleges it may be an affirmation of support or whatever indicates support from the Academic Senate and other constituent groups. Colleges will be notified for the 2018 cohort in mid-spring, will sign by June 30th, and participate in fall 2018 Consortium events.

The first group of cohorts had themes of tutoring, online readiness, and full launch. This year's theme is equity minded teaching. That means they might try some software that has been identified by the Equity workgroup. It is a lens by which they can work programmatically while also preparing courses for addition to the Course Exchange, etc. The team knows technical implementation takes time and this gives others on campus an area of focus while waiting for technical pieces to be completed.

Jodie asked about the focus on equity. She fully supports and agrees with support for student equity, but was concerned that OEI has been criticized for going off in too many different directions and not focused enough on meeting its primary goals. She was especially concerned the team might ask to reevaluate the rubric with additional hoops. Jodie completely supports equity, but wants to make sure the Advisory Committee has discussion and fulfills its advisory role without getting distracted by other things.

Jory emphasized OEI has been achieving its goals. There are areas where additional focus is needed and the committee talked about those today, including

the need for additional courses, and for additional seats in the Exchange. He reaffirmed OEI is operating in a changing environment which is a challenge. In regards to the equity cohort, the project needs a group of colleges to come into the pipeline. One of the lessons the team has learned from the colleges that were not in the full launch group was there were times when there was a lot to do and lots of enthusiasm and other times when there was not and momentum was lost. The goals from the RFA, the Chancellor's Office, and watching testimony at the Senate Finance committee yesterday about online education and about the achievement gap, all indicated equity is part of the OEI charge as well. With OEI people like to focus on the Course Exchange, but with any RFA, equity and decreasing the achievement gap is a charge. It made sense given the work the Equity Workgroup has done and the progress made, but also recognizing the disaggregated numbers show there is more work to be done. Therefore, it made in this expansion to look at equitable teaching practice and perhaps incorporate some lightweight software enhancements that support student equity. It is not about distracting from the other work OEI is doing.

Jodie emphasized equity should be part of the focus. OER is a part of equity. She felt she might be getting mixed messages. There was discussion of the use of NameCoach and other tools for equity at earlier meetings but was told today there wouldn't be pilots of those tools. She just wanted to know if equity is being added to the Course Design Rubric. Kate explained nothing in the rubric is being changed. The new @ONE process with the Design Academy is trying to find the best way to get faculty ready for doing their classes and supporting them. The equity theme is about the Consortium as a group of educators who can make a difference for students. These elements came out of OEI workgroups as ways to support students.

Bonnie further explained that when the Equity Workgroup talked to Autumn about culturally responsive teaching practices, they all agreed the rubric already included those goals. There is no need to change the rubric; a nice job was already done on including equity. Jodie appreciated the importance of equity and that it was already included in the rubric. She also appreciated tools Larry Green presented at a previous meeting. There are many new people on the OEI Advisory Committee and a lot of information is presented in the meetings. Jodie wants to ensure there is enough time to discuss member issues and concerns.

Exchange Targets Fall 2018:

Exchange targets for fall are 300 sections. Cheryl asked members to review information presented today and come back in March prepared for dialogue. The team expects to have large chunks of time then for the Advisory Committee to tackle issues and come up with recommendations. Cheryl explained the format of the meeting today was designed to provide all the information leading into having an informed discussion.

Having two hour Zoom meetings in between five hour in person meetings is the format this committee agreed to in the past. Perhaps the Advisory Committee wants to revisit that. Dave agreed perhaps there should be a discussion of how to make better use of meetings in March.

Cheryl asked members to let her and Jodie know if they want specific items on the agenda or time for particular discussion items. Those ideas or items don't have to be fully formed, just let them know what items should be included.

Other:

Wendy noted while the committee has been on the call Turnitin bought VeriCite.

Kate and Jory have been talking about developing a more comprehensive price list for colleges at various levels of engagement. Right now colleges are trying to plan for the 2018/19 fiscal year. Dave asked for that information to be presented at the next OEI Advisory meeting. Budgets are based on funding the project gets from the Chancellor's Office and the project is also waiting to see the outcome of the next couple of months, but Kate would be happy to share the value the Consortium colleges are getting. Dave suggested Andrea Hanstein, the Communication Director, could shine some more light on that value as well.

Jodie's presentation for the Chancellor's Office Conference was about the entire OEI ecosystem and how Fresno City has applied it and earned higher retention and success rates than the state averages. They are using everything including \$68,000 worth of NetTutor in the last year. She also mentioned Lisa's question from the chat about expanding tutoring to disciplines beyond English and math as well. That would be a great thing to do. Jodie thanked everyone for taking time to attend and get information leading to more robust conversations.

Next Meeting:

March 9, 2018, face to face meeting

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.