

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday May 18, 2018
Sacramento

Voting Members: Adriana Martinez, Andreea Serban, Cheryl Aschenbach, Dave Stephens, Geoffrey Dyer, Juan Camacho, Lisa Beach, and Tabitha Villalba

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Autumn Bell, Bonnie Peters, Deb Barker-Garcia, Erin Larson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Justin Schultz, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Marilyn Harvey, Phil Cerda, Steve Klein, and Vivian Varela

Welcome and Attendance:

Cheryl Aschenbach opened the meeting at 9:30 am and welcomed everyone. She explained that Jodie Steeley is sorry not to be here today, but asked Cheryl to share the reason. Her son is in the hospital for chemotherapy after a leukemia diagnosis. Cheryl encouraged members to provide Jodie support.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

There were was not a quorum so there was no action on the minutes for the April 9, 2017 meeting. They will be reviewed at the June meeting.

Annual Review of the Charter:

Cheryl asked members to share ideas about changes that might be needed in the charter. Changes will be discussed and voted upon at the June meeting. The language may need to change to reflect the OEI/CVC rebrand.

Dave suggested being clearer in the Charter, perhaps borrowing from the CCMS Charter regarding staggered terms for representatives from constituent groups. He also thought it would be useful to add a column to the OEI Roster tracking when a member came onto the project. Cheryl agreed better tracking and communication with constituent groups was needed to be clearer about the responsibility for tracking member attendance or issues.

The announcement of the new RFA grantee will be made on June 4th.

Summer Intersegmental Course Collaboration:

Jory shared information about collaborative activities planned with the CSUs for this summer. Earlier this year the project team attended a meeting at the state capital around intersegmental online higher education. The Governor's office wanted to see more cooperation between segments. Out of those conversations about a variety of ideas and tools, the CSU and CCC decided to collaborate on courses over the summer. This is a one time pilot activity to see what kind of impacts and reach can come from it.

CSU came up with the idea of “Finish Faster” to help students by pulling together a search for high quality courses available in the summer in the CSU and CCC system. The CSUs are aware that many of their students come to the CCC during the summer, that they have impacted programs, and have a hard time serving all their students. This summer project is a joint collaboration to serve students and look at potential long term benefits. There are three focuses for marketing: “Finish Faster” gives the state’s more than two million students access to more than 10,000 online course sections for summer; CSU students will reverse transfer picking up sections and CCC students will have an opportunity to fill their schedule and accelerate their progress to completion; and leveraging the strength and leadership of both the CSU and CCC systems. The UC system is interested, but their online ecosystem is a bit different and they couldn’t meet the short timeline to participate this summer. UC students can still use these searches, it isn’t prevented, but it isn’t formalized. Sometimes a university student needs to get permission from their college before taking a course at another college. There is appropriate messaging when students enter the search through the Cal State site, “Please speak to your college advisor.”

The project focuses on students having a good search experience and understanding how courses transfer. Students will be able to search by IGETC requirements, by CSU breadth, GE requirements, or just by subject. C-ID numbers are embedded in the course descriptions but can’t currently be used to filter searches. The project would have needed more lead time for ADT, so that search is not possible for this summer project.

OEI will float up the teaching college courses up with badging for course review, online tutoring, and student readiness, so as potential students are searching they will see courses that have been through the process, are reviewed, and have these attributes. They also want students to be able to filter by particular attributes, location, etc. This will be for online sections returned in the initial search. The CCC and CSU have both agreed to have each other’s course sections be included in each other’s searches. There will be two entry points for students, one at CalStateOnline.net and one at CCCOnlineEd.org. Students at both will see the full course list but there will also be targeted marketing provided to both audiences. The source material for courses came from data directly from ASSIST. The Chancellor’s Office will make an announcement system-wide next week about the program.

At the prototype site Kate provided a demonstration of searches students would be able to use to find courses. Searches coming through CCCOnlineEd.org will be favored first for Consortium colleges, distance from home college, and then price. CSU online courses are included, but will end up being pushed down the list because of price. In the CSU version, their courses will float to the top. CSU students often end up taking CCC courses during the summer because they are less expensive and the CSU is okay with that since it is just for summer. After finding courses students will still need to apply and register through the college at

which they want to take a course. There is no Course Exchange piece to this project; it is just a collaborative search.

Dave wondered why this wasn't done through the CVC. Jory explained this is not a replacement for CVC; it is just a summer project. However, it should provide the ability to gather a lot of data. The CVC has program and degree information, but this summer project is focused down at the section level. Students can filter at the section level and by start and end date. This is a fast track project just for summer, but published fall courses can also show up in searches.

Kate noted badging it is a lot like Amazon stars, students may not know exactly what each means, but searches will filter those better resourced courses to the top. Bonnie explained they hoped to gather data on whether the badges meant anything to the student.

A member asked about the significant amount of time and money that seem to be invested in this effort. Jory will check into the cost and share it back to the committee. This came out of a Governor's office discussion and smaller pilot they had been doing of this in the spring. It is also a way for Consortium schools to have some support for summer. A lot of CCC schools are down in enrollment and this can help them, emphasize the quality measures, and get great feedback for faculty going through the review process. This can help colleges and faculty see the benefit of that work.

Dave expressed concern with how this fits into the OEI grant which is supposed to be about removing bottlenecks. Additionally, the Chancellor's Office is asking for a decrease in silos and this feels like more fragmentation with adding another mechanism besides the CVC and Cal State Online. He was also concerned the branding, "Finish Faster," was unfortunate and even silly. Erin said the terms of the grant, to expand the availability of technology, fit perfectly with this partnering effort. The governor's Office asked OEI to do the project. "Finish Faster" branding was a CSU idea. There will be marketing to help push ads in Google to the top of the search results along with marketing efforts leveraging social media with Google, Facebook, Pandora, and Twitter. There will also be digital advertising.

This is a course finder with an aggregated search at the section level. A commercial vendor is able to push students to then answer the questions of the CCCApply application. It can also send a reminder to students when it is time to register. That can provide ability to nudge back to students and then to follow up with messaging asking, "Did you get the course you needed?" That would complete the circle. This is just focused on a mobile friendly search. Application, registration, and sending transcripts back is still a local process. Members thought counselors and librarians would find this to be very useful in helping students find the courses they need. This is a summer project that can ease that pathway for students finding courses they need.

Dave asked if the California Virtual Campus (CVC) was going to be used with the Course Exchange at some point. Kate explained CCCOnlineEd.org was used with the idea that whatever transformation happens in the future, that will be a constant that can always forward students until any new solution is permanent. LeBaron noted the budget act language is clear on pulling the OEI and CVC together. CVC budget language and funding has been around for twenty years. With the recession the CVC got incorporated into TTIP North funding with the Technology Center at Butte. This year the budget language took the CVC out of TTIP and embedded it in OEI. This was an intentional move by the Governor to incorporate the OEI and CVC. The CVC has served the system well for twenty years, especially with the resources available to them. It is the Chancellor's Office intent to migrate the CVC and that was put into the RFA. The Chancellor's Office believes a rebranding of OEI will be more meaningful with the CVC.edu versus what OEI currently has. The Online Education Initiative is still doesn't mean much to people outside of the project. The California Virtual Campus may also not be known, but people can guess what it means. This is an evolutionary change being led by the people writing the checks.

A member noted often CSU students often start at CCCs, so they are CCC students too. Helping impacted schools helps by getting CCC students in when CSU students are able to get through and out.

It would have been better for the site to have launched earlier to not miss registration windows; the timing was not ideal. The project is doing what it can to avoid missing the registration window any more than it already has.

How students do their search and then register might impact data gathering efforts. If students find the course and then go directly to the college site, that may show up differently in the data. There may be an impact in how searches are filtered. That is a good point to be aware of and the project wants to gather data on student entry point along with follow up questions to gather as much information as possible. If this is done again next summer there can be student focus groups during the year, to see what is happening.

Geoffrey was concerned Consortium courses being sorted to the top would be a problem for local students at small colleges with the twenty seat enrollment set aside in Exchange courses. Jory emphasized Exchange rules don't apply to this summer project. These are open sections and include the full inventory of courses. The Exchange isn't technically operating in the summer and students will still have to apply and register the regular way.

Courses are populated on the site from publically available published data that is updated regularly. If a college added a second section of a course, it should show up fairly rapidly. A driver behind the administration's interest in this project has been the success OEI had with Canvas and getting onto a unified platform,

including fiscal results. The Governor's Office would like the CSUs to see these system changes to ultimately help save resources for the state.

Draft Meeting Calendar for 2018/2019:

Members discussed and came up with a draft calendar to be voted on at the June meeting. Members tentatively agreed to continue holding in person meetings in September, December, March, and May. They also agreed to schedule virtual meetings from 9:30 to 12:30 with the understanding that voting and discussion items would be planned for the first part of the meeting. Cheryl noted they would try to keep meetings to two hours, but would schedule for three in case more time was needed. In person meetings will be changed to start at 10 am so some members can drive in rather than needing to stay overnight prior. The ending time of in person meetings is proposed to remain at 3:30 pm; working lunches could be used to keep the meetings within time limits, if needed.

No meeting in July.
August 10, 2018 Virtual
September 13, 2018 (Thursday) Sacramento
October 12, 2018 Virtual
November 8, 2018 (Thursday) Virtual
November 30, 2018 Sacramento
January 11, 2019 Virtual
February 8, 2019 Virtual
March 15, 2019 Sacramento
April 12, 2019 Virtual
May 17, 2019 Sacramento
June 7, 2019 Virtual

Policy Recommendation- 20 Seat Requirement for Course Exchange Courses:

At previous meetings Geoffrey brought up concerns he had about having a twenty seat requirement for Course Exchange courses. The new RFA requiring twenty-seats in Course Exchange courses came out on March 8th, the day before the extended deadline for colleges to apply to join the OEI Consortium. The colleges applying may have been operating under their understanding of the status quo arrangement of five seats. Although endorsement of a twenty-seat requirement was suggested by Jodie Steele at the March 9th OEI Advisory Committee meeting, no action was taken at that time. Geoffrey noted class sizes and numbers of sections offered vary by district, but small districts that are at cap and/or lack staffing in certain disciplines may be imposing a barrier to their local students' degree completion by joining the Consortium if the twenty seat requirement is implemented, especially if limited numbers of certain courses are offered, and if teaching colleges' students are in competition with students from all 114 colleges for the seats. Districts that are at cap and don't have large economies of scale simply may not be able to offer additional sections, and if

their class size is small, twenty seats could be as much as two-thirds of the only section of an online course at a small or rural college.

Geoffrey suggested supporting the idea of changing the wording to, “50% of the seats in a course or twenty seats, whichever was smaller.” The OEI AC charter says the committee provides recommendations to the Management Team and Chancellor’s Office regarding the OEI Exchange. Since he had a problem with the the RFA and no action was taken by the Advisory Committee on April 9th, Geoffrey submitted a resolution to the statewide Academic Senate on April 11th, which was unanimously adopted by the 116 voting delegates. Resolution 7.09 is online and hyperlinked in the agenda for the meeting. The resolution supports OEI and its work and also states existing language in the RFA regarding required number of seats potentially creates a barrier to degree completion, especially in a small or rural college. The resolution recommends the Chancellor’s Office identify appropriate mechanisms to ensure participation in the Course Exchange doesn’t impede degree and certificate completion for small and rural colleges. It also recommended the requirement of making twenty seats available for students from other CCCs in Course Exchange courses be replaced with an appropriate percentage of seats per course. Geoffrey emphasized he would have preferred to settle this at the April 9th meeting rather than bringing an Academic Senate resolution, but felt obliged by his position as an Academic Senate representative to take action. Geoffrey is not trying to impede the great work of OEI; he just wants to watch out for small rural colleges.

Jory explained the management team didn’t have input into the RFA process and didn’t know about the timing of its release. That is outside of their control. The project has always had a focus on trying to support small, rural colleges and hopes the grant awardee supports small, rural colleges.

LeBaron appreciated all Geoffrey had to say on this sensitive topic. He and Geoffrey have different perspectives. From the Chancellor’s Office perspective and the way the RFA was constructed, the intent was to ensure the availability of seats to students from other colleges. The budget act language directed them to focus on courses that have the greatest demand and fill the quickest, to help meet students’ needs for courses to graduate. The intent of the Exchange is to provide courses to students who can’t get courses. Courses in the Exchange must have enough seats available to other students or they don’t meet that need.

Cheryl thought that was why the 50% threshold would be helpful; it makes other students as important as the college’s own students. The bottleneck courses aren’t always the high enrollment GE courses. Sometime they are major courses particularly at small rural colleges that can’t offer all major courses or not often. Those colleges have to offer them once every couple of years or maybe once every other year and they tend to have lower enrollments. To open seats up is absolutely beneficial to both local as well as external students. However, if more

than two-thirds of seats have to be reserved for external students, the college isn't serving their own.

LeBaron said maybe a small school having trouble meeting the needs of its own students perhaps shouldn't put that course in the Exchange. Cheryl clarified it could be useful to two small rural colleges to offer that kind of course on different rotations so their courses were available when the other was not. Geoffrey agreed, he thought the idea of OEI is wonderful for exactly that reason. It helps with scheduling issues for smaller schools. Additionally, they are most excited about increasing the quality of their courses through POCR, new feedback, and help with accessibility.

The Chancellor's Office is always interested in the voice of the Academic Senate and the resolution process. This unique situation exists in the midst of an RFA process and no one knows what the outcome will be. LeBaron committed to trying to balance concerns expressed with overall goals of making course sections and seats available to students who can't get them at their home campus. A concern he has expressed consistently from the first meeting of OEI to today, is colleges that benefit from the fruits of this effort and all the resources provided to colleges without making contributions of courses and seats into the Exchange. The language inserted was to make the whole Consortium available to students so that teaching colleges with capacity would be able to fill their courses. There are thirty-three colleges in stability that are not at cap and are in danger of losing FTEs. Sometimes this is a Catch-22 if a college is in stability and losing enrollment with fiscal implications and no ability to add sections and be innovative. The Chancellor's Office will continue to listen and try to work with the selected grantee to address this. The resolution gives some flexibility and is something the Chancellor's Office can consider. However, the clear overall intent is to have enough sections and for students to be able to come to the Exchange to find the courses they need if they cannot get them at their home campus.

Management Team Updates:

The project will be retiring the name SPOC (Single Point of Contact) and changing to Project Leader as the new colleges form their implementation teams. That terminology will be updated throughout the project.

One of the big stories of the project is Canvas. Five years ago colleges were many different course management systems (CMS) and now the CCC is on a single CMS with supports in tutoring, counseling, readiness assessment, and authentication that have really helped close gaps for students. Data on success over time shows OEI pilot sections with success rates 4.9 percentage points higher than the state average overall for online courses.

Consortium Expansion:

Thirty-three colleges have been asked to participate in the 2018 OEI cohort. The announcements were made alphabetically on Twitter every half hour throughout

the day, and then thank you messages were sent out to the original pilot colleges. A map of coverage across the state shows concentrations where the population is dense, but there is also wide coverage across the state.

Colleges received welcome emails and been asked to identify their local teams. They got an invitation from Autumn and the Professional Development team to join the Course Academy and Jory also sent college presidents congratulations. Justin has been organizing introductory webinars on May 23 and 24th about next steps, professional development, and support services. Representatives from the new cohort of colleges will be joining the fall Consortium meeting.

A major lesson learned from the first recruitment of colleges to the new one is the need to have a college-wide conversation about participation. This cannot work well with just a single college advocate. Everyone needed to understand what was expected of them, which is why the process involved a “Self-Assessment Package,” instead of an application.

Academic Affairs:

Thousands of students have now used NetTutor and the WorldWideWhiteboard platform. From July 17, 2017 to March 18, 2018 the colleges with the most use of the tutoring tools were: Mt. San Jacinto, Fresno, Antelope Valley, and Mt. SAC. They represent a mix of different demographics and sizes. Usage also increased when tutoring tools initially limited to online pilot courses was opened schoolwide.

Usage of VeriCite for academic integrity from January shows over 61,000 total users. Twenty-nine colleges overall and eleven Consortium colleges have used the tool. Proctorio has 3,007 new users since January and Chromebooks were recently delivered to nineteen colleges that volunteered to participate in the proctoring network. That will allow students in online or hybrid courses that need to take a proctored test to have access to participating colleges that are closer to their home. Some colleges are launching proctoring next week with finals.

Student Services:

Eight colleges started in 2015 with the Quest Readiness program including a diagnostic measure. There were 1,587 users the first year. Later modules were made available to all colleges; some used them in orientation, while others used them in particular courses. Overall usage was consistently at about 44%. The modules include multi-media tutorials set up with Creative Commons, and the project gave permission for other states and even International schools to make use of them and provide feedback. Bonnie reported they have now started a project with Intellify to determine the level of student engagement with those modules. The results will be available at the end of this semester regarding what students are looking at and where they are disengaging or skipping to the quiz.

Online Counseling was an area the project felt was lacking and necessary. Most colleges did not have comprehensive online counseling that was synchronous.

Additionally, most colleges didn't realize there were guidelines for online counseling. OEI is now providing professional development for online counselors. Previously a DE survey indicated only 27% of colleges had some aspect of online counseling and none were offering comprehensive services. As a result of the project 42% of CCCs are now using ConexED which is a comprehensive platform. The project worked with pilot colleges and non-pilots willing to pay for the platform. So far 7,841 students have received online counseling services and over 214 counselors have been trained. That number will increase as more counselors are trained. Professional development training and a course offered for graduate level credit were developed in cooperation with @ONE. It doesn't teach how to counsel, but how to counsel in an online environment. Two more courses for online mental health are being introduced, one focused on clinicians and the other on non-clinicians.

The team is framing the new cohort as the Equity Cohort, but equity is important in everything. Less than 10% of equity plans include information about equity in online courses. Arnita Porter worked with @ONE to develop the Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning Course for online courses. The first course launched in April and another is coming up in July. Arnita also collaborated with a math instructor at Lake Tahoe to outfit his courses with equity minded principles as a model course. The idea is to get it in a form to hand out to instructors. The team also wants to focus on continuing design and research with other institutions in California and how equity plays into closing the achievement gap.

Professional Development and @ONE:

At the beginning of OEI, Pat James and Michelle Pilati did trailblazing work with the Professional Development Work Group that developed the original Course Design Rubric and POCR training. By the end of 2015, there were more than eighty courses reviewed, but colleges were still using Blackboard, Moodle, Etudes, etc. Courses would get reviewed then with transition to Canvas they were very different and really had to start over. Later there were revisions to the Course Rubric, colleges began adopting Canvas, and in partnership with @ONE, training was developed on migrating courses to Canvas. In October of 2016 there were nine "exchange ready" courses. Then several accessibility specialists were hired to help faculty remediate and overcome 508 compliance issues in courses. By the end of December 2016 there were twenty "exchange ready" courses. 2016 was also the last major redesign of the rubric. It went from a complicated scoring system to a straightforward checklist. Explanatory language was added in the accessibility section to make it less, "This is right and this is wrong," and more, "This is why it needs to be done." There will be some minor changes in redundancies and wording issues before it goes out to the colleges by August.

In 2017 there were major revisions to the review process based on feedback from faculty who had been through it. Instruction design support was embedded. Previously faculty could schedule an appointment for help but the designer hadn't seen the course until the meeting. Two full time reviewers have been hired who

hear about the course from the instructional perspective and what the plan is from the beginning. Instructional designers stay with the faculty member until all check boxes are moved to completion. Additionally, instead of sending an email to faculty, the lead reviewer now meets with the faculty member for a one hour results call to go through the review. Re-reviews were eliminated; instead faculty members work with lead reviewers until suggestions have been incorporated.

There are now 113 courses aligned to the rubric and over 200 sections of aligned courses. Course Design Academy is now open for non-C-ID courses, but they should be part of an ADT pathway, a CTE certificate pathway, or a CSU pathway. C-ID courses are still the only courses in the Exchange.

Subcommittee, Workgroup or Project Reports:

Accessibility Work Group:

Information presented at the last OEI meeting from the Accessibility Work Group was presented to Instructure. One item was student level quiz duration settings that could identify a student at the course level within Canvas. Another item was better recognition for Math LaTeX using MathJax which is a markup language for quadratic equations within the rich content editor in Canvas. The other item was further improvements to the existing accessibility checker within the rich content editor as well. Instructure's response was, "Thank you, but at this time, no more resources are being committed to those things." Autumn's impression was that Instructure is focused on making their platform accessible and not necessarily on the accessibility of what instructors and faculty are putting into it. She asked if the Accessibility work group is coordinating with Statewide Accessibility Standards Work Groups to leverage impact. Sean Keegan who leads the CCC Accessibility Center is working with the Chancellor's Office.

Steve felt CCC needs were well identified and articulated in the conversation with Instructure. A build inside Canvas isn't what the software company is about in terms of delivering a CMS for course management and delivery. This was a good reality check on what the Accessibility Work Group and the system needs to do to think about in going to bat again for an accessibility tool to do what colleges want. Some previous efforts have been made with Ally and YouDolt. Ally is not perfect and YouDolt is an open source tool that has been explored but doesn't do everything needed. Perhaps those kinds of efforts need to be revisited with additional conversations with YouDolt or the University of Central Florida that developed it through a grant from Canvas. LeBaron thought the development team was open to continuing to develop the product. Dave's impression was that YouDolt wouldn't be scalable for the entire CCC system it would probably have to be localized by region or something like that. The Accessibility Work Group now has a comprehensive feature requirement list for a future RFP if funding were made available.

The California state auditors issued a report with requirements for four colleges and the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office has been coordinating

responses for June and September and is making sure accessibility efforts work together. IEPI developed a first layer Q and A tool with linked responses. It will be pushed out to the system in June. The second element relates to Canvas use for both face to face and online courses. The auditor pointed out the Chancellor's Office has not provided information to on ground faculty about accessibility. Most of the time in face to face courses a student with a disability is referred over to the DSPS office and otherwise faculty doesn't necessarily do anything. Faculty is now loading readings and other elements into Canvas for more face to face classes. Once material is digitized the same accessibility requirements apply.

In the Program Course and Approval Handbook (PCAH), accessibility is not even mentioned. PCAH is used by curriculum specialists in developing courses for submission. The Chancellor's Office is putting together a work group, including three members from DEETAC and three from 5C, to take a look at the 2011 DE Accessibility Guidelines to extract information for an addendum to the PCAH. The Chancellor's Office hopes to complete this effort over the summer and get it to the BOG in September. Information about digital materials applies to everyone as faculty use digital materials in all courses in Canvas across the system.

CCMS:

CCMS serves as a conduit for users in prioritizing system needs to send back to Instructure. The top twenty-five ideas in the larger Canvas community tagged with the CCC flag were voted on to determine the top ten. Now the top ten has been narrowed down and the committee is in the process of voting on the top three. The deadline for voting is next Friday when the CCMS call will happen. The results will be discussed and brought back to the OEI Advisory Committee.

The Outcomes Work Group has been meeting with Instructure on a regular basis for about a year. There has been significant development work around what the CCC system asked for in the Canvas platform. They will meet with Instructure May 22nd, to discuss development. The product manager will report on what is new, what is in Beta, and what is getting ready to be released. That information will be brought back to this committee.

Finally, CCMS is transitioning membership as they reach the end of the pilot period. There will be an updated CCMS roster once that is final.

RP Group Update:

Presentation proposal submissions have been reviewed for the Strengthening Student Success Conference. All submitters will be notified. The conference is the first week of October from the 3-6th. An article by Arnita and Jessica on the new Equity framework will be in Perspectives, the RP Group newsletter.

Tech Center Report:

Data Warehouse work has been going on with four colleges: Foothill, Shasta, Butte, and Lake Tahoe with offices of Institutional Effectiveness or Deans of

Research. A release next month will push out different data sets from the CCC system, particularly Canvas data. All colleges already have access to their own Canvas data. Under the direction of the Chancellor's Office, the Technology Center is developing data tables and protocols that allow researchers easier access to data. Colleges have access to the entire Canvas data dump but many aren't able to ingest it into a readable format on their own. This great work came out of what was built to support the Course Exchange, along with the Data Warehouse project which also allows colleges to have easier access to some of their CCCApply data, multiple measures data, and other statewide projects. Mt. San Antonio, Sierra and Ventura, are also on deck. Careful conversations are happening, beginning with the office of the President at each college, about the kinds of data that the data warehouse is providing. The Data Warehouse is providing the college's own data, in a report center level of access. On the roadmap for future releases, under the guidance of the Chancellor's Office, are additional permissions for college staff to have access to the data, including visual dashboards, and different user permissions.

Additionally, there is Project Glue work initiated to support the Course Exchange. Project Glue provides the ability for data to move to and from a college's SIS and ERP. That has supported a number of different activities: the Data Warehouse, the Course Exchange, and also the Canvas integration component of Project Glue. This allows colleges to have Canvas instances populated with student information as well as course information from the SIS and the ability to also read final course grades back to the SIS from Canvas. Some colleges have resources to code transfer of that information from Canvas to the SIS or from the SIS to Canvas but most don't, so these are rolling out under Project Glue activities.

Jodie had submitted an item about concerns with the Shared Infrastructure Partnership (SIP) RFA. There may be some inaccuracies in her assumptions, but she was concerned about elements that related to OEI like @ONE and related student support services. She wondered how this might impact OEI. Jory noted in the background report it said no college submitted for the grant and therefore an extension was given. Actually, the SIP includes multiple existing program grants or major portions of them including: system-wide infrastructure components the Tech Center has traditionally managed like CCCApply and CCCID; the Palomar TTIP South grant; @ONE; the High Tech Training Center Unit run out of De Anza for about twenty years; Library Services and a couple of other things. It is really a consolidated RFA which has multiple grants and entities woven into it. There was a webinar for bidders a couple of weeks ago, which was archived on the web if there are any questions. A member noted this is a huge RFA and covers a lot of services colleges rely on. She went online to check the Chancellor's Office website, and there was a slide deck but it didn't match the scope of the work on the RFA. She asked about getting a review of the RFA but was told the question period had passed. LeBaron forwarded questions about the SIP RFA over to the people responsible for it and they were not willing to go through it again.

Chancellor's Office Update:

DEETAC:

Proposed DE Regulation changes as proposed by DEETAC were reviewed by Exec and modified. At this time LeBaron is not able to share those modifications. It is going through the process and senior management is firm on what is going forward. The changes did adopt 85-90% of what DEETAC recommended. Those changes will be released on June 7th when the Consultation Council agenda is distributed. Consultation Council will meet on July 21st and changes would need to be turned around quickly since items for the July Board of Governors meeting are due on June 22nd. If that timeline is not met, the item has to wait two months.

The next opportunity for comment after that will be at the Board of Governors open hearing in July. At a formal public hearing, people can come and comment in person or can present questions in writing. The Chancellor's Office responds to every question. They don't have to agree or adopt it, but they must respond to each one. The DE Regulations will go through the BOG process in July and then go back for a second reading and action in September. The Chancellor's Office has to report back to the Board any questions received and their responses. Assuming questions and concerns have been addressed, the Board will take action. Proposed changes are submitted to the Department of Finance for review, including potential financial changes or possible unfunded mandates. After review by the Department of Finance, which can take from a week to a month depending upon their workload, the changes go to the Secretary of State for thirty days awaiting public comment. At the end of that thirty day period it becomes law. That thirty day comment period will probably end around the middle of November.

DEETAC met on Wednesday and made recommendations for changes to Exec, but those changes were rejected. The proposed regulations cannot be shared until they are formally vetted at Consultation. This is how the new administration wants to do it. Changes will be released with the agenda on June 7th. Cheryl expressed frustration with being asked for feedback and then having Exec change some recommendations to do what they want. This is instructional and important to faculty. LeBaron explained the Academic Senate, CIOs, CEOs, and other constituent groups have the opportunity to weigh in at Consultation on June 21st. It will be distributed widely and there is an open and transparent process with a number of opportunities to share feedback. There was great feedback from the field and DEETAC took that feedback seriously. There was a robust conversation and LeBaron knows the Academic Senate took it seriously at Plenary. Erin and LeBaron met with two Vice Chancellors and tried to make the rationale for each DEETAC recommendation line by line.

Advisory committees have always been advisory to the Chancellor's Office; that is a consistent message. Committees provide advice and the Chancellor's Office takes the advice or chooses not to; most of the time the advice is taken, but not always. There are many additional chances to provide influence and much can

and does happen at Consultation Council. The Chancellor's Office is also in the process of streamlining committees. Some are created in statute, some in standing order, and some in executive order. The administration is taking a look at how it receives advice from these different groups.

May Revise:

The online college survived in the May revise and the funding is the same, at \$120M. There is \$20M ongoing and \$100M over a seven year period. Pathways that have been identified so far are Medical Coding, IT Support, and a third pathway is supposed to be identified in the next year and a half. One change is that the Board of Governors is now in the language as the permanent governing board. Other changes were made in terms of faculty representation. They listened to many comments put forward yesterday but there was not consensus at Consultation. There was robust discussion, disagreement, and resistance to the fully online college but LeBaron believes the Governor will be successful. This does not use Prop 98 money; it is General Fund money outside of Prop 98.

The Academic Senate has a strong \$6M proposal for Open Education Resources. The Chancellor's Office is asking to consult and engage with the Academic Senate on their proposal. OER has taken root and a two year process with Zero Textbook Cost degrees is wrapping up. There are twenty-five colleges implementing thirty-three ZTC degrees. A combination of that work still needs to be laid out within the Equity program which combined Equity, Basic Skills, and SSSP, into one grant. The January budget language that came out with the Equity Grant specifically authorized the use of Equity dollars to do Zero Textbook Cost degree programs. The Chancellor's Office intends to work with colleges in the system on the use of equity funding in this new support of ZTC and to work with the Academic Senate on how to use this \$6M if it stays in the budget.

The May revise is being discussed in the Assembly and the Senate in different bills; what comes out will depend on how it gets resolved in committees. The Chancellor's Office is confident and hopeful that funding will stay in the budget. The funding formula was hotly debated and discussed. The Governor proposed a modification based on feedback from the system, initially he had a 50-25-25 split, which was changed to a 60-20-20 split between the three levels. The system didn't get funding for professional development, but did ask for \$25M.

The Chancellor's Office continues work on revising FLEX calendar regulations. They pulled together an ad hoc advisory committee to develop two sets of regulations: one for the funding for the \$25M if it came through, and another to revise FLEX calendar regulations to make explicit that it could be used for all employees, not just faculty. This will open up professional development on an equal footing for time with a significant proportion of staff and admin. Senior management decided to set aside work on proposed regulations for the \$25M, until funding came through. The team is working now to address concerns raised

by Exec about the FLEX calendar regulations. They are hopeful those will go to the June Consultation Council and then to the July Board of Governors meeting.

A final regulatory package LeBaron hopes to have to the Board in July relates to tutoring regulations. It would allow more students to receive tutoring through an apportionment based process. Currently tutoring requires referral from a faculty member or a counselor based on an identified need. This new package will allow students to self-refer. Form 399 regarding potential funding impacts is an expected element of this package. On the surface it might appear more students being tutored through an apportionment generated process would increase budget pressure because more students would cost more for tutoring. However, if the quality of DE is improved, it improves the cost benefit to the system by reducing the number of students repeating a course. Students can repeat a course up to three times without a petition, and a fourth with a petition. The Chancellor's Office has gathered data they are looking at that shows allowing more students to self-refer for tutoring does not increase cost pressure, it can actually provide budget relief by reducing the number of students who get Ds, Fs, and withdraw, and are later required to repeat the course. LeBaron's team will meet with the research unit on Tuesday to pull apart the aggregate data for different groups to demonstrate benefit to the system. AB1935 is a bill that will also allow tutoring on more Basic Skills courses. Currently apportionment is only allowed on Basic Skills math and English. This bill will allow tutoring across all credit degree transfer level course sections, which will help the system reach its success goals.

Constituent Group Reports:

Academic Senate:

On April 14th the Academic Senate adopted nine resolutions related to online education. Faculty is clearly interested in improving online education. Three of those resolutions are:

- The ASCCC Online Education Committee has updated their paper "Ensuring Effective Online Education Programs, A Faculty Perspective,"
- Identifying and Sharing Effective and Promising Practices in Oral Communication Courses Online, and
- Identifying and Sharing Effective and Promising Practices for Lab Science Courses Online

All three passed with lots of conversation around the second and third. @ONE already put on webinars with people sharing how they have been approaching these ideas in various disciplines. The resolutions will be assigned at the next Exec Committee in June; probably to the online committee.

The Academic Senate has also been working on the OER proposal to help facilitate OER curation and development within the CCC system. A number of years ago the Council for Open Education Resources (COER), was a joint effort between CSUs, UCs and CCCs; Cool4Ed was the result of that effort. That work was only funded through about two years ago. The scope of the grant required

focus on top fifty high impact courses. However, CCC needs for lower division courses were different from what CSUs and UCs felt were needed for high impact, high need courses.

Now as more CCCs are exploring OERs and course shells have been developed and facilitated by OEI, this proposal has been developed to fund more OER work. Cheryl is hopeful this proposal will stay in the budget and be launched. The Academic Senate would then work with the Chancellor's Office on developing materials for fields that don't have them, as well as housing that material. A link to the proposal was provided on the agenda.

CCC DECO:

Lisa recommended members who have not attended Consultation Council to do so. She attended one recently and found great conversation which represented the varying opinions from throughout the system. It was encouraging to hear the shared governance conversation at that level.

The DE Coordinators upcoming retreat on the 18th is full. Lisa thanked OEI for helping fund it. Members are excited about hearing a student presentation from the Design Workshop. Coordinators requested fewer presentations and more conversations last year, which is being taken into consideration in format this year. They will archive the conversations in some way. PLN has also offered space on their platform for DECO conversations.

ACTLA Report:

The ACTLA conference was April 26-28th. One topic of discussion was online tutoring standards being done with 3CSN. A survey was sent to all tutorial coordinators to determine areas of focus and more than twenty ideas were received. The subcommittee meeting at ACTLA began focus on the areas of training, interaction, accessibility, evaluation, and delivery. Work will continue over the summer and into the fall.

Closing:

Jory thanked everyone for their work; there has been a lot of progress. Cheryl thanked everyone who was able to make it to the meeting today, she appreciated their input.

Amy reminded members to submit Travel Reimbursements before year end on June 30, 2018.

Next Meeting:

Friday June 8th Zoom Online 9:30-11:30 am

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.