

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday March 9, 2018

Courtyard by Marriott Sacramento Airport Natomas

Voting Members: Adriana Martinez, Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Corey Marvin, Dave Stephens, Geoffrey Dyer, Jodie Steeley, Joe Perret, Juan Camacho, Lisa Beach, Tabitha Villalba, Thomas Greene, and Wendy Bass

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Andrea Hanstein, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Erin Larson, Jake Kevari, Jay Field, Jessica Hurtado, Joe Moreau, John Sills, Kate Jordahl, Laura Hope, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Lou Delzompo, Marilyn Harvey, Russell Grant, Steve Klein, and Tim Calhoon

Welcome and Attendance:

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

Approval of Minutes:

Action

There were a few corrections to the minutes for the February 9, 2017 meeting. *Tabitha Villalba moved to approve the minutes and Conan McKay seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with no abstentions.*

Announcements:

Online Teaching Conference and CCCDECO Retreat:

There is information in Basecamp about OEI paying for registration for members of the Advisory Committee. Members are responsible for their travel/expenses.

The CCCDECO retreat is on Monday before the OTC; the same day as the preconference workshops. The website says you must be a DECO member to attend the DECO retreat, but OEI Advisory Committee members have special dispensation to attend. Lisa asked people to register so they have a good count.

Online Meeting Times 2018-19:

In the fall the committee was cancelling meetings, but the last few have been running over scheduled time. Cheryl and Jodie discussed whether meetings should be scheduled for a longer block of time; however, the calendar has been set for a while. Two hour Zoom meetings will continue through June. Changes for next year will be considered in May. Voting items will be scheduled early in meetings and quick special meetings may occur if needed.

Both the Senate Plenary and CIO Conferences happen on April 13th so Cheryl and Jodie will put out a Doodle poll regarding possible rescheduling of that meeting.

Norms and Question Cards:

Jodie provided question cards so members could easily submit questions during the meeting. Members agreed to participate and remain engaged during meetings, while determining on their own when they need to check email, etc.

Basecamp Tour and Unpacking:

Jodie provided an overview of components of Basecamp and where to find documents, etc. The official membership list is on the OEI website, on the front page under governance. The team relies on the Academic Senate and other stakeholder organizations to provide names when there are changes in membership. OEI Management Team, Technology Center, and Chancellor's Office attendees don't count toward quorum for voting.

OEI Staff Organization Chart Update:

Logan set up an OEI organization chart which will be posted within a week after adding reports, along with roles and responsibilities, not just titles.

Reports/Updates- Management Team:

Course Exchange Update:

Course Exchange 2.1 launched February 2018; there are now eight colleges in it with classes. The two new colleges are Mt. SAC and Cabrillo. Colleges are also in the pipeline in user acceptance testing. Hopefully many will be on when fall registration starts. Work continues on some PeopleSoft integration work that was a blocker; it is now moving forward. There were fifty-eight course sections in the Exchange for spring and the projection for the fall is to easily get to one hundred course sections but the charge is to get to three hundred.

Consortium Expansion:

Twenty-nine colleges submitted packets, and a one week extension was allowed. The team hopes to notify colleges by mid spring, sign master agreements by June, and hopefully offer courses by fall. Some like sister colleges, will be easier to bring on. The package was extensive so colleges know what is needed.

Colleges have had challenges after personnel changes or transitions. Joe Moreau introduced Jay Field, who is a new Management Team member at FHDA who joined the team specifically to assist with campus based challenges. For example, sometimes departments on campus don't talk to each other; DE Coordinators, VPs of Instruction, Academic Deans, Instructional Designers, etc. can be ready to go, without having spoken to IT. Jay knows IT culture well and can bridge that gap. He knows will also be able to provide more direct connection with the Tech Center team. Steve explained FHDA's role is to help the entire college feel comfortable with all the individual steps that need to be taken. The Tech Center team enables the software at the local campus, supports the configuration, maintains, and updates the software that operates itself. The handoff between the two teams requires coordination and Jay's place is in the conversation with the IT department; they need to connect with others on

campus conceptually and with what needs to happen. Once the IT Director is on board, they can bring their team on board and Enabling Services from the Tech Center can support the configuration and deployment through testing. There is an important choreography between the teams. When the prep work is done well, the technical team can hit the ground running.

Kate noted the self-assessment packet focuses on college resources and is based on Advisory Committee and Consortium input into what colleges should have in place. It asks if the college is willing to put twenty percent of its online courses in the Exchange, etc. The IT Director needs to sign off on certain pieces and the Academic Senate has to have a resolution or affirmation of participation in the Course Exchange. The project is seeing a significant increase in student success, but there also needs to be more students and courses in the Exchange for OEI to be successful. Thomas noted increased interest in OEI on the part of CEOs. He thought a toolkit around supporting readiness for implementation and adoption would be helpful to institutional leadership. Kate felt the self-assessment was a good learning tool for colleges. The deployment checklist provides a lot of guidance. Thomas felt there would also be value in leadership's role supporting processes so awareness stays on the radar.

Unfortunately, the number of students involved in the Exchange is still quite low. Legislative relief regarding residency and removing the orientation block in Version 2.1 should make a big difference moving forward.

In the new RFA the Chancellor's Office is clear about the expectation all colleges in the Consortium will be teaching colleges with students coming from any home college. This is to help students with course and degree completion. When the funding model becomes based on course and degree completion, having students able to complete courses and degrees will also become more valuable to home colleges.

Plagiarism Tools Update:

An announcement came out during the last meeting that Turnitin bought VeriCite which raised member concerns. OEI had a contract with VeriCite through June 2018 with a possible one year extension by mutual agreement. The team met with Turnitin but still has significant concerns. A big one is related to accessibility; VeriCite is WCAG 2.0 AA compliant, but the roadmap for Turnitin is unclear regarding the technology they plan to use going forward.

As the project builds the budget for next year, the team will determine what they are able to fund. They know accessibility is important. The RFA just came out yesterday and previously the Management Team wasn't clear on details. The colleges in the Consortium are aware of the uncertainty and should build that into their budgets. The executive staff will be meeting the end of March to write their RFA response. Nothing will be certain until the grant is awarded since another

district could be awarded the grant. The team will provide more information about budget planning on the April agenda.

Joe Perret requested the Management Team provide a concise list of goals and key measurements like: number of colleges signed up, number on the list, how many students are taking classes, etc. and have it available for monitoring as the project goes along. Jodie thought that information could come from RP Group reports based on yearly goals and whether or not the project is meeting them. She did not think it was a good idea to ask the Executive Team to focus on that when the grant is due and the project is focusing on getting more colleges on.

OEI Exchange Marketing Plan Update:

In November when Andrea started there little centralized OEI marketing support. Kate had put out a deployment package and there were a few local efforts. So, in December the team did some immediate work to get enrollment going for spring and winter. Logan helped with website modifications and Amy got the CVC updated. They got a published list of courses in the Exchange to counselors, SPOCs, whomever to share because there wasn't a readily available public facing place to find that list. The OEI website was updated to be student accessible. Outreach was done by Bonnie and her team to librarians and counselors, since students often look for information at the library. Social media posts with imagery that colleges could post were also authored.

In January the marketing team had a joint meeting with SPOCs and PIOs at colleges live in the Exchange, to find out which colleges had done any marketing; for the most part it was Fresno, Coastline, and Foothill. Information was gathered on what collateral and tools colleges would choose if they had money available: postcards, posters, displays for plasma screens, geo-fencing (ads that pop up based on location), and social media. Messaging should include information about all of the services OEI provides, be co-branded (not just Cabrillo but Cabrillo/OEI), be respectful of local marketing campaigns, and focus on the college's involvement in a statewide project.

They solicited marketing firm bids and a contract was awarded to 25th Hour Communications. They had done work with the state, with colleges, had experience with community colleges, and two of their head employees are former community college Marketing Directors. The initial marketing focus is on the first eight colleges that are live with a contract that expires in June, but if it continues they want to do marketing for Consortium colleges live in the Exchange. Campaign goals are: to increase enrollment in the Course Exchange, expand awareness of OEI services, communicate in general the value of online education, and demonstrate the value of OEI to the CCC community. Key messages are: "You have the power and strength of the entire system behind you if you are in OEI," "Our classes will help you complete your academic goals thanks to the Course Exchange," "Because of the professional development we offer you are guaranteed your classes are high quality with instructors that have

been trained to teach online,” and “Online student support services will help you succeed.”

Currently the team is interviewing Course Exchange PIOs and finding varying levels of awareness. They will find starting level and look at how to fit into local marketing efforts. The team is also working on an OEI/Course Exchange Style Guide so website templates have consistent messaging. Logan and Kate also have user friendly URLs up and ready for marketing materials. A dollar amount has been set aside to develop collateral and electronic advertising for each college and printed collateral will be shipped directly to them. There are discussions about how to define the Course Exchange in messaging: is it the Exchange, CE, the Course Exchange, or is there another way to define it that would resonate better with students? Cheryl suggested a breakout at the Student Senate to get input. Marilyn noted Career Tech was changed to Career Education and Continuing Education also uses CE as an abbreviation. That should be considered as well. Students do understand the word cross-enrollment, so that might be a possibility.

Joe Moreau reported on a February Consortium panel with Chief Instructional Officers from Foothill, Columbia, and Fresno who provided feedback on what would make the Course Exchange more valuable to their districts. The team is hoping to have panels with students, CEOs, CISOs and instructional support or counselors at future meetings; this is valuable since it provides different perspectives. Joe reported there is interest in expanding courses beyond C-ID into other CSU GE courses. Colleges wanted OEI to help them partner with other colleges in the state to build out fully online programs they may not have fully available in their college. For example, Columbia has a healthy GIS program, but not enough of the right faculty to build out an entire GIS program online. They felt by partnering with another campus they could probably offer one. Fresno felt the same about engineering, and Foothill about Spanish.

Colleges also need help filling online classes for courses that don't traditionally fill from their own home college students; this is especially true for remote rural colleges that can get eight to ten students but not enough to fill a course. Panelists felt there was a need to scale and decentralize the course review process; they liked the move in that direction. They feel strongly about wanting to grow the course review process and Course Exchange mechanism into CTE disciplines. They want help in finding qualified online faculty with Exchange ready courses so they can offer courses they don't have or their faculty don't want to teach online. Colleges would like OEI to come up with strategies for satisfying the lab science requirement. STEM majors need to have in person lab experiences, but for non-STEM majors an alternative lab experience might be appropriate. Jodie noted Oral Communication is now fully online, so there is a precedent there for agreements. Laura Hope explained there has been some signaling from CSUs with recent Executive Orders to depart from a rigid commitment to Pre-

algebra and Algebra pathways. They have not seen that from UCs quite as generally, but Statway and Statistics are approved for both CSU and UC systems

New Foundation for CCC Contracts:

The Foundation for CCC has four new contracts that came out of ideas from OEI's Academic Affairs and Accessibility Work Groups. Barbara wanted to make colleges aware of them. These are all Foundation contracts and not funded by OEI, however, the next OEI cohort is focused on equity and some of these services are ones OEI has recommended that colleges look at.

The Foundation has a contract with Blackboard for Ally. Another contract is for a search engine called Atomic Jolt. It can search across all of a student's colleges in Canvas, and for faculty across all of courses at all of their schools if they are doing updates, etc. Another contract is with NameCoach for gender, name preference, and name pronunciation. Finally, there is a contract with NoteBowl, a social media company. Jorge Burwick will be putting out an announcement and flyer about these contracts. Contact: JBurwick@ FoundationCCC.org

Accessibility Plan and Tools Update:

The law requires a complaint form on the website and Jayme Johnson and Sean Keegan were very helpful and worked with the team to get that form up. It is for anyone having accessibility issues with the website; the user fills out the form and someone gets back to them. An Accessibility Plan is required and the project is working on it. The Accessibility Plan will state OEI is going to follow all Federal, state, and Chancellor's Office rules and laws. It will also include accessibility rules and how the project is meeting them. That Accessibility Plan will be posted on the website next week. The accessibility process doesn't have to be posted on the website. Logan is great about posting links to vendor accessibility plans.

A sub-group of the Accessibility Work Group chaired by Dave has been working to come up with an alternative solution since Ally's cost is above what we expected. This process probably should have happened prior to putting expectation onto contracting with Ally. The group is now designing a function requirements list to rank in priority order as if they were going out for an accessibility tool, whether an LTI that plugs into Canvas, or a standalone scanning environment. Dave showed the list being developed and noted some elements are fairly technical. Items in green are areas where the potential tool already has some degree of integration with the Canvas rich content editor, the primary platform faculty members will be using to post content. This will push on Instructure to ramp up development in that area. This is the system wish list for an accessibility platform in various areas. At the bottom is a list of other suggested features. Right now in Canvas an instructor has to allow extra time per quiz versus setting that up per student, which is how it would normally be needed. The rankings go from 100 for high priority to 10 for low priority. There is a second column for marking if the project is working on requesting it from Canvas. The Accessibility Work Group will continue working on and refining the

Comment [Office1]: Ally is still available. We're not funding it though.

list. Dave hopes this is helpful for the system but there is not timing or funding for it yet. This is a work in progress and they need to refine what they want to make public, Barbara said the group will meet again on March 13th and later make the outcome public.

Lou asked why it wasn't sufficient to just reference using WCAG 2.0 AA and measure against that standard. Dave explained that criteria are included as critical deal breakers. This document is a work sheet/wish list for what the system wants. Chairs on the scoring work were Laurie Vasquez and Sean Keegan and Jayme Johnson and others were involved. The impetus for this work was thinking about products and realizing they should first look at what the product needed to include. Eventually maybe the project or Chancellor's Office can put out an RFP. The work group took a step back from what might not be the right tool and instead focused on ranking the importance of particular functions. Steve suggested checking in with Instructure regarding their accessibility roadmap. This list will also support the CCMS committee's conversations with Instructure.

Jayme is in the process of creating four modules on: Word, PowerPoint, Excel, and pdfs. They will be posted on the OEI website as open resource. They are also working with @ONE to make courses or modules as offerings for faculty.

Chancellor's Office Update: Information

The Chancellor's Office released the RFA for the new proposal for the next version of the CVC/OEI last night. A workshop is planned for April 24th at 11am. Information on the RFA went out to all the major groups and to the CISOs today. Erin Larson and Russell Grant are official grant monitors. This RFA is a joint effort between Academic Affairs and the new Digital Innovations and Infrastructure (formerly TRIS) divisions.

As one of the OEI architects five years ago and as someone in the Chancellor's Office a long time LeBaron has seen this work through a number of evolutions. The CVC has been around for twenty years, at one time it had \$2.9M dollars of funding and five centers around the state. It was even trying to identify a common CMS for quite a while. For the last fifteen years, the CVC has been a line item embedded in TTIP. For 2018 that has changed and it is moved over as an area of responsibility under OEI. This RFA rebrands OEI as the CVC/OEI and the Chancellor's Office has painstakingly tried to say what the new CVC/OEI is and is not. It is not the 115th fully online college; that is a different population and the Governor hasn't yet specified details on is desired for that 115th college. The new CVC/OEI is intended to serve traditional DE students. The RFA sets a goal for three hundred course sections for the fall. They expect to ramp up to about 5,000 course sections in five years. OEI built the circle of the Consortium with colleges as members. The legislature changed language to require making the CVC/OEI available to any college in the state. A student at any college can take a course from any college. The Consortium can be limited to teaching colleges, but with the new RFA, colleges that aren't offering courses can't be in the Consortium.

The deadline for the RFA is May 28th at 5pm and the Chancellor's Office plans to review the proposals within a week or so. There will be a ten day protest period and they plan to put the contract before the Board of Governors in July. The new contract will start the day after the Board approves it.

This is a significant opportunity to transform the project. The CVC has .edu addresses and OEI does not. The Technology Center has done a tremendous job with the CVC program but this is really a rebranding program. There was internal debate, but the Chancellor's Office was required by budget act language to make this change. Wendy asked about changing the name of the CVC, since people in the field may wonder if the CVC is the 115th college. LeBaron explained the California Virtual Campus (CVC) is in the state law; the name will not change. Additionally, in the RFA for CVC/OEI, being the 115th college is included in the "Out of scope items." This project is designed to help the 800,000 or so students already enrolled in community colleges to graduate and be successful.

Update on Collaborative Pathways:

The Chancellor's Office is spearheading a collaborative program in Cyber Security Technology and has invited about fourteen colleges to participate in a meeting in addition to OEI and Academic Senate representation. In the most recent version of the Program and Course Approval Handbook, on page eighty-six, the Chancellor's Office enables a collaborative program where two or more colleges can work on a degree together. This group will explore that. They identified eighteen challenges to setting up a collaborative program and those were pushed out to thirty-three people who might or might not attend the meeting. They were asked to identify additional challenges in nine categories and ninety-nine additional responses were received. LeBaron and his team have been going through and looking at ideas. The focus is on doing collaborative programs better and on a baseline for the ideas Joe was talking about earlier.

CCC Technology Center Updates:

Information

Canvas-SIS Integration Update:

Amy provided a brief history of how Canvas was identified as the CCMS. By the third year of the grant 110 colleges had committed to Canvas with eighty-three fully migrating or transitioning over. There are now about 68,000 active courses in the CCMS and those high adoption rates present an opportunity to develop integration points between Canvas and the SIS with transfer of data and improved efficiencies. This also supports work identified for the Course Exchange in the OEI work plan. Canvas/SIS integration is important because the SIS is the source of data to create and maintain Canvas courses and student rosters. Without integration, faculty or administrators are forced to manually create courses in Canvas. Integration frees up faculty time to be teaching and supporting students. Additionally, with automated processes, students can access courses faster.

Jane Linder reported the goal of Glue, now SuperGlue, is to provide high level integration between Technology Center projects to make separate systems work better and to tie them together to decrease hassle in working between systems. There is a Glue Advisory group with representation from both large and small colleges and those that have already completed integration using a large staff. They want to offer this free to system, to continue to improve it, and give benefit across the system. Steve and Amy helped Jane get input from users as well as the Instructure team regarding how data matches up to put system knowledge into use cases. That helped with information like the importance of inactivating courses rather than deleting them, so they retain access to data. Jane has also been able to get onto the Canvas community and Listserv to post questions and gather information.

Glue provides the ability for Canvas course shells to be created automatically on a schedule from SIS data. Admins can set up a schedule to synch and it will just run to create Canvas course shells and automatically enroll students. The student is then added to the roster automatically and can get started right away. Course data and student enrollment are continuously synched so they are both automatically updated if there is a change in room number or faculty for a course. When a synch happens if a student or faculty account doesn't exist, the creation of those accounts is auto-provisioned. Admins can define the terms. The default is all active sections, but that can be filtered on the year, whether English or math, or on faculty, or by campus. It would also be possible, for example, to filter out faculty members who have not yet completed training. Cross listing of students is supported if the district wants it; a flag can be set to merge or not as desired. There is an option for faculty to merge lists, but some colleges don't want that.

Jane explained this is available now, and they are just rolling out into Beta to get feedback and will then roll into production; they are at code complete now. Production is currently planned for June, but may roll into Q3. A lot of the Glue's user focus is on IT staff and making sure Glue doesn't make it harder for them. They plan for transparency on synchs, etc. with error messages available so the IT staff can troubleshoot if needed.

Proxy has to be in place to use Glue; it is important for students to be able to get into a Canvas instance across the system. Right now that is done by merging the accounts. Dave explained they have problems with a student enrolled in two or more colleges with accounts and LTI not carrying over from instance to instance. Jane explained some configuration has to be done to make this work. The Technology Center needs to set up permissions, provision users, etc. It does use many of the same data objects as Course Exchange, so there is very little set up. The Canvas data integration is a much smaller one.

Jane just finalized the list of five pilot colleges last week after she got them from OEI. This is going to be available to everybody as part of the Course Exchange

Adaptor. It will be part of Course Exchange version 2.2 and colleges will be able to take their time turning it on or off. This is a Beta with a subset of colleges but will be available to the others in the very near term.

Jay asked about the synch schedule and if it was done in “live” or was triggered. Jane explained most SISs don’t support triggering so it is set up on a schedule which can be set for as often as every fifteen minutes or a button can be pushed when you want to do it sooner. Pushing that button will send for a pull from the SIS for a full data set and it compares the changes. Lou explained Glue now has coverage for Colleague, PeopleSoft/Campus Solutions, and versions 8 and 9 of Banner. The Technology Center’s intent is to keep that up to date. The project has engaged with Ventura to stand up a live version of their Banner 9 instance in Amazon for live testing with Glue in the next week or two. Foothill provided a good sandbox, but the system didn’t remember Glue was connected, so Banner 9 will be in the cloud.

Jane will also be at the OTC to provide a presentation for faculty.

CCC Data Warehouse:

With Canvas, the Course Exchange, and other applications huge amounts of data are being generated. The work plan requires the ability to report back and there is a need for access for researchers and colleges. The Data Warehouse project is hoping to simplify and provide a value add to the system with access to that data. Alex Jackl is the product owner for the Data Warehouse and as the Chief Data Steward is accountable for data management (also known as data governance) regarding data access, rules, etc. The Data Warehouse is a centralized structure connected to a lot of other efforts in the Technology Center and in the system. The original vision had to do with capturing multiple measures for assessment, etc. Later they realized this could provide access to instructional information from Canvas. This project is part of a larger picture which includes: MyPath, CCCApply, Glue, MDM, and Canvas.

The team is committee to standards including taking data sets that exist in Colleague and Banner and the MIS as a baseline starting point since almost everyone interacts with them. It will then be easier to integrate systems and data sets and make accurate and appropriate comparisons. Therefore, one of the background goals is to create standards for data storage. The end user doesn’t care about it, but it makes it much easier for the technical workers to deliver coherent data to the end user. It also helps with meeting FERPA guidelines for privacy, etc. Data privacy and liability are very important since the system is sharing data and storing it. TTAC has a part in helping create a framework for data structures and along with the Chancellor’s Office is working on the broader shared data management issues.

The prototype won’t go into full release in pilot until the end of June. There is a prototype with Foothill, Butte, Shasta, and Lake Tahoe which will kick off soon.

Alex is working with an informal data stewards group to make sure the project is following what the colleges would expect. Security is critical: individual college instances are being kept separate, proper single sign on and roles are being set up, in the prototype phase access is being limited only to specific researchers at their college and only to their college's data, and when data is presented they are suppressing PII and private information to make sure no one but people with the correct rights can see it.

The project is building out a data dictionary so the meaning of fields can be clear to researchers. It is also building out a secure interface with four roles: basic users, PII users, super users, and administrators. PII users can see all the data from their organization, basic users can see all reports from their organization but not PII, super users are data stewards for the organization, and admins oversee technical aspects. The project is also building out a set of metrics, dashboards, and data is being tracked and logged so who reported data, which source the data was reported from, and when it was reported can all be logged. It will be possible to look at a constant dashboard of both technical information on whether the Data Warehouse is working correctly, fast enough, etc. and also the data structure so the team can backtrack to determine what data came from where, in case there is any question about the source of the data or the source of a report. They are also building in automated structures so JIRA tickets for action from the technical or support teams can be generated. They are investigating analytics tools for higher end visualizations, etc. which is going to be recommended sometime in the next couple of months. The Bourne release is planned for late June and the team will take feedback from researchers to make sure the pilot release is usable and providing value right off the bat. Then they will work on iterative improvements. The future plan is to support the OEI helping researchers, instructors, etc. to provide student centric learning.

Steve and Jory waited to have this presentation until real colleges were identified and there was a real project to share. This is another facet of the OEI work that goes on under the surface to support student success. The project is working closely with the Chancellor's Office to make the Data Warehouse available to college researchers. The Bourne release will be in June and then later dashboards will be enabled for researchers and eventually faculty to have access to Canvas course data to allow for instructional decision making to better support students and for improving institutional and instructional success.

Local Review of Exchange Courses:

Autumn provided an overview of how the course review process has evolved and been updated over the course of OEI. The focus has always been on offering courses in the Exchange that are of superior quality, of appropriate rigor, and are taught locally prior to being offered in the Exchange. Since 2014 over sixty-eight faculty members have been trained in the peer online course review (POCR) process and over one hundred courses have been redesigned to incorporate best practices. Most course redesigns have taken place in the last six to eight

months when there has been an increase in the pace of course alignment. The course review process first started in the native LMS and later those courses needed to be reviewed again when courses went into Canvas. Over twenty colleges which responded to a survey reported they are using the rubric either for training, as a requirement for peer review, or for peer mentoring around course design.

The existing centralized process consists of several steps. Faculty members attend an online informational meeting about the process and submit a course. Courses are reviewed by one anonymous peer reviewer and one accessibility reviewer with the two sets of results being consolidated by a lead reviewer. The lead reviewer then has a call with the instructor and an instructional designer to go over the results and provide feedback and suggestions. The lead reviewer continues with the instructor and course until final course approval. That existing process is now going to be supplemented by a local course review process to assist with scaling to the system. OEI pilot course sections perform at 3.9% above the statewide average for student success and the project wants to get more courses for the Exchange, and also wants to spread success to more of the CCC system. Therefore, @ONE and OEI are launching a new program to help college teams design, develop, and deploy campus based peer review and mentoring for online course design. The new program will have two parts, first building a local course review process and then having a lead reviewer provide system norming of local results.

The first step of building a local course review process is a course, which is really a series of meetings. They will ask colleges to identify cohorts of a minimum of three people from the campus to go through the “Building a Local Course Review” process together. This will consist of three weeks with one meeting per week and assignments to work on together between meetings. Those will design a course review process that works with the campus culture, faculty needs, and also be aligned with the broader guidelines for course review set forward by the Academic Senate and applied by the OEI. Lead reviewers will participate in the three meetings along with colleges like Coastline that are already doing local course review and can share best practices. Since there are challenges in providing consistency while meeting local needs there are required elements:

- 1) Has to be peer to peer with faculty reviewing other faculty
- 2) Has to use OEI course design rubric
- 3) Local reviewers have to go through the @ONE POQR training
- 4) Participants have to go through regular norming and training on use of the rubric and best practices in online pedagogy in course design

Once colleges complete the process, their team will be given as many coupon codes as they want for the online POQR course. There will also continue to be norming sessions throughout the year. Currently there are four which are a combination of online and face to face opportunities. The team is also open to doing a larger session at an annual POQR Norming Retreat.

A benefit for Consortium colleges will be having local processes recognized for peer review. They could then submit courses directly to the OEI Course Design Academy for lead review and accessibility check. The lead review is important since it is someone from another college and another discipline that will norm across colleges. Autumn has dates for the Building a Local POQR training and for the other POQR classes afterward.

The Senate hasn't previously taken a position in this area. Cheryl has taken information about this proposed process to the Senate as the team has been developing and revising it. The Academic Senate approves the process and appreciates the respect Autumn has shown for their concerns. They feel the norming is very helpful in addressing a major worry. Cheryl is also considering taking this to the April meeting to solicit full Academic Senate support.

Wendy spoke passionately about the course review process and how amazing it has been; she feels it has reinvigorated everything in her teaching both online and in person. She is working with her own personal instructional designer and is bringing changes over to her in person classes as well. She would love for the Academic Senate statewide to support the course review process.

Jodie wanted to provide funding support for this work since there was support for it in the centralized process. Autumn acknowledged the team really wanted to take some money from the centralized review process but found it wouldn't work and be sustainable. Coastline is funding a stipend for their campus course review process. Colleges also have money from Canvas savings. The three week local review training is an amazing professional development process for reviewers and those being reviewed and it doesn't cost anything except time. Jodie noted accreditation requires some kind of certification or training for faculty before they teach online; instructors can't sink or swim with fifty students along with them. She would like the Advisory Committee to advise colleges in being proactive in applying funds from Canvas savings to professional development. There were also two Academic Senate resolutions regarding savings from Canvas adoption.

Jodie was concerned the centralized review process would go away and leave only be local review. Autumn emphasized the review process is not going away; some colleges don't want to do local review and even those which have local peer to peer review still need support from instructional designers for alignment. Kate put together information on the value of participation in the course review process in terms of professional development versus the cost of having a course reviewed through Quality Matters or other online learning consortium certificate programs. Additionally, colleges should look at what it costs to pay instructional designers and accessibility experts; they are extremely valuable. The centralized process provides someone to help instructors make their courses 508 compliant. Members agreed that provided great value. A member noted Guided Pathways work plans are coming due and items nine and ten are good places to include support being given to online students. His campus passed a resolution asking

their Professional Development Committee to give them ongoing FLEX opportunities to meet the rubric through 2020. If there are other creative ways to leverage professional development funding, Jodie suggested members bring them back for the benefit of everyone.

Currently the review process averages about a month. Instructional designers meet on the schedule set by the faculty member being reviewed. Autumn noted they are seeing more instructors putting in their second, third or fourth course.

Online GE Pathways for ADTs:

Marilyn Harvey has joined the OEI team as Dean of Academic Services. At the last meeting the team shared potential opportunities for increasing courses in the Exchange besides increasing GE requirement availability. Marilyn presented a grid showing courses being taught online now that are in the CSU GE pattern where Exchange offerings might be increased. Logan developed the grid by taking schools live in the Exchange, live courses in the CVC, and looking at C-ID, and GE at CSU.

The committee discussed whether to move beyond C-ID courses and Marilyn felt everyone could agree it would make sense to look at IGETC, ADT, and some others as opportunities for expansion of the Course Exchange. The list that was developed will go to the SPOCs to see if anything was missed. In reviewing ADTs, Erin explained Academic Affairs looked first for C-ID, then articulation by major, and then GE breadth certification. They looked at three different potential sources; that might be a logical way to look at expansion.

Cheryl took this topic to the Academic Senate last week, particularly around the topics of online Oral Communication, Public Speaking and online lab science courses. There was a perception that the Academic Senate didn't support online courses in those areas, but that was an informal position; no action or formal position had been taken by the Senate. Looking at the future of education, CSU changes in expectations, and probable movement by the UCs that direction, the Academic Senate Executive Board supports this. C-ID was created as the CSU General Education needed for ADTs but that has been getting expanded. Articulation has to be official for transfer, but for other areas like CTE, it would still be useful to get agreement among those in the field and in discipline areas. The Senate Executive Board, which includes Chemistry faculty, was opposed to online lab science for the Chemistry major. However they thought other majors might possibly find General Biology, Physical Anthropology, Oceanography, Physical Geography, Astronomy, and Meteorology acceptable for transfer requirements.

LeBaron cautioned care is needed with this well-intended work. There is automatic intersegmental agreement with ADTs and C-IDs; in the non-CID realm that may or may not be the case. It is important not to set up a situation where a student takes a course they think can be used at their home institution and later

finds out it can't; that wastes their time. If this is going to be done, LeBaron encouraged starting it within a collaborative situation where colleges have agreed to accept courses so students don't get burned. Barbara agreed it could be helpful for small transfers back and forth between schools that don't have enough students to offer particular courses like Spanish 3, etc. The idea is to look at courses being offered online that could be useful if they were made Exchange ready. The courses in the grid are courses in the CVC for any term and also within that CSU GE pattern, minus courses already in the Exchange. In reviewing ADTs, Erin explained Academic Affairs looked first for C-ID, then articulation by major, and finally GE breadth certification. Those three potential sources might be a logical place to look at expansion of offerings.

Members also discussed courses approved somewhere else, that are not necessarily C-ID and whether it would make sense to try to get descriptors even if there was only a regional need for CTE in a few districts. Cheryl heard from the Senate that if there are courses for the Exchange that don't currently have C-ID, it would make sense to make sure they do by the time they get through the Exchange course review process. A challenge in getting descriptors is not having enough reviewers from the CSU. Tim thought there was a need for some sort of CCC to CCC transfer identifier with the understanding that it doesn't need a CSU reviewer since it would just be for Associate degrees.

The group discussed C-ID, AA, ADT, and AAT related to transfer and articulations. One member thought it would be a good idea to add Exchange classes that are not C-ID but that students need for a degree. There was an Earth Science class cancelled this semester that a student needed it for her degree; if it had been available elsewhere she could have completed. There are a lot of gaps. Completion data can show where cancellation of courses results in a student not being able to complete a degree or certificate. That could be a starting point for faculty and colleges to look at partnering with other colleges to fill in gaps. Bakersfield is currently piloting what they call a Program Mapper that pulls in required or core classes identified in the program inventory or CO-CI, and identifies for each program, the core courses mapped electronically. Alyssa recommended interested members contact Craig Hayward about that pilot.

Other Information-Ideas for Future Agendas:

Joe Perret asked about having a project plan or timeline and Jodie was going to recommend he ask for an agenda item, so time could be set aside for more holistic discussion. Then another member also asked about a timeline for OEI projects, so Jodie messaged Melissa to see if the team could put something together which would also be useful if the project has to be handed off and also for onboarding new members.

Jodie skimmed the RFA last night and felt it was important to talk about increasing the number of seats to twenty in each class. She would like this group to make that recommendation to the Consortium. A member expressed concerns

about how that would impact students locally. Jodie felt it was important to look at how the needs of more students would be served. To have OEI pay off the large investment that has been made by the citizens of California, the number of students in the Exchange needs to be much larger. The rules of the grant state that colleges with courses in the Exchange will pay if they don't play by the rules. She appreciates the new RFA having tougher requirements. Colleges that are collecting services should be working to meet the requirements and some are not. If two colleges both have twenty seats open that makes for a real exchange; otherwise it isn't. One member asked if there was a way to research so colleges aren't offering the same classes and Jodie felt the cohort and collaboration idea would be helpful to that vision.

LeBaron reminded everyone that the very first meeting of OEI he told the group there should be twenty seats per college in the Exchange and there was a lot of pushback. Over the five years of the grant the Chancellor's Office has steadied its resolve and the new RFA reflects that. This is an investment of \$100M over five years, including subsidizing a common CMS for about \$60M. The intent is to have a more educated set of citizens and to enable students to achieve their academic and career goals. The team needs to set hard goals and measure them. If a college is not ready to get on board, maybe it needs to wait.

Kate asked how everything with the RFA would work if it is being awarded at the July Board of Governor's meeting and registration for fall begins March 25th. Erin agreed that is a challenge and suggested for now the project just move forward with more sections and completions. If reminded of that question she can add it to the deck to answer on the 24th.

Jodie acknowledged the focus on more sections and seats. When she accepted being on this committee she knew it would involve work and effort and that is what is required. Twenty seats are in the RFA and as a leader what she believes the Consortium should move forward with and what she is going forward with at her college. With or without the grant conversation, the project should be moving toward 300 course sections.

Next Meetings:

Friday April 13th Zoom Online 9:30-11:30 am
Friday May 18th Sacramento 9:30 am - 3:30pm
Friday June 8th Zoom Online 9:30-11:30 am

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:34 pm.