

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday October 14, 2016

Zoom Meeting

Voting Members: Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Christina Gold, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Edward Pohlert, Greg Beyrer, Jesse Foster, Jodie Steeley, Joe Perret, Lisa Beach, and Morris Rodrigue

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Monica Matousek, and Russell Grant

Welcome:

Cheryl opened the meeting at 9:30 am. There were not enough voting members to make a quorum, so voting did not occur on the two action items on the agenda.

Update:

Jory explained that there has been interest in the VeriCite integration. The team received word that native integration to Canvas has passed QA and is being added to the base of Canvas. There are a couple of additional steps to get into production. Native integration will preserve more formatting of the documents and enables speed grader functionality; it is more tightly integrated into Canvas instead of acting as an external tool. Autumn is working with VeriCite on training for college help desk staff in the next couple of weeks. The team will also be joining the DE Coordinators call next week to provide an overview.

In addition to the native integration piece, they are also making accessibility updates and there is an overall user interface update coming as well. Early implementations this term will see significant improvement with new added features by the start of the next term. The QA process with Instructure has been cleared and is currently being integrated into the code base. They are going back into a test environment for final testing before it is rolled into production. It will probably be in the development environment next week and should be able to be demoed after that; they are running through and wrapping things up now. It is important to be able to provide native integration of plagiarism detection into the LMS. The project has been waiting on this piece and there will be a more comprehensive update about these three components soon.

Members expressed their appreciation for getting this product incorporated into Canvas and look forward to additional information on this integration. Greg asked about the option of colleges being able to pre-populate the site with existing papers. Jory explained that VeraCite is able to populate with historical papers, it just depends on what colleges can get out of their existing data base in terms of

an export and making sure it is in the right format. That is the recommended approach.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

The minutes will be reviewed at a future meeting since there was not a quorum at the meeting today.

Use of revised course review rubric in the November cycle: **Action**

Autumn Bell provided a history of the rubric and revisions that have been made. The rubric was first developed sometime in 2014, had a major revision in March 2015, and this is the third major iteration. The format of the revised rubric is based on feedback from faculty which participated in the course review, as well as feedback from faculty peer reviewers who have a good sense of what has been working and what hasn't in the rubric.

In September the lead reviewers met with @ONE for two days and went over everything in the rubric and did a major revision. The result when compared with the previous version is one with all of the same elements, but in a streamlined form. They have also highlighted the "Exchange Ready" column so faculty can immediately see areas that are exchange ready, exemplary, or incomplete that need work. There is also room for comments both from the faculty member and from the reviewer. The revision group foresees faculty getting the rubric first so they can be understand and do a self-check before going into the review process. Another addition to the rubric is "Additional Exemplary Elements," to let the faculty member know what could be added to make the course really exemplary. This is a professional development element in addition to a way to bring courses into the Exchange.

There are still four sections of the rubric: content and presentation, interactions, assessment, and accessibility. However, since accessibility has been the biggest hurdle for faculty, an attempt has been made to make that element much more user friendly with clear explanations including why items are important. For example, instead of "Tables have designated header cells," the description now says, "Header cells that allow the screen reader to read the table cells in the correct order."

The accessibility piece is now longer with items separated out. This allows for a distinction between what faculty could reasonable do on their own like: add alt text, and use header style, versus larger institutional concerns like: evaluating LTIs and apps, third party media players, and publisher content. A determination of incomplete in this area may result in an additional level of review for OEI Exchange courses. Since these elements are out of the area of purview of most faculty, if a course comes back with everything else in alignment with the rubric but they have problems with publisher content or not knowing if their third party media player is accessible, instead of just giving the review back, OEI would try to help with bringing that course up to the "Exchange Ready" standard with a little

extra support. Previously Jayme talked to the Steering Committee about Ally and the hiring of accessibility experts; those will provide help. The rubric is now broken down into areas faculty can reasonably address, as well as an area for addressing inherently inaccessible material with an accessibility plan, allowing guidance for how to create a plan for accommodations through the DSPNS office.

Jodie explained that previously faculty would be frustrated and sometimes drop out of the process because the number of points in Area D resulted in scores of 50%. This was very discouraging and sometimes faculty would withdraw from the process. The new disaggregated information along with offering help should make it more likely for faculty to resubmit and should help new participants in the process to be saved from some of the frustration of the pilot pioneer group. Faculty is not expert in ADA compliance they are discipline experts, so this is a great improvement.

The new version doesn't include scoring since it was confusing with respect to both minimums of three in individual areas, but also an overall score that required additional points to get to a score of 51. Instead the new rubric requires everything to be checked as Exchange Ready. So if something is incomplete, it is easy to find in the rubric.

Jodie asked if consideration has been given to having a process where resubmission doesn't re-review areas already checked, or to having the course go back to the same review team. Autumn and Jory have been talking about this since the review process currently being managed by @ONE will be moving over to OEI as of the end of December. Many changes will be happening. Currently, the faculty member gets his or her review results by email and looks over several sheets of paper with scores and instructions to schedule a meeting with an instructional design consultant, but many don't. The future process envisions the instructional designer working with faculty from the beginning all the way through to the end. There will be an upfront training element with the idea of getting the rubric self-checked and returned before going into review. This will allow faculty members to be aware of what will be reviewed and to make adjustments. There will also be a lot more support as the feedback comes back. The faculty member will basically be working with one person through completion. The hope is that this will be a more cohesive and service oriented process with one person assigned to each case and an emphasis on conveying the fact that all are on the same team.

Dave Stephens suggested surveying and engaging with instructional designers throughout the system. Not all of them are on the same page in interpreting the course design rubric and different interpretations could cause confusion and frustration. Baseline training for districts is important. Autumn confirmed they will be doing a Professional Development needs assessment, probably coming in the next semester to look at existing resources starting with the twenty-four pilot

colleges. Additionally, since OEI will be taking over managing the course review, @ONE will be freed up to provide more training for local reviewers, OEI course reviewers, and faculty for their own courses. Dave also encouraged districts to consider adopting the course rubric in their local process.

In the absence of a quorum, Autumn suggested allowing introduction of the new rubric to the new reviewers coming in during peer reviewer trainings scheduled in October. Perhaps it could be provisionally tested in the November review cycle and then compare feedback from faculty reviewed with this rubric to faculty reviewed with the old rubric. The decision will be brought back to the Steering Committee meeting in November, hopefully with a strong quorum.

There were no objections to moving forward with the draft rubric. Cheryl confirmed that it will still be possible to make revisions. Autumn also explained that the Professional Development work group reviewed the proposed revised rubric. Christina did not object to moving forward as a draft, but also emphasized the importance of good general policy for the Steering Committee to have a chance to review documents before they are put into use. The committee agreed.

Next Meetings:

November 18th Online from 9:30am - 11:30am

December 9th Face-to-face in Sacramento from 9:30am-3:30pm

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 am.