

## Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday February 10, 2017

Zoom Meeting

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

**Non-voting Attendees:** Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley, Barbara Illowsky, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jory Hadsell, LeBaron Woodyard, Mia Keeley, Michelle Musacchia, Monica Matousek, Nicole Woolley, and Tim Calhoon

### **Welcome:**

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:32 am.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

### **Action**

Greg Beyrer moved to approve the minutes from the December 9, 2016 meeting and Lisa Wang seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. (There was no vote on the notes from the January 13, 2017 Zoom session, because there was no quorum, so it was not an official meeting.)

### **OEI Update:**

### **Information**

Fresno and Lake Tahoe are live in the Exchange. Coastline is ready to go, completing its last checks, and should be up in the next couple of days with their spring courses. More colleges are lined up in the queue behind them.

The project is looking at how to meet the expectations of the Governor, legislature, and Chancellor's Office in scaling up more colleges and courses in the Consortium. Over upcoming meetings, the project will be looking at potential ideas for changing the paradigm of how a course makes it into the Exchange while preserving the quality of courses and good work already done. The project will also be looking at what can be done to improve the experience for faculty, SPOCs, and for the colleges. Those internal management team conversations are starting now.

In the spring, Jory would like the project to take a holistic look at the ecosystem that has been put in place with OEI and to check in and see where it is with vendors and whether there are any gaps or other priorities that should be considered. He wants to bring Phil Hill in to have a facilitated conversation around that to make sure the team isn't missing anything. Those conversations should also inform what to include in a grant renewal application for OEI and ensure there is a good analysis of why the project is where it is.

Active outreach to colleges continues and the project continues to get recognition nationally. Jory was able to present to the League for Innovation at a site visit to

Foothill DeAnza this week. They were impressed with the progress that has been made and the scale of the initiative.

Barbara Illowsky highlighted appreciation over the smooth transition in Executive leadership. It can be tough to switch from a strong founding leader like Pat, and Jory has done a tremendous job.

**Face to Face Proctoring Network Guidelines:**

**Action**

Barbara and Nicole brought back the Face to Face Proctoring Network Guidelines presented for informational purposes last month. The intent is to provide a network for colleges to join that will be voluntary both to colleges inside and outside the Consortium. It should be a resource to help students where online proctoring won't work well or isn't what the faculty needs. The guidelines were also brought to the Consortium where no additions or changes were made. The project is working with Proctorio to get Chromebooks from Google, so that each college that participates will have a Chromebook at their testing center and students can go in for face-to-face proctoring there if they need it.

There are some areas of the state that aren't covered very well, but the project is working to serve the largest number of students as well as possible. At this point it doesn't impact many courses, but it provides flexibility. It mostly involves mathematics courses because of guidelines imposed by the UC on transferability.

A minor change to the language was suggested as a friendly amendment. The phrase "Testing centers must be accessible to online students," was revised to "Testing centers must be available to students regardless of home campus." The change is intended to avoid confusion with accessibility for the needs of disabled students. The goal of the guidelines is to have testing centers open reasonable hours and not to turn away students from other campuses if they are able to get to the center.

Conan McKay moved approval of the Face to Face Proctoring Network Guidelines with the friendly amendment. Greg Beyrer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Criteria for expanding course offerings:**

Barbara brought this information to the Steering Committee last month and Jodie made a valuable suggestion which has been included. The draft was brought to the Consortium and they had no additions or suggestions.

For background, the Steering Committee approved a list of nineteen courses in the fall of 2014, but those courses were never meant to be the only ones in the Exchange. Those nineteen courses were in the most demand at that point in time. Some of them still are, but now there are others in more demand. There needs to be flexibility for the OEI staff to work with campuses to find out what is

in demand and what is needed. In addition, Governor Brown and the legislature provided \$20M to OEI with direction to build up the Exchange and get more courses.

The desire is to set up criteria, but also to work with the colleges on what they need. For example, there might be a small college that has students that need Linear Algebra for the math ADT, but not enough students to fill a section at their campus. Maybe the course can be offered somewhere else, or the college can offer it online and students from other schools in the same situation can join in to fill the course. It is true that the project will need to be thoughtful about providing the right level of variety in courses offered. There could also be a rotation of courses, perhaps offered at one college in the fall and another college in the spring. The idea is to meet the needs of the students. The final decision about which courses to offer will probably be made by the management team with input from the Consortium and SPOCs. The goal is to come up with a robust, balanced breadth of course offerings over time through a collaborative process.

It is important to be aware of the needs of small colleges with respect to potential loss of enrollment. The Consortium will still have the requirement that students are enrolled in courses at their home college. There will be a need for a balance between different colleges' needs. This could also provide a great opportunity for small rural colleges to offer courses that otherwise wouldn't fill, to pull in enrollment from other colleges. The project does want to make sure that no one has a big net loss. Jory also hoped that in the Exchange there would eventually be the opportunity for colleges to collaborate in smaller sub-groups, perhaps with regional collaboration as well.

The management team would like to grow the structure of the Consortium to include sub-groups, one of which could be an Enrollment Management group within the Consortium, which could meet and negotiate things like appeals processes, etc. The colleges will need to work together to set those ground rules. Selection of the courses is not tied to who is added to the Consortium. These criteria are just about expanding the list of courses beyond the original nineteen.

There was a question about colleges having additional pre-requisites beyond C-ID, but it hasn't been an issue in the Exchange so far. With the exception of the Research Methods course, so far the courses are floor level with no pre-requisites. Colleges have also agreed through reciprocity agreements to having C-ID set the requirements.

In the future perhaps it would make sense to include prioritization of courses using OER. On that topic, starting in January 2018, course sections will need to have a course designation that identifies which sections are OER and this will be true of Exchange courses as well. LeBaron is working with the Communication Division on identifying a common symbol or logo for all colleges to use across the

system. Barbara suggested a dollar sign with a diagonal line through it as a symbol that would be easily identifiable.

Greg Beyrer moved to approve the “Criteria for Expanding Course Offerings” to make a brighter future for the students of California. Jodie Steeley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Data collection transparency**

Lisa Beach wanted to discuss questions and concerns some faculty members have about data collection. She is aware that one use is by colleges to improve their own enrollment management, but she thought it would also be useful to post information about data collection on the CCCOnlineEd website. There could be a general statement about data collected and what it is used for. This would include data that is collected by any entity outside of the college through Canvas and other systems adopted through OEI.

It would be useful for Lou Delzompo to give a presentation to OEI on data governance at an upcoming meeting. The Technology Center is in the planning stages of working with the Chancellor’s Office and Debra Connick on building out a data governance structure. The Academic Senate will have a big role in that as well. There are already some elements in place where entities that want to access data have to sign an MOU with the Chancellor’s Office.

Currently OEI is not really gathering anything other than what goes into Canvas, there is nothing centrally being collected at the moment. The goal for the long term does involve saving OEI’s Canvas data to be used for student benefit. Those kinds of items will be covered under the data governance structure that will be developed with serious Academic Senate involvement. Lisa suggested a synopsis of that information posted on a website would be a helpful reference for people with questions. The Technology Center should be able to finish up the Charter for the Data Governance Project in about a week and then it could be available for posting.

Jory also asked the Foundation to work with each of the OEI vendors to stand up a page about what data they collect. The vendors don’t have access to anything beyond what is put in Canvas, which may be a student’s first name or student ID. The data can only be used for valid educational purposes. The project would like to have a statement on the OEI page with links to those vendor pages. By law, California requires online services to have a privacy policy, so it would be easy to link to those as well.

Some faculty is under the impression that data about their course: success data, retention data, or student data would be collected and used in some way to pressure them to do something differently. It would be useful to have a statement explaining that isn’t being done. Tim Calhoon emphasized that is precisely why

the Academic Senate is needed on a data governance committee, no one wants that to happen.

Greg suggested including a link to the data policy for each vendor on the OEI page, and maybe also a statement from the Academic Senate about maintaining local control as much as possible in who is teaching classes and so on.

Data analysis by the RP Group is part of the MOU that is in place with the pilot colleges and student level records are being analyzed with the school. For colleges that are not in the pilot, but are buying into services, only general usage statistics are being collected.

Lisa's campus has a lot of faculty thinking hard about this. She suggested using the term "aggregate", so faculty will understand data is collected but only analyzed as aggregate data, not as individual class data or individual student data.

**Action Items:**

- Have Lou Delzompo do a presentation on Data Governance at the next Steering Committee meeting.
- To be posted on the website:
  - o Links to vendors' pages and data privacy policies
  - o Academic Senate statement about local control
  - o Statement about how OEI is using data

**Announcements:**

A list of the 113 CCCs including links to websites and Board policies regarding DE has been compiled. It will be posted to the CCCDECO page within the next couple of days.

Basecamp does support meeting invitations and a member requested the Zoom information be included.

Nicole will be organizing documents on Basecamp into folders.

**Next Meetings:**

March 10, 2017 Face to Face meeting in Sacramento

April 14, 2017 Zoom online meeting 9:30 – 11 am

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 am.