

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday June 10, 2016

Zoom Online Meeting

Voting Members: Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Fabiola Torres, Greg Beyrer, John Freitas, Lisa Beach, Lisa Wang, and Morris Rodrigue

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley, Arnita Porter, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Bruce Racheter, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Martha Rubin, Michelle Pilati, Pat James, Steve Klein, and Wendy Bass

Welcome and Attendance:

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:35 am and welcomed everyone.

Annotated OEI Course Design Rubric:

Inform and Solicit

Input

Michelle Pilati discussed the Annotated OEI Course Design Rubric posted in Basecamp. The project has heard input about how the rubric directs toward course design that is good for students and course success and also noted that it is also consistent with regulation and course compliance elements. The Professional Development work group put together this annotated version to highlight those compliance elements.

The document was brought to the Steering Committee to gather ideas regarding other compliance pieces that should be added in terms of local uses of the rubric, as well as rules around accreditation, legislation, Title 5, etc. Members were requested to provide input to Michelle within the next two weeks.

Dan Crump reminded the committee about a discussion at a previous meeting about how it is good to refresh the design of a course after three semesters, and wondered if that was included. Pat explained that there was a Public Policy Institute Report in 2014 or 2015 which presented research that the first two semesters of a course aren't the greatest, the third semester was the best, and after that it declined. Michelle agreed that information should be emphasized for good effective practice, but it is not included in the rubric. It is not a compliance issue. There have been conversations about how many times a course can be taught before it needs to be reviewed again, but no policy has yet been set. Michelle and Pat suggested that be brought up at the Consortium, and Wendy agreed to bring it up there.

Legislative Update:

Pat read from an email from Theresa Tena regarding technology budget items that were passed out of conference committee last night. The two versions were the same, and there is no reason to believe there will be changes before the

legislature takes final action in the next five days. The Governor should be signing the budget around the end of the month.

Both versions included the following technology items:

- \$20M for OEI augmentation,
- \$5M for technology infrastructure, ongoing,
- \$7M for technology infrastructure, one time,
- \$5M for zero textbook cost degree programs, and
- \$3M for data security ongoing

Action Item:

Pat will post the notes from the group work at the last in person meeting on Basecamp.

After the discussion was finished, there were enough members to make a quorum so the committee moved on to voting items on the agenda.

Approval of Minutes:

Action

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes for May 13, 2016. Dan Crump moved to approve the minutes and Greg Beyrer seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by the committee.

Plagiarism Detection RFP:

Action

Jory reviewed the history behind putting out this Plagiarism Detection RFP and the evaluation process that was followed leading to the recommendation of a Notice of Intent to Award. The hope is that contracting can be negotiated for the coming year for the eight pilot colleges that don't have an existing plagiarism detection tool and other colleges might choose to make use of the contract.

Morris Rodrigue moved to approve the recommendation made by the evaluation committee to put out a Notice of Intent to Award for the selected vendor. Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously by the Steering Committee.

Implementation Team Update:

The implementation team recently completed ten visits to eleven colleges. Pat thanked the team for their hard work and willingness to travel to make those personal connections face to face. Those kinds of conversations are critical and really help people to develop the necessary trust in each other.

Bonnie explained that it was hard but interesting to visit all of the colleges in a short time. It was very helpful and important to be there and meet with the people from the areas that will be affected by the project. Colleges are still coming up with new ideas and approaches even two years into the project. It was very helpful to be able to explain things clearly to those who were confused about the process. That process of explaining things also helped management team

members understand them more clearly, which made the next visits go better. Bonnie felt that the personal approach will always need to be part of the process. The Exchange was a big part of the discussions, especially in terms of financial aid, admissions, enrollment management, and the different school cultures. It was a successful process that was both exhausting and exhilarating. The Exchange was the focus, but the team also talked about the other tools that OEI is working on and the “Wow” slide really had an impact in conveying what the project has done.

John Sills noted how hard it is to get to Ventura and Fresno. He has a new appreciation for the work required by stakeholders from those colleges to travel to meetings. It was good to visit all the colleges and meet the IT staff he has been working with and to make those connections. After those visits, John believes the project has a good handle on the Exchange product; he expected colleges to bring up features that the team didn't expect or hadn't thought of, but that didn't occur. The team did gather some big ideas for future development.

The ten visits consisted of four hour long meetings with all the stakeholders: enrollment management, IT, counseling, academic deans, DSPS, the whole spectrum. Jory explained how powerful it was to have all of those people in the room at the same time. They were able to see how and why everything is connected together the way it is. It was really valuable in taking the project to the next level of communication and bringing together people with a shared understanding. Now team members on campuses know others that have the same shared knowledge which helps to cement the process; the project is encouraging colleges to continue these campus dialogues.

After the OTC, the management team will be making a complete report on status to the Consortium, which will be passed on to the Steering Committee as well. The project is moving forward with the Exchange and assessing everyone's readiness to start. The team will be meeting Monday to look at all of the variables: the courses that are Exchange ready, where the project is with the Adaptor mechanism that allows for the transfer of information, and other things that affect the launch. The development of the interface both for the admin and student side is moving along as planned. Pat reported that the team will have more information about start dates and so on, after the meeting on Monday. Right now the management team is still looking at when things are going to be done and how close that is to student registration. On Monday they will determine if everything is still on target or if they need to make adjustments. Possible adjustments include looking at the possibility of a staggered implementation for those eight colleges and what to do with early registration in October and who will get to do that. There are many dependencies and it is complex to make it all fit together; the team has just a little bit more to do.

The Adaptor will help with the problem of not having common SIS and getting information across when campuses are using different systems. This will help

with the fact that colleges don't have a common SIS, as well as with CAI, EPI, and other technology across the system. The Adaptor is being developed under a Creative Commons license, so other colleges and systems may also be able to make use of it. The team will keep the Steering Committee informed as things are updated

The Canvas community is also growing. Pat talked to someone from the University of the Pacific (UOP) where they went to Canvas in the last year. They are interested in developing Consortium of Canvas users, across CSU, UC, and CC colleges. With close to eighty-four CCCs coming onto Canvas it would be a great way to make connections with other colleges on Canvas.

Next Meeting:

The next OEI meeting will be online on July 8, 2016.

The next in person meeting will be September 16, 2016, in Sacramento.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:41 am.