

## **Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting**

Friday September 16, 2016  
Embassy Suites Sacramento

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

**Non-voting Attendees:** Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley (online), Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman (online), Caryn Albrecht, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, LeBaron Woodyard, Logan Murray, Martha Rubin, Michelle Pilati, Monica Matousek, Pat James, Russell Grant, and Steve Klein

### **Welcome and Attendance:**

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:40 am, welcomed everyone and asked all attendees to introduce themselves.

Two items on the agenda originally listed as “Action” items were actually “Information” and a couple of items were moved since Michelle Pilati was not available for her presentation until after lunch.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

#### **Action**

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes for the June 10, 2016 meeting. Cheryl Aschenbach moved to approve the minutes and Conan McKay seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### **Elections:**

#### **Action**

Lisa Beach led the process of selecting a new co-chair (to replace John Freitas) for a two year term. Fabiola Torres will continue to serve in her co-chair position for another year. Cheryl Aschenbach and Joe Perret were nominated and spoke about their visions for the role of the OEI Steering Committee. Both felt the selection of the new Executive Director to follow Pat would be important and it was critical to consider expanding the variety of courses offered in the Course Exchange taking into consideration student need. Cheryl Aschenbach was elected the new co-chair.

### **Share Evaluation Plan 2016-17:**

Alyssa Nguyen provided a high level overview of her role as RP Group External Evaluator for the OEI as well as her planned focus for the year in the areas of OEI process, online learning environment, and online teaching environment. She will work in partnership with the management team to provide information to demonstrate impact and evidence of desired outcomes, while also identifying what is working and what could be improved. Results will be communicated internally and externally. Evaluation methods include: review of OEI documents,

surveys, focus groups/interviews, and analysis of student level records from pilot colleges.

The evaluation logic model includes activities at varying levels of outcomes, short term, intermediate, and long term. In the area of OEI processes Alyssa will look at whether there are effective processes in place to ensure key stakeholders are aware of OEI products, services, and its progress. With respect to the online learning environment she will investigate whether students are satisfied with their learning experience using products and services funded by the initiative. Similarly for online teaching environment she will investigate faculty and staff awareness of and satisfaction with products and services, including training in the use of those elements.

The evaluation model is cyclical. It involves collecting information for formative reports, sharing the findings with the OEI management team, and planning next steps based on the findings. Then the results are shared with the OEI Steering Committee and a plan is made for how to move forward with the next phase of evaluation.

Pat requested the addition of elements that measured increase in online sections over time and how well programs are growing. She felt the overarching view would be helpful in looking at impact on the goal of improving online education in California. It would be useful to share Legislative Report findings with the Steering Committee either on Basecamp or in a presentation. Pat explained that there were challenges around not wanting to compare online courses with face-to-face courses, but it was determined that a baseline was needed for face-to-face courses. It is important to see if there is improvement, even without necessarily being able to point to the specific cause, since there are so many things being done that haven't been done before. Pat felt that when the number of online courses is rising, it is probably related to something the OEI is doing. Right now all online courses are rising at the 2008 rate, but face-to-face courses are flat, so something the OEI is doing is probably having an impact.

Alyssa highlighted that while retention rates have been relatively stable across various levels overall statewide for Distance Education, for 2015/16 the overall success rates for Distance Education courses at the twenty-four pilot colleges is higher than the statewide online success rate. Additionally, the OEI specific pilot section success rates are also higher than the overall Distance Education success rate at the pilot colleges. Preliminarily, this is a very positive possible impact contribution to student success rate. The 2014/15 OEI Legislative Report was completed with all of those quantitative outcomes included; Alyssa will try to share those on the next agenda. Those outcomes are important for continued funding and support.

Jory encouraged also looking at the accreditation picture. Pilot colleges are adopting resources, but non-pilot colleges are also adopting services and the

course review process is being adopted locally as well. He felt it might be useful to track the number of colleges on some kind of sanction for Distance Education programs as the OEI is providing these resources; the number might be decreased. Dan also suggested looking at how colleges outside of the pilot are using the resources, since it ties into external perception of the project. LeBaron will be reinstating the annual Distance Education survey and it should be possible to piggyback off of that.

**Executive Director Update:**

Management team updates were posted on Basecamp yesterday and Pat provided the Steering Committee with an update handout sent to TTAC. There are now ninety colleges using Canvas, but they are slowing down as the project gets to the last few. There are also some that have agreed to come on, but haven't done their paperwork yet.

In the last month, Pat was able to have lunch with the incoming Chancellor who asked good questions. Later when he spoke on KQED he talked about the OEI efforts to increase participation.

The OEI received an additional \$20M augmentation in one time funding from the Department of Finance and is working on a budget for it. The Technology Center submitted a budget for building out the Course Exchange architecture to help get more colleges on sooner. The money will also provide funding for getting additional courses into the Exchange, including training teachers, and providing access to quality online course offerings including expanded online inventory of professional development, getting instructional designers, etc. The work plan is about three-quarters done, when it is finished, hopefully in the next week or so it will be posted in Basecamp for Steering Committee feedback.

Unfortunately \$6.5M of the OEI funding for year one had to be reverted back to the State. Funds could be rolled over for a limited period of time, and the first year funds were not able to be pushed back for another year. Theresa Tena is asking that money to be reallocated in the fifth year of the grant and she thinks it will be able to happen. The rest of the grant money is being spent out, it was just an issue that came up with the first year funding with respect to invoicing and how and when funds could be used. Funding the ongoing Canvas subscription could not come out of the first year funds. Fortunately the \$20M augmentation doesn't have to all be spent this year, it goes to 2020/21 and although it is for the Course Exchange and not Canvas, having that funding enables other project resources to go to the Canvas subscription for a common course management system (CCMS).

The project worked with the Chancellor's Office on a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for \$10M to be added to the ongoing \$10M so the ongoing budget also ends up being \$20M. The BCP is supported by the Chancellor's Office to pay for the CCMS. The State recognizes the importance of a CCMS as a linchpin for

online efforts. That platform helps the OEI set up as system that works across colleges. Additionally, the College Adaptor which is being built by the Technology Center allows for SISs to collect and/or share information across from PeopleSoft, Colleague, WorkDay, Banner, etc.

LeBaron reminded members that all grants are issued by the Chancellor's Office for a five year period; he and Russell are beginning work on the new RFAs. Recipients need to reapply so that grants don't become endowments and recipients don't become complacent. The Budget Change Proposal is for funding a Common CMS, not specifically Canvas, it is important that vendors know they must remain competitive and responsive.

Dan wondered if there are other issues address in order to bring on the remaining colleges. Steve explained that there are ninety-two colleges on Canvas now with another ten in decision making processes this fall. The remaining thirteen have a variety of reasons including existing contracts with LMS vendors, and sometimes very strong voices on campus with strong interests in keeping a particular vendor. He felt that generally, concern about ongoing support for a CCMS does not seem to be a major issue. Steve thought complexity of decision making involving many people with strong voices was a larger factor.

On Fabiola's campus it involved designing their own LMS through Moodle and the Academic Senate having some concerns about "how much it will cost after." Since they are the only CC in their area that is not on Canvas, worries about growth seem to be persuading some. Jodie's campus seemed to have a current tide oriented away from Distance Education and a few strong voices against change.

Colleges that made a change relatively quickly often had used the opportunity to have faculty compare Canvas to their existing systems in a sandbox. Faculty liked the ease of use and getting courses in. Some of the last colleges haven't started the discussion process yet and haven't seen or worked with Canvas.

Lisa Beach cautioned that some colleges are concerned about the possibility that they might transition to Canvas and later need to make a change again. The unions are involved now. She advocated for sticking with a vendor. LeBaron agreed that it is challenging, and explained that the State of California is not in the business of guaranteeing a particular vendor in perpetuity. Canvas has to perform, and if they do not, they will not be supported. Steve explained that one of the strengths of the choice of Canvas is that there are checks and balances so that colleges don't end up stuck with an unresponsive vendor.

### **Basecamp 3 Migration:**

There is a new version of Basecamp now available and the project will be making the migration soon. There are a number of new improvements including folder

structures, the ability to tag mentions in conversations (for example, @Logan), pings for private message chats, and enhanced mobile versions for Android and iOS. There are also bookmarks, sharing links, improved search functionality, and notification scheduling.

Logan will move the project over to the new version in the next week. There are a few minor things that won't migrate but will still be accessible in the archive. Not all of the committees will migrate at the same time; Logan will change the OEI and then pass the keys onto the next project.

Greg prefers the ability to preview Microsoft documents that is available in the mobile form of Basecamp 2. Otherwise, Word documents have to be downloaded and opened in Microsoft or Pages. John Sills reported he has provided that feedback, but it doesn't seem to have gone anywhere. Dan would also like to have email messages tagged with the particular initiative they are coming from (for example, Basecamp(OEI)).

### **Ally Implementation and Smarter Measure:**

Jayne Johnson reported on a plan to move forward with piloting a new accessibility tool called Ally, as quickly as it is safe and prudent to do so. Ally has three functions that can be used as separate modules: reporting, a faculty feedback and repair mechanism, and a student facing element with alternate formats. The pilot will run first in the fall semester with the eight full launch pilot colleges and if everything works as expected, they will look at expanding. All OEI Exchange courses are automatically invited and expected to participate in the pilot, and faculty teaching those courses are also invited to bring other online courses into the pilot. It will start when the list of faculty and the courses they want to include is available and will take about a week and a half to set up accounts, process the courses, exchange LTI information, etc. There are two check-in points relative to the starting point, the first at about 2-3 weeks and the other after about a month. The pilot will end on December 15<sup>th</sup> with debriefing on December 16<sup>th</sup> with Alyssa and the RP Group. This is a pilot and at this point the tool has not been purchased.

Steve asked about next steps and evaluation of the tool, with respect to timing of an RFP process. Jayme hopes to find out enough about the functionality of this tool during the first month or two to determine if licensing should be pursued. So far he doesn't believe there is anything else out there that does what Ally does, so a Sole Source Agreement might be appropriate, but he has gotten conflicting information on what is required for that. Jayme felt it would be premature to do an RFP at this point; he wants to make sure Ally is worth pursuing and the system would benefit before spending time on the RFP process. The purchase of Ally would have to be a co-funded venture since the OEI cannot afford to pay for it alone. So Jayme is working with DSPS while also looking at who else will potentially benefit from this product. The pilot is to gauge satisfaction and effectiveness for faculty and DSPS.

Jayme explained that recordings of Ally demonstrations are available; it does more than testing and more than Compliance Sheriff. It does an assessment, but its main point is to automatically create alternative accessible formats. If you put in an untagged, image based pdf, it will do its best to perform optical character recognition, tag it, create an accessible document, and give it a score. At that point the faculty is provided with a helpful, handholding type of experience, to go in and add accessibility enhancements, provide alt text descriptions, verify the heading structure, and verify the table structure. A lot of it involves verifying what the automatic process achieved. It automatically deals with mathematical expressions and STEM content. The legal requirements keep Ally from saying it can make a document accessible, so instead they provide a ranking and score. This tool can be used to go in and fix things, and could be an insurance policy against total inaccessibility. Anything loaded into Canvas automatically gets converted. If the full power is activated, when a student encounters digital media they are provided options to download the format best for them: electronic braille, large print, audio, and different electronic formats. Jayme feels Ally is friendly and not intimidating. He thinks that tracking the original score and how it improves with changes will motivate behavior change and competition to take control on an individual level. He also thought it could be a powerful tool for DE Coordinators to use in the evaluation process for quantifiable data.

Currently course review relies on a spot check that doesn't catch everything and needs very thorough final review. Jayme thought Ally could do that check. ACE reviewers have not used it yet but @ONE is in the OEI instance and Anna Stirling will be evaluating it. Five new accessibility specialists are being hired and this will be part of the work they will do. Jayme is hoping this will allow the Exchange to grow exponentially since accessibility has been a major issue slowing down course review.

Dan suggested extending the end date for the pilot to the end of submitting grades, maybe the end of December, since faculty sometimes give students time past the final. Jayme agreed.

Regarding LTI, TurnItIn, and Canvas, there have been changes made in the degree to which an LTI will integrate into the root menu structure and interface of Canvas. It does not have a huge effect on the end users, but involves a different process that puts tighter controls on the data and allows less opportunity for third parties to do whatever they want.

The supporting technology on the readiness modules has been revamped. AblePlayer now provides better support for accessibility with a full multi-media experience. It has interactive transcript capability and customization requirements for students with learning disabilities and other disabilities. It doesn't look very different but is really good behind the scenes. Bonnie explained they were working on that throughout the spring and finished in July.

The project was able to negotiate unlimited access to Smarter Measure for Quest for the entire system on an annual basis. That means all colleges that are not part of the pilot now have access to all aspects of Quest, whereas previously non-pilot schools had access to the modules but not Smarter Measure. So far thirty-three colleges have contacted the project and thirty are getting the full Smarter Measure key. A few will use it for spring and a few have started for the fall. Anita provided the raw numbers for fall use in Basecamp and the spring 2016 numbers will be posted shortly.

### **Criteria for Onboarding New Colleges:**

Pat shared a document from Consortium discussion on possible criteria for bringing new colleges into the Consortium. Required items included: Canvas implementation, Open CCCApply and SSO/Federated identity, e-transcript California, and no sanctions on accreditation status. There were a number of other preferred items, program development ideas, and course ideas. Pat encouraged members to consider the list, add comments, edits, etc. to the Basecamp Consortium discussion.

Some members thought having sister colleges ready to go was a good criteria, while others thought it was not since it might discourage colleges from moving forward with preparations. Jory also asked members to keep in mind that augmentation funding is to accelerate the number of colleges that can come in, so it may be helpful to look not only at which colleges can come in, but also which can come in quickly. The goal is to have criteria so the project is ready if there are many colleges that want to come on next.

Jodie encouraged consideration of “having a full time DE coordinator” in the criteria to put emphasis on the importance of that position.

Members also suggested looking at growing the list of courses and different groupings of courses for which there is demand. Some courses and paths might be ADT, CTE, and GE.

The Technology Center will probably be ready to start working on implementing the SIS connection to bring the next cohort of non-pilot colleges into the Exchange around March 2017. There is some time to work on the criteria, but it should move forward.

### **PLN, Badging and Portfolium:**

The Professional Learning Network (PLN) is at [prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu/](http://prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu/). The site allows users to submit resources, learn using grovo or lynda.com resources, connect through a discussion forum, track professional development, and look for speakers on the Speakers Bureau, or events on the PLN calendar.

Currently resources are initiative products, invited submissions, or materials from other CCCCCO sites. Users may submit a resource by selecting “share a resource,” unsolicited submissions are subject to review. There are several submission categories and the documentation required depends upon the category selected.

The PLN site can be searched by key word or words and can be limited to particular areas if desired. The calendar is intended to serve as a system level resource to inform the CCC community of upcoming events and prevent conflicting scheduling. Fabiola encouraged some kind of coding for the calendar to make it user friendly for faculty or staff. For example, if meetings for all of the initiatives are posted on the calendar, it would be helpful to be able to filter for particular kinds of events.

Michelle also brought attention to Portfolium, a resource that is being offered free to all CCC’s through the Foundation for CCCCCO. This product is not OEI selected or endorsed. Colleges might find it useful but should do their own due diligence regarding the product.

Steve cautioned that Portfolium’s business model seems based upon sharing student information. There may be storing of third party credit card information on site, and there are a lot of data sharing concerns and issues raised with respect to FERPA. As the system is developing an ecosystem of vendor products that are held to a very high standard, including for interoperability, care should be taken when introducing additional products to recognize the kinds of choices being made. There is a lot of work being done in the EPI around the educational portfolio as well as a tool called Career Coach. Portfolium has connection to careers and LinkedIn, so those interconnections might be important to consider.

Some member campuses had been approached by Portfolium and they thought it was made to sound like it was provided by and approved by the system. One mentioned that Portfolium wanted an email list of every student.

Michelle had a list of specifications provided by the company and encouraged colleges to look into it further to see whether it would be of benefit to their students. Dan noted that LA Trade Tech apparently has a faculty guide for using Portfolium in Canvas. Jodie found it easy to use when she needed to set up an e-portfolio which is what pushed her toward it. She felt there was great potential in the product.

Within an e-portfolio, faculty and students might find it useful to have digital badging to recognize competencies and experiences gained and demonstrated through non-traditional means. @ONE is looking at including a badging system in the PLN. Badges can document and provide evidence of accomplishments; they are portable, granular, and motivational. A CCC badging system would need to: allow for various issuers within the system, be able to display badges from

various sources, have a robust and easy to use interface for the addition of evidence, be valued by the potential audience, and integrate with existing systems in the CCCs.

@ONE is in the early stages of looking into some kind of badging program with @ONE/PLN as issuers and CCC faculty and staff as earners. This is not currently being considered for students or for Credit by Exam. A lot of thought and planning still needs to go into how this would work including whether or not the system recognizes the value. There are various concerns to be addressed including how to prevent fraud.

### **Course Exchange Timeline Update:**

John Sills provided an in depth review of the Course Exchange timeline; it will also be posted in Basecamp. The project is currently working with the eight full launch colleges on getting the SIS Adaptor in place. The administrative workflows were frozen in August and as of yesterday the student workflows were also frozen. The team is now moving ahead with bug fixes and accessibility testing. They plan to release it in October, and bug fixes will continue to be deployed as needed. Concurrently, in September, the team is beginning SIS Adaptor implementation at the other sixteen pilot colleges for the Course Exchange. This will allow for early registration piloting in spring 2017 for courses to be taught fall 2017. The SIS Adaptor will also be implemented with the first CAI colleges while the sixteen OEI pilots are being implemented. The other CAI integrations will also be slated into the spreadsheet.

Currently the team has split the administrative and student workflows, but in the future those workflows will be delivered concurrently. The first new cohort of colleges will be looking at Exchange registration in fall 2017 for teaching spring 2018 classes, and the second new cohort would be registering spring 2018 for new Exchange courses fall 2018.

In order to participate, colleges must have the SIS Adaptor and Canvas in place to underlay the Exchange. Some colleges that choose not to adopt Canvas may still end up with the SIS Adaptor installed for other Technology Center applications. CCCApply, for example, is not currently using the SIS, but will in the future. OEI is ahead of the other projects in integration; ultimately there are about seventeen different integration points, the Course Exchange is just one that will be interacting with the college's SIS. The SIS Adaptor (also known as the College Adaptor or Project Glue), will help colleges with a number of integrations. The SIS Adaptor fits into Project Glue's master data management (MDM) model which leaves the college in control of the kinds of data they are consuming, as well as submitting, into the Exchange or other data flows, like e-transcript or Apply.

OEI is leading the way with its development work in Project Glue happening first, as well as the development work for connecting into Canvas. This will allow

ability for automated data flow to Canvas, rather than having to wait twenty-four hours, there will be almost real time integration. It will also complete the feedback loop of getting the grade back. It is important to be able to get students into classes in a timely manner so they don't miss assignments, etc. John Sills welcomed members passing along additional user stories still needed from an instructor's point of view.

**Action Item:**

Presentation at a future meeting about Project Glue and its impact

Shibboleth or some other Federated identity management with SAML underneath is also required for participation in the OEI Course Exchange. The Technology Center can provide support for the installation of PortalGuard or Shibboleth. Others that can talk to SAML, like Ellucian, can be used, but the Technology Center cannot support them because they can't get answers from Ellucian to be able to support students.

The College Adaptor is now at production readiness with all eight full launch pilot colleges, testing out the web interfaces and then looking at a decision to move into production. For the release timeline, the team has successfully completed end to end testing for a student at Fresno. The next step is end to end testing at Coastline. When that is complete there will be end to end testing between Fresno and Coastline, and then end to end testing with the other six full launch pilot colleges.

Documentation for the administrator pages is complete, and Autumn delivered three sessions of professional development to admin users with good feedback. Now that the code has been frozen for student pages, documentation can be started for those as well. Similar training and professional development will be delivered to counselors who will be working with students using the Exchange.

Once all of the end to end testing is complete, the team will present the full comprehensive test plan, results, and bugs fixed, to each of the college's implementation teams including IT folks. A one week window will be provided to do any additional user testing they feel is necessary. Once the college is confident, they will be able to move forward.

The week of October 24<sup>th</sup> the team will walk through the admin setup for the Course Exchange to track any bugs and move through the process. Afterward they will be ready for the Exchange to go live. The goal is for students to begin using the Exchange on October 31st, if everything is ready on the 24th it could begin sooner.

Bonnie set up a Federal Financial Aid Consortium with agreements in place between the eight full launch pilots. Financial aid will be administered by the student's home college. Students are directed to contact their home colleges

about any courses they are taking in the Exchange. Financial aid representatives will have access to records to be able to verify registration, etc. to make sure the student's whole unit count is included between the home college and the Exchange. That ability was already developed in the administrator screens frozen four weeks ago.

Regarding the ability to track the swirling of students in the Exchange, there is not a specific flag but it could be included in future development. Currently in the Financial Aid reports, and in the enrollments dashboard, it will show all of the college's enrollments and be able to be filtered at the college level. Users will be able to filter by how many students are going to one of the other colleges, or how many are taking a course this term. Right now it is sorted by college and term and that information can be pulled or generated in Financial Aid reports in CSV extracts that can be manipulated to drill down into that information.

The person operating the admin elements will be determined by the individual colleges. It is not a recommendation made by the project, because each college has its own staffing and processes. The user guide is posted and that decision will start with the campus implementation team. One college will have data techs doing it, while another has the DE Coordinator doing it.

#### **Course Design Rubric Discussion:**

The list of courses that are Exchange ready is viewable as a Google sheet at [CCOnlineEd.org/SPOC](https://CCOnlineEd.org/SPOC), which is not linked to the main page it is being used for internal documents. The course list document can be sorted by different fields including: C-ID, course ID, whether the college is a full launch or readiness/tutoring college, and current status. "Exchange ready," status means all elements A through D are complete, including accessibility. "Pending Accessibility," means that is all that remains to be completed. Those "Pending Accessibility" courses are part of a new project. Right now when a faculty member gets their course review, they can get some support from @ONE but most of the time it is up to the faculty member to figure out what to do with that information. The team is hiring five accessibility experts to take those "Pending Accessibility" courses to see if they can be made "Exchange ready" for spring. They are hoping to come up with a model that is scalable.

@ONE will hand management of the Course Review process back to the OEI by December. The Management Team will be working with them on a transition plan. @ONE will still provide training for course reviewers and training on the rubric, but this will free them up to provide more training on VeriCite, NetTutor, and Cranium Café.

Over the next couple of days, Autumn, Anna, and lead reviewers will be going through the course design rubric to see what kinds of changes can be made based upon a year of using it. They will look at streamlining and making it easier for faculty to apply feedback received.

The Online Effectiveness Standards (OESP) course is Canvas and aligned to the rubric; it will take the place of the old certificate program. The next step will be to take the twelve weeks of OESP and make them into modules, so that someone who only needs help in one aspect of Canvas can just take that module.

The project will also be working on developing sample fully aligned courses in different disciplines. The team wants faculty experts to work together, provide support, and build courses that live in the PLN as examples, particularly in areas like math. They would like to bring together at least five of those groups in the next month using some of the \$20M augmentation. Pat wants to hire a faculty member as a coordinator for that work, so she will be contacting Julie Adams. It would be helpful to have more than one example for each field.

Barbara is working with the Equity work group on reviewing Larry Green's Exchange approved Statistics course and OER text. Larry is a past Senate President teaching at Lake Tahoe who is very excited about getting equity feedback since he works with a very homogeneous population (white male skiers). This will become an example of an approved course with the addition of equity review. Language around these efforts should be on enlightenment, and not criticism. In order to grow, there have to be courses to review and faculty buy-in is needed. Great faculty in the field needs to be nudged to participate. Autumn emphasized that faculty members who have already participated are very appreciative and have spoken about it being the best professional development experience of their career.

**Academic Integrity Discussion:**

Lisa Beach brought up an interesting article not just about cheating, but about people paying others to take entire courses for them. There is a whole industry with companies paid to take courses for students. She encouraged discussion of ways to combat this in both online and face-to-face classes.

In terms of tools, Proctorio will have a rollout in the fall, which could include an additional layer (Jory was not sure if there would be additional cost) of validating government IDs. IP addresses can also be checked to see if multiple tests are being taken at the same location. Faculty has a lot of control in course design with proctored exams and making sure to check IDs; academic integrity starts with the faculty member. If there is a systemic effort to defraud the State by impersonating students, LeBaron thought it might be useful to engage the legal department in investigating and reaching out the California Department of Justice.

Pat also felt it was important to teach students why it is important not to cheat, including rationale regarding the value of the degree in the long term.

### **Future Meeting Plans and Strategies:**

The committee discussed whether to continue to support remote attendance at face-to-face meetings. There is a fairly significant cost (\$1200 per meeting) to rent equipment to support it, and not much participation from online attendees. The Consortium decided to have fully in person or fully online meetings and not to support remote attendance at in person meetings.

Dave suggested following the lead of the Consortium and setting meeting dates far in advance so members can plan for attendance. Currently the Charter says that a quorum can be met by a combination of online and face-to-face participants, so a change would be needed in the Charter.

Greg Beyrer moved to no longer support remote participation in face-to-face meetings beginning with the December 9, 2016 meeting. Cynthia Alexander seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

### **Action Item:**

Take up the Charter revision issue related to no longer supporting remote attendance at face-to-face meetings at the next online meeting.

### **OEI Meeting Calendar for 2016/17:**

Members agreed upon the following meeting dates and types.

October 14<sup>th</sup> Online from 9:30am- 11:30am

November 18<sup>th</sup> Online from 9:30am- 11:30am

December 9<sup>th</sup> Face-to-face in Sacramento from 9:30am-3:30pm

January 13<sup>th</sup> Online from 9:30am- 11:30am

February 10<sup>th</sup> Online from 9:30am- 11:30am

March 10<sup>th</sup> Face-to-face in Sacramento 9:30am- 3:30pm

April 14<sup>th</sup> Online 9:30am -11:30am

May 12<sup>th</sup> Face-to-face in Sacramento 9:30am- 3:30pm

June 9<sup>th</sup> Online 9:30am-11:30am

No meetings in July or August

### **Action Items:**

Criteria scoring sheet

Project Glue Presentation

Charter update

Update to Course Exchange at next face-to-face meeting

Fabiola will look at following up on members who are not attending

Please follow-up promptly on the solicitation of agenda items

Steve will refresh CCMS Committee participation with new members/AS

### **Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 pm.