Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday August 28, 2015
Wyndham Irvine- Orange County Airport

Attendees: Alice VanOmmeren, Amy Carbonaro, Anna Stirling, Anita Crawley, Arnita Porter, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman, Christina Gold, Dan Crump Dave Stephens, Debra Sheldon, Fred Sherman (online), Gregory Beyrer, Jayme Johnson, Joe Perret, John Freitas, John Ittelson (online), John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kelly Fowler, Larry Lambert, LeBaron Woodyard, Lisa Beach, Lori Adrian (online), Meridith Randall, Michael Agostini, Michelle Pilati, Morris Rodrigue, Pat James, Ray Sanchez (online), Rico Bianchi, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Guests: Karen Peterson, Kathleen Ayes, Dolores Davison

Welcome:
John Freitas opened the meeting at 9:30 am and took attendance. The group was one short of a quorum, so the vote on the minutes was pushed back until another member arrived. John noted that the project needs to check in with the Student Senate on who the current student appointees are or will be.

Online Learning Consortium (OLC) Presentation:
Joe Moreau thanked members for making the effort to attend during a week when many schools are starting up or getting ready to start. He introduced Karen Peterson and Kathleen Ayes from the Online Learning Consortium. They are interested in promoting the national dialogue about online learning, online teaching and learning effectiveness.

Kathleen explained some of the history of the Online Learning Consortium, which was founded by the Sloan Consortium in the early 90s. The founders saw that the evolving field of online education was going to give people an opportunity to complete degrees, especially some of the populations served by the community college system. They donated money to different institutions becoming engaged in online learning; what they called an "Anytime, Anywhere Program". That evolved into a small community of like-minded individuals who wanted to drive the mission and vision of degree completion and accessible education. Eventually through a planned separation from the Sloan Foundation, the Online Learning Consortium was provided seed funding to become a fully self-sustaining service organization as of the end of 2013.

Karen provided information on opportunities for future collaboration in the areas of professional development, institutional development, and networking. The Online Learning Consortium (OLC) has an Institute for Emerging Leaders of Online Learning (IELOL), with an intensive experience for leaders who see opportunities in their organization and want to invest in that leadership opportunity. Right now there are 50 or so leaders that join them at IELOL for the intensive experience at Penn State where all of the participants for that year gather. The OLC also has an Institute where they offer professional development, workshops, mastery series, and certificates. Karen thought there might be the potential for the OLC to augment the professional development that OEI is doing, as well as having opportunities to share and learn from each other. The OLC has faculty members who engage in their professional development, as well as instructional designers and administrators who find a one week work workshop or a 10 week mastery series that will help them to apply learning to their campus; whether mobile learning, social media, or leadership mastery series. The OLC provides opportunities for networking and collaboration through conferences, webinars, and blogs. These all provide participants opportunities to share experiences and insights.

In the area of institutional development the OLC Quality Scorecard can be used at the institutional level. Quality Matters and other rubrics are at the course level, but the Quality Scorecard is focused at the institutional or program level; how do we support at the student services perspective or the technology perspective, and so on. It looks at all areas of the program and

also helps the institution to engage in evaluation of the data stream that often comes in terms of assessment data, and student learning outcomes. The Scorecard is available on their website today for download. There are other services that are also available for institute members, including an interactive version, a web based version, and a third party review if colleges want someone to come in and look at their work. The Quality Scorecard is a way for an institution to demonstrate strengths; it can also be used by institutions from a continuous improvement standpoint, or for opening conversations on campus. It can be valuable to have individuals from different campus areas: student services, library, technology, and so on, all in the same room, focused on a common tool. Some campuses have also deployed it for the accreditation visit; it is useful for self-evaluation of where the campus is excelling as well as where there are opportunities for improvement. Some institutions focus on one area of the scorecard and start with that, while others engage the entire scorecard; it can be deployed in a variety of ways.

The next OLC Conference will be October 14-16 in Orlando, Florida. Karen invited members to attend this event and experience their vibrant community. They are interested in participation from OEI and in having OEI share experiences and resources as well. Joe Moreau explained that OEI as a project is now an institutional member and therefore there are things that the group will be able to access through that institutional membership. It might be most appropriate for LeBaron and the DE Coordinators to discuss the Quality Scorecard and how that might be used at the institutional or program level. Michelle Pilati will be attending the conference in October to give an update on some of the things that OEI has accomplished. Michelle explained that the Professional Development work group has already started to talk about ways for colleges and institutions to benchmark overall quality, so looking at the Quality Scorecard might be something that aligns with that desire.

Minutes:
There were no corrections or changes to the minutes of July 10, 2015. Terry Gleason moved approval of the minutes. Larry Lambert seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

OEI Update:
Pat thanked everyone for making the extra effort to attend so close to the start of the term. She noted how much the project has accomplished and thanked everyone for their tremendous input and work. She explained that she has been resistant to doing any national presentations until there was data for the project, but after looking at the amount of progress that has been made and what has been completed, she feels more comfortable about sharing what it is like to work with a big system like ours on the panel of WCT in December. A big hurdle is still getting the Exchange up off the ground and running. The start date for the Exchange was pushed back after meeting with the technology team in Sacramento a couple of months ago to talk about the realistic aspects of how things have to be able to dovetail. There are backend elements that have to be coordinated with other projects, otherwise time will be wasted. One in particular is coordination with Open CCCApply to make sure that everything is in concert, but there are others. Pat acknowledged that she had a hesitation to have OEI included with EPI and CAI since OEI is so focused on the dispersed areas of teaching and learning, but with the technical backend elements, all of the projects do have to be grouped together. As a result, the launch of the Exchange has been pushed back to fall 2016. There still may be problems with that, and some pieces may have to be changed from the initial vision, but she will keep the committee involved and informed; work is still going on to hammer out what may need to be adjusted. Pat expressed her thanks to the Chancellor's Office and particularly LeBaron, Alice, Gary, Pam Walker, and Erik Skinner for their support and assistance, especially in working through the quagmire of legal issues and regulations related to Title 5 and Ed Code. Pat also expressed her appreciation to the committee and the pilot colleges for their patience. She noted that the SPOCs at the colleges were incredibly supportive, and most were relieved about the need to push back the deadline. It gives them time to breathe and get things ready. Autumn Bell said, "We've been working with you for a year, and we trust your judgement, so it is good."

Pat introduced Anna Stirling, the Interim Director of @ONE who is taking over for Micah Orloff, she will be attending our meetings from now on.

Policies About the Exchange:
Pat explained briefly some elements related to a policy document posted on Basecamp. She felt that explaining it in person might help to clarify things that might be hard to understand when she writes them out. She asked members to comment on the document on Basecamp and to send any questions to her or to Steve Klein.

OEI will be paying separately for the instances of Canvas where the Exchange pilot courses are offered until/unless those colleges come onto the regular pricing under the OEI Canvas contract. (There are two different pricing structures.) So if Mt. San Jacinto has three courses in the pilot, OEI will have to pay the additional cost for those instances of a college running a course with students through the semesters that they are offered. That will have to be done for all of the eight pilot colleges until they adopt Canvas, then they will fall under the negotiated OEI contract pricing. Since there is an additional cost for those instances, the management team has decided that they will pay for the pilot colleges to offer a course in the Exchange for three semesters, after that the college will have to commit to transitioning (they do not have to complete the transition in that time, just make the commitment to transition). This means that starting in the fall of 2016 with the full launch pilot classes, colleges could have fall, spring, and the following fall, and by the end of fall 2017 the college has to have committed to go to Canvas in order to keep courses in the Exchange. Then when the next pilot group starts they will also have three semesters to commit. If a college decides earlier that they want to go to Canvas, that just switches the college over sooner to the regular pricing plan. OEI is paying for Canvas in both cases, there are just two different pricing plans dependent upon whether a college is piloting or has committed to adopting Canvas. This only applies to the Exchange.

The second policy item decided upon by the management team on a fiscal basis, relates to colleges using the Canvas contract. OEI is paying through the initiative for the contract funding for four years (beginning with contract signing and going through 2018/19) which gives people a real opportunity to get started. The money is intended to be ongoing, and the project would like the ability to pay for it to continue, so they will be talking to the legislature about getting $2.5M more ongoing funding in order for that to happen. If they do not get that money, then a small percentage of the total cost will have to be paid for by the college. When a college gets the agreement it will say how much OEI is paying for your college and the project should have an idea pretty soon about the percentage your college would have to pay after four years if the additional funding does not come through, but it should be a pretty small amount.

The goal of the project is to get the additional money from the legislature and to continue paying for Canvas. Showing that the project is doing an amazing job and saving money would help with making that case. OEI did not choose Canvas because it saves money, Canvas was chosen because it was best for students and provided the best opportunity to do the kind of work OEI wanted to do. However, OEI also wants to show that the funding is being used in a forward thinking and excellent manner. We know that students who go from one CMS system to another to another are having to deal with learning the system before they get into their course and that makes it more difficult for them and we want the data to come out clean as to whether OEI is doing what we hope, which is improving the quality of our courses and having students complete. If that is really our purpose, OEI really wants a college that adopts Canvas under our project to have it be their sole CMS. We do not want to encourage colleges to get Canvas as a second CMS just because it is being provided at no cost to them, and that could happen. So, to support the hard goals OEI wants to accomplish, we are asking colleges to make Canvas their sole CMS and they have three semesters after they migrate to do that.

Pat emphasized that this is not intended to penalize colleges that have specialized programs, particularly in CTE and health sciences that need to have a separate CMS for those programs; if that is the case, the project is willing to work with those colleges as those issues come up on a

one-on-one basis. The project will not be rigid, but will deal with exceptions one at a time. If there is a college that wants to take on Canvas as a second system they will be able to do so at the OEI negotiated price and the college would pay for it, rather than have it funded through the OEI. The OEI contract pricing is in place through the 2018/19 school year.

Work on identifying and clarifying terminology is also going on so that when members say "OEI courses" everyone will understand that refers to courses in the pilot right now or in the Exchange. The team will be working on putting together a glossary that can be posted that will help to clarify elements that people are sometimes confused about. Pat often hears from people who say that they want to "join the OEI" and she explained that really shows a misunderstanding about how the project works. Colleges can adopt Canvas, under the OEI contract, colleges can offer courses in the Exchange, and/or colleges can participate in the activities of OEI. There are many activities and resources provided by OEI whether a campus is interested in adopting Canvas or not. OEI can't and won't force colleges to do anything, but OEI is offering resources that colleges can choose to make use of, if they want to.

Staffing:
The project recently put out two positions through the Foothill-DeAnza District hiring process: a Chief Professional Development Officer, and a Communications person. However, they realized that they would have ended up with the Professional Development person starting about two weeks from now, in the middle of the semester, which would have been a difficulty for whichever college they came from. As a result, they decided to extend that process out to the end of this semester and have recruitment done in November. The new Chief Professional Development Officer will start in January, and in the meantime, thanks go to Michelle Pilati who has agreed to be the interim person for this semester.

They have not selected the communications person yet. There was a relatively small pool of applicants, and the team felt that it was best to go back out again and get exactly the right person with a large enough pool. They also determined that the job description coming out of the Foothill PIO position wasn't quite what was needed, so they will be taking another look at the job description before repost the position. In the meantime, the project will contract to get some marketing, website, etc. done. That contracted person will also help with the marketing plan which will come back to the full committee. If members know people who might have the larger scale marketing talents, skills, and competencies that go beyond college or district level work, have them watch the Foothill-DeAnza employment website so that they can apply when that new posting is made, hopefully under a different banner.

Online Teaching Conference:
There were about 700 people who attended the OTC in San Diego in June. It was a great conference, and some of the presentations that were done can be found on the website; Pat especially recommends looking at Phil Hill's presentation, it was really interesting and good. She thanked Rico and his team for shepherding the OTC this year. Next year's OTC will be in June in San Diego again. Traditionally, the location alternated between northern and southern California, but the attendance has expanded to the point that it is difficult to find a large enough site at a reasonable price in northern California. In order to get the price and the location, the OTC committed to the San Diego Convention Center for next year as well. Canvas usually has a conference at the same time, but they may be willing to change their date so that there is not a conflict.

Chancellor's Office Update:
Alice VanOmmeren, the Interim Vice Chancellor for about three months, updated the committee on recent developments at the Chancellor's Office. Gary Bird was not able to be at OEI today because he is at the Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) Steering Committee. Gary has played a lead role in all of the technology initiatives and a decision was made to promote him to the official lead, since Bonnie Edwards is still out on leave. The Chancellor's Office will also hire

someone to fill Gary's position so that hopefully soon there will again be two staff members overseeing the initiatives.

The Vice-Chancellor position has been open since May. Now that the move of offices to the sixth floor is completed and Erik Skinner is back from vacation, the interviews should begin soon and there should be someone in place as Vice-Chancellor in the next couple of months. Alice has been at the Chancellor's Office for about ten years, but mostly in the area of research. The Technology Division involves technology, overseeing the initiatives, the MIS Unit, the Research Unit, and network operations; so staffing has been stretched pretty thin. There has also been some reorganization of executive staff: Teresa Tena, the Vice-Chancellor of Instructional Effectiveness, will now also oversee the TRIS Division; and Pam Walker, the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, will oversee Academic Affairs and Workforce Development. These changes should provide for a little more coordination and the next step will be to fill the vacant positions. As the architects of all the initiatives, the Chancellor's Office realizes that they structure them, but the implementation is more challenging, so Teresa, Erik and Alice met the other day to think about what additional support they can provide to all the initiatives as they move into the pilot stage. They are well aware of the challenges ahead and are talking about how to collaborate to provide that support. They will also be looking at what is happening in each of the initiatives with respect to professional development to see if any help can be given using Institutional Effectiveness funding.

As they look toward the budget recommendations for 2016/17 the Chancellor's Office is glad to have Teresa Tena on staff, since she was the Director of Finance at the League and has quite a bit of fiscal knowledge as well as good relationships with the Department of Finance. The Chancellor's Office is looking toward addressing technology needs through increasing the funding for TTIP and they are working with Tim Calhoon and Rico Bianchi on that. They realize that the funding for TTIP North and South will help support the initiatives.

Review of the OEI Charter is on the agenda, and Alice explained that after OEI noticed some discrepancies and made some recommendations, particularly with respect to representation, the Chancellor's Office realized that it probably would make sense for the charters to be similar. She and Gary created a work group for looking at the governing structures and coordinating those types of efforts. The Director's Collaborative will also be meeting September 28th, and for increased communication, that group will begin to meet more frequently.

Alice and LeBaron participated in a discussion recently with OEI regarding concerns about state policy restrictions with respect to reciprocity, in state residency, the application, and priority registration. Their initial thoughts are that there aren't any restrictions in those areas, but they have sent the questions on to Twe Win, the new Interim Legal Counsel, to see if there are any concerns or a need for Title 5 changes; she has good knowledge about Title 5. Joe Moreau expressed appreciation to Alice for her support and the time that she spent with Pat and the Management Team in trying to help sort out the possible regulatory and legislative issues; it turns out that for the most part those issues don't exist, but people were concerned they might. It has really helped to bring clarity to the process. Pat explained that OEI is going through the issues related to how to make the Exchange happen across colleges, one piece at a time. It is a complex thing, and the eight colleges want to make it work and are working very hard at gaining trust across the colleges. They met last spring and will probably meet again soon to bring together the Vice Presidents of Instruction, IT people, and DE Coordinators to talk about some of the roadblocks that will come up if the colleges aren't working in concert. Those who have been involved understand it, but others who are coming in later are confused, and those concerns need to be clarified.

CVC Refresh:
Amy Carbonaro, Project Manager for OEI, and Project Lead on the CVC explained the recent CVC refresh process and showed the committee the results. The redesign had been overdue and was therefore a pretty major one; it launched in June. The California Virtual Campus (CVC)

provides complete, timely, and accurate information about online programs and higher education programs and links to them. There are currently more than 19,000 courses and 1400 programs offered through the catalog. There are 169 schools represented in the state of California including: every school in the CCC system, as well as various schools from the CSU, and UC systems, and private institutions. In order to be accepted into the CVC, a school must be WASC accredited and based in California.

The CVC is currently maintained through a manual updating process. Eight to ten student assistants are hired to work during the summer comparing and contrasting physical lists of information exported from the catalog. The students go in to college websites and physically compare the listings. This very manual process takes six to eight weeks to complete; the project is trying to encourage course maintainers to go in and utilize the administrative side of the CVC on a more frequent basis to update courses as applicable.

The tie in between CVC and OEI is that Foothill-DeAnza and Butte as online initiative partners saw an opportunity to establish the statewide initiative as an expansion of the CVC, and the award of the OEI grant provided resources which allowed some to go into updating the CVC which hadn't had an update in a number of years. While students will most likely encounter Exchange courses in their local registration process, the opportunity exists to display them with some sort of identifier in the CVC to highlight those courses.

Amy showed the committee the appearance of the new site and contrasted it with the old one; it now has a more modern feel and level of attractiveness that should draw users back. As a result of a data pull from the Chancellor's Office of ADT courses, the redesign includes highlighting for ADT courses and the catalog is prioritized so that the "check for ADT" is automatically populated for users. Search functionality has been greatly improved including the ability to narrow by feature on all pages of the site; this was meant to increase the usability of the search function and to make it more intuitive. Changes on the administrative side have eliminated information that congested it and that was not really applicable to course maintainers. The site was improved to make it as easy as possible (with two clicks) to get in and update courses. A geo locator was also added so that if a student needs to find a class that is offered at a location close by (for example, hybrid courses that have attendance requirements) they can be located quickly.

Next steps for the CVC include:
- Cross walking top codes with zip codes with the idea that if courses are properly coded we will be able to provide more reliable data on student success
- Integration with CCC Course Program Inventory and C-ID
- Employing scraping techniques to pull data more frequently
- Tie the CVC portlet in with EPI
- Integration of OEI courses, including deciding how to display them, where they will fall, and how they will be highlighted for users

Dan noted that while it is great to identify ADT courses, the next step of identifying which ADT they are good for and integrating with the C-ID identifier is important. Michelle agreed and explained that the way they are displayed now includes all possible local opportunities, which means that there are courses (like Forensic Psychology) that aren't commonly found in any program.

Steve acknowledged Amy and the staff members at the Technology Center that worked on this update through much of the spring and summer, he also explained that the OEI Steering Committee will be brought into the process for future CVC updates. LeBaron also thanked Amy and noted how the CVC has evolved through two or three iterations over an eighteen year period. He noted that Dan and Michelle are correct, and their comments will make an exceptional site even better; this update is going to take the site to an entirely different level in terms of user accountability and ease of use.

OEI Course Exchange Update:
John Sills, Project Manager for OEI, and Product Manager for the OEI Course Exchange, provided an update on the progress of the development work to date for the Course Exchange. At this point developers have been hired, including a software architect, two programmers, and a QA analyst that have been assigned primarily to the OEI Course Exchange. John Sills will act as the interface between those developers at the Technology Center and the Management Team for OEI.

After the developers were hired, an initial planning meeting was held at the Chancellor's Office to bring the developers into the room with Management Team members to talk big picture ideas about how the Course Exchange would work. This was to give the developers an idea of the goals to be accomplished. From that the team started on the nuts and bolts of actual development and the creation of user stories to form a "backlog" for the developers to work from; about 37 user stories have been developed so far. An example of a user story is: As a student, I want to search for available online courses, so I can complete my degree. These user stories also help to narrow down specific tasks that need to be done, like adding courses to the Exchange and so on. After the user stories are written, John Sills sits down with the developers to groom them so that the developers know exactly what the requirements are. The team nails down the information, pulls resources, and provides documentation of exactly what it is so that it can be passed into the development ticketing system called JIRA. All of the documentation, comments, and clarification are collected and any assumptions are verified. The next step will be to prioritize the user stories and then to begin working on development.

Development will occur using an Agile methodology. The Product Manager starts with inputs from the Management Team and pulls them down into the "backlog." The first "sprint" planning meeting will happen on September 10th, and for this first one, the Management Team will be invited back to meet with the developers at the Chancellor's Office. Together they will prioritize the "backlog" to decide which will come first. Then the developers will break the items at the top into tasks and assign them to developers. They will work in three week "sprints," taking on as much as they think they can complete in that time. The developers will then meet daily for a morning scrum and update tracking of their progress. At the end of each "sprint" there will be an open invitation to see a demonstration of the completed work. After each "sprint" the cycle starts over with another three week sprint. Future planning sessions will probably happen online. The focus with the "sprint" is on completing the work quickly and then testing and modifying as you proceed rather than going a long period of time before checking to see if it is what was wanted.

Readiness Spring Pilot Results:
Bonnie Peters presented results that were put together by the RP Group from data gathered January through May 2015 on the Readiness pilot. The global comprehensive report will be available in a couple of weeks. There are also individual reports for the eight colleges, but because they contain very detailed and sensitive information, those will only be presented to the committee in that later comprehensive report, which will group the global information.

Results are based on a pre-survey given to students regarding what they thought about the Quest Program, and then an end of semester survey given to both students and faculty. Some changes have already been made in the program for the fall based on the results, and further changes will be made on an ongoing basis. There were 220-292 students across the eight colleges that took the initial survey, and there were 101 students at seven colleges who took the final survey (one college changed some questions and was therefore not easily included in the final results).

There were three major findings:
- The majority of students across the colleges were satisfied and found the program helpful
- The majority would recommend the program to other students
- Students gave useful feedback and suggestions for changes for the fall Quest program and that data was used to make changes

In the spring there were only five modules that were developed and offered in conjunction with the diagnostic tool (Smarter Measure), those modules were focused on students new to online learning. As a result of student suggestions, the fall pilot includes eleven modules, consisting of the original five along with six additional modules that include modules that are oriented toward the needs of students who are not new to online learning.

The most overall satisfaction in the spring was with Level 4 "Becoming an Effective Learner," and Level 3 "Getting Tech Ready." Students found most valuable: identifying strengths and weaknesses, learning about myths of online classes, troubleshooting tech issues, and time management/becoming an effective online learner. Students who thought that something was least valuable felt that it was too long and some was redundant, that it was best for students who were new to online learning, and that email setup was not necessary. Most students learned about Quest for Success from an email from the instructor and most received access on the first day of class. (The goal is to have students complete Quest at least a week or two before class started, but that was not possible in the spring.)

For the fall, Quest for Success is now being offered as a Canvas course and all twenty-four colleges will have access to it. They will all have access to the diagnostic tool, the tutorial modules, and a quick check on learning, after each segment as they go along. Thus far, there are 1195 students enrolled in Quest, and in terms of the Smarter Measure diagnostic, 603 students have taken certain components (the allowance for compartmentalized modules was also allowed for the fall) and 431 have done the complete Smarter Measure assessment. Additionally for the fall students, will be allowed to go in and out to complete Quest; it would take a very long time in one sitting, and students are being encouraged to do it in pieces.

The Readiness work group has started working with EPI; interacting with them and serving on their work groups for the online new student orientation that they are interested in providing.

Finally, the actual modules (but not the Smarter Measure diagnostic) were released to all 113 colleges a few weeks ago; they were developed under Creative Commons and will continue to be available to all colleges. They are being shared on the TTIP South server and the response so far has been very positive. Notices were sent to DE Coordinators, Deans of Student Development, former Matriculation Group members, CIOs, CSSOs, and the Academic Senate; there was a press release and a news campaign. Bonnie indicated that they hope to do another nudge reminding people that the modules are available, in October, in preparation for spring.

John Freitas suggested creating a list of practices that the faculty are expected to use in order to test out the modules properly. Bonnie explained that a series of handouts with suggestions and ideas have been developed and now that there will be some data, it would make sense to share that and say "this is what we found, and this should be the approach to what you do." They are working on some FAQs that will be put up. Lisa Beach suggested sending out information directed toward the school as a whole with ideas about how to incorporate the modules into student success plans or how to help faculty incorporate them. Bonnie explained that Barbara Illowsky and Anita Crawley have been going out to colleges and providing information for both readiness and tutoring, so that can probably be pulled together from their work.

Action Item:
Barbara will post the Power Point about how colleges can use the readiness modules in the Steering Committee area on Basecamp. It should also be sent to Academic Affairs and cc'd to Debra and Denise for Student Services as well.

The project will be putting out an RFP to find the best diagnostic tool to use with the modules going forward, because the Smarter Measure contract ends in December.

TTIP South Integration with Canvas:
Rico Bianchi provided an overview of the different services offered to the entire community college system:

- e-conferencing services; CCCConfer, Blackboard Collaborate (CollaborateUltra), and ConferNow (Zoom), providing 4000-5000 classes and meetings a month
- Unlimited media storage for any staff or faculty through Amazon S3 cloud services; there are 30,000 mostly instructional videos stored for faculty, but most are not shared. There are about 200,000 views of those 30,000 videos.
- Unlimited web streaming through a YouStream account
- Video conferencing for old video conferencing systems (Polycom, etc.) allowing those to be used on the web
- Event coverage, including video production and streaming for events that have a system wide audience

Information was also provided about the LTI integrations in Canvas. The desire is for the entire system to be able to see TTIP South products when they are using Canvas. There are LTI integrations for CCCMedia and ConferNow (Zoom). Faculty users can add CCCMedia Solutions as an external tool into Canvas and then their students will be able to see videos that are added. Users can also share a folder as a playlist in Canvas. It is also possible to schedule a ConferNow session (that is being installed as a global feature in Canvas) so that every instructor will have the ability to set up sessions daily, weekly, etc. so that their students can see those sessions if they are added to Canvas as a student, even without having a Zoom account. The instructor needs to have a Zoom account, and they can have that account forever at no cost; staff and faculty members have a free Zoom account in the CCC system. Contact Rico and he can put members in touch with those who can set it up.

Rico explained that CCCConfer will be a global offering, but he wondered if a choice should be offered at each school between ConferNow and CollaborateUltra or if a selection should be made and not allow the instructors to choose. John Freitas did not feel that was a question that the committee could answer at this point, but he and Steve felt that referring it to the CCMS work group would be most appropriate. That group of stakeholders from the pilot colleges and this body are charged with wrestling with issues related to how to make improvements with Canvas. That question should be taken up by the CCMS work group and then they should report back to this committee. Jayme should be involved in those discussions so that he has the opportunity to look at accessibility issues with Zoom before any decision is made. He would like to address the lack of accessibility in Zoom, to avoid trouble in the future. Rico explained that Zoom is coming out with another window that will allow for live captioning in the next 3-4 months. Jayme felt that was useful, but noted that captioning does not address all accessibility issues.

Pat asked about captioning when videos are uploaded to CCCMedia and Rico explained that faculty members have the ability to request captioning (which is funded through the DCT Grant). It is now a streamlined process of entering information into 3-4 fields and 8AST does the captioning and sends the file back within a few days; then it is automatically incorporated into the video. You are also able to order live captioning with CCCConfer, there is a field to request live captioning and it is actually less expensive than captioning after the fact.

Action Item:
Send the question of LTI integrations into Canvas to the CCMS work group and have them come back with a recommendation for this group at the next meeting.

Draft Charter Revisions:
In June, a subcommittee was established to review the Charter, and a draft of those revisions was presented. The primary issues to be addressed had to do with absenteeism, and clarifying which organizations are responsible for appointments to the membership. There was also a decision to have two Co-Chairs elected in alternate years to provide for more continuity and stability in the committee, instead of a Chair and Vice-Chair. John Freitas, Fabiola, Dan Crump,

Cynthia Alexander, Greg Beyrer, Meridith Randall, Gary, Pat, John Makevich, and Alice VanOmmeren provided input. Greg also posted a document on GoogleDocs and got input online.

Most of the issues regarding appointments were resolved, with the exception of the need to determine the appropriate body for making a Financial Aid administrator appointment. When replacements are needed or there are attendance issues the Chancellor's Office will be notified to contact the appropriate appointing organization so that they can respond. John Freitas and other committee members noted that requests for particular skills could be made to appointing bodies, but the final decision is up that body.

Based on current vacancies and persistent no-show members, OEI typically starts the meetings nine members down, so while there are officially 27 voting members (therefore with a quorum of 14) there are usually only 18 members. In order to decrease attendance/quorum issues it was suggested that the Executive Director appoint someone who is specifically responsible for maintaining the official roster and the attendance. Additionally there are two suggested changes regarding absences: voting members not present for three consecutive meetings will be declared inactive and will not be counted toward the quorum, and positions may be declared vacant if an appointee to that position is absent for three consecutive meetings (vacancies are not counted toward a quorum).

There was some discussion about having excused absences, but ultimately the group decided that three consecutive absences, whether excused or not, meant that the appointee was not providing representation for the appointing body and that group should determine whether or not to replace them.

Members clarified that having guest "notify the Chair 48 hours prior to the meeting" was a courtesy that "should" occur but that guests would not be turned away from an open meeting. However, with late or no notice, meals might not be available for them.

The committee reviewed the changes and then a motion was made to move the draft changes forward as OEI's recommendation to the Chancellor's Office Charter work group. That motion was made by Larry Lambert, and seconded by Terry Gleason. The motion passed with one abstention.

Management Team Updates:
Planning Update:
John Makevich explained that the team has been using Teamwork as an internal tool, and Michael Agostini has been helping them to integrate work plan changes. They will continue to work with team leads on long term plans and integrating them into the system. That is currently being done using a "pull" model with Michael getting input from the team leads. Over time it will evolve into having people be able to log in and update directly. There has been quite a bit of pre-consortium work with the implementation of the pilot of Canvas, initial conversations about Exchange work, and the Reciprocity Summit. As the work expands beyond the initial phases, the processes will become more formal.

Carol presented an overview of the report that was posted in Basecamp for informational purposes. As part of the grant requirements, the project has to submit a report each year that is a compilation of all the work for the year. One of the documents is an update to the work plan and a summary of why things have changed; it is in a slightly different format and is a very detailed description of all the projects that we are working on so far, as well as expected timeframes for completion of some future events, as of the end of June. The second document is the Year Two Report which covers month 8 through 18 and the project accomplishments in that time; it was submitted today to the Chancellor's Office along with the financials. If there are any questions about the report, please contact Carol.

<u>CCMS Contract:</u>
The contract has now been ratified by Butte-Glenn CCD. Steve reported that OEI has been working with Instructure in a way that they have never done before as a company, with entirely new processes and protocols for use cases that they have never done in the past; a lot of credit is due to them for being with us every step of the way.

Six of the eight full launch pilots are now teaching in Canvas and the other two will be coming on soon. Three pilots have chosen to adopt Canvas campus wide, and in the system, seven other colleges are somewhere in the process of adopting Canvas as well. That means that there are ten new colleges in our system coming onto Canvas, which is consistent with the survey regarding interest in moving to Canvas in the fall, sent out about six months ago. If that data is used to project forward, we will have 24 colleges moving to Canvas between January and April 2016 which suggests the direction many colleges are taking. The project is beginning to work with the other sixteen pilots that will begin teaching in Canvas in January. There were five colleges that were already on Canvas and all will have rolled over to the OEI contract by January 1st.

There are three different ways that colleges can engage with OEI:
- A college may not want Canvas or the Exchange, but does want resources such as tutoring, proctoring, readiness modules, etc.
- A college may want Canvas and love the cost savings, and want resources, but not be sure that it wants to participate in the Exchange
- A college may want Canvas, the Exchange, and project resources

Colleges may participate in any of these three ways, and all of them have different implications. John Sills spoke earlier about how the Technology Center has hired staff to work on the Exchange; that staff will also be working with two other significant initiatives with multiple products and services. Jon Scanlon, the system architect is critical to the Exchange piece, but also to how all of these services will be working together system wide. It is important for colleges to think about the things they want not only from this project, but also from the others, it is a complex decision. Colleges that are considering being part of the LMS are considering becoming part of a learning environment, but are also considering becoming part of a larger connection.

<u>Professional Development:</u>
Courses were being reviewed over the summer and the internal process for accessibility review was perfected. Now as courses are being re-reviewed they are being reviewed for design and accessibility simultaneously.

The first day of the "Applying the OEI Course Design Rubric" workshop is now open to all interested participants, then those who are qualified to be reviewers complete an additional two weeks of training. The first group that came through this summer is now engaged in reviewing courses. Michelle is working on getting all of the dates for those workshops at: Evergreen, Los Medanos, American River, Fresno, and Shasta. She is also talking to Santa Barbara about having something there as well. Those dates will be sent out when they have all been finalized. Pat noted that the course rubric is CMS/LMS agnostic, so even if a college is not planning to change over to Canvas, they should still send somebody to the first day of the workshop because it teaches how to review a course according to the rubric, not reviewing a course in Canvas.

Michelle brought forward the outline for the certification course for online instructors, and the maiden twelve week course is now being piloted in Canvas, so participants are learning to be in Canvas at the same time. They also just had an exercise where they went through the Quest for Success readiness modules, so they are being exposed to those as well.

There is a document that Michelle has posted in Basecamp for members to look at called the Online Education Standards and Practices (OESP). One of the things that will be folded into that document is the need to come to an end of reviewing courses outside of Canvas, in preparation

for the Exchange. This will involve a sunset of reviewing courses in other CMS, to avoid wasting time in reviewing and then re-reviewing and revising in Canvas. Right now the first batch of re-reviews in Canvas is being worked on. The schedule that has been followed for course review is: the date when the application needs to be in, the date access to the course is needed, and the date the review is scheduled to happen barring technical difficulties. The proposed plan is to have the last time that any course can be submitted for review outside of Canvas to be submission of an application for review by November 16, 2015. That allows a good window of time, and an offer will also be made to get assistance moving into Canvas. Committee members expressed no issues with that timeframe.

In a previous committee discussion about proprietary materials at the last meeting, Michelle noted that a big focus was accessibility and the desire to leverage our power to get products made accessible. Toward that end, it will be important to find out what proprietary materials people are using in order to find out where to make pushes. In addition to accessibility, establishing an instructor presence, either through regular and effective contact or regular and substantive interaction is another important area that Michelle hopes to have the rubric address. Another topic relates to the issue of when student records emerge, where they live and the legalities around that; local policies vary widely and there are tools that colleges avoid to be on the safe side. Michelle is thinking about developing some kind of guidance around those issues. It might also be useful to provide guidance and best practices around the use of social media and safe ways to do that. She asked members to confirm their feelings about minimum expectations about how much the CMS is used; there was a case where a course was basically a pass through to another system, leaving the student baffled if they didn't have an access code. Should there be some minimum standards about what should live in the CMS? Members agreed that there should be some minimum. LeBaron also noted that Title 5 regulations on electronic material access and Chancellor's Office guidelines do exist.

Michelle is waiting for the last appointment to the revamped Professional Development work group, after that she will be meeting with the group and hopes to have draft rubrics or minimum standards for using Canvas developed by the next meeting of this group. She mentioned that the initial Canvas implementations were almost universally positive. There were two that she really liked: one at a school with a strong Blackboard culture, where students were initially leery, but then had a good experience; and another where a faculty member was teaching a hybrid course with students in a lab, and when the class was over, he couldn't get students to leave because they were enjoying being in Canvas, and he said, "that never happened in Moodle."

RFP Documents: Academic Integrity and Online Counseling Platform RFPs:
Since Jory and Bonnie are both in the process of developing RFPs they decided to work together and coordinate the timelines for both of them. Jory is working on an RFP for Academic Integrity including plagiarism detection and online proctoring, and Bonnie is working on an RFP for an Online Counseling Platform, which is one piece of a larger project in terms of online counseling; that larger project will also include a counseling network.

The process that has been followed for previous RFPs was to form a work group and draft requirements and deliverables for the RFP, and then bring the draft to the Steering Committee for input before the RFP was released. That did not happen with the Tutoring RFP which resulted in some concerns, so they want to make sure that the committee has access to all of the information in order to provide input. After the committee provides feedback, that feedback will be folded into the RFP and then the RFP will be released. After the responses come back, they will be evaluated, and the vendor recommendation will come back to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will then decide whether or not to approve the recommendation before the Notice of Intent to Award goes out.

Jory and Bonnie would like to get feedback from the Steering Committee on the draft RFPs by the end of the next online meeting. In order to do that, members will need to sign a new NDA which will cover both the Academic Integrity and Online Tutoring Platform RFPs (the previous RFP was

for the CCMS and has now been lifted). The NDA has already been signed by work group members, and is intended to protect the integrity of the RFP process by preventing contact with vendors that might unintentionally or inadvertently cause issues. That NDA will be sent out in the next few days and must be returned before the draft RFP can be sent out. Jory and Bonnie would like the committee to have at least 72 hours to provide feedback, and can receive feedback up to and through the end of the next online meeting on September 11th. If there are any individual concerns regarding the wording of the NDA, members should contact Jory or Bonnie. John Freitas suggested to the committee that while the next meeting is September 11th, September 18th should be kept open in case a special meeting is needed to finish consideration of the RFPs.

Steve thought that it might be possible to develop a more general customized NDA that could be used for future RFPs, particularly because the Foundation NDA has language that is somewhat archaic around the responsibility of the signer to the liability of any disclosures. However, that would happen later and would be separate from these immediate RFPs which Jory and Bonnie hope to have completed in time for the vendors to come on before spring. John Freitas thought that it would be helpful to have something like that so that new members could sign when they come onto the committee. Jory explained that the Foundation is willing to work with customizing an NDA for future RFPs.

Bonnie explained that the draft of the Counseling Platform RFP is about 95% complete with the effort made by the work group, accessibility work with Jayme, and specific language on technical items from Mick Holsclaw. The draft RFP also speaks to what counselors would be able to do for the work of EPI. Similarly, Jory noted that the draft Academic Integrity RFP is also ready for review. The draft RFPs are not posted on Basecamp, it is not an appropriate place for them. The RFPs should only be reviewed by people who have signed the NDA, so they will be sent out to members after the NDAs are signed. The goal is for the committee to provide recommendations for changes by the end of the online meeting. Those changes will be folded into a revised draft and a finalized draft will be sent out. Jory and Bonnie would like to release the RFPs on September 28th and to present the vendor recommendations at the November face-to-face meeting.

Larry Lambert made a motion to move forward with sending out the NDA to be returned by midweek and then as soon as possible after that for Jory and Bonnie to send out the draft RFPs for Academic Integrity and Online Counseling Platform. Dan Crump seconded the motion. The motion carried with no objections and no abstentions.

Other Items:
The Academic Senate has asked work groups to track faculty work hours and give that information to Julie Adams.

Pat has a short, five page, web based presentation piece that she has posted on Basecamp. It is not to be sent out as a link or used as a standalone piece, but instead is intended to act in lieu of a Power Point as an accompaniment for presentations that members give. It is really good for 15-20 minute presentations on what OEI is about; please use it, but don't just forward it!

Michelle explained that the first iteration of OESP is currently scheduled for January, but there may be one earlier due to high in interest. The maiden offering online of "How to Teach in Canvas" will be coming in October and will be first come, first serve.

Next Meeting:
The next meeting will be online on Friday, September 1, 2015.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.