

Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

Friday October 9, 2015
Zoom Online Meeting

Voting Members: Cynthia Alexander, Larry Lambert, Meridith Randall, Christina Gold, Fabiola Torres, John Freitas, Arnita Porter, and Lisa Beach

Non-voting Attendees: Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anna Stirling, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Gary Bird, Jayme Johnson, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Michelle Pilati, and Tim Calhoon

Welcome and Attendance:

Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:33 am and welcomed everyone. There is not a quorum, so an informal meeting will continue for informational updates and no votes will be taken.

OEI Evaluation Plan for 2015/16:

Alyssa provided a high level overview of the OEI Evaluation Plan for 2015/16. In their role as external evaluator, the philosophy of the RP Group is to develop an ongoing collaborative relationship with the project in order to accurately tell the story of the project. The evaluation plan themes for this fiscal year will cover four areas: OEI process, Online Learning Environment, Professional Development resources and services for staff, and resources and services for students. Within each of the themes there will be timely and relevant activities:

- OEI process will include governance, marketing and communication, and project management,
- Online Learning Environment will include the Common Course Management System (CCMS) Canvas, in terms of implementation and accessibility, (with the Exchange planned for inclusion in 2016/17)
- Professional Development resources and services for staff will include the OEI course review process, training and workshops, templates and guides, and
- Resources and services for students will include readiness, tutoring, and embedded Basic Skills (with proctoring, counseling, and library services planned for inclusion in 2016/17).

Evaluation of these areas will occur through various means as appropriate: review of relevant OEI documents, analysis of student records, surveys, focus groups, and/or interviews. Alyssa will be looking at answering various questions including whether OEI participants (management team, Steering Committee, and work group members) are engaged in the process, whether the number of community colleges that participate increase each year, the level of awareness of the resources and services, the level of satisfaction with them and whether the resources provided meet the needs of staff and students. Overall, the focus is on whether or not the project is making the intended impact on the community colleges. The goal is to collect information to be shared with the management team to help improve the process, look at next steps, and develop a plan to be shared at a future OEI Steering Committee meeting. The focus is on always circling back for continuous improvement.

Alyssa is hoping to work with the Management Team on getting the appropriate questions. She defers to them on whether or not they want to share the questions with the Steering Committee prior to use, but would be more than happy to work with individual Steering Committee members that want to help with the wording of those questions.

Management Team Updates:

Technology Center Update:

John Sills reported that the rollout of Canvas is continuing. The team is working with the eight Full Launch pilot colleges currently teaching in Canvas, and is beginning the implementation with the sixteen Readiness and Tutoring pilots. There are sixteen campuses that have decided on a

campus wide adoption of Canvas; a handful of those are pilot colleges, and the rest are outside the pilot but have decided to do a full adoption.

Work is proceeding on the Course Exchange as well. The first development sprint has been completed; it included a lot of work on building the infrastructure that the applications will sit on top of. This week the second development sprint continues work on more infrastructure pieces that are needed to begin coding of an application. Some minimal user interface work has been done and screens showing that work were shared at the end of the review.

Ten colleges beyond the pilot joined in the October Canvas rollout, with a suggested fifteen month timeline. The October and April implementation phases were set up so that faculty would be available to be trained rather than in summer or winter when faculty is typically less available. There is also a year of possible running in parallel with the old CMS. The timelines can be adjusted based on campus needs and what they think is best; some colleges want to do a nine month transition with no parallel conversion process, instead just shutting off the old CMS. The adoption cohorts will continue the cycle of rollouts in October and April and colleges are asked to have their IPA signed so that they are contractually ready to go with Canvas prior to when they are interested in coming on. So a college that wants to start implementation in April should build that into their timeline; include the local decision making process, as well as the time needed for the local Board approval process. The Technology Center can get a contract out quickly when requested, but colleges should allow time for that contract to make it through campus channels and get back to Instructure before April.

The manual updating of the CVC is completed, and final course and program counts will be included in the upcoming TechEDge Newsletter. Amy reported that the next step is to replace the ADT data that was provided by the Chancellor's Office for last year with the new data that has been provided for this year. Developers are working on screen scraping scripts for each school to facilitate automatically pulling data and eliminating the need for those manual updates. Regarding the integration of C-ID into the CVC database, it was determined that integration with ASSIST will be a better route, since it is a better source of truth for all articulations, and as such stores C-ID transfer as well as C-ID articulation when there is no C-ID descriptor. The next step will be development of the CVC mobile app and beta testing; there is still some development and testing needed on that, so a go live date will be provided later.

Basic Skills Update:

Barbara explained an important recent finding in the area of Basic Skills. Students had reported two common reasons for not using the Writing Center: they were too busy (which was expected), but the second reason came as a surprise; students did not know how to save a document as a pdf to upload to NetTutor. To address this gap, Barbara worked with Jayme and Kevin to make two short accessible videos explaining and demonstrating how to save a document as a pdf both on a Mac and on a PC. Kevin set up another OEI Channel (beyond the one for the launch team) which will be used to store more of these videos to help students and faculty. The work group is now thinking about other videos that students might need. Great thanks to Jayme and Kevin for their work on those videos.

Monday was the monthly SPOC meeting on Zoom, and this week they will be meeting with OEI faculty who want to come on. It seems to be useful to meet, even if only virtually.

RFP Status Updates:

Jory and Bonnie explained that the Academic Integrity RFP and the Online Counseling Platform RFP were both published on September 29th. The letter of intent to apply is due tonight at 11:59 pm and the submissions will be due November 2nd. There will be more to report at the November Steering Committee meeting. The review and evaluation of the Online Counseling Platform RFP will be pushed back a bit later than the one for Academic Integrity since Jayme will be on both committees and Bonnie would like to be respectful of his time and availability. Additionally, while the desire is to launch that Counseling Platform in the spring, it does not have to be ready the first

week of January, just soon enough for people to be trained on it, while the Academic Integrity one needs to be ready earlier.

Professional Development Update:

Earlier this week the first Canvas course registration was opened up, and filled in the first couple of hours. There was a lot of disappointed OEI faculty, so two additional sections were added. Michelle explained that OEI faculty will be added to those sections until Monday; after that the sections will be opened to others. There will be a four week online course starting on the 19th, and also a self-paced version for those who want to walk through the materials at their own pace. The team is excited to have those resources out. In the interest of increasing availability of Canvas training, two “Train the Trainers” events will be held so that colleges can have people trained, and the Canvas course will be available for local use; @ONE is doing this work. The team is also getting into high gear for the Full Launch, and getting the Tutoring and Readiness groups ready for teaching in Canvas.

Management Team:

Jory passed on messages from Pat and John Makevich that the team is spread pretty thin right now due to being on site at a lot of conferences and colleges for the next month or six weeks. There is a lot of interest in converting to Canvas and participation in other parts of the initiative. The team is represented at the Student Success Conference for the RP Group this week, DLRN and the Online Learning Consortium next week, as well as WCET and others. This is the middle of conference season and there is a lot of activity in that realm. The Management Team is trying to cover as much as possible, sometimes even trying to get to two places in the state on the same day.

John Makevich is leading the effort to pull together the kick off meeting on October 21st to get the Consortium up and running. It is important to have that official body and the mechanism to formalize agreements between the colleges regarding matriculation, financial aid, and so on. Fabiola and John Freitas will be at the Consortium meeting. They have also been discussing the role of the Steering Committee and its members in becoming more active as the messengers of OEI. Fabiola told members to expect emails from the Chairs regarding stepping up their game as Steering Committee members.

Online Tutoring:

Due to having both a spring and a summer pilot, the combined report for online tutoring should be ready by the November meeting. Jory noted that they are in the last steps of finalizing that report which will include usage data. Barbara has taken over the operational management of the tutoring partnership; she is perfect for coordinating that work because of the linkage between Basic Skills and online tutoring. Tutoring will be integrated with all twenty-four colleges this spring and the operational details should be a little easier to manage because all courses will be in Canvas. NetTutor use was expanded beyond the pilot courses, it was offered to the eight original tutoring pilots for use in all of their online courses. Seven of the eight colleges took OEI up on the offer, with some making it optional, so one or two didn't offer it for all online sections. In total there were 91 sections where tutoring was integrated in pilot courses, and an additional 641 sections where embedded tutoring was offered at pilot colleges for a total of 732 course sections providing online tutoring access for students. The team is looking toward the spring and how to continue to offer that expanded access to pilot schools.

It is still preliminary, but the project has been approached by a potential partner for a student and faculty portfolio network. This could be a strategic opportunity and the team is looking at how that might be accommodated. It would align us with CSU and UC to have some portability and the team has heard from several colleges that there is interest in this area. Jory will be engaging with the Library Services group to look at whether this is something to pursue, and with the Technology Center to assess the technical components and how this might strategically fit with the other initiatives and the overall roadmaps for the portal, etc.

Readiness Update:

Readiness is gearing up again for spring. Bonnie put in a request for an extension on the contract with Smarter Measure for an additional six months, because the team is still working on figuring out what the final product will be with the RFP, and we do not want to just stop the pilots from using the assessment. This semester everything will be offered in Canvas which will provide the opportunity to have a uniform approach; the team met with the SPOCs and had a discussion about what that would look like.

Additionally, Bonnie submitted the final report from the spring Readiness pilot a week and a half ago; Steering Committee members are welcome to share that report as they best see fit. The pilot schools also received an additional individual report with data for the college which was not shared with everyone else. There was specific feedback tied to the spring implementation, so it will be interesting to see the results of having the same program but with a different implementation this semester. The feedback from students was both very encouraging and quite useful. The project has also received feedback from schools outside of the pilot that have been using the modules, as well as inquiries from schools outside of the CCC including Texas and a couple of others that are interested in using the modules under the Creative Commons licensing. There are Google Analytics attached to the site, so that the project can see who is downloading the modules and what they are doing with them.

Discussion of OEI Policy Regarding Minimum CMS Use for Exchange Courses and for the Use of Proprietary Materials:

Since there is still not a quorum for the meeting today, this is a discussion to provide further input regarding the two potential policies, but no formal action will be taken today. Michelle reminded the committee that at the last meeting there was some hesitancy about approving the policy document regarding minimum CMS use for Exchange Courses because there were concerns about whether other issues would be adequately covered in the document related to the use of proprietary materials. She explained that the intent is to provide a minimum level so that if a course was submitted that did not meet that minimum, time would not be spent trying to evaluate it. The document regarding the Use of Proprietary Materials is still in very rough form because it is hard to articulate how to operationalize the various elements related to FERPA and other areas of concern enough to keep faculty from getting into trouble. That rather complicated document is posted in the Professional Development work group space for feedback and input.

Michelle will not be at the meeting on November 13th, but she hopes to gather questions and comments today, and come to agreement about approval of the Minimum CMS Use for Exchange Courses document at a later meeting. The document provides an overview and then a bare minimum standard that must be met as far as what must be on Canvas: syllabus, information about the software, and institutional policy and support; then the student could be sent over to another site where they would be doing the bulk of their work. This policy is not stating this is ideal or preferred, but that this would be the explicit minimum that it would be possible to have. The shell cannot just be a pass-through, this provides a bare minimum which is really a robust pass through, but this way the committee is not infringing on autonomy in any way shape or form.

A member suggested the possibility of adding on a few additional rules: students are always required to use the campus CMS as the gateway into the course for verification purposes before they link to another site; the Deans or faculty evaluators must have access to the other site; and in the event of an emergency there must be some other administrator or faculty member who has access, especially if grades are located there. For accreditation her campus also required that some faculty generated content be on the campus CMS to meet Title 5 requirements, and there be some evidence of regular effective contact on the campus CMS as well. Michelle felt that some of those issues came into play on the other document, but she will look at the feedback and think about how it might be incorporated; there is a balance between objective standards and not going too deep.

Larry explained that a lot of use of publisher material and sending students off to another site for doing actual course work, ends up resulting in no campus technical support for those materials, because IT doesn't have training in the materials or access to the back end. On his campus they are starting to make that situation explicit; if faculty use publisher or third party materials, they don't get technical support from local IT and technical people on campus. There may also be FERPA violations when students go out to third party or publisher sites. A lot of sites have students re-enter their ID or even create a completely new account which also gets into a sensitive area from an academic integrity perspective; it needs to be carefully thought out. Michelle agreed that if students are doing a lot of work elsewhere and it is not supported by the college, it is likely there are FERPA issues, and it is definitely not in line with the OEI standards that the software and technology must be supported. Those issues do need to be pulled into one of these documents. Fabiola noted the importance of how this affects not only OEI, but the whole DE world: what does Title 5 say, what does FERPA say, and what do the 508 Accessibility rules say? Members noted that it is a complicated issue, but several thought that colleges would appreciate a recommendation coming from collaboration between the Academic Senate and OEI.

There was some concern about the use of the word "proprietary," since it can mean material developed by a third party or publisher, but other groups use it to refer to material developed and owned by the faculty. There are also "proprietary materials" that faculty participated in the creation of, but that are not fully owned by the faculty for their free use. Larry noted that the definition of "proprietary" is something that is owned by a single person or a group and is not part of the public domain, which could cover a range of materials. Michelle will look into either finding another word or putting in an explicit definition of what this policy is intended to address; she would appreciate suggestions or assistance in that effort.

Lisa noted that in the midst of their campus move to Canvas, they are asking faculty to use the rubric and find ways to connect the publisher materials into Canvas in a way that doesn't mess with the flow and structure of a really good system like Canvas. Michelle is working with the Academic Senate and Dolores Davison, the Chair of the Academic Senate Statewide DE Task Force, on the best way to do that from a faculty perspective. She felt it would be interesting to encourage publishers to provide materials in a format such that the faculty can put the wrap around to put it in the CMS rather than just going to publisher site. Fabiola will also interact with Cynthia and help connect her in with the work between Michelle and Dolores to make sure that Cynthia's insights and concerns are represented in the discussion.

Jayme also noted that some publishers have traditionally been very resistant to restricting their content to only that which is accessible because it interferes with their revenue stream; that has resulted in a desire to prohibit the use of those publishers. He will be trying to find ways to do some serious negotiating with publishers to ensure quality and accessibility; he also felt that involvement of the Academic Senate critical. Jayme is also working with Sean Keegan on installing an open source accessibility testing tool, so that it can be used in Canvas. It allows for testing content within the Canvas shell and will help with identification and fixing of content right there in the shell. Since it is open source, it is free other than the cost of customizing and maintaining it. It was developed by the University of Central Florida as part of an Instructure grant.

Next Meeting:

Amy will be sending out information on the next in person meeting which will be November 13th in Sacramento at the Hilton Garden Inn, which is closer to the airport.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 am.