Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday July 10, 2015
Zoom Online Meeting

Attendees: Alice Van Ommeren, Alyssa Nguyen, Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Caryn Albrecht, Christina Gold, Cynthia Alexander, Dave Stephens, Fabiola Torres, Gary Bird, Gregory Beyrer, Jayme Johnson, John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Lisa Beach, Lisa Wang, Meridith Randall, Michelle Pilati, Morris Rodrigue, Pat James, Steve Klein, and Terry Gleason.

Welcome:
Fabiola opened the meeting at 9:35am. Since there is not a quorum, the meeting today will provide information and discussion, but there will be no votes taken.

Executive Director Update:
Pat thanked everyone for attending and explained that work continues behind the scenes on the pilots to prepare for the fall and spring. She encouraged members to look at the Canvas website for links to Canvas resources: additions are being made to it on a regular basis.

The project recently had a visit to the Governor's Office. Although the team was not able to meet with the Governor himself, they were able to meet with finance people, his advisors, and education folks. It was a positive meeting and Pat felt the Governor's representatives were receptive and understanding about the amount of work and planning that goes into the intricacies of coordinating all of the pieces of this project. She was encouraged by that meeting and is optimistic about continued funding.

CCMS Implementation Update:
Steve reported that everything is moving forward with the Canvas implementation. The contract was officially signed on June 14th, announced at the Online Teaching Conference, and then due to great team effort from the staff, on June 24th registration information was posted on the Canvas website. The registration form allows both pilot and non-pilot colleges that want to adopt Canvas campus wide to begin the implementation process. So are there are twelve colleges that have completed the registration: three full launch pilot colleges, six non-pilot colleges, and three existing Canvas-using colleges. The registration form process allows the colleges to input: all of the necessary contact information, their projected timeline for adoption, faculty training, when they will begin using with students in face-to-face, online, and hybrid courses, and when they plan to turn off their existing LMS. On the Canvas registration page when asked for the "responsible technology point of contact" that means the IT Director, or person responsible for all technology.

After the registration form is complete, Instructure will set up the Institution Participation Agreement (IPA) with the college. The process is going well, the team worked out a few bugs that came up in early piloting, and is answering a lot of questions from colleges. Instructure continues to be a great partner and is reviewing the IPAs now; those colleges that signed up should start receiving them today. The pilot is on target with the numbers that were expected as well; prior to contract signing the team asked colleges about plans for adoption, and the team anticipated 11-15 colleges in this first cycle.

The first nine colleges have needs, some based on existing contracts and other considerations that are being taken into account, but over time the project team is working toward implementation cohort cycles twice each year, in October and April. While the project will support and accommodate colleges based on their own cycles, the team is also working to move colleges along in the twice a year cycle.

Pat emphasized that the overall goal is to find and support colleges that want to move to adopting Canvas as their only CMS. The project is asking colleges to be actively working to make the transition. The timelines that are set up and should be reasonable for most colleges are for a 15

month implementation and migration, with an 18 month (roughly 3 semesters) transition period to Canvas and away from the old LMS. There may be special circumstances for some colleges on the amount of time needed, timing for contracts, and perhaps some programs that have special needs with another CMS, but ultimately the project is asking if OEI is paying for it, that the college has Canvas as the only LMS. Otherwise, since OEI is paying for Canvas it might be easy for colleges to say, "Yes, I'll take Canvas, but I will also keep using Moodle, Blackboard, etc." The project is asking colleges not to do that, but will provide reasonable time for transition. Colleges are asked in the registration process for an anticipated date/timeframe for implementation, but this does not need to be exact, it is an estimate intended to help the colleges reflect on their own needs and intentions. A major goal is to save the system money and get money to support it from the legislature; paying for duplicate systems does not serve that goal. Additionally, we would like to be able to see if students being in one system across the state helps in keeping them involved in their classes and helps them be successful. In order to collect the data on student outcomes and success, it is best to only be pulling from a single LMS. All of these factors contribute to an interest in having colleges finish somewhere around three semesters following the implementation cycle. The project is willing to have conversations with colleges where flexibility is needed around CE, Adult Ed, or Academy programs. The registration process is intended to identify the profile of the college, and if they are adopting Canvas, where it will fit into the scope of the college's delivery of support for online and face-to-face learning with the LMS.

Management Team Updates:

Planning Update:
John Makevich explained that OEI recently went through a normal reporting cycle with the Chancellor's Office. Those reports contained information about the project that has already been shared with the Steering Committee. As part of that process, some revisions have been made to the work plan; those revisions will be shared at the face-to-face meeting in August, in order to provide better opportunity for questions and discussion, if needed. The team is also continuing their efforts and planning in working with the RP Group on evaluation.

Student Services:
The readiness modules have been revised and will be available to everyone very soon. Bonnie, is continuing to work with pilot schools on how to use them in their fall pilot implementations. She asked committee members to be patient with the process of making the modules available to everyone in the system. She wants to make sure that the announcement is made in a way that goes out to everyone at the same time, and is working with Sandoval to make sure that happens; that announcement should come out around the beginning of August. Darla from the RP Group is helping with the comprehensive report on the spring pilots for readiness. Bonnie has set a deadline of having that report available at the August meeting, along with a short presentation on the results.

Now that the Smarter Measure contract is finishing, Bonnie will be building the group that will help with the RFP for finding the best diagnostic tool to use with the modules. She will be contacting some members of the Steering Committee to help with that process. Additionally, the RFP for a platform for an Online Counseling Network is being looked at; there is a group that is working on that with the Foundation.

Exchange:
There will be a meeting at the Technology Center between the Management Team and technical staff at the Tech Center on Tuesday to discuss the technical piece of the Exchange. Colleges discussed business processes and made agreements and a document has been put together to inform the process. This technical meeting is the next step in further informing the process of determining what can be done and what cannot be done. Bonnie will provide an update on that process in August, or sooner if information is available.

Academic Affairs:
Jory reported that the project is seeing some increased utilization of online tutoring in the 15 colleges piloting this summer, some from each of the three pilot groups. Ireri Valenzuela from the RP Group is helping with the evaluation of the spring pilots. A pre-tutoring survey was done, has been analyzed, and a preliminary findings report has been written. They are working on a post-tutoring survey including perceptions of the impact of tutoring. Those will be aggregated with perspectives from OEI staff, Link Systems staff, and some faculty, and will be put into a more comprehensive report that should be available at the August meeting. They may be able to include some data from the summer pilot as well. One of the preliminary outcomes from spring, included the fact that by offering tutoring for only 2-3 courses it was hard to get critical mass to build awareness of the tool and do full integration and implementation of the tool. Tutoring hours were purchased up front, but in order to develop a larger pool of students the original eight tutoring pilots have been offered NetTutor for all of their online sections for the fall. That would provide hundreds of sections to integrate NetTutor with and could provide better data regarding what a larger implementation would look like, as well as a better idea of what the impact would be on student outcomes. Those eight colleges are having conversations on whether or not they will make use of the offer; the project would like to have the opportunity for additional data.

The team is planning for fall and working with onboarding the remaining colleges that haven't yet implemented NetTutor; those colleges or SPOCs should be getting more information within a week or so. They are also doing a debrief with Link Systems about some of the technical challenges that were discovered and what was learned so that those technical elements can be addressed for fall; the goal is to have the implementations be as smooth as possible. The team is also looking at creating better documentation and promotional materials that faculty can hand to a student, to really reach out and encourage the student to take advantage of tutoring; it is always a challenge to get students to take advantage of the recommendations that are made to them. Barbara Illowsky, Anita Crawley, and Jory will be going out to campuses during Flex Week trying to promote best practices for NetTutor and make sure that everything is in place. Barbara explained that they learned a lot from the spring and summer tutoring groups and put together a handbook for faculty for the summer on ways to implement tutoring and basic skills. That handbook will be updated for the fall; it provides a way to communicate with the colleges and validate preferences into one document.

The Academic Integrity RFP is progressing; the group has been working with the Foundation on the initial skeleton for the document right now although it has been hard to get members together due to vacations. In early August they will convene the full group to write the technical and functional requirements and develop the draft RFP criteria. The rest of the document will be filled in throughout August and early September, and Jory is looking toward a RFP launch date in mid-September. He will provide a more substantial update on that RFP at the August OEI SC meeting.

The Academic Affairs group is pulling together anyone who is interested in developing a face-to-face proctoring network. A group has been set up on Basecamp to share practices. Some colleges already have agreements in place with other colleges or tutors. The goal is to compile that data and look at drafting practices that can be shared across colleges. It is still early, but they now have a place for starting conversations leading toward getting a proctoring network in place.

Basic Skills:
There is a list of OER supports in the handbook. Barbara would like faculty to send in modules that they have as well, and will be sending out an email at the end of summer to get input from faculty.

She made a presentation to the legislature on Wednesday, testifying on AB798 which re-appropriates some funds to give stipends to faculty for finding and adapting resources for OER and their pedagogy for using them. It was supported by the CCC Academic Senate, the CSU

Academic Senate, and the two Chancellor's Offices; it passed unanimously and now goes to appropriations. Barbara also noted that SB 1052 and 1053 set up a council made up of faculty appointed by the State Academic Senate from UC, CSU, and CC to be liaisons working on evaluating OER that would be acceptable by the systems. She would like to start putting that list out and incorporating it into what OEI is doing.

Professional Development:
Michelle has been working with @ONE to streamline the review process and set up another round of reviews; next week she is hoping to send out the schedule for course reviews and re-reviews for the whole year. The new timeline will be three weeks to get courses reviewed and information sent back after courses are submitted. There is a lot of work going on with instructional designers in training them on how to do accessibility support in order to help faculty with accessibility in their online courses as they go through the review process; there is a real need for that kind of help. They are also working on scheduling for about six trainings around the course review rubric in the fall.

Pat explained she is working with Michelle, Anita, and Bonnie to build a module to explain what OEI is, with links to resources, it will be able to be incorporated into every course in the Exchange. That will be available in the spring so that faculty can include it in their courses as a resource for students.

Micah has accepted a permanent position as the Dean at MSJC and as Executive Director of @ONE. Additionally, @ONE is hiring a Director and a number of permanent instructional designers and other staff so that they can ramp up services. Greg asked if Micah or the new Director could be a regular participant in OEI meetings to facilitate more and better communication between @ONE and OEI. Pat explained that Micah has been attending face-to-face Steering Committee meetings, and he usually attends all Management Team meetings as well, she also explained that Michelle meets with @ONE every week. They are very involved in communicating with OEI, and she will reiterate the desire to keep and maintain that good communication; they are a small staff with a large body of contracted staff, so it may be that some of the communication is not getting back out to contracted staff.

There is a twelve week @ONE course that is in development which will be ready by the end of this month that includes some components regarding Canvas. Autumn Bell, from one of the eight full launch pilot colleges, is teaching an online Introduction to Canvas to her faculty and has offered to post those materials on Basecamp. The intention is for @ONE Canvas focused training to be available in the spring. Canvas is also working on revamping their training into two separate trainings of 90 minutes each, so that faculty can get in and play with it and then come back and have questions answered.

Dave noted that his biggest concern is about promotion and advertising of the Exchange and courses; he would like to be able to quell concerns about how are students going to find out about courses that are available in the exchange. Pat explained that the re-emergence of the module idea came from concerns about how to let students know what we are and where we are; so the project will be providing information to get out to your students. Work also continues on the new website, and a new communications person focused specifically on OEI will be hired in the next four weeks or so. Sandoval deals with all of the projects with the Technology Center and the Management Team feels there is a need to set up social media spaces and put together documentation of what to say and give to students focused solely on OEI. Those issues will also be clearer after the meeting next week with the technology folks about how the Exchange is going to be set up. Once those pieces are put together there are plans for information points along the registration process for students; the goal is put together materials that can be standardized and sent out so that everyone is saying the same thing. Dave noted that he has a lot of control over how existing students receive information and register for online courses, but the public relations for prospective students in the whole service area is more challenging. He suggested advising colleges that will be participating in the initial offering of the Exchange to reach out to their public

relations office. John Makevich agreed and explained that meetings and conversations with full launch SPOCs have been occurring to focus on walking through important points and make sure that everything is ready and there is a plan in place for the outreach to additional students, but also set up locally to make sure that things run smoothly.

Pat noted the importance of outreach in the community college system; there are a lot of people in the state who don't think that they can be successful as students, and don't think that college is ever going to be for them. We don't reach out to those people, and we need to start doing so. There are individual colleges that do to some degree, and ICanAffordCollege does so as well, but it is important that everyone is reaching out to those people in the state who could benefit from the community college system, but who have a deep and abiding fear that they are not college material. Additionally, as a system we need to work on not comparing success and retention when it comes to face-to-face and online courses anymore. Instead we need to look innovation of teaching and learning and at the value of the online environment to the system and our students as a whole. Similarly we need to change the conversation away from how online learning can both save money and bring up success and retention; those two things do not go together. Instead we need to focus on talking about what distance learning and the online environment can do across the system in general. Greg quoted Pat in saying, "Every community college student is our community college student regardless of where they are in the state." That is part of the moral case that needs to be communicated to those who fear losing enrollment.

Discussion regarding the use of proprietary content and tools in OEI courses:
Michelle explained that the issue of the use of proprietary materials being used in online courses has come up a couple of times in the course review process. Most recently there were excellent and complete well-developed courses that used proprietary materials to supplement the content which seems appropriate to her. However, there are concerns about cases where an instructor might be using their course as a pass-through to a site that is entirely publisher content, it doesn't seem to be appropriate for the OEI course reviewers to be reviewing course design for publisher content. Michelle brought the issue to the Steering Committee for discussion and input back to the Professional Development work group.

Is it appropriate for a CMS to merely serve as a pass-through to a course that is entirely being offered by a publisher? The committee emphatically felt that was not appropriate; the primary issue being regular effective contact. Meridith explained if there is effective contact, the use of proprietary material that is accessible, is not a problem. Cynthia agreed that a major issue with the use of published materials is the fact that a majority of those materials are not accessible. She thought that if at least 2/3 of the course materials were lecture or instructor content, having the other 1/3 be publisher content would be fine, as long as it was accessible. She advises her faculty to put the publisher's materials in the CMS so that the presentation and grading are in the CMS; but there must be enough lecture materials that belong to the instructor to make it a viable course. Dave agreed that the ADA compliance tracking on most platforms indicates that most do not pass muster. He also noted that he will not enable SSO through to a publisher platform; that way students must acknowledge that they are leaving the CMS that is supported by the district, and entering the publisher environment, otherwise the help desk is overwhelmed with requests regarding the publisher environment. Christina agreed that OEI wants to avoid the canned courses; but she likes the idea that it is fine to use those resources as enhancements to student learning. It can be difficult or impossible for an instructor to create those interactive elements that are fun for students. She noted that the types of materials that are needed as enhancements might be discipline specific. Michelle thought that it would be a good idea to find out what materials/tools are being used by faculty members to get a sense what is commonly used; it would be useful to have concrete data by discipline on what is being used, along with how and why.

Lisa Beach explained that her campus is struggling with FERPA issues with publisher sites; when an instructor uses the publisher's site for grades and other student information, it seems like that would be a violation of FERPA, especially when pre-tests and simulation scores end up being

stored on publishers' sites. Alternatively the publishers want to integrate their materials with the CMS, which has advantages regarding SSO, but then raises issues about whether the college is willing to do that with every publisher that asks.

Greg emphasized the importance of respecting local control and academic freedom as the project wrestles with the issue. It should not be the OEI's purview to judge whether one instructor's use of publisher materials is too much or not. However, it would be appropriate to give some guidance in the area of FERPA, especially with respect to the point in the interaction where an educational record is created. Local colleges would benefit from some liberal and generous interpretation of FERPA; then perhaps appropriate language could be negotiated between the vendor and the institution to deal with FERPA. Instructor quality however, is locally negotiated between a union and a district, and we need to be careful not to come in with a heavy hand. Course review can and should look at regular effective contact and accessibility; that would be appropriate.

Pat agreed that looking at the compliance side: authenticating the student, regular effective contact, and accessibility, could be the focus of effective best practices in a positive way. If OEI could collaborate with the statewide Academic Senate to come up with a position on appropriate use and effective practices, then we could provide examples of good ways to do so and maybe develop a guide for using publisher materials in online courses. It will also help encourage publishers to respond to the accessibility element. Meridith agreed that OEI should come up with guidelines but should be careful not to be too prescriptive; it is important to leave a lot of leeway for instructors to use materials and lecture and so on.

Michelle appreciated all of the committee input; she felt that she now had a better idea of what needs to happen, along with some concrete ideas of where to begin. Dave encouraged putting this as a standing item for input and updates on the agenda for the next several OEI Steering Committee meetings. He emphasized the importance of working with the statewide Academic Senate to provide guidelines; he also felt it was a great opportunity to leverage the collective weight of the system with respect to accessibility. Jayme praised and appreciated the awareness and general understanding of the issues. He felt that the mission was to ensure and promote quality and to recognize the reasons that faculty are driven to use these tools. One of his original hopes for OEI was that it would provide supports for faculty so that they have quality resources and enhancements. He felt the project could also help protect people from legal missteps by suggesting best practices and serving as a means to identify and guide toward a happy outcome.

Announcements:
John Makevich suggested having a brainstorming activity in small groups at the next face-to-face meeting to gather ideas for ways to get information about the Exchange out to students statewide. Committee members agreed, and Steve encouraged John to reach out to Sandoval regarding his ideas for marketing and promotional materials, he could also be a conduit for information to the new marketing person.

Next Meeting:
The next meeting will be on Friday August 28th in Orange County. Amy will send out information about that meeting.

Two sets of minutes will be up for review at that meeting.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 am.