Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday January 12, 2018
Zoom Online Meeting

Voting Members: Adriana Martinez, Andreea Serban, Cheryl Aschenbach, Conan McKay, Geoffrey Dyer, Jodie Steeley, Kathie Welch, Lisa Beach, Stephanie Curry, Tabitha Villalba, and Vivian Varela

Non-voting Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Andrea Hanstein, Anita Crawley, Autumn Bell, Barbara Illowsky, Bonnie Peters, Jake Kevari, Jayme Johnson, Jessica Hurtado, Joe Moreau, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Kate Jordahl, LeBaron Woodyard, Mike Agostino (from Intelify), Naomi Caietti, and Steve Klein

Welcome and Attendance:
Jodie Steeley opened the meeting at 9:30 am and welcomed everyone.

Approval of Minutes: Action
There were a few corrections to the minutes for the December 8, 2017 meeting. *Andreea Serban moved to approve the minutes and Stephanie Curry seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.*

Online Agendas: Information
The management team and Co-Chairs heard feedback at the last meeting about the need for regular meetings whether there is much on the agenda or not. Cheryl and Jodie will have a consistent structure for online meetings including a list of reports from the work groups, projects, management team members, and the Technology Center. There may be more or less reports at each meeting depending upon need and how many additional agenda items are needed. This structure should enable everyone to have information to take back to colleges and constituent groups. Leadership will remain open to comments from members about other adjustments needed.

Jodie did an onboarding exercise to provide new and ongoing members with the information needed to be good stewards to their constituent groups. The goal is to value everyone's time in meetings, have engagement, get feedback, and have healthy discussions.

It is important to make sure all members of the OEI Advisory Committee have Basecamp access. Members who don't should notify Barbara Illowsky or Logan Murray. Basecamp contains important documents, notes, and history of the project. Jory maintains a membership list on the website and Cheryl another for quorum and voting. Jory will link to the list in Basecamp so everyone has access and it remains consistent. The staff contact list will also be updated and posted in Basecamp.

Jodie reviewed the current Charter and explained the committee name was changed from OEI Steering Committee to OEI Advisory Committee in May 2017. The approved Charter is included in the "Admin Docs" file on Basecamp. She also reviewed the organization chart, committee purpose, goals, and responsibilities. OEI is here to promote access to quality online education and is really focused on developing quality instruction and supporting students in success.

The charter also outlines constituent groups represented on the committee. Members are responsible for bringing back information, concerns, and questions from those groups; expertise from each area is important. Members also need to provide updates on project status back to constituent groups. Reports in meetings provide members access to accurate information so there is no miscommunication. Communication back and forth is important. Jory also highlighted the OEI Advisory Committee is a policy focused body and needs to represent all constituent bodies so policy recommendations represent everyone. He felt it was helpful to remember that the Consortium is the operational body for implementation and the Advisory Committee is policy focused.

The committee also reviews progress, project planning and deliverables. Having that understanding helps the project and committee be more organized and to collaborate better across groups. The committee provides recommendations to project staff and Chancellor's Office on policies for the Course Exchange, etc. It also provides input in the annual review of progress done with the RP Group. Those annual reviews are available in Basecamp and show the power of Quest, NetTutor, and student impact in survey responses. Everything OEI does is student focused and now includes a lot of tools that provide benefit to students and promote success. There are now 113 colleges using Canvas, and many using Quest for Success, library services, online tutoring, and embedded support for the online counseling network and platform. Professional development is also available for helping build courses in alignment with the Course Design Rubric. The eight full launch pilot colleges have access to all of the tools and supports OEI provides. TechEDge provides updates to the field on support resources, the vendor and cost structure, and what is available to colleges in the system. Some tools and services are available at reduced cost to colleges.

LeBaron explained it is early yet to know what will happen with FLOW (Flexible Learning Options for Workers). It is distinctly separate from OEI in the budget. That will be reflected in the new RFA along with expansion of OEI including more programs and colleges; that is the Chancellor's Office understanding at this point. Although the budget process begins with the Governor's proposed budget, once he presents it, he is outside the process until May or June. During that time the legislature works its way through committees making additions and revisions. The Governor's May budget revise is based on changes to the revenue and tax structure and what is received and the legislature then goes back into discussion. The Governor has proposed $120M for a local online college, including $20M

ongoing and $100M in one-time funding. Generally, there is one to three years to encumber funding and three to five years to spend it depending upon the wording of the legislation. If it is Prop 98 money, it can't be spent by the Chancellor's Office; it has to go through a district. At this point, everything is speculation; this is just the first step. Jory noted the goal is to offer sub-associate degree levels, to begin enrolling students by December 2019, and to seek accreditation within four years. He emphasized OEI has been assured its work with the 114 community colleges is still very important and critical. OEI has an emphasis on quality, preparedness, etc. All of that is critical for any online college.

LeBaron noted OEI has been serving 114 colleges and if another is added, OEI would serve that as well. Jodie agreed, the goal of OEI is to serve ADT and C-ID courses and the goal of the new online college would be to serve an entirely different population. OEI has laid the groundwork and structure for quality online courses and can also show data that shows that when you support students, they are successful. LeBaron also noted the people teaching in FLOW are likely to come from within and be supported by the existing online teaching community. Jory was glad to see more resources being put into Distance Education and encouraged collaboration and cooperation as FLOW moves forward.

Accessibility Work Group-Defining Parameters: **Discussion**
Ally was being piloted as an accessibility tool by OEI since it was available. The CCC Accessibility Center is also piloting Equidox. Jodie's campus was using Ally actively and liked it, but also quickly realized it doesn't solve everything. Whether Ally or something else is used, it will be important to begin defining system needs to bring back to the Advisory Committee for discussion. Accessibility provides an opportunity to talk about universal design, as does equity, and the OEI rubric. The Accessibility Work Group will meet next on January 19th.

There are two different entities working on accessibility. The statewide Accessibility Standard Working Group was set in motion by IEPI and is working at a bigger statewide level to address accessibility for the community college system. The OEI Accessibility Work Group is specifically focused on online learning and online services for OEI while the state group has a broader scope.

Jory explained the project had a contract with Frontier, the company that developed Ally. Jayme helped to negotiate the contract that ran through June 30th. When the project tried to run the initial pilot, the implementation and technical items took longer than anticipated, so the goal was to request an extension to that contract. In the meantime, Blackboard purchased Frontier, which complicated things. In May the project team, along with Jayme, Barbara, and the Foundation reached out to Blackboard to negotiate a new agreement. The Foundation already had two to three agreements with Blackboard, and Blackboard didn't ask OEI to deactivate the instances out there before June 30th. Calls began coming in mid-December from Blackboard that their legal counsel advised against schools continuing to use the product. That is why the letter was

sent out just before Christmas. Unfortunately, that put the schools using the product in a very challenging position.

OEI is still trying to pursue a pricing agreement colleges can buy into. Because the CSU recently signed an agreement with Blackboard for Ally, the project is hoping this will become the first intersegmental contract they might be able to piggyback on and bring additional volume. There are about 400,000 FTES in the CSU system and the CCC can bring far more and try to drive the price down for everybody. Negotiation is ongoing but has taken much longer than anticipated or hoped, which has been frustrating.

It would be helpful to have the Accessibility Work Group define the functionality needed and the requirements desired. It may be those requirements can't be provided by one tool. There are also some colleges piloting a tool called UDOIT which was designed at the University of Central Florida which is more of an open source type of product and requires a little bit of support locally. There may be some combination of tools or some other solution, but Jory wanted to share the background, how this evolved, and why colleges got that note right before Christmas. The project didn't want to send the note then, but also didn't want Blackboard and the colleges to have any legal exposure for using the tool. The project team will continue to provide updates as it works with CSU, College Buys at the Foundation, and Blackboard.

Barbara tried to keep the three colleges in the Consortium using Ally informed about the challenges with the contract. She posted six to seven email updates starting in September. The project team is very sorry about the frustration and challenges to colleges using Ally, but they kept thinking they were going to be able to get the contract. Jodie acknowledged colleges received the messages, but explained they were also putting time in doing an upgrade with a patch in December which was originally supposed to happen in November. Putting efforts toward upgrading the patch gave them hope the contract was going to continue. Her college still has access to Ally, and needs to make a decision about whether to pull it at the district level or not. She found a pot of money to save her school and accreditation is her primary focus. She is looking forward to the Accessibility Work Group coming out with a replacement recommendation. Jodie also felt the communication that went out on December 22nd could have better communicated the message, "While Ally needs to be pulled, what can be done to help?" The redirect to UDOIT would have been helpful for her district.

Barbara shared names of the members of the OEI Accessibility Work Group. The group has Technology Center staff, Advisory Committee staff, and the remaining people were appointed. Cheryl suggested it would be good to have regular rosters both for the Advisory Committee and also for Work Groups as well; Jory will add those rosters to Basecamp.

Stephanie Curry moved to ask and assign the Accessibility Work Group the task of identifying needs specific to accessibility for OEI. Geoffrey Dyer seconded the motion. There were no objections to the motion and there were also no abstentions.

Reports: **Discussion**

CCMS Committee Update:
At the last face to face meeting the CCMS Committee Charter was approved. As the project nears the end the CCMS Committee needs new members. Amy has been looking at constituent groups and will reach out for representatives.

There are work groups within the CCMS Committee. The Gradebook Work Group will be meeting with the Product Manager later in the month. That work group determines a list of user stories to correct things that are lacking or missing in the product. The user stories are prioritized and brought back to the Product Manager, who looks at how they can be incorporated or worked into future functionality. Another work group is for Outcomes and last met in September. That group also prioritized user stories, but started more from scratch. It is an ongoing process and the group will be getting an update on what has been prioritized for outcomes that should benefit the overall user experience. Once the Gradebook Work Group gets closer to wrapping up, they will start looking at the Discussions Tool since that has been frustrating for a lot of Canvas users. The group established participation for that work group, but there was so much going on with the Gradebook Work Group, the Product Manager had limited time to devote to product functionality. Work on the Discussions Tool will be next.

The next general CCMS Committee meeting is January 26th and anyone from the OEI Advisory Committee is welcome. Amy encouraged interested members to attend those calls. They are quite informative and get into details. The Product Manager outlines future development for whatever product they are responsible for. It is great to see how things are headed and to lend a voice to help influence future development.

Equity:
Arnita Porter and Larry Green did an equity presentation at the last face to face OEI Advisory Committee meeting. The Equity Group is about a year old and has a focus on instruction, students, and equity in the online environment, and how to help colleges make equity and helping students more a part of their identity. The bulk of the work done last year was in identifying the equity framework. Arnita took that framework and worked with Larry as well with some of the @ONE folks looking at the instructional side and shaping what equity looks like. They focused on the math course and are now going to look at English and social sciences. They have been in contact with one of the pilot colleges to see how that can be done. Arnita also worked with @ONE to develop a course she is now teaching with Fabiola. That will be the kickoff for what is planned to be a series of professional development courses for online equity in various areas.

They are looking at ramping up what is being done in terms of equity in some of the key areas with the new Consortium cohort. Outside of instruction they are looking at community engagement for students in the online environment and seeing where equity fits. Jessica will be in the lead taking that on. She will also help colleges identify things like peer mentoring and student peer service for students in the online environment. Jessica has a good background for that work.

Bonnie explained need some new members for the Equity Work Group since some were lost. She would like to get faculty representation for the standing meeting every two weeks. Members who would like more information should contact Bonnie or Arnita.

Academic Affairs Work Group:
There was an update on wellness and mental health work at the last face to face meeting. There was also an update on the OER enabled Canvas course shells.

Dr. Marilyn Harvey is also joining the team as of Tuesday. Barbara posted her biography on Basecamp a few days ago. She brings great experience and background.

Management Team Updates:
The team is in conversation with LeBaron and the Chancellor's Office about setting targets for fall. They are rounding out conversations and working on a plan. That will involve increased communications and marketing efforts.

Andrea reported the team did some last minute triage with the six colleges in the Course Exchange for the spring. They did outreach to counselors, updates to the CVC and OEI website, and also provided the ability for colleges to link directly to courses. Andrea also reached out to Marketing Directors at each of the six colleges and found that a few had no idea what OEI was or that their colleges were participating. She is pulling together a meeting of the six SPOCs and the Marketing Directors by the end of January. They are hoping to do a full scale launch of marketing materials and a campaign as they move forward, perhaps even hiring someone to help.

Consortium Expansion:
The project moved forward with Consortium expansion. Kate reminded the committee the 2018 cohort will focus on student equity. Being part of the Consortium includes the Course Exchange and also significant improvement of student services, student success, and identifying what can be done to move student equity forward.

The deadline for the letter of intent was December 15th and forty-six colleges submitted a letter of interest. That letter had to be signed by the college President and the head of the Academic Senate. The project wanted to make sure everybody on campus understood what was involved and supported

participation. A recorded webinar went through the self-assessment packet colleges need to submit. Colleges will be prioritized using information from that packet. Colleges are working on those packets and there will be a rolling review with a deadline of March 1, 2018.

IT webinars are scheduled for both January 19th and 24th. In the IT webinar, the project will ask the head of IT to sign off. The intent is for IT to really understand what is involved and to agree with those necessary to make the technical parts come together. This is a big lift with the Adaptor and single sign on (SSO) connecting to the Course Exchange, so it is important to start the conversation early with IT Directors to make sure they are on board. Selection of the next phase of colleges should be made by mid-spring, for fall 2018 participation, with the hope that colleges will sign the Consortium agreement prior to July 1, 2018.

The implementation team includes Kate Jordahl, Justin Schultz and Karen Oeh. Their emails will be on the contact list posted on Basecamp. If colleges need anything, the team will be available to help them and to have bigger conversations about equity in online learning, etc. The theme for this phase is taking colleges when they are ready and that effort must be locally fueled and energized.

The project will be looking at the number of colleges that will be accepted to see what they can do. There may be colleges in the same district where it would cost less to bring them on, or colleges which may already be technically ready because of another initiative. The team also wants to continue to serve the colleges that are already in the Consortium. There are a lot of dependencies. Jory explained the team would like to be as aggressive as they can in terms of the number of colleges that join the expansion. There is a strong mandate to have as many colleges join as possible and the team is working with colleges going through self-assessments. Part of the determination will depend on how many colleges come in, whether they are single or multi-college districts, and so on. The team doesn't want to put out a number until they know more, but Jory thinks it will be significant.

Jodie asked about the expectation for colleges to have courses ready for the Exchange and how realistic that is if they are not joining until late in the year. Additionally, how will LeBaron's expectations of having 300 courses by fall work if fall schedules are being put together now? Jory explained they have been setting the expectation that some colleges may already have technical implementation pretty much done. If the programmatic pieces are in place those courses might be able to come in for fall. For colleges that have not been part of a pilot district, the project is setting an expectation there is a lot of work to be done.

The reason for starting the expansion now is the lead time needed for technical work and the work for Financial Aid, A&R, and Student Services. The project expects those to be about a year out. The goal is to have applications in by

March 1, 2018. The team will notify colleges within that month and have them sign the MOU and become part of the Consortium in July. It will really be fall of 2019 for the bulk of those colleges. The project is working as diligently as it can with partners at the Technology Center. This is the most complex piece of the initiative, and some things can't be done any faster than they can be done. The team is really setting an expectation that is about a year out.

Jodie suggested having a discussion at the Consortium meeting about how to get the Chancellor's Office goal met by the existing colleges. It would also be helpful to get some assistance in marketing.

Executive Director Update:
Proctorio made an offer to the colleges impacted by fires, in the north or in the south. There are a lot of colleges still trying to wrap up their fall semester based on losing finals week, etc. Procotio will support online proctoring for any college, in the Consortium or not, trying to get through final exam processes. Jory knows there are at least one or two colleges taking Proctorio up on that offer. @ONE is going to be providing extra training on Proctorio quickly so colleges that want to take advantage of that offer can do so.

Additionally, good ideas were brought up recently about general planning for disaster preparedness for online education. Previous conversations had to do with what to do if the LMS goes down. There is now an opportunity to facilitate a conversation about what to do if the college has to shut down, and what not to do. It is a good idea to get those conversations going now.

Technology Center Update:
The Technology Center at Butte partners with the Foothill team to support online education efforts. The Technology Center manages the overall CCMS contract for Canvas. There are now 113 colleges participating and the project has been at full scale for a long time. There are now 109 colleges in production with some cohort of students. Eighty-seven colleges have turned off their legacy LMS and are completely on Canvas. The Tech Center team meets weekly with Instructure to talk about contract issues and processes that make Canvas successful on college campuses. Those include SSO, implementation, product development, data integration, and third party integration. The team is actively involved with Instructure as a partner and Amy Carbonaro oversees that work.

The team successfully launched Course Exchange 2.0 into production on January 6th. That was great for six of the eight full launch pilot colleges: Butte, Fresno, Lake Tahoe, Foothill, Coastline, and Ventura, although there were some delays with Ventura because of the fire. CE 2.0 is a real step forward that allows students to combine Financial Aid units across institutions. The new release includes a BOG fee waiver piece, along with notifications, flagging of OEI students, better reporting of who is in the Exchange, a dashboard for students to better manage their processes, and some other pieces on the back end.

The team is currently working with CE 3.0 development, and will be doing intermittent releases throughout the year with a final production release in the fall 2018. The 3.0 release will include transcript automation, work around the residency piece that was in AB 637, better reporting, an OER piece, SSO for admins, and ways to group cohorts as courses or academies. John Sills as the Product Manager works closely with Bonnie Peters on the Foothill team.

Part of enabling a college to participate in the CE involves the Tech Center team working with the college IT staff to set up what is called a Glue Adapter which connects to the student information system (SIS). This allows data to be transferred out of the SIS and also opportunities for supporting and managing student processes in registration. An extension of the Glue Adapter work is a new product called the Canvas College Adapter which enables Glue to populate a local Canvas instance with term and section data that comes out of the SIS. This also includes populating students into courses and is able to synchronize the college's SIS with the Canvas instance when students are added or deactivated out of a course. Some colleges have done this work on their own through some custom scripting, but this will be a system wide offering as part of the Glue Adapter. The Tech Center is currently working with a couple of colleges in the pilot phase and will be inviting colleges from the original twenty-four to pilot. A letter will go out soon and pilot deployment will begin in the first quarter of 2018. They are looking at production deployment in the second quarter of 2018. This is really on the back side of colleges activities with Canvas, but has great impact on teaching/learning environments. Jane Linder is the Product Manager for the Canvas Glue Adapter.

The Data Warehouse is a continued extension of the data flow that is able to move out of student information systems and out of Canvas as a result of integrations in the ecosystem. The Data Warehouse is a structured data source that provides opportunities for Data Marts or learning analytics to support institutional and instructional effectiveness. These are in collaboration with the Chancellor's Office Data Governance body that is being put together. The Data Warehouse 1.0 project will involve four pilot colleges: Butte, Shasta, Foothill, and Lake Tahoe. It will involve reports mostly coming through the community college's reporting center where colleges get application data. So it will have CCCApply data and soon Canvas data will be available as well. They are testing the mechanism of the reporting features in this 1.0 release and there are plans for two other releases this year in March and June. Those will add roles and permissions, additional colleges, and additional data sets like multiple measures and e-transcripts. This is a significant effort for the benefit of the system. Alex Jackl is the Product Manager for the Data Warehouse. Alex Jackl and Jane Linder would be glad to come to the next face to face meeting to talk about the Data Warehouse and the Canvas Glue Adapter in more detail if that is agreeable to the committee.

The CCC Integration Project with proxy for Canvas is underway. This supports single sign on when a student reaches Canvas and doesn't have CCCID it directs that student to an Identity Proxy which provides an opportunity to create one. That larger integration of ecosystem components through CCCID enables a Federated environment supporting better services, better tracking, and better support mechanisms for that student. This is the CCC Proxy Integration with Canvas Project and Matt Schroeder is the system engineer for SSO. This is currently underway with Course Exchange colleges and the project team will be reaching out to all colleges since this is a requirement for adoption of Canvas.

Finally, the CVC Catalog remains an ongoing project. The recent update has more than 23,000 online courses identified from higher education institutions in the state; 14,000 are from the community colleges, along with 616 degree programs, all accessible within the catalog. There is also a searchable data base as part of the CVC.edu site. Amy Carbonaro oversees that project.

Analytics and Intelify Presentation:

The group agreed to extend the meeting to accommodate a presentation regarding analytics and the Intelify tool. The presentation will be recorded.

Anita Crawley provided background on development and use of Quest in OEI pilot colleges. Quest is a comprehensive online readiness program now available to all of the CCCs. With the exception of Smarter Measure, all other learning materials inside Quest are Creative Commons developed, so they are free and have been made available for the last couple of years. The diagnostic tool, Smarter Measure, on the other hand, is a vendor tool obtained through an RFP process. It is made available to colleges for supporting online students. The Quest program includes eleven multi-media skill building tutorials. The intention was to provide tutorials to help students gain skills and tools needed for success in online courses. Quest has been upgraded with separate modules for novice and experienced online students, quizzes, and it has been made fully accessible with customizable material. Sixty to seventy schools currently participate and customize the tool to make it most meaningful for local students. Typical customizations are to add Canvas tutorials and local resources. The project partners with the RP Group to provide data and collect analytics, but ran into a wall since the multi-media tutorials are externally connected. This year they began working with Intelify which has the mechanics to overcome that barrier and has been piloting with Cabrillo and Ventura. They want to see how engaged students are with different elements within the Quest program.

Mike Agostino from Intelify explained they specialize in bringing data together in an open standards framework. Their analytics look at understanding and collecting the data available, transforming it into data tables for ease of use, and making them available for users. For Quest they were looking at collecting data from a variety of sources including the OSRT integration, Canvas, and Smarter

Measure. The framework was built to go live in November and be able to collect data in the spring.

The demonstration provided an overview of the dashboard: program level summary; reports on high level data metrics across the data sources; and features, including the ability to filter by college and course name, and adjust the x-axis to look at the data from daily, weekly, or monthly view. There is the ability to drill deeper with data points bringing up a window for the full data set. Reporting can be done for school and course enrollments across data sources. They can collect historical data for Smarter Measure and for Canvas. The dashboard has been provisioned to collect data for Cabrillo and Ventura's fall 2017 and spring 2018 course only. Since this is a new custom deliverable, they only have OSRT data from November 1, 2017 and only if the student is accessing through the applicable Canvas course. Ventura's spring semester is in session and data is beginning to be gathered for enrollments.

They intend to provide a high level view of activity over time. It can be filtered by college and course. A second set of dashboards at the tutorial level can also be filtered by college and course name. They are collecting individual data within the tutorials in Quest. Interaction points are places the student interacts or engages with the material. If students rewind frequently, fast forward, or bounce around that provides information about student ability to consume content.

The ideal would be for everyone using Quest to eventually have access to the dashboard if it is feasible. This is a proof of concept for gathering more personalization data to ultimately be able to present students with specific activities based on results from the diagnostic. Once data is collected from the two pilot colleges the management team will present outcomes and look at whether it makes sense to expand to all colleges in the Consortium.

The RP Group reported students using Quest modules are 10% more likely to be successful. Colleges have implemented them in different ways. It would be useful to use this to support and intervene with struggling students.

Other announcements:
LeBaron invited everyone to the Chancellor's Office Virtual Distance Education Conference taking place later in January. There are currently 353 people signed up with two weeks to go. Autumn's workshop about the OEI Course Design Rubric already has 156 registered.

Next Meeting:
February 9, 2018, Zoom online meeting
March 9, 2018, face to face meeting

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 am.