Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday August 1, 2014
CCC Chancellor's Office Sacramento

Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Anita Crawley, Arnita Porter, Barry Gribbons, Bill Curry, Brian Keliher, Carol Lashman, Caryn Albrecht, Chris Graillat, Clinton Slaughter, Dan Crump, Dave Stephens, Erik Skinner, Fred Sherman, Gary Bird, George Lorenzo (by Confer), Henry Burnett, Jerred Scheive (by Confer), Jayme Johnson, Jessica Millikan (by Confer), Jim Huether (by Confer), JoAnna Quejada, Joe Perret (by Confer), Joe Moreau, John Freitas, John Ittelson, John Makevich, John Sills, Julie Adams (by Confer), Kelly Fowler (by Confer), LeBaron Woodyard, Lorena Dorn (by Confer), Marc Beam, Marie Boyd (by Confer), Maria Gonzalez, Meridith Randall, Michelle Pilati, Richard Matthews, Pat James, Ray Sanchez, Stacey Cook, Steve Klein, Terry Gleason, Tim Calhoon (by Confer), Tom Bilbruck (by Confer) and Vince Rodriguez (by Confer).

Opening and Introductions:
John Makevich opened the meeting at 9:39 am and wished everyone a good morning. Attendees introduced themselves.

Pat announced that Chris White is a new member of the OEI staff; she is the administrative coordinator in the office at Foothill. Members will also see her on Basecamp catching up on what has happened so far with the project. There will be a retreat for all staff members August 27-28 in Sacramento, the purpose will be to transition from the launch team to the permanent staff.

John Ittelson mentioned that it might be worth looking into the use of Zoom.us for video conferencing services. Apparently Zoom does not have some of the challenges that Confer has with Blackboard Connect. John explained that it is possible to get a free 40 minute presentation, or for $10 per month on a personal account a member can have unlimited meeting time.

Minutes:
On page 4 of the June 27th minutes John Freitas suggested that in the Bylaws/Charter Workgroup report John Makevich's last name be added for clarity regarding who was referenced. In the July 18th minutes Dan corrected the spelling of Pam Deegan's name. Barry moved to approve both sets of corrected minutes, Terry seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ethics 101 – Ethics in the RFP Process:
Steve explained that there can be serious ethical and legal issues in the RFI/RFP process, and Bill Curry will provide information on the role that members have in avoiding inappropriate contact with vendors throughout the procurement process.

Bill provided information on his history with government contracting and ethics in government contracts. He had extensive experience in the Air Force with government procurement, and later at Stanford, Lockheed, Butte County, and finally as Interim Director of Procurement and Contracts for CSU Chico. Bill shared both personal experiences and ethics investigations that were newsworthy. He outlined specific rules and consequences and also discussed commonsense guidelines to follow to avoid any question of unethical behavior.

The FBI is involved in many more ethical investigations than might be expected because many financial transactions involve materials that cross state line, and therefore the FBI has jurisdiction.

The main recommendation Bill had for government agencies is to get a financial disclosure form from everyone involved in procurement. Additionally, it might be helpful to establish a contracting code of ethics. Some organizations had a zero tolerance policy and this led to situations in which it looked foolish to bring charges for accepting a cup of coffee. Therefore the DOD rules now

make exceptions for up to a $20 one-time gift and $50 from the same organization over a one year period. There is also a Code of Ethics that was developed by the National Association of Education Procurement that could be used as a starting place.

It is critical to foster and promote open competition, obtain disclosures, and manage communications between vendors and consultants; the main idea is to make sure that all of the vendors receive the same information at the same time. For example, it would be helpful to collect all of the questions from vendors and then post all of the answers on a website all at the same time.

Some scoring systems are more likely to lead to interpretation which opens up the possibility of unethical behavior. Scales of 1-10 and color coded scales are two that may lead to problems. Numerical scores that are consistent or that include formulas for higher weighting for some items can be good. He recommends using a numerical scale from 70-100 rather than from 0-100 and simply disqualify any that would not be at least 70. It can be helpful to use a formula to calculate results so that close scores are more clearly differentiated.

Bill noted that at a minimum members should fully comply with the Chancellor's Office's rules and policies, but also suggested that members consider adopting a zero-tolerance policy for themselves in their interactions with contractors.

Bill has been helping the project teams develop appropriate non-disclosure and financial disclosure forms similar to those done by districts, where individuals must sign off on any financial interest that they might have in any of the companies involved. Those forms will be available soon for members to review.

Bonnie explained that the monitoring of ethical conduct for the RFPs depends upon who issues the RFP. So, for the Online Tutoring RFP that is being developed by the CCC Foundation, the Foundation is responsible, and so on. Steve explained that everyone involved in the CCMS RFP workgroup as well as Steering Committee members will need to sign the non-disclosure/financial disclosure form before they participate in the CCMS RFP process. The non-disclosure is to protect the RFI/RFP process so that: all vendors receive equal treatment, proprietary information is not made available to other companies, and so that companies cannot collude with one another during the process. The financial disclosure form is a statement of non-conflict or if necessary one of recusal regarding any financial interest (employee or shareholder) that a member or their family might have in the companies that are participating in that particular RFP. A customer does not have a financial interest. The non-disclosure form highlights very specific elements at particular points in the RFP process. This provides Steering Committee members with information about what is confidential information during particular periods of time in the selection process.

Dave DeGroot and Brian were concerned about the parameters of the non-disclosure form. Joe Moreau explained that this is not intended to interfere with openness and transparency in getting input from stakeholders. Information that is shared in TechEdge for example, is not confidential information. Neither is information on the requirements regarding features and functionality that is constructed by the workgroup or Steering Committee. However, at certain points in the process the information received back from vendors is confidential. For example, there is an expectation from bidders that the information that they send back to us is confidential until or unless we contract with them, at which point it would become a matter of public record. What we create is transparent and wide open with no need for restrictions, what we get back is another. Bill also noted that during the RFP process, the list of contractors that responded is kept confidential to prevent collusion between them. He also explained that the non-disclosure form is very straightforward with a commonsense list of things that members agree not to do. It is not a long legally worded document; it is a one-page form which includes the non-disclosure as well as the financial disclosure (and recusal if you feel that you have a conflict or potential conflict of interest).

Overview of Stages for Pilot Colleges/Selection of Pilot Colleges:
Pat explained that the team decided to have 24 colleges participate in the pilot in three different groups. One group of eight colleges will be the full launch pilot group, while two other groups of eight colleges each will pilot the readiness solution, and the online tutoring component respectively. This will provide the opportunity to get more information and research on three elements of the pilot. It will also enable the participation of sixteen additional colleges beyond the eight that will be doing the full launch. These colleges will pilot elements, and also complete staging requirements to move into full launch when the project is ready.

Pat emphasized that although there are still many questions that the project team does not have an answer for, they are working on them. There will be a meeting this month for project staff from all three grants to discuss how things are going and elements that need to be coordinated, additionally they are all focused on making sure that the architecture is not built without clear purpose. They want to make sure that the elements of technology and instruction are walking together rather than having to rebuild one or the other after the fact. At this point some ideas are really fleshed out, but it is important to remember that we are in a pilot phase developing something totally new and we don't want to do it incorrectly. We have learned lessons from others who have failed at this. We are not building a ship in the water, we are building a ship and we want it to be good. We are building the project piece by piece until we will be able to pull all of those components together. With respect to the CCMS, Pat noted that we need to not be like the Ice Age character, Scrat, holding onto the acorn to the detriment of our lives. We have to let go of the acorn for the benefit of our students. The bottom line should always be what is good for students, and we need to keep that focus.

The reason for having eight colleges in the full launch pilot is so that the technology component of doing matriculation, working in the CMS, the course conversion and registration which includes some pretty complex technology pieces, can have full focus. That full launch is scheduled to occur in June of 2015 in the CCMS. It will be led by the OEI Project Manager Steve Klein and the OEI Executive Director Pat James.

The student readiness review will consist of eight colleges piloting the Student Readiness Solution, providing feedback and collecting information. This will occur spring of 2015 and the colleges will use their own courses in their own CMS. It will be led by the Chief Student Services Officer for the management team.

The tutoring and support review will consist of eight colleges that will pilot the online tutoring solution. This will occur spring of 2015 and the pilot colleges for this portion will also use their own courses and their own CMS. It will be led by the Chief Academic Officer for the management team.

Reviewing the online readiness and tutoring solutions separately will enable the ability to factor out the different parts of the implementation. It is almost never possible to factor out different components, but this way it will be. There will be data that is as clean as possible from all three groups.

The full launch pilot colleges will establish the business operations and processes, which will be fed out to the other groups for their input as well. All 24 colleges will have to share a lot of information regarding shared business practices to develop processes that will work. The full launch colleges need to be completely ready in Open CCCApply in time for participation; that was a critical factor in order to use the system student identification number. The other two groups will also be staging groups that will be getting ready to move into the launch group when that is appropriate. Perhaps as the project continues it will be appropriate to move other colleges into those staging groups for course review and so on, moving into the CCMS as appropriate.

The student readiness modules pilot will implement and provide feedback on student readiness solutions and the tutoring solutions pilot will implement and provide feedback on the tutoring

solution. For both groups course review and assistance will take place prior to Spring 2015 semester start. Those colleges will use their own CMS with their own students Spring 2015.

The rough timeline will be posted on Basecamp. Pat is estimating that the pilot process for the Full Launch might be a year; summer 2015 to summer 2016.

In both the student readiness and tutoring support there is a minimum of two courses, is there a need for a maximum? Pat answered that the minimum would be two. @ONE is ramping up and they should easily be able to review two courses, by each of the colleges. That is 32 courses, plus the courses for the CCMS launch, so it might be reasonable to just go with two, but she will come back to it after the review process starts to see how fast that happens.

Michelle agreed that they don't know how hard the review process will be; if courses come in largely ready to go, they may be able to do more, but they won't know until courses start coming in. They are hoping that the application process will cause people to review their courses before they submit them, so that they are putting their best foot forward; that would mean that little extra work on them would be needed. They will start the review process in the fall as soon as possible so that they can get as many done as possible.

Dave DeGroot mentioned that some colleges might start doing their summer schedule as soon as November or December. Pat noted that they will be working with the pilot colleges on the timeline.

Ray asked whether the online readiness pilot colleges would not have the tutoring solution, and whether the tutoring pilot colleges would not have the online readiness solution. Pat confirmed that the intent was for those pilots to continue using their own existing systems in the areas other than what they are piloting. John Makevich noted that long term the other groups would get the additional resources, but that initially it would be easier to separate the variables if each group had one resource. Ray wondered if separating the variables outweighed the value of providing the services to the students in both groups. Pat confirmed that it does not outweigh it and that the goal is not to experiment with the students, but that a lot of colleges have one or both services and that this way the other two groups will not have to undo everything else that they are already doing. Ray suggested that it might be beneficial to offer both services to both groups. Pat recommended that the workgroup discuss it and report back. She also recommended that members put their comments and ideas in Basecamp so that they can be incorporated where possible. Proctoring will hopefully be provided for the eight colleges in the full launch, but not for the others, because the others will be teaching their own students in their own courses. Anita noted that the readiness modules that are submitted by November will be available to all colleges that are interested in them, but that Smarter Measure would only be available to the readiness pilot colleges.

Michelle outlined the elements that the team looked at to make their pilot college selection. They started off looking at elements that were objectively quantitatively based and undebatable. Open CCCApply was required and they double checked status on that. They also looked at whether or not training of faculty was required; a good number of colleges have across the board training required, and in others it is clear that they offer a robust training program for faculty. A pretty important factor was how many of the courses on the list of 17 the colleges offered, and the review team paid special attention to certain courses on the list that were not as commonly offered. Afterward they looked at geographic location and type, diversity of CMS, accreditation status, capacity to add courses, and piloting of the other two projects. They also tried to look for colleges where they haven't been able to meet cap and have a need for students and have had that need for a while. Pat noted that only show cause was used when they looked at accreditation status. She also highlighted how robust, clean and clear the conversations were. Everyone provided pieces of the information puzzle. Michelle had professional development information, LeBaron had logistical information about the colleges, and Steve had information about CCCApply, and so on. It was a really good process and turned out to be amazingly easy.

Pat acknowledged that some people are going to be happy with the selections and others are not, but she will be talking to the colleges that were not selected for the pilot about where they can come in. There were 58 colleges that originally expressed interest, and 43 responded with the additional information that was requested (Pat and LeBaron contacted everyone who did not respond).

The Pilot Colleges selected were shared with the Steering Committee.

Brian noted that the committee still needs to decide whether local students can enroll in the teaching college so that information can be communicated to the colleges. Pat agreed that is a critical issue and suggested that the workgroups look at the issue and have that discussion after lunch.

Another issue is what will be allowed for class size; Pat suggested that for the pilot the class size be what the colleges have in place. However, she is aware from reviewing courses for regular effective contact that if a course is too big it will not meet the standard. There is a legal Federal requirement that must be met in order to qualify as distance education. In course design you must look at regular effective contact and whether the course is self-paced or not. If a course is self-paced or automated, it would be possible to do a MOOC; but you cannot. If there is not regular effective contact, it is not distance education. If there is a course with 105-110 students, and that is the only course that a faculty member teaches, it might pass review, but it would have to be looked at carefully. The course review will cover some of those issues. If it is necessary to put a maximum on courses, that will be done, but first we will let the standards do their work.

Ray suggested that the readiness and tutoring pilot groups be allowed to use both or be allowed to opt out of one if they do not want to use it at this time. Pat noted that a reason to keep the pilot groups at eight was to keep the group sizes manageable for vetting purposes, but it might be worth discussing in the workgroups during lunch. Ray also noted that the usage for online tutoring would probably very low, so it might provide a relatively small amount of data. Pat agreed that new resources tend to not be used heavily at first, but she noted that the professional development group is working on a module for each course that explains the resources available and there will be marketing as well. With Smart Thinking they did notice that very few used it the first semester, the second semester there were a lot who used it, and the third semester they had to limit those who could use it because the demand was so high.

Status Reports from Task Force Work Groups:
Joe Perret sent out an email requesting Academic Senate faculty volunteers to participate in the CCMS workgroup. Members should contact him right away if they are interested.

Academic Affairs:
Meridith reported that the workgroup was discussing several questions. In the process of trying to identify the top tier courses to offer they need additional information on how many of the colleges offer each of the 17 courses online and have that course CID approved, it would be most useful to have the full year of data. LeBaron will put in the request for that information internally and get a rapid response. The deadline for submitting data for spring 2014 is next week, and 95% of the colleges have reported. Meredith explained that their goal is to determine which courses would really be filling a gap or alleviating a bottleneck.

The larger question is whether or not the workgroup should continue focusing on five top courses. Pat confirmed that originally the information was for pilot college selection, but that she still needs a prioritized list so that they can try to go down as far as they can in the classes offered during the pilot. She needs to get the list as soon as possible so that they can let the colleges know which courses they expect for the pilot, so that review on those courses can begin. Ric asked whether the eight pilot colleges would be offering two courses each for a total of 16 courses which would all be different, or if there would be multiple sections of English 1 or something like that. Pat

emphasized that the goal is to get as many as possible for the pilot, and they will try to focus on what the most needed courses are.

Another question from the workgroup had to do with registration dates and priorities. In order to alleviate bottlenecks in impacted courses, it might be necessary to have a later registration date (not necessarily a later start date) because all CIOs know that if you start late start classes with the idea that you are going to accommodate students who come late, but you open them at the same time, they fill up with students who don't necessarily need the late start section. Additionally, there is a question about the priorities, although if the courses are open late enough, the priorities may not matter. There is a legally mandated requirement in addition to optional priorities on different campuses. It seemed to the workgroup that it would be very difficult to honor everyone's optional priorities, but instead perhaps they should focus on the legally mandated priorities. Pat thought it might fall out as registration starts to take place, but she asked to add it to the parking lot.

Finally, how many seats in any consortium section should be set aside for the students from the teaching college? Meridith noted that it would be a political nightmare to exclude your own students from a section that you are offering; and it would not be good for the students. Perhaps if there were 10 students on a waitlist for English 1A, the teaching college could open an online section that could accommodate those 10 students and another 30 from the rest of the state. Their initial suggestion was to reserve 25% of the seats in a class for students from the teaching college with 75% from the consortium, and if it doesn't fill up, allow more students to enroll. Meridith also asked about having a cap of 40 maximum for the section, she thought that 35 might be a better maximum, but for now perhaps if colleges want to have a lower cap that would be fine, but no more than 40 throughout the pilot sections. Joe Moreau asked whether there is a general enrollment cap throughout the state of somewhere between 25 and 40? Pat thought that it varied throughout the state and that the team could look at the literature but she thought the literature probably said 20. They can ask the pilot colleges what their class cap is, if they have one, and bring the information back to the group.

Pat asked if there was consensus around the idea of having up to 25% set aside for students from the teaching college with the other 75% coming from OEI. Brian mentioned that there was some discussion about the possibility of the minimum number for a course to make being the floor; at some colleges it would be 15, others might be 20. Pat noted that might be a bigger problem, but she can ask for that number when she talks to the colleges, and then can bring that information back to the committee. Ric thought that flexibility in serving the most students was important, at a certain point in registration if the local college had filled their 25% and the 75% was still open, it should be possible to throw a switch. Clinton was concerned about registration and the feasibility of administering separate registration times for OEI students, and how you could administer the 25-75 split. He understood the logic and the principles but was concerned about the practicality of how to implement it. Pat emphasized that the intent is to not have the weight of that fall on Admissions and Records. Those kinds of issues are part of the matriculation process that will need to be worked out which is part of why the full launch was moved back to next summer. Dan was concerned about how legally to offer a course and reserve 75% for a certain amount of time for students not from that teaching college. LeBaron responded that the cohort model would work because it is based on the ability to provide other opportunities for students. Honors English for example can be set aside for certain students as long as there are enough other sections of that same course to accommodate other students. Some of the conditions for receiving state apportionment are based upon the fact that all courses have to be open to students unless it is in a particular model. The cohort model is one of about 3-4 ways that you can reserve spots for students clustered together. It is allowed as long as you have other opportunities for your regular students.

Pat will check into the specifics of the regulations with LeBaron to make sure that the project has something in place that covers this situation. Rather than retrofitting something, it may mean creating new regulations in order to make it very clear that OEI course are approved.

Vince wondered how students will be identified as belonging to OEI rather than just being any other swirling students; they will need to be identified in order to be put into a cohort. Bonnie clarified that this is a pilot process with many elements; there are business processes and there are technology questions to address how to make the business processes happen within the legal requirements and regulations. Clinton didn't feel that the split between home college and other college was necessary, he thought it might be able to be addressed by looking at net add in courses offered for students. That way if OEI was offering a 51st course when the total was previously 50 it would be expanding access for all students across all areas. Meridith explained that was not feasible because the number of courses offered from one semester to the next fluctuates. Steve noted that these are important conversations regarding he processes that the pilot will help identify and then the technology side will have solutions to propose to address those business processes that this committee and the pilot colleges will determine.

John Freitas made a motion that the project should move forward with up to a 25-75 ratio, with the proviso that the college could open it up to their own students, after a certain point if the class didn't fill the 75%. Dave DeGroot seconded the motion. The motion passed with: 9 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstaining.

CCMS Workgroup:
Fred presented Joe Perret's Powerpoint of the CCMS selection process which includes a lot of work to do in a relatively short time frame. Joe solicited help from the Steering Committee in getting Academic Senate appointees to participate in two workgroup committees. There will be a new smaller workgroup of about 25 people that will be associated with the RFP development that will consist of the nine original CCMS workgroup members, 4 invited Academic Senate OEI SC members, four project staff (Steve, Fred, John Sills, and Marti Harris from Gartner) and one representative from each of the eight pilot colleges (presumably these will be faculty representatives). This small workgroup will be most intimately involved in the RFP process. Joe Moreau asked that Pat, as Executive Director, be added to the staff members on the workgroup, and Fred agreed. There will also be a larger committee of about 50 that will include the 25 members from the CCMS RFP workgroup and additional representatives from each of the eight pilot colleges. There will be 2-3 faculty members nominated by the local Academic Senates from each of those eight colleges and appointed by the Academic Senate President, as well as one distance education coordinator from each pilot college. The idea is to get as broad support as possible from those who will be using the CCMS.

The workgroup is getting ready to start the review of the RFI responses. They would like to have the participation of the representatives appointed by the pilot colleges, but that is dependent upon the timing of those appointments. They will be trying to understand what the vendors believe might be important game changers. The RFP workgroup will provide inputs to develop the requirements for the RFP. The RFP release is currently planned for September 15th with the responses coming back in and scoring of those responses November 3-7th. They hope to have the short selection list ready November 10th, followed by demos from the short list vendors November 17-19th. After that the CCMS final recommendation will be forwarded to the project team and the full Steering Committee for review of the reasons for the selection.
The original CCMS workgroup has one member from outside the Steering Committee, Kirk Hewitt who is the Dean at Foothill. He has been on the CCMS workgroup since they were encouraged to look for additional help in the workgroup at one of the first OEI SC meetings. Steve noted that the workgroup would like the full Steering Committee to affirm their decision to have Kirk continue to participate as a voting member of the workgroup. They do not want any suggestion of favoritism about outside people being involved in the RFP process regarding who has input into that process or decision making.

Terry moved to approve having one additional person who is a voting member of the CCMS subcommittee. Clinton seconded the motion.

John Freitas pointed out that since the CCMS workgroup is a subcommittee of the OEI SC, any recommendations made by that body would come to the Steering Committee for final approval. He felt that there was nothing to preclude the workgroup as a subcommittee from appointing additional people from outside because ultimately the SC would make the final recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Student Services:</u>
Ray explained that the workgroup had a great discussion about whether or not all of the colleges which participate in tutoring should get online readiness and vice versa. They did not reach a consensus, but he asked the launch team to look at the issue again. The Foundation for CC is taking the lead on writing and managing the RFP for online tutoring. JC Sales is the representative for the Foundation and he will be meeting to work through the RFP details regarding the dollar amount, technical details, funding and so on. With the Association of Colleges for Tutoring and Learning Assistance (ACTLA) the workgroup has identified experts in the field for tutoring to participate in developing the requirements for the RFP. They are actively engaged in that process and should be done in about a week or so. They will then move that forward to this SC to take a look at it. It is a pretty quick timeline; they are shooting for a mid-September release on the RFP, since the online tutoring needs to be ready by January.

JoAnna looked at the proctoring processes at the community colleges throughout the system. She was able to obtain some broad input primarily from assessment people, but going forward she would also look at LRCs as well. There were about 40 responses total from the California Community College system and some colleges outside of California. In order to get a sense of the current culture of the colleges, she was looking for answers to three questions: Did they offer course testing at their colleges? If so where? Were students required to pay a fee? Without exception, the CCCs do not charge for placement testing. However, many colleges that were proctoring and testing for students outside of their colleges do charge. JoAnna noted that the student fees handbook for 2012 directly references test proctoring fees, "There is no authority that permits districts to charge students a fee that covers a cost of having someone present while students are taking a test to ensure that students do not cheat on tests." However, some colleges ARE charging fees, but primarily for students from outside of their district.

If students come into OEI and they are out of state students, is that something that we should be concerned about; is Title 5 evenly applied to both in state and out of state students? Pat responded that as a system we cannot charge our own students for proctored testing if we are requiring a test in a course; even if it is cross colleges, we cannot. (If people are coming from Universities or other systems to use our centers or our places to test and they want us to serve as a proctoring site; that is a different matter and has to be taken up elsewhere. That is not what is being discussed here.) Out of state students who are students of the California Community College system are still our students and we should provide testing for them. There is a murky area if we provide proctoring services for our students statewide and they choose to get services elsewhere and pay for it; that is their own business. However, we are required to offer them that free testing.

Pat noted that this is a clear area that OEI can provide the service of making sure that everyone in the CCC is on the same page. Across the state, we could gather information about where each campus does their testing whether in the LC or the assessment center or the library. Additionally, we could record where each campus does the testing, what the mechanism is at that campus, how that process works, and what their hours of service are. If everyone is on board and cross proctoring can take place, we can set up a proctoring consortium and then have a form the teacher uses to set up where the students who cannot access the local testing center, can access the center on the campus that is closest to the student. Additionally, we want to do online proctoring, while it will not be in place for the summer full launch pilot, it should be in the future so that someone can choose if they want online proctoring. In the meantime, the professional development that is offered will also encourage multiple measures and not high stakes testing.

LeBaron added that North Carolina recently won an award for setting up a statewide proctoring agreement that involved reciprocal agreements. They have been invited to present at one of the distance education coordinators' meetings. Pat will work with JoAnna to pull information together to send out to colleges regarding the legal issues and the desire to start the network, and to begin gathering the necessary information. She suggested that process start with the pilot colleges, but noted that every college that offers proctoring needs to be part of the network.

Anita explained that work continues on the online readiness tool, it will be ready by November. Lisa Storm has authored 8 modules which she has vetted on Basecamp. There still needs to be work on prioritizing development of the modules that are core to the launch in January. The modules will be interactive, engaging, and wonderful. As they are developed they will be posted on Basecamp. This is going to be a fast development process, so feedback is helpful.

Professional Development:
Michelle noted that the standards are available for adoption. They have been discussed and posted on Basecamp; only two sections have changed. The standards need to be finalized because they have been adopted for use within this first phase of the pilots; these are the standards by which the courses will be evaluated and the application process for the course and instructor will be tied back to the standard. It is important to recognize that the standards are not about screening out courses, instead they are about identifying where the courses need work and providing that assistance so that the course will meet the standards. These standards are needed to move into the actual application process for the reviewers of the courses.

Brian wanted to clarify what it meant that the course had to meet the standard to be approved for delivery as an OEI consortium course. Michelle clarified that assistance would be provided if needed to get a course up to the standard, but that ultimately the course would need to meet the standard to be offered through OEI. It is not a pass-fail on the first review, but it does need to meet the standard eventually in order to be offered. Pat explained that there are instructional designers that are ready to help instructors to improve the areas that are not up to the standard. If after working with the instructional designer and adjusting the course, it still doesn't meet the standard, that course will have to wait until it can meet it. The original idea was that in the professional development courses there would be both a 10 week course and then modules for each part of the course. Those courses and modules will be available later, but for the pilot, there are designers available to work with instructors, if needed.

Brian was concerned that the standard stated that a score below 2 is not acceptable; however, with the weighting in some areas a course could be approved if one area was scored as a 1 with the other areas scored as 6. Michelle explained that the changed standard required at least a 2 in all areas. Jayme felt strongly that a bare minimum in accessibility would be a score of 3. Brian agreed that he would find 3s across the board acceptable as minimum scores. Michelle asked if a vote on a revised standard with a minimum of 3 in all areas could be taken. Pat suggested that instead the standard be taken back to the workgroup for consensus on the change, so that members of the workgroup that were not present today could approve it prior to moving forward.

Pilot Consortium Charter:
Arnita brought forward the revised draft bylaws/charter which aligns with the Steering Committee Charter. Revisions were made around purpose and responsibility, voting membership rights, and language was added regarding the legislative intent to alleviate shortages of classes. This draft incorporates the new language and was approved by the consensus of the committee. Ray asked if it is intended to include the just the full launch pilot colleges or all 24 pilot colleges. Arnita confirmed that it was set up for whatever number of pilot colleges were selected by the committee, and there may be further revisions once those pilot colleges meet.

Arnita read the changes in the draft recommendation.
John Freitas moved to approve the OEI Pilot Consortium Charter with one suggested change to section 2a) from "when consensus cannot be reached," to "if consensus cannot be reached."

Dan seconded the motion. The motion passed with: 17 in favor, 2 opposed and no abstentions.

Discussion of Upcoming Meeting Schedule:
John Makevich asked if continued online meetings between the monthly were still necessary. Those meetings are currently used largely for reporting out, but he wanted to know if members felt strongly about the need for them. John Freitas thought that it might be good to leave them on the schedule and allow the Chair to send out one week notice if the meeting is needed. Dan found the report outs useful, but mentioned that perhaps written status reports could be posted on Basecamp rather than having the online meetings.

Closing Comments:
John Makevich and Pat thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Pat noted that the hiring of the permanent staff will be completed by the end of next week, and there will be announcements by August 12th. She expressed her thanks to the committees that have worked to get those new staff members hired. The first interviews are all completed, and there are some second interviews that are pending for those that need them.

Next Meeting:
The next meeting will be an online meeting on Friday August 15th on Confer.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Parking Lot/Action Items:
How long will the pilot be? (At the meeting Pat estimated one year from summer 2015 – 2016.)

In both the Student Readiness and Tutoring Support there is a minimum of two courses, is there a need for a maximum? (At the meeting Pat answered that the minimum would be two. There are 32 courses, plus the courses for the CCMS launch, so it might be reasonable to just go with two.)

Meridith asked about possibly having later registration dates and legally mandated vs optional priorities for registration. (Pat thought it might fall out as registration starts to take place.)

Look at class size maximum and whether pilot colleges have a class cap. Also find out what the minimum number is for a class to make. Bring this information back to the committee. (This was part of the 25-75 discussion.)

Pat/LeBaron will check into the specifics of the regulations to make sure that the project has something in place that covers this situation. Rather than retrofitting something, that may mean creating new regulations in order to make it very clear that OEI course are approved. (This was part of the cohort discussion.)