Online Education Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Friday September 5, 2014
Embassy Suites, Los Angeles

Attendees: Amy Carbonaro, Arnita Porter, Barbara Illowsky, Barry Gribbons (online), Bonnie Edwards, Bonnie Peters, Brian Keliher, Chris Graillat (online), Cynthia Alexander, Dan Crump, Darla Cooper, Dave Stephens, David DeGroot, David Morse, Fabiola Torres, Fred Sherman, Gregory Beyrer, Hasun Khan, Henry Burnett, Ireri Valenzuela, Jayme Johnson, Jerred Scheive (online), Jessica Millikan, Jim Huether (online), JoAnna Quejada, Joe Perret, John Freitas, John Ittelson (online), John Makevich, John Sills, Jory Hadsell, Joseph Moreau, Kelly Fowler, Larry Lambert, LeBaron Woodyard, Lori Adrian, Marie Boyd, Meridith Randall, Michelle Pilati, Pam Walker, Pat James, Ray Sanchez, Richard Matthews, Sandoval Chagoya (online), Steve Klein, Terry Gleason, Tom Bilbruck (online), Vince Rodriguez, and Wendy Bass.

Opening and Introductions:
Fabiola Torres and Pat James opened the meeting at 9:30 am. New staff members were introduced: Jory Hadsell, Academic Affairs Officer; Bonnie Peters, Student Services Officer; and John Makevich, Strategic Planning and Operations Officer. Pat thanked the outgoing launch team members for their excellent work, and expressed appreciation for the ongoing work that several will be continuing to do. Meeting attendees introduced themselves. Darla Cooper explained that Ireri Valenzuela has been hired to take over the role of RP representative for oversight of the OEI.

Pat and Fabiola expressed their appreciation to Amy Carbonaro and John Sills for setting up the meeting and testing out Zoom in advance of the meeting. Zoom is now part of CCCConfer and if members of OEI would like to set up accounts to use Zoom for work on this project, they can contact John Ittelson and Blaine Morrow for assistance.

Tim Calhoon and the Butte-Glenn Technology Center have hired Lou Delzompo as an interim Chief Technology Officer to help with the technology needs on all three of the initiatives.

Minutes: Information
The August 15th meeting minutes were not posted for review on Basecamp, but will be posted along with the minutes from today's meeting and both will be put up for approval at the next meeting.

Executive Director Update: Information
Pat James explained that there was a meeting of the Project Managers and Steering Committee Chairs on August 14th to inform one another about the current progress on all of the initiatives and to become clear on potential areas of cross-over and overlap in responsibilities. For example, in Common Assessment (CAI) how they progress will be influenced by OEIs determinations of reciprocity agreements around accepting each other's assessments. Additionally, with respect to proctoring, especially online proctoring, when OEI finds a vendor it is important for CAI to know about it, since they will also potentially be looking at proctoring. In Education Planning (EPI) some degree audit information will help inform OEI's decision making, and communication about the portal will be important since that will affect OEI as well. No decisions were made during the meeting, other than the importance of maintaining ongoing communication for the benefit of all three initiatives.

There was a retreat for incoming staff and outgoing launch team members at the end of August. This was solely for making a smooth transition between team members and so that the incoming staff would be aware of all of the decisions that have already been made in the project. The idea was to transition over all of the information to keep things moving forward smoothly.

No big decisions were made at the retreat, but there were many questions that were generated that will be brought forward to the Steering Committee so that they can be addressed in partnership with the pilot colleges as OEI moves forward.

The Quality Course Design Standards have been completed, and the Course Reviewer applications are out. The RFI to RFP process for the CCMS is moving forward. The RFP for Tutoring is also going to be coming soon. The Readiness Modules will be in prototype form by the end of the month. To see what is going on with those, members can get in touch with Bonnie Peters. The project team has been in contact with the pilot colleges and all have replied back with information regarding their respective contact person; the project requested the contact person be selected in collaboration with the Academic Senate. Each group of pilot colleges will be contacted by their respective lead from OEI: Bonnie Peters, Jory Hadsell, and Steve Klein, regarding what we expect and how we will be moving forward with each pilot. John Makevich and Steve Klein will also be moving forward with the full launch pilot of creating the business processes for the exchange of students in that pilot.

Development of the mentoring coaching network for faculty will also begin soon. It is in the work plan and the idea is to begin providing time for faculty of each of the three pilot groups to begin discussions about teaching strategies, challenges and so on as they work together to build their classes. This will be done by Professional Development in combination with the Academic Senate. The thought is to bring the faculty together, feed them, and create the process so that network can be built. Pat encouraged OEI members to think about how they would like to participate in that process and discuss it with Michelle Pilati.

Update on Student Readiness Pilot: **Information/Discussion**
Bonnie Peters has been getting caught up on the timelines, details, and has been in contact with Anita Crawley. Ray Sanchez provided an update on the most current information. Online Readiness has been named "Quest." Smarter Measure will be used as a diagnostic tool to assess readiness for online success. Work on prioritizing modules to support student success in different time periods has been taking place: prior to the beginning of the first online course, first third of term, and throughout the remainder of the term. Additionally, the group decided to identify students who have never successfully completed an online course. However, due to the sped up timeline, at this point, the group has streamlined the list of what will be included. The following essential modules will be ready by November 1st: Overview, Tech Readiness, Communication, Time Management, Study Skills, Reading Strategies, Organizational Skills, and Getting Started. These are the modules that students will have access to once they use the Smarter Measure assessment tool. When the Quest Modules are completed they will be made available to all 112 community colleges via website. An evaluation plan is also in the works. At this point the Smarter Measure component is just for the pilot; it has not yet been decided what will happen after that. The reason for the November 1st deadline on the modules is so that they will be available for students when they start registering for the Readiness pilot courses in the spring; students can complete the modules before classes start. The modules will be relatively short so that students can complete them quickly. Pat highlighted that there will be a point in time where editing stops so that everything can move forward. She encouraged people to remember that this is a pilot, and things that are not perfect can be fixed later. The module materials will be put up in Basecamp so they can be reviewed, and if members are really uncomfortable with something they can contact Bonnie Peters; she can compile comments to be sent out in a summary document.   Pat also noted that currently the content and ideas are there in depth, but there will be a multimedia production group hired to take the content from the workgroup and Lisa and turn it into a really good interactive piece that the project can be proud of. The prototype should be done by the end of this month so that it can be looked at and edited with instructional design support. The content that is being developed (and all other content developed for the initiatives) is under a Creative Commons License, so it will be available and out there for all of the colleges to benefit from. Bonnie Edwards asked how we will be measuring success; will the colleges set baselines and then work from there? Pat explained that is still under consideration and being discussed.

Action Item:

Pat asked members to share with their colleges the fact that the Course Design Standards are out there and available to be used. It there is feedback from the field, it should go to Michelle Pilati.

Update on the Tutoring Pilot: **Information/Discussion**
Jory Hadsell explained that outreach to pilot colleges has begun, and they will be having the first meeting of the tutoring pilots next week. They will work on getting them all on board, signing a MOU, and thinking about what types of courses might be offered in the pilot. Jory also highlighted that there have been tutoring vendors attempting to contact pilot colleges directly to try to become a provider for the pilot, and he asked OEI members to be aware of the inappropriateness of those actions. Ray Sanchez noted that the group is currently very involved with the tutoring RFP. On August 14th they met with the Foundation to work through ironing out some of the details and questions regarding that RFP, on September 2nd they updated the draft RFP and it is nearly complete, on September 7th the next round of feedback will be needed as they work toward an estimated October 6th release date for that RFP. The submission deadline for the RFP will be in the middle of November, with evaluation and review shortly afterward. The successful vendor should be selected right before Thanksgiving. There are several excellent experts in the field in addition to the Foundation who are involved in reviewing the delivery requirements: Bonita Robinson from Cerro Coso, Kevin O'Connor from Saddleback, John Wood from Pasadena City College, and Jim Julius, from MiraCosta. The tutoring group would love feedback on their second revision, especially regarding usage and rollout. Ray noted that they anticipate that each tutoring college will have access to the online tutoring platform and tutors. Additionally, pilot colleges can use their own peer tutors online, at their own cost, to supplement, if they would like to. The Foundation is helping to write the RFP, so that other colleges that are not in the pilot will be able to opt to make use of the tutoring platform and tutors at a reduced rate, in the future. They are aware that usage of online tutoring is probably desired beyond the pilot, and the RFP is being written to allow for that. Some of the timeline issues on when access to the platform would be available are still being worked out.

Pat explained that some tutoring vendors have contacted the project saying, "We've been contacted by the tutoring pilot colleges, and need to know how to proceed." However, in actuality they were contacting the colleges and one was even using Pat's name as a reference. She has had a conversation with the vendor and asked them to stop. Pat would appreciate if members contact her if there is any direct contact to their colleges or to pilot colleges by vendors claiming that they have been selected by OEI or who are using her name. John Makevich put together a really nice message regarding appropriate vendor contact; prospective vendors should be referred to the website for information.

Action Item:
If there are any problems with vendors, please contact Pat James so that she can put a stop to it.

The tutoring pilot college courses will have tutoring access in the spring, and in the summer the full launch colleges should have everything. Cynthia Alexander asked for clarification regarding colleges outside of the pilot, and the cost involved. Joe Moreau explained that the reason for the contract through the Foundation is so that there will be a statewide reduced rate for the platform and tutoring services, which could be purchased by colleges that opt to purchase them. Pilot colleges who might get some allocation from this pilot, but who wanted more, could purchase additional hours for the interface, and might also administer their own local tutors through the same interface. The goal is to provide maximum flexibility to the pilot schools, and other schools in the state, by using our purchasing power as a statewide system. Jim Huether asked if the tutoring pilots in the spring would have a mix of online tutoring and local tutoring, and Jory clarified that the spring pilot will just be online tutoring for the online pilot courses. The pilot colleges could supplement with their own local tutors, but all of the tutoring would take place online.

Another member asked about having a network of onsite tutors, as well as encouraging community college districts to hire local tutors. Pat James asked John Makevich to make a note of the question for the parking lot. She explained that they have been talking about how to

supplement tutoring services when some colleges have no online tutoring at all, while others have some with a variety of options. She thought that it would depend upon the vendor, but that it should be possible to encourage them to use our people. The member suggested adding that as part of the RFP.

Action Item:
Add to tutoring RFP the desire to encourage the use of local tutors if possible.

Update on the Full Launch Pilot:
Steve Klein explained that contact with full launch pilot colleges started earlier than for the other pilot groups with the purpose of identifying faculty members to participate in the CCMS workgroup and committee efforts currently focused on developing the RFP.   David Morse and Julie Adams helped the team to make contact with each of the Academic Senate presidents at each of the eight full launch pilot colleges, with a request to put forth 2-3 faculty members and one DE Coordinator to serve on the CCMS committee. The team requested that those people be ones with experience teaching in an online environment and that the best possible candidates are those who: are teaching in an online environment, have previously taught in an online environment, have helped others with professional development in online learning, and are seen as a leader on their campus in the area of online education; so that they can be voices for their campuses' input into the RFP development and identification process. As of yesterday, they have the complete group of full launch pilot college representatives. This is the first contact and engagement with those pilot colleges to bring them into the CCMS RFP and procurement process. The timeline for that process is very short; the team is hoping to put it out by the end of the month. Today will be the first meeting of that Full Launch CCMS committee made up of pilot college representatives and representatives from this committee. That full group consists of about 50 people. The Full Launch pilot colleges will take on the voices of their campuses in the selection process, and help to handle the complicated process of identification and integration of the CCMS that is selected onto their campuses with the SIS and the course content. That will be a large undertaking. That committee represents just one layer of input into this procurement process, there are various connecting points.

John Makevich explained to the committee how the teams' efforts will also be focused on expanding the conversations with the pilot colleges in order to inform various business processes. This focus will begin with the Full Launch/CCMS pilot colleges, but will ultimately include Tutoring and Readiness as well. These conversations will go beyond the technology solutions and will have to do with the strategies needed to develop the relationships between colleges and their business practices in addition to the technical side of the effort.

It is also critically important to gain feedback and input from the rest of the field while the work continues with the pilots. In order to facilitate that, yesterday the project team launched IdeaScale, which is a tool to capture comments, ideas, and suggestions from the field of what they would like to see in the CCMS selection process. It will also allow for voting on specific features so that they can be weighted to accurately represent the desires of the system for the evaluation of the RFP. A link to IdeaScale was provided in the TechEdge Newsletter this week, and there is also a link on the OEI website. It is important that DE Coordinators, both the single point of contact and the general Listserv hear about IdeaScale and provide input as well.

Steve Klein provided a demonstration of how to use IdeaScale. There are three ways members of the system can provide input: submit an idea, add a comment to an existing idea, and vote on items. The website does ask system members to verify their identity from a valid .edu website or one of several other email addresses (Chancellor's Office, RP Group, etc.) to help ensure that the input is from voices in the community college field. The project team seeded this OEI CCMS "campaign" with 4 comments to get the discussion started. The other initiatives will also use IdeaScale to gather input into elements of their projects as different "campaigns."

This afternoon when the CCMS committee meets they will begin to work on an initial set of 120 functions and features for the CMS. Input into the relative importance of those functions and

features will come from the level of support they receive and that will help to determine their weight for determining the RFP scoring process.

Action Item:

Members should provide input into the OEI CCMS campaign on IdeaScale and encourage members of the community college system to participate in doing that as well. This campaign for feedback on the CCMS will continue until September 22nd.

Gregory Beyrer asked if it would be appropriate to invite students to provide input into IdeaScale, and Steve Klein repied that the project team had talked about student focus group participation, but asked for further input from the committee. Barbara Illowsky mentioned that since some colleges provide students with .edu email, while others do not, it would be likely to provide a biased viewpoint, which would be unbalanced toward comments from students at those schools and likely based upon their experiences with their existing CMSs. She felt student input would be important but that it would be better to get it in a consistent way. Husan Khan agreed that the parameters for IdeaScale might not make for a balanced view. Perhaps it would work to have a separate branch of IdeaScale? Otherwise student focus groups would be a good idea. The committee agreed that student focus group input would be best.

Action Item:

Steve Klein mentioned that the team will involve the student focus group in reviewing the RFP elements. John Makevich will also work on trying to develop a way to do a better job or a different job of getting student input.

David Morse noted that when they used IdeaScale with the Student Success Task Force there was a problem in not tracking responses based on administration versus faculty or all of the responses coming from one area, one college or one group. Steve reassured that the project team is collecting the name, email address and college role when people use the tool. They are able cross reference that information with the comments.

When additional ideas are added, if a person returns to provide further input, or to vote, the system will not allow them to vote multiple times for an item; it will allow them to change their vote. Over time if there are multiple ideas that are similar, the project team will be able to merge or aggregate those items as necessary. Members can also subscribe or follow comments they leave in order to see responses to those comments.

Update on Professional Development: **Information/Discussion**

Michelle Pilati explained that the application to be a course reviewer went out on Wednesday. They currently have 100 complete applications and 200 in some phase of submission. This first group of reviewers is being asked to participate in a two day face to face training on October 3rd and 4th in San Diego, and then an online training for a week (October 5-10), after which they will be ready to start reviewing courses October 15th. The application responses must be in by September 12th and the workgroup will do a first pass through the applications with the Academic Senate; those who are selected for this first group will be notified by September 19th. The Standards are now posted on the OEI website for quick access. (The application is not posted on the website because it is not open to everyone right now.)

The workgroup is talking about what the process for review looks like, so that there is no conflict of interest, for example, by having friends review courses for their friends; those details still need to be worked out. The Professional Development group has a meeting planned for next week to look at next steps. One of the things they have talked about is having some sort of module within the courses in the OEI that lets students know what they are part of, as well as college specific information. There should be both policy and data information related generally to OEI, and that are unique to the college, but in a one stop shop. They have to figure out how to work that structure so that it is similar to students knowing where to sit and where the teacher will stand in a traditional class. This could be an element that has a consistent piece so that the student knows where to go to get information in any online course.

They are aiming to get 30 reviewers for this first group. This will be an ongoing process; after the first group of reviewers is done they will start running other groups of reviewers. The impact on the field as reviewers get trained and go back to their colleges with the standards and the training; will be a huge win for this initiative. There was an application from someone in the CSU system, but Pat thought that it was best to have this first group focused only on our system. After that first group the committee could discuss other people who might want to participate and whether to use that as an opportunity for outreach into other communities.

Future trainings will be completely online and will not have the in-person time commitment, that element is to help get the first group started and to allow for some evaluation of the training. The Standards for Course Design will be interconnected to training and professional development; the training for the reviewers is based on the standards, and then that training will be modified to be used for professional development for instructors if they are lacking elements from the standards.

Michelle apologized for the timing of the two day training, there were limited times that were available, and they did not realized that it was during Yom Kippur until later. Pat explained that the project team will work to get in those for whom that conflict exists; they should still apply. Pat will put out a message to the field and she asked Barbara Illowsky to help spread that message to those who were concerned about that conflict.

Pat also noted that the three project teams are working on coordinating their scheduling calendars to avoid the conflicts that have been occurring for people who participate in more than one project. The leadership team will also try to put dates out there in advance, to hopefully avoid conflicts with other important events and observances.

In regard to choosing the classes for the pilots, Pat explained that the process being suggested is to ask each of the colleges from each of the pilot groups to submit 5 courses off of the list of courses developed by Academic Affairs. From the list of 5 submitted by each college, the Academic Affairs workgroup will look at the submission list and see which ones are appropriate: from the list, CID approved; and then try to get a breadth of courses for each of the pilot groups so that there are a variety of courses within each group. All of the courses that are being piloted in all three groups will be reviewed, and they will be looking for a good mix of courses offered within the: tutoring colleges group, the readiness group and the full launch group. That process will be used to select 3 of the 5 courses from each college, to go into the review process. The colleges have the Course Design Standards, and they will hopefully look at them and submit their best courses for meeting the standards. Accessibility review will take place at that time as well; Jayme is working on that with a company and there will be people available to help on fixing accessibility issues. At the end of the process the hope is that there will be three of the three that are ready to go forward.

There were no immediate questions from the committee and Pat will post this plan on Basecamp if there are later questions and comments on this operational and policy issue.

Lunch with Workgroup Meetings:
John Makevich asked for workgroups to try to bring in a member who would act as the skeptic and help to make sure that the tough questions would be asked during their lunch meetings. He also asked workgroups to try to break down some of the ideas and questions that have been brought forward that have not yet been addressed.

Reports from Workgroups: **Information/Discussion**
CCMS:
Joe Perret presented a Powerpoint summary of the process that is underway with the CCMS pilot colleges. There is now a smaller group of 31 people doing the more intense work and a larger group of about 50 that is working to define the requirements and eventually the RFP for the new CCMS. One of the first important steps was getting non-disclosure agreements signed by those participating in the RFP process.

The RFI went out and has come back and Fred Sherman put together a nice summary that is not vendor specific that can be shared with everyone. There is also an RFI summary review which John Sills did posted on Basecamp; members received an email invitation to view that one, since it may contain proprietary information from the vendors, and is connected to the non-disclosure agreement.   The next big step is moving toward generation of the RFP by the workgroup made up of: the original CCMS workgroup and two new members from the OEI SC, 4 additional faculty member representatives from the Academic Senate, and the OEI project staff. Additionally, the full launch pilot colleges are part of the larger group and have one representative each in the smaller group as well. The goal was to have a broad representative group while having appropriate numbers to be able to work effectively.

The timeline is built around the September 26th release date for the RFP, then the review and scoring will happen after the responses come back, sometime in November. The goal is to sign a contract in January and have the CCMS live in June 2015. This is an ambitious timeline with many steps. Currently the workgroup and committee is working on identifying and classifying desirable functions of the system from the user standpoint. Additionally, there is work going on for the contract portion of the RFP.

John Freitas asked about the role of the Steering Committee with regard to the RFP. Pat James explained that the OEI SC role is advisory to the project team. Steve Klein explained that members will be invited to view the RFP elements in an online environment during a window of time prior to the RFP release on September 26th; that review will tentatively happen during the third week of September. The CCMS vendor recommendation is scheduled to come back to the OEI SC at the face to face meeting on December 5th.

Ray Sanchez asked if it would be same for tutoring and online readiness, and Pat replied that those are more typical pilots and they will likely come back to the committee through reports and so on. The CCMS is a little more final and needs more eyes on it. Joe Perrett cautioned that during these processes the vendors will spend a lot of time trying to find out extra information about the process and what other vendors have submitted. Be very careful what you say.

Basic Skills:
Barbara Illowsky reported on the formation of the new Basic Skills workgroup. Dan Crump from library science joined and suggested that modules for research skills in the CID should be brought in; they are more advanced than typical Basic Skills, but they are very important for providing support services for students taking the CID designated courses. Fabiola Torres, with specialty in equity and diversity, Arnita Porter, and Jaymee Johnson with accessibility specialization, joined as well. Barbara also requested that David Morse and Julie Adams find four additional general education faculty members: two in mathematics, and two in English, in reading and writing. Michelle Pilati and David Morse met with the workgroup today as volunteers.

The discussion today found many nested priorities, "we need to do this first, but before we can do that we need to do this, but before we can do that we need to do this, and so on." At this point they have quite a lengthy list of priorities. Once the pilot courses are identified, this workgroup would like to contact the faculty and find out what the support services are that are needed for those courses. Perhaps an economics course might need a review module for the intersection of lines, because that goes along with supply and demand curves. In a social science course, there might be a need for support with particular writing skills or for writing in general. The workgroup also wants to work with CAI because once that Common Assessment is developed; they want to be able to work on developing modules for pre-assessment with diagnostic capability.

Pat James explained that the RFA is for research and planning around areas that come up because students come into courses when there is no prerequisite and no assessment required; students sign up for them, but still need support services. Barbara will also work with the RP group or someone who can help to determine which online courses tend to be the ones that students who need support end up in, so that those courses can be targeted first. Those supports will probably not all be in place by the time OEI summer courses start, but work can being on them. There are no immediate plans for developmental courses specifically through

OEI, but as CID starts identifying those courses in the future, it may become more important. Right now research and planning are part of the RFA so providing that resource is the first thing to address. Barbara emphasized that the faculty in developmental education are very split on whether developmental education courses should be offered online, but most faculty members also recognize that being able successful often has very little to do with intelligence and being able to master the content; instead it has to do with everything else, most often student service needs. The desire is to provide support that may be immediately viewable, perhaps by clicking on a link that is available when a student reaches a common area of difficulty.

Basic Skills in a new workgroup, tutoring is in Academic Affairs with Jory Hadsell, readiness is in Student Services with Bonnie Peters, and currently test proctoring will stay with Bonnie as well. Pat James noted that in discussions with CAI regarding assessment there were discussions about who proctors the common assessment and who proctors OEI tests and whether or not those needs are the same or different. There will need to be a vendor to do online proctoring fairly soon. When that vendor is chosen, CAI will need to be notified because they may want to use the same vendor. In the meantime, the DE Coordinators should be able to systematize a proctoring network within the colleges in a relatively short period of time, probably less than a month. Eventually, teachers will be able to decide whether they want their students proctored by a live person at a network site, through online proctoring, or perhaps no proctoring is needed. Those three choices need to be looked at and should be ready by spring for the summer pilot. Online proctoring isn't needed for the tutoring and readiness pilots because faculty will be teaching their own students in their own CMS.

Professional Development:
Professional Development met with Basic Skills today due to their overlapping interests. Michelle Pilati outlined how faculty needs to understand how to work with any Basic Skills modules that are developed, and how to help the students that need those resources.

Academic Affairs:
Jory Hadsell explained that the group is looking at the process of identifying which of the courses that are submitted will be pushed forward to the course reviewers for the pilots. Some criteria to be used as a team needs to be developed, which will then be posted on Basecamp, it should begin with a global view within each group of the considerations for that group. For example, within the tutoring pilot group, it might be important to select courses that lend themselves to the need for tutoring support, so that we don't end up with courses in the tutoring pilot that have low utilization of tutoring. Similarly, in the readiness pilot there might be a desire for more introductory types of courses. Additionally, it might be helpful to find a mechanism so that as courses start to come in, the colleges that haven't yet submitted courses can see the ones that have which might result in a better mix of courses, as colleges elect to submit different courses.

Academic Affairs will need to work with Michelle Pilati on matching the timeline for course selection up with the completion of the course reviewer training so that there is no time lag. The three pilot leads should also look at which group of courses should start first.
David DeGroot asked when the Academic Affairs workgroup would get the five courses from the pilot colleges and Pat James explained that is the timeline that Academic Affairs needs to determine. She suggested that the workgroup look at the criteria used to identify the courses in the first place and communicate to the leads and the pilot colleges the ones that were pulled out as being the most important. Additionally, perhaps talk to the Michelle Pilati and the professional development group about how @ONE is looking at the courses once they are submitted.

Michelle explained that very soon they would need to be asking the colleges which courses they are going to submit. The application process is already developed that the faculty member will be using to submit their course, but the call for submitting courses has not yet been put out. The reviewers will be ready to begin reviewing courses on October 15th, so the request for courses and the time period to figure out which ones will actually be submitted for review should be completed before that.

Jory Hadsell, Bonnie Peters and Steve Klein will have the full conversation with the pilot colleges explaining the whole process. Pat noted that they are just about ready to go ahead with those conversations; it should happen next week. The contact people are identified and the pilot leads will go back and request that the colleges find their best courses from the list. She felt that they would be able to get that done by the 15th, but if not, that there would be some to get started with ready by then.

Meridith Randall explained to the committee that Academic Affairs was in consensus about adding the Psych Research Methods course to the list of courses, making a total of 18 courses on the list instead of 17. The Psych Research Methods course is as useful as the Socio Research Methods course for the ADT. Pat thought it might be a good course to have a group of people work together on developing and offering. TTIP South is developing a content repository for professional development and for learning objects that can be shared which could be a useful resource.

Action Item:
Pat James reminded Jory Hadsell to add the Psych Research Methods course to the Academic Affairs course list for a total of 18 courses.

General Questions and Discussion: Discussion
Arnita Porter noted that many students are fearful about the educational process and she wondered if that would be addressed in the readiness modules and process. There are very basic things like staying on top of their schedule, and reading their syllabus; will those kinds of things be addressed? Bonnie Peters replied that the modules that are being developed are to cover all of those things from the very beginning to later in the term. The Smarter Measure assessment is intended to help push students to some of the modules that they need early on to address what they might be missing, but the workgroup also intends to reference the modules and encourage their use in many locations and at various times during the term in order to meet students' needs. Pat James also noted that these modules would be made available to all colleges and they would be encouraged to put them into their matriculation process, but they will be available on the website also.

Arnita noted that even when students answer self-assessments honestly, they often ignore the results and sign up anyway. Those students need some "hand-holding" on basic things like reading the syllabus and so on. Bonnie Peters agreed and noted that the research will help identify those elements and modifications can be made as the project progresses. Fabiola Torres noted that the support vision of Basic Skills that Barbara is working on will help to support those students in online learning.

Dan Crump brought up a concern about course selection with general education courses that don't have prerequisites; if his course has a reading prerequisite will it be rejected? Pat thought that would fall into the category of things that would need to be decided within the actual groups of colleges themselves. If the prerequisites are different, those are things the college groups are going to have to work out as a business process piece.

Michelle noted that many of the courses have defined prerequisites, so if there are other additional prerequisites there would need to be a way to meet them without too many hassles unless it is waived in the context of the course. Colleges may need to be asked if they have prerequisites that are inconsistent with what CID requires. Academic Affairs will need to make the judgment about how to deal with that. Dan was concerned that courses without prerequisites might be given priority over ones with prerequisites. David Morse reminded the group that Title 5 doesn't allow a general waiver of the prerequisite; it can be challenged but not just waived. Pat highlighted that was not how she thought it would happen, instead it might happen by reciprocal agreements of some kind.

Pat determined that prerequisite issues would need to go to the parking lot as items for which a solution still needs to be found, along with concerns about accepting each other's assessments. Those project team members working with the pilots will help them to start having those

discussions. Tutoring and readiness don't need to be as concerned about those issues yet, but maybe they should consider those questions and issues also so that they can be thinking about them and informing the process as it goes forward. The biggest questions to focus on are what is helping students, and what is good for students, those should always be the baseline.

Joe Perret echoed Arnita's point regarding the fact that we will be measured by how well our students do, so it is important. There is a fine line between steering students to modules that will help them, and allowing them to escape. Research shows that when a student successfully completes an online course, their success rate skyrockets.

Pat agreed and noted that faculty will also be asked to work on components inside of their courses that will help students to succeed. Faculty in online courses figure out over time some of the things that they need to do to encourage students to take actions that help them be successful, like syllabus quizzes or orientations to the course itself.

The content for the online readiness components that are done will be posted in Basecamp today. That information will later be put into a more interactive form.

Ray Sanchez asked if students can be required to take the Smarter Measure assessment and LeBaron said that it could not be required. Pat did say that it may be possible eventually to say, "If you have failed or withdrawn from an online course, we would like you to take this intervention."

Bonnie Peters emphasized that the modules will also be available at multiple times, in multiple places, so that if a student skips them, they will still have later opportunities to interact with them. She also noted that it can be useful for instructors to have a "start here" video for their specific course, and students who find it useful will recommend it to others. That kind of consistency in how teachers run their classes can really help students. Pat agreed and reminded everyone that online courses were first designed organically, with or without training, support, or motivation from the administration. OEI now has the opportunity to teach people how to do good online courses. Procuring an excellent CCMS is part of this as well, it is important to choose a learning environment that builds connectivity for our students. We have to design it and ask for it, this is the big opportunity; the CMS isn't just about a box with all these features, it is about how we make sure that the students feel connected when they get into those courses. Pat wants to be able to say that we were good for online learning!

LeBaron Woodyard is continuing to look at the Title 5 language and the regulatory process so that OEI meets those mandates. Pat also explained that the project team decided that during the pilot they would not worry about limiting the percentages of OEI or teaching college students, they will simply look at them all as students in OEI. That is what they are going to do, unless the eight pilot colleges have some other need and come up with something else. If there is anybody who has a problem with it being that way, contact Pat James to discuss it.

Ray Sanchez asked if the pilot colleges in the spring will also be teaching in the summer, and Pat replied that the conversion of the courses will be quite involved technically, so it would be unlikely. They will have their courses already reviewed, and further courses will continue to be reviewed to build up the inventory of courses, so those colleges can be waiting in the wings. The spring pilots will be the first to come on after the full launch when the technical teams are ready for them. Steve confirmed that there is a lot involved in onboarding the technology with respect to working with IT managers and so on.

Ray asked if the spring pilots could continue to participate using their own CMS, and Pat indicated that she didn't know yet as there are still a lot of details to work out. The exchange for example is one piece of the OEI, and a lot of elements can be separated out from that. The adoption of the CCMS is separate from the exchange, and what is most important is to make sure that we are providing access to seats and they are not being wasted. Additionally, we want to bring up the success and retention in those courses and we want to have a significant impact on education online in California.

RFP Process and RFP Quiet Period:
Steve Klein explained that there is period of time that is referred to as a "quiet period" during the RFP process and he wanted to clarify what that meant, and the reasons for it. Right now the project is in the process of developing the RFP through the third week of September. During this time IdeaScale will be used to collect information from the system regarding the features and functions that are important. When the RFP is released to the vendors on September 26th this begins the "quiet period" when the discretion of the Steering Committee members and others involved in the RFP process is especially important. This quiet period extends from the release of the RFP, until one of three things happens: a contract is signed, a board approves a contract, or the end of the process is announced.

After responses are received back from vendors, those responses will be scored, a short list of candidates to invite for a live face to face meeting will be generated, and the CCMS workgroup will make a final recommendation to the OEI SC on December 5th. Then there will be a month long process of vendor negotiations which will hopefully end in contract approval by the Butte-Glenn CCD at their January meeting. That approval can signal the end of the confidentiality/quiet period.

There are several objectives of the quiet period:
1) To be sure prospective vendors have equal and fair access to the process through the discretion and awareness of what is involved on the part of the Steering Committee and others with knowledge of the process.
2) Communications related to the selection process pass through a single source for consistency and accuracy.
3) To insure that the process of selection of the CCMS is efficient, diligent, and fair.

If there are any questions through the RFP process, pass them along to Steve Klein, Pat James or Joe Moreau and recognize that the goal is to keep conversations about the process within this Steering Committee body. Throughout the quiet period, any contact to a member of this body or a CCMS body by a vendor should send up red flags. Refer them to OEI staff directly involved in the procurement process: Steve Klein, Pat James, Joe Moreau, or Tim Calhoon. Keep the channels clear and consistent by saying that it isn't your topic to address.

This does not prevent normal contact with existing vendors regarding ordinary course of service business, however any discussions of the selection process should be avoided during those business communications.
Joe Perret noted that he used to be a salesman and understands that a common technique is to get someone to verify information that they don't really have. "I heard that your system is going to have …this particular feature," and you are tempted to respond with the accurate information. As soon as the interaction begins your antennae should go up. Even with that experience in sales, he still nearly found himself disclosing confidential information when one of his faculty members said, "I heard that a particular vendor fired their entire executive staff." He nearly started to confirm or deny that information and realized that was information that he was only aware of because of his involvement in confidential parts of the RFI process. It doesn't mean that you can't have conversations, but it does mean that you need to be very careful what you say with regard to the process and with regard to confidential information. Fred Sherman further clarified that proprietary material in either the RFI or the RFP remains confidential even after the RFP process is complete. The quiet period relates to information about the selection process during the selection process, but proprietary information remains confidential and you can't ever go out and speak about it (unless it is publically released, for example in a news story). Pat James suggested that all in all communications about the selection process that members refer questioners to the website, "There is a website for the project, and if you want to know more go there."

Pat James explained that a long time ago (long before she was involved in OEI) she was asked if she could recommend a company and she said that she could; however, now that vendor is using her name and saying that they were recommended by her, even though that was not a recent

recommendation and they have been asked to stop using her name. If a vendor calls you, even one with a long-standing relationship, be very careful; refer them to the website if they have any questions.

Election of a New Chair for the Steering Committee: **Action**
Pat reminded attendees that only voting members were to vote during this action; official members of the OEI SC, not members of the project team or guests. Members agreed that the specifics of the process would remain confidential.

Nominations were opened for the position of Chair; Fabiola Torres and John Freitas were nominated. They left the room and the election was held. Fabiola Torres was elected Chair of the OEI SC.

Nominations were opened for the position of Vice Chair; John Freitas and Arnita Porter were nominated. They left the room and the election was held. John Freitas was elected Vice Chair of the OEI SC.

Fabiola expressed her thanks for the opportunity to serve as Chair and her enthusiasm for the work of the committee leading to a successful launch of the pilot.

Next Meeting:
The next face-to-face meeting will take place in Sacramento; members will be notified about the date as soon as that information is available, there was a conflict with the October 3rd meeting date.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.