

## **Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee Meeting**

Friday September 26, 2014  
Courtyard Marriott Los Angeles Airport  
Los Angeles, California

**TTAC Members Present:** Gregory Anderson, Mandy Davies, Michelle Pilati, Jay Field, Kale Braden, Colton Wiley, Dennis Bailey-Fougner, Wei Zhou, Tim Karas, Tim Kyllingstad, Paul Bishop, and Robert Coutts.

**Chancellor's Office and Staff:** Patrick Perry, Bonnie Edwards, Gary Bird, Linda Michalowski, Erik Skinner, Tim Calhoun, Blaine Morrow, Joseph Moreau, LeBaron Woodyard (online), Jennifer Coleman (online), Cindy McCartney and Caryn Albrecht.

### **Opening and Introductions:**

Patrick opened the meeting at 10 am. He welcomed Kale Braden as a returning member and Colton Wiley as the new student representative. All attendees introduced themselves.

Bonnie expressed her immense gratitude to Pat James, Tim Calhoun, Blaine Morrow, Micah Orloff and Joseph Moreau for their hard work in the complicated process of bringing these complicated initiatives into existence this year.

### **System Update:**

Patrick Perry and Erik Skinner

Erik explained that in the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors everyone is experiencing similar feelings to those in the rest of the system; they are all excited by the work of the initiatives, but feeling spread thin by the work. The Board of Governors has had several new appointments this year and is in an exciting new chapter with a full board being briefed and educated about all of the work that is going on.

Patrick spoke about the institutional effectiveness and technical assistance grant; these are funds that were allocated for the system for the first time this year. The Institutional Effectiveness Grant RFA call went out yesterday. This is for \$2.5M dollars of Prop 98 money that will go to a district for technical assistance in the areas of accreditation, student performance, fiscal health, education code, and federal and state code compliance. The focus will be heavily on accreditation at the beginning, but ultimately the goal is to be proactive and not just provide assistance to colleges in a particular status. The plan is to assemble a group with technical expertise for site visits and to write assistance reports to help districts. The Chancellor's Office is working on getting this out and moved to a district to build the infrastructure. There are fourteen districts that turned in the RFI paperwork, so it should quite a competitive process.

AB1969 which would have required the three segments to coordinate their efforts for large scale IT purchases appears dead. It was one that sounded good on paper, but would have been very difficult to coordinate with the size and complexity of all three segments.

A BOG sponsored bill calling out the importance of professional development for faculty, staff and administration, number 2558, has passed and been signed by the Governor. It lays out professional development as a system priority, and while it does not provide funding, it does create a platform to advocate for funding, and is an important step toward trying to get resources for professional development for all campus employees.

SB1425 which would have required all campuses to have a degree audit system, morphed several times, but has now died. The Chancellor's Office was not opposed to the bill, but the way

it was constructed would have been onerous and costly. The Chancellor's Office provided the exact cost that would have been required, and ultimately that killed the bill. The system is working toward this in the EPI, but not as a mandated element. Michelle asked whether there was still some kind of mandate because of how the Student Success funding is structured, but Linda clarified that while an education plan is required, and a degree audit system would make the work of advising students easier, the degree audit is not required at this time, and the tool to be used for the education plan is not mandated; there is enough flexibility in "automated" to even allow it to be a pdf file. Erik felt that the movement to education plans for all students is critical, even though districts may not yet have the perfect tool; the evolution will continue and that is important. Mandy noted that her district has had a degree audit system for some years, and they have found great opportunities for real efficiency between degree audit and education planning, the counselor only has to do it once and that provides for a real synergy.

Tim Calhoon noted that two bills which passed in August, SB1177 and AB1442 together make up the Student Online Person Information Protection Act (SOPIPA) which is to create privacy standards for K-12 districts that rely on third parties that collect and analyze their data. They have not yet been signed, but are on the Governor's desk and the community college system should be aware of them because it may affect how Calcolleges.edu and CalPASS collect and analyze K-12 data. Bonnie asked if adult learners working on their GED were classified as K-12 or not, and committee members explained that it was a murky area that depended upon how the program that the student was in was structured. Gregory explained that a number of coalitions are working on a proposal to integrate into MIS all of the data for adult education; currently it is assembled completely by hand; somehow it has to be integrated into the MIS.

### **Systemwide Circuit Upgrade:**

Gary Bird

The TTIP budget was increased by \$6M in one time and \$4.1M in ongoing funds for circuit upgrades and equipment replacement. Gary has been working closely with CENIC to develop a plan for using this funding for upgrades on all the sites and approved offsite centers. They developed a priority list and 23 sites have been scheduled and there are another 12 or so that are high priority. Gary will be updating the Chancellor's Office website in the technology section this week with the details. They will be providing 1 Gig circuits and 1 Gig backups starting with the three highest priority categories: 1) Sites with less than 1 GE and no backup; 2) Sites with less than 1 GE and insufficient secondary circuits; and 3) Sites with 1 Gig existing but no secondary circuit.

In the effort to prioritize circuits, several sites have been identified which need 10 GE circuits in order to provide adequate connectivity for students, faculty and staff. Some are not even multi-campus districts. Tim Calhoon explained that the plan is to ask those districts to look at how they are managing their bandwidth and doing it effectively. After meeting with SAC, the suggestions that were developed as criteria to discuss for circuits greater than 1 GE were: 1) Authenticate users (using log-in or Federated Id); 2) Using good firewall protocol (BitTorrent, etc.) and 3) consider limiting bandwidth for students while still providing adequate for studies (perhaps by having lower bandwidth for open areas of campus, or when students are not logged in, with higher bandwidth available when they are logged in). They might also ask colleges that are not using 10 Gig what they are doing to provide services without needing more bandwidth. Tim explained that these are fairly common strategies to use for bandwidth issues.

Approved offsite centers will also be connected during the 1 GE upgrade process and those will be done when it is most efficient, rather than just connecting them randomly. In some cases CENIC and the Chancellor's Office are looking at ways to get better access or using better ring topology for less expensive access.

It has taken awhile because CENIC is doing a large K-12 upgrade due to the need for more bandwidth for Common Core testing (LAUSD had to rent 1100 cellular broadband connections for the trial test last year because the last mile connections were not good or the wireless was poor), and CENIC is also connecting all state libraries now, as new partners. The Chancellor's Office has spoken to CENIC and they have created a more provisioned plan. Patrick also explained that the Chancellor's Office will be working with the CPUC to get the CTF cap removed or bumped up because with the new entities, we are getting very close to that cap.

### **Student Perspective:**

Colton Wiley

Colton expressed his excitement and enthusiasm for participating and providing input to TTAC. He is excited about the number of student services that are being developed and various elements that could contribute to the student experience. He felt that the circuit upgrades were important and would have widespread and universal student support because WIFI is a big issue for students. Colton noted that the work with data, data science and predictive analytics to help with both enrollment management and identifying at risk students, would be of great benefit to the system as a whole, and students in particular. He felt that EPI could have widespread student support depending upon the implementation; he noted that it is important to be cognizant of student issues and complaints as we move forward. OEI is another project that is likely to receive support because of the trend toward acceptance of online education; however, access to technology will be critical to addressing concerns about online courses. Common assessment will have unanimous student support; a large number of students go to more than one college, and anything that makes that easier and lowers the barrier to entry will be fantastic, again if it is implemented correctly.

Please inform Colton which issues are the ones on which student input would be most beneficial, so that he can focus his time and energy on those.

### **TTAC Retreat/Tech V:**

Bonnie Edwards

Bonnie explained that the purpose of the discussion today is to talk about the goals and strategies that came out of the last TTAC retreat with the intent of eventually pulling together more specific details and a timeline for attacking those goals. Some of the areas have movement because of the initiatives and circuit funding, but it is critical to look at where current work can be leveraged and where additional resources may need to be pursued.

Some of the focus of Tech III was oriented around infrastructure: eliminating single points of failure, establishing ongoing support for approved centers, having a central repository and backup solution, having disaster recovery and continuity, and VoIP. We are making great progress on those areas and will move the relevant components over to Tech V for continued focus. There were other elements, now more clearly defined, that are included in the initiatives and other work that is underway: online student services portal; assessment tool; system wide technology efforts to capture, report, and analyze student learning outcomes, and enhance wireless infrastructure.

Bonnie provided an overview of three main goals and some underlying strategies that came out of the last retreat and asked for input and feedback.

Goal A: Establish baseline standards and upgrade the technology to create a state of the art business environment.

Document technology standards

Address minimum technology standards

Increase purchasing power of the colleges

Paul thought that it would be helpful to catalog the 3C sections from the self-studies and to highlight the exceptional ones as models of institutional effectiveness.

Patrick also noted that in the category of increase purchasing power of the colleges, CISCO could be improved. CENIC has a contract with CISCO that is 60% off, but has always just been afforded to CENIC and not the institutions that CENIC serves. However, CISCO is starting to realize that their market share is being decreased by the use of other products, so they are going to extend that discount to all of the CENIC institutions, the Foundation will handle that contract like they do with Microsoft and Adobe. SAC did a technology purchasing survey this year that was beneficial in helping the Foundation identify areas, and LACCD has developed an RFP that is being structured to include other community colleges as well. Jay suggested that next year the survey be sent back prefilled in, so that colleges can just make changes and send it back. Paul also suggested including aggregate spending amounts for each vendor on the survey. For purchasing, Kale thought that it would be important to get information further down from end users, but it might be challenging. It could start with having the Academic Senate develop a group that could help to generate the list, and there should be outreach to DE coordinators as well. For example, Camtasia is a program that would have a lot of interest. Jay emphasized the importance of developing a list of what is already being used to have leverage, and not to just start with a wish list. Blaine also suggested a focus on spam filters and good firewalls.

Dennis reminded the committee that TTAC is made up of people in the upper half of technology users on campuses, so it is important to also remember and focus on the needs of colleges that do not have IT staff or technology. Students on those campuses don't have the same access; we need to be able to get them to some kind of minimum standard. Pat suggested the possibility of developing a strike team or an emergency team that could be sent out to step in and help out. Kale noted that technology is expensive on the introduction side, but once there it also needs to be upgraded and maintained regularly. Tim Kyllingstad reminded the committee that there were recommended baseline standards in Tech II and III for number of techs and so on, but there was never funding for it. Jay explained that it does help to have standards to point to as "this is where the system thinks we ought to be." Technology tends to get cut when there is a budget crunch, and it is important to have some validity and backing for the importance of those goals. Tim Calhoun agreed and emphasized the need to elevate the importance of information security especially at the President and trustee level, the cost to mitigate a breach is rising, currently it is at about \$112 per record of higher education. Kale noted that sometimes there is push-back from faculty members who don't understand the rules and regulations around security, better education about security as it relates to accreditation is important.

Goal B: Leverage technology to increase use of comprehensive and high quality professional development resources that promote students success.

Identify needs

Develop a system to address the logistical needs of professional development

Professional development content

Develop a curated professional development portal

Track the skills attainment

Determine impact

The Student Success Kresge Grant will have a focus on professional development; it provides \$500,000 for two years. Paul Steenhausen's salary will be paid from the grant, and he will be coordinating with Blaine and Micah to build some tools that can be used. There are not a whole lot of resources there though, unless Paul can find more.

Blaine noted that with AB2558 the proposed budget that the BOG looked at the last meeting was \$25M dollars, most of that would go to the college but some would impact professional development. Tim Karas thought that it would be nice to have a link or the ability to map to the certification form when recording professional development. The Flex form is a word document, and is fairly simple, but it would be helpful to have the categories online.

The committee also discussed how professional development is evaluated. Blaine noted that a typical metric is attendance, participation, or whether the activity was held. Pat explained that in an academy program that started small, as it grew they were able to track more and more information. They funneled all the information to one place, then had a website, and started collecting everything, including assessments that were tracked and used to plan the next activity. Erik thought the type of evaluation would depend upon the type of professional development, sometimes it would make sense to track participation and traffic, other times student success or other metrics. It would be necessary to be more specific about the area, type of delivery, etc. Kale asked whether the issue related to an honest assessment of professional development or an accounting of professional development; honest assessment of professional development including a snapshot of where you start, then offering the professional development, then evaluation of improvement, is very difficult to do. Blaine thought that it would be possible to get closer to an actual evaluation if professional development events were actually recorded and tracked for everyone in one location. If teachers at his college all went to the online teaching conference for 5 years in a row and then scored exceptionally well, that might show something. Currently the information gets collected but in individual institutions. LeBaron noted that in its best form professional development and evaluation should be tied together with the goals of the college. Evaluation can begin at a low level with participation and reaction to it, then can move up to individual achievement or skills and knowledge attained by participants, further would include whether participants determined that they were changed in their jobs, and finally at the highest level would be whether they training or professional development had an impact on the college with higher retention levels and so on. Michelle noted that how evaluation is going to be done should be built into the portal along with the awareness that there will be different categories.

Tim Kyllingstad reminded the group that even excellent training provided on security was not widely used; it included great information and a great tool, but was still not used. Tim Calhoun thought that it was because staff members see security as an ancillary issue, and therefore they will not go to the training unless they are made to do it, like sexual harassment training which everyone has to do. Micah explained that with the 2558 language, hours will be obligated as part of the employee contract and that will foster a culture that sees the value.

Goal C: Expand access to data and predictive analytics to inform student, college and state decisions regarding statewide priorities.

## Single data repository

- Develop a single data repository

- Identify data sources

- Aggregate important data

- Maintain data quality

## Tools to compile and visualize data

- Define high value queries

- Develop dashboards and reporting tools

- Establish procedures for continuous improvement and analysis

## Center for data analytics

- Define the center

Gregory noted that many colleges seem to be developing their own dashboards, and the distinction between a local focus and a statewide focus is important because they will be directed different ways. Kale explained that vendors are coming to the doors of the college, Civitas is mining local data and that is encouraging conversations about forward looking data versus backwards looking data. Patrick noted that statewide level data can cross students who swirl between campuses and the reasons why they do so. Colleges are interested in knowing why students are going to multiple campuses, which students are likely to struggle, and how they can help those students to succeed. However, there is complexity in a large amount of data, especially when people are not accustomed to having access to all of it and how to use it. People are used to getting reports about what happened, and we are moving into looking at data that predicts what could happen so that we can intercede and affect the outcome. For example, students could be recommended against taking “toxic course combinations,” or toward “beneficial combinations.” Colton emphasized that how the information is framed can make all the difference in whether or not the student actually hears the message you are trying to send.

Patrick thought that as a system better placement into remedial courses is probably very important. Gregory suggested also looking at efforts that are happening across the colleges. There are colleges with strengths in early assessment, and early warnings and so on. There are colleges that have great dashboards. Look at those strengths and build from them.

Bill Scroggins sent an email recommending technology in support of student equity plans.

The group discussed the potential issue of trying to offer a Common ERP for the system and determined that there could be great benefits from it in communication between schools with respect to swirling students and so on. It could also help to level the playing field for those schools with less technology expertise. However, Patrick noted that the aggregate cost would be quite high, so it would be challenging to get funding for such a large undertaking. Erik agreed that it would be a tough sell and it would be necessary to look at the value proposition; economies of scale would be a selling point, but it would have to come back to student success. Members noted that different implementations of a common ERP could easily leave the system in the exact same place. Perhaps pressure could be put on Ellucian, since they have a major share of the system already. Patrick thought that it might be feasible to set up an ERP for 7-8 small colleges

that are under a certain level of FTE in order to provide some relief for those small schools struggling with understaffed IT departments.

### **Education Planning/C-ID/Curriculum Inventory:**

Tim Calhoon and Gary Bird

The key objectives in the EPI are to: develop a student portal to consolidate, personalize, and sequence information and activities; message students to promote positive actions; provide online planning and guidance services; support all colleges (both with and without existing education planners and degree audit systems); and integrate academic data from across the system to provide for articulation of transcripts and courses/programs. About 50% of colleges in the system have an education planner that has been implemented, they are trying to implement, or is sitting on a shelf. The numbers are approximately the same for degree audit systems in the state.

In 2008 we started to build the technology that would be a foundation with CCCApply, and eventually 103 of 112 colleges used the old version. The new version of CCCApply is part of a portal (that looks like a webpage) that can be included within the portal when the rest is built out. There are now 76 colleges that are live with the new version and 32 that are in process. Even some of the long standing non-participants in CCCApply are considering making the transition. Kern is likely to be joining, Cerro Coso wants to participate in the OEI pilot, Bakersfield wants to participate in the CAI pilot and Santa Monica is interested in the International Application and participation in CAI. More than 700,000 applications have been processed and 15 colleges are live with the BOG fee waiver. There is a 98% student satisfaction rating with the new CCCApply and most students rate the process as "easy" when they finish.

David Shippen is the new Statewide Project Manager for the EPI, he has a Master's in Public Administration and is a Certified Project Management Professional with 25 years IT project management experience. He has the kind of experience that is needed to drive the project forward.

The governance committee was established in March 2014 with statewide stakeholder representation. Pilot college application and selection, as well as an RFI for the Education Planner and Degree Audit System (EP/DAS) were completed in June. Workgroups were put together and started to meet.

The Student Services Portal Steering Committee (SSP SC) is working on developing a portal that will allow colleges to message students. Students will find topics either through a menu in the portal, a search for information, or through a structured checklist. They will select to do some activity, for example the BOG fee waiver, and their data will be saved and profile updated. There will be a workflow engine running, which will use either business rules or machine learning, to update the student's checklist with things to do, send them messages, add things to their calendar, or make recommendations to the student.

The workgroups for the SSP SC were recently consolidated into: Student Dashboard (including portal analytics, system data, momentum prompts, smart calendaring, and passport); self-assessment and career exploration; college explorer; apply for admission (this will be done by CCCApply SC); planning, assessment, and orientation (this will include messaging and some information will be integrated from the Step Forward website); financial aid; and special services. Tim and David have tried to create a logical, manageable, and cohesive structure with the new workgroup structure. The same idea was used to consolidate workgroups for the EP/DAS Pilot

College Committee with groups for: education planning, counseling systems, and degree audit. RFPs will be developed for all of these products.

In order for all of the elements of the EPI to work well together, electronic transcripts and articulation using C-ID and ASSIST are necessary. The C-ID software is an amazing system; however, the independent programmers have left and the programming platform is no longer supported. In order to support C-ID the system was moved to the servers at the Technology Center and they are working on requirements gathering with the Academic Senate. They are also setting up a support tracking system so the Academic Senate can track issues on support calls with faculty; the same system will be used to track changes that need to be made. Testing will go live on the servers at the Technology Center and continued development will happen as evaluation into whether or not to rewrite the platform takes place. C-ID is a really well done workbench environment which defines the articulations that are used to update ASSIST for CCC to CCC articulation and for CCC to CSU articulation as well.

The Curriculum Inventory developed by Governet does not integrate with CurricUNET (it requires a lot of copy/paste actions) and the data integrity/validation checking is very weak. As a result the CCCCO team is gathering requirements, developing a data dictionary, and will be making a decision in the next few months about whether to revise or replace the product.

ASSIST 2.0 development continues, but web services development is currently delayed (it was to start in August). While waiting Tim will be meeting with both Degree Works and Colleague developers to define the web services that will be needed to do articulation with Ellucian. When the ASSIST programming team is ready, the specifications will be ready and if they are not ready, perhaps we could take a download of the ASSIST data and set up a system to use the data until the ASSIST team is ready to work with it.

Dennis asked about downloading ASSIST into the articulation tables so that it will be possible to transfer credit into their degree audit system. Joseph noted that if that was done it would also drive massive adoption of an eTranscript product. Tim explained that he spoke to Wayne Holt at Degree Works about pulling ASSIST and getting it into a format that could be downloaded at least monthly until it is possible to do it "hot and live" for articulation. That might be the first step since they do have a system where you download from a source into their tables. Mandy clarified that the articulation tables are in Banner and not in Degree Works, and it doesn't go back the other way; in order to not lose the transcript articulation, it has to be in the host system.

There are 88 institutions participating in eTranscript California at this time: 57 CCCs, 21 CSUs, 4 UCs (implementing), and 6 private colleges. A multi-step development plan for eTranscript California is underway. First, fully funding e-Transcript CA for all of the community colleges; which is complete, and now marketing to the colleges that do not have it. Second, they will offer mini-grants so that colleges can fully implement the PESC standard, so that all of the IGETC, GE, and SB1440 information that is needed, will be integrated into the transcript. The next step will be putting out an RFP for a developer to provide a verification service against which any vendor will be able to bounce their transcript to verify that it meets the PESC standard. Afterward, will be participation in a PESC EDexchange for college to college, or vendor to vendor exchange of transcripts, rather than relying on the SPEEDE server which is presently a system with a single point of failure for the nation. Finally, there will be an RFP to build a version 2.0 open source e-transcript CA, leveraging the PESC standard and EDexchange. The plan would be that eventually when a student sends a transcript; it is integrated with the SIS and automatically articulated using ASSIST, to be brought into the educational plan and the degree audit system.

During the fall to winter this year EPI will put out RFPs for the Portal Software Development, User Experience Development, and Self-Assessment/Career Exploration (because there are many good career exploration products available). Winter to spring will include: RFPs for Education Planning, Degree Audit, and Counseling, New Student Orientation modules, eTranscript CA 2.0 Development, and C-ID upgrades and refresh. Spring to summer 2015 will include portal and

portlet development and pilot, CCCC Curriculum Inventory upgrade/replace, and ASSIST Web Services Development. Summer to winter of 2015 will involve development and piloting of Education Planning, Degree Audit and Counseling. Finally, fall to spring 2016 will see the continued development of eTranscript CA 2.0.

### **Common Assessment (CAI)/Multiple Measures:**

Tim Calhoon, Bonnie Edwards, and Jennifer Coleman

The key objectives for CAI are: to build a general purpose assessment platform which can be used for online assessment, credit for prior learning, and assessment in math, English and ESL; assessment preparation; multiple measures (folding in the CalPASS/Gates work); professional development; and integrate data across the system in a data warehouse.

The website for the project and the governance group were established in March 2014 with stakeholder representation. In May an environmental scan was completed and pilot college application and selection took place. An RFI was sent out in June and the workgroups were formed and began meeting. Twelve pilot colleges were selected and six workgroups were formed for: math, English, ESL, multiple measures (with work tied to MMAP and CalPASS), professional development (along with Saddleback and tied to ASCCC), and test development process (tied to the CCCC Assessment Standards workgroup so that those who will give the accreditation are involved in the test development).

In the fall 2014 there will be synthesis of the workgroup content along with feedback and vetting through statewide surveys and local channels, with the help of the Academic Senate, and then the RFPs will be released. In the spring of 2015 vendors will be selected and contracted and an iterative process will begin that includes: work, feedback, vetting, review, followed by cycling back through the process. There might be work on assessment prep as well, depending upon what the selected vendor is offering. In the fall 2015 the pilot phase will begin and there will be feedback from the field along with the development of resources for implementation. Spring 2015 the assessment will be released to the system and feedback will continue.

Important notes on the CAI process:

CAI will provide for a Common Assessment Test, it will not prescribe common placement!

There are still opportunities for participation.

There is a need for ongoing communication and feedback.

There is the potential for each college's implementation to be unique, depending upon their SIS and the needs of their local students.

Although a Common Assessment test will be provided, the implementation of assessment on each campus will be unique to that campus.

Linda emphasized that SB1446 focused on assessment for placement; assessment includes a variety of multiple measures and can include a test. Local colleges do not have to include an assessment test; their assessment might be based solely upon multiple measures.

Dennis asked whether scores will be able to be downloaded directly into all of the systems that are in the state, and Tim confirmed that will be a requirement made of the vendor.

Greg encouraged Tim and Jennifer to continue to repeat the message that this is developing a common assessment test and NOT a common placement, because there is still a misperception

that this project will result in common placement. Tim and Jennifer will make sure that the message goes out in the next newsletter/TechEdge to continue spreading the word. Greg also encouraged Tim to provide an update to the CIOs in San Diego.

### **Online Education Initiative (OEI):**

Joseph Moreau, Pat James, and Tim Calhoon

The goal of OEI is to provide more access to courses for students so that they can complete their programs. Pat explained that access, quality and completion are three primary missions within that goal. The full scope is complex and multi-layered so it has been challenging to determine the sequencing of all the parts. Another challenge is that there are a lot of questions that don't have answers yet, but that does provide the opportunity to build the answers collaboratively. This is a huge project with huge implications and there are amazing people involved in it.

In the spring of 2014 OEI formed the steering committee and workgroups, called for pilot college participation, set up professional development components, analyzed the need for ADT/C-ID courses, began designing a student portal infrastructure and began the CVC refresh. The project is focused on providing high quality online courses and ease of use of those courses will depend upon the common CMS, so that is a major element. However another major element is offering high quality effective courses that promote success, retention, and access.

The initial 19 courses were selected using C-ID and ADT, Michelle and the Academic Senate did a great job getting the list together. The list is on the website, and more courses will be added as the project moves forward. Pat noted that they hope to add engineering courses to the list when they are C-ID approved.

The initial call for pilot colleges had responses from 58 campuses. The selection criteria for the pilot colleges included: currently use Open CCCApply, established online education programs, require or have substantial professional development for online faculty, geographical and college size diversity, diversity of CMS used, and participation in the piloting of other projects (one is in CAI, one is in EPI, and Fresno is in both CAI and EPI). From the 58 applications three pilot groups were selected: 8 colleges for a Student Readiness pilot, and 8 colleges for an Online Tutoring pilot (those will both occur in spring of 2015), and 8 colleges for the full launch pilot in the summer of 2015. The full launch needs to be a small group because of the complexity of the technical part, but the other two pilots will be able to act as staging groups that will have their courses approved and be ready to go when the technical issues have been worked out with the full launch pilot. The two pilot groups in the spring will submit 5 courses from which the project workgroup will select 3 to submit for review. Pat hopes that 2-3 from each college will be approved for the spring pilots to use with their own students within their own CMS.

The course review standards have been approved and endorsed and are being disseminated to be used by anyone who wants to use them. Adoption and use of the standards will have a positive effect across the system. The standards are on the website and are also available in pdf form. These standards are about course design and effective practice, they are not about the curriculum; that line was drawn intentionally. The standards do not step on what happens in the colleges in the discipline and curriculum committees; it is about what we know as a system that works in good course design.

The course review process is beginning with training of the reviewers next week. They received 165 complete applications and selected 30 people for the first training who represent 29 different schools. They will attend training in San Diego on October 2-3, and then have one week of online training after that before they begin reviewing the courses. Over 70 courses will be reviewed this fall. Having trained reviewers throughout the system will have a huge impact on the quality of courses.

Permanent staff was hired this summer from a phenomenal pool of candidates; John Makevich from College of the Canyons was selected as the Strategic Planning and Operations Officer, Jory Hadsell from Los Rios was selected Chief Academic Affairs Officer, and Bonnie Peters from San Diego was selected Chief Student Services Officer. In addition, Lou Delzompo was hired as Chief Technology Officer for the Technology Center; he has a wealth of experience in higher education at the executive team level. He will be providing CTO leadership on all three of the initiatives to make sure that there are no technical barriers to interoperability between them.

The CCMS RFP will be released on October 10<sup>th</sup>, with a large group participating in the selection process and a lot of system input from IdeaScale as well. The selection of the CCMS will occur in December. There is a rumor that the CCMS has already been selected; that is false! The RFP will be released in October, and that will mark the beginning of the selection process which will hopefully end in December and be announced in January. The CCMS vendor has NOT been selected! It is not a choice based upon who has the market share; we have the opportunity to do something amazing with the purchasing power of a large system and that is what is intended.

Completion of development of the Readiness Modules will happen this fall, as will the release of the tutoring RFP. The tutoring RFP is being developed with the Foundation holding the contract to allow for more use in the system. One of the requirements is to allow colleges to buy additional services beyond what is being provided in the pilot, and colleges can utilize their own tutors in addition to the professional tutors provided through the service. The objective is to provide optimal flexibility; providing 24/7 tutoring to students is one of the hardest things to do because it is expensive and hard to set up.

Faculty professional development activities and pilot college activities will also begin in the fall 2014, so that faculty members can share their experiences, mentor, and coach one another, and pilot colleges can begin working on course exchange business processes and agreements. The business processes will probably include some manual processes at first and may include conversations with Ellucian to try to get their help since many colleges use an Ellucian product. If they want to keep us as happy customers, it would be beneficial to them to help with ironing out the reciprocity agreements that will be essential to seamless matriculation. The exchange is not going to be an easy thing, but there will be no cap on the exchange for the pilot group to decrease complexity. Pat believes there will be some balancing naturally and that there will not be as much crossover in this summer pilot, which is fine while the technical bugs are worked out. Hopefully more answers will be available by the end of the summer and the project will be able to move into fall with a lot more nailed down.

During the fall 2014, the project will also: map out the scaled up activities and budget for years 2-5, complete accessibility audits and perform maintenance of pilot courses, deploy the readiness modules, deploy the tutoring solutions, create and implement assessment strategies, and develop a plan for proctoring solutions.

In January 2015 the tutoring and readiness pilots will launch, and the formal adoption of the CCMS will be at the end of the month when the contract goes to the board at Butte. This will be a large undertaking and the vendor will be expected to deliver a really good product. Kale highlighted that course conversion is a known challenging issue and one which vendors always say will be "push button" and it never is; the faculty intensive work is a major concern. Pat explained that she intends to ask the vendors to demonstrate course conversion; she is aware that they promise the world and she does not want to put additional stress on faculty.

Through the spring the project will be converting courses and training faculty on the new CCMS and working with the college deployment teams. There will also be the creation of technology solutions for business processes, assessment of spring pilots, ramping up staging colleges, continued review of courses to add to the inventory, and launch of certification courses. The summer of 2015 will focus on full launch and the fall will continue with the same pilot groups,

possibly with crossing over between the groups depending upon a number of factors that need to be discussed with the OEI SC.

Kale was concerned about the timeline with respect to getting coding done and courses onto the new CCMS between February and the beginning of courses in the summer, and Tim emphasized that the vendor will work iteratively with the project. New features will be developed in two week sprints, but those new features will be added into the CCMS during new semesters to avoid confusion for the students. Pat also noted that the summer pilot will only include 8 colleges with approximately 2-3 courses each, so there will be a small start for the summer in order to work out those transitional issues.

The goal is to provide the CCMS for free, but it may end up being a low cost option. The cost may depend upon the vendor that is selected and how many colleges are interested in participating for the long term. The pricing may end up representing a range of options; one price if the number of colleges is in one range and other price points in other ranges. Kale wanted to make sure that there is adequate time for colleges that were not in the pilot to consider the options when it gets to that decision point, because he does not want the decision made by the colleges to come down to a lot of pressure being put on faculty without an opportunity for them to fully understand and participate in the process. Pat felt that the process of training reviewers and having faculty interacting with other reviewers and going back to their campuses with information will help to generate the beginning of some of those conversations. Erik cautioned that vendors should be made aware that the legislature is not likely to provide additional funding for the CCMS, so the pricing that vendors submit should reflect the awareness that the budget for the CCMS is what is there; it will not be expanded by the legislature.

Pat noted that Blaine's group is working on a repository for content and @ONE is in the middle of a lot of the work on training. They are training the course reviewers, and they may put on a course for the curriculum committee, as well as one for administrators on how to evaluate online courses as well as the laws and rules around online education. There are many things that can be done in the area of professional development. Next year the Online Teaching Conference will take place in the north, June 17-19<sup>th</sup>, and theme suggested by John Makevich, "Where we are going we don't need roads," really captures what online education is building.

Pat explained the desire to provide courses and build a structure that will work in the years to come. Currently the budget situation is not as tight as it has been in the past, and enrollment numbers look better, however, the system and mechanism that is built will be in place when the economy turns again and when more courses need to be added. The emphasis on good course design is so that success and retention can be improved and there will be real and lasting change. Administrators would be likely to have more online courses if they had trained teachers, courses developed, and professional development to support them. Erik noted that the original funding was also about building more efficiency into the system, and about using system buying power to drive costs down and free up those resources for other things.

### **Professional Development:**

Micah Orloff and Blaine Morrow

Micah explained that Pat already shared much of what @ONE is doing with professional development and a lot that is focused on OEI. There is a lot of information in the newsletter as well. They are also mobilizing on the certifications for online educator pathways and looking at what it takes to be a skilled online counselor. Bonnie Peters is a really good resource in the area of online counseling. There will also need to be tutors, librarians, and support services online, and training will be needed in those areas; it is one thing to be a librarian, but different skills are

needed to be able to do that online. There should also be pathways for online administrators, and that is an area where some additional professional development resources would be useful.

The certification training with the course reviewers will be hybrid training; two days in person, and one week online practicing by doing mock reviews. Afterward the newly trained reviewers will transition right into the reviews of the 72 courses that will need to be done.

With respect to building the Clearinghouse, Blaine has been generating a contact list of people responsible for professional development on campuses. He started with LeBaron's list of all of the people who were Flex Calendar Coordinators last year, but recognized that those people are not necessarily this year's coordinators because those positions are usually elected or appointed positions. Almost every campus has a faculty coordinator, as well as a staff coordinator. They scraped every college website twice to find all of the contacts that they could, and now have a list of 500 people who are a potential audience for summits. Blaine would like to get some ideas regarding: What would you do with a Clearinghouse? What would you be able to contribute to a Clearinghouse? What would you like to see in it? As a starting point, he knows that there will need to be a common calendar, and that training materials and courses should be stored there. The theme for the summit will involve "making something together." The idea is to make something that keeps track of your individual progress, makes it possible to share expertise, and celebrates what hardworking people are doing throughout the system.

Sacramento City College has a database that a group of professional development people and one programmer put together, it is not large enough scale and probably is not scalable, but it gives some ideas about what could be done.

There will be six summits coming in the month of November with the goal of bringing together people involved in professional development. November 3<sup>rd</sup> in Costa Mesa, 5<sup>th</sup> in San Diego, 7<sup>th</sup> in Marina Del Ray, 12<sup>th</sup> in Pasadena, 17<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento, and the 21<sup>st</sup> in San Francisco. Blaine will post date and location information on Basecamp. The summits will be followed up with a webinar for people who weren't able to go to the summits. He would like to get people involved in professional development excited about the Clearinghouse, and gather ideas about what they would like to see in it. Paul Steenhausen from the CCC Student Success Center will have a role in the Clearinghouse with respect to content as well. Blaine has also been in contact with developers of the Brokers of Expertise, Simple K-12, and Knowledge Delivery Systems websites to gather more information about the different models that are in use. He noted that they will not proceed until they have ideas about how people want to use the Clearinghouse, but they do know that they want it to work with the CCMS.

There is an interesting convergence of different things happening with AB2558 and the different professional development efforts that are taking place, each in a different area. The summits will allow Blaine and Micah to bring together stakeholders from different regions and give them an opportunity to share ideas and focus efforts on the Clearinghouse, but it also provides a chance to push information back out much like the Ambassador Program used to do.

Blaine noted that they have had great participation from CCCCSN with all of the board members on the committee, CCCSN regional coordinators, LeBaron, and Julie Adams and Delores Davison from the Academic Senate.

### **Wrap and Closing:**

The next meeting is currently scheduled for December 3<sup>rd</sup>, in Sacramento; however, that is the Monday after Thanksgiving. Bonnie and Gary will send out a new survey to change the date to one that will not cause as many problems with travel.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.