Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee Meeting
Monday December 15, 2014
CCC Chancellor's Office
Sacramento, California

TTAC Members Present: Bill Scroggins, Dean Nevins, Gregory Anderson, Husan Khan, Jay Field, John Freitas, Kale Braden, Mandy Davies, Michelle Pilati, Robert Coutts, Tim Karas, Tim Kyllingstad, Paul Bishop (online), Michelle Priest (online), and Linda Thor (online),.

Chancellor's Office and Staff: Erik Skinner, Gary Bird, Linda Michalowski, LeBaron Woodyard, Paul Feist, Tim Calhoon, Blaine Morrow, David Shippen, Joseph Moreau, Micah Orloff, Jennifer Coleman, Joseph Quintana, Cindy McCartney and Caryn Albrecht.

TTAC Member Update and Introductions:
Erik Skinner opened the meeting at 10:07am. Patrick Perry is not able to attend the meeting today. Each of the committee members introduced themselves.

System Update:
Erik Skinner

There is a lot underway in the system and at the heart of the work of this committee is communication and updates on the projects throughout the system. The Institutional Effectiveness Initiative is a key project which provided nine staff members as part of the 2014-15 budget; representing the biggest staffing augmentation to the Chancellor's Office in modern history. There is also $2.5M which was put into a Technical Assistance Grant to provide technical assistance efforts, site reviews, consulting, and other support services to colleges. Gary explained that there were many good responses to the RFA, with the award going to College of the Canyons in the Santa Clarita District. It was approved at the November Board of Governor's Meeting and Theresa Tena, as the new Vice Chancellor of the Institutional Effectiveness Unit, will be handling the project. That effort will mainly focus on accreditation in the beginning, and will try to be more proactive as it develops further. The timeline for implementation of the Technical Assistance Grant involves some work this spring, but more real action on the ground in the fall. The RFA application included a clearinghouse for professional development, but since that is already being built, College of the Canyons will be working on content to put into the clearinghouse that Blaine and Micah are working on. Erik noted the desire for the Chancellor's Office and TTAC to be mindful of those kinds of synergies that can be created with various projects that are ongoing at this time. There is an ongoing emphasis on professional development not only for Institutional Effectiveness, but also through the Student Success Center that Paul Steenhausen is setting up. Moving forward, @ONE is carving out professional development resources and bandwidth within the new initiative. Theresa is also looking for connections and synergies needed to leverage the other initiatives and reforms that are going on, whether CAI, EPI, or OEI, there are a number of places that institutional effectiveness can be linked in to make it more effective.

Erik anticipates a fairly healthy increase in state revenues, which will drive up the Prop 98 minimum, so it should be a strong fiscal year. The general trend is positive and although there are some structural issues in the CC budget around STRS contributions and lack of COLA for several years, there should still be some additional money for access and some of the success initiatives. Hopefully the next few years will provide enough stability to put roots down, since 2-3 years of solid steady progress on reforms is needed to accomplish that. There is a growing issue regarding the growth formula that will probably play out in many conversations in the budget committees, but Erik does not know how much it will affect the work of this committee and the projects.

Bill thought that the new accreditation standards would have technology implications that might be worth addressing within TTAC or through highlighting in TechEdge. It would be useful to connect those involved in technology with those involved with accreditation in order to better advise one another with respect to authentication, and so on. He suggested the formation of a work group between 3-4 groups that might otherwise be in separate silos; faculty and others involved in accreditation do not know or understand the authentication technology, and technology staffers do not know about the accreditation standards. Groups that should be included to help develop a fact sheet or white paper with possible boiler plate language are: Chief Instructional Officers (who are often the Accreditation Liaison Officers), faculty, Chief Technology Officers, and DE Coordinators, since on most campuses they do the training and preparation.

Bill also suggested looking into ways to track interventions that are being done on campuses in order to look at data on which ones are producing worthwhile results. This might be able to be tied into an initiative in the MIS to track programs on campuses. The focus has been on gap information, but there needs to be focus on outcomes information from the programs on different campuses. Kale noted that Accreditation 3A calls for data to be disaggregated by SLO, perhaps interventions could also be tied to student outcomes. This project needs to be moved up in priority to give colleges a data element to track that information. Some of the interventions that are currently in use are: learning communities, supplemental instruction, online tutoring, disability services, cohorts, accelerated learning, social integration, assessment readiness, placement strategies, summer bridges, and high school pathways. Data is being collected from some programs, but not in a cohesive and integrated way that can be used to help replicate success at other colleges. Erik and Gary will contact Todd/Alice to find out about where the Chancellor's Office is on the MIS Initiative and to make sure that everyone is tracking the importance of it. Perhaps the various standard effective practices could be coded to help with tracking them at the local level. The local college would need narrative defining how their local program works; data without narrative is not valuable. Erik noted that there is a lot of money for student equity and SSSP, that might be able to assist the work happening in MIS.

Joseph Quintana explained that AB1969 was vetoed by the Governor, who said that the segments work together when it makes sense to do so, and he wanted to leave that flexibility in place. It started as legislation requiring combined procurement for all three higher education segments; it was changed to involve technology and later changed again, until finally the Governor's veto.

Systemwide Circuit Upgrade:
Gary Bird

Gary and Tim Calhoon continue working with CENIC to facilitate circuit upgrades. For the first time in a long time, the funding is available to get all campuses up to a 1G primary circuit with 1G as well for their backup. CENIC has been very busy with two other major initiatives at the same time: connecting all of the public libraries in California and getting better bandwidth out to K-12 schools for their testing needs. These other projects are taking a lot of CENIC's time and focus, so Tim and Gary continue to keep in close contact with them every couple of weeks so that the CCC circuit upgrade stays on track. Campuses that didn't have any backup were prioritized so that everyone stays connected in case the primary connection goes down. Gary posted a priority list on the Chancellor's Office website with a tentative schedule which will be updated with dates as soon as he has them.

In the process of looking at circuit usage, about 9 campuses (including San Francisco and Pasadena) were found that were maxing out their circuits, and those have been bumped up to a

need for a 10Gig circuit. The SAC committee came up with recommendations for campuses to protect and potentially reduce bandwidth appropriately:

- Authenticate Users (with Federated ID)
- Firewall protocols to filter unwanted traffic and other standard anti-piracy measures
- Limit bandwidth for students while providing adequate access for studies

In all 9 of the high bandwidth cases, the campuses had large student populations and had already implemented the recommended measures. In some cases they had even throttled back bandwidth further than the recommendation. The data on bandwidth was from the 6 months from January to June, so by now some of those campuses are spiking even higher.

TTAC members suggested looking into whether or not use of video streaming is having an impact on that usage and if so whether or not it might be possible to encourage the diversion of some of that traffic. Kale cautioned against doing it in a way that had a detrimental effect on courses during the semester. Bill reminded the committee this bandwidth is being provided with taxpayer dollars, so we have a responsibility to use it well. Dean noted that some video traffic (nursing, for example) is hosted by vendors where there are licensing issues that would not allow the content to be moved. Tim will take up the concerns and suggestions at SAC.

Education Planning / C-ID / ASSIST / e-Transcript / CCCApply:
Tim Calhoon and David Shippen

David provided an overview of the goals of the Education Planning Initiative and progress made so far. The goals are to: help students make informed choices based on clear goals and a concrete plan, assist under-resourced counseling services, promote and support coordination between colleges (to include CSU and UC), support SSSP funding, and support management solutions. The project has gathered together stakeholders from throughout the system and has made great progress in defining the requirements for both the student portal and the Education Planning Tool/Degree Audit System.
The team is aware of a number of challenges and risks and is working to address those including through development of a targeted marketing plan. There is concern that some colleges are already selecting other education planning resources. Greg felt that campuses were trying to hold off since they anticipate a solution coming, and David agreed that about 40% of colleges do not have education planning resources in place. On the other hand, Mandy and Bill represent schools that have put a lot of time and effort into their resources. David explained that the project is aware of both ends of that spectrum and is trying to find ways to meet their needs. It would also be useful to learn from the experiences of those who have already been through the process. Kale felt that it would be important to recognize the effort that has been put into those existing systems, and to try to fold into what they may have incrementally. The project should be cautious in how they go about the roll out.

There are more than sixty stakeholders including Academic Senate and Student Senate representatives from throughout the system and the 10 colleges that will pilot the tools selected and developed by the project. The tools that will be developed are: Student Service Portal (SSP), Education Planning Tool (EPT), Degree Audit System (DAS), Orientation Tool, and College and Career Exploration Tool. The pilot colleges are: City College of San Francisco, Crafton Hills, El Camino, Fresno, Fullerton, Los Medanos, Mt. San Jacinto, Santa Barbara, Santa Rosa, and Victor Valley. The pilot colleges will pilot through the summer into next fall and winter.

There is now a list of over 250 requirements and growing which is being used for both the portal development and the procurement process for the EPT/DAS. The portal development team is in place and the first iteration of portal development is in process. An Agile development

methodology will be used to begin with a very basic "Yugo" model which will be refined and improved over 3 week "sprints." This allows for continuous feedback and improvements incrementally along the way. The RFP for the EPT/DAS is being finalized and should go out within a week. The stakeholder communities are connecting and working productively together. It is important that the Student Portal and all portlets developed for this project will be JSR 286 standard based so that they can be integrated into college portals, as desired. Dean emphasized that it would be important for colleges to be able to customize the student portal, so having API available is important as well.

The workflow of the portal can begin with the student checklist and then as the student performs activities on the checklist, the student profile can be updated. Machine learning and business rules can be used to update the checklist and send messages and recommendations to the student as well. David showed a rough diagram of what the portal might look like with a progress indicator, calendar, checklist, messages, and videos or animation. The portal will be brand-able by individual colleges. Kale noted that the portal represented had too much text; it needs to be more visual with pictures, graphics, and perhaps a ring that shows completion, rather than a small progress bar at the top of the page.

Initial portlets would include things like the BOG fee waiver where clean data streams already exist and other similar ones that touch colleges' IT as little as possible, like exploring careers. Later work with the pilot colleges will connect direct web services with the SIS. Tools will be built open source. Tim Calhoon envisions that most colleges will want to use it as a customizable service instead of doing a lot of programming. The colleges will be able to send messages, for example, regarding financial aid, that connect to business practices on their campus. CCCApply will be another big piece that will be moved into the portal. There will be messaging to bring StepForward elements into student awareness so that they understand they need to do an education plan and other items on their checklist. Many other elements can be provided as information for students that are on the needs and interest page of CCCApply; colleges are not currently making use of that information. The college will have control over the workflow of the messaging, but doesn't have the staffing to keep it up to date, so the Technology Center will need to support the information review and making sure that it is up to date. There will also be live support, as well as online help, built in. Additionally, counselors have also made it clear that they want a student to be able to request an appointment, or be offered help if they appear to be having trouble as well. There will be a calendar function and Husan suggested that students be able to select the type of calendar they prefer, since there is a broad range of preference. The student portal will be the overarching mechanism through which the Common CMS, Common Assessment, Education Planning, Career Exploration and a variety of other products will be provided. For example, there is currently overlapping work in the area of basic skills preparation on the OEI side and pre-assessment preparation on the CA side. Barbara Illowsky is working as the Basic Skills Program Manager for OE and she is providing a connection point between those two efforts.

Dean mentioned that colleges provide campus specific email to students; where would the messaging be sent if a student attended more than one college? Tim Calhoon explained that it might be possible to provide a generic email for the system when the student registers through CCCApply and then even if the student was at three schools, any of those colleges might be able to message the student through the portal interface and it would go to their phone, the portal messaging center, and their email of choice. The student could also have control with a "help-meter" over whether they had a high or low level of messaging and help, some students don't want to be bothered unless there is a problem, while others appreciate more assistance and encouragement. The portal would act as a centralized aggregator that might tie into the CCC-ID that is set up when the student creates their Open CCC Account. That Federated Identity is a big part of CCCApply; now at 81 schools. Locally defined roles for authentication will allow, for example, a counselor, to have access to more information than a faculty member, depending upon local policies. Mandy noted that they are looking at trying to intervene much sooner with

struggling students, even by week 2, 3, or 4; often students are lost by midterms, and it is too late. Some of this comes into the case management aspects of the EPT/DAS tool. It is possible for both counselor and instructional faculty to share access to certain elements and allow for more communication between them around the student, while still maintaining FERPA compliance.

The foundation of the development process is an iterative "Agile" process, and the focus will be on mobile first. The process allows for continuous improvement, so although the first version might be terrible and basic (the Yugo), each iteration will be better and better. Bill highlighted that having applications written for mobile devices means more than just resizing for a smaller screen, it has to do with designing specifically for mobile devices. It is not easy to display the data rich information in the mobile environment and that must be taken into consideration as those applications are designed and built.

The project team is looking to release the RFP for the EPT/DAS on Friday and it will include online planning and guidance services. Evaluation of the responses will use RFP 365 to narrow down to three finalists. Demonstrations and interviews for those top three will be in February. They are asking vendors to reduce barriers to use, by bringing 10 years of catalogs into the system, for each college in the state.
The 10 pilot colleges will begin the process, but marketing will extend out to the system and David acknowledged that marketing will need to be both segmented and targeted to carefully reach the different colleges and populations that exist. Colleges with no portal may pick up the Student Portal and dive right in, others may move over to it when they are ready and their existing systems are end of life, while others may just choose to incorporate a few portlets into their existing portals. Greg cautioned against giving the appearance of dumping too many resources into the effort in a way that might appear lavish and wasteful. It would also be very useful to develop a focus group with colleges like Sierra, Mt. Sac, Los Rios, and South Orange which have existing education planning and degree audit tools to learn and benefit from their experiences to help the system in this implementation.

A proposal came up regarding the idea of putting out a combined product that includes both CurricUNET and Curriculum Inventory; the way it should be, as one product where the two parts communicate with each other. Current discussions are focused on whether to fix what we have or to create something new. Dean suggested starting with Curriculum Inventory and then adding the CurricUNET type of interface free to the colleges, which would tie into it. Tim explained that a main issue with the current Curriculum Inventory is that there is no quality control on the data coming in from 112 colleges because of the lack of a data dictionary. This is a big challenge for the Chancellor's Office team and results in hours and hours of effort.
The first version of the new ASSIST has been pushed off for about 6 months or so as the referential database is being changed significantly going from textual to a computer readable version. The delay is frustrating because putting web services on top of ASSIST articulation are critical. Fortunately, because the Technology Center now supports C-ID, it may be possible to put generic web services on top of C-ID data temporarily until ASSIST is ready. ASSIST is what we want for the "source of truth" for articulation, but we need something that can be used on the back end until it is ready. It might be that we could use the same web services on the front end, and then switch the back end from the great data in C-ID over to ASSIST, when it is ready. This articulation is critical.
e-Transcript mini-grants are currently available: $7500 if a campus has not yet moved over to e-Transcript, and $5000 if they are already on, but have not yet fully implemented one of the elements of the California Electronic Standards (SB 1440, GE certification, and so on). There is a calling and emailing campaign launching for that right now. It would be really helpful to have a technical assistance team that could help out with local implementation. Tim noted that the pilot colleges on the Steering Committee represent different products; so DataTel schools could get

help from someone who did the coding at a DataTel school, and similarly for other vendors. There is such a steep learning curve members thought that even if they had to pay for technical assistance it would be worth it; as a system it doesn't make sense to go through that from scratch 70 times. Tim will bring the idea up to CISOA to see about the possibility of formalizing that technical assistance in some way.

Common Assessment (CAI) and Multiple Measures:
Tim Calhoon and Jennifer Coleman

Jennifer provided a general overview of the goals and objectives for the CAI. The overarching goal is to develop a comprehensive common assessment system that will: align to state legislation, reduce unnecessary remediation, provide statewide efficiencies, and effectively support faculty and staff to ensure accurate student placement, resulting in more successful student outcomes. The test will include math, English (reading and writing), and ESL. The project will also incorporate multiple measures, assessment preparation (which will involve crossover work with Education Planning (EPI) and Online Education (OEI), as well as professional development and the integration of data across the community college system.

The project established governance with a stakeholder committee of members from across the system and representatives from UC, CSU, and K-12. They conducted an environmental scan and an RFI in order to update the extensive work done by CCCAssess in 2011. Pilot colleges were selected in May with representatives added to the Steering Committee and the work groups that met throughout the summer and early fall to develop the backbone of the work leading into the complex RFP that was released December 5th.

Draft competency maps were developed by the subject area work groups in math, English, and ESL which were then disseminated to the field. The goal was full range of feedback to make sure that the competencies covered the spectrum of skills needed from lowest to highest, because some tools out there do not go low enough. A higher level math work group was also formed to develop the list of competencies needed to test above college level math into: Calculus, STEM major courses and so on. There is a test development process work group, made up of a subset of the assessment work group, to help guide the process of getting this new statewide assessment through an approval process that is still being developed. The multiple measures work group has overlap with the Multiple Measures Assessment Project that is already in existence and working with a set of pilot colleges, to help incorporate appropriate measures into the process.
The RFP development process included thorough vetting of requirements in Question Pro, prioritization of needs/wants and a focus on vendor management. The community college system is determining the needs for the assessment, not the vendor. Additionally, thought has been put into an exit strategy should it be needed if a vendor is unwilling or unable to meet the requirements of the contract.

The Common Assessment will not have a cut score; instead a report of the results will be presented as a suite of competencies that the student possesses. These results can then be used by the local faculty to map into their local curriculum. This will enable the local school to also determine whether a student with a low score in one area might be able to take advantage of resources being developed by OEI in basic skills, completion of local mini-modules or other local interventions to be able to place into a higher course and shorten time spent in remedial courses.
The next steps for the project are vendor review and selection (the RFP is due in January) and a two component pilot phase. Piloting will take place for both: the test itself, involving data collection and validation; and also for the technology and the testing platform, which will involve work with the SIS interfaces on campuses. The Professional Development Advisory Committee will help with the piloting process and looking at best practices. It will be an iterative process of

rolling out small steps, making adjustments, and then rolling out the next steps. There are twelve pilot colleges which include campuses with crossover to OEI, EPI, and the MMAP. The pilots are: Bakersfield, Butte, Chaffey, DeAnza, Delta, Diablo Valley, Fresno City, Rio Hondo, Sacramento City, Saddleback, Santa Monica, and West Los Angeles.

The legislation states that if a college uses a test for assessment, they must use the common test for assessment; however, it will be virtually impossible to roll it out all at once. Therefore, a lot of work is going into planning the launch and implementation in a logical way that takes into account pilot colleges, early adopters, and external factors such as existing contracts and college resources. Many IT departments have been rolled way back and are stretched to the limit, so the project is looking at how best to put grant resources behind the roll out to assist colleges with their local implementation. The project is very aware of the need for ongoing support and continued validation as well. There are several potential early adopters that have been identified with various types of ESL programs, including both credit and non-credit, so that those target populations can be included early in the process. Piloting is targeted for fall 2015, with early adopters coming on sometime in the spring of 2016. The timeline has to be somewhat flexible at this time because the selection of the vendor(s) will drive that timeline. Ongoing support and validation will also be required for the new statewide tool.

Professional development will need to happen with a number of different user types: IT/software interface, assessment center staff, faculty, and utilization of the results at a local level. Since there will be no cut score, local personnel will decide how to map results into a local placement decision. Saddleback College is the project lead on professional development. The Professional Development Advisory Committee will also provide guidance to all three initiatives with ASCCC in the lead role.

In the vendor selection and contracting, the project has determined it wants the best of the best in each area, so the RFP consists of five parts, one each for: platform, administration (including the report), English, math, and ESL. (The desire is to get a neutral testing platform that can also be used in other areas if needed; nursing and chemistry being two potential areas of need.) This means that there is the possibility of having up to five total vendors that will be required to work together. The Academic Senate passed a resolution at the fall plenary requesting that a human scored writing sample be included in the common assessment, so the RFP requests pricing proposals for both human and machine scored; some colleges would prefer to use machine scoring. Dean noted that it would be interesting to compare machine scored versus human scored results over the long term. Tim also explained that machine scoring comes from learning from hundreds of human scored prompts

The project may put together a summer institute to pull faculty together to provide a large block of time to work leading into the pilot in the fall 2015. Spring 2016 is the target to begin release and implementation for the fall 2016 assessment cycle, which most campuses start around March for fall placement. The Assessment Standards Work Group approval will be contingent on further testing of the results. Additionally, there might potentially be stronger, higher standards for the new statewide test, because it will be used by everyone. The CAI assessment work group, including Mark Samuels, Kitty Moriwaki, Eric Coyland, and John Pogot, is helping work through the validation and disproportionate impact process that must occur before the start of the pilot. The team is looking at ways to incentivize groups of students to take the test, because it cannot be used for placement until it is validated.

Bill expressed concern that with no cut scores, the information that follows students to be utilized at the local campuses will map into competencies that don't exist. He also expressed concern that outcomes from the local determination might be wildly different. Jennifer explained that the "competency maps" that were developed came from working with existing C-ID and CB21 rubrics as well as Common Core standards. Faculty worked with their own course outlines to determine

if the ranges of skills were suitable and had a high correlation to what they will be using for placement. Additionally, she agreed that local placement might be different, but that the strong view of the Academic Senate was for a system with no cut scores. This is a project that is developing a common assessment tool, not common placement. We don't know how it will look when it is finished, but part of that stems from the local control issue. Tim Calhoon noted that as the data warehouse comes into use with data sharing between colleges, they may learn from one another more about how other colleges are placing students. Additionally, there are factors such as AP scores, or Smarter Balanced 11th grade results, which will be used in defining student placements. There are also multiple measures components that may be included in the suite of tools used for placement; however, so far it has been hard to find good data for reliability and validity on non-cognitive measures.

Michelle Pilati noted that the Academic Senate position was always that there not be common cut scores, but she thought that a completely wide open decision was perhaps irresponsible. It would be helpful to at least benchmark those things that are in common. Jennifer explained that was the intent. Many of the C6 Consortium participants were able to agree on some indicators, and the project will be able to make that information available to those who want to use it. Setting up those local placements will be a huge amount of work, and there is great potential for lack of agreement. It might be possible for the report to pull together some referential information, especially depending upon the number of courses that are options at a particular school. Where it is possible, CAI can pull in the commonality with C-ID and CB21.

Jennifer continues to work on dispelling fear and trying to get information out to the system. She is looking to develop one page informational pieces to inform stakeholders who are just hearing about the project. The website at www.cccassess.org is another resource for those who want information on the progress so far.

CCC Assess put in a huge amount of work on common assessment and put out an RFI; then the funding wasn't there. The CAI has been able to leverage a lot of that work, and they do have the resources to implement. The goal is a tool is usable and useful to the colleges individually and that the project provides the resources so that colleges can implement it successfully.

Online Education Initiative (OEI):
Joseph Moreau and Tim Calhoon

Joe provided an overview of the work that has been done in the OEI in the last several months. In the summer the project facilitated a DE Coordinators retreat, approved quality control design standards, began development of student readiness and tutoring components, released a course management RFI, created a course review process, and selected pilot colleges for the first cohort. Twenty-four pilot colleges were selected in three groups. The student readiness group which will pilot in the spring 2015 made up of: Antelope Valley, Cabrillo, Canyons, Hartnell, Miracosta, Monterey Peninsula, Rio Hondo, and West Los Angeles. The online tutoring group, also piloting in spring 2015 consisting of: Barstow, Columbia, Imperial Valley, Mt. San Antonio, Ohlone, Pierce, Saddleback, and Victor Valley. The full launch colleges which will pilot in the summer and fall of 2015 are: Butte, Coastline, Foothill, Fresno City, Lake Tahoe, Mt. San Jacinto, Shasta, and Ventura.

Course reviewers were trained in October. This consisted of two days of in-person training with the remainder online. Almost 200 people applied for thirty training spots, and those thirty reviewers represented twenty-nine different colleges from all across the state.   In the fall the project also: released the CCMS RFP, completed the tutoring RFP, completed the development of the content for the readiness modules, selected Link-Systems International as the tutoring provider, and began reviewing the first 72 courses against the course design standards and for

accessibility. The tutoring platform will be provided by OEI to all 112 colleges in the community college system at no cost to the colleges. Tutoring services will be provided for the colleges and courses in the OEI pilot, and may be purchased through the Foundation by colleges outside of the pilot for any courses, and by colleges in the pilot for courses outside of the pilot. The Foundation has negotiated the same price for tutoring hours purchased inside and outside of OEI. The tutoring platform can also be used with local tutors.

The Consortium Colleges are now starting to work out the Exchange business processes. They are trying to develop a multi-institutional matriculation automation articulation process. OEI is working with those colleges to determine what things are needed to support them to make it easier for students to access courses through this project and complete programs more expeditiously. As part of that process, the project team is having conversations with Ellucian about ways they might be able to help with some of that, since they have a large number of the 112 colleges in the state.

Joe Moreau mentioned that might make sense to reach out to the Foundation when it comes time to look at proctoring solutions as well. John Freitas noted that there were concerns expressed in the Steering Committee about the RFP process that occurred with the Foundation regarding levels of confidentiality and the inability to give real input into the tutoring RFP as a result. If the project went through that process again, it would be useful to look at ways the process might be able to be adjusted. Joe Moreau explained that although the Steering Committee had signed a non-disclosure agreement with Butte, the Foundation needed another one (any fiscal agent would require its own NDA), and the concerns with the process were discussed thoroughly with Joseph Quintana so that they could be minimized or avoided in the future.

Kale noted that there are broader structural issues in how to account for success when our students are attending more than one institution, the system should be facilitating how to fairly capture those metrics. Pat James, Jory Hadsell, and Bonnie Peters are beginning those conversations with Pam Walker in order to mitigate any unintended consequences of sharing courses across campuses. OEI is also working with the RP Group to look into research to quantify the swirling that we all know or believe is happening between campuses. It would be useful to know the scope so that we can discuss it more explicitly, if it is not happening, we want to know that too.

Erik thought there were a number of things that might be done on the accountability score card. If there is a bottleneck, perhaps bonus points could be provided to schools that offer those courses. Additionally, there should be some way to track and reward those "skill builder" sequences of 3-4 courses that don't equal a certificate but do result in higher income. There are broader implications within Title 5 that should be looked at.

The strategy for the project was to start with courses addressed by C-ID, and ADT. LeBaron noted that last week in Academic Affairs they celebrated hitting 100% with 1602 on ADT that had been approved throughout the system. Next to tackle will be the 540 degrees behind the 1440 degrees. CTE courses can be looked at as well. We are learning a lot from this process that can be applied in the future. CMS and tutoring are equally applicable to virtually any other pieces of the curriculum, so the ability will be there to scale out beyond ADT and C-ID when we are ready. Michelle Pilati noted the possibility of future expansion of CTE programs that are only available in certain parts of the state, which could be beneficial to all students. Those are things to be aware of as OEI is built.

For the spring 2015 work is proceeding on: bringing online teaching faculty together for "creative summits," developing a plan for additional student resources (library, etc.), launch of the tutoring and readiness pilots, select CCMS, launch of certification courses, and convert courses to the new CCMS. The CCMS RFP went out and has come back and been through the first round of

evaluation. Three vendors have been selected to return the first week in February to spend 6-8 hours in demonstrations and interviews. After three days of presentations, the selection committee will meet for a day to discuss and decide upon the top candidate.

Micah explained that the certification courses that are being developed by @ONE utilize materials from certification courses for online teaching that have been in use for a long time. However, the new courses will be streamlined to be completed in a shorter period of time, while still allowing for active and critical reflection and improvement in the areas that were problematic in the course design review process. This modularization of the certification will be especially useful to faculty and instructors who already have a body of knowledge, but need improvement in 2-3 targeted areas. Right now the work is on aligning the content to the design standards where faculty is having the most challenges. They are focused on identifying places where there is a need for guidance that is platform independent.

In the summer of 2015 courses will be tested in the new CCMS. Full-launch courses will be piloted in the CCMS and Exchange in the fall 2015 and spring 2016. The team will continue to stage new courses and colleges for entry into the OEI Exchange and use of the CCMS. They will also solidify and test business processes for the Exchange program.

Bill asked about the issue of a student who has gone through the registration priority system at a college and is not able to get into a course because of a lower registration priority at the second college because he or she is a new student with low priority at the second college. Joe Moreau explained that would be one of the business processes to work out through the pilots, but that the second college might simply agree to allow higher registration priority to the student. Linda Michalowski noted that it might be further complicated by different registration dates at the two colleges. Erik thought that it was conceivable that there would be regulatory changes to address some of those issues at some point. All three initiatives are sweeping and will probably result in some changes to Title 5. LeBaron noted that the review of the law and regulations that just went into effect did not seem to indicate anything that would prohibit colleges from accepting students among themselves. He felt that a waiver would not necessarily be required; the law says that a student has to complete SSSP/matriculation process, and if Mt. Sac and Pasadena agreed to a reciprocal agreement between themselves to accept each other's registration priority, it should not be an issue. It might bring up broader implications for the colleges that are not part of the Consortium and have not signed on to reciprocity agreement; that might be where the broader policy changes come up. Erik agreed that these kinds of issues can be figured out, whether it is legal guidance that needs to be issued, policy guidance, or modifications to Title 5. Pat James and the project team are starting those conversations this week with the Chancellor's Office.

Professional Development:
Micah Orloff and Blaine Morrow

Micah went into further detail touching on @ONE's work with OEI. Colleges have been interested in finding out more about the course design standards. @ONE is continuing to provide workshops on training future peer online course reviewers. The goal is to develop a network of certified reviewers, and for schools not in the pilot, there might be an effort to communicate in workshops. The standards can be explained and practices in how to incorporate it locally can be explored. Webinars will potentially take place and scale can be considered in disseminating this information; potentially through "training the trainers." This will honor the local resources that might want to be involved in the process and provide a way @ONE can help with the deliverability and scalability of certification pathways.

Concerns have been expressed by some faculty members that the standards review process can seem evaluative; we are asking teachers to expose their courses to an environment they aren't

familiar with and many have reservations about that process. One of the faculty members Micah is familiar with from MSJC went through the process and provided this feedback after receiving feedback on the course, "To say the least, I have much to be proud of, and plenty more to complete. Excellent experience…Thank you!" Micah thought this captured the feelings of nervousness shared by a lot of faculty in the system. It is important to stress the non-evaluative nature of the course rubric for the faculty; this is not about content, it has to do with design elements that can provide an extra helping of support for students. If we are able to get more people involved in the course review process, knowledge and awareness will help ease that nervousness. Kale agreed and noted that colleges struggle with accreditation standards because it hits into contractual items, but he could see faculty that really engaged with the rubrics being able to write that section of the self-study easily. What you have done would be demonstrable, and it would really provide an answer to an area of struggle. It allows for an open conversation and the ability to document good work.

The course design evaluation is only communicated to the individual faculty member. Joe Moreau noted that the MOU is being finalized with his legal department but is at about the 98% draft point. It will be available soon to share with members of the OEI Steering Committee and the pilot colleges. It includes language that makes it very clear that the course design evaluation is not to be used for evaluation purposes. Michelle noted that the evaluation provides 21 pages of feedback to the faculty member, and can also be thought of as a review of the support network available on the campus and whether or not it has been there in the past. It is a broader holistic view.

Micah summarized that a lot of the activity at @ONE has been focused on work with OEI, especially on the release of the streamlined course which will help to bring people into the program that have been interested in participating, and are now able to do so without as rigorous a commitment.

Blaine and the team have been working on a clearinghouse for professional development. The Student Success Task Force from 2011 recommended revitalizing and re-envisioning professional development. That led in 2012 to a thirty member panel that put forth a recommendation for a virtual resource center for professional development. When OEI was funded, there was $2.5M included for professional development. A good portion of that funding has gone to @ONE for certification courses but some will go to build the virtual resource center. Blaine has been spending a lot of his spare time trying to find the professional development people on college campuses; they can be hard to find on college websites. After some digging he was able to come up with a good database which he has added to with recommendations from 3CSM, 4CSD, the Academic Senate, and the Classified Senate. He sent out invitations to 6 regional summits and had 540 people register with participation from 100 colleges. They have been able to generate a lot of great ideas. Blaine presented an extensive idea map that was generated at one of the summits.

At the summits three topics were addressed regarding the clearinghouse:
- What is the desired feature set? What should it look like? What do you want it to do?
- What kind of content should be included?
- What could you add to the clearinghouse yourself?

The results of the summits have provided a tremendous body of ideas that Blaine will begin to incorporate. Some of the ideas were ones they were familiar with: A common calendar, a place where they can find resources, and how to get trained. Others were more unique. Now the building process begins with meetings January 14-15th with designers to figure out what the clearinghouse will look like. They are hoping that by spring break they will have some modules

and content available, including a calendar. Then it can be added to and modified as needed from there.

Micah emphasized the diverse participation at the summits; there were many classified members that participated and shared their excitement at being invited and included in professional development. This tied into Recommendation 6 regarding having an inclusive nature for all to participate. It is useful to recognize commonalities where we can and have professional development that includes different constituencies when possible.

Some of the feature set themes generated:
- Currency management (the desire to make sure that the content is still recent and applicable by including virtual curation or a date stamp)
- Inclusive classification
- Granular search capability to be able to find what you need
- Peer rating system
- Social community aspect (for professional development developers to be able to come together and share ideas and resources)
- Community of web resources (not just a service but the ability to connect people)
- Granular master calendar of events
- Ability to synch calendar with other calendars

There was great enthusiasm from participants and many expressed the desire to help in the development of the resources.

Tim Kyllingstad encouraged consideration of a professional development branch for web developers, online developers who act as support staff, and another track for web-administrators; those are key areas that need to not be forgotten.

Blaine will set up a platform for resources that can be made available to anyone who wants to use it. Paul Steenhausen will act as a curator or librarian for the clearinghouse and has a Steering Committee to assist with that. Theresa Tena's group should be able to help with getting materials to help colleges successfully go through the accreditation process. We think people need training, this will provide a place to connect people to those who have the resources that they want and need.

TTAC Retreat:
Gary Bird and Cindy McCartney

Cindy has a call in to Kellogg West which is the location being looked at for the retreat this year. As soon as she has confirmation from them for May 7-8th she will let the committee know.
The committee decided that rather than having the next meeting on February 11th as previously proposed, there should be a two hour online meeting sometime during March to set the agenda for the retreat. Gary will send out a Doodle poll to set the date for that meeting.

Minutes:
The minutes for the meeting on September 26, 2014 were approved by the committee with no changes.

Suggested Action Items from the Meeting for Follow-Up:
- Importance of being intentional about a technology project supporting accreditation perhaps by setting up a work group with 3-4 groups, including CIOs, CTOs, faculty, and DE coordinators (Joe Moreau and Tim Calhoon)

- Follow up with Alice/Todd regarding possibility of looking at student success and equity and trying to come up with a tracking mechanism, possibly something in the data element dictionary (Erik and Gary)
- Looking into video streaming usage to see if it is a factor adversely affecting bandwidth while looking at the system circuit upgrade (Tim Calhoon and Gary)
- Portal ability to be designed to work on different sized devices and perhaps extract portlets and applets to be used in a mobile format (David and Tim Calhoon)
- Working with the mature colleges that are further along the way with education planning and degree audit to capture their experiences in addition to the pilot work (David)
- Desire for APIs (David and Tim Calhoon)
- E-Transcript connection and the lack of skill sets on some campuses, perhaps CISOA or a tech group could help over strapped IT departments (Tim Calhoon)
- How colleges will use the suite of competencies from the Common Assessment to do local placement (Jennifer)
- Human and machine scoring comparability on the writing sample (Jennifer)
- Determining reliable multiple measures that are attainable and give direction to colleges (Jennifer)
- Work on validation and disproportionate impact with the assessment standards work group (Jennifer)
- Work with Exchange and getting started with C-ID (Joe Moreau and Tim Calhoon)
- Review of laws and regulations to be clear on what can be done with OEI (OEI team, Erik, Pam and LeBaron)
- RP Group report on evaluation components of all three initiatives (Joe Moreau and Tim Calhoon)
- Consideration of a professional development branch for web developers, online developers who act as support staff, and another track for web-administrators (Blaine and Micah)

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