

# 2016 TTAC Retreat Small Group Activity Summary

**Groups looked at hurdles to implementation and risks as the system moves toward accomplishing the top five goals.**

## **Technology Integration:**

System-wide technology integration is being seeded with CCCApply, Canvas, Common Assessment, and C-ID, so there is the beginning of a track record of success that can be built upon. Some barriers are the very diverse base of installed programs currently across the 113 colleges in the system which people are comfortable with. There will be a need for some kind of local/statewide recognition of need/mandate to be the tipping point. There is a lack of local expertise and local bandwidth for integration. This could be helped by standardized components that tie into system level components.

Potential risks include: many colleges consider standardization to be a bad thing (they feel threatened by it, or feel that local culture matters to students), local political dynamics (“you can’t tell me what to do”), concerns about security and privacy, concerns about potential loss of ability to be agile and nimble to be able to steer quickly, missing local specialized groups of users (important to be purposeful and thoughtful ahead, instead of doing a retrofit later), and fear of individuals that the change is the result of someone trying to get them fired or eliminate their position (at Joe’s campus they work at advancing people into higher positions to address that concern).

## **Data Governance:**

Data governance hurdles include the need for a Chief Data Officer, the need for security and privacy underneath governance, and figuring out all the places data exists. (Who owns what, and where?) Other hurdles are the need for data dictionaries, alignment with FERPA, and the fact that there are currently no standards for access within the CCC system, or even within the Chancellor’s Office. Even in silos that are known, there isn’t adequate communication and standards. There needs to be system-wide buy-in for data governance. The legal office at the Chancellor’s Office is under-resourced and probably needs full-time support, and staff at the colleges will be needed to support this effort. A subcommittee will be needed, perhaps out of TTAC, with stakeholder participation and project sponsorship from the Chancellor’s Office.

Bill emphasized the importance of data as it can impact decision making. As a system a lot of decisions are made without using the data, because it is too hard to use or we don’t know how. The data should be connected to the decision making. The Chancellor’s Office curriculum approval process, for example, generates a lot of data. What data would be appropriate for colleges to receive? Establishing criteria for analyzing data could be very useful in campus enrollment management. However, currently enterprise management systems are awash in data that is not being used. Data driven decision making is an important higher level goal. Debra agreed that having data policies should also include looking at whether the data is only useful for the Chancellor’s Office, or whether it is also useful for individual colleges. It is also important to look at how this topic interfaces with other systems of education, and the Employment Development Department. These points of connection to other systems are currently ad hoc and can be logistically difficult, but are important to discuss at some point. John also noted that both quantitative and

qualitative data should be looked at.

### **Instructional Technology:**

Aspirations for instructional technology include: Smart classrooms, library resources and systems, training in instructional technology and professional development, cloud backed and centrally funded resources, access to instructional software, lab technology hardware, continuation of CMS and OEI resources, intersegmental connections, centralize support/help desk, and library video on demand. Hurdles to establishing a fully funded and sustainable instructional technology infrastructure included defining the "last mile", as well as defining what instructional technology infrastructure means. Other potential concerns include: the perception from the field that this would be prescriptive rather than permissive, sufficient training at all levels, funding and legislative constraints, and long term commitment. Other risks include: tension between local autonomy and system control, adoption and integration issues, local purchasing issues, accessibility, adequate support at the local level, and current silos of instructional technology with turf wars between local factions.

Bill cautioned about taking into account the lifetime and maintenance cost of staff or contracting for installation, upkeep, and maintenance with all technology. He also noted that last mile is important for instructional technology, but also for the comprehensive aspects of the initiatives. Anna noted those elements can be affected by the way the contract is negotiated versus whether local colleges have the ability to buy-in, like Canvas. Implementation and adoption changes the risk of investment. Paul thought another possibility would be for the system to fund the Standards for Instructional Technology that already exist as seventy-two standards.

### **Students/Courses:**

Enabling students to know exactly what courses to take and when, will touch on a variety of functions/roles: admission and records, counselors, data, IT, instructional, etc. The group found that the role of technology solutions was more to support or to make the hurdles more efficient to overcome. Ultimately, the hurdles were based in non-technical areas. When a student takes a course, there needs to be a high level of articulation of courses for it to really count. Does it count from college to college, or to another educational system, or even department to department? Having an accessible data system doesn't help with that. The people in the different colleges, systems or departments still need to agree. This means that communication will be really important, it will be essential to get people together to have those discussions to build articulation and agreement.

The group identified pieces that if expanded, could help, like expanding the Course Exchange beyond online courses with C-ID numbers; it could be a giant articulation system. ASSIST could be the vehicle to establish the relationships and OEI could be the thing that kept it accessible. However, policy issues are also involved. For example, if you want students to take courses in a particular sequence; the current Title V regulations only allows it if there are certain pre-requisite structures in place, or in exceptional programs like nursing. That would need to be revisited to be able to establish sequences of courses. There will also be a lot of work involved in reviewing programs, curriculum alignments, scheduling protocols, faculty assignment systems, and so on.

There will also be capacity and resource issues on campuses. There will need to be enough faculty, classrooms, and equipment, to offer courses that students need. That would have to be delivered on a large scale. Coordination would be needed to establish policy agreements, residency, and Financial Aid, for what would be enacted on a system like this. This would be a major policy and implementation issue, and it has been under discussion for years, but the time is right to do it. This will involve enrollment prioritization, if we want to be able to guarantee the student will be able to take next course. Faculty desire to teach as they want may result in a need for a cultural shift to meet student need and desire: full

time versus part time, online versus on campus, day courses versus night courses, etc. Course schedule data would be available at least a year out so that counseling and students could assist themselves. Some of this work will require CSU and UC to collaborate (for example to agree on GE requirements)

### **Accessibility:**

There has been a proliferation of technology and multi-media in the CCC. There are websites, webpages, third party software, and applications. There are 508 and WCAG 2.0 standards that colleges and the Chancellor's Office have to meet for technology resources. Campuses that don't meet those standards can be held liable and are required to provide accommodations to individuals when they don't meet them. There are legal and financial issues, but most importantly ethically, students and employees don't have equal access to materials, training and content they should. However, even for campuses that are trying to comply, the standards are very hard to understand. Paul Bishop, for example, is a Compliance Officer and a PhD and he finds them hard to understand. It is even harder for the smaller colleges that don't have the resources and are left to themselves to try to understand.

Members discussed the usefulness of also addressing the question of what constitutes a "reasonable accommodation" in the classroom. This would be very helpful to faculty in making their courses accessible, since currently that complex or time-consuming task falls on the faculty. The DECT grant helps to provide captioning, however there isn't enough funding, so 3CMedia (with 1,200 instructional videos to caption) has to determine which to do. It would be helpful to have a committee to deal with accessibility issues. Even with the HTTU, the Technology Center, @ONE, and DECT nobody has enough resources, they are deeply underfunded.

There are two standards: the standard for accessibility in educational materials where everything has to be accessible, and then the technology which helps with reasonable accommodations for lab processes, hearing assistance, etc. where the technology is highly variable. The law regarding accessibility of educational materials has been there for a very long time; that needs to be enforced. It is in the purchasing guidelines, but help with understanding what those rules are and whether a particular vendor meets them would be quite helpful. It would be useful to have a clearinghouse of products or materials that are known to meet the legal requirements, so that campuses are not relying on the vendor's word.

It would be really helpful to bring together a group of experts to put together deliverables, in plain English, explaining the standards and best practices. It would also be helpful to provide examples and best practices for meeting those standards. Campuses could be directed to resources to help with making fixes to meet the requirements, including fixes they could make themselves where possible. This project would actually provide risk mitigation for the system.

### **Creating a Road Map:**

The following draft ideas represent guidance for the five "big ideas" worked on by the groups at the retreat. These were the top goals but the order does not represent a priority order.

#### **Big Idea 1: Integration of system-level technology tools**

##### **If we're successful, why is this important?**

Student success

Consistency/Clarity

- Improve student equity
  - Better data = better services to students
  - Improve student outcomes/persistence
- Efficiency/Cost savings
- Improve security/privacy
- More consistent support for all campuses- higher baseline

**Short-term success metric:**

- Are current initiatives meeting our expectations for seamless integration?
- What do students think? Is this helping? Are we saving money?
- Are adoption rates on voluntary components high?
- Did we establish governance, standards, monitoring, guidance, and assistance to support this initiative?
- Did we identify/acquire sustainable funding?

**Long-term success metric:**

- Have we maintained sustainable funding?
- Is there widespread adoption?
- Have we improved student success: retention and success, completion, time to completion, higher transfer rates, higher employability, and lower student debt?

**Next Steps:**

- Form a governance body- Perhaps a subcommittee of TTAC with other subject matter experts
- Inventory/landscape analysis to establish baselines
- Develop user stories to create standards and metrics
- Identify cost components and funding
- Create and implement roadmap.

**Big Idea 2: Implement system-wide data integration and governance**

**If we're successful, why is this important?**

- Impacts all areas
- Facilitates student success and cost savings
- Operational effectiveness
- Data driven decision-making
- Facilitate best practices among colleges
- Proof for future funding of system enhancements

**Short-term success metric:**

- Inventory all data using an environmental scan or a third party assessment
- Data dictionaries and discrepancies
- Scope document, Charter, Communication plan
- Establish Governance: Identify and recruit stakeholders
  - Charter, agenda, minutes
  - Transparency mechanism (website)
- Project plans and schedules

Determine what roles and resources are needed

**Long-term success metric:**

Cohesive integrated data

90% of system-wide staff/faculty can access data for decision making

Real-time data synchronization

System-wide control processes for change, delete, update, and add data elements

Alignment with external organizations and standards

**Next Steps:**

CCCCO Executive team buy-in

Environmental scan

Third party scan/audit

Master Data Management (MDM) work at CCCTC

Inventory of data and discrepancies

Project scope and planning

**Big Idea 3: Establish a fully-funded and sustainable instructional technology infrastructure**

**If we're successful, why is this important?**

Technology is now embedded in 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning and teaching

**Short-term success metric:**

Usage, focus groups, surveys

How well being done now?

Identified needs now and level of support for improvement

**Long-term success metric:**

Increased sophistication in use of technology and technology resources in teaching and learning

**Next Steps:**

System inventory and needs assessment; identify user expectations

Establish group(s) to identify definition of system instructional technology infrastructure and technical specifications with TCO

Identify funding and implementation framework(s)

**Need to:**

Identify and assess other successful examples (i.e. Florida CC, Virginia CC, CSU, etc.)

Explore funding and purchasing model changes

Use a JPA as a tool for more agility and simplicity?

**Big Idea 4: Enable students to know exactly which courses to take, when to take them, in what order, where they are offered (and whether space is available), and be able to enroll in those courses in a totally seamless fashion.**

**If we're successful, why is this important?**

Everything depends on the students being able to find and take the courses they need  
Currently we do not know what student demand is  
Pre-requisites offered in other divisions /departments  
Goal of avoiding simultaneous conflicting course offerings

**Short-term success metric:**

Use cases to support ASSIST  
Build a crosswalk of courses  
OEI Exchange  
Tech Tools- "pre-mapping courses" conversations: Where is the demand coming from?  
What works best for students?

**Long-term success metric:**

Interest in supporting solution based upon a regional approach  
Focus on NEW students first, low hanging fruit  
Research approaches to answer the question  
Need input into tool (counselor, faculty)  
Evolve and respond to industry  
Change courses to seamlessly integrate into a job

**Next Steps:**

- 1) Catalog validation: audit of existing catalogs, move to online?
- 2) Data dictionary for catalogs- work immediately with courses; encourage reading of the updates
- 3) API interact programmatic rather than silo the program
- 4) ERP User Group (Banner, Datatel): bring user groups to help articulate change to the large group

**Big Idea 5: Ensure system-wide accessibility of technology for both students and CCC employees (faculty, staff, and administrators)**

**If we're successful, why is this important?**

Meet State and Federal requirements  
Save colleges money from not having to provide nearly as many ad hoc accommodations  
Make college personnel's lives easier by clearly understanding requirements  
Reduce the hassle involved to understand standards  
Equal opportunity/moral issue

**Short-term success metric:**

Define accessibility operational standards in plain English

Identify best practices for meeting requirements, including:

- Suggested Board policy for administrative procedures
- Purchasing guidelines
- Communicating out to faculty and other staff on these standards and their responsibilities (Why compliance is so important)
- How to make fixes and available resources to leverage to meet compliance standards

**Long-term success metric:**

Create clearinghouse of third party products that meet standards

Goal of 100% compliance in system

**Next Steps:**

Form system-wide working group convened by CCCCCO to include:

- CCCCCO accessibility experts
- DSPS campus reps
- Hi-Tech Center Training Unit
- Vet representatives
- Any others

Lay out framework and identify scope of work for workgroup (their specific charge)

Produce a guide that translates into plain English and operationalizes the standards in 508 and WCAG 2.0 accessibility

Make recommendations about tools, how to make pdfs, PowerPoints, etc. accessible

Create training materials and place in the Professional Learning Network