

Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee Retreat

Tuesday and Wednesday April 26 - 27, 2016

The Dana on Mission Bay San Diego

TTAC Members Present: Bill Scroggins, Dean Nevins, Dennis Bailey-Fournier, Dolores Davison, Gregg Atkins, Jay Field, Joanne Schultz (online), John Freitas, Mandy Davies, Paul Bishop, Robert Coutts, Tim Kyllinstad, and Wei Zhou.

Chancellor's Office and Staff: Anna Stirling, Brian Miller, Caryn Albrecht, Daniel Kaufman, David Shippen (online), Debra Conick, Erik Skinner, Gary Bird, Jennifer Coleman (online), Joe Moreau, Joseph Quintana, Kirsten Corbin, Pat James (online), Paul Steenhausen, Rico Bianchi, Theresa Tena, and Tim Calhoon.

Welcome/Agenda Review:

Theresa called the meeting to order at 10:00am. Bill reminded members that the TTAC retreat has traditionally been a very influential meeting, one that sets the agenda moving forward. It has also influenced the creation and continuation of projects. The efforts of this group have helped the CCC to secure funding even when it is hard to get, and is commonly cited as a major resource to the state. As several initiatives are maturing, this group needs to focus on "last mile" issues, not only in terms of infrastructure but also in ways to support campuses in implementation.

Additionally, since technology does not stand still, TTAC needs to be looking ahead at what is evolving and what needs to be developed. This group needs to put together a coherent series of practical plans to carry forward. This should include a focus on the essential element of data to be used in decision making, both by students and the rest of the system. John also emphasized the importance of open educational resources and how that affects faculty practice in the classroom. TTAC provides future visioning regarding where technology is going and how it affects practice in all areas of college campuses.

Theresa expressed the desire for a focus on dialogue and brainstorming to help lay out a vision for where the CCC is headed and how to support the effort. The last System Strategic Plan was launched 2007 and updated in 2012 with Chancellor Harris. The activities at the retreat will help structure where TTAC believes the next System Strategic Plan should go. Erik reminded the group of how the powerful ideas that became EPI, CAI, and OEI, as well as others, started with a vision from TTAC.

Daniel Kaufman, Principal and Co-Founder of Third Plateau Social Impact Strategies, was introduced as facilitator for the retreat. His goal was to help the CCC set direction for working more effectively and efficiently by spurring engagement, conversation, critical and creative thinking. The high level objectives for the retreat are to take stock of current projects, start developing ideas leading to the future vision, articulate some action steps for the vision, and revisit TTAC's purpose and function to make the group more effective. The group then came up with norms regarding speaking up, honesty and participation during the retreat. Members felt that it was important to have both a strategic and a tactical focus throughout the retreat discussions. They also encouraged looking for connection points between different users in the system as well as possible connections inter-segmentally.

Taking Stock of Current Projects: Information/Discussion

Online Education Initiative (OEI):

Some of OEI's goals are to increase CCC student transfer to four year institutions, increase student completion through collaboration, and leverage economies of scale in resource and technology acquisition. Joe Moreau presented a detailed slide summarizing all of the resources OEI has developed/provided. The Course Design Standard and professional development represents a major OEI element with ninety courses reviewed and ninety reviewers trained. There have also been 500 faculty and staff members trained in the Standard. Student online readiness

including piloting of assessment is another significant OEI item; the readiness tutorial modules are now in use with 6,000 students at pilot colleges and thousands more throughout the system due to development under a Creative Commons license. The project is also helping with tutoring by providing the WorldWideWhiteboard platform to the system (it is in use at thirty-nine colleges) and NetTutor tutoring at a negotiated 50% cost savings. OEI has a contract with Proctorio for online proctoring and is developing a proctoring network. They also have an RFP out for plagiarism detection.

The common CMS, Canvas, is more than two years ahead of schedule in adoption, with sixty-five colleges committed, and ten additional that are near commitment. Ninety colleges are projected to be on Canvas by December 2017, this represents an annual savings of more than \$8M. Canvas is being used for all courses, not just online courses. The Consortium has twenty-four colleges meeting regularly to work on details for the Course Exchange. Administrative components are near completion, and student facing components are under development. The Exchange will be piloted in fall 2016 with between four and eight colleges. The intent is for the Exchange to provide a way for students to complete courses needed for transfer more expeditiously.

OEI is working with Cranium Café on delivery of an online counseling platform. The project is also working on development of a counseling network, and is coordinating with EPI regarding counseling issues. Basic Skills is collaborating with CAI and is also creating embedded content for underprepared students. Finally, OEI is collaborating with the Chancellor's Office and "Doing What Matters" in looking at credit for prior learning, with a current focus on Veterans.

Key concerns for OEI are: fiscal sustainability, accessibility, the evolution of governance, and communication to the field. The CCMS adoption has been very rapid and driven by centralized funding. Renegotiation of the Instructure contract for Canvas is likely and 100% adoption is feasible. Additional funds will be needed. Accessibility is an ethical, moral, and legal mandate. Assuring content accessibility is a huge task and an ongoing responsibility. The colleges, the High Tech Center Training Unit, DECT, the Technology Center, and OEI have inadequate funding to properly address accessibility issues; there needs to be better funding and coordination in investing in accessibility. Current governance is project based, with the OEI Steering Committee focused on policy issues, the Consortium on operational issues, and the Chancellor's Office on oversight and accountability. However, OEI is rapidly evolving from a project to the new normal and the current governance structure will not serve that long-term need. Communication is a never ending task and challenge. There is a need for coordination with the Chancellor's Office on targeted messaging to various stakeholder groups, while also articulating how the statewide initiatives will be integrated.

OEI Phase two will involve: looking at what is next for the Exchange, data analytics, support for CTE programs, and other support services for online learners.

Information about OEI resources is available at Cconlineed.org

Education Planning Initiative (EPI):

The base infrastructure and platform for the Portal are now complete. Shibboleth integration with pilot colleges is underway, and is nearly complete. Within the Portal, an orientation portlet is being built, and procurement and contracting with EMSI CareerBuilder for Career Coach is complete. Career Coach will be available to the entire system and will be a great place to link together with CTE. The project and EPI Steering Committee are also in the process of building college configurable content, and colleges will also be able to build their own content. The Portal will be a shareable, accessible, and secure product. The team expects to meet their June target for production release of the Portal to pilots.

Starfish by Hobsons is working with the EPI pilot colleges to implement their integrated degree audit, early alert, and retention tools. The pilots are completing their accessibility updates, MIS reporting, and "lessons learned" documentation. A tool that has not been delivered yet but is important to the pilots is the ability to click a "register now" button after a student has an approved education plan for a particular semester. There are thirteen pilot colleges for the Starfish EPT/DAS tools and several of them are preparing to go-live. There are forty colleges in the queue for Starfish tools, and there will be more that come on over time, but David does not expect there will be 100% adoption in the state.

The Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory has three important elements: data harmony, application, and deployment. There is an advisory committee to guide that effort. Software development is underway per the MVP Roadmap, and schedules for sprint reviews are in place.

Maintenance and operations for C-ID Version 1.0 are under the EPI responsibilities. At the same time, the project is coordinating with SAAC, CIOs, ASCCC, Mt. SAC and other constituencies, along with the Chancellor's Office, for C-ID 2.0. The Bonitasoft workflow tool procurement is completed, as well as discovery and thirty baseline workflows. A development burndown is one of the next steps and the estimated delivery on that will be June. (It was pushed back from April 1st due to delays in procurement.) C-ID development is happening in parallel with ASSIST integration. The financial contribution and business process support for the help-desk is complete and contributions for technical program management are ongoing. The integrations from C-ID to ASSIST are also complete. The project is defining integration with education planning tools to accommodate the delayed release of ASSIST.

The e-transcript team is wrapping up the recruitment drive and conclusion of mini-grants. They are working on development of a verification service with PESC workgroup coordination for EdExchange, to provide an alternative to the SPEEDE server. EdExchange will be an open source, secure, point to point, e-transcript solution. The team will also be putting out a RFP for a student ordering tool.

Some challenges for the EPI overall include: the acceptance of SSSP as "net new work" to be done in changing systems; college costs and resource concerns; leveraging SSSP funding to access resources; coordination with Foundation effort; scope creep on C-ID, CO-CI, and the portal; and communication and rumor control.

Common Assessment Initiative (CAI):

All colleges in the state get to adopt the Common Assessment which makes it a significant statewide effort. There are now more than 2,800 completed assessments, with more than 500 in ready/in-progress status. The adoption schedule has been released, and colleges now realize the assessment is really coming. The CAI team has been planning for assistance at colleges to help them prepare for the transition. Throughout the spring 2016 there will be continued item development by LSI on a "back-up" item bank. Planned releases include version 1.1 which will include a paper and pencil version and 2.0 which will include the full package with enhancements. RFPs will be going out for a writing sample and some form of pre-assessment.

Work ahead includes summer approval of the assessment by the CCCCCO Assessment committee and full release and implementation beginning in the fall. A timeline for when colleges will be coming on, which starts with fall 2016 and goes through fall 2018, has been sent out. Continued SSSP funding is tied to adoption of the Common Assessment by the date a college is assigned on the timeline. Priority in scheduling has been given to pilot colleges, sister colleges to pilots, and Compass schools. There were also a few schools that requested placement at a particular point in the timeline based on significant local factors (one school, which recently had turnover of fifty faculty members, for example) and those were accommodated as much as

possible. The remaining small number was randomly placed on the implementation timeline.

There has been and will continue to be a large focus on professional development and continuous ongoing improvement. The project is making every effort to provide colleges with all resources possible for a successful implementation, including development of an eleven step implementation guide to help colleges set up teams and start conversations.

Professional development is targeted to different stakeholder audiences: content faculty, counselors and staff, assessment center staff, IT, etc. There have been five regional professional development events with more than 650 attendees to date and more are planned. There will also be integration with the Professional Learning Network (PLN).

Challenges for CAI include the shortage of local IT resources and integration with other projects. CAI is developing a document to clarify what CCCAssess and the Technology Center will provide, as well as what local institutions will need to provide. There will also be work involved with the data warehouse in terms of data management and data governance. Strategic planning for years four and five is happening now with respect to maintenance, future release cycles, keeping content fresh, technology updates, and responding to inquiries from other states.

Technology Center:

There have been over 837,000 electronic transcripts transmitted over the system, fifty-seven community colleges are on board with another twenty-three in process, twenty CSUs with one implementing, four UCs with one implementing, and five private colleges (including USC and University of Phoenix). The 2015-16 mini-grants provided support for several kinds of upgrades for colleges that already had e-transcripts, including: certification for CSU/GE/IGETC and others, course level transferability and eligibility, as well as providing support for new colleges in the ability to send and receive. Fifty-five colleges applied for mini-grants (thirty-two were new to e-transcripts) and there are twenty-nine more that are in process (eleven new members by June 30th, with eighteen more to follow).

The problem with SPEEDE is that all out of network transcripts pass through this single point of failure that uses legacy technology. The system is slow (with twenty minute delays in delivery) and involves third party storage of PII data, which is a security concern. The goal is to move away from that method of passing transcripts through a third party, to a system that enables network to network transfer. Currently members are working with Credentials (40%), National Student Clearinghouse (11%), and Parchment (2%). EdExchange will allow for point to point network exchange and has been developed by the Technology Center working with PESC and the Aparento Foundation, an open source foundation specifically oriented around higher education. The system is ready to test and testing partners are in place.

That should be included in e-transcript 2.0? It should include some type of student ordering portlet in the new Student Portlet. Another element is integration into EdExchange. Additionally, the Technology Center is looking at setting up a transcript verification service so any vendor can validate that a transcript meets the California transcript data standard.

Currently for CCCApply there are 2.6M OpenCCC accounts. More than 3.2M applications have been processed along with 1.7M BOG fee waiver applications. There are 105 out of 113 colleges in the system now using CCCApply, and the other eight have committed to adopting it. Twenty-eight colleges are using the BOG fee waiver, with fifty-three adopting it. There are forty-eight colleges planning to adopt the International application. Student satisfaction with CCCApply is high, with 98% expressing satisfaction with the process.

The Technology Center has been working with CENIC to administer and fund more than 230 circuits that connect colleges and offsite centers to the backbone, with decision making input from

Gary, Debra, and Theresa at the Chancellor's Office. One time upgrade funds of \$1.4M and ongoing funds of \$4.6M are being used to restore backups and upgrade existing circuits. The current status of that project is that 157 circuits have been upgraded, 147 to 1 Gig circuits and ten to 10 Gig circuits. There are seventy-eight circuits that are in progress or that need review.

Projections of growth from CISCO are for a 30% increase in bandwidth usage compounded yearly, so the system is looking for further funding to "future proof" the network by getting everyone up to 10 Gig circuits. For fiscal year 2015-16 a Budget Change Proposal was submitted for \$7M in one-time funding and \$5M in ongoing funding for these upgrades.

Questions and comments regarding reports:

John and Dolores asked about a reference to "model course content" in one of the slides in the OEI report. Joe, Pat and Anna clarified that this is really a combination of two different areas of content that might be put into the PLN. One would be samples of content that align with the Course Design Rubric. The other would be content developed by bringing faculty together in a group of subject matter experts to develop content to cover a difficult concept perhaps with additional help from course designers. Neither of these ideas is intended to be prescriptive, instead they would be faculty driven. Faculty members suggested that the phrasing "model course content" be changed to something like "course content library for optional use" or "to assist faculty in course development."

Dennis asked about how to get ASSIST 2.0 moving forward and Tim Calhoun acknowledged that it is a point of frustration. We are heavily dependent on ASSIST, but we are not developing it. The CCC is doing everything to be ready for integration with the new version of ASSIST, but it looks like the soonest it will be ready is next summer.

Bill had questions about the full articulation of courses in the Exchange and embedded priority registration. Pat and Joe explained that at this point the colleges in the Consortium that have chosen to be there have determined what the agreements are. These agreements have been set out formally in an MOU for those colleges. For now courses in the Exchange have to have a C-ID and be ADT courses, because they are easiest to articulate. Essentially, those colleges have agreed to honor the enrollment priority from the student's home college at the teaching college. In the Exchange mechanism there is a place for priority because the colleges have agreed to accept that designation from each other. It has not yet been piloted, and the MVP will define priority registration, it is a known issue.

Small Group Discussions:

Small groups discussed issues and policy and implementation implications that came up as they heard the status reports from the projects. Groups focused on challenges, connections and integration points.

It is important to move away from the current reality of distinct projects to a more integrated ecosystem. This includes a need for an integrated system of supports rather than having to deal with many different vendors. Interoperability of different components should be demanded from vendors. Integration of technology pieces even beyond the three big projects that are all at different stages of development and levels of maturity.

There are disparate levels of capacity at the local level, small and medium sized districts being left behind especially those that don't have IT staff, etc. What can the system do to provide support to those on the wrong side of the technology gap? There is an overarching need for IT support and resources.

Issues related to data: integration, use of data, and alignment of data definitions. The importance of creating more structure and efficient data management internally, and between colleges and

the system, as well as better linkages with partners both longitudinally/inter-segmentally. There is a need for data governance and security.

The challenges of the current ASSIST system are critical. It is fundamental to transfer, but housed in the UC and they don't have an appreciation of how dire the need is. Is it possible to elevate this as a higher priority?

There is a need to communicate, share, and underscore that CAI is an improvement for the system. There are campus and system challenges with implementation for some users. What does "Common Assessment, but not common placement" mean at a system wide level and looking at data system wide? The three big initiatives could also spur conversations about streamlining curriculum locally.

Look at perhaps changing the messaging focus of EPI to the aspects of it that make it desirable beyond education planning. Develop better integration between Degree Audit and OEI. It is also important to be able to register from the Education Plan directly. Look at the ability to register by time blocks, and also the ability to register based on historical course offerings. The Exchange system takes students to local offerings first; perhaps should go statewide. Messaging that CAI, EPI, and OEI are education projects supported by technology, NOT technology projects supported by education. Perhaps TTAC should be restructured to have more focus on end users and less on technology representatives.

There were overall concerns expressed about:

- Communication across various constituencies and various levels of acceptance
- Information overload with so much coming down from the state
- Project website clarity, there are various different looks and feels between projects
- Duplication of efforts between projects
- Project creep/having to address unanticipated events
- Ongoing funding
- Remaining aware of equity issues
- Appropriate balance in local autonomy versus centralization
- Elements which make sense at system level versus local
- Need for strategic mapping of messaging

Looking to the Future: Brainstorming

Understanding Our User Groups:

Small groups discussed the needs of user groups in the system. Students need information that is personalized, fit to life, work schedules, and provides a path to completion. Courses and data should be completely transportable, provide short paths to basic skills competency, and provide flexibility in scheduling. There should also be training provided in use of technology.

Faculty want autonomy, a functioning classroom, and students prepared and placed at the appropriate level. They would like to have professional development, technology training, and support for changes in technology. They would like room to innovate, make mistakes, and correct; while feeling supported, not targeted or blamed. Faculty also wants reasonable class sizes, a safe environment, and less non-teaching work. Finally, they want help with meeting accessibility standards, and with adapting to a reasonable amount of change.

Classified staff wants respect and recognition of their role in governance. They want processes that are meaningful and streamlined where possible. They also want professional development

and opportunities for advancement.

Administrators want tools to better manage time and streamlining of administrative processes. They want leadership training and professional development. They also want opportunities to collaborate across instruction, student services, and CTE. Administrators want technology training and training on governance. Finally, they want more clarity into data measures.

What's Trending?

TTAC members brainstormed ideas about trends in education and technology to be taken into consideration in planning. In education, trends that could be considered are: open educational resources, digital supplemental resources, flexible learning spaces, more technology, student appreciation of more use of technology, and the desire for seamless integration. In technology, trends that should be considered are: digital badges, mobile data collection in sciences, data sharing, protecting data/operational integrity of system, adaptive learning and technology, predictive analytics, adaptive assessments, individually tailored and customized solutions, use of bandwidth and robotics.

Developing a Vision Part 1: **Brainstorming**

TTAC members were asked to provide three big picture goals. That list of ninety goals was later narrowed down to five clear top choices.

By 2020/2025, California Community Colleges will:

- Seamlessly integrate all system-wide technology tools
- Implement system-wide data management and governance
- Establish a fully funded and sustainable instructional technology infrastructure
- Enable students to seamlessly navigate and enroll in courses
- Define accessibility standards and implement technology standards to ensure access

An additional three that came up as second tier by number of selections were:

- Create a system level technology center
- ASSIST 3.0 (this might be part of enabling students to know which courses to take)
- Providing a single comprehensive digital identity for all students encompassing their previous, current and future education (may also be part of swirling students being able to take the courses they need)

Strengthening TTAC: **Discussion**

The group discussed the function of TTAC including how it is working well, how it is not working well, and what might be done to improve it.

TTAC has done well with system-wide initiatives that provide real benefit, especially because they are funded. This group supported work which benefits all of the districts. TTAC has also done a great job of bringing together a diverse set of system stakeholders to have good conversations and dig deeper into issues for the system. It has also provided real world advice to the Project Directors from stakeholders. Finally, it has a focus on economies of scale and scalable ideas.

TTAC is not working as well on clarification of the duties and responsibilities of being a member of the committee; there is no onboarding for members. There also needs to be more student involvement in TTAC. (More students should be invited to increase that important participation; perhaps try inviting ten students in order to have three available to participate.) The same is true for CEOs. Additionally, colleges with fewer resources might not have enough staff to send

someone, so there might not be enough representation from colleges without robust IT departments. There should also be more input from end users. Dolores felt that there has not been as much effort to include the faculty as there was in the past; the focus seems to have shifted more to technology representatives.

Some members felt that the last two years the work of TTAC has moved into technology details, and needs to step back to set goals for five, ten, and fifteen years away. Others felt that focus on implementation details was also important. Mandy felt that TTAC could be improved by looking at what makes sense at the system level.

Mandy and Dennis were concerned about communication and clear messaging; their campus had Step:Forward materials sent to students that were contradictory to local campus information which was confusing to students. Colleges were not able to opt out, which was frustrating. There needs to be better coordination on those kinds of efforts. Brian explained that the Step:Forward campaign tried to vet materials at a pretty high level and has also received positive feedback. It is hard to meet the needs of all 113 colleges.

The first ten years or so, TTAC focused on goals, strategies and activities formulated in a plan, and then the plans were updated or evolved. Bill noted that hasn't been done in a while. About three years ago the State gave the CCCs a lot of money and everyone became so focused on keeping up with the work of the initiatives, at the same time that we lost Patrick Perry, who TTAC had perhaps relied on too much for its strategic direction. Joe Moreau also felt that ten years ago was a simpler time and the goals and visions were fewer and more "one size fits all," like CENIC or statewide library resources that could be funded centrally and more easily accomplished. Now education is becoming more personalized and customized which introduces a higher level of complexity and draws TTAC "into the weeds."

Dolores felt that with the small number of meetings TTAC has each year, it is important to balance bigger vision with details. It might be time to look at the Charter, possibly at having some Zoom meetings online, more frequent meetings, or meetings with a specific topic and particular focus. It is important not to have the few meetings each year all focused around report-outs. It would also help to have meeting dates on the calendar as soon as possible. Tim Kyllingstad reminded the group that TTAC used to refer questions and ideas back to the Technology Center, for example, how to do CCCConfer. CSU and UC have nothing that works in the same way; perhaps they can be brought into Confer for a fee. Rico explained that a number of years ago CSU did express interest but didn't want to pay for it. Tim also acknowledged that TTAC used to send more questions to TTIP North and South because they weren't working on the projects.

TTAC has gone from strategic everything with minimal operational detail, to all operational detail focused on the work of the initiatives. Bill emphasized that TTAC needs to move back toward a focus on its driving principals. TTAC has been trying to create system level solutions that benefit every college including concern for colleges that have fewer resources. The desire has been to increase access of students to education, and TTAC has consistently been conscious of the digital divide and looking for solutions that covered a range: infrastructure solutions, user solutions, and applications that took solutions from small scale to large scale.

Erik agreed that the infusion of resources into the system with an exponential growth in projects has resulted in a challenge in how to shift the work of TTAC. Report outs have been important to keep members informed, but there is more than can be absorbed in a short briefing because there is so much going on. It is important to keep strategic planning but also be able to levitate up. We are thankful for the resources, and recognize that it has provided an interesting challenge to keeping ahead of the rapid progress. Part of the responsibility of TTAC is to take a good look at all that is out there and figure out what needs to be done to reduce the chaos for our system.

Daniel asked members to share potential solutions. Debra suggested that communication, governance, integration, and funding will always exist as issues system-wide. Coming up with infrastructure solutions in those areas is helpful. Tim Calhoon suggested that TTAC or a subcommittee of TTAC might be able to provide an oversight function for data governance, as all of the projects are going to be collecting a tremendous amount of information. John thought it would be important to have conversations about what infrastructure means for the system. Bill expressed frustration that the technology solutions on his campus are disconnected from one another. Other areas discussed included: emergency notification services, portal systems, productivity tools (like for document management), integrated instructional media solutions that are accessible that support faculty pedagogy, ASSIST, and “last mile” connections.

Theresa noted that the discussion about the Charter being somewhat dated came up in January but did not yet happen. That discussion should include work on visioning versus operational issues. There should also be focus on the issue of system solutions versus local solutions. She will work with John and Bill to put together some work on timeline or strategy to capture what TTAC should be using from the dialogue today. The intent is to update the Charter. This will include looking at: how TTAC is evolving, the different skills required, and how to create the right organizational structure for that work.

Action Item:

Members interested in working on the Charter update and the vision for TTAC should talk to John Freitas, Bill Scroggins, or Theresa Tena.

Developing a Vision Part 2: Brainstorming

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 21st 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 CCCCO 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

Wrap Up and Next Steps:

TTAC members each spoke briefly about how they felt about the retreat and the processes followed. They expressed excitement about moving forward with a vision, goals, and the potential for getting things done, and about getting back to “the roots” of TTAC with a productive process of listening to perspectives and discussing how to support each other moving forward.

Daniel expressed excitement about TTAC having some crystallization around big ideas moving forward and realization of the work that will be ahead to turn those ideas into reality. John was excited about reinvigoration of TTAC and great ideas for the future that have the ability to coalesce into a plan with the right environment moving forward. Bill was encouraged by honest, constructive conversations regarding what works for TTAC and what can be improved. He is looking forward to revisiting suggestions regarding TTAC membership and process. Some of the goals coming out of this retreat capture past ideas and stand on the shoulders of previous work, but most importantly, Bill was excited that the work today was based on need and not necessarily just technology but instead on fitting the technology to where it might help. Going forward, the key, as always, will be on the ability to follow through.

Theresa echoed the excitement of others in feeling new energy and positive forward direction. She also highlighted the mindset of looking beyond the technology initiatives to supporting important activities and using this work as a starting point to feed into the upcoming System Strategic Plan.

Action Item:

Theresa will work with Bill, John, and other interested individuals in the near future on revising the TTAC Charter and bringing that back to the group.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30pm.