Education Planning Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Monday March 17, 2014
CCC Chancellor's Office
Sacramento, California

EPISC Members Present: Al Konuwa (by Confer), Chelley Maple, Cynthia Rico, Denice Inciong, Dennis Bailey, George Bradshaw (by Confer), Grace Hanson, Heidi Lockhart, Karen Micalizio, Mandy Davies, Martha Robles, Matt Coombs, Michael Greenberg, Norberto Quiroz, Sherrie Padilla, Stephanie Dumont, Victor DeVore, Elizabeth Fernandez (by Confer), Lucinda Over (by Confer).

Guests: Marc Beam (for Darla Cooper)

Chancellor's Office Staff: Patrick Perry, Bonnie Edwards, Gary Bird, Tim Calhoon, Carlo Santos, Debra Sheldon, Jeff Spano, Kevin Flash, Mia Keeley, Cindy McCartney and Caryn Jones.

Opening and Introductions:
Tim opened the meeting at 10:05 am. Patrick welcomed and thanked all the attendees for participating in this large multifaceted project. This project belongs to the entire system and the work of the Education Planning Initiative Steering Committee (EPISC) will provide help and guidance in determining how it grows. Attendees introduced themselves and explained which constituent groups they represent.

Project Information/Initiative Overview:
Tim highlighted his hope that this committee will provide feedback to and from their constituencies throughout the time that the EPISC is working. The reasons for the development of the EPI involve the fact that many students are not completing work in the CCC system (only 23% of CC students are graduating or transferring within 3 years). There is an awareness that not all students desire to complete a degree or to transfer to a CSU or UC, but we want to facilitate the process for those students who do. Students need structured pathways to help personalize and sequence the items that students need to do. This grant will help to consolidate the information available to students into easily accessible locations and with reminders about elements that are applicable to that particular student. Additionally, under-resourced counseling services need assistance in meeting student needs.
The key objectives of this grant are:
1) Create a student portal to consolidate, personalize and sequence information and activities.
2) Message students, based upon knowledge that we have about them, to promote positive actions. (For example, student who are Veterans or who need childcare)
3) Provide an Education Planner and Degree Audit system and guidance services to go along with them.
4) Support existing Education Planners with an element that helps to integrate the data into a cohesive system.

Many system wide technology elements of this grant have been in the vision stage since 2008. The new CCCApply, for example, has streamlined the application process from 35-45 minutes down to about 20 minutes. Federated Identity helps to address a long standing security issue with employees. Many departments use cloud based services, but when an employee leaves a department, their access needs to be revoked, and nobody remembers complete that process. Federated Identity also allows for a single sign-on which will simplify the process of tracking all of a student's data together even if they are attending multiple colleges. Rather than a student having separate accounts at two or more colleges, he or she will have one OpenCCC account with a system wide identifier, the CCCID, made up of 3 letters and 4 numbers grouped to make it easier to remember. Additionally, a process is being developed to be able to document a "good

faith effort," to gather students' social security numbers; because if colleges can prove they are making a good faith effort they will not have to pay IRS fines.

The new CCCApply has very comprehensive helpdesk support with XEROX out of Bakersfield. Calls are answered in English and Spanish within 30 seconds or less, and there is a 90% success rate. Additionally, there is crowd sourced wisdom through a community based support model offered at CCCHelp.Info. The technology platform can be scaled up and down to handle 1 M+ users when needed, but without needing to build the data center capacity for the peak needs, which results in a more cost effective approach.

Mandy asked about the interaction back and forth between the colleges' legacy systems and the new applications, and Tim explained that most of the new applications are being written as portlets. Portlets are not web pages, but instead are applications that work within a portal environment. A career exploration portlet, for example, could run within a college's webpage or portal, or sometimes within another application. The idea is to build all of the system wide portlets so that they are: shareable with colleges, adopt the look and feel of a college's portal, modular, re-arrange-able, reconfigurable, accept a college's single sign-on, and can be sequenced to encourage elements that we want students to be aware of. The amount of information that is stored centrally, and that is passed back and forth locally has not yet been determined. Input will need to be gathered from this committee and from relevant constituencies probably within the workgroups that operate underneath this steering committee. The applications will be developed with business rules and recommender systems similar to those used by Amazon to help suggest pathways for students to follow.

The Education Planner and Degree Audit system are probably connected together in the minds of the legislature, and we definitely want to have ones that work well together. Some colleges already have one or the other, but for those colleges who do not, we want to have an excellent offering for the system. The governance model that will probably work best for this project is to have those colleges which are interested in piloting participating in the workgroups that have significant input into the development. Those pilots may end up developing into steering committees for the applications themselves in the future. Chelley asked about the meaning of "governance" and Tim clarified that the detail oriented work (what some might refer to as "ownership") will be done by the groups that are piloting the applications that are developed. Data to help these programs work effectively will be coming from electronic transcripts, articulation with C-ID and ASSIST, and the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory; so this grant will be providing support for those three programs as well. The new applications will support the Education Planners that already exist in the system as well.

The SPEEDE server in Texas uses legacy technology that forms a single point of failure as well as a system that is far from secure in today's world, so the goal is to switch to an EdExchange system that will modernize the structure. Work on furthering the system in which transcripts will be sent directly via a point to point network is occurring.

The expansion of eTranscript CA will involve:
1) Fully funding eTranscript CA for all CCC's to bring all colleges on board.
2) Offer mini-grants to fully implement the CA Electronic Transcript elements (IGETC, GE, SB1440) with eTranscript CA.
3) Provide vendors with a CA eTranscript Verfication Service to standardize data.
4) Participate in PESC EdExchange Project to replace SPEEDE service
5) Build Open Source California 2.0 leveraging PESC EdExchange. This will be a next generation system and will be free to the community college system. It will allow colleges to be able to send and receive transcripts without a yearly fee. The Chancellor's Office will pay the fee. Colleges that are on Parchment, or with other vendors, will be provided with the electronic transcript standard, so that theirs will match the others in the system. (Currently other formats don't quite match which slows down processing.

Stephanie wondered how many colleges currently have hybrid electronic transcript capability, where they can send, but not receive. Tim noted that is common; in fact, the colleges that are fully implemented with the ability to send, receive and respond to an electronic request are primarily those that participated in the pilot. Many colleges can only push out transcripts upon request, and others can only store them as electronic documents. The goal is to be able to facilitate colleges' ability to integrate the transcript into an education planner or degree audit system, as data (because storing it as pdf, is not data).

Part of the focus of the EPI will be to help with the electronic transcript work, the ASSIST project and C-ID where needed. ASSIST is largely based upon a history of agreement, and as such is very textual in nature, which computers cannot read or use for articulation. Therefore one part of the effort to rebuild ASSIST is to move the text to computer readable format. EPI will help with funding the project manager position, CCC to CCC articulation, acceleration of existing articulation to computer readable, and implementation of web services. Additionally, this project will provide funding to support and accelerate C-ID, as well as building web services that will make it possible to access the data.

Governance:
The Technology Center has been working with the Chancellor's Office to build a governance structure for the three initiatives that is cohesive and does not duplicate efforts. The project directors for all of the grants will report out to the Telecommunication and Technology Advisory Committee (TTAC) which is an existing committee that will be the main overarching body for all three grants. Underneath TTAC will be the Directors Collaborative,(made up of the directors of EPI, CAI and OEI, in addition to existing project directors) which will make sure that work is not being duplicated between the grants, communication is effective, and resources are used efficiently with respect to overlapping areas of need. For example, last week the Collaborative discussed sharing of data analytics between the three initiatives. Underneath TTAC and the Directors Collaborative are the EPI, CAI, and OEI Steering Committees which will have representation from constituent groups throughout the CCC system. Each steering committee will have several work groups that complete work that needs to be done in different categories, and in some cases may involve piloting groups which eventually may become steering committees for those elements in the projects. Work groups for the EPI Steering Committee will probably include: Articulation/Curriculum Inventory and Education Planning/Degree Audit. There are also several committees that will have work that crosses over the work between the three initiatives: Student Services and Portal Steering Committee, to ensure continuity and ease of use for all of the elements that the student will come in contact with through the college or system wide portal; Professional Development Committee for overlapping areas of professional development, training and information to faculty and staff in the system; and the Technical Advisory Committee, which will oversee the technical aspects of all three projects. There will be a single platform that will support all three projects and the goal is to integrate parts and make use of existing committees and structures within the system where possible.

All of the applications are going to be developed as portlets so that they can be modularized. A college will be able to pull a portlet into their college portal or into another application in their college portal so that it will all look and function as one integrated system. Therefore, for example, those colleges that are using the Adapt Courseware for modularized orientation; might be able to open or plug an assessment portlet developed by CAI into the Adapt Courseware platform. Tim has been asked why an online orientation for the system isn't in one of these projects, but if it is a priority, it can be developed to go into the student services portal. Mandy asked about whether there was ongoing funding for updating elements that otherwise quickly become out of date. Bonnie explained that the current grant is ongoing for the next five years, and then the grant can be rebid. This is part of an ongoing allocation in the Matriculation Budget for Student Success and should remain a priority item. The goal is to meet an aggressive timetable and have an education planner and degree audit system ready by the end of the calendar year of 2015. The Governor and the legislature are eager to see these projects make

rapid progress. The next steps involve: hiring staff, forming the governance committees, developing the pilot committees and doing an extensive environmental scan both within the CC system, and in other states, as well as looking at what vendor offerings are available. To meet the timeline, the committee will probably need to meet online about once a month, and then in person perhaps quarterly. Karen was concerned about having enough time to get information back from constituent groups, and Tim felt that there would be time to get feedback from them prior to when he is hoping to get an RFP out in May or June. The workgroups that will be formed for the grant will meet more frequently, monthly at a minimum. Tim will be sending out an invitation to the system looking for colleges to pilot; however the responses will need to include institutional support from counselors, IT, Academic Senate and so on, not just a letter from the CEO. This is a process that needs input from all constituent groups.

Action Item:
Committee members can view the timeline and plan at CCCEdplan.org

Approval of the Charter and Election of Officers:
Gary Bird read through the Charter establishing the Education Planning Initiative Steering Committee including the Purpose/Responsibilities and Committee Composition and Governance. The Committee shall:
- Review progress and provide input on program planning.
- Provide recommendations to the Grantee and CCCCO on program activities.
- Review program outcomes and approve an independent Annual Program Review, conducted by an independent review organization, and submit it to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.
- Solicit input from respective constituent groups to inform the committee.
- Communicate program status to respective constituent groups and colleges.

Tim explained that the RP group is acting as the independent Annual Program Review Committee and will be responsible for measuring progress on the objectives in the grant. Cynthia expressed a concern that faculty and other end users would want to participate more fully in the workgroup tasks, and Tim encouraged interested faculty and staff to participate in the critical tasks of the workgroups that will be formed. Additionally, all members were concerned that the pilot colleges have representation from a variety of schools types, both rural and urban, as well as both small and large colleges. Tim agreed that the goal is to develop an Educational Planner and Degree Audit system that will work for all of the colleges in the system and the best way to achieve that is to have pilot colleges that represent the spectrum of the system.

Patrick noted that members of the Department of Finance are sent copies of the minutes, and additionally, they have the right to sit in or listen in on meetings, which is beneficial to the system. Tim noted that the minutes of the meetings will be posted on the website, and will be sent out to the list serve as well.

Tim asked for a vote to approve the charter, and the charter was unanimously approved.
Matt Coombs nominated himself as Chair of the committee and was unanimously approved.
Mandy nominated Dennis Bailey as Vice-Chair and he was also unanimously approved by the committee.

Over the next few months the project team will need to meet with the EPI Steering Committee to create and follow a plan for ongoing development of policy and process related items to ensure the program can operate legally, effectively, and achieve the objectives of the grant. It will be necessary to come up with some policy to meet the objectives of the grant. Additionally, the annual report will need to be developed. The Steering Committee and the RP group will need to work to put the report together, and later it will be sent to the Chancellor's Office and then up to the legislature and the Governor's office.

Project Progress to Date:
Patrick explained that Janet Napolitano recently expressed a strong desire to get more CCC students to attend UCs and directed her CTO to work with the community college system to build a portal to help students with transfer paths. The Chancellor's Office is now in the early stages of trying to move toward something that is more inter-segmental and integrated into what the community colleges are doing rather than developing a UC specific portal in isolation. Ideally the student planner will be integrated into the campus education planning tool and system which would be much more usable by students. With the current UC planner, the student has to retype their entire transcript into the system. In an integrated system that step would happen automatically.

The Foundation for CCCs received a grant from Kresge with the purpose of messaging students about new rules for student success, program of study and registration priority. The result was an independent website called Step Forward. It is not integrated and was built to satisfy a grant requirement, but ultimately it would be useful to repurpose some of the elements for use in a portal.

Patrick expressed an opinion that research into better defining a student goal is needed. Right now it is asked very bluntly on CCCApply and it does not seem to be very useful or applicable to the student. It isn't used for research or data analysis because it is clearly not a well-thought out choice that is made. Eventually there should be a new MIS element and a new topology, branched or otherwise to help students to refine their thinking about why they are attending a community college and what their ultimate goals are. Chelley expressed that some colleges take "undeclared" off of the list of choices to avoid hitting the 45% limit on undeclared majors. Tim noted that career exploration should probably come before selecting a career goal in the sequencing of student tasks, and Dennis agreed that the current process is unrealistic. Sherrie strongly highlighted that Financial Aid needs to be involved in these kinds of discussions because the program that a student selects is deeply entwined with financial aid: how much, how long to pay back, whether they pay interest and so on. There are many complicated issues with respect to financial aid and the rules for loans and programs or certificates. Bonnie noted that it might be helpful to have a workgroup related to financial aid.

Tim and Bonnie have done presentations to the CCLeague, 3CDUG (Datatel Users Group), DET/CHE (Distance Education Group), CISOA (Chief Information System Officers) and CENIC (California Education and Networking). They will also be participating in a Campus Technology Town Hall in Los Angeles next month which will be simulcast at the Chancellor's Office in Sacramento, and will be attending the Academic Senate Spring Plenary and CACCRAO (Admissions and Records Group) in order to provide information to as many constituent groups as possible about the progress that is being made on all of the grants.

Director's Collaborative meetings are occurring weekly to facilitate communication between the three grant projects. The eTranscript California Steering Committee has been messaged about the future of eTranscript California and the need for more adoption of electronic transcripts. The CCCApply Steering Committee received an overview of EPI and how it will interact with CCCApply. C-ID, ASSIST, and Curriculum Inventory have all been contacted about the interactions with the EPI as well. Additionally team building is occurring as staff is hired for the project. Kevin Flash will be the Statewide Program Manager for Education Planning and will work with eTranscript CA as well as providing coordination and support for C-ID, ASSIST and Curriculum Inventory. Carlo Santos will be the Statewide Program Manager for Online Student Services working with the Student Services Portal and User Experience as well as coordination with CCCApply, the Student Help Desk, and CCCHelp.info. The next steps will be hiring project managers to fill out the team and help with the daily work on the projects.

One of the next steps is to do environmental scans regarding Student Services, Education Planning and Degree Audit, to determine what is being done internally, as well as what other systems and states are doing.

Survey Review:
Tim asked for committee help in reviewing a survey that will be sent out soon to the system. There is an existing Student Services Survey that LeBaron has send out for several years to Distance Education coordinators; they are required to complete the survey, so it has a 100% response rate. People in the Online Education Initiative put together a survey to go out with the Distance Education Survey. Anita Crowley is a specialist in online student services and she helped develop it. The surveys will be combined so that student services for online education and also for the education planning grant will be gathered together.

LeBaron emphasized that the Distance Education Coordinators are responsible for making sure that the survey is returned, they are a Single Point of Contact (SPOC), but they will gather the information by consulting with a Student Services Professional (perhaps a Dean of Instruction or Chief Student Services Officer) and record the name of the person who assists them with the Student Services information. Stephanie was concerned that the DE Coordinator would answer the questions regarding student services for online students, rather than student services that are provided online. Additionally, other committee members were concerned that inaccurate or incomplete information might be submitted if the DE Coordinator did not consult with Student Services personnel. LeBaron clarified that the DE Coordinators know that the survey needs to be completed with student service personnel input and that it is for all student services for all students that are provided online, and not just services for online students. LeBaron and Tim will send a message out to the list serves prior to the survey being sent out, so that CISSOs expect the survey. After the survey is returned, LeBaron will add the student services contact from the returned survey to the automatic pdf response list so that both the DE coordinator and the student services contact will receive a pdf with the complete responses that were submitted.

The committee reviewed the expanded survey and made suggestions about where topics should be expanded or separated into separate categories in order to elicit clearer information on areas where student services are being provided online and the extent to which those services are offered. Bookstore, financial aid and several other categories cover a broad range of services which may differ in the level that a campus provides online services. LeBaron will take the survey to the OEI Steering Committee meeting on April 4th with five days turnaround time on comments, so that there is enough time for complete information to be provided in the 60 day time period allowed for responding.

Tim would like to use the results of the survey to determine areas of potential need for expanded student service offerings. Chelley felt that enrollment priority and identification of enrollment priority would be important items, as well as Veteran identification. Matt suggested that recording whether online solutions used were offered by vendors, or were homegrown solutions, would also be useful. Additionally, it might be important to determine if colleges were interested in an online solution, and if so, what level of priority they would give it. Cynthia gathered a fair amount of information from colleges as part of her dissertation, and the committee expressed interested in viewing that information when it is available. There was some discussion on changing from check marks to a scale of 1-5 or 1-3 on the survey to provide more information. LeBaron and Tim will look at whether that is feasible or whether it makes it too difficult to do tabulation. There will be a comment section at the end of the survey for colleges which want to provide additional information.

Action Item:
Cynthia will send her information out to the list serve and LeBaron will send out the compilation of the results from the last survey as well.

Education Planning:
A counseling survey was done about a year and a half ago which showed that 40% of colleges were not using a computer based education planning tool. Tim thinks that many colleges have purchased a tool, but have not yet implemented it successfully. Stephanie thought that many colleges are a step above using paper, with some perhaps using an Excel spreadsheet or

something similar. Tim would like to get current information about Education Planners and Degree Audit systems used in the community colleges. Do the colleges have one? If so which one? Was it purchased or developed in house? Does the college have one that they have not yet implemented? If the college does not yet have one that is working, what is the reason? Is it money? Is it buy-in? What does the college need to make it viable?

Lucinda noted that some of her conversations seem to have to do with Banner products and the lack of ASSIST support, as well as the fact that they don't know what support will be likely. Dennis noted that the Student Success Act caused many colleges to implement education planners, but they wouldn't have if they hadn't been forced to.

Tim asked if certificates and degrees were easier to process than transfesr because they don't require ASSIST, but Stephanie clarified that does not necessarily simplify the process. She finds that with DegreeWorks some pathways can be done. Dennis confirmed that transfer usually ends up being done at the end rather than when a student first arrives.

Chelley suggested a question regarding the ability of the student to use the system for exploration and planning before seeing a counselor for authentication of the final plan.

Cynthia asked about the ability of the system to capture the same feel, features, meaning and power online that can be captured on paper. What are the components of the system? She had 40 categories and components. Tim asked about getting a copy of those components.

Tim thought that the priority for the system would be on the education planner because the legislature requires it. However, Stephanie thought that the degree audit was needed to build the education plan and to help students track their progress toward their goal. Victor noted the importance of the integration between education planner, degree audit and Student Information System in real time. Matt agreed that whatever is developed needs to feed into 112 different systems and there needs to be a data integration system. The SB1440 verifications from CSU on whether or not students are on track are overwhelming the community colleges.

The Education Planning Initiative will need to relate strongly with the Online Education Initiative. Patrick asked about campus to campus articulation and whether that has to be re-articulated, and members confirmed that regional agreements do need to be updated and re-evaluated every year. C-ID might be a means to do that, but it will need to be a robust system. Out of state credit and CTE credit also involves extra work. Dennis noted that CSU has more flexibility in what they accept as equivalent, whereas the community colleges don't want to mess up a student by saying something equates when the final decision will happen at the CSU or UC. It does help if a student earns a 1440 degree and those are the first priority for C-ID.

Degree Audit:
What additional questions need to be asked with respect to Degree Audit systems?
Some think of DegreeWorks as the main option, are there any good homegrown systems?
Cynthia explained that the homegrown Degree Audit system at San Diego Community College works very well. They can do the audit up front and then translate it into an education plan. They are a three college district and the system works beautifully. Unfortunately or fortunately they are going to PeopleSoft in three years.

Chelley suggested that respondents might be asked to "describe the process used to evaluate outside transcripts."

Matt noted that some schools can't integrate with DegreeWorks, others only use Ellusian, and the Banner schools are on DegreeWorks, while Decision Academics is used with the major universities, Red Lantern is used by some and then finally there are homegrown solutions, it is a very segmented field.

Tim is also looking at counseling tools and ways to leverage technology so that counselors can reach more students. He has a copy of the questions and will try to get the results from

"Technology in Advising Use in Higher Education" done by the National Academic Advising Asociation. Stephanie noted that revisions might be necessary for the community college system, since that association is for 4 year institutions.

Action Item:
Tim will send out the draft survey for committee members to look at.

Committee Articulation:
The role of the Student Services Portal Committee will be to work on the portlets that will go into a structured pathway or checklist that is customized for each student. Some of the portlets might relate to Veteran's, childcare, and so on. These would be customizable Student Services elements. The goal is to have a streamlined, cohesive experience for students when they use the portlets. Committee members felt that the Student Services Portal Committee should have: programmatic representatives (eg. financial aid), students, counseling staff, and student success staff in addition to the representatives generated prior to this meeting. Additionally, Sherrie Padilla, Norberto Quiroz, Victor DeVore, Chelley Maple, Stephanie Dumont, and Martha Robles are interested in acting as EPISC representatives on the committee.

EPI committee members felt that the Education Planning Pilot Committee should contain other experts in the areas of: Financial Aid, EOPS, Non-credit, Degree Audit Experience, and Education Planning Experience. Members of EPISC that are interested in being representatives are: Cynthia Rico, Denice Inciong, and Matt Coombs.

Next Meeting:
A meeting poll will be sent out to determine a date for an online meeting in about a month.

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