REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
<u>REGULAR MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE</u>
College of the Redwoods
- **Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road– Board Room – SS 202**
- **Crescent City: 883 W Washington Blvd, Rooms E-2 and E-3**

March 15, 2019 – 1:00 pm
AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Introductions and Public Comments:** Members of the audience are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Academic Senate

3. **Approve Academic Senate Minutes**
    3.1 **March 1, 2019 Academic Senate Minutes** (Attachment)

4. **Action Items:**
    4.1 **Approve March 8, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations:** Sean Thomas (Attachment)
    4.2 **Senate Co-President Election**: Peter Blakemore
    4.3 **Faculty Development Funding Recommendations:** Hillary Reed (Attachment)

5. **Discussion**
    5.1 **California Virtual Campus & OEI:** Lisa Sayles (Attachment)
    5.2 **Book of the Year:** Peter Blakemore

6. **Reports**
    6.1 **Dual Enrollment:** Angelina Hill (Attachment)
    6.2 **Program Viability Committee:** Peter Blakemore
    6.3 **College Update:** Angelina Hill
    6.4 **Associated Students of College of the Redwoods (ASCR) Update:** Joshua Mata ASCR Representative

7. **Future Agenda Items:** Senators are encouraged to request to place an item on a future agenda

8. **Announcements and Open Forum**
    8.1 Senate Division Elections: Gary Sokolow
    8.2 Academic Senate Website http://internal.redwoods.edu/Senate/
    8.3 District Meeting Calendar/Website - http://internal.redwoods.edu/

9. **Adjourn**

Next Meeting: April 5, 2019

This page intentionally left blank

REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
College of the Redwoods
- **Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road– Board Room – SS 202**
- **Crescent City: 883 W Washington Blvd, Rooms E-2 and E-3**

March 1, 2019 – 1:00 pm
MINUTES

Members Present: Peter Blakemore, Gary Sokolow, Stuart Altschuler, Kristy Carlsen, Mike Dennis, Chris Gaines, Levi Gill, Will Meriwether, Shannon Mondor, Ruth Moon, Hillary Reed, Wendy Riggs, Lisa Sayles, Shemya Vaughn, Erin Wall, Angelina Hill, and Jessica Frint (support)

Members Absent: Michael Richards, Todd Olsen, and Joshua Mata

Others present: Sean Thomas, Jennifer Burlison, Tatiana Robison, Mark Winter (for Todd Olsen), Dan Calderwood (for Michael Richards), Paul Chown, and Karen Reiss (on phone)

1. **Call to Order:** Peter Blakemore called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm

2. **Introductions and Public Comments:** There were no public comments.

3. **Approve Academic Senate Minutes**

    3.1 **December 7, 2018 Academic Senate Minutes**: On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Erin Wall, the minutes of December 7, 2018 were unanimously approved.

    3.2 **February 1, 2019 Academic Senate Minute**s: On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Erin Wall, the minutes of February 1, 2019 were unanimously approved as amended.

4. **Action Items:**

    4.1 **Approve February 8, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations:** Sean Thomas was available for questions. On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Erin Wall the February 8, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations were approved unanimously through roll call vote.

    4.2 **Approve February 22, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations:** Sean Thomas was available for questions. On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Erin Wall the February 22, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations were approved unanimously through roll call vote.

    4.3 **Awarding Credit to Veterans:** Karen Reiss was available for questions. She explained that the document was emended based on the comments from members of the Senate during the prior meeting. On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Wendy Riggs the Awarding Credits to Veterans Policy was approved unanimously through roll call vote. Karen Reiss additionally mentioned that there is not an AP on course substitution, and most schools have a form. She stated the ASPC would like to discuss with Senate if

the form should be more detailed for the process. Peter Blakemore stated that this will be put on the Senate Executive Committee agenda for discussion.

4.4 **AP 4230 Grading and Academic Records Symbols:** Karen Reiss was available for questions. On a motion by Wendy Riggs, seconded by Michael Dennis the Awarding Credits to Veterans Policy was approved unanimously through roll call vote. Senators had questions about the difference between a regular withdrawal and an excused withdrawal. Senators also had questions about when this is effective, it was confirmed that the EW symbol is currently in the system and can be done now by the student providing the documentation to admissions and records.

5. **Discussion**

5.1 **Curriculum Committee Recommendations for Local Policy Changes:** Sean Thomas thanked Tatiana Robison for bringing to the Curriculum Committee's attention the issues negatively impacting students due to verbiage in our currently policy and catalog. S. Thomas explained that the attached document has two components; one involving language to the policy and the catalog and the second involving changes to the catalog. He explained that with ACCUPLACER no longer being used as a placement tool, the language in our catalog and our policy (AP 4025) needs to be changed to remove reference to placement scores from a standardized test. He stated the request is to change the language in the policy and catalog to remove the references to placement scores to **'**demonstrating completion of Intermediate Algebra with official high school or college transcripts'. S.Thomas stated that the Curriculum Committee recommends for the removal of the ACCUPLACER references to be removed as soon as possible, then ASPC can tasked to work on the policy and review Area D3 in depth. Senators agreed to ask President Keith Flamer to include new language to make an interim AP 4025 for the removal of references to placement testing. Sean Thomas explained that the second part of the attachment includes the Curriculum Committee's recommendations to address language in the catalog under 'Limitations to coursework that can be applied to an Associate Degree'. He explained that the Curriculum Committee recommends removing the first, third and last bullets from the catalog. These changes will be reflected in the next catalog.

5.2 **Senate Leadership Taskforce Update**: Chris Gaines and Mark Winters reminded the Senate of the advantages and disadvantages they had listed for the current Senate Leadership structure. He stated that the taskforce reviewed the senate structures at Mendocino, Shasta, and Siskiyou for their length of service, reassigned time, and leadership duties. He stated the taskforce suggested a Vice-President, President, Past-President model. He explained that this would be a three year system with possible extension on the term. He informed Senators that the researched colleges all had term limits. He stated that they showed a typical 40% reassigned time for presidents and they did not find any that were 60%. With the current structure at CR of 40% for each co-president, the taskforce discussed having reassigned time of 60%/20% for a President and Vice-President model. He also stated that they found that it was unusual to have a support staff and that the election process was different at other colleges which should be discussed further as well. Senators agreed that this should come back as discussion at next meeting. Additionally, it was requested that the taskforce bring a bulleted list of their suggestions for the recommended new structure for Senate's review.

6.   **Reports**

6.1   **Goals Alignment:** Paul Chown explained the attachment for the Vision for Success Goals and stated that it was based off of the academic year of 2016-2017 metrics. He summarized each of the goals; Completion, Transfer, Unit Accumulation, Workforce, and Equity. He stated that the IEC has met numerous times and reviewed the goals and felt confident about them.

6.2   **California Virtual Campus & OEI:** Lisa Sayles explained that there have been significant changes for the OEI exchange. She explained how the OEI exchange system created for the consortium colleges to exchange courses has been removed and replaced with a cross-enrollment automated platform that functions through the California Virtual Campus. She explained that this is now the CVC-OEI and it is one website. She explained there are three main areas on the site; Finish faster online, Online Transfer Degrees, and Student Resources. She showed Senators how each of these worked and how to navigate the site. Questions were asked about what the college needed to do in order to be part of the OEI and if we had the technology needed. Lisa Sayles confirmed that the college did have the technology. Lisa Sayles stated that we had to sign an agreement and needed to have one faculty as a liaison to attend the quarterly meetings. She stated that a SARTCO needed to be developed for those who are reviewing courses. She stated once she sees the application packet we will know what specifically is needed. Senators expressed concerns about having the faculty needed to support being a part of the OEI. Peter Blakemore stated that this would be brought to the next Senate meeting as a discussion item if we receive the application.

6.3   **Program Viability Committee:** Peter Blakemore reported that the committee met today and last week. He stated that the committee has started to review past programs that have gone through the 4021 process as part of the new process of yearly review. He reported that the Administration of Justice program has been removed from the 4021 process and one new program, Manufacturing Tech, has been added.

6.4   **College Update:** Angelina Hill reported that the timeline of the bookstore is to have it operating in the spring of 2020. She reported that open forums will be held to ask questions on how proposals differ from the three different vendors. She also reported on staffing changes. She stated that housing which was previous under Joe Hash now is under Erica Barber in the Business Office, Ericka Barber was previously overseeing I.T. which will be moving under Paul Chown, Marketing is moving to Molly Blakemore, Brian Van Pelt will be reporting to her about the website, and Marty Coelho will be focusing on foundations and scholarships.

6.5   **Associate Faculty Committee Update:** Stuart Altschuler reported that last Associate Faculty meeting was held in Del Norte. He stated that Peter Blakemore, Angelina Hill and Shannon Mondor also attended and the meeting was put together by Melissa Courtnage. He explained that the main issues discussed were communications related. He reported that the committee agreed that a more extensive orientation process should be incorporated before each semester for Del Norte. He stated that the goal could be to hold orientation during convocation in August and during Flex activities in January. He reported that the committee discussed thoughts about a Liaison for Associate Faculty in Del Norte and about spoke about ensuring that the Associate Faculty page of the CR website stays updated and complete.

6.6   **Associated Students of College of the Redwoods (ASCR) Update:** Joshua Mata ASCR Representative was not in attendance.

7.   **Future Agenda Items:** There were no agenda requests.

8.   **Announcements and Open Forum**

-    Lisa Sayles announce that on Friday, March 29th DE will be hosting an all-day Ed Tech session, all are invited.

8.1   Academic Senate Website http://internal.redwoods.edu/Senate/
8.2   District Meeting Calendar/Website - http://internal.redwoods.edu/

9.   **Adjournment:** On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Michael Dennis, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm.

Public Notice—Nondiscrimination
College of the Redwoods does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. College of the Redwoods is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats. Please contact Academic Senate Support, 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, Eureka, CA 95501, (707) 476-4259: Office Hours, M – F 8:30 am – 5:00 pm (hours vary due to meeting schedules).

This page intentionally left blank

College of the Redwoods
Summary of Course Changes: March 8, 2019

LEGEND

NEW Course: Creation of New Course
Revised Course: Adjustment to COR of Existing Course
Replacing Course: Will replace an Existing Course
Inactivation: Inactivated Course
Distance Ed: Approved/Renewed for DE Modality in comments
Dual Enr: Approved for Dual Enrollment at HS specified in comments

Large Format: Committee informed of intent to offer large capacity sections
IMF: Committee informed of intent to charge Instructional Materials Fee
Units or Hours: Units for Credit courses, Contact Hours for Noncredit Courses
Credit Type: C (Credit) or N (Noncredit)
UC or CSU Transfer: A (Approved for Transfer) or P (Pending Transfer Approval)
CR GE: A (Approved) or R (Renewed) for the Local GE Pattern

Dept	Course #	Title	Proposal Type	Units (C) or Hours (N) [Lec/Lab]	Credit Type	UC Transfer	CSU Transfer	CR GE	Comments
SPAN	1A	Elementary Spanish I	Distance Ed	4.0 [4.0/0]	C	A	A	A	Newly approved modality: Online
SPAN	1B	Elementary Spanish II	Distance Ed	4.0 [4.0/0]	C	A	A	A	Newly approved modality: Online
ENGL	1L	English 1A Cohort Lab	Inactivation	0.5 [0/0.5]	C	-	A	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. This course has been replaced by ENGL-1S, which provides co-requisite support for students in ENGL-1A.
ENGL	53A	English Lab for ENGL 1A	Inactivation	0.5-1.0 [0/0.5-1.0]	C	-	A	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. This course is rendered obsolete by new English support curriculum, and by creation of new (free, drop-in) tutoring services offered by ASC.
ENGL	53B	English Lab for ENGL 1B	Inactivation	0.5-1.0 [0/0.5-1.0]	C	-	A	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. This course is rendered obsolete by new English support curriculum, and by creation of new (free, drop-in) tutoring services offered by ASC.
ENGL	54	English Lab for Arts, Humanities, and Communications	Inactivation	0.5-1.0 [0/0.5-1.0]	C	-	A	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. This course is rendered obsolete by new English support curriculum, and by creation of new (free, drop-in) tutoring services offered by ASC.

Dept	Course #	Title	Proposal Type	Units (C) or Hours (N) [Lec/**Lab**]	Credit Type	UC Transfer	CSU Transfer	CR GE	Comments
ENGL	**55**	**English Lab for Behavioral and Social Sciences**	Inactivation	0.5-1.0 [0/**0.5-1.0**]	C	-	A	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. This course is rendered obsolete by new English support curriculum, and by creation of new (free, drop-in) tutoring services offered by ASC.
ENGL	**102**	**Developing Reading and Writing**	Inactivation	4.5 [4.0/**0.5**]	C	-	-	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. AB 705 requires that college placement policies give students the best possible chance of completing transfer-level English within a year, and CR data indicates students will maximize their change at completion by going directly into ENGL-1A. This change also supports student equity by eliminating disproportionate impact through placement.
ENGL	**150**	**Precollegiate Reading and Writing**	Inactivation	3.5 [3.0/**0.5**]	C	-	-	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. AB 705 requires that college placement policies give students the best possible chance of completing transfer-level English within a year, and CR data indicates students will maximize their change at completion by going directly into ENGL-1A. This change also supports student equity by eliminating disproportionate impact through placement.
MATH	**380**	**Elementary Algebra**	Inactivation	5.0 [5.0/**0**]	C	-	-	-	Course inactivated, effective Fall 2019. Per AB 705, all students will be placed 'above' this course. Algebra review courses, Math Lab, and a math support course specific to CHEM-2 are available for students who need additional support or review.

Dept	Course #	Title	Proposal Type	Units (C) or Hours (N) [Lec/**Lab**]	Credit Type	UC Transfer	CSU Transfer	CR GE	Comments
MATH	**130**	**Foundations of Algebra for Math Intensive Fields**	NEW Course	4.0 [3.0/**1.0**]	C	-	-	A	NEW Course, effective Fall 2019. This course is designed as an algebra foundations class for students who have not taken Algebra 2 or Integrated Math 3 in high school and are interested in majoring in a math intensive field (BSTEM). AB 705 compliant placement recommendations note that students who have not had Algebra 2 or Integrated Math 3 in high school are highly unlikely to be successful in Math 30/25 (College Algebra/Trigonometry). This course will give students the content they need in an AB 705 compliant manner, allowing them opportunity to complete a transfer-level math course within one year. Course Learning Outcomes 1. Identify and apply appropriate techniques to simplify and evaluate expressions and also while solving equations and inequalities. 2. Evaluate and interpret general functions symbolically, numerically, and graphically. 3. Use mathematical modeling and graphical techniques to solve problems.

Dept	Course #	Title	Proposal Type	Units (C) or Hours (N) [Lec/**Lab**]	Credit Type	UC Transfer	CSU Transfer	CR GE	Comments
GUID	**252**	**Communication through Adapted Art**	NEW Course	36 Hours	N	-	-	-	NEW Course. The Art department has experienced over the past few years many students enrolled in their transferable art classes who are not able to successfully meet the Student Learning Outcomes for the class without significant alteration to the coursework. It is hoped that offering a non-credit, non-transferable class for students with disabilities will allow for greater student success in art and another way to communicate their creativity and feelings. Course Learning Outcomes 1. Interact with students and express ideas in class. 2. Use materials and equipment correctly and appropriately. 3. Create 2D and 3D art representations. 4. Plan and create artwork using knowledge of color. 5. Explain or demonstrate how art functions as communication.
FT	**206**	**Confined Space Awareness**	Revised Course	8 Hours	N	-	-	-	Regular five-year review. Minor updates to course content. Course Learning Outcomes 1. Describe regulations governing operations in confined spaces. 2. Identify and describe the differences between confined spaces and permit-required confined spaces.

Dept	Course #	Title	Proposal Type	Units (C) or Hours (N) [Lec/Lab]	Credit Type	UC Transfer	CSU Transfer	CR GE	Comments
FT	207	**Firefighter Survival**	Revised Course	16 Hours	N	-	-	-	Regular five-year review. Minor updates to course content. <u>Course Learning Outcomes</u> 1. Demonstrate an understanding of firefighter survival terminology and survival attitude. 2. Demonstrate situational awareness and problem-solving strategies to be more self-reliant in an emergency.
ANTH	6	**Intro to Forensic Anthropology**	Revised Course	3.0 [3.0/0]	C	A	A	A/R	Course revised to remove recommended prep, update catalog description, renew for CR GE Area B, and add new approval for CR GE Area A. <u>Course Learning Outcomes</u> 1. Identify primary skeletal markers used in the estimation of age, sex, ancestry, and stature. 2. Analyze and interpret skeletal remains based upon anthropological concepts and data. 3. Synthesize examples of cultural and ethical applications in the field of forensic anthropology.

This page intentionally left blank

Last Name	First Name	Presenter	Status/Site	Past Funding	Complete	Description & Location of Activity	Event Dates	Amount Requested	Recommend to Senate for Funding
Aiello	Andrew	No	Eureka - AF	Yes	Yes	AFCA Conference	1/6/2019 - 1/9/2019	$400.56	$401
Borba	Frank	No	Eureka - AF	Yes	Yes	AFCA Conference	1/7/2019 - 1/10/2019	$384	Request to resubmit
Charity	Brian	No	Eureka - AF	Yes	Yes	AFCA Conference	1/6/2019 - 1/9/2019	$348	Request to resubmit
Christensen	Gary	No	Eureka - AF	No	Yes	NCECA National Council on Education for the Ceramic Arts, Claytopia	3/27/2019 - 3/30/2019	$1,449	$750
Richards	Michael	No	Eureka - FT	No	Yes	California Automotive Teachers (CAT) Spring Conference	4/26/2019 - 4/27/2019	$920	$920
Riggs	Wendy	Yes	Eureka - FT	Yes	Yes	Human Anatomy and Physiology Annual Conference	5/22/2019 - 5/26/2019	$1,475	$1,475
Riggs	Wendy	Yes	Eureka - FT	Yes	Yes	Online Teaching Conference	6/17/2019 - 6/19/2019	$1,173	Round #3, two requests submitted
Sarvinski	Silas	No	Eureka - AF	No	Yes	Ecofarm Conference	1/23/2019 - 1/26/2019	$787	$787
Valente	Megan	No	Eureka - AF	No	Yes	NFCA Coaches Clinic	1/25/2019 - 1/26/2019	$674	Request to resubmit
Wall	Erin	No	Eureka - FT	No	Yes	Reading Apprenticeship (STEM Faculty 101 Course)	3/18/2019 - 5/5/2019	$750	$750
White	Maggie	No	Eureka - FT	Yes	Yes	National Fastpitch Coaches Association Convention	12/5/2018 - 12/9/2018	$2,001	$2,000
							Total:	$10,361	$7,083

Beginning Total This Year	$22,000
Senate Approved Funding - Round 1	$6,366
Recommended Funding - Round 2	$7,083
Difference from previous round/s	$2,376
Balance Remaining	$10,927

This page intentionally left blank

California Community Colleges | Online Education Initiative

COURSE DESIGN RUBRIC

This page is intentionally left blank for printing purposes. If you plan to print the document for your own reference, you may check the page numbers to print just what you need.

Online Course Review Information

Date:	
College:	
Instructor Name:	
Local Course ID:	
Course C-ID: (if applicable)	
Reviewer Name:	

Review Type: ☐ Self   ☐ Peer   ☐ Lead   ☐ Accessibility

Information below this line will be completed by the Lead Reviewer

Aligned Sections:

☐ A	☐ B	☐ C	☐ D

The OEI Course Design Rubric was developed in 2014 by the OEI Professional Development work group to ensure that all courses offered as part of the initiative promote student success and meet existing regulatory and accreditation requirements. It has undergone revisions and updates since then in response to changes in available instructional technology and feedback from both instructors and reviewers.

Courses that are peer reviewed and aligned to the OEI Course Design Rubric:

- have met the CCC's highest level of design standards to support online student success and
- can be made available for cross enrollment to students at participating colleges.

The Rubric is divided into four sections.

SECTIONS A-C

Section A: Content Presentation

The 14 elements for quality course design in this section address how content is organized and accessed in the course management system. Key elements include course navigation, learning objectives, and access to student support information.

Section B: Interaction

The six elements in this section address instructor-initiated and student-initiated communication. Key elements of quality course design covered in this section include regular effective contact, both between and among instructors and students.

Section C: Assessment

The eight elements in this section address the variety and effectiveness of assessments within the course. Key elements include the alignment of objectives and assessments, the clarity of instructions for completing activities, and evidence of timely and regular feedback.

Following a review by a team of trained faculty peer reviewers, each element in Sections A-C will be marked in one of three ways:

Incomplete:

The element is missing or present to a degree that does not adequately support student success in online learning.

Aligned:

The element is present and effectively designed to support student success in online learning.

Additional Exemplary Elements:

This designation recognizes design choices that are aligned *and* go even further to enhance the student experience in the online learning environment.

SECTION D

Accessibility

> The 16 elements in this section are reviewed to determine if a student using assistive technologies will be able to access the instructor's course content as required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (also known as "508 Compliance"). The accessibility elements in Section D focus on instructor-generated content that is primarily under the control of faculty when developing a course. Since Section D addresses elements that are required to be present, the elements in this section, when applicable, are only marked as **Incomplete or Aligned**.

Creative Commons Licensed Content

In addition to preparing courses for the CVC Exchange, the OEI Course Design Rubric is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License and can be used as:

- A roadmap for instructors designing new online courses.
- A tool for instructors seeking to update or improve existing courses.
- The foundation for starting a campus-based POCR (Peer Online Course Review) process.

Visit CVC.edu for more information on the OEI, the Rubric, and the Course Review Process. We welcome your feedback and suggestions.

Table of Sections

Section A: Content Presentation

Section B: Interaction

Section C: Assessment

Section D: Accessibility

Section A: Content Presentation - Unit Objectives

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
A1: Placement of Objectives		
☐ Objectives are not included in individual learning units.	☐ Objectives are included in the individual learning units.	☐ Objectives are consistently placed and easy to locate in each learning unit.
A2: Clarity of Objectives		
☐ Objectives do not include demonstrable learning outcomes.	☐ Objectives consistently include demonstrable learning outcomes.	☐ Objectives are written in language that is student-centered.
A3: Alignment of Objectives		
☐ Learning unit content is not aligned with or sufficient to meet unit objectives.	☐ Content is clearly aligned with and sufficient to meet the learning unit objectives.	☐ The connections between content and learning unit objectives are made explicitly clear to the students.

Criteria A1 – A3 Comments:

Section A: Content Presentation - Use of the CMS

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
A4: Course Navigation		
☐ Navigation and content flow are not easily determined.	☐ Navigation and content flow are easily determined by the user.	☐ Clearly labeled tutorial materials explaining how to navigate the specific course are included.
A5: Unit-level Chunking		
☐ Content is not presented in distinct learning units or modules.	☐ Content is meaningfully segmented into distinct units or modules to aid learning.	☐ Learning units or modules are consistently structured and sequenced to reduce cognitive load.
A6: Page-level Chunking		
☐ Page content is not chunked in manageable segments using headings, making online reading difficult.	☐ Page content is chunked in manageable segments using headings that facilitate online reading.	☐ Page content uses descriptive headings and subheadings that enhance student understanding of the material.
A7: Effective Use of Course Management (CMS) Tools		
☐ CMS tools that could reduce the labor intensity of learning are not used effectively.	☐ CMS tools are used to reduce the labor-intensity of learning and streamline access to materials and activities for students.	☐ CMS tools are used to provide integrated and innovative learning materials and activities for students.
A8: Effective Use of Multimedia		
☐ Content is presented primarily using one medium.	☐ A variety of media, such as text, audio, video, images and/or graphics are used throughout.	☐ Multimedia is used creatively throughout the course to facilitate student-centered learning.

Criteria A4 – A8 Comments:

Section A: Content Presentation - Learner Support

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
A9: Instructions		
☐ Instructions for working with course content are missing or incomplete (e.g., links to articles or videos are provided without any guidance for how the student should work with the material).	☐ Course design includes instructions for learners to work with content in meaningful ways (e.g., guiding students to take notes during a video; explaining what to look for in an article, etc.).	☐ Instructions are directly embedded with the content.
A10: Learning Support		
☐ There are few or no individualized learning opportunities, such as remedial activities or resources for advanced learning.	☐ Individualized learning opportunities, such as remedial activities to support Basic Skills or resources for advanced learning, are provided.	☐ Frequent individualized learning opportunities are provided throughout the course.
A11: Learner Feedback		
☐ Learners do not have an opportunity to give anonymous feedback to the instructor regarding course design and/or course content.	☐ Learners have the opportunity to give anonymous feedback to the instructor regarding course design and/or course content after course completion.	☐ There are opportunities to give anonymous feedback both during course delivery and after course completion.

Criteria A9 – A11 Comments:

Section A: Content Presentation - Institutional Support

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
A12: Course Policies		
☐ Institutional/instructor policies relevant for learner success are not included or are difficult to find.	☐ Policies relevant for learner success (e.g., academic honesty, course drop/withdrawal, computer use, etc.) are included and easy to find.	☐ Institutional/instructor policies are provided in units or activities where they are most relevant.
A13: Student Services		
☐ Links to institutional services are not included, thus requiring students to exit the course to find support resources.	☐ Links to institutional services (such as disability services, online counseling, online tutoring, online readiness, the library, etc.) are included and clearly labeled.	☐ Links to institutional services are provided in the modules, assignments, and/or activities where they may be needed most.
A14: Technology Support		
☐ Information about and links to technology support are not included or easily found.	☐ Technology support is explained to students, and relevant contact information and/or links are easily found.	☐ Links to technology support and trouble-shooting tips are provided where they may be needed throughout the course.

Criteria A12 – A14 Comments:

Section B: Interaction - Instructor Contact

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
B1: Pre-Course Contact		
☐ Instructor does not initiate contact prior to or at the beginning of the course.	☐ Instructor initiates contact prior to or at the beginning of course.	☐ Instructor provides multiple resources to help students successfully start the course.
B2: Regular Effective Contact		
☐ The course design appears to be lacking opportunities for regular effective student contact initiated by the instructor.	☐ The course design includes regular instructor-initiated contact with students using CMS communication tools.	☐ The course design includes ample opportunities for regular effective contact using a wide variety of communication tools.
B3: Student-Initiated Contact		
☐ Instructor contact information, including expected response times, is missing or not easy to find.	☐ Students are encouraged to initiate contact with the instructor through easily accessed contact information that includes expected response times.	☐ Students are provided with multiple means of contacting the instructor and are encouraged to do so throughout the course.

Criteria B1 – B3 Comments:

Section B: Interaction - Student-to-Student Contact

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
B4: Student-Initiated Contact with Other Students		
☐ Students are not given opportunities to initiate interaction with other students in the course.	☐ Opportunities for student-initiated interaction with other students are available and encouraged.	☐ The course makes a variety of tools and methods available for student-initiated interaction to accommodate a variety of communication styles.
B5: Regular Effective Contact Among Students		
☐ Students have no or limited opportunities to engage in regular effective contact with other students (e.g., limited to a single Q&A Discussion Forum only).	☐ Regular effective contact among students is designed and facilitated to build a sense of community among learners.	☐ The design and facilitation of communication activities are responsive to the variety of cultures and communication styles in the learning community.
B6: Participation Levels		
☐ Guidelines explaining required levels of student participation are not provided.	☐ Guidelines explaining required levels of student participation (i.e., quantity and quality of interactions) are consistently provided.	☐ A rubric or equivalent grading document is included within assignments/activities to explain how participation will be evaluated.

Criteria B4 – B6 Comments:

Section C: Assessment - Effective Assessment

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
C1: Authenticity		
☐ There is little or no evidence of authenticity built into assessments.	☐ Assessment activities lead to the demonstration of learning outcomes.	☐ Assessments are designed to mimic authentic environments to facilitate transfer.
C2: Validity		
☐ Students are evaluated on performance unrelated to the stated objectives.	☐ Assessments appear to align with the objectives.	☐ Assessments match the objectives and learners are directed to the appropriate objective(s) for each assessment.
C3: Variety		
☐ Assessments are limited primarily to one type of assessment (either formative or summative).	☐ Both formative and summative assessments are used throughout the course.	☐ Multiple types of formative and summative assessments are used (research project, objective test, discussions, etc.).
C4: Frequency		
☐ Assessments are few and infrequent.	☐ Multiple assessments are administered during the duration of the course.	☐ Frequent assessments occur at regular intervals throughout the course, providing students with timely feedback on learning and performance.

Criteria C1 – C4 Comments:

Section C: Assessment - Guidance and Feedback

Incomplete	Aligned	Additional Exemplary Elements
C5: Rubrics/Scoring Guide		
☐ Rubrics or descriptive criteria for desired outcomes are not included for most assessment activities.	☐ Rubrics or descriptive criteria for desired outcomes are included in most or all assessment activities.	☐ Rubrics and/or descriptive criteria for desired outcomes include models of "good work."
C6: Assessment Instructions		
☐ Assessments include little or no instructions.	☐ Instructions clearly explain to students how to successfully complete the assessments.	☐ Instructions are written clearly and with exemplary detail to ensure understanding.
C7: Feedback		
☐ There is little to no evidence of meaningful feedback on student assessments.	☐ The course includes a clear description of how meaningful, timely feedback on assessments will be provided.	☐ Students are given clear instructions on accessing feedback in the CMS and guidance on applying feedback to improve learning and performance.
C8: Self-Assessment		
☐ There is little to no evidence that students are provided opportunities for self-assessment	☐ Opportunities for student self-assessment with feedback are present.	☐ There are multiple opportunities for student self-assessment that encourage students to seek timely additional help.

Criteria C5 – C8 Comments:

Section D: Accessibility

Instructors need to verify that content they create or add to their courses is accessible to all students. Third party tools and platforms (publisher content, LTI/Apps, etc.) procured by the college or department represent an institutional responsibility. It is important for faculty, administration, and vendors to work together to ensure that such proprietary course materials meet prevailing accessibility standards. The following were noted in this course and may require additional accessibility review by the college:

❑ LTI/Apps   ❑ Media Player   ❑ Links to 3rd party websites   ❑ Publisher content

Because the review of course accessibility is a snapshot in time, instructors and administrators should engage in an on-going effort to ensure that equitable access to instructional content is maintained in the course and that all areas of accessibility are addressed.

For information on the accessibility of services and tools made available through the California Community College Chancellor's Office CVC-OEI grant, please visit CVC.edu. For other web and information technology accessibility needs, please visit the CCC Accessibility Center.

D1: Heading Styles	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Heading styles are consistently used to aid navigation through the course when using assistive technology. Heading levels (Heading 1, Heading 2, etc.) are used in correct order. Fonts, colors, and formats (bold, italics, etc.) are not used in lieu of heading styles. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	❑	❑	❑
D1 Comments:			

D2: Lists	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Lists are created using the bullet or numbered list tool instead of being formatted manually so that lists are recognized when using a screen reader. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	❑	❑	❑
D2 Comments:			

D3: Links	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Links are identified with meaningful and unique text in place of displaying the URL. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	❑	❑	❑
D3 Comments:			

D4: Tables	N/A	Incomplete	Aligned
Column and/or row header cells are designated so that screen readers can read table cells in the correct order. A table caption is included for more complex tables. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐

D4 Comments:

D5: Color Contrast	N/A	Incomplete	Aligned
There is sufficient color contrast between the foreground text and background to avoid difficulties for students with low vision. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐

D5 Comments:

D6: Color and Meaning	N/A	Incomplete	Aligned
Color is not used as the only means of conveying information, adding emphasis, indicting action, or otherwise distinguishing a visual element. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐

D6 Comments:

D7: Images	N/A	Incomplete	Aligned
All images have appropriate alternative text, either explaining instructional value or indicating the image is decorative. Alternative text does not contain "image of", "picture of" or file extension (e.g., ".jpg"). **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations	☐	☐	☐

D7 Comments:

D8: Reading Order	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Reading order is correctly set so that content is presented in the proper sequence when using screen readers and other assistive technologies. **Check:** ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations	☐	☐	☐

D8 Comments

D9: Slides	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Slides are created using built-in accessible slide layouts with each slide having a unique title. All text is visible in Outline View to be sure that it can be read by assistive technology. **Check:** ☐ Digital Presentations	☐	☐	☐

D9 Comments:

D10: Spreadsheets	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Spreadsheets include labels for the rows and columns, detailed labels for charts, and are accompanied by textual descriptions that draw attention to key cells, trends, and totals. **Check:** ☐ Spreadsheets (e.g., Excel, Google Sheets, etc.).	☐	☐	☐

D10 Comments:

D11: Accessibility Checkers	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Files and content pages pass any built-in accessibility check available in the software. **Check:** ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Documents (e.g., MS Word) ☐ PDFs ☐ Digital Presentations ☐ Spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐

D11 Comments:

D12: Video	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
All video must have accurate captions. If a video has no audio or instructionally relevant soundtrack, a note explaining that should accompany the video. **Check:** ☐ Required video content inside the course management system or external video content linked to from within the course.	☐	☐	☐

D12 Comments:

D13: Audio	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Audio files must be accompanied by complete and accurate transcripts. **Check:** ☐ Audio files inside the course management system and external audio-only content linked to from within the course.	☐	☐	☐

D13 Comments:

D14: Flashing Content	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Blinking or flashing content, including gifs, should only be used if instructionally needed and not merely for decoration or emphasis. Flashing content must not flash more than three times in any one second period or exceed the general and red flash thresholds. **Check:** ☐ Videos ☐ Canvas Content ☐ Files, including slides, documents, etc.	☐	☐	☐

D14 Comments:

D15: Live Captions	**N/A**	**Incomplete**	**Aligned**
Live broadcast and synchronous video conferences must include a means for displaying synchronized captions if requested. **Check:** ☐ Plan for captioning any live, synchronous video events planned for the course.	☐	☐	☐

D15 Comments:

D16: Auto-play	N/A	Incomplete	Aligned
Audio and video content should not be set to auto-play. If any audio on a web page does auto-play for more than three seconds, a mechanism must be available to pause, stop, and control the volume. **Check:** ☐ Audio and video content inside the course management system or linked to from within the course.	☐	☐	☐
D16 Comments:			

Consortium Colleges

Since the inception of the CVC-OEI, many California Community Colleges have been working together to address online achievement gaps and increase student access to fully-resourced online courses that propel them toward completion. Together these colleges form the OEI Consortium.

In May 2014, a Call for Participation was issued seeking colleges wishing to participate in the pilot phase of the CVC-OEI to begin in the spring of 2015. Over half of the California Community Colleges responded. A group of 23 pilot colleges were selected that represented, along with other criteria, a diversity of college demographics, geographic location, and technology.

In May 2018, the OEI expanded the number of colleges from 23 to 56. While the first cohort focused on tutoring and readiness, the 33 new colleges have a special focus on student equity.

Original Consortium Colleges

- Antelope Valley
- Barstow College
- Butte College
- Cabrillo College
- Coastline Community College
- College of the Canyons
- Columbia College
- Foothill College
- Fresno City College

- Hartnell College
- Imperial Valley College
- Lake Tahoe Community College
- Los Angeles Pierce College
- Mira Costa College
- Monterey Peninsula College

- Mt. San Antonio College
- Mt. San Jacinto College
- Ohlone College
- Rio Hondo College
- Saddleback College
- Shasta College
- Ventura College
- West Los Angeles College

Equity Cohort

- Allan Hancock College
- American River College
- Bakersfield College
- Cerro Coso Community College
- City College of San Francisco
- Clovis Community College
- College of the Desert
- College of the Siskiyous
- Contra Costa College
- Cosumnes River College

- Cuesta College
- De Anza College
- Diablo Valley College
- El Camino College
- Evergreen Valley College
- Feather River College
- Folsom Lake College
- Gavilan College
- Glendale Community College
- Las Positas College
- Mendocino College
- Merced College
- Modesto Junior College
- Moorpark College

- Orange Coast College
- Porterville College
- Sacramento City College
- San Bernardino Valley College
- Santa Ana College
- Santa Barbara City College
- Santiago Canyon College
- Taft College
- Woodland Community College

https://cvc.edu/about-the-oei/college-participation/

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

We the undersigned are expressing our college's interest in the 2018 OEI Consortium Cohort, with a special focus on student equity and the following components:

- Culturally responsive teaching with a community of practice around online equity
- Name/gender identification for instruction and student support services, including counseling, tutoring, health services, etc.
- Pilot additional online resources integrated into Canvas for community building, student engagement, and collaboration.
- Faculty engagement in collaborative course development using OER materials in Canvas.
- Support for the development of a local, peer-faculty course review process to support equity and student success in online courses.
- Programmatic and technical preparation for Course Exchange participation.

We understand that this letter does not guarantee our participation or bind the college to joining the OEI Consortium. In addition, the signature of the Academic Senate President indicates interest and willingness to explore a resolution in support of joining the OEI Consortium but does not represent an official position of the college academic senate.

However, we would like to receive an application packet and move forward with college-wide discussions in order to remain eligible for the 2018 OEI Consortium Cohort.

_____
College

_____
CEO Signature

_____
Academic Senate President Signature

Who will serve as the primary contact for the OEI moving forward?

_____
Name/Title

_____
Phone

_____
Email

Please return the signed Letter of Interest via email to:
Justin Schultz, College Implementation Supervisor
jschultz@ccconlineed.org
650.949.7939

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

Dear Colleague,

Thank you again for your interest in the 2018 OEI Consortium Cohort! We now invite you to complete a College Self-Assessment Packet and have developed this checklist to assist you in the process.

Schedule a College Planning Team meeting (recommend setting aside two hours).

Ensure your CTO attends the January 2018 OEI / CCC Tech Center webinar (invitation will be emailed separately).

Obtain the required signatures noted in Section IV of the College Self-Assessment.

Obtain a copy of the resolution passed by your local academic senate in support of the college's participation in the OEI cohort.

Return your completed self-assessment packet, including the academic senate's resolution, no later than Thursday, March 1, 2018 to:

Karen Oeh, College Support Representative
650.949.7814
koeh@ccconlineed.org

If you need additional assistance as you move through the checklist, please do not hesitate to reach out to our Implementation Team. Again, thank you for your interest in the OEI. We look forward to working with additional college partners as we expand the consortium!

OEI Implementation Team

SECTION I: COLLEGE SELF-ASSESSMENT

The information in this section should be completed by the college's Single Point of Contact (SPOC) with input from the College Planning Team.

College _____

Contact Information

Name _____

Title _____

Email _____

Phone _____

1. Which of the following OEI tools or services is your college currently using (check all that apply):

    QuestReadiness (readiness tutorial)

    NetTutor (online tutoring)

    Cranium Cafe / ConexEd (online counseling)

    Proctorio (online proctoring)

    VeriCite (plagiarism detection)

    Are there any additional tools your college has implemented or wishes to:

2. Is the college participating in any other statewide initiatives (i.e. guided pathways, educational planning, etc.):

    Yes

    No

    If yes, which ones: _____

3. Has your college adopted the OEI Course Design Rubric?
    Yes
    Yes, but with modifications
    No, but we are open to adopting the OEI Course Design Rubric
    No, we are using another tool to guide online course design on our campus

    If yes or yes with modifications, are you using this as part of a local course approval or review process?
    Yes
    No

4. Would your college be interested in developing a local peer course review process for courses entering the exchange?
    Yes
    No
    Already developed

5. Please describe the ways your college will support faculty and courses participating in the course review process:

6. What resources and/or services do you have in place to support accessibility (508 compliance) of online instructional material?

7. Describe your distance education program and structure. Please include the full-time staff member managing or coordinating the program and his/her role.

8. What will your college uniquely bring to the OEI Consortium (i.e. specific types of courses, faculty expertise, etc.)

9. How will participating in the OEI Consortium benefit student access and program maintenance or growth at your college.

10. Please provide any data relevant to your college's online achievement gap:

11. One of the long-term goals of your college's participation in the Consortium in participation in the Course Exchange. If accepted into the Consortium, is your college prepared to:

Actively pursue a target of 10% of the college's existing online offerings listed and available to students in the Course Exchange within two semesters (or four quarters) of the college going live in the Course Exchange AND scheduling those online courses in a manner that allows students to access at least a portion of available seats via the Course Exchange (Note: Seats designated for the Course Exchange may also be accessed by local students in the event the locally designated cap is met).

Pursue a target of 20% of the college's existing online offerings listed and available to students in the Course Exchange after four semesters (eight quarters) of the college going live in the Course Exchange.

Identify faculty and courses to engage in the OEI Course Design Academy sufficient to meet the commitments listed above. An accelerated process for preparing courses will be available if the OEI Course Design Rubric is applied through a local college peer review process.

12. What programs and courses are currently impacted at your college and could benefit from increased access for students through the Course Exchange?

13. Which programs and courses have low online enrollments or cannot be offered every term, and would benefit from students enrolling at your college via the Course Exchange?

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

SECTION II: TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

The information in this section should be completed by the college's Chief Technology Officer (CTO).

Student Information System:
    Banner
    Peoplesoft
    Colleague
    Other:

Other Requirements:
    Canvas fully implemented for all online courses
        Date of implementation completion (previous CMS/LMS deactivated): _____
    Open CCC Apply enabled
    Implemented eTranscript California
    SSO/federated ID enabled for students enabled
        Please advise if SSO/federated ID is not implemented but is on a near-term
        roadmap_____

Our CTO has attended and/or viewed the January 2018 OEI/CCC Tech Center webinar, which presented a summary of the tasks required of the college/district IT staff once admitted into the OEI Consortium.

Chief Technology Officer initials: _____

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

SECTION III: COLLEGE PLANNING TEAM

Please include name and title for each entry.

Single Point of Contact (SPOC) _____

Academic Senate Representative _____

Distance Education Coordinator _____

Chief Student Services Officer _____

Chief Instructional Officer _____

Chief Technology Officer _____

IT Representative (responsible for SIS) _____

CMS/LMS Administrator _____

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

SECTION IV: REQUIRED SIGNATURES
You may have individuals sign digitally using Adobe Acrobat.

President signature: _____

Chief Instruction Officer signature: _____

Chief Student Services Officer signature: _____

Chief Technology Officer signature: _____

Distance Education Coordinator signature: _____

Academic Senate President signature: _____

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ONLINE EDUCATION
INITIATIVE

CHARTER
Consortium of the Online Education Initiative Pilot

Establishment and Authority

The Consortium of the Online Education Initiative (OEI) Pilot (Consortium) is a committee established by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). The Consortium is comprised of colleges that are committed to participate as teaching and home colleges in the initial implementation of the Online Education Initiative.

The Foothill-De Anza College District shall serve as the Fiscal Agent for the Consortium and shall be represented by the OEI Management Team.

Members of the Consortium, pursuant to the execution of the Online Education Initiative grant:

- Shall advise the OEI Management Team on operational and technical matters.

- May advise the OEI Steering Committee and the OEI Management Team on matters related to policies and procedures.

Purpose/Responsibilities

The purpose of the Consortium is to identify and make recommendations to the OEI Management Team on the operational processes and solutions to any technical issues that may arise in order to facilitate the goals and objectives of the Online Education Initiative grant. The OEI Management Team will inform the OEI Steering Committee of all recommendations from the Consortium.

In addition, the Consortium will collaborate with the CCCCO, OEI Steering Committee, and the OEI Management Team to define the functionality of the OEI ecosystem, which is intended to support the creation and delivery of a rich set of online courses and support services that meet the unique needs of all CCC students, faculty, staff, and colleges.

The Consortium colleges shall also actively promote and deliver online education within the Online Education Initiative. The Consortium colleges will leverage their existing online course activity and provide resources to assist faculty and colleges in expanding and/or enhancing their existing online course offerings.

Access | Quality | Completion

The Online Education Initiative is a project of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

The Consortium will provide structure and guidance to do the following:

- Increase growth for online course development, approval, and delivery to comply with the Legislature's intent to alleviate shortages of certain courses at local campuses.

- Facilitate robust faculty/staff orientation, professional development, and support.

- Assist in the development and delivery of comprehensive online learner readiness resources and other student support services.

- Increase the use of technologies to support online teaching and learning capabilities.

- Streamline student service delivery and the enrollment process.

Committee Composition and Governance

1. **Membership**

   a. Voting Member Representatives

      i. Each Consortium institution shall have two Voting Member Representatives: one administrator identified by the CEO or VPI and one faculty member selected by the institution's local Academic Senate. It is recommended that one of the voting members selected (either administrative or faculty) be the college's Single Point of Contact.

      ii. Each Voting Member Representative shall be the primary liaison to their respective constituent groups (administration or faculty), as well as students, for all matters related to Pilot College participation.

      iii. Two-year terms are recommended for each representative, however a Consortium institution may review and replace representatives at its discretion. Members may be reappointed to serve additional terms.

   b. Ex-officio Members

      i. The Consortium shall include the following ex-officio members:

         1. OEI Executive Director

         2. OEI Steering Committee Co-Chairs

         3. CCC Technology Center Director

         4. CCC Technology Center OEI Statewide Project Manager

         5. CCCCO Technology Director

2

6. CCCCO Dean of Academic Affairs

7. CCCCO Specialist, Student Success and Support Program

8. System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) Liaison

9. Student Success and Support Program Advisory Committee (SSSPAC) Liaison

   ii. Ex-officio members may invite members of their organization or staff to attend meetings.

   iii. Meetings shall not be scheduled for the convenience of ex-officio members or their invitees.

   iv. Ex-officio members and their invitees are non-voting.

2. **Voting Rights of Membership**

   a. Recommendations shall be determined by majority vote.

   b. Issue Resolution

      i. A decision of the majority, with supporting evidence, shall be presented to the OEI Management Team for review. The OEI Management Team shall work with associated committee(s) and/or work group(s) to address issues.

      ii. The OEI Management Team will determine whether the issue warrants consultation with the OEI Steering Committee for advisement. Should the issue need further review, the management team may take the issue to the CCCCO.

3. **Quorum**

   a. A quorum is 50% plus 1 of the active voting membership.

   b. Voting members who are not present for three consecutive meetings will be deemed inactive and will not count towards the quorum. The Co-Chairs will inform the representative and the affected college after this event in a timely manner.

   c. If a college chooses not to fill both of their representative positions, those vacant positions do not count toward a quorum.

   d. A quorum must be established, either in--person or via audio/video conference, for voting to take place.

   e. The Co-chairs have the right to continue or adjourn the meeting if a quorum is not present.

   f. A meeting at which a quorum is initially present may continue to conduct discussions. Any vote taken shall require the approval of at least a majority of the previously established quorum for that meeting.

4. **Leadership**

   a. A vote to elect a Co-Chair shall take place annually or as needed at a scheduled meeting.

3

b. The Co-Chairs shall serve staggered two-year terms. Co-Chairs may be reelected to serve additional terms.

c. The Co-Chairs shall coordinate actions of the Consortium and conduct its meetings.

d. The Co-Chairs shall be voting members.

e. The Co-Chairs may call for the establishment of subcommittees and work groups as needed to assist with designated issues or topics.

f. The Co-Chairs of the Consortium shall serve as non-voting liaisons to the OEI Steering Committee.

g. As needed, the Co-Chairs may identify other members and/or representatives to serve as additional non-voting liaisons to the OEI Steering Committee and/or its work groups.

5. **Meetings**

a. The Consortium shall determine the time and place of its meetings, provided that it meets at least quarterly.

b. The Consortium shall determine the procedures to conduct its meetings.

c. Scheduled meetings of the Consortium may be conducted in person or entirely through audio/video conference, as determined by the Co-Chairs.

d. The Co-Chairs shall provide email notice of the time and place of all meetings of the Consortium to each member of the Consortium, the OEI Management Team, and the CCCCO no fewer than seven days prior to the meeting, together with an agenda of the items to be discussed and proposed actions to be taken.

e. Guests who wish to attend Consortium meetings may do so with the approval of the Co-Chairs after providing notice of intent to the Co-Chairs by email at least three days prior to the meeting. The Co-Chairs shall provide an email copy of the meeting notice and agenda of the next meeting to that guest no later than 24 hours prior to the meeting.

f. The OEI Executive Director shall appoint a member of his / her team to:

    i.   Prepare minutes of committee meetings for the committee's approval.

    ii. Maintain a current roster of the voting and ex officio membership of the committee.

    iii. Keep a record of meeting attendance.

g. The record of meeting attendance shall be provided to the Co-Chairs and the OEI Executive Director.

4

Review and Changes to the Charter

It is expected that, when the pilot phase of the Online Education Initiative concludes, this Charter will be amended or replaced.

In addition, the Consortium may review this charter regularly, as needed, given the unique nature of the activities and agreements in the pilot-implementation and Exchange phases of the project. Review of the Charter shall be performed in consultation with the OEI Management Team.

Any changes to this Charter must be agreed upon by majority vote and the changes forwarded to the OEI Management Team.

Document History

Original document submitted by the OEI Steering Committee August 1, 2014.

Revised by the Consortium Charter Workgroup on November 18, 2015.

Approved by the OEI Consortium on December 11, 2015.

5

This page intentionally left blank

Course	Loc	Section #	CR Liaison	HS Faculty	Start date	End date	18/19 Enrollment	17/18 Enrollment for comparison
CIS 12	FHS	46855	Romero	Errin ODell	8/27/18	4/4/19	7	N/A
DM 7	FHS	46851	Sidell	Errin Odell	8/27/18	4/4/19	5	N/A
DM 7	FHS	47283	Sidell	Errin Odell	8/27/18	4/4/19	8	N/A
AG 63	FHS	46849	Hogue	Hannah Lovfald	8/27/18	12/7/18	13	10
AG 63	FHS	46850	Hogue	Hannah Lovfald	8/27/18	12/7/18	9	11
WT 53	FHS	46853	Walker	Brett Roslosnik	8/27/18	1/24/19	7	6
WT 53	FHS	46854	Walker	Brett Roslosnik	8/27/18	1/24/19	7	2
AG 63	EHS	46840	Hogue	Sandra Lovfald	9/4/18	12/18/18	9	9
AG 63	EHS	46841	Hogue	Sandra Lovfald	9/4/18	12/18/18	14	4
AG 63	EHS	46842	Hogue	Sandra Lovfald	9/4/18	12/18/18	12	7
CT 21A	EHS	46905	Hafar	Dave Stevens	9/27/18	6/13/19	4	N/A
WT 53	EHS	46903	Walker	Kyle Shamp	10/16/18	3/20/19	18	3
WT 53	EHS	46906	Walker	Kyle Shamp	10/16/18	3/20/19	15	3
ENGL 1A	EHS	46901	Bryant Lescher	Nannette Voss	1/17/19	6/6/19	14	N/A
ENGL 1A	EHS	46904	Bryant Lescher	Nannette Voss	1/17/19	6/6/19	21	N/A
						Total	130	55