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Report on Options for an Online, Statewide Community College

In the spring of 2017, Governor Jerry Brown asked California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley to provide him with options for how to establish a community college that exclusively offers fully online programs to make college more accessible and affordable to unserved Californians.

Since then, the Board of Governors has adopted Vision for Success, a document which calls for the community college system to better serve working adults in order to meet California’s workforce needs of the future.

In order to address these challenges, Chancellor Oakley convened a workgroup to assist in the development of a plan to provide three to five options that enable the community colleges of California to better deliver on student success goals, including through online opportunities. The workgroup is co-chaired by CCC Vice Chancellor for Workforce and Digital Futures Van Ton-Quinlivan and Cerritos College President Jose Fierro and has representation from the Academic Senate (ASCCC) and other system constituencies, as well as the Governor’s office.

This endeavor is called “Flex Learning Options for Workers”, or FLOW. Consistent with Vision for Success, Chancellor Oakley defined the target population for the proposed options as “adults with some college and no certification” as well as “working adults with vocational needs” to enable them to earn certifications that lead to better workforce outcomes.

In order to meet the November 2017 deadline established by the Governor, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) was engaged to work with the system stakeholders and online thought leaders to develop these options. The Kresge Foundation is providing funds to underwrite NCHEMS’s participation thanks to the outreach of the Foundation for California Community Colleges and the Success Center.

The general public had opportunities to provide feedback via this linked form hosted at the Chancellor’s office. The collection of those comments can be found in Appendix E.

The scope of work for NCHEMS with the assistance of the workgroup includes the following:

- Identify those whom the California Community Colleges are not currently serving well through traditional education delivery models.
- Identify online education models that will reach these students and best facilitate their completion of useful credentials.
- Determine how the California context factors into the creation of possible options, including existing models.
- Identify three to five options along with pros, cons, and associated challenges.

NCHEMS coordinated the ideation process of the workgroup. The role of the workgroup was to provide NCHEMS with information and insights from their diverse perspectives, but it was not to reach any kind of consensus. All of the data in this report and all of the draft versions of the options were discussed in the workgroup and workgroup members worked together in good faith to provide guidance. The discussions were quite lively and very useful in understanding the variety of perspectives among the members ranging from business models, how to scale operations, sustainability, state regulations, pedagogic considerations, support for students from different
populations, employer partnerships, and specific proposals for models that might suit the requirements. The members of the workgroup included (see Appendix A for biographies):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Ton-Quinlivan</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Fierro</td>
<td>Cerritos College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Aschenbach</td>
<td>ASCCC / Lassen College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Culpepper</td>
<td>Glendale Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ferguson</td>
<td>California Department of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra L. Fried</td>
<td>Success Center, Foundation for Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jory Hadsell</td>
<td>CCC Online Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Heiman</td>
<td>Legislative Analyst’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hernandez</td>
<td>Farmworker &amp; Immigrant Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jarrell</td>
<td>Santa Barbara City College (participated in early sessions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Kaupp</td>
<td>Foothill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Miyashiro</td>
<td>El Camino College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Moreau</td>
<td>Foothill-De Anza Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissette Y. Padilla</td>
<td>West Hills Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Pilati</td>
<td>Rio Hondo College and ASCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridith Randall</td>
<td>Chaffey College (participated in later sessions replacing Paul Jarrell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Rodriguez</td>
<td>Coastline Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Surratt</td>
<td>Student and Proprietor of Karen's Heritage Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treva Thomas</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos O. Turner Cortez</td>
<td>San Diego Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there were several invited observers that attended the workgroup meetings. They included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 28-29 Meeting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis Delzompo</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Technology Center, Chief Technology Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Feist</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Vice Chancellor of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Grant</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, System Software Specialist III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hope</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Executive Vice Chancellor for Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Volk</td>
<td>Alvarez &amp; Marsal, Director of Business Consulting, Performance Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBaron Woodyard</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Dean of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This workgroup reviewed the major online projects that already exist among the community colleges, other California initiatives, and out-of-state initiatives that serve large numbers of students online. The presentations by these groups can be seen in Appendix B.

In addition to the workgroup of Californians, Jay Box, President of the Kentucky Community and Technical College Systems, Adrian Sanner, Senior Technology Fellow at Arizona State University Online, and Spencer Stewart, Chancellor, Western Governors University Nevada all provided ongoing information and insights. NCHEMS also conducted individual interviews and/or more in depth discussions with the following individuals for their insights and experiences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Aschenbach</td>
<td>North Representative (ASCCC) / English Professor (Lassen College) ASCCC /Lassen College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Bergson-Shilcock</td>
<td>Director of Upskilling Policy at the National Skills Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cardona</td>
<td>Learning Objects Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos O. Turner Cortez</td>
<td>President San Diego Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ferguson</td>
<td>Principal Program Budget Analyst III California Department of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Fierro</td>
<td>President/Superintendent Cerritos College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra L. Fried</td>
<td>Executive Director Success Center at the Foundation for Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hernandez</td>
<td>Associate Secretary Farmworker &amp; Immigrant Services Labor &amp; Workforce Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Heiman</td>
<td>Principal Analyst Legislative Analyst’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia James</td>
<td>(Pat James Consulting) Served as Executive Director for the Online Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jarrell</td>
<td>Chief Instructional Officer Santa Barbara City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale P. Johnson</td>
<td>EdPlus @ ASU Arizona State University (adaptive learning specialist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert T. Jones</td>
<td>Education &amp; Workforce Policy Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Jury</td>
<td>Chairman Texas Workforce Investment Council Office of the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Kaupp</td>
<td>Director of Workforce San Mateo Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian King</td>
<td>Chancellor Los Rios Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Klingler</td>
<td>Education Services Salt Lake City UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Matthews</td>
<td>President Distance Education Accrediting Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Miner</td>
<td>Chancellor Foothill-De Anza Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Moreau</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor of Technology &amp; CTO CCC Online Education Initiative Executive Sponsor Foothill-De Anza Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Pilati</td>
<td>Professor Psychology Rio Hondo College and ASCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Richter</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer Texas Workforce Investment Council Office of the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Randell</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent Instruction &amp; Institutional Effectiveness Chaffey College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Surratt</td>
<td>Student and Sole-Proprietor of Karen's Heritage Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritza Urquiza</td>
<td>Staff Finance Budget Analyst California Department of Finance Education Systems Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Ascher Webber</td>
<td>Building Skills Partnership California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBaron Woodyard</td>
<td>Dean Educational Programs and Professional Development California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Winn</td>
<td>President Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Wyse</td>
<td>Superintendent/President Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Zastrocky</td>
<td>Executive Director The Leadership Board for CIO’s in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Analysis and Conclusions

In order to validate and refine Chancellor Oakley’s directives for the target population for FLOW, NCHEMS used available state and national databases to compile and analyze information regarding the audience for FLOW. As Figure 1 shows, about 45% of Californians have at least a secondary school credential or some college but no degree (over 40% do have degrees). Figure 2 breaks this group into standard ethnicity groups. The majority of individuals in these categories are Hispanic - almost 700,000 Hispanics have only a secondary school credential (see Figure 3) and 550,000 Hispanics have some college but no degree (see Figure 4).

Figure 1. Percent Attainment, All Adults Aged 25-34, California, 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Figure 2. Percent Attainment, Adults Aged 25-34, California by Race, 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Figure 3. Adults Aged 25-34 with High School or GED, California 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Figure 4. Adults Aged 25-34 with Some College, No Degree, California 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample. If the target population is expanded to include individuals aged 25-64, the size of the potential audience grows to 8.75 million.

As all Californians are aware, different regions of the state are unique with regard to economies, populations, etc. and there is a need to stay aware of those differences. In order to get a clearer picture of who could benefit by FLOW services, NCHEMS analyzed data by region. Figure 5 indicates the economic regions of the state that were used in clusters of further analyses.
Breaking out the educational attainment levels by region mirrors the population distribution of the state. From Figure 6, it is apparent that the Los Angeles (LA) region of California has the highest number of Californians aged 25-34 with educational attainment of only a high school credential at an estimated 327,892 individuals. Figure 6 also shows that 21% of the population in LA in that age group has only a high school credential. The Central Sierra region has the lowest number of Californians aged 25-34 with educational attainment of a high school credential only but it should be noted that an estimated 30.3% of 25-34 year olds in the Central Sierra region have only a high school credential. Thus while the numbers are much lower, the percentage in the Central Sierra is higher. The other regions of the state with percentages of 25-34 year olds with only a high school credential approaching 30% include the Inland Empire, San Joaquin Valley, and Northern California.

By breaking out the regions by numbers of Californians with some college but no degree (see Figure 7), there is a similar pattern based on the population distribution. The most important part of the analysis is that there are 2.5 million Californians between 25 and 34 years old with either just a high school credential or some college but no degree; of those, nearly half (48%) are Hispanic. This becomes the population that is most likely to benefit from a statewide online community college that focuses on working adults to open access. NCHEMS chose the ages of 25 to 34 because this is the population most likely to enroll. It is anticipated that a statewide, online community college designed to do a good job serving this younger adult population will also attract and be valuable for many adults aged 34 to 65 (a group consisting of 6.25 million individuals).
Figure 6. **Number of Californians with High School Diploma or GED, Aged 25-34 by Region.** Percentages of the population in each region are also included.

![Bar chart showing the number of Californians with HS diploma or GED by region.](chart6.png)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Figure 7. **Number of Californians with Some College, No Degree, Aged 25-34 by Region.** Percentages of the population in each region are also included.

![Bar chart showing the number of Californians with some college, no degree by region.](chart7.png)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Over 80% of individuals in this target population are currently in the workforce. While the rate of work participation varies by regions, the percentage of working adults is highest in the most populous regions of the state (see Figure 8). The not-in-the-labor force label does not include those who are unemployed but seeking work.

Figure 8. Labor Force Participation, Adults Aged 25-44, 2015

The percentage of officially unemployed varies by the regions of the state (Figure 9). In the most populated areas, the percentage is 5% or less. In the less populated regions of the state that percentage climbs to close to 10%.

Figure 9. Employment Rates, Adults Aged 25-44, 2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Figure 10, taken from a report prepared in September 2017 by Centers of Excellence for Labor Marker Research for the Chancellor’s Office on middle-skill occupations in California, shows the disaggregation by required educational levels. The report authors note that recognizing these required educational levels offers program planners insights into levels at which new educational and training programs are needed. They also note that most of these occupations require third-party certifications from industry or government licensure.

**Figure 10. Middle-Skill Occupations by Education Level**

![Pie chart showing educational levels required for middle-skill occupations.](chart.png)

Source: September 2017 report from the Centers of Excellence for Labor Market Research

Finally, Californians earning one to two year awards in 2015-16 were served by a variety of sectors. Figure 11 indicates that 26,963 Californians received these credentials from for-profit institutions (2-year and less than 2-year for-profits combined). California’s public community colleges produced only 14,568 such awards. In other words, there is a demand for individuals holding these types of credentials but it is the for-profit institutions that currently meet most of the demand in California. This analysis does not tell us how many Californians attempted to earn these credentials but never completed them, yet likely incurred debt with which they are now burdened.
Figure 11. NCHEMS NCES IPEDS Completions Survey: number of Californians earning one to two year awards (2015-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>CIP Description</th>
<th>Private 4-Year</th>
<th>Private 4-Year</th>
<th>Private 2-Year</th>
<th>Private 2-Year</th>
<th>Private Less 2-Yr</th>
<th>Private Less 2-Yr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, And Related</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Natural Resources And Conservation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Architecture And Related Services.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Communication, Journalism, And Related Programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Communications Technologies/Technicians And</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Computer And Information Sciences And Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Personal And Culinary Services.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>11,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Education.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Engineering.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Engineering Technologies And Engineering-Rela</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Family And Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Legal Professions And Studies.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Biological And Biomedical Sciences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mathematics And Statistics.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, Leisure, And Fitness Studies.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Physical Sciences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Science Technologies/Technicians.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Homeland Security, Law Enforcement, Firefighti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Public Administration And Social Service Profess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Construction Trades.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mechanic And Repair Technologies/Technicians.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Precision Production.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Transportation And Materials Moving.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Visual And Performing Arts.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Health Professions And Related Programs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>10,409</td>
<td>23,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Business, Management, Marketing, And Related</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>14,568</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>47,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of these data points and considerable discussion leads to the conclusion that the initial target population for the FLOW statewide, online community college should be the almost 50% of Hispanic Californians between the ages of 25 and 34 who have at least a high school credential, or some college but no degree. As the NCHEMS analyses indicate, most of these people are working but may not have the skills and knowledge to advance their own careers, make a living wage, and contribute fully to the future economic development of California.

As Figure 12 indicates, the FLOW target population hold jobs in a wide variety of industries but are concentrated in a few. This information jump-starts the planning for which industries to target initially for partnerships.
NCHEMS used Burning Glass data to create a picture of the current demand at the sub-baccalaureate level for different regions of California. Figure 13 is a snapshot of California as a whole. The larger the bubble, the higher the number of jobs that are being advertised in fall of 2017. The bubbles to the farthest right indicate higher salaries. It shows that the good wage jobs in high demand are in the healthcare industry, manufacturing, finance, clerical and administrative, plus maintenance, repair and installation. All these jobs require education beyond high school. The full interactive model NCHEMS built can be seen at https://goo.gl/imAKv8. It enables the user to explore the career demands by region of the state and to also see what skills are required for the various jobs within the career clusters. An example is found in Figure 14. The tool can be used to help program designers understand the needs for different types of jobs in different regions of the state. The program designers can also use the tool as an additional source of information when working with statewide industry associations or employers when developing programs that respond to workforce needs.
Figure 13. Jobs Demand Throughout California as Displayed in the NCHEMS Interactive Tool

Figure 14. Skills Associated With Specific Jobs Listed in Advertisements for the Health Care Career Cluster (STEM)
As the data collected for the FLOW project make clear the design considerations for the project, point to a target audience of working adults that need to be supported differently than students coming directly out of high school who are less likely to be employed and have families.

**Technological Realities for Target Populations**

It is critical that arrangements be made to make assignments and assessments accessible to working, adult students. In addition to examining high-enrollment online institutions and programs, NCHEMS also explored the types of technologies available to the population that FLOW is targeting. While some sets of assignments and assessments will require access to computers (which can be found at most public libraries, through partnerships with school districts, and local community college campuses), the students’ own cell phones can be counted among technological resources available to facilitate learning. There is a body of evidence suggesting that cell phones will be an almost ubiquitous tool for reaching students. This is recognized by the major companies selling platforms for educational distribution that are all working to assure their tools are mobile enabled. Cell phones can facilitate voice communication, short quizzes, as well as short learning modules. An example of cellphone-based student interaction is EdTech Center’s Mobile Up! collaboration:

**Mobile Up! – Cellphone First Education for Low-Wage Workers**

- English, Career Technical Education and coaching by cellphone designed to help immigrant adults and other low-wage workers in high-growth industries gain skills and advance their careers.

- Why Mobile? The following data come from a survey conducted September 29, 2016 – November 6, 2016 by Pew Research Center (link: http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/):
  - 95% of individuals in the United States have a cellphone of some kind.
  - 77% own smartphones (up from just 35% in Pew Research Center’s first survey of smartphone ownership conducted in 2011).
  - 18% are simple phones.
  - 69% of individuals in the U.S. with educational attainment of a high school diploma or GED have a smartphone.
  - 80% of individuals in the U.S. with educational attainment of some college, no degree have a smartphone.
  - 64% of individuals with household incomes below $30,000 own a smartphone.
  - Many smartphone users don’t have traditional home broadband service.
  - Reliance on smartphones (instead of home broadband) for online access is especially common among younger adults, non-whites, and lower-income individuals.

While the level of access to cell phones is useful information, an organization called Cell-Ed ran experimental pilots for an adult education program in the Los Angeles area delivered through cell phones in order to study its effectiveness. In short, the program:

- Teaches adults (15+) basic skills for jobs and life on any mobile phone through call, text, or click three-minute lessons and personalized learner support;
• Is a cross-platform 24/7 solution with no internet required; and
• Provides interactive text and audio instruction that is automated and customized.

There are many limitations to offering a full educational program using a cell phone distribution strategy but they did find the following:

• Proven effective in randomized controlled trial, product testing, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation;
• Learning gains observed in both stand alone and blended models;
• Found learners studied at all hours and in own ways;
• Learners connected with an “audio” virtual teacher;
• Texting works (99% open rate)
  ○ Learners like texting to practice writing
  ○ Learners like instant feedback
• Distance teaching and coaching by cell phone works;
• Peers can help introduce others to technology; and
• Empowered learners to be self-directed
  ○ Learners reviewed past texts “just in time”
  ○ Learners proactively contacted bilingual coaches for help
  ○ Learners requested additional learning resources and referrals to education/training and jobs
  ○ Students started researching resources themselves and running them by the coach
  ○ Students asked for career advice.

“Digital Diaspora,” a November 2012 report by the nonprofit Welcoming Center for Pennsylvanians details the findings from a study on technology usage by select Philadelphia immigrants. (Link to full report: http://www.immigrationresearch-info.org/report/other/digital-diaspora-how-immigrants-are-capitalizing-todays-technology)

Their data suggests a previously undocumented level of technological fluency and activity among this population:

• Attitudes and usage held steady across an extraordinary diversity of ethnic, linguistic, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

The “Digital Diaspora Report” cites the following national research findings (link to full report: http://www.thehispanicinstitute.net/files/u2/Hispanics_and_Broadband_Access_0.pdf)

• “National research indicates that 40% of Latino immigrants are coming from countries where mobile phone usage is more widely available than landlines.”
• While Hispanics trail other U.S. populations in overall Internet access, they are among the most avid users of mobile broadband. Hispanics and African Americans lead mobile
broadband use (53% and 58% respectively), with both communities far ahead of Whites (33%).

- “Immigrant users are investing in both hardware and unlimited usage plans – buying smart phones even when they have limited income. All indications suggest that this investment is occurring equally strongly among individuals who have limited English proficiency and those who have limited literacy in any language.”

Additional information comes from an interview with the lead author on the study that resulted in the Digital Diaspora report, Amanda Bergson-Shilcock, Director of Upskilling Policy at the National Skills Coalition.:

1. People are really smart and savvy about using mobile and tech tools to do things they want to and have urgency to do.

2. The idea of fractured knowledge: a grandparent may know how to text someone to send a picture of a grandchild but might not know how to pay a bill online; just because you use the technology tool well in one area does not mean you do not need assistance using it in another area. Many immigrants come from countries where there is much greater use of mobile phones than landlines— in a way, they are ahead of others because they are accustomed to using mobile phones for getting various tasks done.

3. It is critical to design for your audience, realizing what resources and abilities they have. For example, it would be a mistake to require flash player to receive a lesson or complete a task if you do not know for sure that the device the learner will be using has flash player. Another example is requiring a learner to complete a task in one sitting (i.e. no option to save progress and return at a later time) when the learner may be using computers in the library for access that have a time limit which would mean they get locked out of the computer before having enough time to complete the task.

Obviously most academic programs could not rely exclusively on cell phone technology so FLOW students would need to have some access to laptops and broadband. California policy makers are concerned with having low connectivity throughout the state. In fact, just recently bill 1665 was passed in both houses and was sent to the Governor for signature. This bill is the result of the successful negotiation of a $330 million bill package to expand broadband access and digital literacy in communities deprived of a reliable internet connection.

Supporting Working Adults in Online Education

Connecting Credentials, a non-profit group working with education and industry partners to better understand credentials, badges, etc. and their value to awardees, has recently released a report that does a good job of characterizing the important elements needed to fully support working adult students. These elements include:

- **Financial aid** – Federal rules prohibit financial aid for “smaller credential” programs (which may well be valuable for career path entry). Also, adults may be going to school part-time and not taking enough credits to qualify for a Pell grant or other financial aid. Note that this Pell Grant restriction may be lifted in the near future.

- **Dealing with educational debt** – Prior unpaid tuition is a huge obstacle for many adult learners, preventing release of past transcripts and credits. Flexible rules and aid in paying off back tuition are needed to enable returning students to pay off back tuition debt.
- **Placement/Locality** – Where and when providers offer training matters; location may be a long way from a learner's home or job, particularly in rural regions and in urban centers with weak public transportation systems. Workers reentering postsecondary education often need courses to be available at nontraditional times and days as well as in nontraditional modalities, such as distance learning.

- **Academic preparation** – Many entering adult learners need to strengthen foundational skills without derailing academic/occupational paths.

- **Flexible, inclusive credit transfer and credit for prior learning** – Adult students enter postsecondary education with many strengths, assets, and skills which often go unrecognized in the credentialing process.

- **Family needs** – Adult learners come with a full life of circumstances to manage including care for dependents – children to adults.

- **Support needs** - Transportation, secure housing, food, child care, counseling, wellness and mental health services are major examples of widely felt needs.

- **Pathway navigational help** – Many adult learners need help in understanding how to navigate through educational institutions, learning plans, and career pathways.

- **Coaching/mentoring** – Adult learner success increases significantly when they receive consistent support, which can come from a coach, a mentor, and/or becoming part of a cohort of learners.

- **Special needs populations** – Some adult learners face barriers that are specific to their circumstance - for example, Opportunity Youth (those returning to their community from incarceration), and persons with disabilities or advanced age.

### Other Sources of Information

In addition to compiling information about the general services needed for adult students to be successful, NCHEMS collected information on large scale online post-secondary programs and found the following.

I. **From Arizona State University data**

A summary of facts on online learning show efficacy with minority students, backed up by Action Lab at EdPlus research.

- For ASU’s programs, **online and face-to-face learning produce comparable results** for completing, passing, and mastering course material.

- Results across 257 courses offered online, 1 million student-course sample indicated **only very small or no differences across different genders and ethnicities in online course completion, passing and mastery** relative to face-to-face.

- The ASU results add to a body of literature suggesting that **delivery modality – online vs. face-to-face – may now be an artificial distinction.** Online learning is in general as efficacious as face-to-face.
Online learning, particularly in blended online learning courses as well as adaptive offerings, have consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching.

Online learning provided the best net return across access, outcomes, and economics versus traditional methods, in that it provides more flexible scheduling for students and can contribute to improved retention and graduation rates.

Summary: Overall, the ASU research showed results consistent with online learning providing improved access, outcomes and economics to a broadly diverse socioeconomic student population. The ASU findings on enrollments also show slightly higher share of Pell students and an increase in both female, African American, and older student population, in part due to offering greater flexibility for students with work or family commitments.

II. Rio Salado College, AZ data

As reported in the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA), AY 2014 – AY 2016, that benchmarked Rio Salado College (primarily online) student performance against student performance at 171 community colleges across the country. The data is disaggregated to view underrepresented minority student success.

- Two year completion rates for degree and/or certificate completion:
  - Rio Salado College students completed degree or certificates at higher rates within the following demographic groups:
    - American Indian/Alaskan (15.5% to 9.1%)
    - Black (11.1% to 7.1%)
    - Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (17.4% to 11.1%)
    - Hispanic (19.5% to 11.4%)

- Two year transfer rates (without having earned a degree or certificate):
  - Rio Salado College students had higher transfer rates within the following demographic groups:
    - American Indian/Alaskan (25.4% to 12.8%)
    - Black (28.0% to 20.3%)
    - Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (34.8% to 15.2%)
    - Hispanic (28.1% to 13.4%)

- The VFA data show that Rio Salado College’s Hispanic students have a higher first term credit success rate than those at the benchmarking institutions (72.5% to 69.0%), however the other disaggregated demographic populations have lower first term credit success rates than those at the benchmarking institutions.

III. The Public Policy Institute of California reported on an extensive review of academic literature and interviews with eight online-education specialists in the California community college system, including faculty and distance-education coordinators. The report highlights the following key areas for making students successful in online learning.
It is critical to move away from the individual, faculty-driven model of online course design and delivery toward a model under which faculty members collaborate with administrators, media developers, and information technology experts. This more systemic model is more conducive to ensuring quality by creating teams with a range of skills that a single instructor is unlikely to have;

Faculty members must receive appropriate training and ongoing professional development in order to maximize the potential of the online learning environment (instead of the frequent practice of simply trying to create an online version of a traditional course, taking little account of the differences in learning environment);

Students need additional support in the online learning environment and this is economically viable only if instructional functions are performed differently;

Setting expectations (dispelling the myth that online courses are less rigorous than traditional ones is part of this) and preparing students to make the best possible use of online learning technology is an important best practice; and

Regular and effective interaction between students and instructors, among students, and between students and the online course material is essential to establish a successful online learning environment.

IV. Oregon State University

Oregon State University has developed a new research database (see ecampus.oregonstate.edu/research-database) that allows users to explore whether the learning outcomes of online education are at least equivalent to face-to-face environments and explore what components are critical for effective online learning. The database is searchable by a range of categories including year, sample size, and discipline, and whether an article is peer reviewed.

Considerations for Design

Based on the evidence presented above, the research on how to serve working adults, and the insights shared by experts, the FLOW workgroup developed the following list of factors that should drive the design characteristics of the options:

- Very large scale capacity is critical for any option;
- Must be economically sustainable over time;
- Must be designed for underserved Californians
  - Initial target populations have educational attainment of at least high school diploma or GED or some college, but no degree
  - Must offer Spanish language options especially with student intake and student support interventions; programs should become English only by their conclusion
  - Must be culturally appropriate;
- Must reflect student centric, not institutionally centric, design
  - Not tied to academic calendars
- Asynchronous access to learning materials — to recognize time constraints of adult learners
- Any fundamental skills development must be managed as co-requisite with centralized support for language, writing, and/or computational skills (e.g., vocational ESL is a good starting point for micro-credentials);

- Significant tech-enabled student supports must be embedded as well as technologically enable person-to-person support
  - Should assume that students will tap into the support on weekends, late at night, and other irregular times
  - Must meet ADA requirements
  - Will require a high-touch component (intrusive student monitoring and interventions);

- Students need access to financial assistance
  - Price must be affordable
  - Employers could provide tuition aid
  - Variable sources of aid must be available
  - Any state subsidy must be set up appropriately
  - Portability of student aid must be allowed
  - Must be available regardless of citizenship status;

- Initial credential should be sub-associate degree (micro-credential), stackable into transferable credits, and rigorous;

- All certifications must be employer valued and sensitive to regional job opportunities that pay a living wage (documented high value);

- Third party assessments should be used to ensure rigor and acceptance by employers;

- Skills must be linked to industry standards that translate into competencies, enabling competency-based education (CBE) as part of any option.

  CBE allows/requires:
  - Time-independent progress to a credential
  - Learning materials be available anytime and anyplace
  - Subscription pricing with full costs bundled into the price
  - Demonstration of outcomes achieved needed to indicate progress through the program and eligibility for award of certification
  - Rigor built into the program/course design;

- Evaluations of success should be based on metrics developed jointly by educators (faculty and psychometricians) and employers;

- Any consortium or cooperative of program providers must have investment by the member colleges;
Utilize common infrastructure
- Adherence to common set of educational technologies, data interoperability, and open standards (including Open Educational Resources [OER] where appropriate)
- Student specific records centrally maintained
- Learning materials are centrally created and managed

- Mobile-technology enabled services are critical as is access to broadband and a computer/laptop, however student support services can start with voice.

- Must explore options for regulatory relief as existing roles in the system do not transfer well – skills and duties of faculty and non-academic staff will need to differ if the above considerations are to be met; and

- Marketing/outreach cannot be an afterthought.
  - Centrally provide marketing support can be customized for the target segment
  - Designed for regional workforce realities
  - Working closely with employers to recruit students.

Scenarios illustrating how the FLOW model can benefit California’s working adults can be found in the section following Cost Considerations.
Options for FLOW

Based on the data and information provided, the FLOW workgroup discussed four options that could be forwarded to the Governor and Chancellor in response to the charge given. There was not universal agreement on these options, but rather they are the result of weighting many different points of view regarding structure, financial feasibility, and flexibility. In addition, these options are not recommendations, and are not mutually exclusive. The options are:

- Create a FLOW unit with a statewide mission within an existing institution;
- Establish FLOW as a consortium of colleges hosted by an existing institution;
- Create a new FLOW district to develop and deliver fully competency-based programs;
- Establish FLOW as an extension of the existing Online Education Initiative (OEI)

Common to each of the three options are the following set of design features:

- **Workforce Orientation.** Employer engagement and industry partnerships will assure the credentials earned by students will actually lead to employment or to skills-building in ways valued by the employer. Accordingly, all program materials will be co-developed or approved by college faculty and industry experts. Many industry associations already exist, e.g. auto dealers, hospitality, travel, food chains, hospital chains, other healthcare groups; these could be the starting points. The state itself would also be an employer with which to partner.

- **Credentials.** The programs will result in micro-credentials, designed so they can be combined for transferable credit toward more traditional CTE certificates and associate degrees.

- **Course Scheduling.** Each option will move away from a traditional academic calendar to enable a more flexible schedule for students.

- **Program Delivery.** Program delivery is statewide. Academic programs can use the Canvas platform under the statewide license. This platform may require some modification for competency-based programs and needs to be compatible with mobile delivery.

- **Student Costs.** Student payments could be on a subscription model which is the norm now for the marketplace. That is, students pay a fixed, all-inclusive rate for unlimited access to courses and services for a specified number of months.

- **Student Support.** The target population requires specialized support services. A high level of support (technology-enabled but paired with person-to-person contact) will accompany the student’s personalized academic journey.
  - CCC technologies deployed to support Guided Pathways will support FLOW. Additional, targeted resources—including a 24x7 virtual help desk available in English and Spanish—will be added.
  - cccMyPath/FLOW would be created as the student landing page using the FLOW ‘skin’.
  - An opportunity to provide system wide student services.
• **Student Assessment.** Design of assessments and evaluation/scoring will be done by different groups of faculty to promote objective and consistent assessment of student learning. Assessments will take many forms (tests, demonstrations, projects, etc.) and evaluators will be selected for their expertise. Some types of assessments can be automatically scored (e.g. multiple choice tests). These are very useful for formative assessments. Proctoring (either electronic or face-to-face) would be required for any summative assessment that would count toward a credential.

• **Regulatory Relief.** In order for any of the options to be successful, it is recommended that regulatory relief be considered. However each option has different issues regarding regulatory relief:
  
  o Option 1. Regulatory relief to enable different practices could be difficult to obtain for a subset of academic programs, while not applying to other programs in the same college. Granting such relief could face pushback from within the college. Not granting relief could mean that special services for the target population would have to be provided under existing structures thus increasing costs, or that adequate support services could not be provided.
  
  o Options 2 & 4. Regulatory relief to enable different practices and staffing patterns could be difficult to obtain for programs comprising a small part of many colleges’ offerings.
  
  o Option 3. Regulatory relief might be easier to obtain, particularly if the new entity is set up like a new organization. The relief could allow different staffing patterns for faculty and non-academic staff that would enable financial sustainability for service to large numbers of Californians.

• **Funding.** For any option chosen, the state could provide on-going categorical funding to support core operations.

• **Definition of Student Success.** Success would be measured based on outcomes and could incorporate the essential employability qualifications like the Essential Employability Qualifications developed by the Quality Assurance Commons.

• **Faculty Development.** FLOW will use resources already available through the Online Education Initiative (OEI). If needed, these could be further developed for competency-based programs. The instructional design team within the OEI can also help faculty incorporate adaptive learning modules into the curriculum where appropriate.

It is important to note that for each of the four options presented, there may be significant push back from traditional community college personnel.

Each option has a different timeline for staffing up and scaling to serve a target level of 45,000 students within seven years. This target was chosen based on a conservative estimate of the demand and to allow a budget to be developed.

The FLOW workgroup did not discuss the notion that all programs need to be developed as competency-based education (CBE), but did discuss the need to put a strong emphasis on assuring high quality. All the options could be able to incorporate CBE. It is the case that using a competency-based design with high thresholds for demonstrating proficiencies can assure rigor and appropriate outcomes to meet employer/industry needs. Each of the options is described below.
Option 1 – FLOW unit with statewide mission within an existing campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Performed by/ scope</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>Using the overall design considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program development</td>
<td>Campus faculty and instructional designers</td>
<td>College would be responsible for employing or contracting the instructional designers and ensuring they apply FLOW design criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>Campus staff (academic and non-academic) /partners</td>
<td>In addition to using existing student support services, college would have to provide extended hours and alternative modes of delivery to meet target population’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student records</td>
<td>Campus’ Student Information System (SIS)</td>
<td>The existing SIS may need to be modified to fit non-semester dependent learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program choice &amp; employer</td>
<td>Campus staff and faculty</td>
<td>In addition to relying on existing local and regional employer relationships, college would need to develop new ones statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>In addition to district’s and college’s regular quality assurance processes, Chancellor’s office would review activities and compare them to the design considerations to assure FLOW model adherence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros:

1. Could enable a college or educational entity to push the evolution of its current practices to meet requirements for the target population.
2. There would be an organizational structure already in place.
3. An already accredited entity could open door to Title IV federal aid if the program is at least 12 months in length. Students could also be eligible for federal training funds currently in place and probably more to come. Some of the funds from which students could draw include EITC, SNAP, CalWORKs, Employer Training Panel and the like if eligible.
4. Would have existing CTE certificates and have degrees into which micro-credentials could “stack.”
5. Could offer a campus the opportunity to develop competency-based education programs.

Cons:

1. Constrained by existing structures, policies, processes and procedures (e.g. development and approval processes and timelines, delivery mechanisms designed for existing student population that might not serve FLOW students effectively, and financial and student record systems designed for the traditional academic calendar).
2. If students needed access to resources in their local community, financial reimbursement arrangements would have to be made by the FLOW college.
3. Uncertain whether an existing entity, with its current structures, could operate at a scale and cost needed to accommodate the numbers of Californians that need services.
4. Local governing board’s priorities could conflict with state’s broader priorities.
Option 2 – FLOW Consortium of Colleges Hosted by an Existing District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Performed by/ scope</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Existing district organizing collaborating colleges</td>
<td>One example is that the collaborating colleges could invest in the College Owners Association (COA) in order to share in the cost of coordination and play by the pre-established rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program development</td>
<td>Faculty from colleges in the COA</td>
<td>District would be responsible for employing or contracting the instructional designers and ensuring they apply FLOW design criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>District support staff</td>
<td>Keeping support for students under one district can ensure consistent quality. District likely would have to develop the targeted services (which typically are provided at the college level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student records</td>
<td>District Student Information System (SIS)</td>
<td>District would have to acquire an SIS or create a new “instance” of an existing SIS. An existing SIS may need to be modified to fit non-semester dependent learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program choice &amp; employer relationships</td>
<td>District would manage this process</td>
<td>In addition to relying on existing local and regional employer relationships, district would need to develop new ones statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>In addition to existing district’s regular quality assurance process, it would have to provide types of program oversight typically done at the campus level. Moreover, Chancellor’s office would review activities and compare them to the design considerations to assure FLOW model adherence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros:

1. In one version, each college would have an investment in the consortium it joins, and the state could match that investment. There would have to be a commitment for a specified period of time before which any college pulling out would not see a return on its investment. This would lower the state’s direct expenses for start-up operations. Any excess revenue would be returned to the investors after the 5 to 7-year start-up period.

2. Both academic and non-academic services could be improved through specialization, with different participating colleges serving specific groups of Californians.

3. Consortium colleges could be non-geographically contiguous to provide greater geographic coverage.

4. The participating colleges would likely have strengths in different programmatic areas allowing more rapid start-up.

5. The sponsoring district may be able to achieve access to financial aid through one of its existing colleges (depending on the parameters of the educational programs). Students could also be eligible for federal training funds currently in place and probably more to come. Some of the funds from which students could draw include EITC, SNAP, CalWORKs, Employer Training Panel and the like, if eligible.
6. Colleges would have existing CTE certificate and degree programs into which micro-credentials could “stack.”

7. Would create a broader impetus for innovation across multiple colleges.

Cons:

1. Complicated to manage with member colleges having competing priorities and intrinsic constraints based on past practices.

2. May be difficult to create competency-based programs that can fit within the existing colleges’ systems, but not impossible.

3. Oversight and accountability measures cannot be the same as the status quo, but changes to existing oversight and accountability structures may not be possible if existing colleges are the providers and ‘owners’ of the consortium. The hosting district would have to establish appropriate accountability and oversight for a group of institutions.
Option 3 – New FLOW district, operating under the CCCCO and fully competency-based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Performed by/ scope</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>FLOW district</td>
<td>Created by the CCCCO. Chancellor with statewide Board of Governors hires chief executive officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program development</td>
<td>Faculty at California colleges working with instructional designers, and employer advisors</td>
<td>The FLOW district would issue Requests for Proposals to the CA colleges for the programs to be offered statewide. Instructional designers would work for the FLOW district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>FLOW district</td>
<td>Specialized student support personnel (including both faculty members and non-academic staff) hired specifically for FLOW, would work directly with students to keep them on-track. They would be assisted by appropriate technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student records</td>
<td>FLOW district</td>
<td>An SIS that is compatible with most of the colleges (to facilitate simple credit transfers) would be contracted from an existing CA college/district or licensed by the Chancellor’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program choice &amp; employer relationships</td>
<td>FLOW district</td>
<td>Relationship development would follow current navigator model to reach from statewide to regional/local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>FLOW district with external evaluator</td>
<td>In addition to new district’s regular quality assurance process, which would include external evaluation, Chancellor’s office would review activities and compare them to the design considerations to assure FLOW model adherence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros:

1. Regulatory relief might be easier to obtain, particularly if the new entity is set up as a new organization. The relief could allow different staffing patterns for faculty and non-academic staff would enable financial sustainability for service to large numbers of Californians.

2. Embedded, tech-enabled student supports could be built in as part of the design phase.

3. The centralization of the design criteria of learning materials (either created or acquired) will assure they meet the requirements of working adults as laid out in the design considerations and utilize appropriate technologies. College faculty (with employer input) would create the curriculum.

4. Could be eligible for federal training funds currently in place and probably more to come. Some of the funds from which students could draw include EITC, SNAP, Cal Works, Employer Training Panel and the like, if eligible.

5. More easily designed in ways that do not require traditional academic calendars.

6. May be easier (have the capacity) to license/purchase learning resources.

7. Agility to reach market could accelerate as a startup.

8. The Student Information System (SIS) and financial record systems would be designed explicitly to deal with the flexible delivery methods of the FLOW district.
Cons:

1. If full degree is not offered, not eligible for Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) nor the national Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC) recognition as a possibility avenue for federal financial aid nor Cal Grants (in their current form). Student outcomes would have to be tracked and validated as an index of quality (see Quality Assurance Commons’ Essential Employability Qualifications https://theqacommons.files.wordpress.com/2017/04/theqacommons-draftereqcertcriteria-6-14-17.pdf as an example of emerging projects that try to address the limitations of our current accrediting system).

2. Would not have existing degrees into which micro-credentials could easily “stack.” To accomplish this requirement, the FLOW district would have to negotiate agreements with existing colleges.

3. Would not have previously established ties to employers.

4. Student support services would be limited to person-to-person phone conversations until agreements were negotiated with other support agencies throughout California.
Option 4 – Status Quo with Enhancements

Establish FLOW as a unit within the Chancellor’s Office (e.g., Online Education Initiative (OEI)). In this option:

A. Individual campuses continue to develop and deliver their own programs.

B. There is a coordinating and support entity attached to the Chancellor’s Office (possibly an enhanced OEI) that:
   a. Provides statewide advertising and outreach services.
   b. Provides technology and data systems support.
   c. Continues, and broadens, current OEI support services (faculty development, etc.).
   d. Ensures that outcomes produced by campus programs are aligned with employer needs and that third party assessments are utilized wherever possible.
   e. Solicits development of programs if there is a mismatch between employer need and available programs.
   f. Maintains a portal through which potential students can obtain information about workforce programs offered by all California community colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Performed by/ scope</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office (potentially expanding OEI)</td>
<td>CCCCO would have to create a separate unit within the current structure (incorporating and expanding the functions of OEI), to oversee and support the overall design considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program development and delivery</td>
<td>Faculty at colleges in the community college system</td>
<td>OEI could provide support by employing or contracting instructional designers that would work with college faculty and ensure they apply FLOW design criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>OEI and participating community college staff</td>
<td>OEI staff would coordinate staff at participating colleges to ensure that both extended hours and alternative modes of delivery to meet target population’s needs are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student records</td>
<td>OEI Student Information System (SIS)</td>
<td>OEI would need to coordinate student records among the various colleges’ SIS systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program choice &amp; employer relationships</td>
<td>Faculty and staff at partner colleges would take the lead in order to leverage their existing connections</td>
<td>In addition to managing the process – the coordinating entity would have to establish new statewide partnerships and rely on existing local and regional employer relationships through the participating colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Campuses offering the programs</td>
<td>Campuses would provide their usual quality assurance process and program oversight. The Chancellor’s office would review activities and compare them to the design considerations to assure FLOW model adherence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pro:

1. Using an established infrastructure that helps collaborate across campuses.
2. Existing OEI participating colleges might shorten time to launch (as colleges would likely have strengths in different programmatic areas), but adding staff to OEI to accomplish a new mission may not improve start-up time.
3. The existing colleges could collaborate to create one-stop shops for students to find on-line opportunities and receive student services.
4. The individual colleges would be providing programs so after undergoing a substantive change review students may be eligible for financial aid (if the program meets the federal requirements regarding length, etc.). The coordinating entity may be able to make a student’s financial aid transportable regardless of which college within the California CCs the student attended. Students could also be eligible for federal training funds currently in place and probably more to come. Some of the funds from which students could draw include EITC, SNAP, CalWORKs, and the like, if eligible.
5. Colleges would have existing CTE certificate and degree programs into which micro-credentials could “stack.”
6. Would be the option with the greatest support from the colleges and their faculties.

Cons:

1. Complicated to manage with participating colleges having competing priorities and intrinsic constraints based on deeply ingrained policies and practices.
2. Constrained by existing structures, policies, processes and procedures (e.g. development and approval processes and timelines, delivery mechanisms designed for existing student population that might not serve FLOW students effectively, and financial and student record systems designed to work only on one campus).
3. May be difficult to engage staff/faculty members in different types of work than has been the case in the past, as FLOW is made part of the established structure of the community college system.
4. May be difficult to move quickly and scale up. California’s prior experience in a similar endeavor (OEI’s work) has been focused on associate degree completion – this new initiative would expand the mission to include CTE programs, sub AA programs and certificates, and engage in workforce development. This change in focus could take time.
5. Oversight and accountability measures that stay with the college providing the program may result in inconsistencies for FLOW students.
6. Likely to be difficult to obtain the necessary regulatory relief for (potentially) all community colleges in the system.
7. Existing campus programs on which FLOW would depend for initial content were designed to serve a local workforce market. Expanding their reach to statewide audiences will require relief from constraints on marketing outside district boundaries and considerable support from the coordinating entity.
Cost Considerations for Flow Model Options

Assumptions Underlying Cost Estimates

Rough cost estimates have been made for each of the first three options. The fourth option was added late and the assumptions under which it might work would be basically the status quo funding with enhancements to enable service to the target population. The first three options have several factors in common, but they differ in some key areas. Estimates for all three options have the following cost elements in common:

- A Directors Office responsible for the overall management and coordination of the endeavor.
- A head of partnerships development and staff to develop partnership arrangements with employers and employer associations.
- A Chief Instruction Officer – on the assumption that this is a sufficiently large undertaking that it cannot be added to the workload of the campus CIO.
- A Finance Office – responsible for ensuring that the bursar and accounts payable functions are incorporated smoothly into campus functions (or are established separately to meet the specific requirements of FLOW).
- An Institutional Research (IR)/Data Analytics capacity to allow formative assessments of FLOW operations and the identification of areas in which modifications/improvement are needed.
- Costs of recruiting/on-boarding students. Experience elsewhere indicates that initial costs are high (estimated at $5,000 per matriculant the first year) but becomes smaller over time (estimated at $1,000 per matriculant in year 5).
- A series of start-up investment costs for support systems – student information system (SIS), finance, etc. These are assumed to be smaller in options 1 & 2 where the costs are associated with modifications to existing campus systems. In Option 3 the costs are assumed to be higher as a result of the need to acquire a system specifically for the purposes of supporting FLOW.
- Program development – assumed to be $1,000,000 for each program developed.
- Annual maintenance costs for both programs and supporting systems. The annual costs are estimated at 10% of initial investment costs (except in Option 3 where annual system maintenance is assumed to be half the initial investment).
- Costs of assessments and access to online materials are assumed to be the same in each option.
- Costs for professional development of faculty are included for each option.

The areas in which cost factors vary for different options are as follows:

- In Options 1 & 2 there is assumed to be a cost for quality assurance oversight located at the CCCCO. Since Option 3 is under the direct oversight of CCCCO, this function is embedded in the general operations.
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- Option 3 includes costs of rent/insurance/utilities. These costs are assumed to be borne by the host campuses in the other two options.

- Costs of program delivery. This is the area in which costs of the different options are greatest. All options require deep involvement of faculty in the program development activities. Options 1 & 2 assume that program delivery will be done by campus faculty at student/faculty ratios typical for California Community College online delivery. Option 3 assumes that content will be delivered largely electronically with faculty members and others sharing direct support of students as the primary point of contact (student/support person ratios demonstrated as being appropriate elsewhere). Access to full-time faculty acting as content experts will be provided in each program.

- The rough estimate of per student costs derived from application of these assumptions are shown in Table 1. It should be noted that much of the difference can be explained by the underlying assumptions about regulatory relief (or lack thereof). Option 3 assumes that the entity would be established as a new organization and would be free of many of the regulations under which community colleges function (such as the 50% law). If given regulatory relief, Option 1 & 2 could operate at lower costs.

Table 1. Per Student Costs Associated with Each Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$7,866</td>
<td>$6,410</td>
<td>$5,217</td>
<td>$4,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$10,833</td>
<td>$7,896</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
<td>$5,709</td>
<td>$4,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
<td>$4,867</td>
<td>$3,633</td>
<td>$2,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the cost calculations are presented in Appendix C.

Revenue Sources

The workgroup discussed the question of revenue sources to support FLOW and all recognized the importance. The possibilities are numerous and include:

- A direct appropriation from the state. This could be divided into two categories:
  - An initial investment that pays the start-up costs and initial development of both programs and support systems. The investment in recruiting and on-boarding the first three cohorts of students should be included as a start-up cost.
  - On-going support for operations in the form of a categorical appropriation.

- State support through the community college allocation formula – Proposition 98 funds. Since Options 1 & 2 assume that FLOW would be campus-based, this source of funding is particularly apropos for these two options. Since the students will be essentially half-time students, at current rates this would yield approximately $2,500/student. It is also appropriate for Option 3; however, arrangements would have to be made for one of the existing districts to act as fiscal agent for the new entity.

- Students/employers. Prices to students must be kept low – a half-time student in California’s Community Colleges pays $630 in tuition over the course of a year. A program tied to
specific work skills with employer/industry commitment for employment could charge a premium; say $750 per student to be matched by the employer. This may be an optimistically high amount for the student component, but employers may be willing to pay more.

Since the programs to be offered by FLOW will be co-designed by faculty and employers to meet industry needs, there is also the possibility of direct employer aid to support students. Joe Moreau (Vice Chancellor of Technology & CTO and CCC Online Education Initiative Executive Sponsor, Foothill-De Anza Community College District) has developed a conceptual model for how employer support for students might work (see Figure 15). The employers with whom he shared it have been enthusiastic. One source of funding for this component may be Employers Training Panel (ETP) funding.

There is a good chance that Options 1 and 2 could eventually result in student access to federal grants and loans through the current Title IV requirements if full degrees or certifications lasting at least one year in length were offered. That is less likely for Option 3 in the near term as there is not an accreditable entity that fits for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) or Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC) (both require that the entity offer at least one associate’s degree). While this could be overcome, it might be wiser to seek other sources for student financial aid. Most higher education policy watchers agree that when Congress actually proposes a re-authorization of the Higher Education Act it is likely to open student aid for more workplace-related programs. In addition, Cal Grants is being reviewed and that may also be a source of aid for the students in programs targeted by FLOW.
Figure 15. Conceptual Model of Employer-Based Student Support

Employer-funded Certification Program.
In this model, a student is simultaneously employed by a sponsoring company and admitted to a CBE program at the fully online CCC. The student benefits by being employed while attending college online. The student is motivated to complete the certification program by regular salary increases at certification milestones, the guarantee of their fees being paid by their employer, and the promise of a promotion upon completion of the certification program. The employer benefits by being able to customize the certification program to the specific needs of the company and/or a job. They will be able to bring new employees into a productive role faster and at less cost than their traditional recruitment model. The college benefits by having a guaranteed revenue stream and has a fiscal motivation to assure the student completes each certification and the program as a whole.

Employers and the college collaborate on hiring an applicant into an entry-level position and admitting the applicant as a student in a certification program. The certification program is personalized for the specific company, position, and applicant.

Upon completion of the certification program, the employee/student is eligible to pursue an associate degree with documented competencies from the certificate program articulating to general education requirements of the degree.
How FLOW Model Can Work for Students

The following brief scenarios show how FLOW can be valuable to working, adult students in a few different areas that are, or may become, fields with high demand throughout California.

Example 1 - Facilities Manager

An area of growing demand for workers is that of facilities managers. Facilities managers are needed in residential, government and commercial facilities such as:

- Manufacturing plants
- Health care facilities
- Schools and universities
- Retail facilities

There is a general shortage of individuals with the necessary skills to fill these positions. Facilities managers are employed in various fields and their specific job duties may vary depending on the type of facility they work for. The general progression of jobs and training towards the facilities manager position varies considerably, but the following is an example of progression of jobs:

1. General facilities maintenance – custodial and minor maintenance tasks.
2. Maintenance of a single system – dealing with specific issues at a level below that of a skilled/journeyman worker.
3. Maintenance of multiple systems with supervisory experience – again at levels below that of skilled/journeyman workers. These individuals have to be able to diagnose problems, fix many of the problems, and know who to call when the problem is beyond their level of skill and knowledge.
4. Facilities Management – overseeing the maintenance of the entire facility; planning and overseeing projects (from creating a project plan specifying the purpose and budget to evaluating project outcomes); handling quality matters such as ensuring and monitoring compliance with codes, regulations, policies, and standards; handling finance and business aspects of the facility such as by developing, recommending, managing and overseeing the facility’s budget requirements; handling communications activities such as creating and disseminating reports for stakeholders; ensuring that the facility’s technology needs are being met; making sure that the required occupant services (e.g., parking and janitorial services) are being fulfilled satisfactorily; and ensuring that practices support the performance of the facility organization.

To help prepare workers for such jobs, FLOW would operate in the following manner:

- Students would be recruited from among employees with a high school diploma or GED already performing lower level maintenance work and clerical work in various kinds of facilities as well as other individuals with a high school diploma or GED from areas of California that have unfulfilled job openings. The type of individuals recruited could evolve based on evidence as the program matures.
- Skill requirements would be developed in collaboration with employers.
• Learning materials would be prepared for all the job levels outlined above. For each level there are online components (many are open educational resources—OER). Successful completion of the educational activities for each level would result in a high-value certification that all build toward the highest level—Facilities Manager. Students who complete the program will be prepared to pass the International Facilities Manager Association’s (IFMA) Essentials certification exam.

• Direct services to support students’ learning would be bilingual (English and Spanish at first; other options would be offered as the program matures). When students have questions about the program, their own requirements and funding options, tutoring, coaching, and job placement they could choose English or Spanish.

• The hands-on aspects of the program would be done in the facilities in which students are working or in nearby facilities with supervisors in those facilities serving as coaches.

• Assessments would include demonstrations of skills and knowledge that mimic the worksite.

All online learning materials would be designed to be accessible on mobile technology. Direct student support would be primarily by phone conversations. At the initial levels the learning materials would be available in both Spanish and English (learning materials would be offered in additional languages as the program matures). As learning materials progress through the certification levels they would be increasingly migrated toward English as the ultimate IFMA Essentials certification exam is only offered in English.

The designers of the learning materials will include teams of instructional designers, employers, evaluation specialists, college faculty members, and those charged with delivering the content. Each learning module would be required to map to the specific workforce requirements as well as to components of credit-bearing academic programs, so that credits could be accumulated to satisfy the requirements of an associate degree.

In the FLOW program, students could start at any time (not based on the usual college terms system) and could have access to learning materials and assessments at any time they need them. While students will progress at their own pace, they would need to make a targeted rate of progress to remain in the program. The price of participation would be bundled, so that all costs to the student would be known. To encourage acceleration, the student would pay a fixed price every two or so months regardless of how much of the coursework they can master. It would be a subscription model.

To complete a full degree, the student would enroll in a complimentary program offered by an existing California community college.

Example 2 - Future Workers in the Drone Industry

The operation of the rapidly growing technology of unmanned aircraft requires a range of expertise. People are increasingly using drones in many industries, including:

• Agriculture – hydration needs, security fences for cattle
• Energy inspections of towers, wind farms
• Law enforcement needs
• Insurance industry to check security of job sites, for roof inspections
Municipalities’ infrastructure checks on cell towers, roads, water systems, disease areas

There is a dearth of individuals adequately trained to supply this growing area with the needed workforce. The general progression of jobs and training that would be useful looks like this:

1. Observers – needed because the legal use of drones requires constant visual contact that can be part of a crew working with a licensed pilot to extend the coverage for any drone flight.

2. Operators – able to pilot drones under the direction of a pilot in charge (PIC), but need training to protect the investment of the drone itself (the cost of a single drone can be in the tens of thousands of dollars) and to protect against liability to other property associated with the drone’s flight.

3. Pilot – required for commercial drone flights and pilot must be licensed.

To help prepare workers for this growing industry FLOW programs could operate in the following manner:

- Students would be recruited from areas of California that have unfilled job openings. They would be accepted into the program based on common criteria that would initially require a GED or high school diploma, but could evolve based on evidence as the program matures.

- Learning materials would be prepared for all the job levels outlined above. For each level there are online components (many are open educational resources (OER) on government sites but are not designed for people with broad ranges of prior educational experiences). Successful completion of the educational activities for each level would result in a high-value certification that all build toward the highest level.

- The direct services to support students’ learning would be bi-lingual. When students have questions about the program, their own requirements and funding options, tutoring, coaching, and job placement they could choose English or Spanish.

- Hands on demonstrations and practice would start on simulators near potential job sites. Assessments would include proctored online tools and face-to-face demonstrations of skills and knowledge that mimic the worksite.

All online learning materials would be designed to be accessible on smart phones. Direct student support would be primarily by phone conversations, which has been successfully used by large scale educational institutions with a wide variety of students. At the initial levels the learning materials would be available in both Spanish and English (learning materials would be offered in additional languages as the program matures). As learning materials progress through the certification levels they would be increasingly migrated toward English as the ultimate pilot’s license assessments are only in English.

The designers of the learning materials will include teams of instructional designers, employers, evaluation specialists, and college faculty members. Each ‘course’ must be mapped to the real workforce requirements as well as elements of transferable credits so that if a student chooses he or she would stack those to achieve an associate degree he or she may do so.

In the FLOW program, students could start any time (not based on the usual college term system) and have access to learning materials and assessments anytime they are ready to study. Even though students will need to progress at their own pace, they would need to make a targeted rate of progress to remain in the program. The price of participation would be set into a subscription model; whereby all costs to the student are bundled within it. To encourage acceleration, the student would
pay a fixed price every two or so months regardless of how much of the coursework they can master.

When the student is ready to take another step in his or her career path, it would be time to enroll in a degree program offered at one of California’s community colleges.

Other Considerations

The faculty members on the FLOW workgroup and others who have sent comments through the public site or offered them to the Board of Regents have indicated they have concerns about the first three FLOW options. The phrase that emerged is “Staunch the FLOW.” Some of those concerns seem to stem from a misunderstanding that full-time faculty were not explicitly discussed in early drafts of the options. Some faculty interpreted the general framework as excluding the usual faculty roles in curriculum development. Thanks to the input from workgroup members the earlier drafts have changed. That is the purpose of an ideation group. The fourth option added more recently does seem to be more popular among college faculty members.

Another concern seems to be that the FLOW project might somehow undermine the on-going Online Education Initiative (OEI) efforts. The leadership of OEI has indicated that FLOW and OEI would be complimentary. The structure and activities of the OEI are not such that OEI could accomplish the directives given for FLOW in its current configuration. The OEI current structure could dovetail with the first three FLOW options to reach the objectives to enable educational services to reach a new population of Californians. The fourth option would shift the current structure and mission of the OEI to include FLOW assumptions.

A concern raised by some faculty and one president relates to a specific recommendation by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Inspector General the suggested the competency-based education (CBE) model used by Western Governors University should be considered correspondence education. There does not seem to be support for that perspective in the Department, the Congress, the professional licensing organizations, nor the regional accrediting association that recognize WGU. That recommendation says nothing about the other dozens of CBE programs in operation around the country that have gained both the approval of their regional accrediting associations and the Department of Education. There are real advantages of a CBE model for adult workers as several colleges across the country have demonstrated over the last five years. In addition, employers are enthusiastic about graduates from CBE programs.

Some college presidents and faculty members have expressed concern that a FLOW initiative will draw students away from the existing community colleges when enrollments are already dropping. As this report indicates, there is a large number of working adults in California community college service districts who could be served more effectively. The fourth FLOW option recognizes that many community colleges in the state have online programs that offer somewhat flexible schedules and could utilize new practices to reach the adult workers. It is important to note that the people for whom FLOW is being designed are not currently being served by the existing colleges. It is designed to attract a new group of Californians into post-secondary education. Some of the individuals may well use their FLOW experience to enter more traditional associate degree programs. The college presidents who have been interviewed seem to understand the strategic shift that FLOW represents for underserved populations in the state.

The FLOW initiative has the potential to provide a model to other states regarding how to take steps to solve one of the largest issues facing the whole country. The options outlined in this report start with the needs of populations not being served by our traditional higher education systems, and
then utilize the people and structures in those systems to enhance opportunities for greater inclusion in the workforce.

---

i Mobile Up! Presentation by Alison Ascher Webber, Director of Strategic Initiatives, EdTech Center at World Education

ii Cell-Ed Report: Learning without Teachers? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment of a Mobile Phone-Based Adult Education Program in Los Angeles

- Unlike many other technology-enhanced education programs, the Cell-Ed learning curriculum was completely provided via a series of voice and SMS-based operations on the mobile phone (no internet required), and therefore did not require teacher instruction or in-situ learning.

- The platform uses voice (audio) and SMS messages to deliver 437 adult education lessons (called “micro-modules”) to learners. Each micro-module consists of three components: 1) audio instruction: an audio lesson on a particular concept (vowels, consonants, words), and varying from 1-3 minutes in length, is introduced when the learner calls a designated number; 2) written instruction: a SMS message reinforcing the voice lesson is sent to the participant; and 3) interactive quiz: a SMS question is sent to the participant asking them about the lesson that they recently learned, and the participant must text a response. A correct response to the question triggers the beginning of the next micro-module, whereas an incorrect response leads to a repetition of the same micro-module until the user succeeds. To activate the program and each micro-module, participants call the Cell-Ed phone number from their own mobile phone. Students could access the program 24 hours a day, seven days a week, allowing them to learn when, where and how they wished.

- Seventy Spanish-speaking adult students were randomly assigned to the treatment (Cell-Ed) or control group, with the control group phased into the program after a three-month period.

- Found that students’ reading scores are substantially increased over a four-month period, equivalent to a 2-4 year increase in reading levels. These results are robust to correcting for non-random attrition using a variety of non-parametric methods. The program also increased participants’ self-esteem by 7% (used the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the General Self-Efficacy Scale). Researchers posit that these increases may be due in part to the flexibility of the curriculum, as learners opted to learn at all times of the day and for short durations, in stark contrast to the fixed schedules of many adult education programs.

“Admittedly, our experimental set-up has several limitations. First, we are unable to compare learning via the Cell-Ed platform with learning in a traditional adult education program, or the interaction between the two. As a result, we are unable to conclude whether such programs are complements or substitutes for teachers and in-classroom learning. Second, our small sample size greatly limits the external validity of our results. Nevertheless, our results show that a distance learning program via a simple mobile phone significantly improved adults’ learning outcomes in this context, and suggests that there is great scale and scope for using these technologies in education programs in both developed and developing countries.”


iv Compiled by Kate Smith, Vice President of Academic Affairs at Rio Salado College

v Public Policy Institute of California report “Successful Online Courses in California’s Community Colleges”. Link: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_615HJR.pdf

vi www.qacommons.org
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Van Ton-Quinlivan

Van Ton-Quinlivan is a nationally recognized thought leader in workforce development with a proven track record for driving large-scale organizational change. In her role as Executive Vice-Chancellor of Workforce & Digital Futures at the California Community Colleges, she oversees the workforce mission and education technology portfolio of California’s 114 community colleges, the nation’s largest higher education system.

Appointed by the California Governor in 2011, Ton-Quinlivan spearheaded the creation of Doing What MATTERS for Jobs and the Economy (doingwhatMATTERS.cccco.edu), a unifying framework to improve workforce outcomes for California’s 2.1 million community college students and fuel strong regional economies. During her tenure, her administrative responsibility has grown from $100 million to $900 million as a result of her ability to inspire others toward a common vision.

Most recently, Ton-Quinlivan led the ground-breaking Strong Workforce Task Force to create one million middle-skilled workers in California, which resulted in the Governor signing the Strong Workforce Program into law along with an annual commitment of $200 million in funds for career technical education.

Named a White House Champion of Change in 2013, Ton-Quinlivan has been quoted in the New York Times, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and Inside Higher Ed, and has contributed to the Stanford Social Innovation Review, U.S. News & World Report, the Fresno Bee, and others. Ton-Quinlivan is vice chair of the National Skills Coalition and co-chair of the Workforce Action Team of the California Economic Summit. She serves on the California Council on Science and Technology and the National Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship.

Prior to her current role, Ton-Quinlivan oversaw workforce development for Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). She holds degrees from the Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford Graduate School of Education, and Georgetown University. Ton-Quinlivan resides in California with her husband and two children.

Jose Fierro

Jose Fierro is the President/Superintendent at Cerritos College. He works tirelessly to strengthen and maintain connections between the college, unified school districts and communities it serves. Fierro has extensive instructional experience in both face-to-face and online environments, having taught undergraduate and graduate courses in multiple institutions. He has developed curriculum for several online and hybrid courses in the natural sciences and authored a number of journal articles. Additionally, Fierro has presented at multiple educational conferences on the topic of faculty development for online teaching and the institutional strategies necessary for online programs to succeed. Fierro earned his D.V.M. from the University of Applied Sciences in Bogotá, Colombia; his M.S. in Leadership and Management of Educational Programs from Nova Southeastern University in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida; and his Ph.D. in Higher Education Leadership from Northcentral University in Prescott, Arizona.

Cheryl Aschenbach

Cheryl Aschenbach is an English professor and Academic Senate President at Lassen Community College in Susanville, CA. She is also an elected representative for the Academic Senate for
California Community Colleges (ASCCC) where her work has focused on noncredit, basic skills, curriculum, online education, open educational resources, and assessment.

Anthony Culpepper

Anthony Culpepper’s experience covers a variety of business structures. He is an experienced Executive, Academician, and Administrator. His background includes over 25 years of executive experience in both corporate and academia; profit and non-for profit models. Currently, Culpepper is the Executive Vice President at Glendale Community College. Culpepper has served as Chief Business Officer/Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services at Bakersfield College; Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs at Ashford University; Dean of the Colleges of Business Administration and Information Systems at Trident University; Dean of the College of Business and Management at DeVry University; Dean of the Keller Graduate School, and Dean (interim) of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at DeVry University.

He has served in several corporate executive positions as a Controller and CFO/Vice President of Finance. He is a member of the Glendale City Oversight Board. He has been serving as a member of the board of non-profit organizations for over 23 years.

Culpepper’s experience includes accreditation and assessment gained from a variety of ACCJC, WASC, and AACSB development workshops. He is a member of ACCJC, and WASC Evaluation teams.

His academic accomplishments include a Professorship at Forbes School of Business, a mid-tenure track professorship as an Irvine Scholar of Accounting at Pepperdine University, Professor of Accounting, Business Administration and Organizational Leadership at Trident University, and an adjunct Professor of Accounting at the University of La Verne. Culpepper has developed programs, curriculums, and taught courses in a variety of disciplines that include accounting, entrepreneurship, management and leadership.

Culpepper holds several degrees; Ed. D of Organizational Leadership (Pepperdine University) and Executive MBA (Graziadio School of Business and Management); BS (CSU Dominguez Hills); AA (Long Beach City College). He is a licensed CPA, CMA, CFM, and EA. Culpepper’s research interest includes Human Capital and Non-Financial Metrics.

His cross-disciplinary background and practical business experience has equipped him to share theoretical and practical knowledge with students in the courses that he has taught, as well as, with organizational leaders to whom he speaks by invitation. Culpepper’s professional and academic experiences have enabled him to build colleges based on practical and empirical research. He continues to collaborate with faculty on publications in the disciplines of financial and managerial accounting, management and leadership.

Chris Ferguson

Chris Ferguson is a principal program budget analyst at the California Department of Finance, where he supervises the office’s analyses of issues related to community colleges and K-12 school facilities. He has worked at the Department of Finance since 2007, with roles as an analyst responsible for various education programs including the development of the Local Control Funding Formula. He earned a bachelor’s degree in economics from the University of California, Riverside, and a master’s degree in economics from Wichita State University.
Sandra L. Fried

Sandra L. Fried is the Executive Director of the Success Center at the Foundation for Community Colleges, a position she has held since January 2017. The Success Center supports the professional development efforts of the California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office by managing the Professional Learning Network for the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative and by providing policy analysis and development that supports student success efforts.

Ms. Fried has worked in public policy for more than 28 years, focusing primarily on higher education policy and advocacy in both the State Assembly and the University of California. She began her career as a Legislative Aide for Speaker Willie Brown and Assembly member (now Congresswoman) Susan Davis, providing general policy analysis and development. A desiring to focus on higher education led her to join the University of California’s office of State Governmental Relations where Ms. Fried transitioned from an analyst to a legislative advocate, working on issues ranging from the establishment of UC Merced to research to financial aid. After ten years with UC, Ms. Fried returned to the Legislature by the Chief Consultant of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, where for six years she analyzed legislation, managed committee hearings, negotiated policy issues and served as the Assembly’s lead staff person on higher education issues. During her tenure, she worked with the Senate and California Community College stakeholders on the development of the Student Success Task Force study and implementation legislation.

Prior to joining the Success Center, Ms. Fried served as the Associate Director for Legislative Affairs at the University of California’s office of State Governmental Relations, where she directed that staff that worked on policy issues with the Legislature and Administration.

A native San Diegan, Ms. Fried graduated from UC Davis with degrees in history and economics.

Jory Hadsell

Jory Hadsell is currently the Executive Director of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative (OEI). The OEI, managed through a grant to the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, is a collaborative effort for the CCC to ensure that significantly more students are able to complete their educational goals by increasing both access to and success in high-quality online courses. The OEI represents a comprehensive and collaborative online education ecosystem that leverages best practices and technology to significantly increase the opportunity for higher education degree attainment in California. Prior to this role, Hadsell served as Chief Academic Officer for the OEI, as well as in leadership, faculty, and support roles within the Los Rios and Sierra community college districts.

Judy Heiman

Judy Heiman is a principal analyst at the Legislative Analyst’s Office, California’s nonpartisan fiscal and policy adviser. In this role, she provides analysis and recommendations to the state legislature on postsecondary education, focusing primarily on issues related to California Community Colleges. Previously, she served as Deputy Secretary of Education in Virginia and senior budget and policy analyst at the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget. In these roles, she analyzed statewide higher education funding and policy issues and developed and implemented initiatives to support several Governors’ education policy agendas in collaboration with state agencies, educational institutions, and the broader education community. Earlier positions include leadership and management roles in the public and nonprofit sectors. Judy has an undergraduate degree from Brandeis University and an MBA from UC Berkeley. She is an Associate of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
Jennifer Hernandez

Jennifer Hernandez serves as the Associate Secretary for Farmworker and Immigrant Services at the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency. She has spent much of her career working on farmworker and labor issues. Prior to joining the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, Jennifer worked for the National AFL-CIO where she served as regional director. She has extensive background in the non-profit and advocacy community working with farmworker and immigrant communities. Hernandez is a graduate of Georgetown University, where she holds a Bachelors in International Politics and Law; and a Master’s in Public Policy from George Mason University.

Paul Jarrell (served in the early stages of the FLOW workgroup)

Paul Jarrell currently serves as Executive Vice President, Educational Programs at Santa Barbara City College. At SBCC, Paul provides leadership and oversight to all instructional and student services programs. In addition, he serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer for the District and is a representative on many statewide and national educational advisory boards. He also serves as a member on the Cottage Health Research Advisory Board.

Prior to coming to Santa Barbara City College, Paul was an Academic Affairs administrator at Pasadena City College serving as Dean of Science and Mathematics, Dean of Business, Engineering, and Technology, and Dean of Instructional Support. Before moving into administration, Paul was a long-term faculty member in the Biological Sciences at Pasadena City College, Cosumnes River College, Southern Oregon University, and the University of Oregon. Paul has his bachelor’s degree in Biology from Ohio University and his Ph.D. in Biology and Quantitative Genetics from the University of Oregon. Jarrell also served as the founding Director for the Los Angeles/Orange County Biotechnology Center. In collaboration with Pasadena City College, the Center functioned to provide a trained and trainable workforce pipeline for regional bioscience industries.

Raymond Kaupp

Ray Kaupp is Associate Vice President of Workforce and Career Education at Foothill College. He comes to the community college arena following a 20+ year career in technology, at Apple and as a startup executive at Digital Impact, BroadWare, and several other Internet technology companies. Kaupp’s research on the equity implications of community college online implementations has been widely cited, most recently in Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins’ Redesigning America’s Community Colleges (2015).

Ross Miyashiro

Ross Miyashiro is in his 32 year in higher education; serving 16 years in the California State University system and 16 years in the California Community College system. For the last three years Ross has served as the Vice President of Student Services at Coastline Community College. Prior positions include Dean of Enrollment Services at Long Beach City College, Associate Director of Transfer Services and Student Programs at the CSU Chancellor’s Office, Director of Academic Advising at CSU Monterey Bay, and Admissions Counselor and Upward Bound Counselor at CSU San Bernardino. Ross has also served as the President of the California Association of Community College Registrars & Admissions Officers, and the President of the Inland Consortium of Articulation & Transfer. Ross has participated in the SB 1440 and 1456 Chancellor Office implementation committees.
Joseph Moreau

Joseph Moreau has held a variety of higher education leadership positions including manager of the Instructional Resources Center at Pasadena City College; Dean of Learning Resources at West Hills College; Dean of Academic Information Services at MiraCosta College; and Chief Technology Officer for SUNY Oswego. In 2012, he was appointed Vice Chancellor of Technology for the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. Joseph has served on the boards of a number of organizations including the California Community Colleges Chief Information Systems Officers Association, the SUNY Faculty Advisory Council for Teaching and Technology and currently serves on the Educause Board of Directors. Joseph also serves as the executive sponsor for California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative.

Lissette Y. Padilla

I am from a small rural town in the CA central valley called Avenal. I received my Bachelor’s Degree from the University of California, Merced in Sociology. I am a first generation Mexican American and the first in my family to graduate from a university. Being a student and a member of the central valley, I understand the difficulties many students face and I strive to provide equitable access to all the resources available. I consider myself a champion for all students.

Michelle Pilati

Michelle Pilati is a past President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and a professor of psychology at Rio Hondo College where she has been faculty since 1999. From 2014 - 2016 she served as the Chief Professional Development Officer for the Online Education Initiative. At the national level she has pursued her interest in online education, serving as an Editor for MERLOT (www.merlot.org) and was a founding Editorial Board Member and served as Co-Editor of its peer-reviewed journal, JOLT. At RHC, she served as Distance Education Coordinator and Curriculum Chair. Pilati earned her Bachelor of Science degree in biology and psychology at the State University of New York at Albany. She completed her doctorate in psychology at UCLA.

Meridith Randall (joined the FLOW workgroup in its final stages)

Meridith Randall has been a Chief Instructional Officer (CIO) in the California community college system for 17 years and has served as President of the statewide CIO organization twice, most recently in 2016-17. She began her career in community colleges as an English instructor at Palau Community College in 1993, eventually becoming Dean of Academic Affairs there. In 2000, she joined Mendocino College as Associate Dean and was promoted to Vice President of Educational Services before leaving in 2012 for Shasta College. In July 2016, she became Associate Superintendent at Chaffey College, an Aspen Award finalist. During her career, she has been an Accreditation Liaison Officer for four different institutions; served on six visiting accreditation teams; participated on state advisory committees for dual enrollment, institutional effectiveness and online education; and has supported the development of multiple career technical education programs. Currently, her college is moving forward with zero textbook cost and guided pathway initiatives. Ms. Randall has a Bachelor’s Degree from Amherst College, a Master’s Degree from Cornell University, and a Juris Doctor Degree from New York University School of Law. She lives in Fontana with her husband Remeliano and has three sons who are making their way in the world.

Vince Rodriguez

Vince Rodriguez has been at Coastline Community College since 1998 and worked as a classified employee, instructor, and administrator. During his years at Coastline, he provided leadership at each of Coastline’s learning centers and spent many years overseeing a Distance Learning program.
that accounts for over half of the enrollments at the College. He is currently the Vice President of Instruction at Coastline Community College. Rodriguez grew up in Orange, California. He graduated from Orange Coast College and went on to earn a Bachelor of Science degree in Information Technology and a Master of Arts in Education with an emphasis in Distance Learning and Adult Education. In 2011 he completed his study related to retention of online students while earning his doctorate in Educational Leadership from California State University, Long Beach.

Karen Surratt

My name is Karen Surratt; I am a 30-year-old single mother of a wonderful 13-year-old son. He is an eighth grader and is involved in sports and keeps me busy.

I am a sole proprietor of an In-home child care facility, “Karen's Heritage Daycare.” Reading and Beyond – Fresno Bridge Academy has help me to grow personally in which they have helped me to build my confidence and self-esteem.

While enrolled in the program, I was able to go back to Fresno City College and receive my Child Development-Associate Teacher Certificate. I became a licensed provider on June 17, 2017 and opened my business the next day. I am at full capacity and looking forward to expand my business to a larger facility. The new License would allow me to have twelve under age six and two school age children.

Through Reading and Beyond I attended a James Irvine Foundation Workshop and by the end of the workshop I was asked to participate in an interview and share with them about my challenges. Here is the link to the printed interview along with the video https://www.cavo ices. net/ 04k.

Also, while enrolled with Fresno Bridge Academy, my Career Family Navigator nominated and assisted me with the process for a $2,000 Pete Weber scholarship for New Business Owners. I was selected and was awarded the top $2,000 scholarship.

Treva Thomas

Treva Thomas earned an Associate of Science degrees in Accounting and Finance from Lake Tahoe Community College; then transferred to California State University, Sacramento earning a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration; followed by earning a Secondary Teaching Credential from Sierra Nevada College. Taught high school for 4 years and then was hired at Lake Tahoe Community College to teach for the Business Office Administration Department. Completed an MBA at National University, with an emphasis in organizational leadership and now teaches in the Business Department. Served as secretary and vice president for LTCC’s Academic Senate. Currently serves as the single-point-of-contact to the Online Education Initiative and is the distance education coordinator for Lake Tahoe Community College.

Carlos O. Turner Cortez

Carlos O. Turner Cortez presently serves as the President of Continuing Education with the San Diego Community College District. He most recently served as Dean of Academic Pathways, Workforce Development, and Student Success and Acting Vice President of Instruction at Berkeley City College. Turner Cortez is also as adjunct faculty at Central Michigan University, the University of Southern California, and the University of California, Berkeley. His research interests center on the role of educators and administrators of color in the historical development of American social welfare and education policy. He is also an expert in the area of promoting equity and access in urban education through literacy and policy initiatives. Before BCC, he also served as Director of
Options for a California Online, Statewide Community College

Education Extension at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). Prior to UCLA, he worked in education at the P-12 level as a classroom teacher, administrator, and researcher.

He began his career in education as Teach for America Corps member. His experience spans the public, private, and charter school sectors in Washington DC, Houston, New York City, Los Angeles, and Berkeley. Turner Cortez served as Principal of New Village Charter School in Los Angeles and as Assistant Principal at Grape Street Elementary School. In these positions, he was known for his dedication to teachers and students, the development of innovative programs and services, and sound fiscal management. He has worked primarily with underserved student populations from low income communities and has been a staunch advocate for policy and finance reform as a member of various state and federal level legislative task forces, including most recently the California League of Community College Legislation Advisory Board. His commitment to social justice drives his passion for urban education reform. In 2017, he was awarded the Martes Award for Research by the Association of California Community College Administrators.

Turner Cortez’s educational background includes a bachelors degree in History and Sociology from Georgetown University; a masters degree in Race and Gender Politics from New York University; and a doctor of philosophy in Education Policy and Administration from the University of Southern California.
Appendix B. Existing Programs Presentations
Overview of the OEI Ecosystem
FLOW Workgroup

Jory Hadsell
Executive Director
August 28, 2017

Online Education Initiative
Mission:
Increase student COMPLETION of transfer degrees by working together to increase access to quality online courses and online support services for students.
OEI as a CCC Infrastructure Platform

Technology platforms and interoperability
Access and online support for students
Faculty support and professional development
Institutional collaboration, at scale

Leveraging the collective size and expertise of the system to reduce costs, align to common platforms, and create a sustainable model that yields better results for students and institutions.

Common Course Management System

• “It can’t be done.”

• 108 colleges within the last 25 months!
  – Increased access to CMS
  – Greater equity & reliability across colleges
  – Seamless student and faculty experience
  – Reduce overall costs
Support Infrastructure

- Back-end processes to connect data
- Student support through integrated resources
- Faculty PD with a focus on course quality
- Helping colleges maintain regulatory compliance
- Accessibility / 508 efforts
- Reducing costs for colleges

Online Learning Support

Ecosystem

- Professional Development & Course Design Rubric
- Online Counseling Network & Platform
- Embedded Support for Underperforming Students
- Online Tutoring 24x7 & Platform
- Online Readiness (Quest Program)
- Coordinated Online Library Services
- Online Test Proctoring & Plagiarism Detection
- Accessibility Support & Universal Design

Common Course Management System
What are the results?

- Statewide, the gap between face-to-face and online success rates is closing.
- Statewide: Gap narrowed to ~6%
- OEI Pilot Colleges:
  - +2.9% above statewide average for OL success
- OEI Pilot Sections:
  - +3.9% above statewide average for OL success (68.8%)

Data: Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges "The Online Education Initiative: Access and Quality of Online Education in California’s Community Colleges" – 2017.
Online Course Exchange

• Simply put: Enhanced access for students to get a course needed for completion from another college in the consortium that they cannot get at their home college, without a lot of hassle.

Creating a Course Exchange

Challenges

• 24 pilot colleges
• Data transfer between SIS that vary by college/district (72 versions)
• Differing college business processes
• Outdated regulations (e.g., residency determinations)
• Variability of college technology infrastructure, resources
• Multiple reciprocity agreements needed, requires collaboration
• Developing the actual tool

Approach

• Focus on “what’s best for students”
• Stage college participation in phases
• Allow for creativity
• Determine mythical local policy versus actual regulation
• Change regulation where needed
• Assist with technology upgrades or implementations
• “Fully resource” Exchange courses
• Build goodwill between institutions
Course Exchange

Updates:
- Automated combining of financial aid coming in September 2017
- Limited pilot of 6 colleges currently cross-enrolling fall students
- Moving 14 additional colleges forward for go-live by end of year

Future Possibilities:
- Expand focus beyond transfer coursework
- Support ZTC courses and programs via Course Exchange
- “Networked pathways” through college collaborations

Summary
A new fully online college, even operating through a radically different paradigm, could leverage the new common infrastructure and complementary OEI-provided resources to get off the ground quickly.

The OEI can serve as a conduit for innovation between a fully online college and existing “traditional” online programs.
Our resources are available at:

http://CCCOnlineEd.org

or contact me directly:

Jory Hadsell,
Executive Director

jhadsell@CCCOnlineEd.org
Twitter: @joryhadsell

Follow us: @CCCoei
The Status Quo

• Socrates would feel right at home
  • Our basic instructional and business models have not evolved in millennia
• “One & done”
  • A singular education experience is intended to last a lifetime
• Institution-centric model
  • Students are required to navigate & comply with our structure
• Status quo is being challenged by learners, alternative providers, & employers
• There is probably more at stake than we realize
  • Might we be heading the way of music stores? bookstores? taxis?
Institution-Centered Higher Education

- Program
- Transcript
- Location
- Financial Aid
- Faculty Qualifications
- Schedule
- Timeframe

A Radical Departure

- The learner is the center of all academic and administrative engagements & transactions
- The institution facilitates a learner’s educational journey
  - Effectively recognize a learner’s existing skills, experience, & knowledge
    - Assess the indigenous knowledge
  - Contribute to the ongoing development of the student
    - Certifying small & large accomplishments
  - Support the transportability of learner accomplishments & certifications
  - Design for lifelong learning at the outset
- The institution provides diversified program offerings
  - Competency certifications & microcredentials
  - Courses, programs, & degrees for those who still seek them
Student-Center Higher Education

- First Job
- College Classes
- Apprenticeship
- Employability Cert
- Personal Learning Record
- Promotion
- Second Job

Student-Centered Higher Education

- College Classes
- Employability Cert
- Apprenticeship
- Promotion
- Personal Learning Record
- First Job
- College Classes
- Second Job
Easier Said Than Done

What will it take?

• Listen to learners – who are we not serving or not serving appropriately?
• Listen to employers – how can we better meet their needs for preparing learners for employment and success?
• Challenge convention
  • Legislation & regulation – what needs to change for 21st century education?
  • Organizational structure – we cannot apply the status quo structure
  • Funding models & mechanisms – how does the state, students, employers fund this?
  • Accreditation – is it necessary? when?
• Design the organization with diverse outcomes in mind
• Adhere to global standards

A Transformational Task

Our Comfort Zone

Where the Magic Happens

Printed books will never be the equivalent of handwritten codices. Why? Because scribes display more diligence and industry than printers.

Johannes Trithemius of Sponheim
1492
Coastline’s Vision for the Online College

Presented by Ross Miyashiro
Vice President of Student Services

The College Without Walls

- Over 40 years in Distance Education & 20 years in Online Education
- Serving older working adults
- 52% of enrollments are online
- 42 Online degrees available
- 39 Online Certificates available

- How have we remained a leading provider of online education?
  - Commitment to serving students at a distance
  - Highly qualified Faculty
  - Flexible Schedules
Gaps in CA Community College Online Education

• Underserved Students
• Student Success and Retention Rates
• Lack of System Flexibility
• Insufficient Student Support

Online Education Ecosystem Conceptual Model

Framework
• Student-first commitment:
  – access without barriers
  – guided success
• Collaborative
• Non-competitive
• Regional- based

Characteristics
• Flexible start times and variable term lengths
• Recognition of prior learning
• Competency-based
• Industry-recognized badging & micro-certificates
• Streamlined Pathways: From Community College to University and from College to Career
• System-wide alternative measures of success that reward collaboration
In Summary

• Propose a regional collaborative model
• Coastline is invested in working together to address the gaps
Concept Paper
California Online Community College
Office of the President
September 17, 2017 (revised)
August 28, 2017

Eloy Oakley Ortiz, Chancellor of the California Community College System
Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley
California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office
1102 Q Street, Suite 4550
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: San Diego Community College District’s Letter of Intent and Request for Alignment

Dear Chancellor Oakley and distinguished FLOW Committee members,

As you know, Chancellor Oakley has recently formed a work group to recommend options that enable California community colleges to better deliver on student success goals outlined in Vision for Success. This is to inform you that San Diego Continuing Education (SDCE) is prepared to answer Governor Brown’s plea to “take whatever steps necessary” to achieve a positive result, and has developed a thoughtful, realistic proposal to achieve California’s first, fully online, synchronous credit community college to serve nontraditional students.

SDCE’s proposal focuses on advanced information technology and computer science certificates and degrees. SDCE has already begun to explore the process to adopt badging and micro-credentialing, which could be expanded in collaboration with industry partners under a new credit division. Additionally, SDCE has partnered with the local workforce development board (San Diego Workforce Partnership) to bring TECH/HIRE to San Diego in a co-location partnership that secures 400 jobs and 150 paid internships per year for students. This model will be replicated throughout SDCE programs including the new online college.

The San Diego Community College District sees value in competency-based education, global standards, and persistent learning records. As the concept paper delineates, SDCE calls for a radical new approach to distance education that can work in tandem (rather than compete) with the California Virtual Campus (CVC) or the Online Educational Initiative (OEI). SDCE’s online college will address criticisms of the current systems regarding: affordability, scalability, transferability, and most importantly, flexibility.

In the history of California, Governor Brown’s support to the success and expansion of the state community college system is unmatched. For decades, the Governor has been a champion of technological innovation, workforce development, equity, student success, and system expansion; yet, he has asked very little of the community college system in return for this support. SDCE’s proposal specifically honors the historical backing of the state, while simultaneously redefines adult online public post-secondary education in California and nationwide.

We expect, and are prepared, to be met with resistance from system stakeholders who presently do not fully understand the sophisticated design of a fully online college, but we are prepared to “take whatever steps necessary” to achieve this bold, innovative approach for this Governor’s administration. SDCE’s proposal has my full support and I urge you to also consider the positive impact this transformative new approach could have on the community college system and the students we serve.

Sincerely,

Constance M. Carroll, Ph.D.
Chancellor
California Online Community College
Associate Degrees and Certificate Programming Online

Purpose/Rationale
California’s Governor Jerry Brown, in a June 2017 memo, directed California Community College Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley to develop a plan for a fully online community college in order to reach more non-traditional students and working adults (Ashford, 2017). The expectation is that the new college be completely online, without competing with current online community college programming; the college will appeal to nontraditional students not currently enrolled and struggling with the costs associated with for-profit institutions who provide flexibility and acceleration, but not the equity of affordability.

As indicated in the Vision for Success (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017) report, adult learners, in particular, are highly diverse and face many challenges including finding child care and transportation, along with issues such as food and housing insecurity, mental health issues, and serious learning disabilities. The report states the need for California Community Colleges to find “systematic ways to identify the needs of adult learners and connect them with the right services on and off campus”.

This concept paper focuses on these non-traditional adult students, which represent, according to the report, 41% of the current California Community College (CCC) student population. “Across California, an estimated 15 percent of working age adults, about 4.5 million people, have participated in higher education at some point but stopped out before completing a program of study” (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017, p. 12). This is the critical component – they have stopped out and therefore need to be recruited back into the system, within a context that allows them to succeed. “Likewise, adults who never entered college need multiple avenues back into education, as well as support to address the challenges that led them to leave and avoid returning to school in the first place” (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017, p. 12). In addition, there are disparities in basic CCC service coverage in different regions of the state. “Areas with the lowest college attainment of adults and the lowest median household income also have the lowest CCC enrollment per capita (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017, p. 13). Thus job-training is not accessible where it is often most needed.

This concept paper will address how a synchronous, fully online community college can support the seven goals as indicated in the Vision for Success report in order to “realize its full potential to meet the future workforce needs of California: focus relentlessly on students’ end goals; always design and decide with the student in mind; pair high expectations with high support; foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence; take ownership of goals and performance; enable action and thoughtful innovation; and lead the work of partnering across systems” (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017, p. 19).

Program Demand
- As of 2014, 14% of all higher education students were taking all of their instruction at a distance and 48% of those students were doing so at a public institution, with almost five times as many undergraduate versus graduate student enrollment (Allen, Seaman, Poulin & Straut, 2016)
- For-profit institutions enrolled more fully distance education students per percentage of their total population (Allen, Seaman, Poulin & Straut, 2016)
California has an estimated 15 percent of working adults who have dropped out of college, as well as those who have not been able to enter programs due to access issues related to disparities in CCC service areas and personal responsibilities that prevent access.

Examples of institutions with Online Associate Degrees:

- Ashford University
- Kaplan University
- PennState World Campus
- University of Phoenix

Market for the program

- For-profit and not-for-profit educational institutions target CCC student populations. SDCE must provide an alternative. Programs must be:
  - accessible (frequent points of entry, every 8 week session);
  - dynamic (face to face interaction and real human connection);
  - rigorous (equivalent of classroom brick and mortar experience);
  - affordable (no better option in the country than California’s community colleges);
  - flexible (asynchronous online platform with synchronous component);
  - career-oriented (aligned with workforce development board and community college labor market data);
  - responsive to industry demands (expedited curriculum and program process is essential), and
  - data-informed (decisions need to be made based on reliable and valid data).

Relationship to other programs

- California Virtual Campus offers online classes only (not program specific), and
- California Community College online programs and the growing Online Educational Initiative (OEI) are primarily asynchronous and not solely focused or structured on servicing students in a virtual environment.

- A significant risk exists if a fully online college is not established. Partner systems must be leveraged to increase access and retention in order for students to meet their goals.

Program Description

The fourth college of the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) will be accredited through the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Western Association for Schools and Colleges (WASC) as a post-secondary educational institution; in addition, it is expected to be designated as a HSI (Hispanic-serving institution). The program will be accelerated with students starting one level below transfer for math and English. All other basic skills will be noncredit and online creating on-ramping programming with SDCE’s
noncredit high school diploma and career technical education programs, as well as advanced ESL levels. Programs will be developed within the Guided Pathways framework, with the first degrees as follows:

- Transfer
  - Liberal Studies
- Career Technical Education (CTE) Certificates that articulate to associate degrees
  - Coding
  - Computer Science
  - Interactive Media
  - Networking Technology
  - Web Design

Students will have the option to begin their coursework with noncredit programs in ESL and basic skills or CTE. Basic skills programs will allow for the admittance to college level math and English courses using multiple measures rather than testing for placement; noncredit CTE programs will provide college credit through “credit by exam” articulation agreements, enabling students to complete credit degrees by fulfilling their general education requirements and upper level major specific courses. All programs will be 100% online and degree plans will be dictated, with few electives available, in order to streamline the educational plan development and completion process.

Program Aim and Goals

**Program Aim/Mission**

The California community college system is built to serve more traditional students. SDCE proposes a fully online college with instruction delivered through a dynamic synchronous platform to meet the needs of nontraditional students (e.g., students with disabilities, second language learners, working adults, and students who have not been successful with past educational experiences). The proposed fully online college would institutionalize Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) degrees built into Guided Pathways and designed for working adults, which will include the development of fully online student services, accelerated basic skills sequence (offering all pre-transfer coursework through noncredit), open educational resources (no costs to students for materials or books), and NetLab, a distance education-based laboratory essential for the application of technological skills.

**Program Goals**

Students will be:

1. expected to complete all pre-transfer course work through the noncredit division of SDCE;
2. assigned to an advisor who regularly and proactively checks the students’ progress;
3. advised and placed into distinct guided pathways with an associated educational plan identifying each course and the sequence in which to take required courses, in a cohort model;
4. expected to register for one (part-time) or two (full-time) 8-week courses at a anytime while enrolled in the college;
supported to remain on a chosen path (or further advised throughout the process should a change be sought) and provided with interventions and supports as necessary;
6. assessed systematically to ensure learning and mastering outcomes in all classes;
7. provided with convenient evening and weekend course options;
8. able to access all student services online, and
9. exempt from any course material or textbook costs.

Faculty will be:
1. provided with curriculum design and support resources to develop and maintain common course shells for each course offered;
2. assigned to a faculty librarian to assist with identifying appropriate Open Educational Resources (OER) with designers to develop OER resources, and
3. expected to work in collaboration with support from student services faculty and staff, to ensure their students are obtaining support when they are not satisfactorily progressing.

Curriculum will be:
1. aligned with industry standards;
2. developed in partnership with employers;
3. identified within a program and work pathway, and
4. transferable to four-year degree granting institutions; Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) will be maintained for students to fulfill lower-division general education requirements for transfer to all California State University (CSU) campuses and most University of California (UC) campuses/majors. Note: Further exploration will be required to align acceptance into private/independent or out of state online institutions.

**Delivery Methods**

**Instruction**
Distance education has historically been offered asynchronously within the California Community College System. This proposal identifies a shift to allow for synchronous instruction, an alternative to the traditional classroom, and to aggregate all services within a web portal, partnering with organizations such as Noodle to secure the required resources. Instruction will be interactive, instructive and accessible with:

- Synchronous with asynchronous components
- 8-week course offerings: *Harnessing the Power of the Synchronous Classroom in Staff Development*
  - Full-time: 2 courses per session (up to 48 units per year)
  - Part-time: 1 course per session (up to 24 units per year)
- Open Educational Resources (OER) / Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC)
- Virtual learning communities

A synchronous delivery system will be imbedded into the portal and/or learning management system (LMS) such as Canvas. Days and times for real-time communication will be detailed on each class syllabus with optional attendance and recordings for later reviewing (participation in one or the other will be required and monitored with associated assessment tools). Faculty will identify multiple weekly online office hours to accommodate student schedules. Online learning communities will be developed within the class using synchronous and asynchronous
discussions and collaborative small group work where appropriate, within a statewide service area. Minimal Ed Code and policies will need to be modified to allow for virtual libraries.

Advantages of synchronous instruction, according to Moallem’s (2015) research results, show that immediacy and intimacy are more likely to be obtained in a synchronous or synchronous/asynchronous combination that ultimately results in both a cognitive and emotional connectedness, as opposed to isolation, which negatively impacts student retention. Faculty need to manage and be supported in order to minimize concerns with synchronous instruction, and thus will be provided the technology tools, and have access to instructional design experts to support the development of online courses. This support will also extend to tutoring services for students.

OER provide a no or low cost alternative to students, but also requires additional training for faculty. According to Zou (2016), not only do faculty need to be trained in the development of OER, but in actually using OER; it is recommended that librarians work with faculty to more efficiency and effectively evaluate OER resources for inclusion in their courses.

Student Services
Academic advising, according to Jones and Hansen (2014), increases a student’s success; however, for distance education students, it is virtual intrusive advising that is needed; which is a proactive and intentional approach designed to create personal connections as well as establishing student responsibility for educational plans and success. Virtual intrusive advising also provides early interventions; all of these approaches are virtual and in addition to standard support currently provided to community college students.

Online student services will include:

- admissions and records;
- institutional and programmatic orientation;
- assessment using multiple measures (in support of incorporating competency standards); counseling services including career, academic and mental health;
- case management and advising, including monthly check-ins with students, reminders to register for upcoming courses, and triage to support services;
- career services including career exploration, career counseling, workplace experiences;
- job placement and a job board;
- health services; tutoring services, library services, technical support for technology systems; international student services;
- Student Affairs, Student Equity including DSPS, CalWORK’s and gender equity, and associated student groups in the form of learning communities.
- Note: Availability of 24/7 or a high percentage of service access will be explored, as well as minimal Ed Code and policies will need to be modified to allow for virtual support services (such as mental health services, and support services provided in the languages of the uppermost majorities of enrolled students).

Potential Students
Nontraditional adult students: Gregory and Lampley’s (2016) research comparing community college student success online versus the equivalent brick and mortar class shows overall students in online classes were more likely to withdraw; however, nontraditional-aged students had a higher rate of success online than traditional-aged students—even when considering the greater personal responsibilities that are more likely to exist with nontraditional students.
Further, nontraditional students are interested in a synchronous delivery model that has not been effectively executed by most colleges in the state system.

**Admissions and Records**

Admissions will continue with the CCC-Apply application. Systems and reporting will be put in place for staff to contact students who have applied to proactively engage with them as prospective students, and advise them in the enrollment process.

Certifications “along the way” will be built into traditional Associate Degrees along with micro-credentials. Examples already exist in current noncredit programming that articulate to credit in the form of “credit-by-exam” agreements. The Web Development and Business Information Worker certificate classes are examples of noncredit classes that articulate directly to a credit institution’s degree program.

**Program, Student Assessment and Engagement**

The ability to collect and analyze data is critical to the success of online programs and to the success of students. Data must be used to make evidence-based decisions, and to develop appropriate student intervention and advocacy infrastructure and supports. Qualitative and quantitative data must be collected and analyzed to support the goals and objectives of distance education programs.

According to Thistoll and Yeates’ (2016) research findings, the key student-centric enablers as well as barriers to engagement include mentoring, supporting and monitoring, connecting, and motivating students. It is therefore through a support infrastructure of mentoring and advising that students can engage in continuous discussion about their goals and application of the skills they are acquiring; supporting and monitoring of student assessment data and connections to tutors allow advisors to proactively engage with students who are not fully utilizing the institutional support services; student connectivity is enhanced within the virtual classroom through group work and engaged online discussion; and student motivation is a critical factor that influences course completion and can be enhanced through both faculty and support staff by proactively engaging the student. Thistoll and Yeates (2016) found it was “a lack of relevance, mentoring, and course advising [that] was cited as reasons for [students] dropping out” (p. 186).

**Affordability**

Students will have access to financial aid (including through employers), the San Diego Promise (paid enrollment and textbook fees), OER, ZTC, paid internships through entities such as TECH/HIRE which is a co-location partnership with the local workforce development board (San Diego Workforce Partnership) that secures 400 jobs and 150 paid internships annually, along with on-the-job training. This new fully online college will collaborate with other system colleges to advocate for competency-based training to be officially recognized by the state.

**Financials**

California’s first fully online college will be created with specific startup funding, which SDCE must identify to cover costs associated with the development of an accreditation application (approximately $150,000) and rent for leased space and with technology and furnishings to support the college’s services and employees (approximately $10 million). Employee space will be pursued in the ethnically diverse community of southeast San Diego. In addition, SDCE will
request annual incremental funding while building the new program to reach the full five-year target FTES allocation, with expected scalability to support the needs designated by the California Community College system.

Conclusions
Due to the link between student success, motivation and aspiration, it is critical that institutions facilitate students enrollment in courses “which match their aspirations and [are] applying motivational models to improve the student’s ability to succeed (Thistoll and Yeates, 2016, p. 189). The incorporation of synchronous instruction alongside of asynchronous instruction, supports not only student motivation but connectedness, which is also shown to help increase student retention. Synchronous instruction allows students to participate and feel less isolated; students become “aware of themselves as members of a community rather than isolated individuals communicating with a computer” (Chauhan, 2017, p.1345-1346). It is only with the additional support mechanisms being proposed in this concept paper that a California online community college can be designed with the student in mind, and a focus on end goals. Creating an infrastructure that includes high support expectations, fosters the use of data and inquiry, and partners resources across systems that will enable both action and thoughtful innovation, and will ultimately facilitate the success of nontraditional adult students.
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A Brief Overview of Distance Learning in a Competency-Based Model at KCTCS

President Jay Box
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EVOLUTION OF LEARN ON DEMAND
Competency-Based Education at KCTCS

• Distance Learning has evolved at KCTCS in a linear progression of continuous improvement:
  A. Research and Development of Learn on Demand model began 2007
  B. Launch of Learn on Demand (LoD) 2009
  C. 2014 Ad Hoc Group reviews and recommends strategies for improvement
  D. 2016 Work Group recommends all KCTCS distance learning move to competency-based model
THE VISION

• The vision for a competency-based, start anytime model to attract new students first surfaced in 2006 when the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) Marketing Department conducted research to survey prospective adult students without a college degree.

• The research concentrated on the barriers potential students face in continuing their education as well as to identify the motivations for seeking higher education. The research revealed the specific need for support services, including financial aid and personalized advising.

• The research also revealed that of the 2 million adults aged 19 to 54 in Kentucky, 1,340,000 did not have a bachelor’s degree or were currently enrolled. Of the 1,340,000, a total of 576,200 had some higher education and 763,800 had no higher education. Of this group, 14%, or 187,600, indicated interest in enrollment.

LIST OF INITIAL STAKEHOLDERS

• PLT-President’s Leadership Team-16 College Presidents
• CPE-Council on Post Secondary Education
• KET-Kentucky Education Television
• CRD-Center for Rural Development
• Kentucky CEO’s and Industry
• College Faculty and staff
• CRC (Curriculum Review Committee) and Faculty Senate
• System Office Staff
• Business Officers
THE COLLABORATIVE MODEL

• KCTCS senior leadership in collaboration with faculty and staff, launched a research and development effort in 2007 with the “code name” Virtual Learning Initiative (VLI).

• A VLI workgroup was formed and charged with creating a new distance learning model “to address the needs of Kentucky students who could be better served with a flexible and online path to a credential.”

• The VLI workgroup began with collaboration as a priority.

THE COLLABORATIVE MODEL

• The Virtual Learning Initiative workgroup conducted research focused on how to:
  ➢ capitalize on the progression of digital technology;
  ➢ increase delivery modes to students as well as student usage;
  ➢ increase relevance to new generations of students;
  ➢ increase the use of learning technologies;
  ➢ create efficiencies in learning delivery; and
  ➢ increase student success.
From VIRTUAL LEARNING INITIATIVE To LEARN ON DEMAND

The Birth of the Model

LEARN ON DEMAND

• VLI sub-workgroups refined processes for Learn on Demand implementation:
  • Processes defined and put in place for:
    ➢ Program and course development
    ➢ RFP for technology
    ➢ Help Desk Management
    ➢ *Success Coach role and “intake” enrollment management
    ➢ Course modules’ identifiers within Peoplesoft
    ➢ *Financial Aid-SAP
    ➢ *Quality Assurance process and Peer Review
    ➢ *Home vs Delivery college –funding and revenue sharing
MODELS OF COLLABORATION

• President’s Leadership Team - PLT met to review an Environmental scan and to conduct an analysis of models. PLT wrote recommendations for moving forward with a business plan adoption and identified collaborative workgroups across the system.

• Virtual Learning Initiative Workgroup - formed from faculty, staff, and System Office leadership to create a working business plan from the PLT recommendations.

• Focus Groups - consisted of students, colleges and faculty to determine needs analysis from all stakeholders in the process of a flexible competency based online model.

LEAD COLLEGES

Six initial LoD Lead Colleges selected from this criteria:

• *Lead Colleges must have program approval for LoD programs to be a college in which students register for the program and from whom students receive their degree/certificate/diploma.

• Lead Colleges of the consortium will have ultimate responsibility for providing and managing the delivery of their assigned program.

• Lead Colleges receive nonrecurring grants to develop their programs for implementation.
**LEARN ON DEMAND**

**INITIAL REVENUE SHARING MODEL**

- Non-recurring grant funding provided as interest free loan from CPE
- All six LoD Lead Colleges received grant funds
- Tuition Revenue placed into shared LoD Account
- Charges taken out for faculty facilitators, technology, success coaches, Learn on Demand Staff, repayment of non-recurring grant
- Return on Investment plan required Lead Colleges to project time to profitability
- *6-7 years to profit*

---

**COST OF STUDENT SUPPORT**

All courses in LoD offerings have:

- 24/7 Help Desk support
- Assigned Success Coach through duration of program
- E-text embedded in course at reduced price
- Out-of-State tuition equal to in-state
- Early Warning/Retention Support
- *Learner Analytics- in progress*
TRAINING! TRAINING! TRAINING!

- A second coordinated effort on training LoD faculty and staff for the new process occurred before launch and is ongoing in several focused areas:
  - Faculty facilitators
  - College Business Officers
  - Financial Aid officers and Registrars
  - Success Coaches
  - CAO’s- Matriculation-Curriculum
  - Technology training
  - Enrollment management and 24/7 student support
  - Distance Learning Peer Team Leads and LoD Project Team Leads

2009 LoD LAUNCHED!

- Official Launch of Learn on Demand at KCTCS
- LoD Unit of Chancellor’s Office established
- SACS (Regional Accrider) – Substantive Change filed
- Transfer agreements signed with state universities
- AA and AS degree in LoD format delivered
- Focused Marketing begins
- Faculty PD and Training
2014- FA ISSUES RESULT IN CHANGES

Financial Aid reporting for non-term delivery caused compliance issues and a cessation of modular offerings.

In turn several adjustments were made:

• Parent Courses instead of stand-alone modules
• Reduced marketing and re-evaluation of student demographic
• Re-design of virtual environment for Parent Courses
• RFP for technology to address reporting for non-term delivery

New Strategic Plan: to unify all distance education/eLearning into a single, system-wide, delivery mechanism that is designed to meet the learning needs of KCTCS students, and to create measurable outcomes that verify student competence and increase their employability throughout Kentucky and beyond.

2014 CREATION OF RENEWED VISION STATEMENT

2014 Vision Statement

• At KCTCS, our vision is to be the nation’s premier community and technical college system in the delivery of distance education and use of e-Learning technologies.

2014 Mission Statement

• The KCTCS distance education and e-learning mission is to improve the employability and quality of life of Kentucky citizens.

• New Strategic Plan: to unify all distance education/eLearning into a single, system-wide, delivery mechanism that is designed to meet the learning needs of KCTCS students, and to create measurable outcomes that verify student competence and increase their employability throughout Kentucky and beyond.
LESSONS LEARNED
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

• Need for intensive student support- success coaches-early intervention
• Issues with non-term financial aid reporting- Acquired Regent Software
• SACS Issues: Regular and Substantive Faculty Interaction
  • 25% Residency
• Faculty Buy-In and Faculty Loads in Non-Term
• Quality Assurance imperative to best practices and student experience
• DATA- Importance of data collection for learner analytics and intervention
• Virtual Environment/Student Cost- Open Educational Resources, ADA Compliance, Copyright, Quality Matters
• Competing models of online delivery

2016- NEW BUSINESS MODEL FOR DISTANCE LEARNING

• The New Business Model for Distance Learning seeks to propel KCTCS forward as the premier higher education organization for distance learning to support Kentucky students with CBE as a standard for all online courses that are:

  • Competency-based.
  • Quality assured.
  • Revenue-shared.
  • Scalable
Q & A

HIGHER EDUCATION BEGINS HERE

KENTUCKY COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
IT’S ALL ABOUT THE STUDENT
CBE AND INNOVATING BEYOND

WGU

• Nonprofit, founded in 1997 by 19 governors
• Competency-based, all online
• 60+ degrees in high-demand fields in four Colleges:
  – Business
  – K-12 teacher education
  – IT
  – Health professions
• $6,000 per year, “all you can learn”
• 83,000 students and 87,000 graduates in all 50 states

Created to expand and enhance higher education opportunities for busy adults
NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS ARE THE MAJORITY

…and they have different needs

- Flexibility
- Access
- Affordability
- Recognition of knowledge and skills already acquired

WGU: COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION

Recognizes adults have different levels of knowledge and learn at different rates.

- Hold learning constant, let time vary
- Advance when mastery demonstrated
- Personalize and adapt learning path
- Regular, substantive progress

ONLINE ≠ CBE
WGU: CBE AT SCALE

Quality + Relevancy + Assessment + Faculty

- Quality
  • College & Program councils
  • Academic & industry advisors
  • Assessments designed into curriculum
  • Data-driven

- Relevancy
  • Aligned with workforce needs
  • Regular review by employers
  • Graduate surveys

- Assessment
  • Knowledge & Application
  • Expert, independent evaluators
  • Secure, online proctoring
  • Integrated field / clinical experiences

- Faculty
  • Specialized roles
  • One-to-one, personalized support
  • Guided by real-time data
  • 100% student focused

Technology-enabled Student Learning & Experience

PROGRAM & COURSE DESIGN

- Required competencies defined and updated in collaboration with academic and industry experts
- Leverage best third-party course materials, where available
- 6-month terms, beginning each month
  - Allows for shorter cycle advancements in programs/courses
- Competency validated through expert assessments
  - Students move quickly through what they already know
  - Focus on what they don’t know and need to master
### Faculty at WGU – Specialization

**Student Mentors**
- Dedicated, regular one-to-one support for students

**Course faculty**
- Provide individualized instruction
- Lead group discussions
- Support students engaged in specific courses

**Evaluators**
- Experts grading / evaluating students performance

**Curriculum and assessment faculty**
- Select and develop course materials and assessments

---

### WGU: A Low-Cost Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Focus</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Less Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-volume, high-demand degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All-you-can-learn pricing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $6,000 / year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No increase in 9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-books and learning resources included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-Connect included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30 months to graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsible borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fewer defaults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
IT WORKS

Lower Tuition, Faster Time to Graduate

Individualized Learning  
Greater Student Support

DELIVERING A BETTER STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Job-Related Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenging Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Faculty Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Academic Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would Attend Again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating of Entire Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGU</th>
<th>US Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Survey on Student Engagement
DELIVERING VALUE TO GRADUATES

WGU graduates find the jobs they seek.

Employed Full Time

- WGU 86%
- US Avg 74%

Employed in Field

- WGU 86%
- US Avg 78%

... And earn more.

Higher Raises

- WGU Grads: $14,700
- US Avg: $8,900

Source: Harris Online poll

DELIVERING VALUE TO EMPLOYERS

- 100% said WGU grads were prepared for their jobs.
- 98% said WGU grads meet or exceed expectations; 92% said they exceed.
- 93% rate WGU grads’ job performance excellent or very good.
- 94% rated WGU grads’ soft skills equal to or better than other grads.
GREAT JOBS, GREAT LIVES

Perfect School for Me: WGU 92% vs. US Avg 65%
A Mentor Encouraged Me: WGU 89% vs. US Avg 53%
Passionate About My Success: WGU 80% vs. US Avg 59%

Academically Challenging: WGU 83% vs. US Avg 77%
Worth the Cost: WGU 91% vs. US Avg 65%

Source: Gallup

QUESTIONS?
ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by who we exclude, but by who we include and how they succeed.
ASU EdPlus
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Education at Scale and Speed, for Everyone, Everywhere.

study from anywhere
100% online

ASU online
ASU Online launches success center

Trying to juggle that perfect work/life balance in between your ASU courses can sometimes get a little chaotic. Luckily, for students enrolled through ASU Online, that's where a dedicated Success Coach comes in. Part personal advisor and part cheerleader, success coaches are focused on supporting ASU's online students in achieving their goals.

From helping adjust to life as an online student, to offering success strategies and time management tips, to connecting students to the various resources at ASU, Success coaches are available to help smooth any bumps in the road and to cheer students on as they cross the finish line.

LEARNING REALMS

01 TECHNOLOGY ENHANCED CAMPUS IMMERSION
Adaptive General Education Redesign

02 TECHNOLOGY ENABLED DIGITAL IMMERSION
ASU Online

03 OPEN SCALE COURSEWORK
Global Freshman Academy
Introducing
GLOBAL FRESHMAN ACADEMY
Reimagine your first year of university with edX and ASU.

www.edx.org/globalfreshmanacademy
Same courses, same faculty, same credit

Global Freshman Academy is made possible by a powerful partnership between Arizona State University and edX. Actually start college today and begin working toward your degree at ASU or a different school of your choice.

Custom-designed courses and award-winning faculty
Take ASU courses online at edX
Earn ASU credit
Pursue degree at ASU

View Courses

Santa Monica College
Arizona State University
The Audiences for an Online Community College in California: Background Data

presented to:
Project FLOW Workgroup
Sacramento, CA
August 28, 2017

Target Audiences

“Adults with some college and no certification as well as working adults with vocational needs.”

To enable them to earn certifications that lead to better workforce outcomes.

Chancellor Eloy Oakley
Percent Attainment, All Adults Aged 25-34, California, 2011-15

Percent Attainment, Adults Aged 25-34, California by Race, 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Percent Attainment, All Adults Aged 25-64, California, 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Percent Attainment, Adults Aged 25-64, California by Race, 2011-15

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-34 with Less Than High School, 2011-15

California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>650,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>808,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Adults Aged 25-34 with High School or GED, 2011-15

California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>315,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>77,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>6,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>91,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>684,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,200,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-34 with Some College, No Degree, 2011-15

California

482,681
304,544
147,517
47,347
549,369

White Black Native Asian Other Hispanic
Total: 1,337,370

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Adults Aged 25-34 with Just an Associates, 2011-15

California

170,267
26,298
1,456
64,302
15,592
154,132

White Black Native Asian Other Hispanic
Total: 432,947

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Number of Californians with Less Than High School, Aged 25-34 by Region

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Number of Californians with High School or GED, Aged 25-34 by Region

- Los Angeles: 21.2%
- Bay Area: 15.7%
- Inland Empire: 29.4%
- San Joaquin Valley: 28.4%
- San Diego Imperial: 39.5%
- Orange: 17.0%
- Sacramento Tahoe: 22.1%
- Central Coast: 21.2%
- Northern California: 25.2%
- Upper Sacramento Valley: 23.7%
- Central Sierra: 30.3%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Number of Californians with Some College, No Degree, Aged 25-34 by Region

- Los Angeles: 22.5%
- Bay Area: 19.3%
- Inland Empire: 27.8%
- San Joaquin Valley: 27.0%
- San Diego Imperial: 24.8%
- Orange: 23.3%
- Sacramento Tahoe: 29.3%
- Central Coast: 24.5%
- Northern California: 30.2%
- Upper Sacramento Valley: 33.8%
- Central Sierra: 30.7%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Number of Californians with Just an Associates, Aged 25-34 by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Imperial</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Tahoe</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Sacramento Valley</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sierra</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% In the Labor Force</th>
<th>% Not in the Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Imperial</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Tahoe</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Sacramento Valley</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sierra</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Employment Rates, Adults Aged 25-44, 2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Additional Detail
Adults Aged 25-34 with Less Than High School

Bay Area
- White: 11,671
- Black: 5,546
- Native: 366
- Asian: 12,356
- Other: 2,311
- Hispanic: 86,946

Central Coast
- White: 2,957
- Black: 736
- Native: 122
- Asian: 680
- Other: 670
- Hispanic: 56,124

Central Sierra
- White: 3
- Black: 154
- Native: 19
- Asian: 124
- Other: 148
- Hispanic: 1,169

Inland Empire
- White: 10,011
- Black: 3,708
- Native: 471
- Asian: 2,005
- Other: 1,030
- Hispanic: 80,125

Los Angeles
- White: 11,871
- Black: 5,568
- Native: 166
- Asian: 10,053
- Other: 2,225
- Hispanic: 86,946

Northern California
- White: 9,424
- Black: 615
- Native: 274
- Asian: 208
- Other: 104
- Hispanic: 4,244

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Adults Aged 25-34 with Less Than High School

Orange
- White: 4,220
- Black: 211
- Native: 36
- Asian: 2,268
- Other: 518
- Hispanic: 48,939

Sacramento/Tahoe
- White: 11,150
- Black: 9,223
- Native: 175
- Asian: 7,226
- Other: 1,226
- Hispanic: 86,946

San Diego
- White: 8,695
- Black: 1,718
- Native: 61
- Asian: 7,242
- Other: 961
- Hispanic: 43,451

San Joaquin Valley
- White: 2,179
- Black: 80
- Native: 341
- Asian: 1,179
- Other: 45
- Hispanic: 2,984

Upper Sacramento Valley
- White: 121,679
- Black: 480
- Native: 1,516
- Asian: 5,405
- Other: 1,504
- Hispanic: 101,279

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-34 with High School or GED

Bay Area

Central Coast

Central Sierra

Inland Empire

Los Angeles

Northern California

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Adults Aged 25-34 with High School or GED

Orange

Sacramento/Tahoe

San Diego Imperial

San Joaquin Valley

Upper Sacramento Valley

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-34 with Some College, No Degree

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-34 with Just an Associates

Bay Area

Central Coast

Central Sierra

Inland Empire

Los Angeles

Northern California

Sacramento/Tahoe

San Joaquin Valley

San Diego Imperial

Upper Sacramento Valley

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Number of Californians with Less Than High School, Aged 25-64 by Region

- Los Angeles: 21.5%
- San Joaquin Valley: 14.1%
- Bay Area: 11.3%
- Inland Empire: 11.6%
- Orange: 15.8%
- San Diego Imperial: 15.5%
- Central Coast: 20.3%
- Sacramento Tahoe: 13.8%
- Northern California: 15.5%
- Upper Sacramento Valley: 14.1%
- Central Sierra: 10.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Number of Californians with High School or GED, Aged 25-64 by Region

- Los Angeles: 20.8%
- Bay Area: 16.2%
- Inland Empire: 16.8%
- San Joaquin Valley: 18.5%
- San Diego Imperial: 16.8%
- Orange: 16.7%
- Sacramento Tahoe: 11.3%
- Central Coast: 21.2%
- Northern California: 25.2%
- Upper Sacramento Valley: 24.4%
- Central Sierra: 27.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Number of Californians with Some College, No Degree, Aged 25-64 by Region

Number of Californians with Just an Associates, Aged 25-64 by Region

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
### Adults Aged 25-64 with Less Than High School

#### Bay Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,288</td>
<td>23,044</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>27,048</td>
<td>5,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Central Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,366</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>4,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Central Sierra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182,408</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inland Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>416,126</td>
<td>15,119</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>311,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,544</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>4,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Northern California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101,714</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>311,166</td>
<td>101,714</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>311,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### San Joaquin Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>395,082</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>3,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source

U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-64 with High School or GED

Bay Area

Central Coast

Central Sierra

Inland Empire

Los Angeles

Northern California

Sacramento/Tahoe

San Joaquin Valley

San Diego Imperial

Upper Sacramento Valley

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Adults Aged 25-64 with Just an Associates

Bay Area

Central Coast

Central Sierra

Inland Empire

Los Angeles

Northern California

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Adults Aged 25-64 with Just an Associates

Orange

Sacramento/Tahoe

San Diego Imperial

San Joaquin Valley

Upper Sacramento Valley

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-15 American Community Survey Five-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Labor Force Participation, Adults Aged 25-64, 2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.

Employment Rates, Adults Aged 25-64, 2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
Appendix C. Cost Estimates Detail

Rough estimates of the costs associated with each of the three options are presented on the following spreadsheets. The assumptions behind the calculations are evident in these spreadsheets. These have been created in an interactive format that can be accessed at (URL to be inserted). Users can modify the assumptions and ascertain the overall cost consequences of those modifications.
### Option 1 - Cost Estimate for Online Community Colleges

#### Core/On-going Costs at Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director's Office</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Partnerships Development</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office &amp; HR</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Recruitment/Onboarding (per Student Served)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Insurance/Utilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR - Data Analytics</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>18,610,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,610,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,610,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core/On-going Costs at CCCCO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of design and assessments - QA</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start-up Investments - Initial Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications to Student Financial &amp; Course Mgmt Systems</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Costs Associated with Investments - Annual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Record system - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Record System - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management System - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Delivery Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (150 Students)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments ($100/Student)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Learning Materials ($100/Student)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Faculty</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Per Student</strong></td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option 2 - Cost Estimate for Online Community Colleges

**Community Costs at Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director's Office</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office &amp; HR</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Recruitment/Onboarding</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Insurance/Utilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR - Data Analytics</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,300,000</td>
<td>76,450,000</td>
<td>17,300,000</td>
<td>76,450,000</td>
<td>17,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Costs at CCCCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of design and assessments - QA</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications to Student Financial &amp; Course Mgmt Systems</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,900,000</td>
<td>33,400,000</td>
<td>7,900,000</td>
<td>33,400,000</td>
<td>7,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ongoing Costs Associated with Investments - Annual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Record system - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Record System - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management System - 10% of the cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Maintenance</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Delivery Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Served</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (1/60 Students)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments ($100/Student)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Learning Materials ($100/Student)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
<td>94,750,000</td>
<td>114,650,000</td>
<td>138,400,000</td>
<td>139,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Student</strong></td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>7,896</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>4,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option 3 - Cost Estimate for Online Community Colleges

### Core/On-going Costs at Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director's Office</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Partnerships Development</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Office &amp; HR</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Recruitment/Unboarding (per Student Served)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Insurance/Utilities</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/Onboarding</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,550,000</td>
<td>$41,550,000</td>
<td>$59,550,000</td>
<td>$50,550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core/On-going Costs at CCCCO Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Support</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Start-up Investments - Initial Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cost</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment System development</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$4,350,000</td>
<td>$4,350,000</td>
<td>$4,350,000</td>
<td>$4,350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ongoing Costs Associated with Investments - Annual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Maintenance</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Delivery Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Coaches (1/100 Students)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (200/Student)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Learning Materials (500/Student)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Access to Program Faculty (150,000)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Faculty</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$29,250,000</td>
<td>$29,250,000</td>
<td>$29,250,000</td>
<td>$29,250,000</td>
<td>$29,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Student</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Student</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
<td>$6,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Revenue Scenarios

The workgroup spent relatively little time addressing the issue of the sources of revenue necessary to support FLOW. The spreadsheets in this appendix present one set of scenarios for how FLOW might be financed. These scenarios are based on the following set of assumptions:

1. The state, through a multi-year investment fund, covers:
   - Recruiting/matriculation costs for the first three years
   - System and program development costs for the first two years

2. The state, through an ongoing categorical appropriation, an amount (less than $6 million) to cover management costs of FLOW entity for Option 3.

3. State appropriations through Prop 98 funding at the rate of $2,500 per (half-time) student for Options 1 & 2. State appropriations through Prop 98 funding at a lesser amount for Option 3.

4. Fees from students and contributions from employers at the rate of $1,500/student.

5. For Option 2, contributions from collaborating partners
   - 10 partners
   - 200,000/per partner
## Option 1 Start-up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students served:</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>$32,500,000</td>
<td>$70,790,000</td>
<td>$115,380,000</td>
<td>$156,520,000</td>
<td>$185,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Start-up Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>$54,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; System Development</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
<td>$54,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - Prop 98 @2,500/student</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$22,500,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Employers at 1,500/student</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$30,500,000</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>$126,000,000</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Less Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$10,620,000</td>
<td>-$36,520,000</td>
<td>-$5,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Start-up Contribution (Sum of Recruiting and Program &amp; System Development)</td>
<td>$111,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Prop 98 expenditures are calculated on the assumption that students are half-time.*
### Option 2 Start-up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Students served:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated Expenditures                                      | $65,000,000 | $94,750,000 | $144,650,000 | $188,400,000 | $199,350,000 |
| Revenue                                                   |            |            |            |            |            |
| Partner Contributions (10 x 200,000)                       |            |            |            |            |            |
| State Start-up Investments                                |            |            |            |            |            |
| Recruiting                                               | $30,000,000 | $48,000,000 | $63,000,000 |            |            |
| Program & System Development                              | $7,000,000  | $1,000,000  |            |            |            |
| Subtotal                                                 | $39,000,000 | $49,000,000 | $63,000,000 |            |            |
| State - Prop 98 (2,500/student)                          | 2500        | $15,000,000 | $30,000,000 | $52,500,000 | $82,500,000 | $112,500,000 |
| Students & Employers at 1,500/Student                     | 1500        | $9,000,000  | $18,000,000 | $31,500,000 | $49,500,000 | $67,500,000 |
| Total                                                    | $63,000,000 | $97,000,000 | $147,000,000 | $132,000,000 | $180,000,000 |
| Revenue Less Expenses                                     | -$2,000,000 | $2,250,000  | $2,350,000  | -$56,400,000 | -$19,350,000 |
| State Start-up Contribution (Sum of Recruiting and Program & System Development) | $149,000,000 |

*Note: Prop 98 expenditures are calculated on the assumption that students are half-time.*
## Option 3 Start-up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students served:</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Expenditures

- **Year 1**: $29,250,000
- **Year 2**: $57,700,000
- **Year 3**: $87,600,000
- **Year 4**: $109,000,000
- **Year 5**: $112,900,000

### State - Categorical for Ongoing Costs

- **Year 1**: $5,650,000
- **Year 2**: $5,650,000
- **Year 3**: $5,650,000
- **Year 4**: $5,650,000
- **Year 5**: $5,650,000

### State Start-up Investments

- **Recruiting**
  - **Year 1**: $15,000,000
  - **Year 2**: $36,000,000
  - **Year 3**: $54,000,000
- **Program & System Development**
  - **Year 1**: $4,400,000
  - **Year 2**: $3,750,000

### State - Prop 98 (2,000/student)

- **Year 1**: $6,000,000
- **Year 2**: $18,000,000
- **Year 3**: $36,000,000
- **Year 4**: $60,000,000
- **Year 5**: $90,000,000

### Students & Employers at 1,500/student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$67,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

- **Year 1**: $35,550,000
- **Year 2**: $76,900,000
- **Year 3**: $122,650,000
- **Year 4**: $110,650,000
- **Year 5**: $163,150,000

### Revenue Less Expenditures

- **Year 1**: $6,300,000
- **Year 2**: $19,200,000
- **Year 3**: $35,050,000
- **Year 4**: $1,650,000
- **Year 5**: $50,250,000

### State Start-up Contribution

- **(Sum of Recruiting and Program & System Development)**
  - $141,400,000
### Option 3 Start-up Costs (Version 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students served:</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>$29,250,000</th>
<th>$57,700,000</th>
<th>$87,600,000</th>
<th>$109,000,000</th>
<th>$112,900,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State - Categorical for Ongoing Costs</td>
<td>$5,650,000</td>
<td>$5,650,000</td>
<td>$5,650,000</td>
<td>$5,650,000</td>
<td>$5,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Start-up Investments</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>$54,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; System Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - Prop 98 (1,500/student)</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Employers at 1,500/Student</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$34,050,000</td>
<td>$72,400,000</td>
<td>$113,650,000</td>
<td>$95,650,000</td>
<td>$140,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Less Expenditures</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>$14,700,000</td>
<td>$26,050,000</td>
<td>-$13,350,000</td>
<td>$27,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Start-up Contribution** (Sum of Recruiting and Program & System Development) $141,400,000
Appendix E. Summary of Public Comments on FLOW Options
I respect my colleagues who teach online classes with rigor and oversight. I know for a fact that this occurs, and I applaud my DE colleagues who have committed themselves to making their online classes rigorous and meaningful because I know that doing so takes a great deal of work. However, a purely online college concerns me for many reasons. First, I do not believe that creating a 115th online college is in the best interest of students, especially the targeted populations; a purely online college will encourage more of these students, many of whom are unprepared for college, to attempt to get through the rigors of academics in a more accessible way. This seems to me to set many of these students up for failure; these very students often need face-to-face contact and support in order to be successful. Second, we currently have state-wide inequities with respect to how online learning is evaluated and delivered, both with respect to students taking the classes themselves, as well as the faculty who teach these classes. I would very much need to see the consistent application of a faculty evaluation and oversight process with respect to online delivery and teaching in order to make me more comfortable with the idea of a purely online college, for any population, target or not. Third, college is and should be a place for students to come together and find themselves through finding one another. It is often the first opportunity such students have to come together, in physical real space, with people of shared interest. There is a certain magic that occurs when people come together in this way. This invigorating aspect of being in college cannot be replaced with 100% online learning -- where is the community-building? Where is the human connection? Where is the interaction? It is lost or, at best, replaced with something artificial. I find it telling that many online learning environments attempt to replicate the physical classroom experience through a variety of interactive experiences -- always approaching but not quite getting to the point of fully substituting for the physical classroom experience. Fourth, for many of the very students this proposal will target, their immediate environments may not be conducive to learning for a variety of reasons. Bringing these students to a physical campus is for many of them a freeing experience even if they don't immediately recognize it as such: it provides them with physical contacts that they would never ordinarily make, it makes them interact with individuals outside their immediate spaces which can be good for them in far-reaching ways, and it provides a physical space that is positive, learning-centered, and full of tangible energy. I can continue, but in short, for me, the bottom line is I believe that there is no way that a purely online college can fully replicate or replace the benefits of interacting directly with other human beings in real physical space.

Don't misunderstand me: I am not opposed to all DE education. I do think that some online education is good for students today. I do think that today students need to know how to navigate an online world and that taking online classes will help promote this skill. I also think that taking a few well-staffed online classes can provide students with different challenges than the ones they face on the physical campus, and I do think that some college classes may even be delivered better through DE mode -- but when I think about ALL of a student's college classes delivered this way, the human and social costs of such are just too high in my opinion. Are we really so eager to have students "complete" that we will not allow them the social-interaction and personal growth that going to college traditionally affords them? If so, what does this say about us with respect to how we value the very students this proposal is
Professor Health, Fitness and Wellness

How is this really different from current adult education courses? Why not create certificate programs for current adult ed courses? All of this points to a trade-tech mentality.

What is the CCC’s role in higher education? In the past, CC has offered a low-cost entry-level education that opened the way to a four year traditional degree. Is that goal now being scrapped?

Hybrid coursework is already a standard at many institutions. Why not make this standard for all courses to allow for student workload?

Beyond enrollment, how do we police who is actually doing the course work? How do we detect cheats?

This is a form of tracking which has been around for a long time. How is this different from limited certification courses that are already available?

How is this co-partnering with private-sector labs and businesses different from work-experience credit?

How does this program respond to the changing job markets?

How does this program address aspects of job saturation and new job creation? Case in point: the programs offered for radiation technologist. As of 2004, the program was saturated with application on a non-priority lottery basis. In addition, available jobs in California were also saturated so that graduates had to move out of state to search for jobs. How are the program specific certificates going to be determined?

Most private sector jobs look at experience and training but often look at degree completion as a sign of individual determination as well as evidence of the overall knowledge attained. Other than that, they expect that employees will gain direct and specific on-the-job training that suits their own company culture. How do these certificates address real world training?

The goal of higher education is to increase the students’ overall knowledge and critical thinking capacity so that they can address and create their own job opportunities and pathways. How is a certificate going to address this?

adjunct faculty, English

Should California community colleges provide online degrees? Yes. Should we be VERY careful about how we go about this idea? Hell, yes!

As a face-to-face and online educator, I can tell that we still do not have at the national college level a standardized playbook by which students and educators can follow in order to develop, offer, or take an online course. The Chancellor’s Office should first develop a frame work by which ALL California community colleges can follow:

1. What do we mean by ADA compliancy? How do we validate that a course is ADA compliant? If a classroom is not - a campus can get into immediate trouble. Not so much for online learning. Is there a double standard for online courses?

2. How do we validate who is actually TAKING a course vs. who is signed up to take the course? Are students paying other students to take their courses? Of course. Do we know how severe this is? Nope. This is the first media bombshell that could negatively affect online learning.

3. Who is grading the students? Are there instructors at private and public institutions using essay grading software to grade papers? Yup. Publishers go out of their way to inform faculty of this ability. Should faculty be required to always grade student work personally? Yes.

Is this another potential media bombshell to negatively impact online learning? Absolutely. The amount of “robo-courses” offered to students at the college level is alarming. How do I know? I ask my students!!!

4. There is very little to zero evidence to suggest that two student populations, one provided face-to-face learning and the other taught online, when both provided a face-to-face comprehensive exam would result in scores that are statistically equal. I grow weary of my colleagues telling me that they WOULD be; prove it!

Scoring a touchdown on an actual football field is not equal to scoring a touchdown on Madden 2017.

As someone who is really just learning how to be an online instructor, I worry that a online learning scandal is right around the corner and is going to bite us all right in the behind.

The state has to get on board, but we better know what we’re signing for!

Page 20 - 80% of individuals in the US with ‘some’ college, no degree, have a mobile device. Online learning, if done effectively, may require more than a phone. How many of this demographic own an iPad or laptop computer?

Page 25 - Excellent inclusions for all options. Helps to ensure student success.

Page 26 - Where does the money for this high level of student support come from? What does the ‘human contact’ aspect look like? Assuming this is funded by numbers of students enrolled, i.e. more students more resources, what happens to the student who is in a area that is under enrolled? No support?

Page 27 - proctored exams a must

Page 32 - Program choice & employer relationships conducted by campus staff and faculty - in an era when faculty are over loaded with initiatives, working toward transitioning to Guided Pathways, accreditation responsibilities in addition to effectively engaging their students with content and pedagogy that is current and relevant, where will they find the time to reach out to develop new partnerships? Is this realistic? Add to that the added responsibility of assessment for quality assurance. There are only so many hours in the day for faculty. As a faculty member fully overloaded at the moment, this is completely unrealistic.

Page 40 - “Done well” - That's the kicker. Instructional designer a must! Regular evaluations and comparisons of what was said would be done with what is actually being done essential as well.

I am eager to see where this goes. Thanks for your hard work on the behalf of all students struggling to get an education and employment.

Public Comment Inventory
Page 2
I love the idea, and say wholeheartedly, "Let’s do it." Here, I want to contribute some reasons in addition to the ones you have outlined and offer some more ideas. Many years of online teaching experience—and recent training in the Canvas LMS—have shown me that online teaching requires full-time attention to really respond to student questions and send questions throughout the day, yet when I am on campus teaching in a classroom, creating frustrating delays in getting a response from me because my cellphone may be off for two-hour blocks of time. Additionally, students want instant feedback on assignments, yet I teach English, which requires grading lengthy essays. Frankly, many of us have campus obligations that divide our time and attention. Therefore, I recommend that community colleges allow faculty to teach fully online courses and give state apportionment to community college campuses for their online offerings if they do this. It would, furthermore, encourage campuses to build their online offerings to enable working Californians to have the option to start at developmental classes through transfer-level classes, as currently my community college does not offer any developmental classes online. To further explain why this is mutually beneficial to students and faculty, I think students in disadvantaged communities may not learn of the option for fully online education if they do not see it advertised in their local community college catalogs amongst campus class listings. Beyond that, this would enable the virtual college to benefit from having experienced online faculty. My understanding is the current model would require you to start a hiring process which could be cumbersome and could delay it considerably. I suggest, as another alternative, that you could offer for faculty to move seamlessly into teaching in the fully online college without losing their years of service as public employees. Fully online options would benefit students in California, but also experienced fully online teaching faculty would benefit online students’ education. I would say to do a fully online college, 115th college.

---

Professor of History/Student Equity

---

Instructor, Business Department

Regardless of the direction this project goes, it is essential that the DE environment be addressed with the intention to tap into its fullest potential to create personally engaging, relevant learning experiences, and not passive "information delivery" platforms. In other words, this would be an opportunity to not only apply DE technologies to a broader student population, but to truly serve all students by making sure DE faculty are trained and supported to deliver DE more personally engaging environments. Granted that this is not always accomplished even in the face to face classroom, but it is needed in both the face to face and the DE learning environments. It seems a combination of options 2 and 3 might work best—a consortium of colleges so as not to recreate the wheel, but with a powerful DE support organization that would serve as the hub for design, support, student services, etc., not in lieu of existing services at each of the colleges, but in partnership with them. Faculty involvement and consent is critical for the success of any initiative of this sort, including faculty involvement and shared governance in any new organization that comes into being.

---

Professor of History/Student Equity

Instructional Activities Coordinator

This seems like a waste. How will asking already overworked, overscheduled workers to cram more into their day help them get ahead in school? When will they have time to study and to complete assignments? As an instructor of online classes this proposition makes me worry. The evidence from online education is a 50% drop rate or higher. Education systems have not shown that online learning is going to help open access of classes to students. Let's say a worker is working 50 hours a week. They enroll in one online 3 unit class which required a minimum of 9 hours study/homework time. That is a total of 12 hours class time. So now they have 52 hours of work, 12 hours of class time. They now have 52 hours of total occupied time. There are a total of 168 hours in a 7 day week. We’ve just taken 62 leaving our worker with 106. I'm taking out 8 hours/day for sleep because I am a scientist and that is what medical professionals should be insisting on for healthy people. That is 52 hours per week. Now we are left with 52 hours of time left over. If we are honest, we know that workers have to commute to and from those jobs. Here in the bay area the average commute is 31 min (one way) so approximately 1 hour a day. We now need to reduce our 52 hours by 7, to 45 hours. That if our worker is only working one job. If they work two, drop to 38 hours. Now, our worker has approximately 5 hours a day to take care of kids, eat, grocery shop, pay bills, clean the house, visit a doctor, or volunteer in a classroom. We really need to look at the time commitment we are asking of our 'potential' students before we ask them to add more to their days. This may seem reasonable, but as any assumptions are made, please break down the hours in your day. You'll see what your asking is very difficult if not impossible.

Can we included in the funds grants that would available to pay people to quit one job (or more) and/or pay for child care to get them into school full-time or part-time. Then they can choose which experience will be better: a face 2 face experience or the online delivery. We need to help workers be successful in their already full days. The only way we are going to get more people in school is if they have the time for school. When the economy is poor, people are not working and have time, so they enroll in school. When the economy is good, people are working and do not have time for school.
I agree that many students find it challenging to attend F2F classes, and there is a need to offer more online courses to improve access for students who are working, etc.

However, as a college Professor, I am completely against the idea of a separate Community College for online learning, for the following reasons:

1. ENROLLMENT: Enrollment is dropping at Community Colleges, this "online CC" will suck the lifeblood out of these institutions. Instead of creating a separate "online college," I believe the money would be better spent to support the development of online courses at each community college. In order to avoid duplication of courses, there could be a system in place to help colleges coordinate their offerings.

2. QUALITY OF EDUCATION: I have recently started teaching a Master's Degree course at an online University. I have been shocked by the attitude of the students in this program...they expect to just do the minimal amount of work. They are not interested in "learning," they just want to add an MBA to their resume. They perform at a much lower level than my City College undergraduate students! They do not complete assignments, because they are "working full time," or "have other obligations," etc. And, they expect that this will be acceptable and they can just get their diploma. These are MASTER's level students! Can you imagine how undergrads will behave?

The California Community College System is among the best in the United States. Do we really want to undermine our reputation and quality by chasing after a poorly conceived idea?

3. LEARNING IS "HANDS-ON": It is extremely difficult to learn complex, relational or mechanical issues online. Some courses lend themselves to online learning, others don't. For instance, you can't really learn how to make a pitch for a business idea online-you have to physically practice and get feedback from the audience. You can't learn from your peers/classmates' experiences if you've never met them face to face with the same depth as in the classroom setting.

You can argue that you will only offer certain online courses where this is not an issue, but then, why not just let the local CC offer that class?

4. COMMUNITY: This is the COMMUNITY College System. Each CC has a distinct impact on their local community. At Community Colleges, connections are made; interactions between businesses, education and students are fostered; a certain amount of community pride is developed. Technology is great, but are we giving up on our HUMAN interaction? If a local CC

To Whom It May Concern:

I have taught online for twelve years. I spear-headed the first online class in my division. I also encouraged more creation of online classes, attended numerous online conferences, and helped other courses across the curriculum become online equivalent. I was on the Distance Education Committee at Fresno City College for several years. Additionally, I was selected to be a part of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative (O.E.I.), in which I have taught for several years. Last, I was a presenter at the Online Teaching Conference in 2015.

First, I like the idea of students being able to earn their degrees fully online. In fact, not only am I an advocate for this very idea, I was also accepted into UTEP's Online MFA Program, so I could earn my MFA while teaching full-time. UTEP's online program has been very successful, and I believe California Community Colleges can also be as successful, if not more. The Flex Learning Options for Workers has so much potential, and I believe this is the time to seize the opportunity to move forward online. Online no only helps students, it helps the college. [...]College, for example, is impacted in every way. We have limited class space, limited office space, and limited parking space, to name just a few areas that can really benefit from online class opportunities.

Second, I hear stories from working class students all the time, who share their concerns and frustrations about the limited access to online courses. Their education is stalled or halted because they cannot take the next necessary course due to the lack of online offerings, or, sadly, there may not even be an online offering for the needed course at all. Moreover, with impacted programs like Nursing, some of these students, who have literally waited for years to get into the Nursing Program, may be denied because they did not complete all the prerequisites through no fault of their own.

Last, I hope that one day students can earn their degrees fully online. I would also like to see instructors like myself teach fully online, so that we can discuss the unique course online issues that we encounter. We need specific support and training and collegial conversations that will help us continue to improve our online courses and create stellar course models. The more students and instructors can work together to make online education accessible and excellent, the better Flex Learning Options for Workers Project can meet the needs of hard working students who just need access to finally graduate from college and find success.

Thank you for the opportunity to share.

Best,

English Instructor
While I can appreciate the options that online courses can present, and I realize that the target population is those currently in the workforce seeking certificates (so far), the concept of having a completely online college is not without its weaknesses. Here are some of my concerns:

1. The statement mentions that workforce development is one of the reasons for the existence of the community college. This demonstrates then that there are other reasons. Agreed, all of us hope that students will use their educations to create opportunities for gainful employment, but the community college does not exist for job training exclusively (or even mostly). We are about mind training and human development. We have many academic degrees that do not directly translate into employment, and to lose that focus is to minimize the rich nature of a well-rounded education. Education for the sake of education is valuable; education solely for the sake of employment cheapens the nature of what it is that we do.

2. My understanding is that dropout rates for online students is significantly higher than those of face-to-face students. If that's true, how will we address it? Are we willing to exchange persistence for convenience?

3. Students regularly struggle in their academic achievement even in the direct presence of counseling, tutoring, faculty office hours, on-campus programs, and the healthy pressure of being prepared for class. Is there evidence that students at large are successful when they are completely self-monitoring?

4. I don't see how all classes can be taught online. How will performance classes (speech, music, sports, physical education, drama, etc.) or classes requiring lab work or physical training (biology, chemistry, nursing, police and fire academies, welding, carpentry, auto maintenance, etc.) be taught exclusively online? Unless we are willing to lessen the experiences of students by substituting valuable face-to-face coursework with those that are more theoretical in nature, how it can be accomplished?

I’d like to commend the leadership for returning to this much needed gap in higher education, working adults. After a decade of coordinating the highly successful PACE, Program for Accelerated College Education, at […] College, I’d like to share my insights as the state moves forward in this endeavor.

First and foremost, while making education accessible via online, there’s still many pockets throughout the state with folks lacking the necessary confidence and skills to successfully navigate their portal, assignments, etc. This causes initial fear in even considering such programs as an option and often those most needing the education, training, and certificates, remain most apprehensive knowing they lack such technological skills and savvy know-how (often depending upon their teens).

So I’d recommend as the program begin with having initial in-person sign ups, information sessions, and then orientations, a three step process to lure them in, access their abilities and have the necessary student data and information to immediately make changes throughout the program state wide. (Similar to the state’s one-stop shops for unemployment, etc).

Remember, students with money, knowledge, and wherewithal have no difficulties navigating technology and glide through their online higher education at ASU, the top degree granting institution.

However, typical community college students venturing into an open enrollment environment do so because it’s the nearest to access, and most comfortable, so they’re able to ask questions, follow up with knowledgeable, caring staff, until they’re able to do for themselves.

By “front-loading” a strong student-focused, mandatory orientation, we quickly and effectively moved students from frightened to active learners. And adult students were very willing to help others like them knowing their hesitation, especially male students (two nearby Navy bases).

Basically, by knowing the student population, especially in various locales, and then tailoring the intake to provide answers to their concerns without them having to articulate them, such ESP provided immediate student buy-in, engagement, and erased their fears on their initial steps into the program and their college education.

Second, and perhaps most importantly, having the ability to hire the best faculty to work with this population will be most critical to student persistence and success once they’re enrolled. Because the pace of our program grew so quickly with the impending CSU, Channel Islands becoming a transfer university, we often found ourselves at the mercy of hiring “anyone” due to the explosion of students.
On behalf of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), I appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments on Project FLOW.

FACC’s Board of Governors thoroughly considered this initiative on November 17, at which time we unanimously voted to oppose it in any of its current forms. While we would have appreciated the opportunity to examine three distinct options for serving the target population, we have been presented with three forms of the same proposal. Since the underlying basis for this initiative is inherently flawed, we believe a complete reexamination and restructuring is needed before proceeding.

The following outlines FACCC’s opposition:

1) While the proposal is meant to extend educational access to a mostly Latino population of workers lacking a college degree, it actually exacerbates educational inequities by segregating this group from our traditional offerings. FACCC agrees that our system can do a better job in reaching this population, with online education as a component, but the design of Project FLOW does nothing to integrate this group with other in-class or online students. In fact, it does the opposite. We are deeply concerned about the statement we would be making and the precedent we would be setting if we adopted this initiative. Project FLOW runs counter to the ideals of the California Community Colleges and would be a serious departure from our efforts to expand educational equity.

2) There is no evidence that the target student population is requesting this proposal. With a target audience in mind, it would be appropriate to first ask them what educational opportunities are lacking and what they would want to pursue. Project FLOW would require substantial effort and resources into a modality that may not resonate with the intended target. This reflects a fundamental problem with the process that should be addressed before moving forward.

3) The fact that the target population has access to cell phones does not constitute online availability for higher education learning. Faculty members who teach online have substantial experience in working with students in a distance-based educational setting. While cell phones offer connectivity, they are not necessarily sufficient instruments for test taking, reading material, or other online instruction. If increasing student success is truly a goal of the system, this must be taken into consideration. Moving forward on the assumption that a cell phone can replace a computer will likely set up our students for failure.

4) The research on student success in online education is much less optimistic than presented in Project FLOW. In any of its current forms, Project FLOW looks less like the California Community Colleges’ Online Educational Initiative (OEI) and more like a new way to deliver MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) to San Jose State suspended its experimental MOOCs after a celebrated inauguration, citing low levels of student success. Moreover, the Legislature rejected MOOCs for the California I believe that an online, subscription-based, and competency-based education is the totally wrong direction for community colleges that do not adequately meet the needs of our students. The entire FLOW Process has lacked genuine faculty input and development, and appears designed to keep faculty out of the normal curriculum development, minimum quals, performance review, and program review. Who will be responsible for evaluating the FLOW program to determine if it is meeting the needs of students. Will this FLOW program maintain the 50% law, 75/25, and will the funding of this program come from Prop 98 funds? How will faculty be represented by the union, how will a collective bargaining contract be developed, who will represent faculty if there is a grievance. Targeting a specific student population, older, some or no college, in or out of the workforce, and Hispanic to enter into a program that is noncredit and does not give them any credit toward a degree is on the face racist. To guide such a student into these programs rather than credit toward a degree is separate and unequal treatment, I thought we decided that this was not right in Brown v. Board of Education many years ago.

Maintaining a specialized central online space for FLOW students provides a focused environment where their needs are primary. Faculty, staff, and support hired for this campus would be fully aligned with the mission. Everything about Option 3 prioritizes the students.

My only recommendation with Option 3 is that CCC 115 build upon an academic foundation. Skills-based programs would necessarily have an academic aspect including at the very least, math, and English or communication studies.

As for the myths v. realities, Myth 1; the OEI and the Course Exchange will likely have a far greater impact on local DE programs than Option 3. Myth 4; the CCC has always had a focus on employability and credentialing, they just haven’t done a good job with it. Jumping to Myth 6; I have been a fully-online CCC composition professor since Fall 2001. I have yet to come across a student who is incapable of learning online. Non-traditional students, fully-employed students, students in ill health, and students with young children at home who are looking to embark on careers as their children grow are all highly motivated to learn online even when online learning is not their preferred method of content delivery.

Further, many online students take advantage of distance learning because they may not have cars and cannot rely on public transportation due to distance or time factors.

I have successfully taught all of these students.

There remains a great divide between faculty who believe and understand the benefits of online learning and faculty who dismiss it as inferior and are unwilling to accept that students are able to thrive without stepping foot in their hallowed classrooms. Invariably this second set of faculty discriminate against distance learning from a position of ignorance having never taken nor taught nor trained to teach online. I have worked with this faculty since I put an inaugural class online at two CCs in 1999 as a part-time instructor, and I’ve interacted with this faculty every year since. On some level they grudgingly accept that distance learning might be "Ongoing" and "help identify" are key terms that indicate campuses are making scant progress while collecting dollars resulting in few tangible outcomes that are never a priority.

Maintaining a specialized central online space for FLOW students provides a focused environment where their needs are primary. Faculty, staff, and support hired for this campus would be fully aligned with the mission. Everything about Option 3 prioritizes the students.

My only recommendation with Option 3 is that CCC 115 build upon an academic foundation. Skills-based programs would necessarily have an academic aspect including at the very least, math, and English or communication studies.

As for the myths v. realities, Myth 1; the OEI and the Course Exchange will likely have a far greater impact on local DE programs than Option 3. Myth 4; the CCC has always had a focus on employability and credentialing, they just haven’t done a good job with it. Jumping to Myth 6; I have been a fully-online CCC composition professor since Fall 2001. I have yet to come across a student who is incapable of learning online. Non-traditional students, fully-employed students, students in ill health, and students with young children at home who are looking to embark on careers as their children grow are all highly motivated to learn online even when online learning is not their preferred method of content delivery.

Further, many online students take advantage of distance learning because they may not have cars and cannot rely on public transportation due to distance or time factors.

I have successfully taught all of these students.

There remains a great divide between faculty who believe and understand the benefits of online learning and faculty who dismiss it as inferior and are unwilling to accept that students are able to thrive without stepping foot in their hallowed classrooms. Invariably this second set of faculty discriminate against distance learning from a position of ignorance having never taken nor taught nor trained to teach online. I have worked with this faculty since I put an inaugural class online at two CCs in 1999 as a part-time instructor, and I’ve interacted with this faculty every year since. On some level they grudgingly accept that distance learning might be,...
As the Director of Distance Education at a California Community College, […] of the California Community College Distance Education Coordinators Organization (CCC DECO), a member of the Online Education Initiative (OEI) Advisory Committee, and a member of the Distance Education and Educational Technology Advisory Committee (DEETAC), I would like to offer my opinion on the options provided by the FLOW workgroup.

I will state up front that my recommendation would be to create an entirely separate 115th CCC, as outlined in Option 3. Here is why.

Online Faculty Need Support
In my role as the DE Coordinator on my campus, I understand all too well that there is faculty opposition to a variety of aspects of online education. However, I also believe that the will of faculty on any given campus may be both underestimated and overgeneralized. Our shared governance system of decision making results in small numbers of people representing their constituents in every governing body. In theory, this means that everyone has a “voice” in decisions made, and all groups are well-represented. In practice, however, it can often mean that certain people can use their positions to further their own agendas.

On any given CCC campus, you will find faculty who disapprove of online education for academic, financial, and even “moral” reasons. You will also find faculty who want to teach online and who believe in its academic equivalency and its innate ability to reach an otherwise-unreached student population. These faculty, however, may feel the need to quietly go about their educational activities without voicing their support for instructional modality they prefer. In particular, adjunct faculty may defer to the “louder” voices on campus in an attempt to avoid disruption of their tentative employment status.

Because of the opposition that online education often faces on our campuses, the faculty who teach these classes are often under-supported. A recent Babson survey (Time for Class, 2017) of higher education administrators and faculty reported agreement that resources to implement digital learning are lacking. The reason cited was that “…the decentralized decision-making structures in place at most institutions today generally slow the adoption of [digital] teaching and learning technologies…”

If a new, online California Community College is going to address these issues, they will need to find a way to separate themselves from the opposition that reduces online instructor support. In my opinion that would only happen with Option 3.

Online Faculty Need Freedom to Innovate
The culture of each college in the system can have an enormous impact on the acceptance and adoption of new technologies, learning platforms, and educational models. Just as technology in general is expanding and changing at a rate even Moore’s Law may not have predicted, digital teaching and learning tools are expanding and changing at an equally exponential rate. New learning management systems, multimedia production and integration products, communication tools, etc. are arriving faster than anyone could possibly keep up with. And while no one would propose the adoption of every new technology that appears on the horizon, if decisions are to be data-informed, then let’s collect data. Insufficient time for consideration and input have been made available. Creating another “tier” or “type” of community college would hardly seem to fit in the California Educational Master Plan. Also, if a college is to be accredited, it must meet all accreditation standards - including those related to student services. Offering all student services, especially counseling (not online advising, but counseling) becomes problematic (and, therefore, an issue for accreditation). As an EOPS Counselor, I am very concerned that this “college” will be configured in such a way that underrepresented students cannot be served by EOPS, thereby giving them yet another disadvantage. I urge further research, deliberation, and input by both administrators and faculty before action for implementation is taken.

Professor
Just because 80% of Californians have a mobile device does not mean that they have reliable or sufficient Internet access/bandwidth for academic work.

You need to make sure that online students actually have an Internet access plan that can accommodate watching video for course work while the rest of the family is watching Netflix.

Rather than a FLOW District, the CCCCO should be the liaison to industries to find out what employer-needed micro-credentials are useful. CCCCO can send out RFP for CCC faculty to develop them and to make them available for all CCC to use in offering their own courses. Faculty should be allowed reassigned time from their full-time position to work on the RFP.

I support the ASCCC Resolutions passed at the Fall 2017 Plenary regarding four FLOW, which are listed below:

7.10 Using System Consultation and Faculty Input to Address Expansion of Online Education https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/using-system-consultation-and-faculty-input-address-expansion-online-education
7.12 Endorse Consortium Approach to Expanding Online Educational Opportunities https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/endorse-consortium-approach-expanding-online-educational-opportunities
9.02 Expand System-wide Online Educational Opportunities https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/expand-system-wide-online-educational-opportunities
9.03 Online CTE Programs and Competency-Based Instruction https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/online-cte-programs-and-competency-based-instruction

Further, the ASCCC has positions relative to Western Governors University, and given that the models presented by NCHEMS are advocated for by the Chancellor's Office incorporate many aspects of WGU's approach to instruction, they may also be of interest: 13.04 (Spring 2011) Opposition to Western Governors University California https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-western-governors-university-california
2.05 (Spring 1998) Western Governors University https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/western-governors-university

Mathematics Faculty
Community colleges around the state are already offering online courses in an effort to improve accessibility and support students in their academic/credential goals. In reviewing the three options developed, I believe a model similar to option two would be the most successful. If the assumption is that there are students out there that are not currently accessing education, yet want to, then we should be working on our marketing, not creating something new. A consortia or clearinghouse to organize online programs around the state would be invaluable.
There are serious concern as to the ramifications of any of these Options with regard to the Faculty Unions, the Classified Unions, and each of their Collective Bargaining Agreements:

* What would be the status of the Faculty teaching in, and Clerical Staff supporting, this Online Institution?
* What Collective Bargaining Agent will represent these Faculty and Classified Staff members?
* If it is Option #1 or #2, how will this affect the Employees’ regular working hours and duties?
* If it is Option #3, a separate District:
  * Who will be the Employer be?
  * Will the Faculty/Staff be living in California, in another State, or even in another Country?
  * Will they be Full-Time Faculty or Adjunct/Part-Time Faculty, like most Faculty at For-Profit Institutions?

With regard to “Myth #3” (page 41):
For most of the CTE Programs I can think of, this is absolutely ridiculous; “hands-on and clinical components of a program are accomplished across the country using labs and employer sites at off-hours and contracting with professionals at clinical settings.”

I have over ten years of experience both teaching and taking online course at all levels of higher education. I currently teach an online-only research and information literacy course (Library 101: Introduction to Information Literacy). I also provide research support to both face-to-face and online students at our library’s reference desk and through our online chat reference service. I support online education as a great option for some students. At the same time, I have some concerns about Project FLOW, both about access to library materials and research support, and about the efficacy of online education for the target population.

As a librarian and information literacy education expert, I am concerned that the Project FLOW draft makes no mention of library resources and reducing the depth, breadth and quality of their course offerings. If the State of California is focused on materially increasing opportunities for online learning in the state, this objective would be much better served by increasing online learning options to the population at large.

We have not been given enough time to really consider all of the options presented. Our school already offers online courses, during our four semesters. Most CCC are facing enrollment problems, that could further be complicated by some of the things proposed. It would be helpful to have a single location that indicates which Schools are offering online options and what areas they meet on Plan B and C, CID, course descriptions that include prep req’s and enrollment information. This would also require a better system to document courses among schools and a more universal transcript for better interpretation for students and Schools interpreting the courses. Students need to have a clear understanding of the courses they are taking and how they impact their resources available to existing community colleges to offer more and better online courses, as well as to promote existing online learning options to the population at large.

As far as the three Options, I support Option #3 for a few reasons: it is likely to be more flexible, rather than having to rely on the facilities, staff, resources, and expertise of a particular existing college or district; it will enable more faculty from throughout the state to participate; and it will more easily enable the new online CCC to have its own identity/personality because it wasn’t be false.
Currently, with the discussion of FLOW on our campus, there is opposition, or rather, caution on the part of faculty at Sacramento City College. The issue is the development of the student as a whole. Those of us who have direct student contact understand the delivery of material, but also, the development of the student as a complete person, the intangible factors, such as the moment a student learns something new, establishing of trust and respect between student and faculty and even as far as a student finding a mentor in a faculty or staff member. Distance education does limit that human relationship/interaction, where unspoken cues to a student’s success are not always evident in an online environment.

The 2.5 million students who are the target population, and depending solely on technology such as a computer, smartphone or other device may still be a divide that the target population does not have access to. If 48% are from Spanish-speaking households, what support service or component is evident to bridge the communication gap? There are many other underserved populations in California such as Southeast Asians, Middle East immigrants and those students who may have disabilities, would not be so easily served by the FLOW objectives.

There are many other aspects that were or may have not been discussed with FLOW, such as the delivery of support and student services. These services are crucial to the success of students.

With what I have mentioned, and maybe a dozen other concerns, we as a State, cannot leave people unprepared for generations. I am in full support of Governor Brown’s vision, but his perspective is from a high altitude and wished he would have consulted the staff and faculty who deal with students on a daily basis.

The concept of FLOW is a paradigm shift for educators. A majority of educators are entrenched in how we have taught students 25 years ago. Students have changed in the twenty years I have been a counselor. So, we have to change with the current, and unfortunately, the technology current is a fast wave and must work quickly to not be overwhelmed.

The three options presented to the Board of Governors seem realistic, but in my opinion, if the Governor and Chancellor want things to happen quickly, Option 3, creating a new community college district is the path of least resistance. Hand select people who are in favor of technology and education. Identify CTE programs that transcend limited language, physical and labor market barriers. That will be a difficult task, when the “T” in CTE is technical and FLOW is advocating a supplementing or enhancing of existing skills in the 2.5 underserved population.

Dean of Academic Affairs

Option 1 is the middle of the three options.

Option #1 would have the effect of blessing a particular college though there are already multiple colleges that have made high quality online programing central to their mission.

Option #1 is the middle of the three options.

Option #2 would have the greatest ability to build on the OEI in a way that leverages lessons learned while expanding online education to serve more students in California and beyond.

Option #2 is by far the most appealing option.

[...]

I support FLOW Option #2, however, can see a hybrid between #2 and #3 as being a successful model. I believe that regional and local expertise is essential and is a strength of our system. Faculty with local knowledge are vital to the provision of relevant instruction, especially towards degrees that include elements of general education and CTE pairings. If existing faculty can be included in a statewide platform for online instruction and receive training, common curricular elements, shared marketing and outreach and common expectations, we could put all other competitors out of business! Local districts though, have unique student supports ( free tuition, scholarships, tuition subsidies, etc. ) that should still be honored and available through the registration process. Additionally and perhaps most importantly, students identify with specific institutions and then become alumni and members of specific local communities. Building student cohesion and alumni identification is important and a virtual college that exists only online, may not provide our students with what they need ( which for many first generation students is an enduring relationship and mentoring). The hybrid I envision includes:

- System-wide/statewide marketing, outreach, recruitment and online platform
- Local instruction by local faculty, unique regional programming, student registration conducted locally, local college student affiliations, and curricular development
- Statewide training and common expectations
- Online degrees issued by local institutions

This is an exciting endeavor, however, I disagree with the premise that older, non-degree – completer students will be the ones that will participate at the highest level. I think younger, entry level students will find this option the most appealing, as the online platform is comfortable for them and especially in high cost of living areas in CA, they are in fact working as much as mid- level non-completers.

Thank you for requesting input!

[...]

Counselor/Articulation Officer

The OEI has done exemplary work to improve the quality of online instruction at California Community Colleges.

The OEI has been well supported by the governor and the Chancellor’s Office.

The OEI has done great work in bringing professionals together from colleges across the state to improve an already robust system of online education.

Despite the label “Myth #1,” it seems very unwise for the state to sponsor development of an institution that will complete with existing colleges, especially given the struggle many colleges have in meeting FTES targets during a period of low unemployment. Option #3 is the least attractive.

Option #1 would have the effect of blessing a particular college though there are already multiple colleges that have made high quality online programing central to their mission.

Option #1 is the middle of the three options.

Option #2 would have the greatest ability to build on the OEI in a way that leverages lessons learned while expanding online education to serve more students in California and beyond.

Option #2 is by far the most appealing option.

[...]
Hello,

My name is [...]. I am a math teacher at [...].

I have taken a look at the draft options for FLOW.

First of all, I want to commend the board of governors and the chancellor for their emphasis on workforce orientation. I believe it is essential that we focus on providing degrees that are in demand in the labor market.

Secondly, I wish to suggest that this new program, if implemented, start small and scale up as they learn what works. I am concerned that a lot of funding will go into a new program that will not show the results needed to justify its funding.

Therefore, I would support options 1 or 2 (using an existing campus or a consortium) over option 3 (the creation of a new college district). I see option 3 as containing a high risk of creating a new institution which will end up not providing the education and certifications proportional to its budget.

Thank you for reading my thoughts.

[...]

College Math Teacher

I'd like to add a few cents ...

I was on the OEI Steering Committee since the beginning and stepped away a year ago so that additional ACTLA faculty reps could participate. Currently, even though I hear that the formal Steering Committee model has or will change, Tabitha Villalba -- Fresno City College, is representing ACTLA. From the very beginning, the Chancellor’s Office representatives, Butte and Foothill College leadership, and the entire Steering Committee was adamant that the work of the OEI would not morph into the next entirely online “115th college.” This is no doubt reflected in the minutes from initial meetings and many public documents thereafter. As recent as 2015 the OEI published a list of FAQs that state unequivocally that the ‘Exchange’ and work of the OEI would not become an independent college. Of the folks I see on the FLOW working group, Jory, Joe, Michelle, and Meridith were on the Steering Committee.

I realize intentions and circumstances can change and, whether or not the Steering Committee was committed to steering away from a fully-online college, legislative pressure and ‘re-focus’ can occur. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to ask the folks mentioned above exactly why the Steering Committee was opposed to the concept. First, it never would have gotten off the ground and been supported by the ASCCC. Second, the CSUs tried and failed at a similar endeavor.

See the attached: Section II: Debunking Myths regarding the OEI’s position on creating a fully online college.

[...]

Tutorial Center Faculty Coordinator
Hello, first I want to clarify that I do not teach online nor do I wish to. However, I understand the need for exploration of creative and relevant curriculum delivery to meet the needs of today’s diverse student population.

The comments I hear most often from my colleagues who have converted courses to hybrid or online are: one, that the training to become certified to teach online is too many hours on top of a faculty member’s assignment. The second is that technology infrastructure is inadequate to support the needs of the online courses we have now, much less to consider going forward with even more online classes.

As regards the first reason, training is important and probably should be the number of hours it currently is or more. Best practices must be constantly updated and adhered to in order to ensure not only good completion rates, but good learning. Faculty should be given release time to do this properly and to have time to process, think, and develop high-quality materials and delivery systems.

Second reason, technology infrastructure. In various conferences I have attended on flipped classroom technology in my discipline, instructors emphasize that if online learning includes a lecture component, then best practice is for the instructor to tape themselves lecturing: “students like to hear the instructor’s voice”. Their recommendation was for instructors to use cell phone technology to tape themselves and coordinate verbal lecture with PowerPoint slides, for example. However, any verbal material must be captioned to be 508 compliant. Captioning technology must be readily available and supported. If faculty are expected to caption their own lectures, they must be given even more release time to accomplish this very time-consuming process.

Continuing with technology infrastructure, I am told that our [...] Disabled Programs Students and Services department has access to certain software packages available to qualified students for voice-to-text, text-to-voice, etc. I’ve seen a demonstration and these capabilities are amazing for multi-modal delivery. These technologies should be available to ALL students, in order to capture varied learning styles.

Continuing with technology personnel, our college needs more, many more, IT support personnel. The IT staff I have worked with over the years here at [...] are all excellent. However, there are not enough of them and they are not paid enough. An institution must have IT personnel separately dedicated to HelpDesk, and Development, at minimum. IT staff should not be expected to cross-train other than to make sure staff are available at extended hours for HelpDesk assistance. A friend of mine was between jobs and looked at the IT open positions here. She said salaries were very low.

Before anyone knew what was an ‘Internet,’ I was in graduate school using it. I would write my computer science friend, whom I met during my year abroad, in green text on an IBM. I remember that flashing prompt, that I could write to him on this screen and I would wake up, turn it on and words appeared back from him.

Twenty-seven years ago, I finished graduate school and began working in Distance Education at [...]. And for sixteen of those years, I have been adjunct faculty teaching sociology online.

I have over these years been a part of many changes, from scantron tests, to independent study classes, to pushing for a simple webpage before we had a college web presence so students could find us, etc.

I have used WebCT, Blackboard and now Canvas. I’m glad all of us will be on one platform. It’s great for students and eventually most of my colleagues will agree.

I waited a long time for technology to catch up to what I’ve felt is some of it’s potential and this plan, Gov. Brown, absolutely puts us – California community colleges – where we should be, leading.

From my early days working at Chabot, I wanted more apprenticeship/internship type programs to help us become a direct bridge to higher paying jobs.

I like what I read about FLOW. Maybe part of the curriculum for the new online community college will include a core set of general education classes. I think it’s important as we train new workers that they have exposure to GE classes for personal adaptability and for those who want to continue a more traditional education.

The second part of that sentence is where I see myself, teaching sociology. I help my students become critical consumers of information and take an active role in their education.

My only suggestion is that an on-line college should use the state’s C-ID course numbers for all their courses. This will make it easy to transfer to the CSU & UC colleges, as well as to transfer on-line classes to any community college.

In fact the community colleges and the CSUs & UC’s ought to use the same numbers for the same course. The on-line college can set the example by doing it right.

Case study: We offered C-ID ENGR 220 “Programming in Matlab” for the first time last Fall. Our course, our course was approved by the state, before being offered. In the year since, we have only established articulation agreements/letters with 4 UC/CSU campuses out of 30+. Since the course was approved by the state, articulation should be automatic, but we now have a time-consuming process that will take years to complete & causes many problems for the students who transfer to these schools. It seems that each student has to submit documentation to get the course approved. SO, let’s have the on-line college do it right.

All the more reason why the majority of faculty, Part Time (adjunct/contingency) faculty needs to be paid a fair amount by the course, not by “load” or other ridiculous different hourly rates for office time, lab time, grading time, prep time, proctor time, development time, … (any other itemizations administrators use to justify various pay rates for the same job same work).
Dear FLOW Work Group,

First and foremost, thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on these options—though I do wish that the comment period was longer and more heavily publicized within the CCC system. Below are my thoughts on the 3 options:

Option #1: I do not believe that FLOW should exist at a single college or district from our CCCs. Educating our students and the importance of their success and employability—and therefore by extension, online education—is the responsibility of ALL of us across the state, and so we should all take it on more aggressively.

Option #2: I perceive this to be the best option of the 3 presented, since I think that a consortium approach within our existing CCCs is the way to go. However, again, I do not believe that FLOW should exist at a single college or district from our CCCs. Instead, I believe that California Virtual Campus and the OEI Exchange Consortium should be leveraged, and more resources should be invested there. If colleges were incentivized to join the OEI Exchange Consortium and to provide more online opportunities and augment or add to their support services for online students, then I believe that we can make wonders happen. Let’s give this option a chance to bloom before we consider pursuing other options. An idea that I have about how we can incentivize existing colleges to adopt aspects of what FLOW would like colleges to implement, is to approach it in ways similar to Guided Pathways—provide information and toolkits via a dedicated space/site online, host webinars and conferences on best practices for implementation, and then maybe incentivize colleges via a small fund to help with implementation expenses.

Option #3: I do not believe that adding a new college/district to our system is the appropriate approach at this point in time. Given that we already started down the California Virtual Campus and OEI Exchange Consortium route, I think that we need pursue that more wholeheartedly and give it time to fully realize its potential first (I elaborated on this in the option above).

Lastly, I’d like to conclude by mentioning that I am generally a proponent of the vast majority of initiatives that come out of the Chancellor’s Office, including most recently: OEI, @ONE, Canvas, OER, and Guided Pathways. I advocate for virtually all of these initiatives and many more at my college, and even work with colleagues from other colleges that I used to work at, to advance these initiatives and spread the word about them. So, it’s very rare for me to have anything but positive things to say about a CCC initiative—with exception of this. Unfortunately, I feel that this is moving far too fast, and without adequate and necessary collegial consultation from faculty across the system. I have always appreciated moving swiftly, but not so swift that it’s not an inclusive process and unfortunately, that is where I feel we are with this initiative. I understand that the Governor has asked for this, but I also believe that we must ensure that decisions are not “top-down” and this one feels like it is. True leaders know that buy-in is important to cultivate, and moving forward, I would like to see stronger leadership in this area regarding FLOW.

Instructor, Anthropology
I am writing in response to your request for comment on the draft of options for Project FLOW.

I am grateful that Governor Brown, Chancellor Oakley, and the Project FLOW Working Group, under your joint leadership, have dedicated time to examining how colleges can better leverage online learning to make education even more accessible and affordable for Californians.

In response to your request for input, I am providing observations on each of the three options presented by the Working Group, followed by suggestions on how to improve the capacity of colleges to achieve the stated goals of the Working Group.

Option #1. FLOW unit with statewide mission within an existing campus
- Perceived resource drain from other colleges.
- Prohibition on marketing outside the district.
- Students choose online classes from colleges/communities with whom they have a connection.
- Reimbursement of colleges when FLOW students use library, wifi, health center, etc.

Option #2. FLOW consortium of colleges hosted by an existing district
- Duplicates existing model of OEI.

Option #3. New FLOW district, operating under the CCCC0 and fully competency-based

My main concern with Project FLOW is not with the conceptual idea of providing more flexible learning opportunities for adult workers in California. My concern is that this will siphon off funding from our existing colleges to accomplish the missions we are trying to accomplish already. A 115th community college, or a college or collection of colleges attempting a new strategy like this is fine as long as it reflects a "yes and" strategy of funding (yes and we're ponying up more money to do this). If the funding is derived from the existing pot of funds available for allocation to existing colleges, I say enough already. We are nowhere near the funding level of pre-recession days in terms of per-pupil funding.

Add to this the apparent impending mandate to provide the first year of CCC enrollment for free without a pre-funded strategy for funding that college promise, one wonders when the initiative frenzy will stop? How can it be that the taxpayers of this state will fund both a new college or a new collective of colleges to offer FLOW and provide the first year of tuition free to all new CCC students? Maybe I'm the boy who cried "WOLF" (that's FLOW spelled backwards!), but can we please focus on core mission funding for a little while...or at least ensure this is added to the core funding?

Instead of creating a new 115th online community college, the OEI Exchange that is currently in pilot mode becomes the infrastructure to deliver online education to their identified target population. This will allow for the Exchange to handle enrollments and to enhance the individual community college distance ed programs. The home college can still offer support that has been carefully implemented for their student population as well receive completion rates. As well as offer online courses on the exchange for FTES. • The state has dedicated 56 million dollars over the last five years to offer training, technology tools and support to community colleges that have allowed them to create quality distance ed programs based on their community needs. Is the state willing to diversify their dollars now and compete with the initiative that hasn’t even concluded yet? • All of the 114 Community Colleges have been working to develop distance ed programs that fit the needs of their communities including support services and programs. Gavilan alone has over 20 Certificates available for completely online for working students or non traditional students. • 80% of our online students also take face to face courses as well. This means they are coming to campus and have support opportunities. • I think if there is a separate 115th fully online community college, it will in some capacity compete with these programs.

Two general comments: (1) If the main thrust of FLOW is creating job skills and increasing the ability of students to find work that matches skills they have learned, the career planning and placement piece is critical and does not seem emphasized enough in any of the listed proposals. (2) faculty will work hard to produce content that's ready to put on the OEI course exchange and if a class has met those standards and is available on the exchange, it should be eligible for FLOW whether or not it comes from a member institution.

I like the idea of focusing on improving social and economic mobility of specific segments of CCC student population and focus on working adults by providing them with training in job skills, and I like option#3 the best. The key is accreditation unless the Chancellor's Office is foregoing ACCJC accreditation entirely for its FLOW college. I would say this work is going in the right direction but needs to be modulated to accommodate accreditation requirements.
Instructor

The Flow Project had almost no faculty involvement to begin with and the targeted audience for this project is less likely to handle online learning without vast resources, including tutoring and other important student services. Online learning still has serious ADA/508 compliance issues so students with disabilities will be left out from this project. Community Colleges are presently doing students a great service by providing a rich blend of learning modalities.

I approve any efforts to provide education, online or not, to those without it.

Faculty DSPS

Providing more educational opportunities, especially targeting a specific population is a good idea. However, there are a few concerns that I didn’t see listed or researched in regard to the Flex Learning Option for Workers (FLOW) Project.

First, creating new opportunities outside of previously established institutions will negatively affect enrollment figures for community colleges that already offer online certificates. Focus should be placed on assisting community colleges to make their current curriculum align with the goals and target audience of the FLOW Project.

Secondly, while bi-lingual tech support is available in both Spanish and English, this proposal does not mention (or has not researched) how the online educational opportunities will be available to non-English speaking populations. Will all technical/trade areas be available for bilingual enrollment. The data suggests that areas such as my own (Los Angeles) has a very large number of Hispanics with some education and no degree, but does not include any data about language proficiency. If this is initiated based on the market research, target population, and data collected, it could potentially be a huge waste of tax payers dollars if we focus on creating opportunities (eg. Online classes in English) to our target market (80%+ Hispanics) when the opportunity cannot be used by a vast majority of the target market based on language acquisition and proficiency.

Assistant Professor of Music

Given that collegial consultation or any reasonable form of faculty participation in the decision making and development of this project has been de facto lip service this project is destined to fail. It will not work if faculty don’t lead it from the onset... that is a universal axiom of any institution or system of higher education. Frankly this is just one more example of autocratic behavior from Brown, Oakley and Quinlivan. One would think they voted for Donald Trump given the way they’ve rolled this out.

Chair, Computer Studies Department

I believe that Option 3 (pages 36-38) would be the best choice. Starting a new district will allow a clean path towards assuring the necessary resources are allocated for instructional design and it will take the burden off of existing colleges/districts. Existing colleges/districts are functioning to maximum capacity (counseling, curriculum approval, etc.) and adding FLOW would only push them over the limit. Developing FLOW in conjunction with other colleges/districts is not offering an exclusive "online college". If a FLOW District is developed a curriculum approval process would need to be implemented.

HIT/CIM Full-time Tenured Faculty

Only one faculty member on the committee. (3) That’s sad.

"The target population is not capable of learning online." (44) No one says this. You made this up, so you could argue some other point on your agenda. Sad. The true statement is that "The target population does not learn online well because of poverty and demographics." because they don't have access to or have time to invest in, or don't know how to learn using an online platform.

"80% of individuals in the U.S. with 'some' college, no degree have a mobile device." (20) Are you really equating having a mobile device to online access for a course? How many of those mobile devices have data caps? Do you know what papers look like when they are written entirely on a mobile device?

Mr

This opportunity, to be fair, meaningful and effective with respect to the outcomes, should also be offered in face-to-face classes. The online method is no magic for effectiveness of educational instruction. The rationale of convenience is hyped up as a reason for assuming not only that more people would sign up for the classes (which might be so) but does not address the lack of data of effectiveness or satisfaction. Careful assessment of this program is absolutely necessary.

Faculty
As a full-time faculty member who has been teaching in the CCC System for the past 15 years, I am very troubled by this proposal. This idea is basically the CCC System's equivalent of a MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) College. The ASCCC, faculty unions, and Chancellor's Office rejected this modality of offering courses years ago because students do not learn effectively in this environment: most students do not complete these courses; there are limited or no student services (counseling, tutoring, office hours, etc.); and faculty-student contact has proven to be the most effective way to guarantee student success. If the CCC System is concerned with providing quality education to the residents of California, project FLOW is going against the "flow" of the CCC mission!

The goal of this project appears to be the generation of funds—but NOT to support student success. This pseudo-college would cut costs by cutting out faculty, counselors, and student services—the very heart of what we know works to ensure that our students finish and pass their courses and achieve their educational goals. This "college" would also undermine the effective online programs of all 114 colleges.

If you care about students and supporting their learning, please reject this proposal. Thank you.

Professor

As a full-time faculty member who has been teaching in the CCC System for the past 6 years, I am very troubled by this proposal. This idea is basically the CCC System's equivalent of a MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) College. The ASCCC, faculty unions, and Chancellor's Office rejected this modality of offering courses years ago because students do not learn effectively in this environment: most students do not complete these courses; there are limited or no student services (counseling, tutoring, office hours, etc.); and faculty-student contact has proven to be the most effective way to guarantee student success. If the CCC System is concerned with providing quality education to the residents of California, project FLOW is going against the "flow" of the CCC mission!

The goal of this project appears to be the generation of funds—but NOT to support student success. This pseudo-college would cut costs by cutting out faculty, counselors, and student services—the very heart of what we know works to ensure that our students finish and pass their courses and achieve their educational goals. This "college" would also undermine the effective online programs of all 114 colleges.

If you care about students and supporting their learning, please reject this proposal. Thank you.

Faculty

I strongly oppose the method being used to establish an online-only Calif. Comm. College. The whole process is lacking transparency. I question the necessity of such an entity because the CCs of our state already have a huge array of excellent online programs. Why duplicate them? Better to establish a website that brings together a list and description of the online programs available that is user-friendly, allows potential students to browse and compare and then links them to applications. That's a much more effective and much less costly solution to a "problem" that seems to only exist in theory, not fact. Money could be spent much better by supporting the existing CC system.

I am opposed to this proposal.

Local students should work with local colleges whenever possible, since those local colleges have programs and services specifically designed for the local populations. Also, students have somewhere to go and speak with a real person when they need to if they are working with the local college, even when taking courses online. When this isn't feasible, the OEI can help students access online education not offered in their local area. It seems like we have the stated goals of the proposed online college covered already, and this proposed college would suck FTE's from local colleges, making them all worse off, which diminishes the quality of education that can be offered throughout the state.

Economics and Statistics Instructor, Full-time

I do not support this idea. Community colleges are very available to students in their own communities. None of my students—many disadvantaged—have told me they have difficulty accessing their school. In fact, they have told me that they were surprised how convenient it is, and that they appreciate getting to come to a campus and dedicate that time to class, and meeting other students in their area. I feel any funds intended to increase student enrollment would be better used toward creating more physical campuses.

I would also be especially concerned with teaching ESL students online. How are English language learners to learn most effectively when they cannot use their newly acquired skills in person?

Additionally, our community colleges currently offer online courses for those who wish to take them. I don't understand why, if there is to be an emphasis on online learning, more support would not be given to the existing community college online classes instead of creating a new system.

Please listen to educators.

Adjunct Assistant Professor

It seems to me that this might be a duplication of the work that the Online Education Initiative has been undertaking. Shouldn't those efforts be combined? There is so much infrastructure that has been created through that work. I would suggest building on that work and including more CTE faculty.

Associate Professor
As a doctoral student myself, I was impressed by the amount of research and graphics displayed in this presentation. The statewide team of experts who have come together to consider this learning alternative is also impressive, and I can speak from experience that Jory Hadself will be a welcome addition to this team. I realize that the FLOW initiative is targeted toward an audience who is currently not being served by CCC education, but I'm not 100% certain that accessing the education from a mobile app is advisable. However, I trust that this team of professionals will do their best in analyzing the described options. Of these, I would feel most comfortable if Option #2 is considered to have a consortium of colleges work collaboratively on this effort; but I can envision that as plans come together, Option #3 might be the end goal for those involved in the planning phase. Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on these preliminary plans, and I look forward to hearing more in the months ahead.

Associate Professor of Nursing

This entire proposal seems to not understand the significant work of the system around outreach, expansion of access, and online innovation and instruction. The three proposals all seem wastefully duplicative of current efforts and inappropriately cognizant of the entire mission of the California Community College System.

Faculty

Online classes work best when people have easy and quiet access to computers, internet connection, and study space. Lay-off or unemployed workers with only a high school degree are likely to be paying outrageous rents in many parts of California and may have to do without computers or internet at home. If they can go to a college in person and make use of its resources including in-person tutoring and the vital social capital they can build (not least of all to learn about available jobs) through informal relationships, meeting people in class, etc., they are much more likely to build connections to a bigger world whether that be internships or new knowledge about job preparation and jobs, period.

Wealthier people know other wealthy people. Poorer people know other poor people. If poor people are kept at home, isolated, will only a computation to interact with, they are likely to lose motivation. They will not have the pride of being a student on a campus, they will not get to know their professors the way they do in face-to-face classes. These sped-up, online classes are meant to benefit computer companies and to save short-term expenses on college, but they are more wasteful in the longterm because they are not effective, and no human is paying close attention to intervene in what are sometimes very complex human situations. Save online classes for the wealthy and privileged who are already socially connected and don't need to become part of a bigger world.

Ms.

I am astonished at the amount of energy that the administration seems to put into selecting, and re-selecting, and then again re-selecting our learning management software. What of the cost to instructors who must keep re-imagining their courses over and over again, learning the new software, nurturing the students as they learn another software that can be a barrier to their success. It all seems like we are chasing a rainbow, when in reality we should sort out the best way to use the tools that we already have.

I'm concerned that we have moved away from Moodle to Canvas, just as the CSU is opening to switch from Moodle to DesiretoLearn.

Instructor

I am especially concerned about low-income, at risk students (like EOPS students) will be supported in this environment where research has proven that "high touch" is the most beneficial. How will programs like EOPS exist in an online college?

EOPS Director

I have a few concerns based on my experience observing students in the library and as an instructor who has taught online.

Proctoring - some instructors will want proctoring for exams and there isn't currently enough infrastructure for this.

Mobile devices - what does this mean? I've observed many students taking entire classes on their phones and it's far from the best option. Just because they have cell phones does not mean they're set for taking fully online classes.

Students need something to clue into how different online classes can be - some sort of baseline certificate to test their tech abilities and other skills that are important to online students such as self-sufficiency and time management.

Is there tech support? Even students who self-report being "tech savvy" need tech support. And what happens when their main point of access to education breaks?

Instructor preparation - are the faculty who are teaching these courses fully trained and certified to teach online? It's not the same as teaching in person.

Cost of instructional materials - still an important concept to worry about.

Librarian and Coordinator of a Library Skills Instructor

This needs much more time to review with staff/faculty and add additional options and guidance. Also, it seems the research is based solely on one school and a for profit school at that. Not definitive of our demographics.

LVN, M.Ed. Instructor

While a laudable attempt to provide more of our citizens with affordable advanced education, I am deeply concerned that FLOW will create programs and degrees that are regarded as "lesser" much as is already the case with degrees from many for-profit institutions. I can see FLOW degrees becoming known as PHONEY degrees. From my experiences as director of the nationally-recognized UC Davis Biology Undergraduate Scholars Program, I know that students learn more and better when they can interact with each other, and especially when they can interact face-to-face with instructors. There are some things that technology cannot emulate successfully, and quality education is one of them. FLOW may very well further "ghetto-ize" the very people it is meant to serve - those who have already been the victims of "the soft bigotry of low expectations."

Professor/Dr.
I am primarily concerned about educational quality getting a back seat and the autocratic way in which this was fast-tracked through. The AC Senate (e.g., resolutions), FAACC and the unions should be consulted regularly on this. There are too many types of concerns to list here, but I will summarize the subset that relate to serving/targeting Latinos. The numbers of US Latinas/os/x who have high school diplomas and have dropped out of college previously (no degree, some college) and have cell phones as described in the proposal, start to be a smaller number when you consider those whose cell phones do not connect to the internet as well as individuals who cannot benefit by instruction in English. So some of the data is not suitable. Many studies show that Hispanics are among the most responsive to social elements in instruction, a retention strategy which is diminished in an online format.

When planning for the future of higher education, we need to be asking how Hispanics will be able to get equal or preferably better higher education than they and other groups have gotten in the past. So I would question whether it is appropriate to focus most on "flow," on changes to create "faster" and "cheaper" attainments of "credentials". I think these are the wrong words, the wrong paradigm (Gates Foundation: "Faster, faster, cheaper.")

Here's why it's the wrong paradigm. In our own daily lives, we are usually well aware of the difference between "cheap" and "cost effective." We want VALUE. We also distinguish between the map (e.g., certificates and degrees) and the territory (the education they should symbolize). In our pursuit of the improvement of access and success in higher education for all groups—and especially those less well served now—we need to keep this same eye on true value. The total value to the individual, the family, and society. Top quality education that is cost effective would be a laudable goal. Creating some mediocre thing (14-17% grad rate like WGU)—an expert consulted for this project—and U Phoenix to crank out fast, but second class, Latina/o/x "outcomes" is not a goal we should buy into. All that allows us to do is to pretend that we are serving people when we are not. Instead, a new majority and other groups deserve at least the same high quality of education as a former majority. Most desirable would be to aim at quality that is much better than what we have now. We need to find out how tech can be used for true value, not for phony claims that CCC is serving everyone now.

That means the system needs to work WITH faculty and other internal constituencies more sincerely, and actually listen to criticisms, instead of referring them as " myths," in the myths section of the rationale, there were vague defensive counter-claims.

I do not support the creation of a 115th college. I support the idea of a cooperative or consortium of colleges.

Professor Emerita and Student]

Political Science instructor]

Please keep in mind that local colleges have the option to offer on line courses and programs at this time and a statewide online college would be competing with local efforts. By creating a totally on line college for the state would change from serving local needs to creating state competition for jobs. It is not as easy as creating content and posting a class on line. There is the collegiality among colleagues regarding pedagogy and learning strategies. I am also concerned that these students would not have full access to student services that support students to EOOPS, financial aid, counseling and advisement, accommodations for students with disabilities, co-curricular activities that are a part of college life, etc.

In general, I have strong pedagogical opposition to moving to a completely online learning environment for degrees and certificates for students. I oppose the idea that the state wants to move for students. Clearly, technology and online learning have a place in higher education but in the zealously to reach more students, we are giving up quality in order to "show better numbers". This does not equal a quality education.

Specific responses to the Project FLOW Document:

Page 21 states "Online offers flexibility and accessibility. When is online a quality education?

Arizona State University Online" however, there is not footnote or endnote showing where this specific research comes from. At our college, Santa Ana College, we have found that students in online course have retention rates far lower than traditional lecture classes and completion and success rates are lower in online classes as well.

Page 27 states that "to count toward credential assessment must be proctored" when students are trying to receive credentials through our colleges. We should not only being meeting students in person to give exams. We need to be able to engage with students during the period of instructions and the students with one another. Meeting in person only to proctor exams does not equal a quality education.

Pages 29-28 regarding the FLOW options - none of these options address the idea of learning communities and collegiality. How do you create a sense of place when there's no "there there"? In addition, how will faculty and staff be able to organize themselves to collectively protect and bargain for their salaries and working conditions? And if the state deems to create a state-wide program that is designed from the top down...that doesn't allow for the individual and unique content knowledge and teaching styles of various faculty state-wide to teach what they are experts in. Now they may be possibly be told WHAT to teach. That would be a horrible turn for education in our state to take.

Professor of History]

Page 26: DEI Faculty Development resources are untested at scale. It would be good to re-evaluate these options. Also, many of the resources were acquired without public bid which might be a concern.

Page 30: Option #1 - FLOW unit with a statewide mission within an existing campus. Very few of our campus’ districts infrastructure were designed to operate at scale and on-line. For example, to my knowledge, there are no colleges with a SaaS Student Information System (SIS) capable of handing large numbers of on-line users for things like payments, etc.

Page 37: Option #3 - SIS compatibility is not a real concern. Project Glue can be modified to support integration with any SIS. The real reason should be the purchase of an SIS that is cloud based and can scale to the millions of enrolled students level.

Overall, I find the idea to be very worthwhile. Certainly, challenges exist, but I would vote for new blood over leveraging an existing set of institutions for a variety of reasons. The students that the system is not currently reaching require new thinking and new ideas. It comes down to providing value to the potential students, not reinforcing the current system.

Complicity-based instruction isn't rigorous instruction, or at college level. Online education doesn't allow for necessary hands-on or clinical component of the program, employability is not the mission of CCC; education is, faculty is removed from academic equation; the target population is not the population that learns online; expect a tremendous drop out rate that sets this population up for failure, and the fact that the list of people pushing this or in the group to discuss it are administrative positions, not faculty, and I assume haven't spent time in a classroom. I am not opposed to online courses, but the only work for highly motivated students, typically that are in classes at the same time. I shudder to think California is following Kentucky, Nevada and Arizona, not particularly leaders in education in this country. Students who work a great deal, often struggle in regular classes, they fail in online classes. These are not myths, they are reality. So, are you saying that you are going to set up your own public online college that may not even be accredited?
I have been teaching at City College of San Francisco for 17 years and worked with many marginalized, working students who rely on the personal/in-person connections they make with classmates in order to learn deeply. Fully online college ignores much of what we know about neuroscience, human development, and tenacity matters for learning and that non-verbal clues are vital to comprehension. We all know that Facebook friends are different from real friends and so, too, do connections made in a virtual classroom differ in magnitude and depth from face-to-face connections made in the classroom. For instance when two single working parents meet in class and get to know one another they trust each other enough to meet up with their children at a park to discuss the class challenges. In-person interactions matter. In-person teaching is vital. Please do not ignore the need for students -- especially working students -- to have regular time together in the same space/classroom by removing in-person teaching from your plan.

If you need any proof that virtual classrooms fail many demographics, please consult the literature on MOOCs.

Sincerely,

Instructor

I like the option #2; however, I do think that colleges will need some help and coaching with building capacity and buy-in from faculty. With all of the large initiatives coming out of the State Chancellor's Office right now, colleges are likely to feel overwhelmed and tapped for capacity. The question will inevitably arise "how can we manage growth toward guided pathways and participate in FLOW." This will inevitably exclude college with less capacity don't feel capable of participating in both initiatives.

Faculty/ Early Alert Coordinator

Colleges and Universities have been providing online courses already; the FLOW project is something that should have been implemented many years ago. I am on board with this project as it will be beneficial to working adults like myself.

Web Developer

My concern is strictly online vs. online hybrid. I read pgs. 26,31 and 41 and those concerns are addressed there with emphasis on student support and hands-on relationships.

Dept. Chair, Adm. of Justice/Fire Science

As a both an online and on-ground community college instructor, I am excited about the possibilities of the FLOW program. I know firsthand that there is a large student population who will greatly benefit from online degree or certificate programs. As someone who has earned her gradate degree fully online, I firmly believe that rigor is not on issue. In my college #2 seems the most viable at this time, with #3 perhaps being a goal. Thank you for the opportunity to comment - I am looking forward to being an online student.

Associate Professor

Very much need a respected online portfolio of all classes needed for Certificates/AA - challenge to get current faculty who are experienced to manage online learning - different skills. Course content has to be quality DESIGNED for online learning. Students need to be taught to learn in online environment.

Deputy Sector Navigator

I am greatly dismayed at the proposal for FLOW. The three scenarios for FLOW: Scenario 1 would have one existing campus cannibalize its own resources in order to provide FLOW, essentially competing against itself. Scenario 2 would put undue pressure on one district to manage FLOW for the whole state at a time when district management is under severe scrutiny from accreditation agencies; many boards do not have resources, skill, or delegation to manage something like FLOW. Scenario 3 would essentially bleed resources from the OEL, putting 114 campuses in competition with FLOW. The myths are not only inaccurate and misleading, but cast community colleges in a negative light. Myth #1 leaves out how students at for-profit colleges are saddled with enormous debt, suffer through abysmal or nonexistent job placement services, and do not have higher placement or growth options than students graduating from CCCs. Myth #2 leaves out that CCCs offer much competency-based learning through CTE programs that require board exam preparation and all are required to ensure quality through student learning outcomes. Myth #3 shows how the labs that exist already at CCCs are essentially providing the same service as they would for FLOW; if students' ability to travel to the campus is the issue, how does this solve it? Myth #4 is not a "myth" or belief that is widely shared among CCCs. Myth #5 leaves out that in fully online systems (see University of Phoenix), it is FULLTIME faculty who shoulder the burden of development, and new colleges start with very few full time faculty, relying almost entirely on adjunct. Myth #6 leaves out that success rates in online learning for the target population are quite low; online learning has greatest success rates among degree-holders and working professionals, not displaced or "stranded" workers. Overall, FLOW is attempting to address the very same population that CCCs are already.

Professor

Online learning is an important option and should be offered by ALL colleges with Distance Learning programs that meet state and accreditation standards. But CTE programs often involve mandatory psychomotor examinations and competency testing; therefore each program should be allowed to hybridize or determine the amount of DL to incorporate based on their student population, needs, and outcomes assessments. I fear that this clustering of all online training into a single college is a slippery slope to removing distance education programming at local community colleges. Not sure why the need to cluster all online into a single college would increase costs for physical facilities, and probably drain experienced educators from live classes, in addition to the potential cost savings of new online programs.

Paramedic Program Director

I strongly support this vision for education of those unable to attend live classes, or for whom live attendance creates a hardship. To implement this vision, I strongly urge using the experienced faculties, staff and facilities of existing colleges. Starting a new college would increase costs for physical facilities, and probably drain experienced educators from live classes, in addition to the potential cost savings of new online programs at existing colleges would be less than the cost of creating a brand new college for online courses.

Professor and attorney

I strongly believe in utilizing current community colleges to offer online courses and do not support a fully online community college. Regarding page 41, I disagree with the effectiveness of online courses for math and science courses with required labs (e.g., for nursing).

Regarding pages 21 and 22, while it presents the effectiveness of AZU and Rio Salado College success rates, I want to see the success rates of California community college's online courses across different ethnic groups and socioeconomic background.

As a counselor, when I see “adults with high school credential or some college and no certification - compatible with working and vocational needs” and to advise them "to enable them to earn certifications that lead to better workforce outcomes" I find that they prefer to meet in person and they may need to take online classes to meet their computer skills. So while 80% people may have a mobile device; having a mobile device does not mean that they have computer or academic skills to succeed in online courses.

Counselor/Instructor

I have been looking at doing hybrid or online courses for Appliance Service, but there are things we offer students at the campus that you can't get online. It's learn to take something apart you have to have the it apart. Also teaching trouble shooting on paper and applying it to a machine are completely different. I would like to come up with some classes that will help reach out to people outside our area that want to learn appliances and someday will, but it can not be ready by January 2018.

Assistant Professor

I have been teaching at City College of San Francisco for 17 years and worked with many marginalized, working students who rely on the personal/in-person connections they make with classmates in order to learn deeply. Fully online college ignores much of what we know about neuroscience, human development, and tenacity matters for learning and that non-verbal clues are vital to comprehension. We all know that Facebook friends are different from real friends and so, too, do connections made in a virtual classroom differ in magnitude and depth from face-to-face connections made in the classroom. For instance when two single working parents meet in class and get to know one another they trust each other enough to meet up with their children at a park to discuss the class challenges. In-person interactions matter. In-person teaching is vital. Please do not ignore the need for students -- especially working students -- to have regular time together in the same space/classroom by removing in-person teaching from your plan.

If you need any proof that virtual classrooms fail many demographics, please consult the literature on MOOCs.
I am concerned about the idea of a fully online college that is separate from the current CCCs. As someone who has nearly 50% of my division's offerings online, if an online college were formed, enrollment in my programs (Business and CIS) would plummet.

I believe that the CCCs can fill the need noted for FLOW without adding additional infrastructure and cost.

It would seem to meet interests of all parties to be sure that the course needs are communicated to CCCs so that they can be put into an online environment. If full programs online are needed, that is also something that can be implemented within the current system without much difficulty.

Dean, Business & CIS

I am somewhat concerned about the impact on enrollment for local programs that would be in even greater competition for students with a State-wide on-line college. As long as local colleges remain funds based on enrollment, like kindergarten courses, I think this idea is more harmful than helpful. Numerous online courses and degrees are currently offered and awarded by the CCCs and I think this is a poor choice of how to expend limited resources.

Associate Professor

As a faculty librarian, I prefer Option 1 – implement FLOW within currently existing college(s). I think it will be easier to provide student support when we are already providing materials and services for our existing online students. The framework for doing thi in a consortium seems unclear, and a whole new setup would require much more expenditure in resources and personnel (although maybe it would require hiring more librarians which would be fine). Option 1 seems the simplest to me, and the most free of pitfalls. However, I am dubious about online-only education for many reasons. Despite the FAQ stating otherwise, I question whether active learning can be made as effective in an online-only environment as it can in one that is live or hybrid. I think online-only makes it more difficult for instructors to act as mentors and behavioral/professional examples. And I know that with our students at Shasta College there IS a difference in success and persistence between online and live, with online definitely coming off second best. There's also the lack of the added value of campus clubs, activities, culture and friendships. In short... Option 1 but I wish we wouldn't be making this call.

Librarian

I support option #3 and would love to be part of that! I've been teaching for 20 years, 15 of them online. And my field is psychology, which is essential in designing learning environments. I am also a proud Canvas and HTML geek. Online learning evolved haphazardly (which is how tech revolutions start), and in my opinion most if not all college still do not have a fully robust plan with staff who are passionate about and dedicated to online learning. To fully serve online students I believe one needs to have walked a mile in the online user experience. A few years back, I was told that Canvas training had to be in person because one simply can't get the same community feeling online. I found that offensive and thought why the heck are you even in online education with that attitude? Developing online courses has been more to fill a need, and an opportunity for leadership positions, than to pursue a passion in an exciting new era. I’ve felt pretty alone until this (amazing) OER movement. This isn’t new about my college in particular, but something we need in online learning in California if we are to develop a fully robust, effective, and user friendly online college. Part of that is putting faculty and staff in the user seat, using our own tools to work together so we can learn what works and what doesn’t. And we need people who are passionate about online education, who already know it is not inferior to live education, and who are excited to contribute to this exciting new step for California. If we use our OER and a mish mash of people, many of whom simply do... not get it and are not passionate about online education. At this point in the online evolution, and with the OER revolution, creating a new FLOW district would open up the opportunity to recruit faculty and staff who have the passion and experience to develop an online college. It's also an opportunity to use a diversity lens to create a gender balance and recruiting people of all ages, cultures, SES, etc. to contribute to this new online college community. Too many of our local people are still stuck on the ground, operating within that perspective, and are less able to understand the user.

Online adjunct faculty, Psychology

As an educator for over 16 years, having taught all of those 16 years online as well as face to face, and having taught populations of students from the well to dos, to primarily very poor, I have issues with the suggested FLOW options. The idea that we can reach these students directly with an online format, and teach them well, flies in the face of the experience that I have had with many of these same types of students. However, there are already many colleges working locally to improve education for these students; Strong Workforce, OEI, Student Equity, SSSP, AEBG, and now Guided Pathways, all can be utilized to reach out to the target student here and help them make real improvements - without the need to completely reinvent the wheel.

This gets down to another issue I have with the entire process - the way in which the materials have been pushed to the handpicked people on the committee. This is NOT participatory governance in any way, shape, or form. This is top down management and it leaves out the voice of the professional - the educations and administrators who are pushing back hard on this initiative. It is for a reason - and that reason is not one of protecting their territory. If they felt this would be what is best for students - with all we have going on right now in our own colleges - they would not be pushing against this! They would sit back and say 'well done!' Please understand that we are professional educators and we want nothing more than to do everything we can to increase the opportunities for all of our students - past, present, and future students - and we work hard to help this to be a reality. FLOW is not the answer. If I had to endorse any option, it might be #2...but even then I would prefer to allow the OEI to be expanded to include this mission. We have a network already in place; lets use it!
My biggest question regards the essential need for hands on, properly supervised learning experiences (especially for CTE programs). This is especially true for those certificates and degrees requiring human interaction. What conversations and support will be provided for students and colleges to ensure students are meeting the practical application of the online studies?

Units are devalued in expedited classes/less cohort contact classes. As in person classes seem more difficult to realize.

Students expressing ideas solely in writing is not optimal for CC students who often find writing challenging. Verbal and visual cues from in class responsive instructor/student dialogue is vital.

Units are devalued in expedited classes/less cohort contact classes. As in person classes seem more difficult to realize.

We need this to happen because right now the CSU's charge extreme prices for Extended Studies Programs, classes and skills training. These are much too expensive for our California citizens.

In short, Online learning is almost always a poor substitute for in-class learning.

In online learning, particularly when structured, it is mentioned that online learning, particularly when structured, has consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching. I am skeptical of the success rates indicated for online students as compared to onsite students for I have not observed these outcomes in any district of which I'm employed. Nor do the majority of my students request/support online learning over onsite learning. It is very easy to weight retention and success numbers to benefit specific proposals, especially if those proposals promise to reduce educational costs statewide. Yet the reality is across the board student retention and success rates are lower in online courses as compared to onsite learning. Many factors contribute to lower success rates, including but not limited to: lack of student prior knowledge, prep, planning, and self-initiative, student isolation, lack of collaboration, peer feedback, and course achievement, problems w/App accessibility, functioning, and support. It is especially disconcerting to think that FLOW planners believe ESL students will benefit more from online courses, an idea that is counterintuitive when considering that the isolation of these students in an online learning environment only adds to the language barriers they already encounter to achievement. In addition, it also seems counterintuitive to believe that CTE students will benefit more from online courses vs. in-class, hands-on instruction of job related skills.

Numerous students that I’ve talked with about online courses, in general, have expressed their disappointment with online courses. Initially, they commonly take online courses, because they believe the courses will be more convenient, allowing for greater flexibility in their schedules. Yet upon taking online courses, they often find themselves floundering early on in the courses for a variety of reasons (as noted above). In addition, there are skills that are entirely devoid in online courses of which students benefits tremendously from learning, practicing, and mastering throughout their academic careers in preparation for future employment.

Skills such as interpersonal communication and socialization, collaboration, team-building, group project development, planning, application, and goal achievement, budgeting, problem solving, and long-range assessment and projections are not realistically obtainable in an online learning environment. These skills are imperative for students to learn, experience, and refine through practice with their colleagues to give them the acumen they need to contribute fully as compassionate, productive, and successful members of their families and communities, and as future employees and citizens in our society.

This is not to say that I am adverse to online course instruction. On the contrary, I am currently in the process of designing an advanced English course online. There is a segment of the student population who prefer online courses and do well in those courses. Additionally, I anticipate as the Generation Z group reaches predominance in our college populations, they are increasingly more readily accepting and desirous of online educational platforms - for their population, online learning may become the new normal. Yet I anticipate the Z Generals also may not comprehend what skills they are sacrificing for convenience. And granted, hybrid courses may help alleviate some of the issues addressed in the paragraphs above but not all. Also, certain disciplines are more easily adaptable to an online learning environment than others. For example, subjects such as Algebra, Trigonometry, Calculus, etc. lend themselves more readily to online course environments. Potentially, any discipline.

I have a number of concerns (listed below) regarding the FLOW proposals, and direct you to the following:

1. At Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, four FLOW-related resolutions were passed. Please find them here:
   7.10 Using System Consultation and Faculty Input to Address Expansion of Online Education https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/using-system-consultation-and-faculty-input-address-expansion-online-education
   7.12 Endorse Consortium Approach to Expanding Online Educational Opportunities https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/endorse-consortium-approach-expanding-online-educational-opportunities
   9.02 Online CTE Programs and Competency-Based Instruction https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/online-cte-programs-and-competency-based-instruction
   2.05 (Spring 1998) Western Governors University https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/western-governors-university
   13.04 (Spring 2011) Opposition to Western Governors University California https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-western-governors-university-california

2.05 (Spring 1998) Western Governors University https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/western-governors-university
3. There are some serious issues to consider in light of audit findings of Western Governors University:

4. Below are comments from some faculty at Sacramento City College:

a. Thank you for providing context and history to this very important development. I appreciate that there is immense opportunity in the online education landscape, but I encourage us all to think critically about the possible downstream latent effects and ask important questions before swallowing the discussion. We need to have constructive dialogue and continue to ask questions.

b. I believe that this new undertaking should be organic at all levels. Hence, I believe option 3. Create/Develop Online Education in Concert with Other Institutions. is the appropriate option. We should support the expansion of online education and online learning opportunities, but we must be cautious in how we proceed.

c. The CTE programs I have been involved with have consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching. I am skeptical of the success rates indicated for online students as compared to on-site students for I have not observed these outcomes in any district of which I'm employed. Nor do the majority of my students request/support online learning over onsite learning. It is very easy to weight retention and success numbers to benefit specific proposals, especially if those proposals promise to reduce educational costs statewide. Yet the reality is across the board student retention and success rates are lower in online courses as compared to on-site learning. Many factors contribute to lower success rates, including but not limited to: lack of student prior knowledge, prep, planning, and self-initiative, student isolation, lack of collaboration, peer feedback, and course achievement, problems w/App accessibility, functioning, and support. It is especially disconcerting to think that FLOW planners believe ESL students will benefit more from online courses, an idea that is counterintuitive when considering that the isolation of these students in an online learning environment only adds to the language barriers they already encounter to achievement. In addition, it also seems counterintuitive to believe that CTE students will benefit more from online courses vs. in-class, hands-on instruction of job related skills.

d. Students expressing ideas solely in writing is not optimal for CC students who often find writing challenging. Verbal and visual cues from in class responsive instructor/student dialogue is vital.
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As I said, there are some definite opportunities to serve disproportionately impacted populations with innovative strategies, but before we jump on board early with our support, we can really help steer the ship!” This framing is problematic in that it plays on fears of losing control over curriculum and serves to consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching. I am skeptical of the success rates indicated for online students as compared to onsite students for I have not observed these outcomes in any district of which I'm employed. Nor do the majority of my students request/support online learning over onsite learning. It is very easy to weight retention and success numbers to benefit specific proposals, especially if those proposals promise to reduce educational costs statewide. Yet the reality is across the board student retention and success rates are lower in online courses as compared to onsite learning. Many factors contribute to lower success rates, including but not limited to: lack of student prior knowledge, prep, planning, and self-initiative, student isolation, lack of collaboration, peer feedback, and course achievement, problems w/App accessibility, functioning, and support. It is especially disconcerting to think that FLOW planners believe ESL students will benefit more from online courses, an idea that is counterintuitive when considering that the isolation of these students in an online learning environment only adds to the language barriers they already encounter to achievement. In addition, it also seems counterintuitive to believe that CTE students will benefit more from online courses vs. in-class, hands-on instruction of job related skills.

As I said, there are some definite opportunities to serve disproportionately impacted populations with innovative strategies, but before we jump on board early with our support, we can really help steer the ship!” This framing is problematic in that it plays on fears of losing control over curriculum and serves to consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching. I am skeptical of the success rates indicated for online students as compared to onsite students for I have not observed these outcomes in any district of which I'm employed. Nor do the majority of my students request/support online learning over onsite learning. It is very easy to weight retention and success numbers to benefit specific proposals, especially if those proposals promise to reduce educational costs statewide. Yet the reality is across the board student retention and success rates are lower in online courses as compared to onsite learning. Many factors contribute to lower success rates, including but not limited to: lack of student prior knowledge, prep, planning, and self-initiative, student isolation, lack of collaboration, peer feedback, and course achievement, problems w/App accessibility, functioning, and support. It is especially disconcerting to think that FLOW planners believe ESL students will benefit more from online courses, an idea that is counterintuitive when considering that the isolation of these students in an online learning environment only adds to the language barriers they already encounter to achievement. In addition, it also seems counterintuitive to believe that CTE students will benefit more from online courses vs. in-class, hands-on instruction of job related skills.

As I said, there are some definite opportunities to serve disproportionately impacted populations with innovative strategies, but before we jump on board early with our support, we can really help steer the ship!” This framing is problematic in that it plays on fears of losing control over curriculum and serves to consistently outperformed traditional classroom teaching. I am skeptical of the success rates indicated for online students as compared to onsite students for I have not observed these outcomes in any district of which I'm employed. Nor do the majority of my students request/support online learning over onsite learning. It is very easy to weight retention and success numbers to benefit specific proposals, especially if those proposals promise to reduce educational costs statewide. Yet the reality is across the board student retention and success rates are lower in online courses as compared to onsite learning. Many factors contribute to lower success rates, including but not limited to: lack of student prior knowledge, prep, planning, and self-initiative, student isolation, lack of collaboration, peer feedback, and course achievement, problems w/App accessibility, functioning, and support. It is especially disconcerting to think that FLOW planners believe ESL students will benefit more from online courses, an idea that is counterintuitive when considering that the isolation of these students in an online learning environment only adds to the language barriers they already encounter to achievement. In addition, it also seems counterintuitive to believe that CTE students will benefit more from online courses vs. in-class, hands-on instruction of job related skills.
I think online is great. I have wonderful students in my online classes. I teach them in three different districts, some short term and others full semester online courses. The variety is endless, and students seem to like them. I have few students who take them who have disabilities, in fact, that is maybe 1% of my students, at least, who ask for disabled services to request the extra time for such students to do the assignments. Most are working individuals who are weekend warriors, posting their work mostly on the weekends. They seem to enjoy anything I can post for them, even extra credit questions for "further thought" type exercises. I hope this idea goes through for a fully online college and degree. Anything we can give the students as an edge to getting into the workforce is a good move. In our Library Technology program, for example, the majority of students are rushing from work days in libraries to get additional certification for advancement in their careers. The content easily lends itself to an online environment, and we offer numerous hybrid classes to support their success already.

17 November 2017

---

I strongly support flexible online options for adults in the workforce. In our Library Technology program, for example, the majority of students are rushing from work days in libraries to get additional certification for advancement in their careers. The content easily lends itself to an online environment, and we offer numerous hybrid classes to support their success already.

---

As a professor who has been teaching online for many years, I support this proposal. I have kept track of my online vs classroom success for many years and find only small differences. I would support option #3 with the reasoning that it takes a village to raise a child and a larger district would have more resources to bring to the table and more options to offer students.

---

As a CTE professor and liaison I do NOT feel this proposal has taken into account the ramifications this will have on community colleges. I fell this is a missed opportunity for collaboration with community colleges.

---

Student Assessment. I believe that any option selected will need to have the individual professors create the assessment. This is a major piece of academic freedom, and exists for many needed reasons.

---
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While there are examples of state community college systems that have state online offerings (i.e. Georgia), I would ask that as
CCC moves forward, that they be mindful of the online engagement that needs to be present in those offerings if our students are
to be successful. Doing online offerings the right way, require intentional planning, communicate effectively, and investment in online faculty
to assure consistency in course delivery. One concern, however, is how the state course offerings might affect the individual
students. I have several concerns about this proposal. First of all, why should we create a new college (with a separate, costly,
administrative structure) when many CCCs already offer online degrees and certificates. We are reinventing the wheel. Why not
create a statewide clearing house for these online programs?

Also, I have concerns about competency-based credits. As a CTE faculty member, I have worked with students who have
requested credits for work experience. It's a long, laborious process, and many students do not have the appropriate work
experience when they believe that they do. This is what private for-profits do. Do we want to sink to that level?

Instructor

As an employee, I feel that online classes, and therefore an online degree, lack credibility. I would be very cautious about hiring an
employee with an online degree. As an instructor, I feel that online courses lack the personal experiences that an instructor brings
to the classroom. I don't care how hard an online class is, the students do not receive the personal experiences and knowledge of
the instructor, for which they were hired.

Associate Professor/Interim Dean

While I support the concept FLOW, I do have concerns. First, I would ask that FLOW does not negatively impact the current
offerings of these types of programs that are already in effect within the California Community Colleges. Next, I would like to make
sure FLOW does not contradict the Online Education Initiative (OEI). Many have worked countless hours statewide to put the OEI
into effect and it is work in progress. Last and most important, Faculty MUST be included in the formation, integration and approval
of FLOW. This program cannot just be put in place by legislatures without education experience or it could have negative
collateral consequences to the CCC Education Programs already approved and in effect. I support FLOW as long as it continues to require
approved curriculum-based courses. It is incredibly important to maintain the credibility and integrity of the courses that are taught
online.

Professor

How would these faculty who would teach in this "college" be represented, meaning how would a contract be bargained and how
would they get due process? Other issues such as faculty qualifications are also important and fall under the purview of our

Faculty Member

How does PROPATH fit into the program?

Professor

I understand the impulse behind this, but it's a horrible idea. I am a fairly young professor, and I myself took some online classes
and have taught online classes. These types of courses are NEVER as effective as face-to-face, no matter how good and
innovative the teacher is. The one redeeming thing about them as they are taught right now is that they are taught by people who
have been around a student's experience, so they are able to carry over skills that they're learning in face-to-face classes. There is also RAMPANT

Dr.

I do like the concept of FLOW! I've been teaching over 15 years in a community college and have experience teaching traditional
face-to-face, web-enhanced, hybrid, and online courses. Although I am in favor of providing greater access to students via an
online course/college, I do have some reservations and questions. On page 27, it mentions that there will be a variety of
assessments. How will these assessment align or copy what community colleges are doing now? Right now, colleges are not
assessing and instead asking students to use their GPA to self-select their courses. I do prefer Option 3 of FLOW. Option 3 will be good in the beginning as the concept is tested. I think when you have one campus/one district, it is easier to change/modify/arrange as needed. Once it has been proven successful with data and results,
then other community colleges may join (Option 2) and help with staffing, student resources, counseling, etc. Speaking of student
resources and counseling, how will FLOW students be supported and assisted? This is where having other community colleges
(especially all 114 colleges) integrated into this model can prove beneficial. Because students can go to their nearest community
college and seek help or use student resources, such as math and writing centers, for additional help. I guess the question would
be, how will community colleges finance this extra layer of support once they see an influx of FLOW students? Will the governor
provide additional funding (to compensate for new staffing, office, or extended hours of operation) to participating colleges?

In terms of faculty, will both part-time and full-time faculty participate? What type of teaching experience, primarily online, will be
required? Will participating instructors be paid by their respective districts? Will there be health and retirement benefits? Or will all
instructors be on part-time basis? What type of training will instructors receive to be successful online instructors? Will ACCJC be
assessing student outcomes?

English Instructor

Professor

No.

Option No. 1 would use an existing campus to create a statewide delivery system with campus faculty and campus instructional
designers creating content. College employer partnerships would be used and new ones developed statewide.

Regarding Option 1, the Option would promote only the talent and resources of one of our state's community colleges and ignore
those of the other California community colleges. The effort should be collaborative.

Option No. 2 would use an existing community college district to host a consortium of colleges that opt-in to collaborate on FLOW,
with faculty coming from the participating colleges. The host district would employ or contract with instructional designers as well as
develop employer relationships.

Option 2 is the best of the three choices.

Under option No. 3, a new community college district would be formed and operate under the California Community Colleges
Chancellor's Office, which would hire leadership for the competency-based program. Selected faculty would work with the new
campus district's instructional designers, and customize student services.

Sounds like a plan to focus on the new community college district and ignore the issues and needs of the other community
colleges.
These are exciting times.

There are tremendous, wide ranging discussions addressing multiple topics related to the New Fully Online College.

However, my comments here are focused upon the Political Dynamics of the three options. The Political Dynamics of collaboration versus competition will ultimately determine the immediate, medium, and long term success of the New Fully Online College.

One of the huge strategic factors in the success of the Online Education Initiative (OEI) is the collaborative approach that the OEI Leadership took in working with faculty colleagues.

The collaborative management concepts in Ken Iverson's book, Plain Talk are proven operational and strategies resulting in organizational success. Strategically involving the individuals who are actually going to do the work in the decision-making process has proven very successful at Nucor Steel and other organizational enterprises. That strategy is currently serving the Online Education Initiative very well.

The proposed Option No. 2 provides the greatest opportunity for collaboration and involvement among the California Community Colleges. The collaborative approach demonstrated by the OEI successes can be very tedious and cumbersome. However, the buy in and acceptance, particularly by the Academic Senate, has been extremely powerful in moving the OEI Project forward. The selection and adoption of the Canvas LMS by 112 of the 114 Community Colleges is significant proof of to the success of a collaborative approach. The Political Dynamics are very positive at this stage of the OEI Project.

Obviously, the OEI also saw opposition from various factions within the CA Community Colleges; however, those fears were set aside with great Academic Senate leadership such as David Morse. The OEI Leadership listened very carefully to faculty and administrative concerns. OEI Leadership responded to those concerns.

So from a Political Dynamics perspective, Option No. 2 has the greatest potential acceptance by community college faculty and administration. The positioning is collaborative; rather than, competitive. Ultimately those same faculty who will be in the discussions are the same experienced faculty who will be ready for repositioning and re-crafting course content to meet the demands of the FLOW workforce project.

Director of Strategic Planning and Operations

Joseph Perret brought the Career Technical Education (CTE) perspective to the OEI Steering Committee. Joe was very frustrated this kind of a proposal seems like it should have the community college faculty on board with. At this point in the proposal, I don't see it being in the best interest of the students, the faculty, or the state of California. I appreciate the desire to make college more accessible to our students. I absolutely support that goal, but not having faculty involved is not the way to do it. Student success is regular student-teacher communication. Part of this communication is the instructor's expertise in the field which they are teaching. You take that away and the student is learning from a robot. This student-teacher relationship is important for effective learning.

Assistant Professor

On-line learning has many positive dimensions, but it is also fraught with serious limitations. Unlike correspondence courses, the online format lends itself to too much anonymity which can be corrosive for underprepared students. Also, it is too easy for students to cheat in DE courses. No student should be able to earn a degree with all on-line classes.

Instructor of History

A face to face education is essential for novice learners. We are building their foundation for a journey of lifelong learning. Please don't make community colleges all online. It would be a huge loss to our society.

Professor of Nursing

I have been teaching 100% online courses for over ten years now. According to student evaluations, the key to an effective online class is regular student-teacher communication. Part of this communication is the instructor's expertise in the field which they are teaching. They are experts in their field and can make that expertise accessible to our students, I absolutely support that goal, but not having faculty involved is not the way to do it. Student success.

Professor Communication Studies
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The for a fully online Community College is misguided. The argument for may be “increased access,” yet our CC system offers
colleges within driving distance of the vast majority of students, all day, evenings, and some weekend course offerings, flexible
blends of online, hybrid, and face-to-face instruction.

While your letter praises the CC’s for our leadership role in online instruction, it does not address issues of student success and
retention in these courses—both are much lower in online courses

I’m particularly concerned about developmental courses in English and math and the sequences offered in these core disciplines. If
a student wishes to try these courses online, our CC system offers this option. However, the statistics reveal lower success rates
and a majority of students who have underperformed or failed admit that “online was not a good option” for them.

As you no doubt know, students who drop or fail risk losing financial aid; in addition, their lower GPA’s imperil transfer (as do those
who underperform by earning C’s).

This seems like an attempt to compete with or take over from For Profit universities who promised students so much and delivered
so little. A close examination of how they failed students would be instructive.

Again, CC’s have fashioned programs blending online, hybrid and face to face (offering a safety net of easy, individualized
intervention and advisement for recovering GPA’s etc.) with scheduling options that provide flexibility for working students.

Consider who, how and why will be most damaged if this experiment fails.

Equally important is the article in Inside Higher Ed (May 22, 2017), “Signs of Ceiling in Online Ed Market” showing drops in online
enrollment for CC’s nationwide. The idea is that the market is maxed out. Those who want online courses have sufficient supply. In
short, I have pedagogical and financial concerns in creating a 115th college—administration and evaluation and oversight cost
would simply be duplicating what is already in place and offered locally.

Overall, the document is well thought out and supported by data. This is a project that is long overdue and I would love to see this
succeed. It is important to realize that there is a lot of competition for online education now, so the curriculum we provide through
online modalities must be better than the competition’s. It will need to be more engaging, the content needs to be more complete,
and the avenues to student success will need to be better defined than any other online offerings that are currently available.

Fortunately, our colleges have an incredible number of talented educators who can be drawn upon to contribute their expertise to
the push for a fully online Community College is misguided. The argument for doing so may be “increased access,” yet our CC
system offers colleges within driving distance of the vast majority of students, all day, evenings, and some weekend course
offerings, flexible blends of online, hybrid, and face-to-face instruction.

While this effort is framed as a way to promote student success, lower student success and retention rates in these courses may
affect a student’s progress and financial aid and lower GPA’s imperil transfer.

I’m particularly concerned about developmental courses in English and math and the sequences offered in these core disciplines. If
a student wishes to try these courses online, our CC system offers this option. Many students who have underperformed or failed i
these classes admit that "online was not a good option" for them.

This seems like an attempt to compete with or take over from For Profit universities who promised students so much and delivered
so little. A close examination of how they failed students would be instructive.

CC’s have fashioned programs blending online, hybrid and face to face (offering a safety net of easy, individualized intervention
and advisement for recovering GPA’s etc.) with scheduling options that provide flexibility for working students. Consider who will be
most damaged (and how and why) if this experiment fails.

Equally important is the article in Inside Higher Ed (May 22, 2017), “Signs of Ceiling in Online Ed Market” showing drops in online
enrollment for CC’s nationwide. The idea is that the market is maxed out. Those who want online courses have sufficient supply. In
short, I have pedagogical and financial concerns in creating a 115th college—administration and evaluation and oversight cost
would simply be duplicating what is already in place and offered locally.

I have serious concerns about one central online college serving the whole state. I think there would be a real danger of creating a
"degree mill" with little student contact or college accountability. Our college, like so many others, has invested years in
researching which courses are effective in an online modality and carefully selecting the best curriculum choices. Our online faculty
devote a great deal of time to communicating and developing a relationship with their online students. I am concerned that the
good work on distance education taking place at so many campuses would be diminished by a large, centralized online program.

Among the options presented, I prefer Option 1, which gives the most local control.

I have been an educator for 35 years. Public speaking is required for most degrees, I am completely opposed to this project
because I do not feel that anyone other than trained faculty should be teaching and advising one of the most important skills that
employers say is necessary among college graduates. Our college has also worked toward the online degree. Faculty work very
hard to work with all returning students regardless of where they are at in life. The College of the Canyons has numerous
programs to better serve working adults within all populations. The skill I teach will not be well served through this project, or being
taught only through 100% online experiences, particularly where English is a second language.
I strongly support programs that provide access to online education because they worked for me as a student. When I went back to school at 30 years old in 2002, I didn’t believe it was possible to be successful because I couldn’t see how school could fit in my schedule since I had 4 young children at home. Online classes neutralized that concern and helped me to feel successful early in the process, which allowed me to see a way to succeed in a short amount of time by building a class schedule that included online classes and traditional classes only two nights per week. I owe my current professional success to that experience because it taught me that I can make paths to finish my goals. I agree that we need to spread the value of online education for adults with vocational needs and some, little or no college experience.

However, as a community college employee and a leader, I am concerned about the idea of creating a separate college that is fully online. Redirecting our online FTES to a separate institution has the potential to create a hardship for our current institutions, and I don’t see the necessity of a separate institution to be competitive against for-profit schools. In my opinion, developing a robust online program to serve working adults should remain with our local community colleges. Doing so will aid these schools in continuing to update the traditional college environment to accommodate the 21st century student and make us competitive with for-profit schools. I believe it will also help the community college system become a school of choice for the children of these “adults with some college or no certification” if their online programs are associated with our local colleges. When a parent graduates with a degree or certification from their local college they become an alumnus of that school. This creates an identity and lifelong relationship which the immediate family and even extended family can identify. There is no compelling reason why a separate institution is the only solution to updating our college model in order to serve the targeted population.

Our current institutions are the answer to the California’s workforce needs. We don’t need more legislation to make that happen. Instead of spending money on a new CEO and a building to house the online college, redirect these funds to the 112 incumbent Workers support and skill building training have once again been left behind, particularly in rural California communities. Community College based Online training, workshops and credentials can address these problems. Despite intense marketing in urban centers in the state, our rural communities are unaware of the renewed focus of the community colleges to enhanced Career Education services. A more robust outreach program is needed to educate our incumbent workers and our rural communities that online training provided by their local or regional community colleges is available and contemporary.

Los Rios CCD CITD (global trade) has worked closely with Folsom Lake College to provide an 18 unit online for credit certificate in Global Entrepreneurship. New online classes developed by faculty involving international trade are oversubscribed and we have learned that students with BS degrees in other disciplines are registered for this certificate. An online global trade focused incumbent worker training and skill building program has been a long term project of the LRCDD CITD over the past 10 years and has been awarded the President of the United States E and E Star award during that period for the outstanding training program mentioned herein. This program needs the financial and programatic support of the CCCCO EWD program to grow statewide.

Our students need the flexibility of online learning which is why we added the online option for the CERTIFICATE IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS at Contra Costa College. Through a collaboration among a consortium of 5 community colleges, local students can now access the courses they need to complete the certificate, and gain access to a host of additional resources. These online courses are a significant component of their experience and are an opportunity for them to achieve their goals.

In my position, I have been in a number of different roles, and I have always been a strong advocate for online education. I believe that it is a powerful tool that can help students achieve their goals, and it is something that has worked for me personally. When I went back to school at 30 years old in 2002, I didn’t believe it was possible to be successful because I couldn’t see how school could fit in my schedule since I had 4 young children at home. However, online classes neutralized that concern and helped me to see a way to succeed in a short amount of time by building a class schedule that included online classes and traditional classes only two nights per week.
Faculty are tired of initiative after initiative with no real gains in student success and learning as a result. After many have worked very hard on OEI (Initiative!), their work may be subsumed by yet another initiative. In addition, the Governor is not an education expert, nor are many involved in this process. Often “experts” draft these initiatives. As someone who has taken online classes, and who teaches online classes at the CC where I am a full-time faculty member, I support online education. However, I don’t support a plan that is based on the profit-model and an unaccredited school like Western Governor’s that has come under fire for many issues of late. I also think that many CC’s have a local set of expertise in what they do really well. OEI was poised to bring together the best and strongest into a robust program. I still believe that’s possible. I’m not sure why we are throwing out that model. In addition, I’ve known a couple of faculty who’s courses have gone through the OEI process—the faculty are critical in the design and subject area expertise. Instructional designers can’t bring that to a course and should not replace faculty—as I’ve heard from those at the meetings. I also don’t know how all of these jives with accreditation. Our ACCJC standards require frequent and substantive interaction initiated by the faculty instructor. How will that be accomplished in a course with little faculty input or presence? Or perhaps you aren’t concerned about accreditation? A totally new model without check and balances? This is all exhausting and confusing. As a faculty member I try to do the best for my students, but I often feel like I get undermined by things like this and I am not asked about how to best serve students. Which I think is insurmountable flaws. Please explain to the Governor that we already have the capacity to accomplish his goals without the new model.

I support option #1, “Use an existing campus that will deliver its online courses statewide” so that every college will have access to qualified instructors and support staff to offer courses at the same level of quality.

I strongly urge you not to create a stand alone district (Option #3). With the OEI, we have already have the framework in place to create a strong consortium of our trained and skilled online instructors that are already teaching our students across the state.

I am very concerned with the lack of faculty involvement in the proposed online courses. My colleagues who teach online tell me that they spend much more time (not less) with their online courses answering students questions and concerns than in their face-to-face classes. We need to have qualified faculty members teach these classes to ensure the courses are actually teaching.

How do we know if student success? There are so many variables to consider—college readiness, language and writing issues that may need one-on-one, face-to-face assistance. My concern is whether this will “water down” the academic performance or lower the academic standards. Which disciplines will this impact? Some disciplines would fare better than others. Science disciplines probably would not. There are too many unanswered questions for me to support it at this time.

I am very concerned about the proposals for Project FLOW. The colleges are weary of the plethora of initiatives which provide little new except for the ongoing costs. As a Ph.D. researcher trained in the sciences (UC doctorate) I looked at the data and it is weak and certainly does NOT support the extreme measures be proposed in the FLOW program. I would recommend the second option if you go forward at all and perhaps considering merging that collaboration under the auspices of OEI.

President

If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?
What collective bargaining will represent these faculty members?
Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?
Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?
Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be part time/adjunct faculty?
These are issues which have not even been considered and they do matter.

The President signed the Letter of Candidacy but his support is tenuous. He has signed the CTA comments below:

*The Community College Association and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “Internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the students who appear to be in the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data.

I am very concerned about the proposals for Project FLOW. The colleges are weary of the plethora of initiatives which provide significant funds but heavily restrict how they are spent. Because the funds are all time-limited, existing employees must carry the burden to apply for, monitor, report, develop consensus, plan, and otherwise lead these initiatives. Funds cannot be spent on critical ongoing needs, such as more fulltime faculty.

If funds exist, they should be spent to provide augmentations to general funding for current operations, not expanded to new ones.

More related to the specific proposals, they will compete with existing online programs, noncredit programs, and community education programs. They represent a net draw against current college activities and are likely to further decrease enrollments at our institutions. Moreover, with the OEI still trying to get off the ground, the colleges need to spend their efforts working to expand this initiative to better serve students instead of some other brand new alternative.

Finally, I’m concerned that the type of student targeted by FLOW (those with limited education, multiple jobs, and extensive family responsibilities) may be the least able to succeed in the independent learning environment of an online class not designed to...
As a community college professor and faculty union president, I find myself at odds with the purpose of the FLOW program. My college, like most of the CCCs, offers online as well as evening courses geared towards reaching all of our area's students. FLOW does not appear to be necessary as it would largely duplicate our online offerings.

In addition, FLOW appears to target a group of students that are inherently at risk. Will students be able to access their coursework with something other than a smartphone? College videos can easily eat up valuable GB. Will the students be able to access counselors, financial aid officers, and faculty through modalities other than the Internet? If not, a simple smartphone theft could completely sever a student's link with his institution.

Finally, I am concerned that the faculty will have an inferior status compared to other faculty throughout the State. Who will serve as the union for these faculty? How will their wages and benefits be determined? How will they be evaluated? Who will be their administrators? What processes will be in place to deal with curriculum, concerns, and complaints? In most of the past expansions of the system, a CCC was first a center of another institution, so the new college generally inherited existing processes. However, if we do the same in this case, a single CCC district will make decisions that affect students far from its local administrative offices, and that's hardly in line with the "local control" philosophy of the CCC system.

In summary, FLOW appears to be an idea that cannot be easily implemented in search of a problem to solve. If there are region needs for online coursework, existing colleges should be encouraged to develop such courses. We already have the necessary structures in place to accomplish such so this approach would be much easier than starting a new college.

Professor
My concern has to do with serving the needs of the target population. It doesn't look like there is any person with ESL instruction experience as part of the planning team. If the project, in part, aims to target students whose first language is not English, or who do not have experience with academic reading and writing in English, it is imperative that ESL instructors are invited into the conversation and become part of the planning. Working with students in ESL and basic skills programs, I see first hand how much support and guidance they need with technology, as well as with the soft skills needed for academic success. Please also consider creating support systems (tutoring, supplemental instruction) that are successful in face-to-face classes with similar populations.

Instructor
All the CCC districts have online classes, it doesn't make sense to create a new 100% online district (option 3). Creating a whole new district is a waste of time and money. Many districts are already creating online, non-credit, career focused courses. Hence the consortium model (option 2) makes more sense. If you would like to speed up the process then make the approval of non-credit curriculum and non-credit program faster. That's what is really slowing down the response to industry needs.

Professor
I oppose FLOW. It will detract from our college’s online program which is excellent and available throughout the state. Existing open access colleges can offer the same courses at a lower cost. Additionally, the only students who will benefit from these online courses are the graduate students. I agree with the previous speaker who said the only students who will benefit from the online course are the graduate students. Our students are different than ones we are already serving and the evidence must be clear that this population is already going to another institution.

Professor
I, along with statewide faculty leaders, support the consortium model because it brings with it many questions and a redirection of taxpayer funds. Please WAIT to create this new college, at taxpayer expense, before we rush headlong into a course that will not necessarily serve our students well.

Associate Professor
This proposal is highly problematic and does not have the support of educators. I also believe that without proper guidance it will fail. Online teaching programs like these have failed in mass. Just look at the history of MOOCs. This takes that idea and applies it to an entire college. This will be costly.

Professor
What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members? How will their wages and benefits be determined? How will they be evaluated? Who will be their administrators? Without proper answers to these questions, this move to online education makes no sense.

Professor & Vice President
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Academic Senate President
If you would like to speed up the process then make the approval of non-credit curriculum and non-credit program faster. That's what is really slowing down the response to industry needs.

Instructor
I am registering my opposition to FLOW.

Art History Instructor
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Trustee
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Instructor
I have strong concerns about the FLOW project proposals for a separate online community college district. This new online district's focus on job skills would not create a clear path to degree completion and upward mobility for its students, which is a major focus of the current state model for California Community Colleges. Additionally, it is concerning that this new online district would be dependent upon educational coaches and instructional designers, and not professors. Educational coaches and instructional designers do not have the education in the subject areas or the experience in instruction to create a learning experience for students that would be equivalent to the current online courses offered at California Community Colleges and taught by seasoned professors with expertise in their subject areas.

Professor
I think this is a good way to establish a template for online education. However, I think faculty will still ask how is this population different than ones we are already serving and the evidence must be clear that this population is already going to another institution because CA doesn't have what is needed.

Instructor
As noted in several of the resolutions passed by the ASCCC just a few weeks ago, we MUST explore our existing online offerings throughout the existing 114 campuses first, rather than assume that the need identified can only be met with a new college, which brings with it many questions and a redirection of taxpayer funds. Please WAIT to create this new college, at taxpayer expense.

Full time Faculty CIS dept
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Animation Instructor
I have read through the options, and I feel that option #3 is especially unwise. That option would undercut the already limited funds which go to our face-to-face classes at community colleges with online offerings. I believe that we need to maintain a strong push with online offerings, but I don't think creating a completely new online community college is the way to go. Options #1 and #2 seem like a more balanced approach. I'm also shocked at how little time has been given to the CC community to assess and respond to this.
The Community College Association and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution.

• If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?
• What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?
• Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?
• Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?
• Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty?

These are issues which have not even been considered and they do matter.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor's Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have "internet access." I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as "internet access." While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have "internet access." I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as "internet access." While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge.

The Community College Association and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution.

We need to step back on this idea and think it through very carefully prior to applying huge dollars to this initiative. Allow OEI to work in the area of CTE course development, now that we have the infrastructure and rubric.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

In addition to my last set of comments, I wish to add a few more. The ownership of mobile devices falls short for justification of preparation and access to online course delivery. Access to internet, use of only a cell phone to complete online coursework and absence of a working computer are all to be considered when assuming under served students can successfully complete an online class.

Also, if courses are designed with a hands-on lab, (CTE), the course is no longer considered fully online per ACCJC. Also, the online college will need full accreditation through ACCJC, which is not such an easy task.

The Community College Association and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution.

We need to step back on this idea and think it through very carefully prior to applying huge dollars to this initiative. Allow OEI to work in the area of CTE course development, now that we have the infrastructure and rubric.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I have SERIOUS reservations about the FLOW proposal. Specifically, I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

While there are many colleges that offer online only programs, research has shown that success rates for online courses is dramatically low and unsustainable for many students. Online success rates for the lower socioeconomic populations are also low. An online community college is not the solution to providing more accessible and affordable degree programs at community colleges. Community college is already affordable and in most cases free for community college students with the Promise, BOG, DREAM, etc. Community colleges should have a greater focus on student success for the populations that are consistently struggling or not attending college at all directly after graduating from high school. [... ] is already economically challenged and is dramatically low and unsustainable for many students. Online success rates for the lower socioeconomic populations are also low. An online community college is not the solution to providing more accessible and affordable degree programs at community colleges.

As a former DE coordinator for Chaffey as well as a long-time DE instructor, I am concerned that FLOW is a duplication of classes already offered at our community colleges. We have worked for years to develop robust DE programs, and it seems like FLOW will not only be starting at square one, but that it will at least to a small degree supplant the local programs. 99% of my online students live in the Chaffey district, and the OEI has more or less shown that students prefer to take classes at their "home" districts. Finally, I am concerned about the difficulty of maintaining the academic integrity of a college that has no physical focus.
Instructor, Early Childhood Education

To Whom It May Concern:

As with all successful initiatives, it is critical that those implementing the initiatives are an integral part of the creation process. FLOW implementation MUST involve system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. Without faculty and colleges involvement, this initiative is destined to fail.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Academic Senate President

I am concerned that a complete college community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

Adjunct Faculty, History

I am concerned that a complete college community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

Full-Time Faculty

I am concerned that a complete college community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

Distance Education Coordinator

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Professor of Fine Art

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Instructor, Early Childhood Education

I would like to point out that there are numerous online classes already being offered. I have been teaching online classes for over 6 years! An "all on-line college" is redundant! In addition, I question the following: 1) What is the criteria that will be used to determine the minimum qualifications of instructors? 2) What adverse impact will this have on part-time faculty who, through no fault of their own, are unable to find full-time, tenured track jobs? 3) What guarantee is there the work will NOT be "outsourced" to some foreign entity to "teach"? 4) How can the "need" for such a college be justified when the current Community (emphasis on Community) College to expand their programs to meet these needs. Faculty at California Community Colleges are dedicated professionals and I am wondering what the underlying purpose of this proposal is. Perhaps to open an online college and hire all adjunct faculty and support resources available to help them be successful. I am also concerned about the quality of the instruction and do not like the students who are set up for success. Students who have a level of digital literacy and access to all the technology and student online environment. I am very pro-online (especially given what I do for a living :) However, I only want to offer these courses to students to be successful both online and in a traditional setting.

History Professor, Associate (Part Time)

Not all people on successful online or have access to a computer when needed. This is why people need options at the community college level. Face to Face and online/hybrid should both be options.

I truly believe that we need to look at working smarter and not inventing the wheel. Most colleges are currently working with the OEI initiative which is providing online instruction and taking it to the next level. This is an amazing initiative that will enhance the online instruction that is currently taking place. Colleges throughout CA are providing opportunities for students to complete many degrees fully online already.

We need to currently utilize the vast resources that are already available by California Community Colleges. We work with our students on a daily basis, we know the many challenges they face, and we provide many online certificates and degrees for our students to be successful both online and in a traditional setting.

The following was shared at the AS Fall Plenary by Cheryl Aschenbach and Michelle Pitala.

Governor Brown asked Chancellor Oakley to explore options for a new college, a fully online college:
• Reach more students by using a technology platform
• Target: unemployed or underemployed adults, including returning veterans, displaced workers, and working adults with some college but no credential

California Community Colleges are providing and reaching out into our communities to provide the opportunities for many of the above mentioned.

Option 2 (p29) seems like the best option. It utilized the existing student services, financial structures and faculty resources, but should also provide a more broad offering for students as not all colleges offer all programs of study. This would also help established colleges with softening enrollment and to ensure best practices are followed. If current online offerings are not meeting certain standards, then those should be updated as well.

I am against establishing an entirely separate college given the previously mentioned enrollment softening and the well established student services structures that the other 114 colleges have in place.

I also have concerns that certain CTE programs do not lend themselves to online learning, since so much of the skills are learned by "DOING." Significant opportunities will need to be provided for students to practice what they are learning in the online setting. For example, Auto Technology, students need to actually work on cars. Myth 3 (p41) seems to address this issue, but I am unsure how this is supervised by faculty and/or industry.

I am glad that the Chancellor's office is working to address the needs of this population, but the best place to do this is at our established schools in order to expand current offerings and make the necessary changes to work with this population.

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. (Reject Option #3 from pages 36-38 of FLOW project DRAFT document posted by CCCCO edu here:)

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?

I am concerned that a complete online community college would be able to hire professors of high quality. How would such standards be established and met?
Why is a new online community college needed when our existing colleges already offer online courses? Who will represent the faculty teaching at a virtual college? Why have faculty unions and the online faculty they represent not been consulted more in this proposal?

Online education sounds great; however, the fact is many online courses have less student retention and success when compared with face-to-face classes. Why not invest more resources into our existing online programs to increase retention and success and expand our online offerings?

Professor

Visiting Faculty

In my formal answer to the Chancellor's Office survey I chose Option 1, that is to offer FLOW via just one campus. I just want to make clear that I generally oppose FLOW. We have documented that online-only education makes it more difficult for students, especially in our demographic of rural, isolated, non-college-ready students, to persist and succeed. It makes active learning and instructor mentorship more difficult. It is also good for students to have the cultural, activity-based and social experiences from coming to a college campus for at least some of their class work.

I urge you to not go forward with this separate online college. I work with the Governor's office on the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. I know that the board is supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.

Librarian

I have served on my local senate executive committee, and was my union president for 4 years, so I do understand the issues with the unions. Who will represent these faculty? Who will evaluate them? Who will pay for their salaries? While I support the state's efforts to improve job training options for our residents, I am concerned that this proposal seems to have bypassed the unions. Who will represent these faculty? Who will evaluate them? Who will pay for their salaries? Why is a new online community college needed when our existing colleges already offer online courses? Who will represent the faculty teaching at a virtual college? Why have faculty unions and the online faculty they represent not been consulted more in this proposal?

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is "if not us then who?". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district which's sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.

I support online learning to satisfy a need for those who can't make it to a face-to-face class. However there are many colleges that have worked hard to create an accredited online learning environment. I feel that FLOW should fulfill a need and not take what others have worked very hard to have available.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I would also hope the system can get employer groups to have more skin in the game as well. Done correctly, many of the costs of the new District could be sponsored or supported by industry with the proper incentives provided by the Governor and his staff.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Professor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I reject option #3 - the creation of New Online community college. This rush with an unusually short public comment period smacks of a sneaky way to bring about FLOW implementation without statewide faculty and college' consultation and approval. This option will siphon significant statewide allocations away from our district. There is a need for system wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is “If not us then who". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district whose sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.

I support online learning to satisfy a need for those who can't make it to a face-to-face class. However there are many colleges that have worked hard to create an accredited online learning environment. I feel that FLOW should fulfill a need and not take what others have worked very hard to have available.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I would also hope the system can get employer groups to have more skin in the game as well. Done correctly, many of the costs of the new District could be sponsored or supported by industry with the proper incentives provided by the Governor and his staff.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.
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I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is “If not us then who". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district whose sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.

I support online learning to satisfy a need for those who can't make it to a face-to-face class. However there are many colleges that have worked hard to create an accredited online learning environment. I feel that FLOW should fulfill a need and not take what others have worked very hard to have available.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I would also hope the system can get employer groups to have more skin in the game as well. Done correctly, many of the costs of the new District could be sponsored or supported by industry with the proper incentives provided by the Governor and his staff.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.
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I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is “If not us then who". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district whose sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.
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I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is “If not us then who". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district whose sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.
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I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I look forward to seeing the system develop this valuable online option. The questions for all of us is “If not us then who". As you may already realize, many of our current CTE students are seeking similar educational opportunities outside our system. Many of these options are very detrimental to our students. In my opinion, given the nature of "local control" it may be impossible to effectively bring a group of colleges or districts together in a timely manner. I would support a new college district whose sole purpose is to provide online CTE options. I would be particularly supportive if all the course offerings must all lead to some form of an industry recognized credential as well as be part of a guided pathway towards a college degree. This may also be an opportunity to ask the Governor to support this new online college.
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The response to Governor Brown's request should be a call to use and strengthen existing resources in the CA community college (CCC) system as opposed to creating a new online college or other entity. Most, if not all, of the CCCs have online courses, and we also have the systemwide capabilities of the Open Education Initiative (OEI). These are programs that can best meet the needs addressed by the Governor and they need additional support and resources. OEI also has a charge to explore competency-based learning and the use of prior learning assessment. I would also suggest that a focus on CTE be added to OEI's charge—this would be a more effective use of resources than creating a new online college.

Having said this (i.e. opposition to a new online college), if there is no alternative, I have heard that there is a modification of one of the options (#2) to be a "turbo-charged OEI" adding CTE options to OEI. And I would support that (again, my first wish is for no new online college).

Associate Professor

I oppose.

Professor of Meteorology

I believe we should have as much online education as possible. I'm not sure about the idea of 115th campus. That would depend on how it is implemented. The more technology we can use the better.

Assistant Professor, Computer Science

This initiative is sorely needed in the CCC system. For traditional full-time students, the Pathways Programs provides a means to complete coursework for transfer or certification in an expedient manner. However, for working adults -- many of whom are non-native speakers of English and/or may need additional literacy/writing support -- pathways programs provide an inadequate way for this population to succeed. With the demands of family and work, online instruction can be a great way to provide an alternative form of instruction.

Of the options presented, perhaps the most beneficial would be either options 2 or 3. Working within an existing college structure could have the potential to limit innovations. Consortia would have the benefit of multiple inputs, resources and training, yet could also be confined by stakeholder biases.

From my perspective as a former instructional designer, DE administrator and now teaching faculty for ESL writing, option 3 would work best if it included a Writing Across the Curriculum component. This would allow for more flexible scheduling and course design, would prevent the incorporation of expensive adaptive software that might take away from active learning, and would allow our students at the California Community Colleges access to online classes, lots of opportunities. How about we create more opportunities for our students with disabilities? They learn differently and need human contact and real life experiences. It seems to me that the California Community College is a great place for this learning and experience to occur. Can we do better by these students and their families before we turn our attention to an online only college? Please. And what of the faculty? Will faculty members live in California or will this be another outsourced service? This only scratches the surface of the problems that this unnecessary proposal raises. I'm sure you can find more productive things to do with your time.

Faculty, ESL

I am against the FLOW project which wishes to create a completely online community college. First, all community colleges already offer online classes by qualified professors. Second, through surveys on our campus, most students prefer a traditional classroom setting. In addition, research is showing that online education is not always an appropriate substitute for a traditional classroom setting, particular for language learning. Online education is being advocated due to convenience, budgetary concerns and administrators' whims, rather than a concern for a quality education. In many cases it serves to water down the rigor of a university education and does little for preparing students to interact in a university setting. Also, what collective bargaining agent will represent these online faculty members? Will they be living in California and will they meet the minimum qualifications? Will they be full-time or entirely part-time? There are many questions that need to be addressed, number one being what need is there for an entirely online college when all campuses already offer online courses? There are many courses that cannot be offered online, so are these courses no longer relevant to a well-rounded education? Are we really educating people by having them spend more time in front of a screen? If you want to take education seriously again, then politicians and administrators need to stop thinking only about convenience and money. Education has costs other than just financial: time, effort, and a willingness to meet the need that FLOW is trying to meet; rather than creating a completely new college, I urge you to consider utilizing the systemwide capabilities of the Open Education Initiative (OEI). These are programs that can best meet the needs of the students.

Lisa J. Schimpf, M.S., Ph.D.

An educational standard for English language learners, ELI, Our students at the California Community Colleges have access to online classes, lots of opportunities. How about we create more opportunities for our students with disabilities? They learn differently and need human contact and real life experiences. It seems to me that the California Community College is a great place for this learning and experience to occur. Can we do better by these students and their families before we turn our attention to an online only college? Please. And what of the faculty? Will faculty members live in California or will this be another outsourced service? This only scratches the surface of the problems that this unnecessary proposal raises. I'm sure you can find more productive things to do with your time.

Spanish professor

As an instructor for online course, I appreciate alternative solutions to reach students. However, all of our colleges already offer online courses. The courses also operate under a collective bargaining agreement. From a collective bargaining standpoint, FLOW is problematic. Who will the employer be? Will the same collective bargaining agreement that I endorse serve this new faculty? And what of the faculty? Will faculty members live in California or will this be another outsourced service? This only scratches the surface of the problems that this unnecessary proposal raises. I'm sure you can find more productive things to do with your time.

Associate Faculty, Department of Art

Although some students will benefit from online access, in general students do not learn as well from online courses versus traditional classroom courses. Students must be carefully screened as online-eligible. Otherwise many students will fail with an online class or not learn as deeply even if they pass.

adjunct assistant professor

Our students at the California Community Colleges have access to online classes, lots of opportunities. How about we create more opportunities for our students with disabilities? They learn differently and need human contact and real life experiences. It seems to me that the California Community College is a great place for this learning and experience to occur. Can we do better by these students and their families before we turn our attention to an online only college? Please. And what of the faculty? Will faculty members live in California or will this be another outsourced service? This only scratches the surface of the problems that this unnecessary proposal raises. I'm sure you can find more productive things to do with your time.

Associate Faculty for learners with disabilities

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. Our students at the California Community Colleges have access to online classes, lots of opportunities. How about we create more opportunities for our students with disabilities? They learn differently and need human contact and real life experiences. It seems to me that the California Community College is a great place for this learning and experience to occur. Can we do better by these students and their families before we turn our attention to an online only college? Please. And what of the faculty? Will faculty members live in California or will this be another outsourced service? This only scratches the surface of the problems that this unnecessary proposal raises. I'm sure you can find more productive things to do with your time.

CIS Full-time Instructor

I am opposed to the proposal of a community college that is 100% online. Our colleges already offer online and hybrid format courses taught by faculty that are interviewed and supervised within the academic disciplines that hire them on each campus. The proposed 115th "100% online campus" would be a duplication of services already provided. The academic integrity of any college program and its value to students requires full-time faculty and counseling/administrative staff who are invested, who share accountability, and who can evaluate learning situations as appropriate, then innovate and adjust. Our campuses are already using enrollment management strategies to consider intersections of data, pedagogical integrity, and best practices for course delivery.

Associate Professor of English

While technology is a tool, we must not be reductive in our view of online delivery as a silver bullet. Nuance is required.

Business Instructor

We already offer online courses. We need for more.

Associate Professor

There is no need for a new online college. There are many online classes at countless schools. Furthermore, what collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?
In regards to the FLOW proposals, I believe the best course of action is to delay and/or extend the commentary period for faculty. Without the extended input of faculty in the ideation stage, NCHEMS risks undermining their efforts to create quality proposals that can be embraced by faculty and provide quality learning opportunities for Californians. Second, by giving faculty such a significantly limited time to comment, it limits potential good-faith discussions with faculty moving forward.

The following is a series of questions and comments derived with looking at the Project FLOW presentation. The extent of the questions and comments should serve as evidence that these proposals require much more input by faculty before moving forward as many of them were derived during a short period of time. This fact indicates that much more could be revealed during an extended commentary period. It also implies much more rigorous research must be done before attempting to implement any of the proposals.

-Why is access to the internet via mobile devices being counted as evidence? Are mobile phones to be seen as sufficiently capable of providing a quality online education?

-What use of ASUOnline as an example suggests that any proposal should be integrated with already existing colleges. This is particularly relevant to proposal #3, which would create a completely separate college, disconnected from any local or regional workforce.

-Comparative success rates between online and in-person instruction is irrelevant unless it can be first demonstrated that both are provided with the same rigor.

-CTE at BCC is already working on developing relationships with local and regional businesses. How do these proposals help this existing process?

-How does a subscription model help students? First, does this not undermine the goal of Guided Pathways by giving student unlimited options rather than helping them toward the best courses given their goals? Second, does this help reduce the impetus and costs to students, who would not be required not only to take initiative to get a subscription, but also force them to pay for classes they may not want or need to take? Third, how does this fit with existing modes of financial aid for students?

-Where will the workforce for human-contact student support stem from, and what does this mean on a practice level? If human-learning occurs in multi-faceted mode and well-balanced online and in-person teaching is the most appropriate approach, I reject Option #3, which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and college consultation and approval.

I oppose the measure to provide an online-only college. All of our colleges already offer a plethora of online courses and I have concerns about the rights of faculty at such an institution. I must send it back to committee for clarification and revision!

I'm not in favor of this project as it stands. It's poorly constructed and needs considerable revision before moving ahead. Please provide with the same rigor.

I oppose the Flow Proposal. All of our colleges already offer online courses. I am concerned with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the students who appear to be the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data in this Pew study. Why another college to fill a need?
I have been teaching one of my courses online for the past 18 years of my 25 year teaching career, and I can say without a doubt that there is absolutely ZERO need for a separate fully online community college campus. Each of our colleges offers a sufficient breadth of online courses that students have no difficulty obtaining a fully online degree.

I do have collective bargaining concerns—who will teach the courses? Full or part time? who will govern the college? etc.—but far greater than my collective bargaining concerns are concerns of accessibility for our students, particularly those who cannot afford a computer or Internet access, as well as for those who require supplemental resources or course modifications to ensure equitable access and success.

The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to successfully complete assignments for SOME college classes on smart phones, it is impossible for students who take my Critical Thinking and Writing online class to do so. Using a cell phone, students simply do not have access to the kind of word processing programs they will need to write and revise properly formatted, extensive, analytical and argumentative, documented, researched essays, to successfully complete the required assignments of the course. (Students have TRIED to take my course on a phone, but none have ever continued to try that method beyond the first two weeks of the course.) A cell phone also does not provide a screen large enough to see a sufficient amount of text in order to perform the careful, close, extended critical reading and analysis required in a critical thinking course.

Even if students have access to computers rather than cell phones, the retention and success rates in online classes are typically far lower than traditional courses, with an average of 40-60% retention and about 65% success of those retained in RCC's online classes. Most community college students simply are not equipped to handle the demands of a fully online campus. (And the high schools that are currently involved in this enterprise are turning out woefully underprepared students. Let’s not continue this trend to the college level.)

I would be very interested in this. Before the worldwide web (way back in the 1980’s) one of my dissertation topics was identifying the collaborations necessary to create internationally-accessible learning areas in virtual reality. This could be the beginning of that Many of the systemic assumptions upon which our hegemonic pedagogy/andrology rest are demonstrably false. Students do not learn at the same rate or in the same ways, but they are herded into academic terms and graded as if they do. These grades are then used to ration future academic access. An online college could explore individual learning styles and capacities toward mastery that do not cohere with current institutional functioning. I look forward to future developments. However, if this turns out to be merely McDonaldization of education, or a mechanization of the same flawed practices, I will be quite disappointed.

I oppose the FLOW project. Online courses are already available at my community college. Students have overwhelmingly voiced their opposition as well. Associate faculty also overwhelmingly are opposed to FLOW.

Barstow College offers online courses for all students. Students taking online courses have lower student success rates than do students in traditional courses. Students need the option of taking traditional courses as well as online courses.

I responded because I am on the State Council for Education and was encouraged to write. My comments were general as I had not read the actual proposal for a totally online college, nor could I find it on the CCCCO website. Please send me a link. Thank you.

Dear CA Work Group,

Without going into the many problems associated with the creation of the FLOW proposal, which was rushed through a work group process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) involving little substantive engagement with faculty, program experts, and colleges, and without engaging all the faulty assumptions built into the research and analysis, I’d like to register the following views:

FLOW Option #3 is totally unacceptable. The creation of a new completely online community college would undermine the capacity of the community college system to carry out its mission by reducing enrollment and siphoning off resources from the system as a whole.

FLOW Option #1 would have similar impacts, and is counter-productive to work already ongoing.

FLOW Option #2, the consortium model, is the only viable option. That said, it should only be pursued if: (1) it is intentionally folded into the ongoing OEI project; and (2) there is REAL, SUBSTANTIVE collaboration and engagement with faculty and colleges in its further development and implementation.

In my view, not one additional dollar should be spent on this FLOW process if Option #1 or #3 are pursued.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback/public comment on the FLOW proposal.
City College of San Francisco has offered online instruction with comprehensive faculty and student support for many years. The college offers thousands of online and hybrid classes and CTE classes/certificates. Though there is always a cohort of younger students recently graduated from high school in attendance, the vast majority of City College of San Francisco's students have always been older students who are working, have families and are attending classes to change careers, retool tool skills and/or upgrade technical skills. I have taught both in person and online courses with age ranging from age 16 to age 74 enrolled in the same class and found the diverse student groups to be enriching for all in the class. This is also true for many of our in classroom offerings, especially in CTE areas. The FLOW proposal seems to me to duplicate. I strongly recommend that the FLOW group take a very close look at City College of San Francisco's offerings and data for the past many years as well as looking at other locations that also might be offering some similar courses and programs.

After many years of experience in the Broadcast Electronic Media Arts Department at City College of San Francisco I observed that 1) students who do best in academic transfer online classes are generally students who earn A or B grades. 2) students enrolled in CTE courses generally do best in hybrid courses that provide both online instruction/discussion/testing and hands on work in appropriate labs with an instructor. I was also fortunate to have my CTE faculty member teaching those skills. 3) there is a drop out rate in many online classes as students come to realize that a certain level of literacy is required to be successful and teaching an online course properly requires more time and effort on the part of a faculty member than teaching in person in the classroom. Proper teaching online requires daily focus on students and prompt response to questions and discussions. In some cases this requires faculty attention 24/7 to ensure student success as well as student satisfaction in a particular course.

One option missing from the FLOW proposals is to explore LOCAL offerings near where students needing skills live. Also there's nothing preventing students from enrolling in classes offered at a distance from almost anywhere in the state. Why not create a resource for students statewide showing various programs and courses offered online that fits their needs?

What exactly will be accomplished by establishing an entirely new college district for a purpose already being served in many locations by the statewide CCC system? As someone always interested in cost and "following the money" ... it seems to me that creating a new and fairly redundant system might not be the most cost effective solution. Where will funds for a completely new and redundant college come from? Will those funds then lower general fund budgets/resources for the current statewide system in the long term?

And finally, how can we best serve students? Perhaps there are districts statewide where the majority of students are 24 and younger. However, City College of San Francisco has never been one of those districts and has decades of on the ground experience serving older student cohorts and providing contract education to companies with specific needs for workers.

I am very concerned about adding an online college to the existing 23 institutions. First of all, California has about 700,000 older students. Foremost, we have a system in place for online education to take place at the local level through each CCs. Second and most importantly, the lack of funding for CCs is already a problem that will be complicated by drawing funds away to start a new online college. I am asking for some restraint here and time to research all of the possible options with out adding another college. I understand there are several plans that have been proposed. The only one that makes sense is the supercharged OEI plan that would allow for colleges already providing online courses and programs to students house a network of new online certificates and programs targeting this particular population of workers for further training. The real issue is that unless we offer affordable options at the local level for ALL people, not just those who have the luxury of attending in a full time capacity via the Promise programs around the state, no progress will be made. Many of the workers who would need further training don't have the luxury to take 12 units to get some education for free. So my question is how will you lure in or create an incentive for these workers to take classes toward a certificate or some degree? Our colleges can create whatever is needed with the funding and resources to help us do it but first we have to know what we are creating and know that there will be workers to take the classes. Unless faculty are provided the necessary professional development needed to bring their courses to the next level of teaching excellence in the online environment, no progress will be made either. Thankfully the OEI is providing incentives like free professional development for our online classes if we choose to align them to the rubric which I did. The investment should be made in the system as a whole, not in a new virtual institution until we have a stream of students who are willing to take these courses. It might be that hoping to increase their knowledge and skills. I do not see the advantage of creating a separate institution outside of the current California Community Colleges. It is unfortunate that this project has been rushed through and that faculty have not been given the space to think through the issues in a thoughtful manner. Many on-line instructors are now offering classes that do not require a text purchase, a great incentive for students, so it is anticipated that the number of on-line classes will continue to grow.

If the proposed college is to be a separate on-line college, who will be the employer? Will it be part of an existing district? Will the California Community Colleges be able to deal with the increased issues that must be addressed? The California system already needs to divest any of its limited revenue to establishing a new college district with the overhead that implies.

I support Option #2 that involves a consortium of established colleges working together to offer expanded options for students hoping to increase their knowledge and skills. I do not see the advantage of creating a separate institution outside of the current California Community Colleges. California Community Colleges, traditionally have grown scattered throughout the state with little organization. They have not yet had to deal with any of its limited revenue to establishing a new college district with the overhead that implies.

Opinion Poll 2: Option 1 is the only one that makes sense.

Instructor, Special Assignment
I prefer option 2. I think this task would best be handled without creating a new district.

Math Instructor
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with a systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I only had a few hours to read and consider the online information, but from what I understand I do not support this project. I teach online and in the classroom. I believe that our community colleges already do provide high quality service to the communities that have been "targeted" for this proposal. As online faculty we are fully trained and our courses regularly reviewed. The three most significant and worrisome differences I see between the current system and this new one are:

1. A non-standard timetable and extended learning times for courses could be a bureaucratic and academic nightmare to integrate into the currently existing systems. How could course equivalency be determined?

2. Students can sign up for as many courses as they want for a flat fee. I see this leading to students signing up for way more classes than they can possibly handle, in an attempt to finish quickly and save money. This would lead to students failure, disillusionment and alienation, even with a cadre of exceptional counselors. This is the exact opposite of the sense of competency and love of learning that we are striving to develop.

3. An advantage of working in a "real" college on a shared timetable is that online and classroom instructors can talk together, sharing experiences and advice about that particular population of students. That would be very hard to do in a flexible schedule system, where groups could rapidly get out of sync, and would be even harder to do if the entire college was "virtual," enrolling students from who-knows-where.

I think that it might be a much more helpful investment to increase the number of trained online faculty at the colleges we already have. I am against the "Flex Learning" for a number of reasons. I believe that help our learners succeed. I do not think that FLOW is a good idea at this time. There has not been enough analysis of the potential negative enrollment on local FTES and several colleges have or are building online AA degrees. In addition, it does not appear that a true shared governance process occurred in deciding to move forward with this...
I believe that providing additional online learning options works great for students so inclined. However, there are subject areas that required more hands-on learning for skills development. I have successfully implemented online learning in the auto collision repair field, generally considered a “hands-on” only program by many. It is possible. Creative use of Online for lecture content and periodic lab sessions at local area shops or education centers, ROPs, Adult Education labs, etc, could provide added opportunities from the local colleges, which are already suffering from low enrollment. It seems it would also facilitate more inter-college.

Using an existing district to create a fully online college seems to make the most sense, and would be less likely to detract students where I teach offer NUMEROUS online courses, taught by highly qualified faculty. Still, online courses are not appropriate for all students and not all students WANT online only colleges.

There are numerous personnel issues related to the FLOW Project; these issues have NOT been fully researched nor piloted to verify the reliability and validity of such a proposal.

For the reasons stated above and others not mentioned in this email, I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE FLOW PROJECT and urge that further research be conducted as well as consideration be given to our “customers” we humbly serve—the students!

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval. Online courses, certificates, and degrees are already available throughout the CCC system.

What about the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution?
- If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?
- What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?
- Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?
- Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?
- Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be part time/adjunct faculty?

Employers that want online training for their workers on a non-academic schedule and for specific skills can already offer classes through contract education by contacting their local CCC.

While the technology may seem like a wonderful thing, remember that students in online classes are already much less likely to stay in class and be successful. Add a population that isn’t ready for college, and you’re just asking for failure.

I have some concerns about online only instruction: the selection of online books for English is not robust. Students who have as their mobile device a phone are less likely to do—frankly, a phone is not the same as a computer.

Why are we doing this? for an online host company? Students pay one fee and have access to all classes? That tells me we don’t expect the students to complete the courses; if we did, then the online school would be losing money. Unless, of course, the classes are modules—not teaching, just completing the worksheets. Yes, I’m very skeptical.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

My concern is that, while online courses can be a great part of an education that also includes in-person classes, steering students towards online-only degrees and certifications will not be as beneficial to them and will exacerbate achievement gaps:

http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/what-we-know-about-online-course-outcomes.pdf

Unfortunately, I was unable to compare these studies to the results stated on the FLOW Overview Presentation because the presentation failed to properly cite its sources.

Our college provides online education/classes already. My experience as a Reference/Instruction librarian finds many online undergrads need the valuable feedback and clarification that comes with face-to-face interaction within the classroom. Most online-only students come to me with little or no understanding of their coursework/assignments and hope the librarian will clear the obstacles to the success of students I work with is a lack of study and learning skills. They don't know how to be students while online classes do work well for some students, I think the emphasis on online is severely misplaced. One of the biggest obstacles to the success of students I work with is a lack of study and learning skills. They don't know how to be students they won't complete courses if we did, then the online school would be losing money. Unless, of course, the classes are modules—not teaching, just completing the worksheets. Yes, I'm very skeptical.

I have some concerns about online only instruction: the selection of online books for English is not robust. Students who have as their mobile device a phone are less likely to do—frankly, a phone is not the same as a computer.

Why are we doing this? for an online host company? Students pay one fee and have access to all classes? That tells me we don’t expect the students to complete the courses; if we did, then the online school would be losing money. Unless, of course, the classes are modules—not teaching, just completing the worksheets. Yes, I’m very skeptical.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

My concern is that, while online courses can be a great part of an education that also includes in-person classes, steering students towards online-only degrees and certifications will not be as beneficial to them and will exacerbate achievement gaps:

http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/what-we-know-about-online-course-outcomes.pdf

Unfortunately, I was unable to compare these studies to the results stated on the FLOW Overview Presentation because the presentation failed to properly cite its sources.
Upon reading the materials presented I have several concerns about the information presented. I have listed them below.

1. The third option for competency-based learning is not unique to the structure presented. Competency based style programs already exist in many CTE pathways.
2. Nontraditional semesters are not unique to competency based only programs. Nontraditional semesters and/or self-paced learning already occurs in current community college systems. Open entry/open exit models allow for this.
3. The statement about community colleges already have faculty who are poised for change is presented in a manner that indicate faculty are supportive of the third model of the FLOW project. This is a hasty generalization. The truth is there are faculty who are poised to embrace and encourage change at the community colleges however, there is no indication that competency based education (specifically the third model presented) is the change faculty want to see.
4. The slide that indicates poverty and demographics do not equate to online learning capability oversimplifies the argument that the target population is not equipped to learn online. This misses the point that students in lower socioeconomic brackets may not have access to the structures needed to succeed in an online course. These structures include reliable internet access, a computer, word processing programs, and/or other computer programs necessary for completion of a course.
5. Regarding the myth surrounding community colleges and their relationship with local industry/employability. This is absolutely a faulty myth. The California Master Plan asserts the one of the primary functions of community colleges is to prepare individuals for the workforce. Additionally, strong workforce programs have brought this key element of the community college purpose back to the forefront of our focus. The community colleges should be focusing on developing strong employees, however competency based programs are not the way to do this. Much of the research available indicates that employers are looking for individuals with mature soft-skills (communication competency, leadership, creativity, collaboration, etc.) before they look for individuals with a distinct set of measurable skills. The expected employee shortage is not just, because individuals lack competencies that are job function related. The employee shortage is due to a lack of employees with job function competencies AND matured soft skills, which is not what the third option is producing.
6. Option three leaves much to the imagination and does not address the following concerns surrounding education: meeting accreditation standards, human resources structure (which includes who handles what part of each component, minimum qualifications required to teach/tutor/assist, what student services will be available, who is administering these services, etc.), there are no faculty voices in the FLOW employee structure other than offsite contracting, and it relies on the faculty expertise to build content but not to execute that content.
7. The population targeted by FLOW is better served in a guided pathways program that has stackable certificates IN ADDITION to ESL instruction and traditional education. These can be offered online, which would serve rural populations and those who are unable to attend traditional class. Further, research indicates that International and ESL students need support to be successful. This support includes things like welcoming family, guidance with regard to financial aid/academic progress, in person academic/personal counseling, workshops on study skills/career development, student advocates, and co-curricular offerings.

This email is in regard to the implementation of FLOW, namely the proposal to create a new online community college. As with all processes, transparency is paramount and should include consultation with faculty and colleges systemwide. Please consider an alternative approach that involves an opportunity for the system and its constituents to have a voice.

Best,

To Whom It May Concern:

This email is in regard to the implementation of FLOW, namely the proposal to create a new online community college. As with all processes, transparency is paramount and should include consultation with faculty and colleges systemwide. Please consider an alternative approach that involves an opportunity for the system and its constituents to have a voice.

Best,

To Whom It May Concern:

This email is in regard to the implementation of FLOW, namely the proposal to create a new online community college. As with all processes, transparency is paramount and should include consultation with faculty and colleges systemwide. Please consider an alternative approach that involves an opportunity for the system and its constituents to have a voice.

Best,

To Whom It May Concern:

This email is in regard to the implementation of FLOW, namely the proposal to create a new online community college. As with all processes, transparency is paramount and should include consultation with faculty and colleges systemwide. Please consider an alternative approach that involves an opportunity for the system and its constituents to have a voice.

Best,
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

The creation of a new completely online community college has the potential to disastrously undermine enrollment in our district’s course offerings, as well as siphon significant statewide allocations away from our district.

A completely online community college is not pedagogically sound and does not come close to fulfilling the mission statements of California Community Colleges.

Department Chair of Foreign Language

Math Faculty Emeritus

Assistant Professor

Instructor

Adjunct Faculty

Wellness Coordinator/Associate Faculty

Assistant Faculty

Associate Faculty

Instructor, Humanities

Associate Professor

Professor

Assistant Professor

These proposals should have a much longer period of public discussion. Option 3 is the most questionable in its attempt to reconfigure the CC system without real discussion of its effects.

It is absolutely critical that Chancellor Oakley respect the principle of shared governance when making system-level changes. Shared-governance guides the decision-making of the colleges he oversees, and by limiting the faculty voice in this critical process, he is assuming power that has not been given to him.

I'm wondering if this is really about cutting our teachers, rather than helping students. It seems to me that, too many hours are frequently being imposed, that are not pedagogical sound, to "help students", like teaching Math in a class that only meets one or two days a week; too much information to consume at one time and too much time between classes to receive help and feedback. As a Math instructor, I know from over 25 years of experience, nothing truly takes the place of inclass instruction for those that are not strong in this area. The idea of online only sounds nice but may not be good for all types of classes; like science and math. The push for OER is already a poor idea to "force" on instructors. Free doesn't mean better: you get what you pay for. Is the next idea going to be...?

These existing faculty and staff already teach the full range of courses online. It makes no sense and may be bad for adjuncts. It’s unclear to me why the system requires an all-online campus, especially given the fact that campuses like mine already teach a wide array of online offerings. Moreover, the proposal raises a host of issues related to collective bargaining. For example, will the new campus hire all part-time faculty? What representation will the new faculty have?

I support option 2 (AKA the “Consortium” model) as it best integrates the current online learning models with the initiative, while continuing to allow for faculty-led creation of course and program content. It also best complements the institutional diversity found at each college and recognizes the strong level of attainment with the current system while allowing for it to grow in the future to meet new needs and populations. The FLOW option (#3) achieves none of this. In fact, it may well work against the current model of collaboration across local colleges with all of their support systems and cohort community of local peers.

There is already the full online education faculty and infrastructure in place. Let this be a way to increase enrollments and faculty involvement in their own community's needs.

The Southwestern College Education Association Executive Board, (SCEA Exec) would like to register and record serious reservations about this proposal. We have concerns about student access, equity, andragogy, and labor issues—as well as concerns in additional areas. We have not brought this idea forward to our membership due to time constraints, so this statement is being made on behalf of the SCEA Exec only—not the entire union.

Please register my opposition to the creation of a new California community college to provide solely online instruction. The existing community colleges already provide online instruction, and the creation of an additional, online-only college raises many difficult questions. The majority of students that I teach do not have internet access or a computer at home. Smartphones can help, but it takes a lot of time to learn how to access educational resources on a smartphone. I can only imagine the difficulty of trying to take multiple classes with only cellphone access. Our college provides computer labs and individualized instruction to our students in learning via online resources. Instructors are also available for face-to-face interaction with online students. Surely it would be better to expand the online courses currently offered by qualified faculty at existing colleges that to create a new, completely online college.

I respectfully vote NO on the proposed FLOW program. Too many flaws.

Please reject option 3 of the wholly online community college plan. This plan needs to be looked at and refined by those involved—the faculty and students.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

I support the idea that the Southwestern College Faculty Association, along with the SCEA Exec, should carefully review the plans for FLOW and that the ideas be formally presented to the SCEA Exec. The SCEA Exec would then make its recommendation to the SCEA Board. A detailed report should be prepared for the Board to review and discuss.

I support this if it is connected to the existing local colleges with all of their support systems and cohort community of local peers. Implementation of FLOW without fully consulting the 114 campuses of the California Community College system, many of which rely heavily on online enrollments, could lead to unanticipated effects which local faculty and administrators are better positioned to foresee. Further, the mission of our system to serve their district residents may well not be served by the FLOW proposal.

My name is [...], and I am an adjunct faculty member in the Humanities Department at De Anza College, located in the Silicon Valley region. Our vibrant college depends on the support of students from a variety of backgrounds, ranging from full-time traditional age students to part-time returning students, and many of these students depend on distance learning offerings. I can say anecdotally that my distance learning class for next term filled in mere hours, and in four days has accumulated fifteen student reservations.

Dear Members of the FLOW Working Group,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Thank you for your consideration.

As an online and OER instructor at LBCC for many years, I believe our students learn best when taught by a local faculty who shows the relevance of their course content to the local community. Further, who would be the faculty teaching in the completely online college? And, what would be their union and their representation? Would the faculty be full-time or part-time? How would students benefit from this completely online college? I am opposed to this proposal as I do not see how it would serve the interest of our students.

It’s unclear to me why the system requires an all-online campus, especially given the fact that campuses like mine already teach a wide array of online offerings. Moreover, the proposal raises a host of issues related to collective bargaining. For example, will the new campus hire all part-time faculty? What representation will the new faculty have?
I AM REGISTERING OPPOSITION TO THIS PROPOSAL. MIRACOSTA COLLEGE ALREADY OFFERS ONLINE COURSES. THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE UNIONS HAVE WORKED LONG AND HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT ONLINE EDUCATION IS Viable. I ONLY TEACH ONLINE CLASSES AND HAVE BEEN TEACHING ONLINE SINCE 2002. I WONDER IF THE FACULTY WILL MEET THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHING IN THEIR FIELDS?

Instructor

I am very concerned about creating an alternative fully on-line district. If this were to occur, it should be overseen by faculty at an existing college or through a consortium, as these existing institutions will have extant local procedures and guidelines ensuring quality and oversight by faculty, not managers or admin. I also do not believe that a subscription service is consistent with the public mission of community colleges. I think you will find that the majority of faculty at California Community Colleges have views tantamount to having a United States University! Clearly that would be a bad idea, unless the State doesn't mind being usurped by a Federal University with the same rationale. Why bother with a California Online University when we can simply have the federal government, with much more resources, usurp all online education in the nation, not just our State? I fail to see the logic in this proposal at all. Will employees have collective bargaining rights? I don't see how they could and this is not good for students. To allow the faculty to be California teachers?

Professor of Philosophy, Chair of the Philosophy Department, and Faculty Co-Chair, Ed-Tech Committee

This proposal really makes no sense. Online courses are already offered at individual institutions all over the state. To me this is tantamount to having a United States University! Clearly that would be a bad idea, unless the State doesn't mind being usurped by a Federal University with the same rationale. Why bother with a California Online University when we can simply have the federal government, with much more resources, usurp all online education in the nation, not just our State? I fail to see the logic in this proposal at all. Will employees have collective bargaining rights? I don't see how they could and this is not good for students. To allow the faculty to be California teachers?

President

I would love to see this initiative be placed into the hands of all of the community colleges, with state support, standards and access to instructional designers that are following a comprehensive rubric such as Quality Matters.

Professor

I would also like to see that the invitation is open to faculty who have been champions of online learning and progressive competency based models in the existing framework of the CCC. Many of us have been fighting against the traditional vision of what college looks like for our entire careers. A fully online California Community College is very attractive but I feel it leaves the other Community Colleges in the dust, instead of requiring a certain amount of online programs/courses/enrollment out of the existing system. Canvas has been a great addition to the commitment to online learning, now we just need to get both faculty and students opinions in online learning improved, and really show and lead our faculty that are interested in contributing to an online program to the table. So often we have been told NO.

Instructor

Our contracts have items that deter good online learning faculty from pursuing online courses. Let's start with some standards, a change of framework, some incentives for colleges to increase online enrollment, and really target those faculty who are passionate about developing and contributing to online learning. Let's allow faculty to solely teach online within some departments, as long as they are proven as good online learning professors. Let's think outside of the box and toward the future and start with the existing system. Moving to a WGU model for competency based programs can make the FLOW plan Option 3 seems redundant with programs already in place at most of our community colleges. I find it hard to believe that funds are so abundant that they can be diverted to foster this level of redundancy. The plan also does not address the QUALITY of the education that FLOW proposal would offer to students. I understand the need to make more options available to the changing California demographic that comprises our students and potential student. That need would best be addressed by the existing facilities of the California Community Colleges. Thank you.

Professor

I am specifically concerned about how this idea is to be implemented. Although I think an online college is a good idea for our students, the implementation process is not been made clear. Hopefully an online college in California needs to be taught by qualified individuals in the state of California working FULL TIME so that all their resources are dedicated to this endeavor. There also needs to be a method for evaluating students in a face-to-face exam. Cheating has become all too prevalent, and is made easier when there is no one proctoring exams. In order to guarantee the quality online education equivalent to what is given in the classroom, programs/courses/enrollment out of the existing system. Canvas has been a great addition to the commitment to online learning, now we just need to get both faculty and students opinions in online learning improved, and really show and lead our faculty that are interested in contributing to an online program to the table. So often we have been told NO.

Assistant Professor

We already offer these classes. I oppose.

Professor

I am unclear why we would start another college to replicate work currently being provided. I personally have been teaching online since 2003 instead of opening a separate college, perhaps we could examine students ability to take classes from any California college. Option 2 makes the most sense, we are already doing that. It won't stop competition with classes already offered. It won't cost tax payer's money, it values the integrity of using professionals trained in their fields to instruct students. It won't turn into a profit for poor quality education competing with other low quality for profit online education systems already out there who are cheating their students.

Professor

I am NOT in favor of an exclusively online community college in California. I have been teaching online since 1997 as part of RCCs Open Campus program. Distance education is already offered at a number of California community colleges. How would the addition of a new "online college" effect those programs already in place? Many of us have worked long and hard to create our online courses and to teach them with the same rigor as our face-to-face classes. Who would create the courses for a new "online college"?

Another concern is regarding the faculty that might teach online. Many four-year institutions offer online courses taught by faculty living all over the United States. Would an community college online employ faculty living in California, or would the faculty come from anywhere? The needs and experiences of California students are unique. It seems problematic to me to have a professor who has never lived in California teaching students that do.

Furthermore, I am unclear as to who the employer would be. Would the employer be the state of California? I am currently a professor at Riverside City College. I have support staff and administrators that I can go to with any issues that may arise. In a virtual setting, how would this be handled?

In conclusion, I hope due consideration is given to these questions (and many others) that are of concern. Rather than creating an additional virtual college, why not give additional funding for expansion to those existing distance education programs? I see no need to reinvent the wheel.

Professor

Anything online should be handled at a local level and with as much connection to the brick and mortar colleges as possible. These are some very at-risk students when it comes to success - we need to target local job market needs and have high quality full-time faculty teaching. Online students usually do not succeed or retain at the highest rates, and so we need to provide them with a product that will actually lead to their success. They need the support of learning resource centers and even computer labs to do the work. I strongly oppose the creation of an online only college.

Asst Professor

Community Colleges already offer robust online courses. There isn't a need for a solely online college. Who will the faculty be? The faculty should be both full and part time, with a union, and fully qualified to teach their area. Will the faculty be California teachers? Students often say they can take online classes but only have cell phones which are inadequate for their online course needs. Would assistance be provided to get students proper equipment?
As a tenured ESL faculty member who has been teaching many immigrants in the California Community College (CCC) system for over 17 years, I am deeply concerned about this proposal as it is almost identical to the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), which was rejected by various CCC professional organizations such as the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges and faculty unions years ago because students do not succeed an environment where faculty support and students services (e.g., counseling and tutoring) are extremely limited. If the CCC System is truly about providing quality education to Californians, project FLOW must be rejected.

Project FLOW seems to be about cost-saving, rather than student success, as it would not provide adequate student interaction with faculty, counselors, and student service staff, who have essential roles in ensuring that students reach their educational goals. Further, this online “college” proposal would negatively impact many CCCs’ online programs.

I urge you to reject this proposal to show that you truly care about the success of California community college students. Thank you for your attention.

I am deeply skeptical about the effectiveness of a completely online education, and I am concerned about the barriers to access that such a mode of education can be to students of color, adult or senior citizen students and students in a disadvantaged socioeconomic state. In addition, as an educator I have observed that despite the fact that my institution offers a wide array of online courses, students continue to opt for brick-and-mortar courses. When I ask students why they choose these brick-and-mortar courses, they simply say that online learning doesn’t suit them. If we are offering pathways that suit the needs of many different learners, then we should consider the fact that some students are not cognitively receptive to online learning. Finally, while technological access has increased in recent years, I know that many students still struggle to attain access to the internet.

There are logistics issues; all the colleges would have to adopt a common LMS, such as Canvas, they would then have to submit their online classes to a “central hub” in order to make up the programs. And finally, there would need to be a dedicated division of faculty, counselors, and student service staff, who have essential roles in ensuring that students reach their educational goals.

There are concerns about who will be teaching the classes and will they carry the same standards as ours. If it’s a for-profit institution, I have strong concerns that their motivations will be less student-centered. Online education requires considerable continuous growth and another concern is that such a mode of education can be to students of color, adult or senior citizen students and students in a disadvantaged socioeconomic state. In addition, as an educator I have observed that despite the fact that my institution offers a wide array of online courses, students continue to opt for brick-and-mortar courses. When I ask students why they choose these brick-and-mortar courses, they simply say that online learning doesn’t suit them. If we are offering pathways that suit the needs of many different learners, then we should consider the fact that some students are not cognitively receptive to online learning.

I am against a totally online degree. The students will miss a lot of the college experience and there is really no way to ensure the person doing the work is the real student. I see this as a convenience for students but it is also a huge money maker for the institution. I have taught online for ten years. I have some concerns about this proposal. We already offer viable online classes and are working diligently to ensure they are accessible and comply with the OEI course design rubric. The plan raises several concerns about who will be teaching the courses and will they carry the same standards as ours. If it’s a for-profit institution, I have strong concerns that their motivations will be less student-centered. Online education requires considerable continuous growth and another concern is that such a mode of education can be to students of color, adult or senior citizen students and students in a disadvantaged socioeconomic state. In addition, as an educator I have observed that despite the fact that my institution offers a wide array of online courses, students continue to opt for brick-and-mortar courses. When I ask students why they choose these brick-and-mortar courses, they simply say that online learning doesn’t suit them. If we are offering pathways that suit the needs of many different learners, then we should consider the fact that some students are not cognitively receptive to online learning.

I think that the following sums up my opinion (https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/11/13/california-mulls-three-options-new-california-online-campus) “The idea that students are breaking down the barricade to have this is a fallacy,” said Jim Miller, an English professor at San Diego City College and a member of the California Federation of Teachers, a faculty union. “It would be one thing if we had no online options, but we already have it.” Additionally “The two-year system’s Online Education Initiative, which debuted last year, allows students to register and participate in online courses across multiple degree programs. The initiative also provides online counseling and allows students to find and take online courses that may be overbooked on their home campus. There’s also the California Virtual Campus, which works alongside OEI, to help students transfer to California State University. It seems as if the Chancellors office is unclear about the plans that are already in place. While as Oakley stated “The intention isn’t to compete with currently available online options, said Eloy Ortiz Oakley, the system’s chancellor” that is exactly what it would do compete for students. In times of low enrollment, this seems like a plan that would increase this problem.

I question that Oakley really understands the system in California (or has chosen to ignore) when he stated “...In order to reach a different population of students, particularly working adults who are looking to quickly gain skills and have economic mobility, “we have to give them a different option than what we’re offering at the brick and mortars.” The options also seem to have been developed by someone uniformed about what exist in California-maybe they have us confused with another State or possibly, Country?

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleague consultation and approval.

A “California Community College Online” campus: It sounds great but there are concerns: What about the rigor, or management of such a system? Who is there to answer questions or interact with students?

We could build out on our existing college system that can address this. There are enough current community college districts in the state to create a “Online Consortium Campus.” All we need to do is set up designated programs of study that allow a student to take online classes from any number of different campuses and have it look transparent to the student.

There are logistics issues; all the colleges would have to adopt a common LMS, such as Canvas, they would then have to submit their online classes to a “central hub” in order to make up the programs. And finally, there would need to be a dedicated division of faculty, counselors, and student service staff to handle the issuance of Associate degrees and certificates as well as transfer concerns.

The advantages are that we have better classes, taught by established California instructors who will respond to students needs.

This is the way to go, not with some “artificial” online campus with no established process of vetting course content, rigor, or methods.

Let’s go forward with a California Online Campus, made up of our current and future online classes offered by our great existing...
My college already offers online courses and we are in the process of developing more classes online. The academic senate and the unions have worked long and hard to make sure that online education is viable, including training for online instruction. Teaching online is very different than teaching in the classroom; I have simultaneously taught online and in person the same class at least 14 times. In my experience, for students who attend brick and mortar classes the retention and passing rates are higher and they have a richer learning experience than the online sections. Taking a few classes online may be helpful, but for community college students, an entirely online college would likely not serve the population well. Their needs are different than university student needs. Our students benefit from small class sizes and one-on-one personal attention from the professors, which they would not get from an online-only experience.

Another concern is access to online courses. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” A review of this study shows the data include smart phones as “internet access.” Smart phones can be used for some aspects of an online class (viewing lecture notes), but for others it is not appropriate (writing an essay). The students who appear to be the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data in this Pew study. A student taking online and in person classes at the same time can use the computer lab on campus to access their online class if they only have a smartphone.

Faculty are the experts on learning and want to be involved more actively in your discussions. I love helping students learn how to learn so they can reach their potential and realize their dreams. That is why I teach.

I am totally against establishing a new college for FLOW.

There is a great question as to who would receive the FTES when work is taken at a different college. FTES right now link to monetary issues. A consortium might work, yet would most likely require administrators—putting more weight there in terms of the 50% rule. The best possible outcome would be to run FLOW at each campus. I reserve any additional comments.

REJECT New Online College. FLOW implementation MUST involve system wide faculty and colleges.

The Cabrillo College Faculty Senate unanimously voted to oppose the FLOW project, including the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

The Cabrillo College Faculty Senate agrees with the resolution passed by the state Academic Senate at the recent fall plenary session: 7.10 F17. Using System Consultation and Faculty Input to Address Expansion of Online Education. We agree that the goals of the governor and the FLOW workgroup can be better accomplished using existing resources and structures within the community college system rather than by creating a separate online college or other entity.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the students who appear to be the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data in this Pew study.

Please involve faculty experts more actively in your discussions. We want to help our students. That’s why we teach.

The Community College Association Board and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution.

If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?

What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?

Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?

Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?

Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at-for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty?

These are issues which have not even been considered and they do matter.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the students who appear to be the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data in this Pew study.

Please involve faculty experts more actively in your discussions. We want to help our students. That’s why we teach.

The Cabrillo College Faculty Senate unanimously voted to oppose the FLOW project, including the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

REJECT New Online College; FLOW implementation MUST involve system wide faculty and colleges.
Assistant Professor

We already teach online classes where appropriate. This is a reckless attempt to pawn off our already vulnerable students to a for-profit model that does them an enormous disservice. It's also suspect from a labor perspective—who will teach it? Where will teachers be located? What will be their relationship with collective bargaining? How will this impact on-campus education?

As Faculty English & Distance Education Coordinator, we propose moving forward with the three proposed selections. We are encouraged by the discussion of how online learning can better address the needs of the "stranded worker/laborer". However, we share strong concerns regarding the organization, timeline, and transparency for initiating Project FLOW and would like clarification on the following:

(1) Workgroup organization and selection: How was the workgroup formed? Should there be more faculty representation? Right now, the two faculty who are on the workgroup are also part of the OEI. What trade faculty will be part of this group?

(2) Relationship to existing efforts of the OEI: What will the relationship be to the OEI? Certainly, these are similar terrains?

(3) Relationship to existing efforts of the colleges: What work/research has been done to compare and evaluate the efficacy in funding existing online efforts of the local community colleges to design their online programming for workforce/trade versus a larger State-wide college?

(4) Timeline and Transparency: What is the intended timeline? And, why wasn’t the initial idea vetted publicly?

We recommend revisiting the needs of the "stranded worker" and the relationship to online education before putting forward a proposal for a State-wide online College as an answer. In addition, we feel that work should continue towards fulfilling the goals of the Online Education Initiative first, which seeks to harness the expertise and skills of the system’s current faculty and colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

Professor of Psychology

I have been teaching online since 1996, and before that I did telecourses. I am a firm advocate of distance ed, and a Peer Online Course Reviewer for the OEI. I like the idea of a 115th California CC, but this has to be done right. Allow current faculty who are experienced in online to transfer to the new college. Offer courses that are impacted (e.g., GE, impacted courses) and preserve academic freedom. Do not use "canned courses" that are written by "a committee" turning instructors into "facilitators" who just follow a script. Above all, preserve the interactive aspect of online and the power of discussion and student generated content. Do not become a profit model that does them an enormous disservice. It's also suspect from a labor perspective—where will faculty be located? What will be their relationship with collective bargaining? How will this impact on-campus education?

I believe that the FLOW proposal was created and rushed through a workgroup process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) that involved very little consultation with systemwide faculty or colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

Faculty English & Distance Education Coordinator

Hello,

I am an instructor at De Anza College and West Valley College. I believe that the proposal for a new online college is a horrible proposal which would only undermine the mission of the community college system by siphoning off funding to create a new bureaucracy. The aims of FLOW should be incorporated into existing strong-workforce and OEI programs, and the only conceivable option to date would be to implement FLOW in a consortium of existing colleges.

I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges ("ASCCC") and the Community College Association ("CCA"). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty's voice in the state of California.

Professor of Political Science

I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges ("ASCCC") and the Community College Association ("CCA"). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty’s voice in the state of California.

As a faculty member that already teaches many of my courses in an online format, I have many concerns about the proposed FLOW project. The major concern is how faculty will be chosen and whether they will live in California and meet minimum qualifications for faculty to teach in their discipline. What quality control measures will be in place to ensure that a faculty member teaching one of these courses actually is competent to teach it and how will evaluations of the course and faculty member be conducted?

Many courses are already taught in an online format, so how does this new project supplement (and not supplant) what is already being done?

Many other concerns have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges ("ASCCC") and the Community College Association ("CCA"). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty’s voice in the state of California in your decision-making process.

Instructor

[...]

Faculty English & Distance Education Coordinator

One last comment—where can we see these comments publicly? It would be helpful to see how others are responding.

Professor

Community colleges already offer online courses. All community college constituents, students, faculty, staff, administrators and community members at the college, district and state level have been discussing this for years and have worked hard, and continue to work hard, to create online education that is accessible, convenient and effective. I am extremely concerned that FLOW fails to acknowledge and build upon this work, and that it fails to specify whether courses would be taught by all full-time or all part-time faculty.

We recommend revisiting the needs of the "stranded worker" and the relationship to online education before putting forward a proposal for a State-wide online College as an answer. In addition, we feel that work should continue towards fulfilling the goals of the Online Education Initiative first, which seeks to harness the expertise and skills of the system's current faculty and colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

Professor

Community colleges already offer online courses. All community college constituents, students, faculty, staff, administrators and community members at the college, district and state level have been discussing this for years and have worked hard, and continue to work hard, to create online education that is accessible, convenient and effective. I am extremely concerned that FLOW fails to acknowledge and build upon this work, and that it fails to specify whether courses would be taught by all full-time or all part-time faculty.

We recommend revisiting the needs of the "stranded worker" and the relationship to online education before putting forward a proposal for a State-wide online College as an answer. In addition, we feel that work should continue towards fulfilling the goals of the Online Education Initiative first, which seeks to harness the expertise and skills of the system’s current faculty and colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

Associate Professor, Chair

Moreover, the entire concept is ill-conceived and counter to the spirit of promoting and valuing student success when the data is overwhelming that students learn best through human interaction and that online learning is a supplement to on-campus learning not a replacement for on-campus learning.

I am opposed to the idea Long Beach City College already offers online learning and think the concept of a new State College is for profit and would be represented by vendors and not faculty or students. We already teach online classes where appropriate. This is a reckless attempt to pawn off our already vulnerable students to a for-profit model that does them an enormous disservice. It’s also suspect from a labor perspective—who will teach it? Where will teachers be located? What will be their relationship with collective bargaining? How will this impact on-campus education?

I am opposed to the idea Long Beach City College already offers online learning and think the concept of a new State College is for profit and would be represented by vendors and not faculty or students.
Facility at the 14 CA community colleges I represent have been calling and writing to me for the past two weeks as they try to catch up with this accelerated process, and without exception they are appalled and frustrated. Our system seems bent on investing only in what is new, rather than supporting efforts already underway. And all too often, it seems the new, untested programs have a higher priority than any real discussion at Consultation Council of any aspect of the FLOW report. We make better decisions as a system when our processes are more collaborative and inclusive.

Please note that faculty support the goal of expanding access and supporting workforce needs. Clearly, we can and should expand online CTE instruction. But this can be done more effectively and efficiently through our existing structures (like the Online Education Institute), and with colleges continuing to build on and expand existing programs.

The "myths" section of the proposal seems particularly disturbing to me. One can't actually refute valid concerns simply by labeling them "myths." The concerns about quality and about undermining efforts already underway by diverting resources (and perhaps students) to new, yet-to-be-created, untested programs do have significance. If more discussion and attention than any previous year, we need a more thoughtful, inclusive discussion of how best to target the population FLOW seeks to serve. The pace of the process is more collaborative and inclusive.

President and Professor of English

I am writing to let you know that I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Student Senator

California should not cave to the economic pressures of offering the least amount of education for the least cost, which is what an all-online community college would be. Online courses of high quality struggle to retain students who are often ill-prepared to undertake all online studies. To expect the underpaid, overtaxed California worker to also undertake only online students is to align ourselves with the predatory practices of other online "schools" like University of Phoenix, Corinthian College, and other for-profit schools, where part-time teachers report they are notoriously inflated with their grades in order to keep the college happy with high enrollment. What's more, employers aren't fooled by the "degree" from these substandard online schools and sometimes even announce "Do not apply..." if students are graduates of bottom-ranking online for-profit schools. Already part-timers are under pressure to "retain" students in community college classes, and they will cave in standards more (says national data that reports part-time English teachers may have a full-grade higher than full-time teachers.) I object to this ONLy online college for these reasons and more. We already have plenty of online offerings. Why would we use the public's money to offer California

Instructor Professor

English Professor

1. I think the employer should be the same as the college from which the course is being accredited by, but as an extension college format.
2. As for the bargaining unit it should be the same as for all faculty per location, and a subchapter should be created to represent adjuncts teaching these courses as well as all faculty.
3. Faculty could live outside of California, but not outside of the USA, and should meet Min Quals for CA, particular to the subject matter.
4. For instructional purposes I believe an adjunct faculty should have the option of becoming a full-time instructor after teaching the same as regular in college faculty after a certain criteria has been met, say after two years of instructing 5 classes per semester.

counselor/instructor

All our colleges already offer online courses. In fact, I teach a few courses online on a regular basis at my campus. I believe in having regular contacts with the students and that's why I offer monthly review sessions face to face. Why would we need a separate college? Who will teach these courses and where would they be living? Are they willing to meet with students who would like to have some face to face time with their instructors?

Associate Professor

I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges ("ASCCC") and the Community College Association ("CCA"). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty’s voice in the state of evaluation. Our faculty here at LBCC are hired with very strict minimum qualifications and requirements and I have a concern that this "college" would not have as be strict...in addition, I’m not sure who/what would be the governing organization of this college to do the hiring, etc. With that said, who/what is doing is the instructor evaluating in order to maintain the integrity of the educational institution all faculty need to be evaluated and I have concerns that this will not be done.

Thank you,

Professor-Department Head

I agreed to give feedback briefly but this is a brief description of the proposal. It is not a fair idea.

English Instructor

but I find ETUDES, the learning system pioneered by several Bay Area colleges, far more useful than Canvas for online teaching.
I am a community college faculty member and a member of the LBCCFA faculty union. A completely online community college is a bad idea. These classes are already taught online by qualified faculty at our current colleges. Who would be teaching these classes and would they meet our minimum qualifications? Where would these faculty be located? How would they be represented in collective bargaining? Would they be full time or part time?

EOPS Counselor/Coordinator
I would like to know how Extended Opportunity Programs and Services would be implemented with an online community college. I would prefer to see the online option implemented into existing community colleges.

An online community college will undermine the efforts of the current community college system. There are already so many online programs available and many educators agree that the quality of education can be questionable. As an educator who teaches both online and face-to-face classes, I completely disagree and do not support a stand-alone, virtual community college.

Professor
I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (“ASCCC”) and the Community College Association (“CCA”). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty’s voice in the state of California.

I am in complete agreement with the words of 

"The Community College Association Board and the California Teachers Association are completely supportive of alternative solutions to reach students who want higher education and improved job training. However, we have discussed the FLOW proposal and we have serious concerns. One of our concerns has to do with the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution. If it is a separate college, who will the employer be? What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members? Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields? Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India? Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty? These are issues which have not even been considered and they do matter.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge.

Please involve faculty experts more actively in your discussions. We want to help our students. That’s why we teach."
We are already offering many on-line and hybrid courses at Long Beach City College so there are some questions:

If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?

What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?

Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?

Assistant Professor Reading

Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty?

If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?

What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?

Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?

Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?

Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty?

These are issues which have not even been considered and they do matter.

Our other concern has to do with student access. The Chancellor’s Office presentation cites a Pew Research report to support the assertion that 80% of adults in the target group have “internet access.” I reviewed this study and it appears that the data include smart phones as “internet access.” While it is possible to do college classes on smart phones, it is quite a challenge. And the students who appear to be the target population are the ones who consistently show a lower rate of internet involvement in the data.

Assistant Professor of Dance

As a faculty member, I have serious concerns regarding the FLOW proposal and I do not support it. Chief among my concerns is what collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members that would teach as part of FLOW? Also, the fact is that we already offer a robust online selection of courses.

Counseling Faculty

My recommendation is Option #2, the consortium approach.

None of these proposals are acceptable, especially the third which attempts to privatize our existing community college online delivery system. Let the OEI subcommittee continue their work and quit trying to push an agenda on us. We have been efficiently delivering online courses at the local CCC level for over 11 years, why should that stop? Our system is working, leave it alone!

Professor of Geology

Another example of government intrusion in what should be LOCAL CONTROL. We will not go down without a fight, trust me.

Given the importance of STEM in our current job markets, and being a Physical Science teacher, I see the value of online learning resources, but fail to see how an all-online program would adequately prepare students in the science and health fields.

Assistant Professor

I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (“ASCCC”) and the Community College Association (“CCA”). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty’s voice in the state of California.

Associate professor

I support Option 2, but more importantly, I question many of the suppositions in the FLOW report. The research presented aiming to show that the target students are likely to succeed in courses taken over the phone is extremely thin. It does not appear to actually test the target audience with the modality, specifically.

Furthermore, many areas of career/technical education are not suited for an all-online degree or certificate. Career/technical educators are severely under-represented in the working group.

Finally, I believe that FLOW may duplicate and supplant two other statewide programs - the Online Education Initiative and the Strong Workforce Program. I am concerned that FLOW would only create more silos.

Thanks you.

November 22, 2017

To: Governor Brown
Chancellor Oakley
Community College Board of Governors

Re: […] Response to Online College Proposal

[…] writes in opposition to all the options in the FLOW proposal.

First, most California community colleges already have their own online classes and furthermore the OEI project gives students access to all the CCC online classes statewide.

This is an alleged solution to a problem that does not exist.

Ironically, the students who are supposedly helped by this proposal are mainly the students who do not perform as well in online courses. How is creating an entire new online college actually going to help? The evidence simply does not support the idea that this initiative will help.

This all begs the question “Who actually benefits from this initiative”? The group of folks and interests that put this initiative together are not inclusive of the broad concerns of the students and constituencies of the California Community College system. The suggestion that the Western Governors University is the model to follow, especially without an inclusive discussion, leads us to suspect that private interests, not underserved students, are the primary beneficiaries of this plan.

We also have basic questions about the quality control for education. Who will teach these classes? Will it be all part-time instructors? Will there be professional development obligations? Will this simply be a testing mill with minimal teacher-student interaction? Will this be an “Uber Goes to College” model where professionals jobs are reduced to a permanent gig economy?

President

Please seriously consider the concerns expressed by the ASCCC and the CCA regarding a fully online college. While conceptually, this idea has merit, the logistics and impacts need to be more fully understood and agreed upon.

Associate Professor
After reviewing the proposed FLOW proposal, I am not in support of this project. It appears superfluous given the current online offerings by the majority of our CCCs. While I am for student access to college, I see this as less access than a college that offers an online environment. I do not like the idea of creating a pipeline into other online-only programs (such as ASU or University of Phoenix), which commonly grant worthless "pay for paper" degrees. Do we really want to pipeline into a large portion of for-profit online colleges, which are more prone to fraud and faculty/student abuse? Many online for-profit colleges stack students with huge debt. How does that help them become work-ready (unless you consider desperate work-ready)?

The "Myths" section of this proposal (pages 39-44) is full of more holes than Swiss cheese. I also noticed that only two out of nineteen (page 3) of the workgroup are faculty. Will this new college reflect a similar administrative block? There is absolutely no representation from the vast majority of disciplines. While online education can be effective, the truth of the matter is that it isn't as effective most of the time. I'm not talking about SLO data or GPAs given or degrees earned. That's all bullshit that makes administrators feel like they're doing a good job. A subject as complex as human learning cannot be quantified in numbers, but that is another topic. Ask students. Ask teachers. Ask lots of them (in online and offline programs).

If you really want to flesh out the details with a teacher, feel free to contact me at any time.

FT Faculty, Performing Arts - Music

The Distance Education and Educational Technology Advisory Committee (DEETAC) serves as an advisory body to the Chancellor of California Community Colleges. The group has as its charter to improve student success in and access to distance education programs and effective use of education technology in all methods of instruction provided by the California Community Colleges.

In this advisory capacity, DEETAC urges the Chancellor to formally appoint one member of the DEETAC committee in further development of any proposal for Project FLOW. The members of DEETAC are veteran distance education professionals from throughout our system and represent faculty, staff, and administrators with deep knowledge and experience in the field. DEETAC acknowledges the Governor has requested a proposal from the Chancellor by November, 2017. The members of DEETAC are poised to assist with the crafting of this proposal and believe their input is critical to the success of this important and innovative project.

To whom it may concern,

I want to express deep concern over the process by which the state has proceeded with the FLOW initiative. While I believe that online education can be a rich and valuable opportunity to serve students - many of whom would not be served as well in other formats - I also know that, like any educational endeavor, it must be engaged and developed thoughtfully and collaboratively in order adequately meet the needs of the students we all seek to serve.

I am dismayed by the rushed process that is resulting in poorly thought out options which have not had adequate time for consideration (let alone meaningful input) from the major constituent groups within the California Community College system.

I urge the governor and the CCC Chancellor to extend the time for this exploration so that all constituent groups can work collaboratively to weigh the implications of the 3-4 choices that will be offered up - and which will inevitably foreclose other possible options that might have been developed through a more robust and collaborative process.

Also, and finally, I must express strong opposition to the third option offered by the NCHEMS workgroup. It is, in my estimation, essential to the success of the endeavor that the online offerings of the California Community College system remain intimately connected to the broad range of local and regional considerations and subsequent offerings that developed by faculty and administrative collaboration across the state. A separate district - disconnected from the 114 existing community colleges in the state - would undermine the integrity of the system and capacity to serve the needs of a diverse set of students (even within "targeted" populations).

Sincerely,

Dr.

Professor of Philosophy

To ensure quality of education and fair employee compensation, I believe that any attempt to implement a fully online degree should utilize the regular online offerings by the various California Community Colleges and "outsourcing" to other outside faculty should be prohibited. I have no concern about utilizing courses from a variety of California Community Colleges toward a single degree earned. That's all bullshit that makes administrators feel like they're doing a good job. A subject as complex as human learning cannot be quantified in numbers, but that is another topic. Ask students. Ask teachers. Ask lots of them (in online and offline programs).

I am very disappointed that the feedback process has been so rushed as well as that it does also appear that the faculty serving of the committee value input was not followed. I would in particular like to know what input have you received from the CTE faculty and the Hispanic committee. This appears to be a limited description of a project that wasn't well thought out including implementation. How will faculty and counselors be engaged to assist this population? Will students who students who wish to continue their education be able to use these courses to transfer? Will any of these course articulate to other courses or programs at our home campus programs. There are so many unanswered questions I would recommend that you suspend this project for now until implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Distance Education Coordinator

I'm not impressed with any of the three options. I don't understand why: 1) the projects is not integrated as part of the CCC OEI, and 2) there is little or no attention to equity.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Distance Education Coordinator

A new online California community college is a terrible idea. There are already plenty of online community college course offerings that may be used by students anywhere in the state. This proposal would take students away from current programs and cause further enrollment problems. A far better and more cost effective idea would be to simply improve the currently available online programs and courses already offered from the state's community colleges.

I have been teaching on-line courses for 15 years. As community colleges already offer many courses (and some degrees) on-line I don't see the need for another, exclusively on-line college. My concerns: If it is a separate college, who will the employer be? What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members? The FLOW proposal needs to consider its impact and cost/benefit for existing students and colleges.

Professor of History

I have been teaching on-line courses for 15 years. As community colleges already offer many courses (and some degrees) on-line I don't see the need for another, exclusively on-line college. My concerns: If it is a separate college, who will the employer be? What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members? Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields? San Joaquin Delta College in Stockton offers a wide variety of online courses now. As an educational professional, I have serious concerns with the FLOW proposal. Among these are: If it is a separate college, who will the employer be? What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?

Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?

Faculty

Par Time Faculty

I am not in support of the initiative to create a wholly online college for several reasons, many of which have been articulated well by faculty groups such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges ("ASCCC") and the Community College Association ("CCA"). I ask that you consider seriously the positions of those bodies who represent the faculty's voice in the state of California.
I have been teaching for 34 years at both public and private colleges and universities. I simply do not believe that this proposed online college will accommodate the selected targeted population. This is a political marketing ploy. Why pull students from our existing colleges? We need to invest in our existing cc’s and if there are problems with enrollment/success it is primarily the fault of middle management and the corporatization of academia. Too many cooks in the kitchen who are unsure or afraid to turn off the oven even when the place is on fire.

Where will the faculty/instructional designers be located? Florida? The Philippines? Forget it! The minute the term "instructional designer" was introduced you are headed for trouble. (pg 30)

I would not trust a facilities manager or an automotive technology manager who got a credential from a class offered on a mobile phone. (pg 20, 24) This is not upward mobility. This is a sham.

After writing the above and thinking I might be too biased and set in my ways to provide feedback, I decided to ask my students who are just finishing up for the day. I read the document overview describing this proposal to a group of about 15 students who essentially laughed at the whole prospect and readily compared it to Phoenix or DeVry. They commented that online classes are not very effective overall, especially for any technical related coursework. Many said that online classes are not very effective overall, especially for any technical related coursework. Many said that this would target the unsuspecting students just like those from DeVry who think they will get a job with a 6-month credential. An "emotionless, robotic attempt at learning" is what one student said. Another commented "...another corporate takeover".

I, myself, would argue with any of the "myths, realities, and benefits" statements that were made. I am very sad for this country if this is the direction of education. Stop looking at data, which can be manipulated to suit any desired outcome. To think California's education system was once the envy of the world.

I think the online education should be left with each college, not a 115 college.

Dear CAWorkgroup,

Good morning. I am very interested in applying for a seat on your committee focused on working toward FLOW/Vision for Success.

I am currently a full-time professor at […]

I hope you will consider me for any future positions that may arise, as I could greatly add to the expertise of the group and represent our state in many ways.

[...]

To whom it may concern:

Creating a new and separate 115th virtual community college is a waste of time and resources.

My local community colleges offer ample online programs and services. Having a centralized and local facility allows students to reach out and to directly contact their instructors, if need be.

Online education may be helpful to some but it does not have the far-reaching benefits that would warrant such a comprehensive state program. Monies would be better spent training instructors on best practices and improving access for Students at their local and regional campuses.

I urge you to redirect resources to the 114 campuses that are doing their best to educate students in both real and virtual forums.

Most sincerely,

Dear CA work group,

I am writing to express my concerns about creating a fully online community college. Online classes have a poor track record of completion. There is a high dropout rate when students do not have time pressure or peer/teacher pressure to finish the work. Putting state money into an online college is a bad use of limited resources.

We would do far better to focus our energies on expanding the many existing community colleges we already have.

[...]

I am emailing to inquire if/how faculty, interested in the initiative, get appointed to the Working Group.

Additionally, I wonder if Workgroup meetings are open to the public?

I ask because I’m interested in participating!

Most sincerely,

I’m curious if/how I might be able to participate in the Workgroup, either as a formal member or as a guest.

Sociology Instructor
To Whom it May Concern:

I wish to reiterate the resolution passed by the state Academic Senate for California Community College:

Whereas, On May 11, 2017 Governor Brown requested that Chancellor Oakley design and deploy a plan to develop a 115th college to solely offer entirely online degrees, and Chancellor Oakley contracted with National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to constitute the Flex Learning Options for Workers (FLOW) workgroup to provide three to five options to Governor Brown;

Whereas, California already has 114 community colleges offering both online courses and, in many cases, fully online degree programs to students seeking immediate employment, transfer, or both, and the system has benefited from the resources made available by the Online Education Initiative, @ONE, and other efforts;

Whereas, Many of the resources necessary to serve the student populations and goals envisioned by the governor and by the FLOW workgroup already exist or could be developed within the existing structure of the community college system, thus more fully ensuring that the system’s safeguards regarding academic quality are respected and maintained; and

Whereas, Program development and curriculum are academic and professional matters, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and local academic senates should have opportunities for input and implementation, and additional system stakeholders, including the Chief Instructional Officers (CIOs), Chief Business Officers (CBOs), Chief Student Service Officers (CSSOs), Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Student Senate for California Community Colleges, have information and experience critical to the discussion of the best ways to accomplish the goals of the governor and the FLOW workgroup;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to relay to the governor and other interested parties that the goals of the governor and the FLOW workgroup can be better accomplished using existing resources and structures within the community college system rather than by creating a separate online college or other entity; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to develop a clear and effective plan for addressing the goals of the governor and the FLOW workgroup in a manner that utilizes existing system structures and ensures academic quality for all students.

As an educator that has taught online since 1999 and who is educated in online teaching, learning, and course design, I am opposed to moving forward with any of the options. The information presented is supported by limited and questionable research. In addition, the options do not address all community college student needs. Further, this process is moving far too quickly for stakeholders to realistically explore, ask questions, etc.

Business Professor

[...]

There are many CTE programs that cannot be taught online.

Department Chair

[...]

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Project FLOW as currently envisioned by the Chancellor’s Office Workgroup co-chaired by Von Ton-Quinlivan and Jose Fierro. In the FLOW proposal, Myth #5 states the reality that “Faculty involvement is critical for this innovation”. Ironically however, only one faculty person was involved in this project. And that faculty person is someone serving in an administrative role on the OEI project. The lack of faculty involvement is quite stunning on such a matter that directly affects faculty: namely, instruction. What has been proposed here appears to be an attempt to develop a state-funded MOOC (Massively Open Online Course) platform using Canvas. This effort seems to be primarily motivated by a desire to reduce the costs of education. But for whom? California Community College students already pay the lowest tuition in the nation. Furthermore, many qualify for Board of Governor (BOG) Fee Waivers and pay no tuition at all. Additionally, soon many students will qualify for Promise Programs that waive all tuition in the first year. Such an approach has already been tried and heavily studied. In 2012, San Jose State launched with great fanfare a partnership to let its students take credit classes online with Udacity, a popular MOOC-provider. The hope was that thousands of students could take courses at reduced prices. However, the results were quite dismal. Students failed at a rate of 56-76%, according to the San Jose Mercury News. Outside of San Jose State, completion rates at MOOC providers typically are below 10%. Duke University’s experiment with Coursera had similar results – only 3.5% of the 60,000 enrolled students actually completed their coursework. At a time when the Vision For Success challenges our system to improve
Thank you for the opportunity to comment, however, eight business days to solicit feedback that will be useful is a small window. It indicates that feedback will not actually used or needed; I hope that is not the case.

The following feedback is based on the press release alone; no additional information has been given to my institution.

It appears that at the request of Governor Brown the State Chancellor and a work group have come up with three options and two of them compete with existing programs within the CA community college systems. All three options will negatively impact enrollment for existing online programs in the CA community college systems. In effect, Option 3 has the potential to have a state-run charter school that competes for students with the community college system. This is not how I want my tax dollars spent.

Noted a quote from Jim Mayer of California Forward which makes it appear that this special interest group is moving this issue forward.

What will the criteria be to determine which option is taken, and will there be an option for “none of them”?

Option 1: This could be any of several existing online programs at CA community colleges, but since the president of Cerritos is a co-chair of the work group it seems likely the choice will be Cerritos. This option results in increased competition for students between community colleges. And by the way, doesn’t OEI operate similarly to this option??

Option 2: This option defines what the state Online Educational Initiative (OEI) is! Why divert more state funds to another entity that is essentially the same? This is not a fiscally responsible option.

Option 3: A direct competition for students from the state to all state community colleges, negatively impacting enrollment for all existing online programs.

Respectfully,

[...]

Hello,

I am curious to know why we are receiving this now, four days before the deadline. According to an email received 16 November:

"Public comment is welcomed from November 8 to 22, 2017."

I request an extension beyond 22 November to fully consider this. That is, if faculty input truly is desired. Four days in the middle of the busiest time in the semester is absurd.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]

Hello CAworkgroup,

Although the intentions behind FLOW may be honorable, the actualization of an online college will be a sham; it will promote all kinds of capitalist opportunism* with educational consulting and ed. tech firms reaping huge profits, and it will have little to do, if not zilch, with educational best practices, or with education. Courses will not be taught by experienced discipline experts with advanced higher degrees, but instead by low-paid novices. Research is mixed on OE and OE degrees and much of it negative.

*I have been a fulltime professor for over 3 decades and have seen this kind of thing happen over and over, and could cite specific examples, if asked to do so.

Thank you for your work in the interests of educational opportunity and social justice.

[...]

Greetings,

Without spending a huge amount of time to completely explain every aspect of my opposition to this idea, let me just summarize it as follows: While there may be a role for distance education in general education courses, for all courses involving the development of new skills online education is possibly the worst approach that one could imagine.

[...]

Professor, English

Professor, English

Professor of Physics
Colleagues,

I have a number of concerns (listed below) regarding the FLOW proposals, and direct you to the following:

1. At Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, four FLOW-related resolutions were passed. Please find them here:

   7.10 Using System Consultation and Faculty Input to Address Expansion of Online Education

   7.12 Endorse Consortium Approach to Expanding Online Educational Opportunities
   https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/endorse-consortium-approach-expanding-online-educational-opportunities

   9.02 Expand System-wide Online Educational Opportunities
   https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/expand-system-wide-online-educational-opportunities

   9.03 Online CTE Programs and Competency-Based Instruction

2. In addition, the ASCCC has positions on Western Governors University (WGU), and given that the models presented by NCHEMS and advocated for by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office incorporate many aspects of WGU's approach to instruction:

   13.04 (Spring 2011) Opposition to Western Governors University California
   https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-western-governors-university-california

   2.05 (Spring 1998) Western Governors University
   https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/western-governors-university

3. There are some serious issues to consider in light of audit findings of Western Governors University:


Good morning:

Office Technology Instructor

I am absolutely against a 100% online degree. Students cheat. Employers lose. The integrity of the degree is lost.

[...]

I support a fully online college.

As long as it's using best practices.

Instructor

Schools like Arizona State have shown that this can be done well. I'd rather have our students within our system rather than at a place like U. of Phoenix.

[...]

To help promote high quality learning and consistent faculty/student interaction:

Please emphasize the necessary time commitment involved when facilitating successful online learning experiences.

Attempt to make the class sizes smaller and/or the full teaching load smaller than a regular teaching load.

Professor of English

[...]
Dear Committee Members,

I have read the information on the website, studied the charts, and clicked through the PowerPoint about FLOW. I have some concerns about the design.

1. In the Q & A, the idea of “cannibalizing” other colleges’ online offerings was summarily dismissed. Will you be restricting enrollment to your target students only? If not, then yes, that is a very real concern. Also, please note that your plan is not 100% online—the lab courses will still occur face to face.

2. It is breezily stated that Arizona State Online has a very high success rate for online classes. Note that for a BA, ASU Online does have entrance requirements: English 4 years, Math 4 years, Lab. Sci. 3 years, Soc. Science 2 years, For. Lang. 2 years, and Fine Arts 1 year. This could be why their success rates are high. Our success rates are not as high at the community college and this is after tutorials both online and in person, and much guidance. Of course, success rates for masters degree courses are high. They always have been. Are you lumping apples with oranges in that statement?

3. Also, in the Q & A, it is states that students are already taking courses from private online colleges. Are those credentials accredited? Transferable? Please note that there was a housecleaning just a few years ago of predatory lending to college students at colleges for profit. Have you disaggregated your data from those colleges? What is the data anyway?

4. When the topic of rigor was discussed, the statement was that “reality” backs up that competency is a rigorous as other modes of teaching and learning. Again, how was that determined? Are you taking advantage of the fact that rigor is hard to define?

It is likely that there are more factual presentations on the website that I missed. If these were answered there, I would appreciate your help in finding them.

Thank you for considering my comments.

[...]
I will start with a disclaimer: I have never taught an online class.

I AM TOTALLY AGAINST A TOTALLY ONLINE COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY.

I will speak first to my major. Administration of Justice/ law enforcement / criminal justice, by what ever title the major goes by, it is a people interaction” major. Successful students need to learn how to interact with people in a very wide variety of situations, both low-key and high-risk. Not all students come to college with the required skills of communication and social interaction. As an instructor, you can not observe and evaluate a student via a computer screen. I feel that a very critical part of an instructor's duty and responsibility is to evaluate students and assist them in “advancement” for "correction" in how to deal with other people. I have had heart to heart discussions with students individually and with entire classes on this very subject.

The true and effective presentation/discussion on some topics is only possible face to face. And this is not only for students but for instructors also; I learn a lot from my students about current ‘generational’ values, mores, morals, and opinions. I am able to show reaction and suggestions effectively with face to face that would be missing with a computer screen. Students also learn from other students in face to face settings from peer reactions, experiences, and opinions.

I have researched results from on-line courses and the learning capability and retention/success rate is not promising. There are some courses taken by higher motivated and goal driven students that have very positive results. But, for the average student, on-line courses are difficult for them to maintain their ‘attendance’ due to a variety of personal, work, or family issues. Knowing you have to face your instructor who will be marking down whether you are there or not is a strong motivator to attend on a regular basis. Our college recruits and supports students from our community that have not had a solid high school experience that prepared them for the rigors and requirements of college and I fear this type of student would not be successful. I had a discussion this week with a student who was under extreme stress due to a lack of confidence in herself and her abilities; one fear was that she was a failure and would fail college. How could I effectively address this issue and support her with encouragement and support services via a computer?

A totally on-line college/university might be acceptable for a small minority of students but will cheat and doom to failure a much greater number. FAILURE, DOOM, AND CHEATING STUDENTS ARE NOT CORE VALUES OF OUR COLLEGE.

Dear CA Workgroup:

I have serious concerns about the FLOW proposal, specifically about the resources required. Startup, development, and maintenance of a completely new statewide initiative, especially if it is developed as a completely new online college managed by CCCC, will take SIGNIFICANT resources.

Rather than be set up as a separate initiative/project, the objectives of FLOW should be incorporated into already developing statewide CCC efforts, such as the $60 million Online Education Initiative http://cccclined.org/ as well as the $900 million dollars already dedicated to statewide ramping up of CTE programs.

My major issue with FLOW is that it looks to be yet another large statewide initiative that siphons off more of our limited CCC and statewide resources and further dilutes the ability of all of the system's colleges to make our online offerings more robust, effective, and responsive to students' needs and boost the student success of not just the students that FLOW intends to reach, but all of our student populations. I look at what happened with CAI -- $10 million spent towards that effort that is now for naught. How much of an impact on student success could have been gained if that $10 million had been allocated to the colleges to scale up and strengthen existing infrastructure of programs and interventions with proven track records for increasing student success, especially for underrepresented students?

Generally, local colleges are not only more nimble, and better positioned/networked to tap into connecting with industry workforce agencies that are most likely to hire their students, but are also able to better tailor their services to serve the needs of local students than an office that purports to serve every student statewide. We just need the support of resources and encouragement from our state Chancellor's office to let our people do the work to the best of their ability and capacity. We've only just begun to get directed resources in this direction with OEI and CTE support from the Chancellor's office.

Please don't embark upon yet another largescale unfunded statewide initiative such as FLOW that would jeopardize or dilute either the potential success of other statewide programs already in motion, such as OEI, or the efforts that local colleges are already working hard on scaling up.

Sincerely,

From: [...]
I am a full-time faculty member at […] and former member of the Academic Senate. We have offered online classes in various departments across the college for nearly 30 years. We have done an excellent job with these programs. I have many concerns about the concept and the timing of the FLOW program. I see no need to re-invent the wheel.

A main and vital feature of community college life is in-person interactivity with other students, faculty and staff. Academic coursework is but one part of the overall experience.

Socialization is of primary importance. Learning to work with other people who look, think and act differently is something that cannot be learned online. Students learn from their peers and well as their professors. The creativity and collaborative skills necessary for success in 21st Century California cannot be developed in online instruction.

Another important point is that 1 in 10 working Californians have a job related to the Arts. In San Francisco, that number is closer to 1 in 7. For some reason, this information always seems to be discounted in the rush to privatize, downsize and put online the community college experience. And, by and large, it does not reflect the wishes of the communities served by community colleges, particularly in San Francisco.

Thank you for your attention.

While I am in favor of increasing the opportunities for students to learn, I am opposed to any options that circumvent the shared governance process. Please allow the current community colleges to work together to come up with the best option that meets the needs of the students. Thanks, […]

Dear Julie and Chancellor’s group,

Ironically, when I started my first year teaching at Orange Coast College in 1971, I found the district chancellor’s love affair with distance education to be so revolting that I helped lead a revolt against him and the board of trustees for pouring massive district resources into the ineffective use of distance learning (TV education back then) and now, at the end of my career, I have watched the rise of on-line distance education.

In the early 1970’s, because the OCC curriculum committee would not always approve poorly produced TV classes, Chancellor Norm Watson created Coastline College, a way around OCC. Turmoil ensued starting with 40 of us at OCC writing to the UC system concerning a TV composition class at Coastline; UC then denied its transferability; so the district punished us with 40 letters of reprimand and the firing tenure tract faculty. (No whistleblowers though.) The faculty then put a large amount of energy into recalling the whole board of trustees and dumped Watson.

Nevertheless, Watson’s legacy continues as on-line education has grown and Coastline CC now offers 100% on-line transferable composition classes. Judging whether essays are written by the enrolled students and not edited or written by someone else is still a concern. OCC hybrid classes have some advantages: instead of only oral discussion, students respond to each other in writing on-line and the instructor still meets with the class half the time for live interaction and in-class writing assignments.

Perhaps on-line lectures could replace large-lecture halls, but on-line lectures are not inexpensive, needing constant updating lest they become stale, even laughable. On-line lectures though could free up time for professors to meet with more small groups of students to discuss and ask questions about those online lectures and other material. Small group interactions is where real learning takes place: students learn to comport themselves, to question each other and the professor, and to develop oral and written critical thinking skills that can be evaluated by professors who know the student. My fear is that instead of developing a quality education, and despite the old propaganda line “that we can reach more people” with 100% distance education, saving money is the state’s chief goal and that will be the ruin of a meaningful college education. Maybe no education is better than a pretend education.

Best,

An online degree program is nice in concept but may be poor or misguided in execution. Biggest problem is establishing integrity of the evaluation system. Lots of room for inappropriate behavior here, both on student and facility part. Hard to imagine how you are going to get sciences to fit into a completely online program. There is a lot to be gained from face-to-face interaction that cannot be given in a completely online format.

Good afternoon, my name is […] and I am the […] After reviewing your proposal I had a few questions about the structure of the new initiative and timeline and will like to discuss this further. Please advise what may work best to discuss this partnership.

Sincerely […]
Hello,

I am an instructor at [...] and an officer on the Academic Senate. We just had a meeting about FLOW and some of our faculty have raised concerns about the work of FLOW and in particular, the option about creating a 115th college.

Why can’t we just building on what we are doing statewide (e.g. the OEI) which is the second option, or consortium model. Of the three, if I had to choose just one option, it would be the second one.

Does the data show that the potential students exist or that this is a need or even would serve the needs of our students in California? The research from the powerpoint on the website is not very convincing.

This appears to be a move that could jeopardize quality of instruction and education in exchange for moving students to enroll as many students as possible without regard for quality. It’s clear some areas/disciplines should not be offered online, in fact it could be dangerous to move too far forward into online in certain disciplines.

The basis for this initiative is what concerns me most, and I am joining a growing chorus of community college instructors across the state in questioning what appears to be a move to a for-profit like model at the detriment of quality education for our students. I we’re talking about workforce training we are more nimble and agile to meet those needs locally at our campuses vs. statewide.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.

--

CIS Department Chair

Each of the present 114 Community Colleges recognizes there are students that have schedules that are extremely challenging for traditional on campus course work. Each Community College is working to solve the issue keeping in mind the support that students need to succeed.

FLOW completely ignores not only what is going on in individual community colleges but has completely ignored that this is the very mission that OEI was created to solve.

Option 2 is okay, but options 1 or 3 are absurd.

I suggest that the FLOW workgroup follow the resolutions from the ASCCC as stated below:

"That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to relay to the governor and other interested parties that the goals of the governor and the FLOW workgroup can be better accomplished using existing resources and structures within the community college system rather than by creating a separate online college or other entity"

"That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, given the timeline provided by the governor, endorse the establishment of a cooperative or consortium of colleges or districts to develop a new online opportunity that would meet the stated goals of the governor and the presumed needs of the target population identified by the chancellor; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the chancellor to request of the governor an extended deadline in order that a plan for meeting the governor’s goals be developed with greater consultation, deliberation, and effectiveness."

Counselor/Instructor

"That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and system partners to explore the feasibility of developing non-traditional online programs, including but not limited to programs with a focus on awarding credit for prior learning, experience, and competencies, programs with more flexible scheduling options, and programs with innovative student service supports that are accessible 24-7; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for the use of existing system resources, including the Online Education Initiative and C-ID, in development of identified non-traditional online programs."

Best,

[...]

Greetings,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Best wishes,

[...]

To whom it may concern,

As a faculty member of a California community college, I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Sincerely,
Dear FLOW Working Group,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Best,

[...]

My argument for Option 3, CCC #115. Thank you for considering my view.

Option 3, CCC #115, is the option of the forward thinkers. An option that can result in real change for the workers of California. The other options exist alongside faculty that either don’t want, don’t understand, or who will willfully thwart this initiative. Existing campuses have had every opportunity to prioritize workforce development. Consider this statement from the Legislative Analyst’s Office: “Ongoing Proposition 98 funding to help community colleges identify regional workforce education and training needs.”

http://www.lao.ca.gov/Education/WorkforceEd/Programs "Ongoing" and "help identify" are key terms that indicate campuses are making scant progress while collecting dollars resulting in few tangible outcomes that are never a priority.

Maintaining a specialized central online space for FLOW students provides a focused environment where their needs are primary. Faculty, staff, and support hired for this campus would be fully aligned with the mission. Everything about Option 3 prioritizes the students.

My only recommendation with Option 3 is that CCC 115 build upon an academic foundation. Skills-based programs would necessarily have an academic aspect including at the very least, math, and English or communication studies.

As for the myths v. realities, Myth 1; the OEI and the Course Exchange will likely have a far greater impact on local DE programs than Option 3.

Myth 4; the CCC has always had a focus on employability and credentialing, they just haven’t done a good job with it.

Jumping to Myth 6; I have been a fully-online CCC composition professor since Fall 2001. I have yet to come across a student who is incapable of learning online. Non-traditional students, fully-employed students, students in ill health, and students with young children at home who are looking to embark on careers as their children grow are all highly motivated to learn online even when online learning is not their preferred method of content delivery.

Further, many online students take advantage of distance learning because they may not have cars and cannot rely on public transportation due to distance or time factors.

I have successfully taught all of these students.

Art Department

Sincerely,

[...]

Faculty member

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Faculty member

[...]

This proposal was rushed through without proper vetting.

Faculty member

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Instructor

"I support Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. I would be happy to help with any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval."

Have a good one,

[...]

Instructor

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval."

[...]

How are you? Hope all is well.

Instructor
The option 3 of the FLOW proposal is a disaster waiting to happen. We already have 114 colleges in the state that have been working furiously over the past several years to build quality online class offerings. While there are in fact many prospective students who currently remain unserved, there is zero evidence that establishing a brand new college with exclusive online offerings, is the solution.

In developing the best solutions to the challenges of online education for under-served students, the Chancellor’s office should rely on the state academic senate and the faculty throughout the state who have the most experience in serving our students.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Instructor

[...] says it best below, though maybe the current generation can make it work. I can see augmenting classwork with an online component, but 100% online strips away the best parts of the learning process. How does a computer demonstrate the sound of a well-constructed paragraph, the texture of “leather-hard” clay, the correct heat of a welding torch, the feel of a healthy pulse? A math wiz might thrive in an online class, but what happens to the mathematically challenged? Work that is difficult in a classroom with a caring instructor could become impossible on a screen. Even in computer science, online instructions are useless in the face of unanticipated variations. Try learning Canvas strictly online: it can take many frustrating hours sifting through manuals and blogs to find solutions to simple problems, when in only seconds an instructor could save the day with a few quick keystrokes.

More questions: How do online classes address different learning styles and varieties of intelligence? How do they meet the needs of kinesthetic or interpersonal learners? Students with processing difficulties? Lousy readers? Learning largely depends on the subtle, real-time modifications and adjustments made by teachers in the classroom, coupled with regular interaction with fellow students. It relies on the encouraging glance as much as on the dry sequencing of tasks. Struggling and gifted students often inspire each other and stimulate higher achievement. Friendships develop. Networks are formed. Insecurities and awkwardness diminish in response to the kind encouragement of others. These social skills carry over to the workplace and increase the likelihood of success on the job.

As for plagiarism, how can instructors truly (truly!) know who does the work? Even in the absence of overt plagiarism, parents and friends often “help” struggling students. We’ve all read grammatically polished essays by bright, original thinkers who can barely speak the language. Or consider the reverse: students with rudimentary ideas whose essays swell with graduate-level complexity. Instructors might suspect something’s up, but in the absence of regular face-to-face contact, how can anyone be sure, much less build an airtight case? If essays can be bought online, so can stand-ins.

Online learning might make sense for adults in remote locations or with difficult schedules, but I don’t yet see how a degree based exclusively on online classes could be considered equivalent to hybrid or traditional training, particularly in disciplines involving critical thinking skills, vocational training, performance, and personal interaction: nursing, radiology, culinary arts, hospitality, welding, communications, kinesiology, physical therapy, instrument repair, construction, art, dance, filmmaking, music, journalism, etc. The option 3 of the FLOW proposal is a disaster waiting to happen. We already have 114 colleges in the state that have been working furiously over the past several years to build quality online class offerings. While there are in fact many prospective students who currently remain unserved, there is zero evidence that establishing a brand new college with exclusive online offerings, is the solution.

In developing the best solutions to the challenges of online education for under-served students, the Chancellor’s office should rely on the state academic senate and the faculty throughout the state who have the most experience in serving our students.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Instructor

[...]
To Whom It May Concern:

I have SERIOUS reservations about the FLOW proposal. Specifically, I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Thank you,

Math Instructor

To Whom It May Concern:

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

Health Education and Wellness Instructor

To Whom It May Concern,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

To Whom It May Concern,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

The rush with an unusually short public comment period smacks of a sneaky way to bring about FLOW implementation without statewide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. This option will siphon significant statewide allocations away from our district. There is a need for systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Regards,

Economics

I believe we already are providing numerous online courses and would like to keep enrollment for face to face instruction secured as there is great value in group work and personal discussions - in person - versus computerized learning.

With Kind Regards,

To Whom It May Concern:

As with all successful initiatives, it is critical that those implementing the initiatives are an integral part of the creation process. FLOW implementation MUST involve system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. Without faculty and colleges involvement, this initiative is destined to fail.

Math Instructor

To Whom It May Concern:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Professor

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my wholehearted disagreement with the options being discussed in the Flex Learning Options for Workers (FLOW) workgroup, namely, the proposal to create a 115th college completely online, and the suggestion that creating separate CTE for Spanish speakers is somehow an equitable plan. I strongly urge you to reject these ideas, as they would cause great damage to the systems already in place at 114 colleges throughout the state.

1. The proposal for a fully online college is a hastily-worded idea that is destined to decimate existing online resources at 114 colleges. Colleges are already reeling from the repeal of the Common Assessment Initiative – had there been more deliberation in that project, it would have been discovered that the creation of a common assessment would not be fiscally or logistically feasible. Yet, hasty mandates propelled faculty into a three year waste of time, effort, and money, only to be scrapped in the end. Have we not learned our lessons from hasty action regarding education?

And what of online instruction being seen as a panacea for transfer and graduation rates? The workers that FLOW is targeting are not the demographic who have been shown to thrive in an online setting. Online education is most successful with degree holders and professionals, not the “stranded worker” that FLOW intends to serve. California’s 114 community colleges are already serving those workers, and we need to retain the resources that are dedicated to that service.

2. “Separate but equal” is a chilling moment in our nation’s history, and therefore it is shocking to hear a suggestion that creating a CTE program for Spanish speakers would do anything to solve the inequities that nonnative English speakers face. As an ESL faculty member, I can assure you that, while education in Spanish may educate the workforce, those workers will be forever doomed to menial jobs due to their inability to conduct their jobs in English. The second-class system will prevail and will be deepened; we have seen this in Early Childhood Education and carpentry, where the workers are educated but are ineligible for anything that actually pays minimum wage. Let’s not repeat the mistakes of the past by suggesting that CTE in Spanish will solve this problem.

Finally, I strongly urge you to consult with the Academic Senate and hear their voices. It appears that this project is being pushed through with minimal consultation and aimed at meeting predetermined outcomes. This is an egregious assault on our community college system and on our students. Please reject these ideas and engage in collegial consultation to create better options through online and traditional offerings.

Sincerely,

Mathematics Department

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Chair and Instructor in Economics

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

To whom it may concern,

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval."

Sincerely,

[...]

I reject entirely the whole FLOW concept. This Idea is not sound as far as I’m concerned.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Math Instructor

--

[...]

To whom it may concern,

As an online educator, I strongly reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. We have these options in place currently and watering down our educational standards is not a valid option for reaching additional students. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges consultation and approval.

Thank you considering rejecting this option as this important educational decision.

Best to you,

[...]

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Sincerely,

[...]
To Whom It May Concern:

ESL Instructor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

Instructor of Meteorology

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. As a faculty member at a California Community College, I feel that there are tremendous resources already in place at the existing community colleges to meet the need that FLOW is trying to meet; rather than creating a completely new college, I urge you to consider utilizing the guidance and resources of your already existing and well trained faculty.

Sincerely,

ESL & Linguistics Faculty

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Thank you,

[...]

Professor, CIS

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

Physical Education

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

To whom it may concern:

Accounting Instructor

I strongly reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Furthermore, I believe we already have the OEI (Online Educational Initiative) which is funded already and should be used to further student online studies. We DO NOT need another bureaucratic agency set up to do the very same thing.

FLUSH the FLOW!!!

[...]

Past Academic Senate Officer

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

CIS Professor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

Math Instructor

As an instructor at [...] and member of the school board of our [...] school district, I urge you to take the time to engage colleges and faculty before proceeding with an online college. I have seen some specific cases where online education works for individual course, but in all cases we have seen the critical importance that the interaction with faculty and other students plays in a student's education. The virtually universal failure of for-profit online institutes provides ample evidence of this. Working with faculty and colleges can only help ensure that steps to incorporate online courses into educational options supports the education of our students instead of giving them a false promise.

Sincerely,

[...]
To whom it may concern:

In regards to the FLOW proposals, I believe the best course of action is to delay and/or extend the commentary period for faculty. First, without the extended input of faculty in the ideation stage, NCHEMS risks undermining their efforts to create quality proposals that can be embraced by faculty and provide quality learning opportunities for Californians. Second, by giving faculty such a significantly limited time to comment, it limits potential good-faith discussions with faculty moving forward.

The following is a series of questions and comments derived with looking at the Project FLOW presentation. The extent of the questions and comments should serve as evidence that these proposals require much more input by faculty before moving forward as many of them were derived during a short period of time. This fact indicates that much more could be revealed during an extended commentary period. It also implies much more rigorous research must be done before attempting to implement any of the proposals.

-Why is access to the internet via mobile devices being counted as evidence? Are mobile phones to be seen as sufficiently capable of providing a quality online education?

-The use of ASUOnline as an example suggests that any proposal should be integrated with already existing colleges. This is particularly relevant to proposal #3, which would create a completely separate college, disconnected from any local or regional workforce.

-Comparative success rates between online and in-person instruction is irrelevant unless it can be first demonstrated that both are provided with the same rigor.

-CTE at BCC is already working on developing relationships with local and regional businesses. How do these proposals help this existing process?

-How does a subscription model help students? First, does this not undermine the goal of Guided Pathways by giving student unlimited options rather than helping them toward the best courses given their goals? Second, does this help reduce the impetus and costs to students, who would not be required not only to take initiative to get a subscription, but also force them to pay for classes they may not want or need to take? Third, how does this fit with existing modes of financial aid for students?

-Where will the workforce for human-contact student support stem from, and what does this mean on a practice level? If human-resource options are not provided with the same rigor.

Without going into the many problems associated with the creation of the FLOW proposal, which was rushed through a work group process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) involving little substantive engagement with faculty, program experts, and colleges, and without engaging all the faulty assumptions built into the research and analysis, I'd like to register the following views:

FLOW Option #3 is totally unacceptable. The creation of a new completely online community college would undermine the capacity of the community college system to carry out its mission by reducing enrollment and siphoning off resources from the system as a whole.

FLOW Option #1 would have similar impacts, and is counter-productive to work already ongoing.

FLOW Option #2, the consortium model, is the only viable option. That said, it should only be pursued if: (1) it is intentionally folded into the ongoing OEI project; and (2) there is REAL, SUBSTANTIVE collaboration and engagement with faculty and colleges in its further development and implementation.

In my view, not one additional dollar should be spent on this FLOW process if Option #1 or #3 are pursued.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback/public comment on the FLOW proposal.

Sincerely,

[...]

Dear CA Work Group,

Without going into the many problems associated with the creation of the FLOW proposal, which was rushed through a work group process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) involving little substantive engagement with faculty, program experts, and colleges, and without engaging all the faulty assumptions built into the research and analysis, I'd like to register the following views:

FLOW Option #3 is totally unacceptable. The creation of a new completely online community college would undermine the capacity of the community college system to carry out its mission by reducing enrollment and siphoning off resources from the system as a whole.

FLOW Option #1 would have similar impacts, and is counter-productive to work already ongoing.

FLOW Option #2, the consortium model, is the only viable option. That said, it should only be pursued if: (1) it is intentionally folded into the ongoing OEI project; and (2) there is REAL, SUBSTANTIVE collaboration and engagement with faculty and colleges in its further development and implementation.

In my view, not one additional dollar should be spent on this FLOW process if Option #1 or #3 are pursued.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback/public comment on the FLOW proposal.

Sincerely,

[...]

In regards to the FLOW proposals, I believe the best course of action is to delay and/or extend the commentary period for faculty. First, without the extended input of faculty in the ideation stage, NCHEMS risks undermining their efforts to create quality proposals that can be embraced by faculty and provide quality learning opportunities for Californians. Second, by giving faculty such a significantly limited time to comment, it limits potential good-faith discussions with faculty moving forward.

The following is a series of questions and comments derived with looking at the Project FLOW presentation. The extent of the questions and comments should serve as evidence that these proposals require much more input by faculty before moving forward as many of them were derived during a short period of time. This fact indicates that much more could be revealed during an extended commentary period. It also implies much more rigorous research must be done before attempting to implement any of the proposals.

-Why is access to the internet via mobile devices being counted as evidence? Are mobile phones to be seen as sufficiently capable of providing a quality online education?

-The use of ASUOnline as an example suggests that any proposal should be integrated with already existing colleges. This is particularly relevant to proposal #3, which would create a completely separate college, disconnected from any local or regional workforce.

-Comparative success rates between online and in-person instruction is irrelevant unless it can be first demonstrated that both are provided with the same rigor.

-CTE at BCC is already working on developing relationships with local and regional businesses. How do these proposals help this existing process?

-How does a subscription model help students? First, does this not undermine the goal of Guided Pathways by giving student unlimited options rather than helping them toward the best courses given their goals? Second, does this help reduce the impetus and costs to students, who would not be required not only to take initiative to get a subscription, but also force them to pay for classes they may not want or need to take? Third, how does this fit with existing modes of financial aid for students?

-Where will the workforce for human-contact student support stem from, and what does this mean on a practice level? If human-resource options are not provided with the same rigor.

Without going into the many problems associated with the creation of the FLOW proposal, which was rushed through a work group process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) involving little substantive engagement with faculty, program experts, and colleges, and without engaging all the faulty assumptions built into the research and analysis, I'd like to register the following views:

FLOW Option #3 is totally unacceptable. The creation of a new completely online community college would undermine the capacity of the community college system to carry out its mission by reducing enrollment and siphoning off resources from the system as a whole.

FLOW Option #1 would have similar impacts, and is counter-productive to work already ongoing.

FLOW Option #2, the consortium model, is the only viable option. That said, it should only be pursued if: (1) it is intentionally folded into the ongoing OEI project; and (2) there is REAL, SUBSTANTIVE collaboration and engagement with faculty and colleges in its further development and implementation.

In my view, not one additional dollar should be spent on this FLOW process if Option #1 or #3 are pursued.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback/public comment on the FLOW proposal.

Sincerely,

[...]
To CA workgroup members,

I am writing to express my objection to Option #3 in the FLOW proposal, which would create a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

I am appalled that faculty and colleges are being sidestepped by this proposal.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Sorry - but this is an attempt to dumb down a college degree so that everyone can get one.

Most - if not all the completely online degree programs are not competent programs imparting a measurable degree of knowledge.

They are diploma mills that hand out a piece of paper for 'real world experience' rather than learning. Look at all the 'for profit' colleges that have closed rather than step up to the required level of education for student loan qualification.

I strongly reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval. Furthermore, I believe we already have the OEI (Online Educational Initiative) which is funded already and should be used to further student online studies. We DO NOT need another bureaucratic agency set up to do the very same thing.

I don't understand why you would want to add and complicate what is in place

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Furthermore, I believe we already have the OEI (Online Educational Initiative) which is funded already and should be used to further student online studies. We DO NOT need another bureaucratic agency set up to do the very same thing.

I don't understand why you would want to add and complicate what is in place

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

If there are employers itching to have us provide online training for their current employees, we have a way to make this happen - and on their schedule and with their direction - we all it contract education. We can make things happen without all of our pesky rules that ensure we spend the state's money wisely - you just have to pay for it.

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

Hello,

I am a Disability Counselor, at [...], and I find the FLOW proposal quite alarming. I have been working for 43 years in the field, including many years at the Department of Rehabilitation.

It is extremely important to provide equal services, with equal access at all of the Community Colleges, not just one virtual entity up in the clouds. The only option that I could support, would be option #2. I understand that there is an option #4 being developed. However, I cannot support any option that takes the local Community Colleges out of the loop.

Sincerely,

Hello,

I am a Disability Counselor, at [...], and I find the FLOW proposal quite alarming. I have been working for 43 years in the field, including many years at the Department of Rehabilitation.

It is extremely important to provide equal services, with equal access at all of the Community Colleges, not just one virtual entity up in the clouds. The only option that I could support, would be option #2. I understand that there is an option #4 being developed. However, I cannot support any option that takes the local Community Colleges out of the loop.

Sincerely,

As currently proposed, I don't have any strong objections to the FLOW project although I do have a concern. The FLOW program does not appear to impinge on current programs operated by community colleges in California. However, I am not entirely sure of that detail. As a result, I do have some concern that this program could affect those districts, such as [...], that have traditionally served a large noncredit population. It appears that there may be some slight overlap in the target population between FLOW and these noncredit programs, but it is not entirely clear from the proposal. This issue should be explored further to make sure that there is no overlap that would be created.

The first rule of any new program should be that it does no harm to existing programs. As long as the FLOW program does not negatively impact existing college programs and there is sufficient new funding (i.e., not from existing funds presently being allocated to community colleges), then the […] would be supportive of the program.

Chancellor
To Whom It May Concern:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Thanks,

[...]
To Whom It May Concern

On behalf of the [...] Academic Senate, I submit this letter of opposition to the FLOW project. Our grave concerns are centered in three main areas:

1. **DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS AND FUNDING:** With the amount of funding already spent on the Online Education Initiative, this online college looks to be a duplicate and therefore, seemingly to taxpayers, a waste of money. If the desire to create online CTE curriculum is present, use the existing exchange from the Online Education Initiative to house vet and house these CTE courses.

   In addition to having a system to vet and offer courses, the OEI already has established necessary student services such as library services, tutoring and test proctoring. Why re-invent the wheel, especially since the average taxpayer will consider this another expensive state boondoggle.

2. **ACCREDITATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY:** Are you aware of the steps required by our accrediting body, the Accreditation Association of Junior and Community Colleges to establish a new college? Ask Clovis College. They just spent approximately 2 years going through this process to be able to open their doors, accepts students, offer curriculum and award degrees and certificates. How is it that this “115th college” will short change a system that every single California Community College has abided by? At best, bypassing accreditation standards in establishing a “115th college” gives the impression of shady dealings.

3. **OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE:** Who is to oversee the dealings of this 115th college? All California Community Colleges are required by Title 5 regulation to have a Board of Trustees which oversees established practices. Who is to complete program review which is also required by Title 5 regulation?

   This concept of a 115th online college flies in the face of logic, transparency and all that is admired worldwide of the California Community College. It is wasteful and duplicates efforts. It take the community out of Community College which has been our strong point. The [...] Academic Senate strongly urges the deactivation of the concept of a 115th online college.

Sincerely,

**Instructor**

There are over 100 community colleges in California, and each has developed online and hybrid options. This took energy, work, and created exciting opportunities for students. Why would we create a competing institution that ignores this work?

We, members of the OEI committee and faculty at California community colleges, have spent a minimum of five years developing coursework and a system to link all of the online educational experiences in California. The goal of this work, these discussions and the structure being built is to make education more accessible and students more successful. There is no need for a separate community college to do online coursework.

Please let me know if you want data or to have a conversation.

Sincerely,

**Associate Professor, Noncredit ESL**

Please do not rush into creating an additional district. Online education is not as respected by employers and other schools of higher education. Instead we should be looking into strengthening our districts’ hybrid and online programs that already exist.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval. This is undermining the Community College Mission and should NOT be undertaken without a full systemwide discussion and review.

( [...] (Instructor for 44 years)

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

**Part Time Faculty**

Cheers,

**English Instructor**

I'm writing to reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

If you would like to follow-up with me further on my position, please reply.

( [...] (Instructor for 44 years)

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Colleagues,

( [...] (Instructor for 44 years)

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.
Associate Faculty, English

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval. Online courses, certificates, and degrees are already available throughout the CCC system.

What about the status of the faculty teaching in this online institution?
- If it is a separate college, who will the employer be?
- What collective bargaining agent will represent these faculty members?
- Will the faculty be living in California and will they meet the Minimum Qualifications for teaching in their fields?
- Or will they be living in Texas or maybe even in India?
- Will they be full time or will they, like most faculty at for-profit institutions, be all part time/adjunct faculty?

Employers that want online training for their workers on a non-academic schedule and for specific skills can already offer classes through contract education by contacting their local CCC.

While the technology may seem like a wonderful thing, remember that students in online classes are already much less likely to stay in class and be successful. Add a population that isn’t ready for college, and you’re just asking for failure.

[...]

Faculty Director, Math Learning Center and Mathematics Instructor

Thank you,

[...]

Department of Art

[...]

Hello,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

My concern is that, while online courses can be a great part of an education that also includes in-person classes, steering students towards online-only degrees and certifications will not be as beneficial to them and will exacerbate achievement gaps:
http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/what-we-know-about-online-course-outcomes.pdf

Unfortunately, I was unable to compare these studies to the results stated on the FLOW Overview Presentation because the presentation failed to properly cite its sources.

Sincerely,

[...]

EOPS Faculty Director

[...]

Please reject the third option (#3) which proposes an online community college for California without having provided adequate opportunity and time for faculty and colleagues throughout the existing 114 colleges to consult and influence this proposal. After sufficient consideration and consultation, the CCCs may approve; however, at this pace and using the process that has been employed, there hasn’t been the time to evaluate the implications of an online CCC in order to support its creation.

Associate Professor of English

Among many questionable plans is the idea to split CTE offerings into Spanish-speaking and “The Rest” - it is unsound.

Thank you.

[...]

Chair, Design Department

Thanks,

[...]

Professor, Mathematics

[...]
To Whom It May Concern,

As an instructor of primarily online coursework, I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Although my classes meet online, I often physically meet with my students to provide assistance. I understand the needs of the students in my particular community, and this understanding increases my efficacy as a teacher.

Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Sincerely,
[...]

History Department

Reading Department Instructor

To Whom It May Concern:

This email is in regard to the implementation of FLOW, namely the proposal to create a new online community college. As with all processes, transparency is paramount and should include consultation with faculty and colleges systemwide. Please consider an alternative approach that involves an opportunity for the system and its constituents to have a voice.

Best,
[...]

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to comment upon the various FLOW initiative options. I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Thank you,
[...]

Professor of Art History

To whom it may concern,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

The creation of a new completely online community college has the potential to disastrously undermine enrollment in our district's course offerings, as well as siphon significant statewide allocations away from our district.

A completely online community college is not pedagogically sound and does NOT come close to fulfilling the mission statements of California Community Colleges.

Cordially,
[...]

Associate Professor of Nursing
Academic Senate Representative

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

The creation of a new completely online community college has the potential to disastrously undermine enrollment in our district's course offerings, as well as siphon significant statewide allocations away from our district.

A completely online community college is not pedagogically sound and does NOT come close to fulfilling the mission statements of California Community Colleges.

Cordially,
[...]

English Instructor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

Professor of Spanish

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Part Time Faculty

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Business Instructor

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

[...]

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

[...]

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval."

[...]
Professor of History

I strongly reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Wellness Coordinator/Associate Faculty

Please make note of my concern below:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Thank you.

Biology Instructor

CA Workgroup:

Option #3 is a bad idea. Students who would consider this option are probably the least prepared for college and in need of guidance and one-on-one experiences.

Creating this online college and targeting Spanish-speaking students creates a separation among the CCC students at large.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

REJECT Option #3 New Online College; FLOW implementation MUST involve systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

To Whom It May Concern,

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval. Ramming through such a massive proposal without proper contemplation and wisdom is dangerous to our educational system as we strive to provide quality education for all community colleges. Thank you.

Instructor, Social Sciences & Humanities Division

Dear Members of the FLOW Working Group,

Implementation of FLOW without fully consulting the 114 campuses of the California Community College system, many of which rely heavily on online enrollments, could lead to unanticipated effects which local faculty and administrators are better positioned to foresee. Further, the mission of our system to serve their district residents may well not be served by the FLOW proposal.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmly,

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I urge you to reject option #3 proposes the creation of an online community college in our system. Flow implementation must involve systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

FYI: More and more students tell me that they are sick of using computers and doing things online and learn better in a face to face setting.

In our program, we have found that the online classes work better when they have a live teacher and meet at specific times.

Instructor

On-line teaching is of questionable value when attempting to teach an on-line chemistry class.

Thank you for your consideration,

\[\ldots\]\n
English Instructor

Dear Sir/Madam:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

On-line teaching is of questionable value when attempting to teach an on-line chemistry class. I also reject option four the proposal to offer a Spanish Only Program. This is racial and language discrimination. What we need is more money and resources dedicated to CTE.

\[\ldots\]\n
Instructor, Social Sciences & Humanities Division

Implementation of FLOW without fully consulting the 114 campuses of the California Community College system, many of which rely heavily on online enrollments, could lead to unanticipated effects which local faculty and administrators are better positioned to foresee. Further, the mission of our system to serve their district residents may well not be served by the FLOW proposal.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmly,

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I urge you to reject option #3 proposes the creation of an online community college in our system. Flow implementation must involve systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

FYI: More and more students tell me that they are sick of using computers and doing things online and learn better in a face to face setting.

In our program, we have found that the online classes work better when they have a live teacher and meet at specific times.

Instructor

On-line teaching is of questionable value when attempting to teach an on-line chemistry class.

Thank you for your consideration,

\[\ldots\]\n
English Instructor

Dear Sir/Madam:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

On-line teaching is of questionable value when attempting to teach an on-line chemistry class. I also reject option four the proposal to offer a Spanish Only Program. This is racial and language discrimination. What we need is more money and resources dedicated to CTE.

\[\ldots\]
I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.”

Counselor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Gerontology and Psychology Instructor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.”

Best,

To Whom It May Concern:

I have taught online for twelve years. I spear-headed the first online class in my division. I also encouraged more creation of online classes, attended numerous online conferences, and helped other courses across the curriculum become online equivalent. I was on the Distance Education Committee at […] for several years. Additionally, I was selected to be a part of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative (O.E.I.), of which I have taught for several years. And, I was a presenter at the Online Teaching Conference in 2015.

First, I like the idea of students being able to earn their degrees fully online. In fact, not only am I an advocate for this very idea, I was also accepted into UTEP’s Online MFA Program, so I could earn my MFA while teaching full-time. UTEP’s online program has been very successful, and I believe California Community Colleges can also be as successful, if not more. The Flex Learning Options for Workers has so much potential, and I believe this is the time to seize the opportunity to move forward online. Online not only helps students, it helps the college. […], for example, is impacted in every way. We have limited class space, limited office space, and limited parking space, to name just a few areas that can really benefit from online class opportunities.

Second, I hear stories from working-class students all the time, who share their concerns and frustrations about the limited access to online courses. Their education is stalled or halted because they cannot take the next necessary course due to the lack of online offerings, or, sadly, there may not even be an online offering for the needed course at all. Moreover, with impacted programs like Nursing, some of these students, who have literally waited for years to get into the Nursing Program, may be denied because they did not complete all the prerequisites through no fault of their own.

Last, I hope that one day students can earn their degrees fully online. I would also like to see instructors like myself teach fully online so that we can discuss the unique course online issues that we encounter. We need specific support and training and collegial conversations that will help us continue to improve our online courses and create stellar course models. The more students and instructors can work together to make online education accessible and excellent, the better Flex Learning Options for Workers Project can meet the needs of hard-working students who just need access to finally graduate from college and find success.

The Option #3 under consideration is very concerning. It disconnects the students from the processes pathways they may well be already linked with in other classes taken on the ground and other instructors that they are currently taking classes via the local CC.

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Business Administration Instructor

[…]

As a community college instructor with 10 years of experience teaching both face-to-face and online courses, I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval. Those of us who are on the front line deserve to have our voices heard on this matter, and hopeful students need them heard.

Thank you,

[…]

To Whom It May Concern:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[…]
To Whom It May Concern,

Creating the 115 community college is unnecessary. The work done in its creation thus far has merely paid lip service to participatory and shared governance at best. There exists within the status quo plenty of options to provide these services more reliably.

I insist that the State stop pursuing the creation of a 115 virtual community college and work with the ASCCC and the current processes to better serve this identified audience. [...]

Academic Senate President

I ask you to reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]

Librarian

I reject Option #3, which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

English Professor

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Counseling Faculty

I would highly recommend that further research be conducted to identify which students in our state have proven to be successful with online college coursework. It would be ideal that a consortium of community colleges within our state system that have effectively implemented a significant portion of their curriculum online be utilized as experts in implementing an online statewide expansion. It is my understanding that the governor will be making a decision on this matter in the next few weeks.

I would suggest that wherever our community colleges have not had the supply of courses to meet student demand, it could be advantageous to utilize a consortium to provide effective online courses. The consortium could support their colleagues on the local level at various campuses throughout California with matching students who are more likely to be successful with online coursework.

Multiple measures to assess student probability of online course success could be coordinated at the different campuses in collaboration with the consortium.

Just an idea from a counseling faculty in the trenches for over fifteen years.

Have a great holiday.

[...]

Counselor

I believe community colleges must offer a fully online degree to assure ANY person has access to this option. Too often students who work full time and trying to get ahead in life are forced to use private proprietary institutions that put them into serious debt.

My only concern is that there needs to be completely online services available as well, including counseling, tutorial services, financial aid and admissions and records, otherwise it does not meet matriculation standards. There also needs to be monitoring of online course rigor and effectiveness with regular oversite and data collection and analysis.

[...]

Instructor/Counselor

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval."

[...]

Hello,

I am an instructor at [...] and [...]. I believe that the proposal for a new online college is a horrible proposal which would only undermine the mission of the community college system by siphoning off funding to create a new bureaucracy. The aims of FLOW should be incorporated into existing strong-workforce and OEI programs, and the only conceivable option to date would be to implement FLOW in a consortium of existing colleges.

I believe that the FLOW proposal was created and rushed through a workgroup process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) that involved very little consultation with systemwide faculty or colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]

English Professor

I reject Option #3, which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Humanities

I am writing to let you know that I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Hello,

I am an instructor at [...] and [...]. I believe that the proposal for a new online college is a horrible proposal which would only undermine the mission of the community college system by siphoning off funding to create a new bureaucracy. The aims of FLOW should be incorporated into existing strong-workforce and OEI programs, and the only conceivable option to date would be to implement FLOW in a consortium of existing colleges.

I believe that the FLOW proposal was created and rushed through a workgroup process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) that involved very little consultation with systemwide faculty or colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]

Instructor/Counselor

"I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval."

[...]

Hello,

I am an instructor at [...] and [...]. I believe that the proposal for a new online college is a horrible proposal which would only undermine the mission of the community college system by siphoning off funding to create a new bureaucracy. The aims of FLOW should be incorporated into existing strong-workforce and OEI programs, and the only conceivable option to date would be to implement FLOW in a consortium of existing colleges.

I believe that the FLOW proposal was created and rushed through a workgroup process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) that involved very little consultation with systemwide faculty or colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]

English Professor

I reject Option #3, which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Humanities

I am writing to let you know that I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges’ consultation and approval.

[...]

Hello,

I am an instructor at [...] and [...]. I believe that the proposal for a new online college is a horrible proposal which would only undermine the mission of the community college system by siphoning off funding to create a new bureaucracy. The aims of FLOW should be incorporated into existing strong-workforce and OEI programs, and the only conceivable option to date would be to implement FLOW in a consortium of existing colleges.

I believe that the FLOW proposal was created and rushed through a workgroup process facilitated by an outside group (NCHEMS) that involved very little consultation with systemwide faculty or colleges.

Thank you for your consideration,

[...]
I reject Option #3, which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system-wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Respectfully,

[...]

Dear Committee Members:

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Existing colleges already have the online capability of providing comprehensive instruction. There is no need to create a separate entity. Adding an Option #4 days before the end of the comment period and in the midst of the holiday week is hasty and discourages thoughtful input. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with system wide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Sincerely,

[...]

Dear Project Coordinators,

I will be intrigued to see what you come up with in terms of this program. As an instructor and having taught my first online class, I can only say that from my limited experience, I find online classes generally a waste of time and money for the student, and a disservice to instructors who truly are interested in teaching. I'm not clear exactly on what kinds of programs vocational certificates cover, but regardless, I find that for instructors, the real opportunity to teach in an online setting is limited, and I believe students, for the most part, put in less time and effort, are less engaged and learn much less from online classes than they do from face to face classes with real instructional interaction. I certainly understand the issue, and see the intent for offering online classes to serve a population that otherwise may not have easy access, but I just don't think online is the answer, at least in the way that I see it executed today.

I am certainly not an expert but wanted to share my perspective with the hopes that a better solution could be found.

Sincerely,

[...]

I reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

[...]

To whom it may concern,

I want to express deep concern over the process by which the state has proceeded with the FLOW initiative. While I believe that online education can be a rich and valuable opportunity to serve students - many of whom would not be served as well in other formats - I also know that, like any educational endeavor, it must be engaged and developed thoughtfully and collaboratively in order adequately meet the needs of the students we all seek to serve.

I am dismayed by the rushed process that is resulting in poorly thought out options which have not had adequate time for consideration (let alone meaningful input) from the major constituent groups within the California Community College system.

I urge the governor and the CCC Chancellor to extend the time for this exploration so that all constituent groups can work collaboratively to weigh the implications of the 3-4 choices that will be offered up - and which will inevitably foreclose other possible options that might have been developed through a more robust and collaborative process.

Also, and finally, I must express strong opposition to the third option offered by the NCHEMS workgroup. It is, in my estimation, essential to the success of the endeavour that the online offerings of the California Community College system remain intimately connected to the broad range of local and regional considerations and subsequent offerings that developed by faculty and administrative collaboration across the state. A separate district - disconnected from the 114 existing community colleges in the state - would undermine the integrity of the system and capacity to serve the needs of a diverse set of students (even within "targeted" populations).

Sincerely,

[...]

Instructor, Anthropology

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly reject Option #3 which proposes the creation of a new online community college in our system. Any further steps on FLOW implementation should proceed only with systemwide faculty and colleges' consultation and approval.

Furthermore, I believe we already have the OEI (Online Educational Initiative) which is funded already and should be used to further student online studies. We DO NOT need another bureaucratic agency set up to do the very same thing. Please do not ruin what we have worked hard to build.

[...]
I favor Option 2, with an existing community college district hosting a consortium of colleges that opt-in to collaborate on FLOW.

I attended the ASCCC Fall 2017 Plenary Session and the break-out session on FLOW.

[...]

To Whom It May Concern,

I find it curious that the value of education is reduced to non-skilled, non-educated technicians. Would politicians like to be replaced with less learned individuals making state legislators using non-skilled designers and non-educational coaches? The professional faculty are the gateways to our future inventors, policy makers, entrepreneurs, artists, and great thinkers.

Sincerely,

[...]

Professor of Sociology
Appendix F. White Papers

The following white papers were shared with the workgroup in preparation for the first workgroup meeting.
Making Online College Work for Workers: A California Community College Primer

Compiled by Ajita Talwalker Menon
Senior Advisor to the Chancellor
California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

The California Community Colleges (CCC) is the largest community college system in the country serving 2.1 million students, more than 40 percent of which are adults over the age of 24. The mission of the CCC is designed to offer lower division academic and vocational instruction for both younger and older students, including returning students, primarily to “advance California’s economic growth and competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement.” The CCC contribute to a segmented higher education system within the state of California that includes the California State University System primarily designed to provide “undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master’s degree,” and the University of California System authorized to award undergraduate and graduate degrees with the primarily responsibility to award doctoral degrees and function as the state-supported academic agency for research.

Within this market segmentation, the CCC seeks to fulfill its primary mission in part by optimizing the role of technology in providing flexible options for Californians seeking to upgrade their knowledge and skills in order to access in-demand jobs and advance their career opportunities. The timing of this effort is critical to meet the growing needs in California’s economy, where 1.1 million bachelor’s degrees will be needed by 2030 to keep pace with economic demand and also because nationwide job growth (95 percent of jobs created during the nation’s economic recovery are concentrated in areas requiring at least some college education).

In accomplishing this effort, the CCC faces unique constraints and opportunities to operationalize a strategy that meets the needs of adult students and establishes the gold standard in online education needed to deliver strong student outcomes.

The Current Operating Environment

Current California Online Initiatives

The CCC has a culture and tradition of local program development enshrined in foundational laws and regulations designed to support participation of campus stakeholders in campus decision-making governed by local community college district Board of Trustees. Central planning required for effective online and related technology initiatives within the CCC may be hampered by this history from the student perspective. Two foundational system wide initiatives illustrate some of opportunities and challenges to offering online educational opportunities in the CCC: the California Virtual Campus (CVC) and the Online Education Initiative (OEI).

The California Virtual Campus
More than half of colleges offer at least one fully online degree or certificate program through their college, yet information about program requirements and outcomes is scattershot. Many of the available courses and programs are catalogued on the California Virtual Campus site, but students are directed back to individual campus websites to navigate course and program exploration, admissions, and course registration. This can be challenging for students to compare similar courses and programs as well as construct a coherent pathway leading to a credential of value. Additionally, the CVC provides little oversight or quality review of courses and programs catalogued in the CVC; the catalogue currently includes programs and courses offered by California public, private independent and private for-profit colleges.

**Online Education Initiative**

The recent OEI pilot launched this spring represents a move towards greater standardization of online offerings within the system, with the objective of promoting opportunities for students to earn online credits towards their credential or transfer and addressing a critical barrier in a student’s pathway to completion: the lack of availability of required courses at the student’s home campus. The exchange is set up to streamline individual campus requirements around the admissions and registration processes and courses in the exchange are presently limited to “in demand” courses from participating colleges, but are alone insufficient to allow for the ultimate awarding of an online degree or credential. Students are required to have a “home” campus and are subject to the program of study and other locally set requirements such as academic progress standards for the receipt of financial aid (disbursed through the “home” campus). While there are currently only six colleges currently participating in the exchange (Butte College, Coastline Community College, Foothill College, Fresno City College, Lake Tahoe Community College, and Ventura College) strong interest from roughly half of the CCCs indicate a likelihood of significant expansion in the number of participating campuses and accordingly the number of course offerings and additional funding has been made available by the legislature to offset technology costs at campuses to facilitate greater participation in the OEI across the CCC.

**Online Program Development**

Program creation itself and online offerings vary significantly by campus and may be driven more by campus governance structures rather than based on a systematic review of state and local workforce needs. Online offerings are often advanced in disciplinary silos and are reliant on dedicated and enthusiastic faculty members who may not have the full information needed to optimally push online initiatives forward (e.g. campus-wide information on student course progression, or labor market information, etc). In particular, California Education Code §70902(b)(7) highlights the right of faculty “to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.” This principle of shared governance was designed to ensure input, but in practice presents a challenge for implementing system-wide initiatives where market information, effective program delivery, and field expertise are the hallmarks of a
successful program. Absent statewide directives, it can make intra-system articulation challenging and can confound the ability for an online initiative to robustly offer options across the system that are critical to meet the needs, particularly of working adults. The result is a fragmented approach to online education system-wide that misses an opportunity to establish clear and coherent pathways to high-demand credentials, degrees, and transitions to baccalaureate study for students that may benefit the most from online education and training.

A recent comparison study investigating the effects of the educational delivery modes (exclusively online, exclusively in-person, and blended online and in-person) on the retention and progression of undergraduate students found that no meaningful retention differences existed between students in blended programs and students attending exclusively in-person, in contrast to previous studies that suggested students in online courses were less likely to persist and progress.\textsuperscript{vii} While a differential continues to be observed for students in exclusively online courses (“mild, negative impact”) relative to other modes, the age of the student (among other factors) influenced the likelihood of retention; notably older students taking only online courses were retained at much higher rates than younger students taking only online courses.\textsuperscript{viii}

\textit{Tension with Current Statute and Regulations}

Providing effective online program pathways for working Californians requires design and utilization of resources that provide the necessary support to students taking online courses and faculty teaching online courses. Identifying necessary resources at the campus level to create, expand, and support online options can be challenged by current statute and regulations governing local funding allocation. In addition to campus and system governance issues, some of the current obligations described below illustrate the tensions in the process of resource allocation that can inhibit successful implementation of expanded online offerings needed to create flexible options for working Californians.

\textit{The 50 Percent Law}

California Education Code §84362(d) details that 50 percent of a community college district’s fiscal year Unrestricted General Fund expenditures (“Current Expense of Education” or “CEE” as defined by California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Section 59204(b), which delineates applicable Objects of Expenditure and Activity Codes that constitute the CEE), must be used for salaries of classroom instructors, which can present a challenge for campuses in balancing compliance with the rule and increasing expenditures in under-resourced areas necessary to support the teaching and learning of students and drive successful student outcomes.\textsuperscript{x} Areas such as orientation, assessment, and counseling required under the Student Success Act of 2012 are not counted towards compliance with the 50 Percent Law. Additionally, expenditures for classroom technology (including hardware and software) needed for online offerings, instructional program designers, and online tutors also do not count towards compliance with the 50 Percent Law.

\textit{The 75/25 Ratio and the Full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON)}
California Education Code §87482.7 laid a marker for full-time faculty instruction by requiring the Board of Governors to establish minimum standards for the amount of credit classroom instruction that needed to be taught by full-time faculty. With the subsequent adoption of Title 5 regulations, the Board of Governors established a working goal aimed at reaching 75 percent of total credit hours be taught by full-time faculty. Specifically, the Board of Governors regulations prescriptively require funding increases in certain areas to be used to increase full-time faculty to move towards reaching the 75 percent target. Enforcement of the standard is governed by the full-time faculty obligation number (FON), which requires community college districts to increase their base number of full-time faculty over the previous year proportionate to the amount of growth in funded credit full-time equivalent student (FTES). Maintaining compliance on the FON, in addition to the 50 Percent Law, underscores the types of budgetary constraints on institutions as they seek to adapt to new ways of teaching and learning that are necessary for effective online programs.

**Community College State General Apportionment Funding Allocation**

California Community Colleges state apportionment is primarily driven by the Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) workload measure and not directly tied to student outcomes. The CCC general apportionment funding mechanism is comprised of state “Proposition 98” funds, local property taxes, and enrollment fees (tuition revenue). Proposition 98 requires the state to spend a certain percentage of the budget on K-12 and community colleges the amount of which is determined based on the current economic conditions, prior year funding levels, and enrollment growth. Under this enrollment-driven funding model, colleges do not have an incentive to facilitate access to other colleges’ programs or courses, which can present a significant design challenge to optimizing online offerings that are broadly accessible to students. Additionally, the state funds specific program functions through a myriad of categorical funds with differing program requirements making intersectional work that has become the hallmark of effective online programs challenging.

**Complimentary Policies and Initiatives**

While creating expansive and comprehensive program offerings in this context presents a challenge, several recent initiatives illustrate opportunities to create a rational framework of interoperability within the system and between the CCC and the California State University System to facilitate the creation of flexible pathway options for workers with strong student outcomes. Key policies and programs such as the Associate’s Degree for Transfer (ADT) and other transfer agreements with four-year colleges and universities, the new Guided Pathways effort, and CCCApply lay critical groundwork to provide a more seamless postsecondary experience that makes it easier for students to take the necessary action to successfully enroll, persist, and complete in order to realize their educational and career goals.
**Associates Degree for Transfer (ADT)**

Under California Education Code §66746(a), the CCC was required to develop an associate’s degree for transfer (ADT) that would create clearer pathways from the CCC to the California State University System (CSU), provide an incentive for transfer students to obtain an associate’s degree, and reduce the number of excess units students must take to fulfill CSU’s graduation requirements. Students who earn the two-year (60 unit) are guaranteed admission into a CSU bachelor’s degree program that can be completed within an additional two years (60 units) of CSU coursework and receive priority admission to their local CSU campus and a degree program that is similar to their associate degree major.xiii With over 1,000 available across the system, ADTs are uniquely positioned to facilitate successive knowledge and skills both within the CCCs and throughput to the CSU bachelor’s degree, which can be capitalized on in an online context.

**Guided Pathways**

In July, the California Legislature approved $150 million in one-time, multi-year funding to support system-wide implementation of “guided pathways,” a student-centered approach to provide students with clear, educationally coherent program maps that include specific course sequences, student supports, progress milestones, and program learning outcomes. The effort provides a framework to integrate existing initiatives traditionally operating in silos and to align knowledge and skills required by four-year colleges and universities and the labor market in order to increase the number of students earning community college credentials, while closing equity gaps.xiv This approach can strengthen the delivery of online options with enhanced student supports to drive better outcomes in both on campus and online contexts.

**CCCApply**

CCCApply.org is an online gateway where students can learn about community college admission requirements, apply online and access tools resources to determine their academic pathway. CCCApply is the statewide online admission application infrastructure for the CCC that combines individual college identity and processing with system-wide consistency, compliance, and support to streamline the application process for students and colleges. Nearly all (more than 100) of the CCC campuses use CCCApply and typically receive 80 percent to 100 percent of their admissions applications online. xv

**Additional Considerations**

While not unique to California, many additional considerations factor into the ultimate design of high-quality, online options, that require thoughtful examination to avoid compounding some of the challenges identified above. Needed clarity around individual campus and program accreditation, including approval for online offerings; the local and varied environment of credit for prior learning; and a slow embrace of competency-based education are examples of key areas the CCC (along with many campuses and systems
across the country) will need to tackle to ensure program design that works in the interests of working Californians.xvi

---

xvi Source: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=66010.4.


x Source: https://www.caguidedpathways.org/.

xiv Source: https://rpgroup.org/All-Projects/ctl/ArticleView/mid/1686/articleId/114/Prior-Learning-Assessment-PLA-and-Competency-Based-Education-CBE.
I. Excerpt - History of Learn on Demand, Dr. Sandy Cook:
   o The vision for a competency-based, start anytime model to attract new students first surfaced in 2006 when the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) marketing department conducted research to survey prospective adult students without a college degree.
   o The development of Learn on Demand incorporated several important views of strong leadership, including an articulated clear, compelling vision, an emphasis on value for the colleges and the students, valued input from constituents at all levels of the organization, and, importantly, recognition of the importance of continuous quality improvement and acknowledgment that innovation takes time.
   o KCTCS colleges’ online offerings started with the 1999 launch of the Kentucky Virtual University (KYVU), a statewide initiative that organized all of Kentucky’s public higher education online offerings into a single website. Within a few years, KCTCS colleges were firmly established as the state’s largest developers and providers of online learning. By 2006, the system had six times the number of online course enrollments than the next-largest deliverer among Kentucky public postsecondary institutions.

II. KCTCS Online Business Plan – Virtual Learning Initiative (VLI) Specific Processes

The processes of the Virtual Learning Initiative (VLI) included the following:

   o Colleges may continue current online offerings independently of the VLI.
   o The VLI will develop a request for proposals process to solicit proposals from KCTCS colleges in 2007–2008 and thereafter.
   o Each VLI proposal will be developed by a program consortium.
   o If the program consortium is composed of more than one college, the program consortium will designate one college as lead college for the consortium.
   o The lead college of the consortium will have ultimate responsibility for providing and managing the delivery of the program.
   o Once authorized by the VLI, the program consortium will receive a nonrecurring grant to develop the program for implementation.
   o Tuition and any course charge revenue for each VLI program will be credited to the VLI account to be disbursed as follows:
      Pay the cost of infrastructure services.
      Pay for program consortia grants for development of programs.
      Pay the program consortium the cost of delivery by instructors for the program based on a budget recommended annually by the VLI.
• Pay the program consortium a recurring additional allocation based on a budget recommended annually by the VLI.
• Allocate net revenue from the VLI to all the KCTCS colleges through the funding model.
  ◦ Colleges must have program approval for VLI programs to be a college in which students register for the program and from whom students receive their degree/certificate/diploma.

III. KCTCS Online Virtual Learning Initiative Funding Model
  ◦ The KCTCS Virtual Learning Initiative (VLI) was initiated with a $460,000 interest-free loan from the CPE’s Kentucky Virtual University Revolving Loan Fund. The loan was repaid within 3 years, and the programs are now a revenue generator supported by tuition income. With funding available, the development phase began with formal requests for proposals (RFPs). RFPs were released, and applications were accepted in phases over a 2-year period. The first round in 2007 called for the development of two associate of applied science (AAS) degree programs, one in business administration and another not specified but later approved for information technology (now computer and information technology), as well as general education courses. Subsequent rounds focused on nursing programs; additional general education courses; transitional courses in developmental math, reading, and writing; and college-specific approved programs and course.

IV. Degree Programs Offered in the Learn on Demand Modality
  ◦ Six original Learn on Demand colleges began in 2009 and continue today. These are Big Sandy, Elizabethtown, Jefferson, Somerset, Southeast Kentucky, and West Kentucky. These six colleges offer the following degree programs in the Learn on Demand modality:
    • Associate in Arts
    • Associate in Science
    • Business Administration
      ◦ Human Resources Management Track
      ◦ Management Track
    • Computer and Information Technologies
      ◦ Applications: Computer Support Track
      ◦ Information Security Track
      ◦ Network Administration Track: Microsoft Windows Administration Sequence
      ◦ Network Administration Track: CISCO Networking Associate Sequence
      ◦ Programming Track: Information Systems Sequence
      ◦ Programming Track: Software Development Sequence
    • Criminal Justice
      ◦ Corrections Track
      ◦ Criminal Justice Track
      ◦ Law Enforcement Track
• Security and Loss Prevention Track
  ▪ Logistics and Operations Management
    • Logistics and Operations Management Track
  ▪ Marine Technology
    • Marine Culinary Management Track
    • Marine Engineering Track
    • Marine Logistics Operations Track
    • Wheelhouse Management Track
  ▪ Medical Information Technology
    • Electronic Medical Records Track
    • Medical Administrative Track
    • Medical Coding Track
    • Medical Office Management Track

V. Renewed Focus

  o A subsequent renewed focus began in 2014 and a focused workgroup provided recommendations as part of their charge in 2016 for a competency based education focus for all online offerings. KCTCS is presently undergoing a re-boot of our Online programs with the Development of a New Business Model for Distance Learning that seeks to offer all online courses in a Competency Based format across three levels of modality, with centralized services, Quality Assurance and embedded student support as integral components of our premier distance learning programs.

  o The KCTCS New Business Model for Distance Learning will focus on four integral components:
    ▪ Competency-based.
    ▪ Quality assured.
    ▪ Revenue-shared.
    ▪ Scalable.

  o The timeline for this new initiative will commence with the Business Plan Implementation Workgroup convening September 2017 with the goal of scaling up our successes in Learn on Demand to all online offerings by Fall of 2020. This includes a return to non-term offerings along-side traditional term-based online courses for greater flexibility for student needs.
ADVANCING THE NEW AMERICAN UNIVERSITY.

At Arizona State University (ASU), we pride ourselves on being a comprehensive public research university measured not by whom we exclude, but rather by whom we include and how they succeed. We believe that all qualified students who seek a college degree should have access to the education they desire. ASU campus enrollments have increased 50% since 2002, but through the introduction of ASU Online, we have increased our ability to serve more students by an additional 25,000. In the past 15 years, ASU has tripled the number of students it graduates annually and increased the academic quality, rigor and outcomes of its programs, all while growing the faculty by only a modest amount. Building a culture of inclusivity as well as innovation has allowed ASU to continue its growth and expand to reach students across the globe, both in on-campus immersion and digital learning methods.

In 2014, ASU launched EdPlus, a central innovation unit within the university that houses ASU Online, to advance the university's mission of **inclusion, excellence and innovation** into digital arenas, enabling access to educational opportunities that were previously out of reach. The EdPlus mission is to find ways to educate every person who has an interest in earning an education. We continue to strive to remove barriers, increase access, innovate, and create more master learners for the 21st century. It is within this environment that ASU Online thrives.

ASU ONLINE CREATES A NEW GOLD STANDARD FOR ONLINE EDUCATION.

ASU Online believes that everyone deserves a high-quality education and has designed an innovative and technology-enabled digital learning experience with student success in mind. Leading ASU faculty work EdPlus instructional designers to create courses unique to the subject matter and to the student. ASU Online is continually investigating and investing in new support services, instructional design methods and other tools to improve students’ access to university resources and increase their prospect for success. ASU’s online bachelor’s-degree programs were ranked No. 4 in the country according to U.S. News & World Report in 2017, placing ASU Online at the top of more than 1,300 schools reviewed. Formidable online colleges like Ohio State and Penn State were tied for No. 8.

WHO WE SERVE.

ASU Online provides opportunities for anyone, anywhere to access the education from an innovative, tier one research university with the same award-winning faculty who inspire on-ground classrooms. For this coming fall, students can choose from 149 degree programs, including 60 graduate programs, 72 undergraduate programs, and 17 graduate certificates. At its inception in 2010, ASU Online had fewer than 5,000 students; by fall of 2017 that number has grown to over 27,000 undergraduate and graduate students and is on track to serve 100,000 students annually by 2025.

DIVERSE AND SCALED, ASU ONLINE REACHES A GLOBAL AUDIENCE.

Our students come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, with 59% female, and 41% male. The majority of students reside in the western U.S., with the highest enrollments in Arizona, California and Texas. The average age of an ASU Online student is 30 years old, with the majority working full- or part-time and transferring credits. We have a high need population that we work closely to identify and provide with assistance. For example, ASU awarded $6.6M in institutional funds to our high need online population, with 15% of students enrolled overall for 2015 receiving assistance.

The top 10 most popular ASU Online degree programs include:

1. B.A. in Psychology
2. B.S. in Electrical Engineering (fully online, ABET-accredited)
3. B.S. in Information Technology
4. M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction (Applied Behavior Analysis)
5. B.A. in Organizational Leadership
6. B.S. in Criminal Justice
7. B.I.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies
8. B.S. in Software Engineering
9. B.S. in Communication
10. B.A. in English
WE ARE OUTCOMES-FOCUSED.

One key metric of success is retention. ASU Online graduate retention is at 80%, and undergraduate retention is just under 70%. Innovations like orientation courses at the undergraduate level prior to session start help position students for success in an online educational environment, develop strong study habits, and prepare for transition to university work and life balance. This orientation has been customized for specific populations, including veterans. Students who successfully complete an orientation course have shown on average 5% higher retention as compared to peers.

Online students have access to the Student Success Center, a team of nearly 100 Success Coaches, that partners with students in thoughtful and creative ways, guiding them to reach their full potential. Through quality conversation and meaningful exploration, a Success Coach will focus on goal setting, overcoming obstacles and achieving success. The Success Coach builds relationships with colleges and advising teams across ASU and ensures students have access to necessary resources and tools. This Center works to improve student retention and enhance the overall student experience. Students also have remote access to some face-to-face services including career services, library services and a portion of health and wellness services.

PARTNERING FOR SCALE AND IMPACT INCREASES ASU ONLINE’S REACH.

Like-minded culture and a passion for innovation drive the development of the EdPlus partner community. EdPlus has formal collaborations with nearly 200 technology and content partners for the development and dissemination of its digital offerings and related student services.

Some major partnerships have allowed ASU Online to scale more rapidly, and, pushed the bounds of our Online team’s services and integrations across the university. One example of this is the Starbucks College Achievement Plan. In this first-of-its-kind corporate program, Starbucks, in partnership with ASU, provides an opportunity for all qualified U.S.-based benefits eligible Starbucks employees (“partners”) to complete their bachelor’s degree through any of ASU Online’s more than 70 undergraduate degree programs. There is no obligation for partners to stay at Starbucks after they graduate from ASU. Now celebrating its third year, the Starbucks College Achievement Plan (SCAP) continues to grow. In early 2017, ASU and Starbucks announced Pathway to Admission, which leverages ASU’s Global Freshman Academy and provides partners an opportunity earn admission into ASU. The 2016-2017 academic year ended with more than 7,100 Starbucks partners enrolled at ASU through SCAP, and with more than 300 partners graduating in May 2017, where Starbucks executive chairman Howard Schultz delivered the commencement address. ASU has graduated more than 780 Starbucks partners since program launch.

“Since we move a fair amount for my husband’s career, it made it difficult to establish residency in one state and reside there long enough to finish. I heard of the Starbucks College Achievement Plan through Starbucks and applied as a barista. I’m very thankful. I consider the opportunity to finish college a true blessing.”

Karol Pomplin, Starbucks partner and ASU Online graduate through Starbucks College Achievement Plan

DIGITAL CAPACITY AT ASU FOCUSES ON NEW PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGIES DESIGNED TO SERVE ALL STUDENTS - INCLUDING ON-GROUND STUDENTS.

The environment of EdPlus, under which ASU Online continues to grow and expand, also fosters new kinds of digital capacity and allows ASU to have hundreds of thousands of other learners engaged in organized learning globally.

For instance, ASU and edX partnered to create Global Freshman Academy (GFA), a first of its kind collaboration offering first year college-level courses for academic credit on the edX platform. Students enroll in freshman-level GFA courses for free, building confidence in their college readiness with the option to earn academic credit for their work when they succeed. Because students only pay for credit after they’ve successfully passed their courses, GFA significantly reduces the financial risk students undertake as they begin their college careers.

As an example, MAT 117: College Algebra & Problem Solving is a GFA course aimed at helping students clear one of the most challenging hurdles on the path to success in higher education:
math. GFA College Algebra uses the adaptive learning tool ALEKS to more effectively teach freshman level mathematics at scale. ALEKS accurately assesses a student’s zone of proximal development and provides the student with detailed, high-frequency feedback on his/her performance throughout the course. GFA College Algebra combines this personalized, adaptive approach with a scalable coaching model that employs trained undergraduate coaches to provide reusable video answers to student questions and data-driven interventions to improve the study habits of struggling students.

To date, GFA College Algebra has attracted 56,000 students globally. More than 750 students have mastered all material and completed this course, with nearly 50 students converting the course for academic credit. We are focused on continuing to help students master material and are seeing increasing rates of persistence.

Overall since its inception, GFA has reached nearly 270,000 students, registering for more than 335,000 courses total.

**WE’VE LEARNED THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN OF EDPLUS ENABLES POSITIVE OUTCOMES FOR NOT ONLY ASU ONLINE, BUT ASU OVERALL.**

The centralization of EdPlus and ASU Online has contributed to efficiency gains as resources, like Instructional Designers, have become more efficient over time due to greater standardization, targeted hiring and common approach to common problems in online learning. Shared video equipment, media rooms and instructional design support has reduced duplicated cost over time. Centralizing the majority of existing courses and launching in a coordinated way new courses and programs in partnership with ASU’s schools and colleges, allows for standardized quality, and supports faculty development of online courses. The model of reliance on current ASU faculty amplifies faculty expertise of teaching online, while maintaining the same quality as campus immersion courses. A boot camp designed for faculty new to online learning, hosted annually by ASU Online, helps onboard new faculty and create cross-university awareness and support for ASU Online.

Ultimately, ASU Online offers implementation lessons about delivering digital learning at scale. Some of these lessons include:

- Scale helps to lower costs and makes activities more sustainable
- Centralization of instructional design, media and student support resources can help improve outcomes
- Leveraging the same faculty as campus immersion students creates a standard of excellence and consistency, as well as the infusion of digital across campus to kick start innovation and promote an enduring cultural change
- Third party partnerships can help spur growth and retention
- Adaptive software provides high quality, high frequency student feedback at low marginal cost, generating much richer data than static online courses
- Improved introductory course retention can increase overall degree completion rate

Investments in ASU Online infrastructure and professional development have second order benefits for the rest of the campus through improved processes, new resources to encourage digital engagement, and, a mindset of digital among university faculty and staff.

**DIGITAL @ ASU: THE ROAD AHEAD**

ASU has embraced technology without hesitation. Unlike most universities, which view online learning as secondary to campus immersion education, ASU applies innovative technologies to prioritize student needs and advance learning worldwide. Building on its leadership position in digital education, ASU will continue to invest significantly in digital immersion as a means to meet enrollment and student success goals and to keep the cost of instruction at the lower quartile of universities with similar missions (per student and per degree awarded). ASU intends to develop market-leading digital curricula in every field in which it can make a difference in the lives of students and their chances for academic success.
AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH FOR THE 21ST CENTURY STUDENT
One size fits all does not fit today’s college student. In the past two decades, college students have changed, and they will continue to change.

Today, the majority of college students are nontraditional students—they are over 25, are working, and have families. These savvy 21st century students need and expect an education that is tailored to their individual needs. Colleges and universities need to develop models, programs, and systems that fit students rather than expecting students to fit into their systems.

Finding high quality, affordable ways to help these busy adults get the education they need is a national imperative, and colleges and universities must find new ways to educate 21st century students. One of the most promising innovations in higher education is competency-based education.
Competency-based education (CBE) measures learning rather than time. Instead of being designed around semesters, classes, and syllabuses, CBE allows students to advance as soon as they can demonstrate that they have mastered the subject matter. With CBE, the focus is not on where or how the student learns, but that the learning occurred and the student has acquired a defined set of knowledge and skills.

Most traditional learning models hold time constant (fixed-length semesters or terms for each course) and let learning vary. In contrast, CBE holds learning constant and lets time vary. With CBE, students, not the institution, set the pace. Students come to college with varying levels of knowledge and very different learning styles, and CBE lets them move quickly through what they already know so they can focus on the things they still need to learn.

A 2015 report by the Rand Corporation provides additional perspective: “Many traditional courses are designed with learning outcomes or competencies in mind, yet students are typically exposed to a common set of materials (e.g., syllabus, textbook, lecture topics) and are required to sit through full courses regardless of when the material is mastered. In contrast to traditional courses, competency-based programs allow for substantial variation in the content and structure used to achieve mastery of competencies.”

Competency-based education is becoming increasingly popular today, and many institutions are in the process of developing CBE programs. Western Governors University developed and pioneered the use of CBE, and has been offering competency-based degree programs since 1999.
Although CBE programs differ by institution, programs generally share a common set of design features.

### 1. FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING AND COMPLETION

Students are typically able to complete coursework and assessments at variable paces. To facilitate self-paced movement through coursework, competency-based programs often offer more flexible calendars that allow students to end and begin new courses throughout a traditional course semester.

### 2. ONLINE DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION

Competency-based programs often rely on online platforms for course delivery and communication between faculty and students; online platforms allow for self-pacing and flexible scheduling through continuous access to learning materials.

### 3. VARIATION IN COURSE CONTENT

Within and across programs, the material used by a student to master a competency may vary. Some students may not need to study material that they have previously mastered, and students may have choices of a range of different learning materials from which to choose (e.g., texts, videos, computer modules).

### 4. EXCLUSIVE EMPHASIS ON ASSESSMENTS LINKED TO COMPETENCIES

Competency-based programs typically rely exclusively on a set of assessments as the sole means of determining mastery and moving students through the program, and these assessments are directly linked to the competencies mapped out for the full degree or certificate program. Institutions often use a range of assessment types within a single program or course, including computerized, exams, projects, essays, research papers, problem solving, and demonstrations. Students can take the assessments as soon as they feel they have mastered a competency.

### 5. ALTERED FACULTY ROLES

Given the personalized, self-paced nature of competency-based learning, the roles of faculty differ from those played in traditional degree programs. Rather than lecturing, faculty members devote efforts to compiling and creating course materials, guiding students to materials that might be most useful in mastering competencies, providing students with instructional support and general guidance as they move through the program, and administering assessments and certifying results.

### 6. STRONG STUDENT SUPPORTS

Given the significant autonomy students have, institutions often provide them with regular, comprehensive support through staff referred to as “coaches”, or “mentors” who monitor and facilitate student progress and success.

### 7. ALTERNATIVE TUITION STRUCTURES

Some competency-based programs have adopted a subscription-based model of tuition, under which students pay a fixed price for a term and are able to complete as many courses as possible for that fixed price. This provides incentives for students to complete coursework as quickly as possible.

This list of design features is taken verbatim from the 2015 Rand study cited previously.
HOW DOES COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION WORK AT WGU?

COMPETENCIES
Properly selected and well-defined competencies are the foundation of a competency-based degree program. Competencies are the knowledge and skills a student must be able to demonstrate to pass a course, and ultimately, to earn a degree. At WGU, they are identified in collaboration with program councils, which include representatives from employers and other universities. By working with industry leaders to define competencies, WGU ensures that students acquire the skills they need to be prepared for their careers. Once competencies have been established, program councils continue to meet regularly to review them, ensuring that they stay relevant and up-to-date.

COURSES
WGU faculty members develop courses that map to the competencies identified by program councils. With CBE at WGU, there are no instructor-led classes. Course titles and content are much the same as those found in traditional settings, but all of the materials, which WGU calls learning resources, are available to students online 24/7. And, all of the course materials are designed and selected to help students develop required competencies.

LEARNING RESOURCES
For each course at WGU, students use course materials and other study materials designed to ensure that they acquire the knowledge and skills they need to demonstrate competence. In addition to textbooks (most provided as e-books at no additional charge), students have access to practice tests, webinars, interactive exercises, simulations, and videos. WGU provides a variety of different learning resources to accommodate the different learning styles and preferences of students. Rather than creating learning resources, WGU acquires them from the best external sources, ensuring that they are up-to-date and relevant.

ASSESSMENTS
Because competency-based learning is based on demonstrating knowledge, high-quality, accurate assessments are vital. Using the competencies identified for each course, WGU faculty members develop assessments—either objective exams or performance assessments (papers, presentations, case studies, etc.). Objective assessments, which are multiple choice, true/false, etc., are always proctored and can be taken from home using online proctoring. Many assessments are created by third parties as well.

FACULTY
Mentors
Competency-based learning changes the role of faculty from that of a “sage on a stage” to one of a “guide on the side.” Because there are no classes with set meeting times, the majority of WGU faculty members, called Student Mentors, work with students one-on-one to guide, coach, and instruct. Their sole focus is on helping students learn and progress. Student Mentors, who hold at minimum master’s degrees and have relevant work experience, work with students individually from enrollment through graduation, helping them plan their studies and offering ongoing encouragement and motivational support. Course Mentors, who typically hold PhDs in their fields, working with students while they are engaged in particular courses, leading discussion groups and webinars as well as providing individualized instruction as needed.

Program Faculty
Other WGU faculty members, Program Managers and Curriculum Developers, are responsible for developing new programs, courses, and curriculum as well as ensuring that existing programs are relevant and up to date. They collaborate with Program Councils as well as Mentors to ensure that degree programs are helping students acquire the competencies they need to succeed in their fields.

Evaluators
A separate group of Evaluators, all with master’s degrees or PhDs in their respective disciplines, review and evaluate performance assessments based on rubrics. These include the papers and presentations students submit to demonstrate competency in some courses. Evaluators and students submitting assessments are anonymous to each other, which maximizes the objectivity of the evaluations.
WHAT IS COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION LIKE FOR THE STUDENT?

GETTING STARTED

Because competency-based education allows students to learn at their own pace and on their own schedules, students can enroll at WGU on the first day of any month. Terms are six months long to accommodate the needs of busy adult students. Longer terms allow students the flexibility to take a few weeks away from studies as needed to take care of issues related to family, health, or job obligations.

On the first day of the term, the student and his or her Student Mentor work together to plan the coursework for the term. Together they will develop a Degree Plan, which maps out a schedule for completing courses, by term, all the way to graduation. The Degree Plan, course materials, and other needed study tools all reside online on the Student Portal. Students who are able to complete courses faster are free to go faster than their original Degree Plan, and this allows many students to accelerate their time to degree and graduate sooner.
MOVING THROUGH COURSEWORK

Once the student has established a Degree Plan, she can begin her coursework immediately. The learning resources, including e-texts, are available online 24/7. For many courses, students have the opportunity to take a pre-assessment, an exam that determines what they already know and identifies competencies they still need to master. Students who do well on their pre-assessments often elect to take the final assessment for the course quickly. If they pass (they need to earn the equivalent of a B grade or better to pass), they have completed the course and can move on to the next course. If the pre-assessment identifies areas students still need to learn, the student can focus her studies on those specific areas rather than spending time studying material she has already mastered. When the student and her Mentor agree that she is ready, she can take the assessment, and when she passes, she is ready to move on to the next course. If the course requires a paper, case study, or presentation, the student submits them for evaluation and receives feedback through the Portal.

FACULTY SUPPORT

Competency-based education, while rigorous and challenging, does not mean that students “go it alone.” Each student has individual support from their Student Mentor, meeting by telephone weekly, and emailing and communicating as often as needed. For each course, the student will connect with a Course Mentor, as well as other students taking the course. Course Mentors help students work through course subject matter as well as providing online discussions and webinars aimed at enriching the learning experience.

COMMUNITIES

WGU hosts communities for students to provide an online gathering place for them to discuss course topics, ask questions, and offer each other advice and support. These communities are hosted and monitored by faculty members.

COMPLETING A DEGREE

CBE allows students to take or turn in assessments on a schedule that works for them, and as a result, students complete courses at WGU—and graduate—every day. While all students may attend commencement in person (or online), graduates receive their diplomas as soon as they complete their degree requirements, regardless of the date.
Competency-based education is gaining widespread acceptance and positive recognition from the White House, Congress, higher education agencies, national foundations, and notable think tanks. According to a 2016 report by the American Institutes for Research assessing the success rates of CBE programs, the authors concluded:

On average, CBE programs are increasing student access, especially for adult students, those with prior college credits, and Pell Grant-eligible students. These programs also appear to be at least on par with, or better than, traditional programs in terms of student success; on average, students seem to progress through CBE programs at a similar or a faster pace than students in traditional programs, and they appear to complete the programs at similar or higher rates. Clearly, there is a set of students who accelerate through programs when those programs allow, which means that some students are able to shorten their time to degree completion and reduce their opportunity cost of enrolling in the program. It also appears that students are at least as satisfied with their experience in CBE programs as their peers in traditional programs.

Employers are increasingly seeing the benefits of competency-based education because it assures them that the graduates they hire have mastered the knowledge and skills they need. And, more and more colleges and universities are developing their own competency-based programs. While most are online, competency-based learning can take place on campuses, in person, as well. As the U.S. continues to look for ways to grow and sustain a well-trained and educated workforce, the higher education community continues to expand the options for earning a college degree. Competency-based education, with its focus on measuring and ensuring learning, is an innovation that works for the 21st century.

GROWTH IN CUMULATIVE GRADUATES

34% YOY cumulative growth in FY16; 30% YOY cumulative growth in FY17.

CUMULATIVE GRADUATES BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates by College</th>
<th>Undergraduate FY15</th>
<th>Undergraduate FY16</th>
<th>Undergraduate FY17</th>
<th>Graduate FY15</th>
<th>Graduate FY16</th>
<th>Graduate FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business College</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,900 degrees awarded in FY16 (1,286 bachelor’s and 614 master’s degrees); 2,275 degrees awarded in FY17 (1,534 bachelor’s and 741 master’s degrees).

WHERE OUR GRADUATES WORK (SAMPLE)

Adventist Health
AT&T
Cedars-Sinai Health System
Cisco
Dignity Health
Hospital Corporation Of America
Huntington Memorial Hospital

Kaiser Permanente Affinity
Kaweah Delta Medical Center
Loma Linda University Medical Center
Los Angeles Unified School District
Providence Health & Services
Sacramento City Unified School District
San Diego Unified School District

Sharp Healthcare
State Of California
Stockton Unified School District
Sutter Health
Tenet Health
UCLA

GRADUATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADUATES BY AGE

36% of WGU's graduates in California are first-generation students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates (Cumulative) by Age</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 29</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENROLLMENT GROWTH

17% compound 3-year annual growth in enrollment

ENROLLMENT BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY15 Undergraduate</th>
<th>FY15 Graduate</th>
<th>FY16 Undergraduate</th>
<th>FY16 Graduate</th>
<th>FY17 Undergraduate</th>
<th>FY17 Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business College</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>8,292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more information about CBE implementation, go to www.cbeinfo.org
August 9, 2017

Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley  
California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office  
1102 Q Street, Suite 4550  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Chancellor Oakley:

I have been giving some thought to the notion of the online community college that Governor Brown is seeking. The goal of expanding online education to serve the needs of those who are place bound or time constrained is a laudable vision. However, it seems to me that the notion of a fully accredited, online-only college within the California Community College system would serve only to duplicate the efforts that we are already making in regard to providing access to those who need flexibility in their schedule.

Throughout my career, I have been involved in policy discussions that resonate with this. It seems to me that the CCC System already has a robust online education program that could be streamlined to take advantage of our collective strength. Over the past couple of weeks I have been discussing what this college might look like with Dr. Alec Testa, a good friend and colleague who has a great deal of expertise in distance and competency based learning. Dr. Testa is currently an associate professor of education at Southern Arkansas University. Prior to that, he was a key player in the development of Western Governors University’s competency based education. He also is a California expat and has good knowledge of our system (he was involved in the Transfer Center pilot program in the late 1980s).

As we have discussed what a new online college might look like, we considered a number of progressive and successful examples that might inform the design of the proposed online California community college. Below are several elements from which to choose. They all have in mind access, affordability, portability, and expedited time to degree. It seems that the best models for such a program would tip the cost/benefit ratio (budget resources/ students earning degrees and credentials) squarely in direction of students. Therefore, the following are offered for consideration among “the handful of options.”
Components of Recognizing/Awarding Credits

- No residency requirements. Should a student possess credits, from a variety of means, that equate to a degree, a degree will be awarded.
- Wide, perhaps universal, acceptance of transfer from regionally accredited colleges and universities.
- Wide acceptance of Prior Learning Assessment as advocated by the Council on Adult and Experiential Learning and other learning experiences recommended by the American Council on Education and as implemented by Excelsior College.
- Leverage existing community college courses, and support and enhancement of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative.
- In addition to online platforms, there is great innovation in competency-based education (e.g., Western Governor’s University, Community College of the Air Force, Southern New Hampshire University).
- Encourage, support, and provide technical expertise to California Community Colleges to increase the offerings of courses on non-standard terms, with regular ongoing start dates, similar to the programs offered at Rio Salado College in the Maricopa system. Leveraging content includes identifying and removing barriers to admission and enrollment of students.
- Develop new programs and courses through individual colleges or college consortia within the California System.

Components of degree/certificate design and establishing credentials

- Each program area would have councils of CCC faculty members to define credential content from existing offerings within the system. The most popular (and needed) offerings typically have wide agreement on their content (e.g., ADT requirements).
- The Chancellor’s Office would create a college administration (that should be small in number and nimble) that will ensure that degrees meet all statutory, regulatory, and accreditation requirements (essentially a source for A&R, financial aid, and other student services).

Components for faculty and college governance

- Council faculty members would serve as a curriculum committee for determining degree requirements and other curricular/academic decisions.
- A faculty senate, for the purposes of shared governance and to ensure academic quality, would be created with representation from the program council members.
- The governing board would consist of representatives from the CCC presidents, Chancellor’s Office and members of the public.

Imagine then the college from the student’s perspective. Through a website and call center they learn of degree offerings and cost, that much or more of what they have already done will count towards a credential, that there are multiple and flexible paths towards completion, available 24/7, and that they can begin anytime. The college can and will recognize that
students will and do learn in multiple ways, and that the college has as its mission their success, degree completion, and career or personal fulfillment.

Such a community college would directly meet the needs of students, leverage the substantial investments made by California Community Colleges, minimize the risks inherent in launching a brand new (and some might say competing) institution, and be the quickest route to realizing the challenge set forth by the Governor. The proposed community college also recognizes and takes advantage of the investment that students have made towards their education. Not only would it be appropriate for the non-traditional and mid-career student, it has great potential for the concurrently enrolled high school student (who perhaps also takes advantage of advance placement and CLEP), making it possible to matriculate at our universities as upper-division students.

A careful reader will readily identify a number of questions regarding implementation. It isn’t my intention to address them all in this letter. And, while answers await, there very well could be better ones. The ideas here aren’t perfect and require much development, but I think this sort of approach would be much less daunting than creating a new degree granting, course offering, college from scratch.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kevin G. Walthers, Ph.D.
Superintendent/President

C: Deputy Chancellor Erik Skinner
Coastline Community College's

Whitepaper on the Proposed Online College

Submitted by Dr. Loretta Adrian, President of Coastline College

California Community Colleges have failed to adapt rapidly enough to changing student needs, economic forces, and underserved populations. Traditionally, higher education has been primarily housed in physical locations and courses have been delivered during specific timeframes. Over the past two decades, institutions have sought to break that barrier of access to education by expanding options to programs and services online. Recently, our Governor and Chancellor put forth a vision of innovative online learning that embraces the new, second curve as described in Charting New Paths to the Future—learning that responds to the economic needs of our state, the agile world of technology, and the needs of our industry partners.

The following paper outlines Coastline Community College’s (Coastline’s) expertise in distance education, what persistent gaps remain in California Community College online education, and our concept of an online educational ecosystem designed to alleviate these challenges.

Coastline’s Commitment to Flexible Learning

Coastline was founded in 1976 as the “College without walls,” focused on bringing education into the community where people live and work. Since its inception, Coastline focused on creating access for older, working adults through various methods. The College utilized non-traditional formats to provide distance education class offerings that used mass media to provide students with weekly lectures and instructions. The very first classes utilized the local newspapers.

The creation of Coast Learning Systems resulted in 20 Emmy-Awards for Instructional Content, and the purchase of television station KOCE and the College’s own television channel allowed the College to broadcast its educational programs to support students in our distance education courses and programs. Site-based instruction was offered at over 100 locations throughout our district’s service area and in a variety of lengths, schedules, and meeting patterns to address the needs of the older and working students. Although the College has since moved nearly all onsite offerings to its three campuses, the College continues to focus on development of schedules from a student-centered approach. This is exemplified by online classes with multiple start dates and lengths.

In 1997, Coastline offered its first online courses. Today, Coastline serves 83 percent of our students through distance learning modalities. We offer 42 degrees and 39 certificates online and lead the state in proportionality of online enrollment (Coastline 52%, State 16%).

Coastline serves a diverse student population which extends beyond the borders of the college service area. Over 60 percent of students taking Coastline courses reside outside of district boundaries. Additionally, Coastline serves over 6,000 incarcerated students annually with support from our distance learning department.
Coastline’s flexible distance education programs have enabled us to become a leader in military and corporate education through our Extended Learning Programs. Our military education program served over 6,300 students in 2016-2017. Coastline also acts as the academic integrator for the Navy College Program for Afloat College Education (NCPACE).

NCPACE is a collaborative partnership between ten two and four year institutions designed to serve deployed Navy students. This innovative, collaborative program serves students by eliminating the competition between institutions, focusing on the student’s educational goals, and filling in the gaps to reduce time to degree completion. The partners include: Central Texas College, Dallas Colleges Online, ECPI College of Technology, Governors State University, Old Dominion University, Saint Leo University, Thomas Edison State University, University of Oklahoma, and Vincennes University.

Coastline has delivered courses in the NCPACE program since 1988, and became the lead academic integrator for distance education in 2004. In this capacity, Coastline provides technology and service to all NCPACE partners such as: creating and supporting an online portal for all partners, advisors, and students, enrollment management, catalog management, exam inventory, auto-email communications, course completion and grade management, degree roadmaps, invoicing and reporting. Collectively, NCPACE offers over 250 courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels leading toward several associate, bachelor, and master degree programs.

Another collaborative partnership is our Learning 1st program which offers non-competitive pathways that allow completion of fully online associate to bachelor’s degrees. Students complete one application for Coastline and the partner college and, after completing the associate’s degree, have guaranteed transfer to the university partner. Throughout all our different programs, Coastline serves over 27,000 students, which equates to more than 72,000 enrollments annually.

Coastline has worked to continually increase student success, retention, and persistence rates through all modalities. In our Military/Corporate Education programs, Coastline boasts 96 percent retention and 85 percent success rates. The support staff in Extended Learning work with faculty to reach out to students who are behind in classes or non-responsive, offering tutoring or administrative support. This proactive student engagement has resulted in high success rates in Extended Learning. Coastline overall has a 70 percent success rate and 85 percent retention rate in online courses. Although Coastline is a small community college, we awarded 2,220 degrees in 2016-17 and 1,392 of our students completed transfers to four-year universities. This is due to our exceptional faculty and their commitment to quality education as evidenced by their creation and adoption of the Academic Quality Rubric in 2009.

Coastline’s culture of collaboration and innovative student-focused mindset is evident in the programs and support services offered by the College such as our virtual library, distance learning department, and technologically advanced support services. Coastline has been an early adopter of new technologies such as predictive analytics (Civitas), asynchronous interaction (Skype, Cranium Café, My Path, EAB Navigate), and mobile applications. Most recently, Coastline completed a
college-wide transition to and implementation of the Canvas learning management system in one year. The College features a Faculty Success Center for Innovation and Teaching Excellence, instructional designers, and an accessibility expert who are all tasked with supporting excellence in our online courses. Coastline also employs a significant number part-time faculty who bring industry experience to our classes.

Gaps in online education in California

While consistently working to improve our student support, access, and retention, Coastline acknowledges that there are several gaps in online education in California Community Colleges. Specific challenges include:

- insufficient adaptation to underserved students;
- lower student success and retention rates as compared to traditional face-to-face courses;
- lack of system flexibility; and
- insufficient student support

Underserved Students

Underserved students have specific needs that are not being met by current online structures and offerings. For example, older and working students are often left behind in online education. This population faces specific challenges as online students in CCCs. Learning is seldom tied to outcomes that translate effectively into the workplace. This results from a scarcity of industry partnerships with CCC online education providers. Further, working students seldom receive appropriate recognition for their learning. Many drop out before the completion of a certificate, AA or ADT, which leads to a lack of reward for their investment of resources (time and money). Working adults also need flexible start dates as they balance professional and personal obligations with career and vocational goals. Further, online education throughout the state suffers from persistent achievement gaps. Efforts to narrow these gaps have been met with success at some leading CCCs, but, as a whole, much work remains.

Student Success and Retention

Success and retention continue to be difficult challenges for online education. According to the CCCCCO data mart (n.d.) in fall 2016, online courses show an 8 percent lower success rate than traditional face-to-face courses. Similar trends show a 5 percent gap exists between end-of-term course retention in online courses in comparison with traditional face-to-face courses. Many faculty are not prepared for the unique challenges of delivering online education. Difficulties may result from lack of technological training, support, and/or pedagogical expertise required to deliver an excellent online course.

Lack of System Flexibility

CA Community Colleges require students to navigate multiple systems to apply, enroll, acquire financial aid, verify residency, and complete online coursework. Each college has their own complex
web of systems that students must navigate in order to succeed in online courses. This distinct lack of system flexibility leads to artificial barriers for students, especially if they need to attend more than one college to achieve their goals. Further, CCC systems vary in their use and acceptance of Multiple Measures Assessments. This lack of flexibility can prove prohibitive for many students.

**Insufficient Student Support**

Counselors play a vital role in supporting online students as these courses require more self-regulation than face-to-face courses. According to a 2016 Coastline study, online learners cite time management as a key barrier to success. Counselors and advisors can support students in coping with these challenges, yet professional obligations limit working students’ ability to access services during standard 8:00am-5:00pm hours. Unfortunately, many CCCs do not offer sufficient online or virtual support options even though they offer online learning.

**Online Community College**

Coastline commends and supports the Governor’s vision of making online education more accessible, affordable, and successful for all, with a special focus on underserved populations. We also support the Chancellor’s Vision for Success as outlined in the document.

We offer the proposed structure, guiding principles, and programmatic components for expanding California Community Colleges’ capacity for using online education to fulfill the Vision for Success by creating opportunities for seamless, affordable education for all California students.

Coastline proposes that we work together to build on the successes of leading California Community College online education programs by establishing a collaborative, student-first structure, similar to our work with NCPACE. The NCPACE program is a collaboration of two and four year institutions that supports students by offering a student-first commitment. Key to this structure is a commitment to the student first, rather than an orientation away from the student due to competition with other CCCs. Our proposed collaborative structure is detailed in Coastline’s proposals below that describe how to increase access, enhance student support, and improve post-CCC outcomes.

**Increasing Access**

Increasing access requires a commitment to system agility and alignment. Specifically, a common application, common student portal, common learning management system (LMS), financial aid integration, and student data/transcript sharing would reduce the barriers students face when taking courses at multiple CCCs.

Further, we propose adopting four, six, or eight-week course schedules to create more access for those with professional and personal obligations. We have had success with this model in our Military and Corporate Education programs. Courses are offered in eight-week terms, five terms a year. Added flexibility would benefit students and provide a more personalized learning experience.
Affordability continues to be a barrier for CCC students as textbook prices increase. We must commit to using Open Educational Resources (OERs) and creating zero-cost degrees and certificates to reduce costs for students.

Another barrier to student access is lack of recognition of prior learning and experience. We recommend system-wide adoption and cross-recognition of the Multiple Measures Assessment which has shown to decrease student time-to-completion and associated costs.

Additionally, we recommend exploring the provision of credit for verified training through the military and other professional entities. Primarily, career and technical education (CTE) students may benefit from prior experience, as many entry-level courses could be challenge through competency-examinations. This strategy would also decrease the time to completion and associated cost for obtaining skills needed to obtain a higher paying position.

Enhancing Student Support

We envision shifts in advising and student support that would aid students in reaching their goals. For example, upfront advising; virtual advising and counseling services; learning communities to aid in retention; 24/7 support for students unable to use services during typical hours; and dedicated success coaches would improve student success and retention rates. Additionally, we envision faculty support through instructional designers, technological skill building, and course quality review that will create high-quality online courses.

Improving Post-CCC Outcomes

In order to improve post CCC outcomes, online education must expand industry partnerships and recognize learning as it happens. This can be accomplished by creating milestones that support career advancement such as digital badging verified by employers, stackable certificates, and competency-based education. CCCs must also expand sequencing as well as associate to bachelor’s degree programs with guaranteed transfer such as the Learning 1st program.

Conclusion

We acknowledge that these proposals would require institutional changes in practices as well as system-wide changes that would reward California Community College partnerships such as success points for all colleges who help students along the way instead of only the home institution. We remain hopeful and inspired by the Governor and Chancellor’s commitment to improve access, affordability, success, for all California students.
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Relationship to Existing Online Programs and Initiatives
Whatever form the new online college takes, it should be separate and distinct from the CCC Online Education Initiative (OEI) and traditional online programs currently offered by our colleges. Of course, it would be fully supported by OEI as are all our colleges. However, in order for it to launch successfully it should not be competitive with the CCCs, but uniquely amplify the work of the system.

Experimentation with competency-based education (CBE) and certification may be an important trajectory on which to begin. It is a genuine departure from current instructional delivery methodologies and will draw equally passionate support as it does opposition. Support will come from innovators who recognize we are already behind other institutions that have been reaching student populations who are rejecting brick and mortar, semester-based experiences. The current approach has tended to focus on adult learners and issues of convenience, but Generation Z and younger are likely to expect virtual learning given their experience as digital natives. Opposition will come from those who see threats rather than opportunities for unions, senates, and institutional bureaucracy.

The Core Mission
It will be essential to identify the specific students or programs to be served by the new online college. That question might begin to be answered by assessing the characteristics of students already being served by non-traditional providers. These characteristics might be based on program acceleration or “on-demand” instruction. Regardless, the new online college should strive to do things that have never been done before in the system. Online instruction is the best delivery method to pursue this as it is not bound by time and place.

With the educational and income inequality that exists in California, engagement in this space by CCC’s becomes an issue of equity. We can offer alternatives to high cost degrees at both nonprofit and for-profit institutions that have been particularly troublesome for students of color and have weakened public confidence in American higher education.

Organizational Structure
The plan for the new online college should consider the organizational components required for launch. These might include:

- Assessment of learning (subject matter expertise and assessment mechanisms)
  - Competency standards
- Open Educational Resources
- Virtual learning communities
- Repository of student data/portfolio material/credentials
- Decision-making/governance structure
- Financial models
Competencies and Transferability
Considering decades of input from employers, the new online college might focus on fundamental skills for employability. This might suggest developing alternative methods of certification. For example, transcripts might include specific competency certificates as well as suggested equivalencies for grades and units earned. Linking competency certification directly to existing curriculum standards described in the CCC C-ID program would respect the existing standards and assure transferability of student accomplishments. Could the new online college consider the development of a competency equivalent of the IGETC program?

In support of competency-based learning, a new online college should develop the capacity for microcredentialling. Instead of exclusively issuing students “bulk” credentials (i.e. a grade in a course, a certificate, or a degree), a new online college should adopt technology and standards that would support microcredentials to represent and validate discrete job skills or learning achievements that are specifically attractive to employers. Rapidly evolving, leading edge technologies like Blockchain could support this approach.

Partnership
Any plan for the new online college must include significant and intentional partnerships. The new college could partner with organizations like ACE for the development of certification standards. The new college could partner with “consumers” of degrees/certifications such as UC Santa Cruz, Arizona State, Western Governors University, and other progressive transfer institutions to validate transfer competencies. The new online college could partner with progressive employers to validate employability certification. Employers that might be interested in such a partnership include Amazon, Apple, Cisco, Google, and VMWare along with many others. Despite being late to the game, California could emerge as a national leader in CBE that could cross the boundaries into four-year institutions. Scaling with employers and transfer institutions would greatly enhance sustainability as well as credibility.

Adoption of Global Standards
Regardless of the specific plan for a new fully online college, this new institution should adhere to and support global standards for data interoperability and exchange. The IMS Global Learning Consortium has been well established over the last two decades. Their standards are broadly accepted and can facilitate a host of “next generation” learning models and activities. Given California’s prominent role in U.S. higher education along with its significant population, a newly formed online college that supports these global standards could help advance the state of the art in competency-based instruction nationally.

Persistent Learning Records
A new online college should consider radically transforming the process and format of credentialing. For decades, student credentials (i.e. transcripts) have been institution-centric. Essentially these credentials describe what a student has achieved exclusively at one institution. The modern model of credentialing should be student-centric. What are ALL the competencies and accomplishments a student has achieved throughout their academic pursuits regardless of where or when these accomplishments occurred. This means a new online college will need the capacity to consume and contribute to a transportable, verifiable student learning record. This is another critically important reason to adhere to global standards from the inception of this institution.
Financial Aid
In addition to current Federal financial aid programs available to non-traditional providers, there might also be opportunities to develop new financial aid channels directly from employers based on student competency certifications.

Flexible and Personalize Learning Pathways
Following is an adapted excerpt from the University of Wisconsin System website that provides an illustrative overview of the kind of online college our system could create:

What are the benefits of competency-based education?
By focusing on what a student knows rather than how much time they spend learning, competency-based education puts the student in charge of their education as never before. No longer are students confined to a rigid set of courses and semester schedules. Instead of working at an instructor’s pace, studying material students may already know, competency-based education makes it possible for students to work at their pace, studying only the things they need to learn.

The idea is especially appealing for the millions of American adults with busy schedules who already have significant knowledge or even some college credits, but no degree. Many of these adults may need a degree to become eligible for promotions or raises, but due to work and family commitments, they simply do not have time for a traditional education. These people need a more flexible option that allows them to earn a college degree on their own terms.

Following the U.S. Department of Education’s March 2013 endorsement of competency-based education, Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, said in a written statement: “This is a key step forward in expanding access to affordable higher education. We know many students and adult learners across the country need the flexibility to fit their education into their lives or work through a class on their own pace, and these competency-based programs offer those features.”

For returning adult learners, the competency-based Flexible Option aims to be:

- **Flexible.** No classes, no commutes. No set semesters or study times. The Flexible Option lets students start when they want, the first of any month, and work toward a degree online, on their own time, when and where their schedule allows.
- **Personalized.** The Flexible Option recognizes and rewards prior learning by giving students the opportunity to pass assessments using knowledge they already have. Students study only the material they need to master and never spend time or money revisiting things they already know. In addition, an Academic Success Coach will work with a student to customize their learning plan based on their specific knowledge and goals.
- **Self-paced.** Students may take assessments whenever they are ready. They can practice assessments first to make sure they are prepared. As soon as a student demonstrates mastery, they receive credit and move on, without having to wait for the next lesson or semester. Students can move quickly through material they know or take more time if they need it.
- **Supportive.** Students can receive personalized mentoring and advising from an Academic Success Coach who will help them prepare for assessments and guide
them to the learning resources they need to succeed, such as textbooks, web pages, and even free online resources offered by other universities.

- **Skills-based.** Students make progress by passing assessments that show they have mastered the skills essential for a certificate or degree — not by accumulating credit hours, either in the classroom or online.

- **Respected.** The Flexible Option builds on the System’s reputation for quality and innovation. By measuring and assessing a student’s mastery of competencies, the Flexible Option provides proof to employers that a student has the skills and knowledge a field requires.

- **Affordable.** Instead of paying by course or by credit, the Flexible Option allows students to pay a flat rate for a subscription period of their choice. If a student is highly motivated and has significant experience related to their program, they may be able to accelerate their progress and shorten their time to completion, saving time and money.
Career California: Online Community College

The Opportunity
By 2020, 65% of all jobs will require advanced education beyond high school. Nearly half of these will be middle skills jobs requiring industry-recognized credentials, associate degrees, or certificates. While the Online Education Initiative (OEI) aims to increase completion by increasing both access to and success in high quality online courses, this initiative focuses on in-demand courses within a relatively traditional academic framework. By design, the OEI Course Exchange does not offer online degrees, certificates, or industry-recognized credentials. Instead, the OEI allows students who cannot get the courses they need at their home college to enroll in equivalent courses from another college. The OEI addresses an important course-level access need in our community college system. Building on this momentum, we have the opportunity to address the need for online career education programs and pathways by creating an online college focused on career education. This online college will address a significant gap in access to high-quality online career education programs while providing non-traditional working students the flexibility they need to earn industry-recognized credentials, certificates, and degrees.

A Regional Approach
Using the existing framework of the seven regional consortia and the Strong Workforce Program, the Career California: Online Community College will target in-demand career education pathways on a regional basis. As a pilot, Los Rios Community College District, in partnership with industry stakeholders, would facilitate the development of online career education pathways within the North Far North Regional Consortium. These regional online career education pathways would:

- Enable a consortium of colleges to develop and offer online career programs which meet regional industry needs.
- Utilize a sector-based approach to allow regional online career programs to be expanded statewide based on similar labor market needs in other regions.
- Offer program portability via a statewide online career education model (P-ID as opposed to C-ID).
• Target the development of in-demand online career education programs and pathways to provide students alternatives to more costly for-profit programs.

• Emphasize employability skills, digital badging, and competency based certifications.

**Collaboration**

Recognizing that creating an online community college focused on career education is foundational to meeting California’s workforce needs, this project will be approached from a holistic and collaborative perspective. This model would include competency-based education as well as module-based, on-demand instruction such as the New World of Work online training for fundamental employability skills. Other best practices for any online college model would include: persistent learning records which contain all of the competencies and accomplishments a student has achieved regardless of institution, seamless registration across institutions, flexible start and end dates, and comprehensive online student support services.

**Career California Pathways**

**Career Ready:** Utilizing a skills-panel model and digital badging, this pathway would emphasize employer-driven essential 21st Century Skills Badging identified by New World of Work. American River College and Folsom Lake College are among the 22 California Community Colleges already participating in this project. The North Far North Reginal Consortium has dedicated funding to support New World of Work training.

**Career Now:** “Here to Career” online pathways that include complete programs for entry-level and middle-skills jobs. All programs would be aligned with industry standards and be consistent across the state with a template similar to the ADT model. Scheduling would be flexible with multiple start dates, short-term classes, and on-demand learning, offering accelerated completion to expedite students’ participation in the workforce.

**Career Advancement:** Online “skills builders” courses and course sequences targeting working adults. Skills-builders students are experienced workers who take a limited number of community college courses to maintain and add to skill-sets required for ongoing employment and career advancement. These course offerings would be industry-specific, utilizing competency-based models.
## Online Career Education

| **Online Career Education Programs** | • Identify career education programs which already have statewide industry-informed “program templates” which can be offered fully online such as Business Information Worker and Information Security.  
• Develop a P-ID collaborative workgroup similar to C-ID for online career education programs and pathways. |
| **Industry-led & Competency-based** | • Ensure that each online career education program is based on industry-recognized standards.  
• Partner with organizations such as National Network and ACE for the development of certification standards. |
| **Flexible Learning** | • Replicate the flexibility of scheduling offered by for-profit colleges.  
• Incorporate self-paced learning into online program models.  
• Offer credit for prior learning and use an assessment model to emphasize skills-based learning. |
| **Skills Builders** | • Offer online career education courses which lead directly to career advancement for incumbent workers.  
• Offer foundational online career education courses which prepare students for accelerated on-ground career education training.  
• Offer industry-specific, self-paced online modules which keep workers up to date on emerging technology and related skills. |
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FORWARD BY OEI MANAGEMENT

As we work in our fifth year of the Online Education Initiative for California Community Colleges, we have been offered the opportunity to provide input and support for the “Flexible Learning Options for Workers (FLOW)” project investigating the possibility of a fully-online college in the state. We appreciate this opportunity to help other initiatives also aimed at supporting our changing student population based on the effective use of technology and support structures.

We have asked MindWires, LLC, a market analyst and strategic consulting company, to help us write a description of OEI to help the FLOW working group. MindWires brings a wealth of experience both inside California and across the nation, leveraging their knowledge and experience working with other online initiatives. And we also benefit from their market analysis through the e-Literate blog.

Beyond the descriptions, we are fully supportive of the key recommendation in this paper that by viewing OEI as social and technology infrastructure that we could directly or indirectly help a fully-online college get off the ground quicker, serve as a conduit of innovation back to the existing 114 colleges, and enable shared lessons in the long run.

Jory Hadsell, Executive Director

On behalf of the OEI Management Team
INTRODUCTION

Two months ago, Governor Jerry Brown directed Eloy Oakley, Chancellor of the California Community College System (CCCS) to “take whatever steps are necessary” to establish a fully-online college. Subsequently Chancellor Oakley has formed a working group to develop and recommend options that enable the community colleges of California to better deliver on the student success goals outlined on pages 15-16 in the Vision for Success document recently adopted by the Board of Governors. The project has been given the name “Flexible Learning Options for Workers (FLOW)” and is being led by Van Ton-Quinlivan (Executive Vice Chancellor of Workforce and Digital Futures) and Jose Fierro (President of Cerritos College).

The purpose of this paper is to lay out and describe the California Community Colleges’ Online Education Initiative (CCC OEI) and its work to date in supporting these same goals, to inform and support the FLOW working group. There are three primary sections of this paper:

• **Background** – An overview of the OEI and its technology ecosystem, services offered, and collaborative approach to change

• **Lessons Learned** – A description of lessons learned to date, including initial research results, feedback from pilot colleges, and challenges faced

• **OEI as Social and Technology Infrastructure** – A description of OEI not as a standalone initiative but as one that provides technology and support infrastructure to help other colleges and other initiatives in the online education space

BACKGROUND OF OEI

The OEI is a collaborative effort for the CCCs to ensure that significantly more students can complete their educational goals by increasing both access to and success in high-quality online courses. While the program does provide enabling common infrastructure (such as the common course management system) and centralized support services that have benefits in and of themselves, the larger long-term benefit to the state is OEI’s ability to provide the individual campuses with the means and incentives to both
propagate teaching and student support practices to improve academic outcomes and collaborate across campuses to achieve improved efficiency.

The initial grant allocation included $16.9 million for the first year (December 2013 – June 2014), with ongoing funding of $10 million for subsequent years. Recently, this allocation was increased to $20 million annually in order to fully fund the state’s commitment to a common course management system and expanded online student services.

**Technology Ecosystem**

The OEI, since inception, has identified, procured, and made available to California’s community colleges a robust common course management system (CMS) powered by Canvas. The tool is made available to all colleges at no cost through the OEI, and now includes 108 CCCs as users of the resource secured by the initiative. The pretext of a common CMS is to pave the way for both access and equity by offering a seamless user experience across all participating CCCs, allowing students, faculty, and staff a singular online CMS environment.

### SYSTEMWIDE RESOURCES PROVIDED BY OEI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available at No Cost to All CCCs via OEI Funding</th>
<th>Available at Reduced Cost via Negotiated Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CCMS infrastructure</td>
<td>• 24/7 Online Tutoring Services*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 24/7 help desk support for students and faculty</td>
<td>• Online Student Authentication &amp; Proctoring Technology Solution*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online tutoring platform</td>
<td>• Online Plagiarism Detection Technology*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online learner readiness multimedia tutorials, including SmarterMeasure online readiness diagnostic</td>
<td>• Online Counseling Platform*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OEI course design standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embedded basic skills resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four-week training course for colleges adopting CCMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research and support strategies for serving underperforming, non-traditional and socioeconomically disadvantaged students online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items marked with an asterisk (*) are provided to Course Exchange pilot colleges at no cost.*

Through resources made available by the OEI, all 114 of California’s Community Colleges can avail of the initiative’s online support infrastructure in varying degrees. The OEI has also identified tools as online support resources – an *online education ecosystem* for the
These resources are available at no cost to the OEI’s pilot institutions, and were secured through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Funding is dedicated to ensuring resources are available to pilot institutions, and within reach of affordability for others. In addition to Canvas, resources such as Net Tutor (online tutoring) are present at 79 CCCs, Proctorio (online proctoring) at 19 CCCs, and VeriCite (online plagiarism detection) at 12 CCCs. The initiative’s online student readiness assessment, provided by SmarterServices, is made available to all 114 CCCs at no cost.

Continued investment in sustaining existing online support resources has always been an integral commitment of the OEI. The OEI sought out opportunities to expand online resources available beyond the current ecosystem by working with Distance Education Coordinators, and end users, to identify need and solutions that can continue to positively move the needle on student success as it pertains to online learning.

**Services**

A key role Canvas plays in the initiative is as a foundational tool in deploying an effective Course Exchange (CE). The CE provides a seamless pathway for students to register for online courses across pilot colleges without requiring a separate application and matriculation processes. CE courses are available to all students attending a pilot college, and will reward the student with completion credits (at the student’s home college) upon satisfying requirements for completion. During the grant period, the CE completed its initial year of operation, while the California Community Colleges Technology Center (Tech Center), housed at Butte College, continued an exhaustive development of the CE’s second iteration, CE 2.0. Development of CE 2.0 occurred concurrently with maintenance of the first iteration of CE – a commitment the Tech Center fulfilled during the grant period. Sustaining both software maintenance and development required the Tech Center to use both in-house and external expertise for the OEI’s pioneering CE project.

To support the OEI’s professional development objectives, the initiative taps on to the immense field knowledge that currently exists within the CCCs. This expertise base includes over 100 faculty from more than 40 different colleges that serve as Course Reviewers. Course Reviewers must complete a three-week online training and are approved by the ASCCC before being considered for inclusion to conduct course reviews...
for faculty interested in offering courses through the Course Exchange. Course Reviewers are thoroughly trained in best practices of online course design to support student success, as required by the OEI Course Design Rubric as well as methods for providing formative, supportive feedback to their peers. Each course in the review process is assigned a team of four reviewers: two single-blind Peer Reviewers, one single-blind accessibility reviewer (known as ACE – Accessible Course Evaluator), and one open Lead Reviewer who synthesizes the review documents and shares the feedback with the instructor.

In addition to supporting effective practices for online learning, many of these resources are being provided or facilitated by the OEI to help colleges meet the distance education program compliance requirements for students with disabilities (ADA/Section 508), accreditation requirements for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), and compliance with US Department of Education and California state regulations governing distance education.

**Collaborative Approach**

Many of OEI’s benefits to the system are by the ways in which it reduces friction for collaboration between the campuses and with CCC OEI on improving practices:

- *I now know that I can ring up any other [Distance Education] Coordinator and we’ll be speaking the same “language” regarding the use, training, and administration of the [course management system]. I’m also really looking forward to faculty being able to share ideas and resources via Commons.*
  
  - Director of Distance Education, Santa Rosa Junior College

Our Professional Development Coordinator is encouraging the creation of Pro Dev workshops in [common course management system] Canvas, such as health and wellness ("dealing with difficult people"), how to create Open Educational Resources, how to use [Student Learning Outcomes] for better teaching, and a lecture on science and its assumptions. What is developed at Butte can be instantly shared with other schools, and vice versa. I see a renaissance of Pro Dev opportunities!

  - Technology Mediated Instruction coordinator, Butte College

*We are also using the [common course management system] Canvas trainings that were written by the [CCC] OEI. We have incorporated the Introduction to Canvas with the Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning for faculty new to teaching online*
and it is part of our certification process. In addition, because a lot of faculty taking the courses and many on those of the [Distance Education] Subcommittee are not yet teaching online, they have reported that these resources are actually helping them be better teaching in their face-to-face classes as well in the way they present information and organize their materials. This is certainly an added benefit we never expected.

- Faculty Senate Curriculum Chair, College of the Desert

The last quote is particularly illustrative of similar feedback that we have heard from other programs where faculty receive training for online teaching. Many instructors have little to no formal training in teaching. To begin with, this lack of professional development experiences frequently contributes to online course failures because faculty do not know how to adopt sound pedagogical principles to the online environment, as the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) found in its June 2015 report Successful Online Courses in California’s Community Colleges:

- We define an online course as highly successful if at least 70 percent of its students earn a passing grade, and if student performance is at least as good as in traditional versions of the same course. Another key element in our definition of course success is whether students in an online course continue to do well in subsequent courses (either online or traditional) in the same subject. By all these standards, only about 11 percent of online courses in the 2013–14 academic year were highly successful.

What is it that makes a few online courses successful when most are not? We find that online course development in California’s community colleges currently depends primarily on an individual instructor who designs the course, creates the online content, and teaches the course—a paradigm we call the individual model of online course development. Some dedicated instructors have exploited the online medium to create successful online courses. Too frequently, however, the instructor simply tries to create an online version of a traditional course, taking little account of the differences in learning environments. This has been the dominant online learning model in California, and the result is a piecemeal approach that lacks consistent standards.

LESSONS LEARNED

The initiative has been investing in efforts to evaluate effective use of the infrastructure developed, and there already are preliminary results to share.

Research
Using the depth of experience of the Research and Planning Group (RP), a third-party evaluation and research firm with community college expertise, the OEI was able to determine reach and impacts during the grant period as it pertains to student success and completion rates.

The state has measures by which it can monitor the return on its investment. In the short term, growth in Course Exchange participation and demonstrated improvements in outcomes from courses that follow the Rubric are metrics that CCC OEI is providing and can continue to provide. In the longer term, it should be possible to see the effects that a scaled exchange has on efficiency and effectiveness across the system. Initial results are promising; the RP Group’s 2015-2016 OEI Enrollment, Demographics, and Outcomes Summary reports the following:

- **Overall, students enrolled in OEI courses achieved a success rate 5.5 percentage points higher than the statewide rate.**

- **OEI students between the ages of 30 and 39 had a success rate 18.0 percentage points greater than the statewide rate for this age group (87.8% compared to 69.8%).**

- **Success rate for African-American students taking OEI courses was 26.6 percentage points greater than the statewide rate for this group (80.0% compared to 53.4%).**

These results are very early and should be taken as suggestive of program potential rather than dispositive of assured long-term results. The important point for current purposes is that the state is already being provided with tools for auditing the impact of their investment. These measures will become increasingly valuable as the program scales.

**Feedback**

Feedback from OEI-participating campuses suggests that they are using the funding from the common course management system licensing subsidization to make these investments:
- Our courses are much improved. In one year we have had 75% of current online instructors are fully certified. Almost 80 additional faculty are in process of being certified. We have approved 46 online course sections and reviewed or are currently review this semester another 35-40 courses. Without the resources from OEI and @one, we could not have made this happen.
  - Faculty Senate Curriculum Chair, College of the Desert

Funding that would be used for [the common course management system] can be redirected to training for faculty who need extra help learning HOW to teach online.
  - Dean, Business, Technology, and Career Technical Education, Ohlone College

- Part of the people/resources that Coastline was able to shift, include our new Faculty Success Center, whose staff was able to create a new online course template in Canvas that helps faculty design a quality course. In addition, we were able to devote trainers to help faculty learn to use [the common course management system]. In this environment, our Academic Senate then felt comfortable mandating training for online instructors, something we never had before. I believe all this would not have happened if we had to pay for the [the common course management system] license....

So, continued state/OEI support for the...license will be critical for us to continue to train/support faculty and disseminate the use of these [OEI support] apps and support services....

One thing we were able to do, due to the free license, is pay all District faculty a stipend for the completion of [course management system] training.
  - Associate Dean, Distance Learning, Coastline Community College

Challenges Faced

The greatest challenge that OEI faces is the need for patience and flexibility, particularly with the establishment of the Course Exchange. OEI has taken a fully-collaborative approach aimed at helping any individual California Community College to improve its own online offerings rather than making new online courses the primary focus. The Course Exchange is a critical piece in OEI’s offerings, but enabling and supporting change across a system as complex and as historically autonomous in academic strategy as the CCCs takes time.

Based on MindWires experience in the field, we believe students need to be able to find the Course Exchange courses as easily as finding a corresponding course offered in-person at their local college. Most systems solve this problem by ensuring the exchange
courses are listed in the same workflow (that is, in the same course registration system) alongside traditional courses. For the OEI Course Exchange to become self-sustaining, the approach must evolve to become more creative and easy to use and easy-to-find method for students to discover the Course Exchange courses. This type of issue is non-trivial and takes time and flexibility.

A second challenge that OEI faces is navigating California regulations that historically have made it difficult for colleges to collaborate. AB637 is a major step in helping in this area - allowing for reciprocity of residency determinations and student-authorized data transfer between OEI Consortium colleges, thereby allowing students to enroll in Course Exchange sections in real-time. OEI may need additional regulatory flexibility to more fully enable inter-college collaboration.

**OEI as Social and Technology Infrastructure**

In effect, the OEI program design layers a social infrastructure on top of the technical infrastructure that has been provided by the common course management system and related technology investments. As the previously referenced PPIC report observes:

---

*Our research suggests that a more data-driven, integrated, and systematic approach is needed to improve online learning. It is critical to move away from the isolated, faculty-driven model toward a more systematic approach that supports faculty with course development and course delivery. A systematic approach better ensures quality by creating teams of experts with a range of skills that a single instructor is unlikely to have completely.*

---

The benefits of training for teaching online are often reported by faculty who receive it to have benefits that extend beyond online courses. We frequently hear from faculty in programs throughout higher education that high-quality training for teaching online improves their traditional classes as well, since some of it is simply good research-backed pedagogy, regardless of the course delivery method, to which the participants had no exposure in graduate school.

CCC OEI is already becoming a vector by which faculty learn effective teaching practices that impact not only a college’s online offerings but potentially all courses, whether or not
they are online, that are taught by faculty who are trained in the practices promoted by the program. The common course management system makes propagation of these practices easier by reducing friction that impedes this kind of collaborative work, but many of the real benefits come from the collaboration itself.

To the degree that the Course Review Process / Rubric and Course Exchange are adopted at scale by the individual campuses, they can have substantial ongoing impact system-wide efficiency. As was mentioned earlier, participation in OEI is a vector for promoting best practices for improving student outcomes with traditional as well as online courses. All faculty who design or teach courses on the exchange will be exposed to the best practices in the rubric (including practices for accessibility compliance, which enables greater equity while reducing potential legal liability).

Once the Rubric is embedded into the fabric of course design on the campuses via the Course Exchange, it can continue to function as a conduit for improvement as new research-backed practices are identified and included in the Rubric design. For example, CCC OEI recently commissioned MindWires to collect and analyze current effective practices for improving equity of outcomes in online programs. Findings from research efforts such as this one can be incorporated into future versions of the rubric and ripple out to the campuses, and some of those new discoveries may impact face-to-face as well as online courses.

**COMMENTARY ON FULLY-ONLINE COLLEGE**

The headcount for CCCs peaked in 2009 at 2.93 million students and has since dropped to the current 2.36 million level, a reduction of 19%. Across the state, colleges are looking for ways to increase, or at least slow the decrease, in overall enrollment.

What is most striking in the data, however, is the shift from older students (age 25 and above, or “adults”) to younger students (age 24 and below, or “traditional”) for the community college system, with the mix roughly reversed from 25 years ago. State leaders are right to note that the older student population is not being served well, at least if we use actual enrollment as a proxy. And the situation is getting worse, not better.
Yet based on comparison colleges, a new fully-online institution will likely take 5-10 years to get to some meaningful level of enrollment (e.g. 20,000 or above). See the following post for analysis details: http://mfeldstein.com/enrollment-implications-regarding-directive-online-community-college-california/

The California and national data argues that California needs a multi-pronged approach, relying on collaborative efforts such as OEI that seek to raise the bar for the majority of existing colleges as well as institution-level approaches such as establishing a fully-online college.

The existing infrastructure of OEI may even help a fully-online college get off the ground quicker and enable shared lessons in the long run.

Given the nature of social and technology infrastructure developed by OEI, the initiative may be able to support the new fully-online college regardless of the precise form recommended to the Governor in Fall 2017. This infrastructure support could also be bi-directional in nature, both making it easier and faster for the new college to develop its programs and services, and also providing a conduit for innovation from the new college back to the existing 114 colleges.
Some thoughts to consider for a full on-line California Community College

Background

On May 11, 2017, Governor Brown wrote a letter to Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley urging the Chancellor to create a plan to design and deploy a fully online college and submit the plan to the Governor’s office by November, 2017. In this letter, Governor Brown cites the California Community College system as being at the forefront of online education in California, with significant expansion in on-line course offerings and the use of technology in innovative ways to increase the chance of student success. As well, he cites the need to increase accessibility and affordability through this initiative.

Recommended Approach

For practical purposes, the best approach to this effort will be to have an on-line college grow out of a college that is already accredited. Ideally, a college could create a center out of FTES that it already has through on-line offerings. This center then could quickly be grown into a separate college using the already established and proven method of gaining accreditation for an additional college in a district. Advantages to this approach include (1) the ability for immediate financial aid eligibility for students, (2) the ability to simply file a major change application with the ACCJC to have the center approved, (3) the ability to quickly receive annual center status base funding of $1.1 million for the college to support the effort through current funding structures and the further ability to receive annual college base funding of $3.6 million once initial accreditation is received as a separate college, (4) the built in governance structure of an existing locally elected board, and (5) the immediate compliance with all applicable state laws and regulations for operation of the initial on-line center and eventually the on-line college.

Innovation at its Core

Selecting the best environment and the right leaders for this effort are paramount to insuring success. The district selected to lead this effort would need to demonstrate and meet a considerable number of characteristics. These prime characteristics include but are not limited to:

- A history of innovation as a core value of the district with demonstrated success in implementing innovative ideas
- Significant experience in on-line offerings that demonstrate quality and success of students
- Demonstrated ability to employ people remotely as an on-line college will most likely employ many people in locations outside the district boundaries
- Demonstrated commitment from the district’s faculty, board and administration, especially in senior leadership, to the success of the project
- Practically, it is likely that the district should be a reasonable distance from Sacramento.

Funding and other considerations

While any district with at least 1000 FTES currently generated through on-line course offerings would be able to quickly create an on-line center and receive the available $1.2 million of annual center status
funding, additional start-up funding would likely be necessary. The expenses generated with moving 1000 FTES into a center would necessarily have to follow the FTES, thereby creating a zero sum game for income and expenditures outside the additional $1.2 million generated for a new center. A local district may be able to identify additional one-time start-up funding to assist implementation of the project. This would be a bonus. However, the State should commit start-up funding to such a project, as it will be designed to serve the entire State and not just the local district’s residents. One possible source of significant, one-time start-up funding could be found in the system’s unused 2015-16 allocation from the State. If desirable, this avenue of funding should be pursued as quickly as possible so that it is not designated for other purposes or re-appropriated by the State for other purposes.

Additionally, any district that approaches this opportunity as a way to supplement its existing operational income is likely not understanding the resources necessary to ensure a successful endeavor. Any savings from the lack of operating a large physical plant (e.g., custodial, maintenance, grounds and the like) would need to be focused for the provision of additional student and faculty support resources to help ensure strong success and completion rates. As well, these savings would need to be used to provide technological solutions to issues generated through on-line education.

Finally, it is expected that some kind of apportionment sharing agreements would need to be developed for a number of significant purposes. Although many will believe that this new college will end up robbing FTES from the rest of the districts, that mindset is not necessarily correct. There are millions of California citizens with some college and no degree that are currently not attending college. The market is large enough to generate additional FTES, not simply re-distribute existing FTES. However, an innovative revenue sharing approach would be mutually beneficial. It not only could help overcome expected resistance to this change from other districts, but it also could greatly benefit students of the new on-line college. In what way? When looked at as a system, the existing centers and campuses of the 72 community college districts are in nearly every community of the State, with some rural area exceptions. A well-crafted revenue sharing agreement would take advantage of this reality and, for the sake of argument, in exchange for 10 to 15 percent of the apportionment generated through students living in the zip code area served by a district, the district would agree to allow the student to use certain of its facilities and services such as libraries, computer labs and tutoring centers. This could help increase student success.

**Conclusion**

The creation of the 114th community college in the California community college system as an on-line, state-wide college presents an unprecedented opportunity to bring together innovative best practices in on-line education from across the state and the country to improve access and opportunity for the entire state of California. It also would present an opportunity to re-think some of what we do and pull together many of our existing efforts, such as in equity, student success, and guided pathways. As well, it provides potential opportunities to look into best approaches in open source textbooks and competency based education. Like any new initiative, there is a high probably of resistance from existing systems and stakeholders around the state, especially from within the community college system itself. However, if approached from a mindset of unrelenting advocacy for student success and through a willingness to use innovative and creative practices to build a new endeavor within the many constraints of a California public community college, there is a high probability of living up to Governor
Brown’s description of our system and helping even more students achieve their educational and career goals.