Present: Marilyn Bejma, Cheryl Cluchey, Teresa Cook, Paula Hagstrom, Meegan Lillis, Elaine McCullough, Emily Mitchell, David Nicol, Larry Schult, Robbie Teahen and Spencer Tower

Call to Order: 9:40 am

Further discussion of our draft Implementation Plan for Online Learning continued:

STUDENT CAPABILITIES

Emily Mitchell has created numerous tutorials for students that could be useful in testing student competencies if the tutorials can be tied into FerrisConnect. It is possible through Captivate to create quizzes and e-mail them or possibly hook them up to Blackboard, Blackboard being the preferred option. Faculty would have to click on the Score tab to see if a student has completed the tutorial.

A prerequisite in Banner could display when a student has successfully completed the test, so that taking it only one time would be sufficient, rather than retaking it for every online course registration.

Another place to have the quiz would be on our Ferris website, so that potential students could take it before enrollment.

Student workers in Technical Communications could be consulted and used as a pilot test group.

Emily agreed to work on setting this up, along with Meegan and Spence. Sandy Balkema along with a student worker will also be consulted.

FACULTY SUPPORT

Robbie reported that the proposed requirement to use FerrisConnect as the sole portal university-wide was passed by the Academic Senate this week.

We agree that online and in-seat courses should be assessed on a continuing basis. All faculty are expected to be engaged in improvement efforts, and QM is a part of this.

Add the words "online programs" after "Ongoing review of" in the sixth recommendation.

Regarding greater collaboration throughout university faculty:

- If several people teach the same course, they should collaborate and use best practices
- Make sure the objectives of each course are met
- There exist online-user groups in both Allied Health Sciences and Arts & Sciences, Lang & Lit department
- Our intent is to engage collaboration university wide at the department level, with faculty spearheading and department heads supporting such groups
- Department meetings should be seen as an opportunity for such engagement, with at least 5 minutes devoted to review of what's working or not for students

- Examples of really good courses, taped by Bea Griffith-Cooper, will be shown at department meetings in Lang & Lit
- FCTL is available to speak to user-group meetings if invited

We have a contract with students to teach the course outline, separate from the outcome, regardless of the methodology.

Should we promote new technologies? We could add a *caveat* to any recommendation: "with the understanding that student capabilities may be limited" – move this last recommendation to the Administrative Support category

It is useful for faculty to check out the latest products to see what they can use, rather than reinventing the wheel.

PLANNING

We officially recommend to move forward with online learning within the financial restraints of the university.

- The University must acknowledge that there is a finite pool of resources
- Set class sizes appropriate to the topic, within financial realities
- Make this Planning section the primary section of our Implementation Plan document
- Any reallocation of resources must take financial restraints into consideration
- Even in a boundaryless environment, do we have the capacity to compete with a sufficient distinctiveness?
- The desire for online courses by students is a huge growth factor
- We should make informed decisions toward evolution, not do something just because it's out there
- Increase class sizes in incremental stages, allowing time to acclimate to each before moving on to the next stage
- Raising class size by a substantial amount will not be realistic; we should use a percentage increase until we are more comfortable teaching online
- Quality controls are a complete necessity
- Courses that meet 3-4 times per week are not conducive to students who are working; more and more, we have fewer traditional students. It may be time to revisit this instructional issue.
- Look at the whole spectrum of courses, and see what doesn't generate demand and what does.
- What we give up cannot be more financially viable than what we go for

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Proposed Recommendations:

- Any course prefix that has had two or more consecutive semesters with 20% decrease should have an assessment to see how to improve enrollment
- Work toward aligning performance expectations, regardless of how the class is delivered. Outcomes should be the same, and students should be expected to perform as well in both forums.
- The Academic Core Review Team recommendation is that CPTS would be the "umbrella" to administer the online program; course choices would be made by the colleges

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

We should include the actual statement and percentages of agreement from our E-MAT Survey in our Implementation Plan recommendations.

Possible question for APR: Are delivery methods appropriate to market trends, especially fully online classes?

What if a course that was supposed to be face to face is consolidated into online? Currently, the face-to-face instructor is required to teach the course online, and it's inappropriate to put someone in who is not capable of teaching the course.

There are 2,700 students taking at least one fully online course this fall (1 in 7 students).

An invitation has been extended to our E-MAT group to meet with the Higher Learning Commission during their on-site visit April 18-20. Please revisit our history and be willing to talk about how far we have progressed. Our emphasis is on quality online learning, and we have heightened this awareness on campus. The HLC team will invite feedback.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, April 21, 2011 – 10:30 – noon in CSS 302

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Bejma