Attending: Cheryl Cluchey, Bill Knapp, John Urbanick, Elaine McCullough, Stacy Anderson, Spence Tower, Paula Hagstrom, Robbie Teahen, and Elise Granza.

Absent: Enid Carlson, Leonard Johnson, Ellen Haneline, Dave Nidol

Introductions
Two new faculty members joined E-MAT, replacing Rick Van Sant and adding one additional position. Spence Tower, College of Business, and Paula Hagstrom, College of Allied Health Sciences, joined the group, having been selected by the E-MAT group from a long list of interested faculty members. The group also welcomed a new Student Services representative, Elise Gramza, who works in records. Each member also shared how they were involved with online, and Robbie outlined the roles of the various online groups.

Student Fees Committee Recommendation
The group discussed the Student Fees Committee recommendation to add a fee to each online credit. The summary of that discussion is reflected in the memo that is being sent to Sally Depew, Beth Logan, and Fritz Erickson:

> At the Friday, May 14, meeting of the E-Learning Management Team, the pending recommendation concerning a fee being added to online courses was discussed. The group has both some observations as well as an alternative recommendation for you to consider:
>
> First, our recommendation: We recommend that the University "reinstate" the technology fee that reportedly formerly existed. A re-instatement, we believe, will be more palatable to prospective students and also is more easily explained, as we conclude that all of the students benefit from technology at this university. Examples include the significant renovations in classrooms to support technology; the wireless network; the extensive technology access to learning resources in FLITE; in addition to the use of the FerrisConnect platform and all of the support associated with that. FerrisConnect has more than 10,000 students being supported. I do not have an exact count at hand, but fully online enrollees at most represent 25-30% of these. Thus, the IT support, the Faculty Center Instructional Technology Support, etc. are in fact supporting the entire university's offerings, not just online students.
>
> Spreading the fee over all students would make the impact lesser, and has the capability of garnering more resources to support instruction that utilizes technology in varied ways. It is reported that the fee was formerly $50 per student per semester. Thus, a $50 fee paid by 13,500 students would generate $675,000 per semester, and close to $2 million in three semesters. Our estimate is that a $10 per credit fee (as we understand that the current conversation may suggest) would generate only $300,000. Thus, even a $25 fee per semester will generate close to $1 million. (Note these are very rounded numbers as I have not looked at head count in each semester and I recognize that the "all" students count is much lower in summer.)
>
> Of the 9 people present at this E-MAT meeting, only two supported adding an online fee at this time, and each of those two indicated that it needed to be very clear how the fee would be directly applied to supporting an additional service online students would receive that other Ferris students are not receiving, if you intend to differentiate in this way. As noted earlier, not all online courses have reduced class sizes. Further, addressing the question of appropriate class size should be resolved directly, not in this indirect way that would even suggest that the current model is the right model and we will charge students to support an agreed-upon model, because I do not believe that accurately represents a shared view.
>
> Inherent in this recommendation (above) are some of the problems we see with the current recommendation. First, as you accurately observe, it is difficult to isolate the costs for online. . . maybe impossible. . . as it has become what I believe the president has intended, an ongoing part of our ongoing delivery systems. It is immersed in the colleges, in IT, in FCTL, etc. It is not possible to

isolate each variable that contributes to support of online students vs. blended, web-enhanced, or total face-to-face classes. As one example, Scott Randle was hired to both support the FerrisConnect platform as well as Tegrity. As noted above, as many as 3/4 of FerrisConnect users are not online students. Further, he supports Tegrity. Although used with some online instruction, Tegrity is in fact used more in the face-to-face classroom.

We believe a technology fee, especially reinstatement of one, is much easier to explain and defend. One of our faculty members, from Business, also notes that the University will need to craft its marketing strategy for this new fee. That was one of the reasons that most who expressed the view that they did not believe this was the right way to go at this time, because people have already enrolled for fall. They are not saying that at a future date this might not be an option, if there is a clear added benefit that we will provide as a result of charging this fee that other students do not get. We do not feel that the class size issue, although real, should be resolved in this manner.

The clear message from the group is that we need to know the purpose of the fee before we will feel comfortable with its being added. Likewise, it is felt that there is insufficient information upon which the student fees committee recommendation was based. Spence asked about how this would position the university with reference to our competitors. Cheryl was asked to bring that information back to the next meeting. Spence noted the importance of a marketing strategy for introducing this new fee, if it is added.

Update on Budget Priorities
Robbie shared with the group that at present money is not available to fund the two highest priorities identified by the group – a backup e-learning administrator and Tegrity. We continue to search for resources and the suggestion was made that if an online fee is charged, this might be one use. However, as the above discussion suggests, neither of these is exclusively related to online.

Guidelines for Distance Learning from the HLC
Attendees had not all had time to review the standards and provide their perception on the check list. Thus, all have been asked to submit their evaluation of our status with regard to each by the end of next week and this will form the basis of future discussions as well as priority setting. It was noted that in the perceptions of those who had rated in advance of the meeting, there is a belief that the University does not have sufficient mechanisms in place to assure quality. The difference in the cultures of colleges/programs was noted, as the College of Allied Health Sciences faculty share courses and work collaboratively and some in Languages and Literature, in contrast, do not want anyone to see their courses. The sentiment was expressed that it will be important to move toward the ability to encourage this sharing and perhaps the use of a neutral person, possibly through the Quality Matters evaluators. The suggestion was also made that we see if newer faculty (3-4 years) are more open to sharing, collaborating, and/or mentoring – perhaps through a survey. In addition, the opinion was expressed that until faculty are able to see what highest-quality online courses look like, they cannot know how theirs compare. One outcome of the spring pilot Quality Matters project is to make some of these examples available.

Enrollments
Cheryl reported that there are still 91 students on the wait list. About 40 want the popular culture course, HUMN 240. Robbie agreed to follow up with the Provost and the College about getting one of these courses offered. At this date, enrollments are 16% ahead of last year at final count. Fall still has 208 on the wait list but about half of these will be taken care of with additional offerings in AHS. Off-campus enrollments are running 40% ahead of last year. Cheryl noted that more students are reporting that they have "got to work," both on-campus and off-campus. A meeting held earlier with the Provost, CAHS, AHS, and CPTS resulted in a directive to supply the number of courses that students need and to get them in place early enough to assure students' access. That agreement has resulted in the availability of many additional sections this summer.

Next Meetings
The July meeting will be extended to 8:30 – 12:30 with lunch with a goal of working on developing new strategies for the future development of online. The June meeting will focus on the Checklist begun today.

Reported by Robbie Teahen