Present: Robbie Teahen, Cheryl Cluchey, Ellen Haneline, Elaine McCullough, Bill Knapp, John Urbanick

Absent: Enid Carlson, Kristen Salomonson, Leonard Johnson, Dave Nicol, Stacy Anderson

Debrief of the "Big Tent" Meeting:

Attendees were asked to provide reactions to the all-groups, "big-tent," meeting.   Among the observations were these:

- People seem to want to know "what we want to be when we grow up." There remains an interest in a vision for Ferris' online programming. It is also thought that a major component of this is "how large does the university want to grow its enrollment in online? How does this relate to the site-based enrollments?"
- A broad spectrum of people participated . . .pleased to see how many attended who are not on any of the committees
- About 2/3 of the concerns related to quality; rest were on student issues and a couple on planning
- Concern that online enrollments are driving us, and that we are not driving online
- Many question how quality is being assured
- Concerns expressed about preparedness of instructors. Reviewing design is not very effective – like inspecting a car at the end of an assembly line in contrast to the Toyota model where every step is checked to build quality in.
- More investment in faculty preparedness, such as the online certification process, may be desired. Others asked whether this is what will make the difference. Some asked, how do we encourage faculty to seek it?
- Need more people in the course and certification review process.
- In other survey data, a common student theme is that faculty are not prepared
- Any reforms must be from the bottom up – communicating among departments; getting departments more interested. Need to personalize what they do at the local level. It can be more related to a field of study and how to deliver that content. Grass roots efforts need to take place within a university framework.
- Some have not thought through how best to adapt instruction to different pedagogy.

Discussion
- Concern about too many committees. Some suggested combining FAB and AOTF, but there was a belief among some that these functions are much more discrete. Another idea was one large committee with several small task groups. Another was to have E-MAT serve as an umbrella with subgroups. Overall, the group recognizes that communication must be enhanced and this can best initially be facilitated by assuring that there is overlapping membership without unnecessary redundancy AND more regular communications from all groups.
- Mention of a need for policies but uncertain about which are most needed; thought is that class size, use of FerrisConnect, timeliness of responses; training of faculty are among some that were mentioned.

- Concern was expressed about limiting the software that can be used since it is completely the opposite of the industry direction, where lots of open source software is used. Perhaps we should simply indicate what the University will support but not discourage the use of other software products.
- We need to hear from legal counsel about the "vulnerability" or risk factors when instructors are not in a Ferris approved "classroom environment." At a future meeting, we will invite a representative from General Counsel to address this question. Feeling of some is, "how can we use these things safely?" "Maybe the greater issue is not policy—but education."
- What measures of quality will we use? There was strong agreement that the best measures of quality are NOT enrollments, grades, or satisfaction but rather comparative learning outcomes. Departments need to be encouraged to look at student learning outcomes in various delivery modes. TracDat may be helpful in tracking this information. This advice and ideas for ways to accomplish this will be shared with Chairs' Council.

Action Steps

1. We will ask for time on the July Chairs' Council meeting to encourage departments to take on leadership for building in quality at that level in ways that best meet the needs of the department. Particularly, Bill Knapp and Elaine McCullough will share ideas of how this can happen so that it is not imposed from the outside.
2. Continue to have the "big-tent" meeting – with a goal of having the next one in early November, after groups have had time to meet.
3. Robbie will convene a meeting of the chairs of each of the online groups so we can assure that the varied and priority agendas are each addressed.
4. Efforts will be led by Bill Knapp and/or the FCTL to develop additional instructional design capacity at the College levels through some vehicle(s). Ideas considered are sending some individuals to design workshops; providing workshops on campus for college "mentors," working through FAB, hiring instructional design assistance, etc. A plan will be forthcoming with a goal of having some training available not later than August. It was recognized that we cannot build designers with short workshops but we can enhance design capacity.
5. Recommend that instructors utilize back-up systems that they communicate in advance to be used when there are planned or unplanned outages. Examples provided were that both Doug Haneline and Elaine have backup systems in place – either bymail or Facebook in these cases-- for a communication vehicle.
6. Future meetings will provide a more definitive plan, because despite goals and some objectives, detailed plans do not exist at the University level nor do we have the required plans from the Colleges, as provided in the adopted goals. Robbie will follow up with the Colleges to get their plans once E-MAT has more discrete items to share– yet this summer.
7. Developing a vision will be revisited.

Reported by Roberta Teahen

C:\EMAT_Minutes_5-15-09.docx