Present: Stacey Anderson, Marilyn Bejma, Cheryl Cluchey, Paula Hagstrom, Meegan Lillis, Elaine McCullough, Dave Nicol, Robbie Teahen, Spencer Tower, John Urbanick

Guest: Mary Holmes

Call to Order: 2:05 p.m.

Minutes as revised were accepted and will be posted on our website.

FUTURE MEETING TIMES

Marilyn will check team members' schedules and propose several possible meeting times to find the optimum day/time for the majority.

NEW TEAM MEMBER(S)

Robbie suggested Ron McKean and/or Larry Schult be invited to join our team as COET is not represented and we need a replacement for Ellen. This met with approval from the group, and Robbie will extend the invitation.

BAKER COLLEGE

The group discussed updated information in regard to the Baker case.

OUR CURRENT POLICIES

It is time to revisit our policies for Use of FerrisConnect and Student Authentication. John, Cheryl and Meegan reported that a thorough vetting of both Moodle and the next version of Blackboard has been done, and results have been posted on the FAB website. In a meeting of FAB with Provost Erickson, direction was given to move forward with Blackboard in the spring of 2011, and only if it does not meet our criteria, will we then look at alternates, starting with Moodle. Staffing level in IT and training dollars both played a part in the decision to go with Blackboard first, as it is our current system and received a good endorsement from faculty at the FAB meeting. Mary will be going back to the Senate to talk about this decision.

In regard to student authentication for online classes, the possibility of using webcams was mentioned. The students could be asked to sit in front on their webcams and hold up their picture ID's for facial recognition. We have a policy in place that requires students to surrender an ID if ever asked by a university official.

Robbie asked the group to review policies stated in her handout and give her any feedback by Monday, November 1.

The team took a couple of minutes to write down two-to-three pieces of advice that might engage the larger community into producing a vision for the processes of online learning:

- How does online learning fit into your college as a whole?
- What would students like to see as a vision?
- Are the work groups looking at different aspects and issues of all topics?
- Set the right format of a specific course (associate-degree level would not be a program).
- At the department level, all professors articulate what are the policy needs for the university; meet and form task forces.
- Anyone who cares about online to come to a meeting and whittle the numbers down to a task force.
- Bring in speakers about these issues and jumpstart conversations.
- Publicize and let people be a part of the process; we need to get the people who are not involved with online so that they will understand what is happening.
- What is a quality online class? How do best practices play into that?
- Does online make sense for the particular programs?
- What do we want to pursue online: expand our markets limitlessly, or degree completion and value-in for existing markets?
- What are the resource implications of any online determinations?
- Conduct a survey of getting the topics out and having the results being people under the tent by reacting to the results of such a survey.
- Bring in a speaker who is either an expert on the topic of online learning or a speaker to facilitate discussion
  - Robbie knows that Mark Merline (sp?) of MCCA is a very dynamic speaker who now is with the Gates Foundation
- What are our needs related to quality – how can we insure we have consistent quality?
- What do people think we should be doing?
- Focus Groups: Pick groups to follow-up with, composed of instructors and students who are and who are not involved in online.
- Prove they are getting what they need to get out of the course.
- Duality of opinion voiced by faculty for the qualifications to teach online; some want it measured, others object.
- Differences between face-to-face and online teaching?
- What's necessary to achieve quality in teaching online, rather than comparing online to face-to-face instruction.
- We should have informed rather than visceral discussions.
- Marketing: should be sponsored by Senate or E-MAT, not by the Provost.
- Open-space big-tent meetings, with subtopic groups formed under the main topic. Attendees will be asked to go to the topic they are interested in.
- An ongoing series, facilitated by difference people at different times, two-to-three times a week, inviting any interested in that session's topic to come.

- Survey could preview what questions should be discussed.
- Broad-based picture of what people need will be required at sometime.
- What would be the best way to spend the money that is available?
- Conduct a survey(s) in the fall, followed by a big meeting in January, with focus groups in the spring.
- An ongoing assessment will be a necessary component.
- Survey of involved, non-internet faculty and students about what questions need to be asked.
    - From that, generate what questions we are going to use
    - Now survey those three groups (possibly different individuals) to seek answers to those questions and take information to the "Big Tent."

Robbie will be meeting with Financial Aid to discuss what a timeline might look like.

OPTIONS

Mary reported that online access to a course is not available before term starts and after the term ends, but there is no option for faculty to set the availability themselves. She could add a week to the terms at the beginning and everyone will open at the same time whether or not the class shell is ready. Robbie suggested Mary get together with Spence, Meegan and Elaine regarding what the pros and cons are on this issue and how do we communicate (through FAB) that there is a change.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, November 17, 2010, 10:00 a.m. IRC 121.

Meeting adjourned 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Bejma