Members Present: Lisa Foss, Kristian Twombly, David Sikes, Lucas Golliet, Kerry Marrer, Michele Mumm, Debra Carlson, John Eggers, Mark Springer, Bob Lessinger, Dick Andzenge, Judy Kilborn, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Susan Hubbs, Steve Hornstein, Mike Sharp

Minutes – September 5, 2013 & September 19, 2013

September 5, 2013 – Approved as corrected - Hornsby to Hornstein

September 19, 2013 – Approved

Announcements and additional agenda items:

Accessing SharePoint Site – Contact David Sikes with questions

Online Task Force Final Report – Orn Bodvarsson and Jo Ann Asquith (continued discussion)

- Content expert recommendation – concern anything that is created that way would not be the property of the person. Report makes it sound like we need to move towards a model of using the resources that are available. No intent to mandate.
  - Purpose is to have people available to help with design and content to speed up the learning curve. Early adopters will not be guided along. It is intended for later adopters who are reluctant because of their hesitation with technology and with things that are new. Not a requirement but rather available for people to use and help us develop an online development
  - Perspective we do have some capacity already to support faculty work with online but we do not have enough. We have a low participation rate. A number of faculty are not involved at all.
  - If we are going to move ahead and embrace the technology that is available, we are going to need more resources.
- Not looking at individual departments when considering the big picture. This work has to begin in departments and they have to consider what the appropriate structure is for them and then start working with their deans from that point forward.
- Concern around course load, enrollment of students, and quality of education being offered.
- Transparent process and everyone has to have a role within the department
- People should not be mandated to include as part of their PDR and PDP.
• There may be costs incurred negatively in the form of retention issues for students who are not getting what they need from an online course.
• Need for policy discussion around a need for compensation that is informed by university wide information.
• Duplication of efforts by adding a position of VP of Online.
  o Complimentary to the role of Dean of Cont. Studies
  o Academic side of online - including assessment
• Faculty involvement, administration – structure
• Funding needed in order to move the suggestions forward
• Ways to be creative and does it require additional funding or reassessment of current structures.
• This process needs a home and needs to be coordinated.
• Looked at other models including those in MnSCU. SCSU only one that has used the misc. instructional category for compensation of online courses. Others are providing incentives.
• Considered as extra or other – integrated into the footprint of what we want SCSU to be when offering online classes.
• More intentional discussion – what do we want our students to do in terms of digital literacy by the time they graduate? What makes sense for our department in terms of an online presence? Support the idea of having someone in academic affairs.
• Missing a more active focus on pedagogy.
• Students expressed concern about the pricing differential of online. They see the online offerings as a way for SCSU to gouge them.
• Assessment – presented a model that could become separate from assessment of the same course that is delivered face to face. Model needs to be integrated and comparable to face to face instruction.
• Very important that it not be separate at all but rather fully integrated with the overall design of the university.

Recommendations:

Given the financial implications of the recommendation of the Task Force that online and technology enhanced courses be integrated into the regular university structure for instruction, we recommend that multiple financial models be investigated so that an appropriate model can be selected. No objections. Motion Passes.

Motion: Judy Kilborn   Second: Lalita Subrahmanyan   No objections. Motion Passes.
Recognizing that online education incorporates a range of instructional pedagogy and the range of technology uses from face to face to full online instruction, we recommend a discussion about pedagogy starting with departments and programs and their instructional goals and online approaches.

Motion: Judy Kilborn    Second: Dick Andzenge    No objections.  Motion Passes.

Assessment of the current course work and online offerings be reviewed by departments and programs so we are consistent with HLC criteria.

Motion: Mark Springer    Second: Mike Sharp    No objections.  Motion Passes.

Meeting adjourned.