

**DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
Minutes of the February 17, 2011 Meeting

**Attendees:** Betty Evans, Neal Callahan, Art Spisak, Jeff Morrissey, Gary Rader, Deanne Camp, John Bourhis, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Steve Robinette, Pam Trewatha, Rose Utley, David White      **Absent:** Rachelle Darabi, Bill Piston

**1) Evaluation Incentives vs. Requirements**

No general consensus, but discussion included:

- Ways to encourage students to fill out the surveys, questions for thought and options.
- Whether there is any solid evidence of benefits for requiring evals be completed (withhold grades)?
- What is best? Requiring vs. voluntary, privacy, legal implications, incentive/award for completion vs. punitive action? Honor system, extra credit, ease of use, etc.
- Does requirement diminish quality of results, increase response, etc. SoTL consideration – some faculty resist giving extra credit, but with extra credit survey completion rates can make it to about 86%.
- Pilot of Evaluation Kit in next few weeks. First for online courses only, potential for all-campus use because system is robust, though costs are based on quantities purchased and could be prohibitive for unlimited use at \$12K. Will percentages/results be negatively affected if students must go to a special site to input?
- Having a choice to opt out or not fill out survey would lessen legal consideration and would also allow grades to be provided rather than repercussions from withholding grades. Reduce paperwork associated with giving incomplete grades.
- Utilizing a mid-term eval tends to increase rates, students tend to be more invested and suggestions can be incorporated in second term of class. Relevance.
- MSU is piloting “Evaluation Kit” for online courses in next month. Completion is tracked with Login ID, but no comments are traceable to the ID.
- Suggestions:
  - Go to General Council/Penny Groves (Clif Smart) for legal concerns and options
  - Rose to follow up with General Council and join DEC subcommittee on student survey

**2) Certification of online faculty – ALC Update**

Certification for online faculty was approved! Rachelle to streamline the document, then will announce. IDs will assist in creating handouts to discuss the flexibility of the program using ‘circuits’ or ‘tracks’ based on experience. 1<sup>st</sup> rollout 80% online, next rollout 100% online (?). Receiving development stipend would require ID integration, and for no stipend – still voluntary, but will be encouraged to utilize IDs. Not intended to stop anyone from developing, but to place intrinsic VALUE on receiving the certification for curriculum vitae/status, etc. With increased program organization, faculty can more fully trust system for payment accountability and DEC seen as strong support.

Questions: How to work with Per Course, off site faculty? How to determine level of experience? Would Department Heads query this?

**3) Instructor Drop Policy – online courses**

Consensus: Adopt current policy and modify to best fit online scenario, so in essence only one policy.

Questions: 1) Is there a way to be officially notified of actual drops? Streamlining and gaining information faster would allow wait list to be best utilized and no loss of enrollments. Is there a way to also remove their names from BB?

- 1) ‘Triggers’ can be sent via Banner and can potentially be automated through email system. Jeff Morrissey will be looking into this.
- 2) BB 9 auto-populates names, so should also be able to remove them.

A **HANDOUT** will be forwarded (send also to David White). If approved by all then Art will share with Provost.

**4) Eduventures Report**

Coordinating boards for Higher Education in every state have different standards for DE providers to report their activities in said state. Will require due diligence to keep in standing with Federal requirements. The thought is

that the DE division will work with each state's coordinating board to ensure that MSU DE programs meet requirements. Arkansas has the largest MSU student count and has the strictest requirements. Gary reaching out to Clif Smart to determine best approach to multiple states, potential language for letters, etc.

#### **5) Title III Grant Update – Grant Proposal Development Meeting February 23<sup>rd</sup>**

To maximize the University's chances of receiving a Title III grant award, the president has approved and provided funding for an external grant writing consultant to assist in the development of the University's 2011 - Title III grant proposal.

On February 23<sup>rd</sup>, grant writing consultant, Mike Gaudette, will be on campus to host a series of planning meetings to gather information he needs to assist us in developing a 2011 - Title III grant proposal. The facilitated Title III planning meeting is a crucial element of the development of a competitive Title III grant proposal.

Key components and/or benefits of the grant proposal include but are not limited to:

- Syncing key initiatives of the University's next five year plan with the five year grant period.
- Infusing indirect funding into the provision of tools, infrastructure, and support services.
- Enhancing instructional technologies and the associated support services.
- Incorporating Distance Education Committee (DEC) initiatives, focused on the development of online and blended course offerings:
  - Capitalize on the broadband expansion initiative funded by the NTIA grant provided to the State of Missouri to develop a State Broadband Technology Expansion Plan.
  - Correlation of recruiting and marketing efforts with targeted areas of broadband expansion to increase student enrollment.
- Funding of networking infrastructure and bandwidth expansions to support instructional technologies, and the increasing number of online and blended course offerings.
- Expanding professional development opportunities offered by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning to enhance faculty skills in utilizing instructional technologies, and online techniques to enhance student learning.

On February 23<sup>rd</sup> the effort will be to:

1. Identify the highest priorities for the project
2. Develop themes for the project (all projects typically have three or four separate "threads" that link project activities together)
3. Discuss project management, identify a Project Director, Activity Director(s), and the appropriate skill mix for them
4. Discuss specific strategies to implement the project
5. Draft a rough budget to assure resources are adequate to accomplish the project activities
6. Develop a strategy to engage the campus community in the Title III planning process
7. Identify strengths of academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability
8. Identify weaknesses of academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability
9. Draft Major Problem statements for academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability
10. Discuss appropriate objectives for project outcomes and strategies for evaluation

#### **New Business:**

Mention made that the DEC should send out a communication to faculty in each college to update them with the highlights of the DEC topics and accomplishments. Suggested distribution: 1-2 times per year as a 'redundant' communication to give brief, to the point update including the Website address for more details.

DEC Membership – standing or termed? Faculty termed, others standing. Faculty from each college may rotate. NEED CNAS representative since Ag no longer part of CNAS.

Minutes submitted by:

**Teresa Arnette**

*Administrative Assistant II*

*MSU Online*