



AGENDA
Distributed Learning Council (DLC)
September 20, 2010

Members Present: Kathy Austin, Matt Baker, Hansel Burley, James Bush, Cliff Fedler, Don Collier, Mary Fehr, Sarah Foley, Steven Frazee, Karissa Greathouse, Melanie Hart, Sherry Herzog, Bob Hickerson, James Hoffman, Patrick Hughes, John Kobza, Julie Martenson, Michele Moskos, Amy Murphy, Carla Myers, Valerie Paton, Jean Scott, Vickie Sutton, Kimberly Vardeman, Vicki West, and Kent Wilkinson

Members Excused: Ariel Fernandez, Isis Leslie, and Melinda Mitchell

Guests: Richard Novak

Dr. Baker welcomed everyone to the DLC Meeting. Dr. Baker introduced our guest, Dr. Richard Novak, Associate Vice President for Continuous Education and Distance Learning, Rutgers University Division of Continuing Studies. The DLC members introduced themselves to Dr. Novak.

Action Items

1. Approval of August 16, 2010 Minutes – Matt Baker

Kent Wilkinson moved and Mary Fehr seconded to accept the minutes with revisions as noted by Dr. Baker. Kimberly Wagner will make corrections to minutes and post to the DLC BlackBoard site. Minutes approved.

Dr. Baker reminded everyone that the DLC has a BlackBoard site. All new DLC members have been provided access and directions via email and can access the site at www.blackboard.ttu.edu.

Information Items

2. DLC Membership – Matt Baker

Dr. Baker welcomed our new DLC Members:

- James Bush – College of Visual & Performing Arts
- Cliff Fedler – Graduate School
- Melanie Hart – College of Arts & Sciences
- Don Collier – Faculty Senate (Ex-Officio)

Dr. Baker mentioned that we still have a vacant seat that needs to be filled by the College of Architecture. He hopes to have a new member soon.

3. Online Learning Guide – Michele Moskos

Michele Moskos provided the DLC members with the new handout/card for the Online Learning Guide. The Online Learning Guide was created in order to answer questions and provide an excellent resource for students returning to school. The Online Learning Guide can be downloaded at www.de.ttu.edu.

Moskos noted that the Office of the CIO will be placing this link on TTU's main website page. Moskos asked the DLC members to kindly handout the information card to any students interested in online learning.

Baker thanked Moskos for the fine job that Marketing did with the Online Learning Guide.

Discussion Items

4. Distributed Learning Program Review – Dr. Richard Novak

Baker shared with the members of the DLC, that University College has asked Dr. Richard Novak to conduct a review of TTU's distributed learning programs, infrastructure, and support services in order to answer the following questions:

- Is TTU offering the right types of degree programs through distributed learning relative to peer institutions?
- What are the key centralized services needed to support distributed learning, i.e. IT, marketing, student services, instructional design support?
- What gaps exist in programming and services?
- How can TTU optimize its current distributed learning model of decentralized (academic programs)/centralized (support structure) for future program expansion? What other models should be considered? Should public/private partnerships be established to grow our enrollments?
- How can University College support system-wide programming and growth?
- What strategies could be utilized to make our programming most cost effective and efficient?

Baker explained that experts from across the nation were asked to nominate recommended consultants for this review. The consultant short-list was then presented to Provost Bob Smith who prioritized the list based upon expertise and institutional reputation. Dr. Richard Novak was chosen on the basis of his international reputation for developing and growing distributed learning at Rutgers University. Dr. Novak directs Rutgers Online, the centralized home for online instruction, with enrollments of over 4,000 students each semester in fully online courses and over 35,000 students annually in web-enhanced courses. Dr. Novak is responsible for executive leadership and policy recommendations for a complex system of continuing education units, distance learning, and off-campus facilities.

Baker welcomed Novak and thanked the DLC members for this opportunity to discuss our distributed learning programs and to share with Dr. Novak specifics regarding their respective colleges.

Novak addressed the DLC and shared with them that Rutgers, located in New Jersey, is a land grant institution. Rutgers University, Division of Continuing Studies, offers face to face courses as well as satellite centers. Rutgers has received multiple reductions in state revenue and therefore has been charged to create new revenue streams. Novak noted that they have been able to create new revenue streams through online learning and summer programs. Rutgers version of RCM is called "All Funds Budgeting". Rutgers has been offering distance learning courses since 1997. Although Rutgers used to offer more video conferencing, they are now moving toward online and decentralized centers. Novak noted that Rutgers and TTU has many parallels as we move to be a Tier-One institution.

Novak asked the DLC members to share their perceptions, perspectives, recommendations, and challenges for their respective colleges. The following questions and/or comments were discussed:

- How are off-campus sites perceived at Rutgers? What role do they play?

- Novak responded that Rutgers has partnered with local community colleges in order to leverage their facilities, as well as create political good will. Every off-campus site is chosen and driven by having an active community college partner. Since Rutgers, like TTU, receives funding tied to on-campus courses, rather than off-campus courses, they have a revenue share model in order to make the off-campus initiatives attractive to the various community colleges. Rutgers Continuing Studies Division handles the administrative issues, registration of students, and tuition revenue distribution which allows the Rutgers academic departments to simply provide the courses. Novak noted that from a traditional on-campus perspective, Rutgers views off-campus sites with mixed feelings, and in years past, with great suspicion. However, recent data with regard to learning outcomes for on-campus and off-campus students has shown that off-campus students' outcomes have met, and in some cases exceeded, on-campus students. Novak noted that perceptions of off-campus offerings have changed over time.
- Would it be prudent to have a TTU campus in Washington, DC?
 - Novak responded that since TTU has the technology to connect individuals from any site, this would be an intriguing, interesting and novel idea. Novak stated that perceived value is very important to consider. If Texas Tech were to pursue something like this, Novak recommended that we consider the type of program, local tie-back, and pricing. He recommended premium pricing, which may run counter to traditional higher education thinking, since premium pricing most often denotes value. In the Washington, DC market, there is much competition.
- TTU is striving for a more diverse student population. How does Rutgers compare with TTU in this area?
 - Novak responded that Rutgers is situated in one of the most diverse populations of the country. However, there is an intentional plan with regard to diversity on campus. Discussion followed that included:
 - Diverse students and distance education
 - Digital divide
 - Hispanic learners and on-line education
- Novak asked for the DLC members' perception of TTU's online and off-campus programs.
 - DLC members responded as follows:
 - How to manage distance education, accounting issues, and distance sections was discussed.
 - There is strong support regarding the maintenance of the programs.
 - With regard to distance education and working with other universities, i.e. Texas A&M, there are some challenges in dealing with the different graduate schools in acquiring each universities seal on diplomas.
 - DLC members have some mixed perceptions. As an institution, we have not assigned an institutional delivery model. The colleges are not consistent in their handling of distance education.
 - There is not a clear model of resources and how it should be handled.
 - Some colleges have a perception of fear, while others have a perception of empowerment. Rather than answering a perception question, we need to address more fundamental issues regarding technology, funding, and support.
 - Some faculty choose to work in silence and try to figure out distance education on their own which results, at times, in a feeling that they are not supported when it comes to distance education.
 - Novak responded that all of the above comments describe a typical university. In order to truly understand distance education you have to see a bigger picture and the type of institutions that succeed.

- The DLC asked Novak to address how Rutgers prepares their faculty to teach online.
 - Novak responded that it varies from school to school. Although they cannot mandate anything, they can suggest some specific training. Rutgers offers some chalk and talk, reviews distance education models, provides a three (3) hour lab session to assist faculty in building their course, and short “how to” videos. Respecting the diversity of learners, Rutgers also provides manuals, webinars, and an annual university wide conference. The annual conference exceeded their expectations with an attendance of 180. The conference proved to be a very powerful experience as it affirmed that distance education was a priority to Rutgers.
 - Novak noted that Rutgers’ hybrid grant program is the only exception to mandatory training. First, they developed an institutional definition of hybrid as follows: ½ classroom, ½ distance education which includes feedback and is tied to the face to face course. Faculty are required to attend training and subsequently provided with a grant to develop a hybrid course. The courses developed had to meet the model in order to receive grant funding. In this instance, no one complained about the required training and the program was very successful.
- How does Rutgers handle the issue of additional compensation?
 - Novak responded that the vision that Rutgers has for faculty incentives requires that before a fully online course is developed, it requires a negotiated faculty agreement which includes 1) compensation, 2) copyright clearance, 3) intellectual property - who owns it, and 4) intellectual property - specifics as to how a course can be utilized. 1/3 to 1/2 of Rutgers courses have an agreement. Rutgers is in the process of working with legal counsel to simplify their individual negotiated agreements to comprise of a form with check boxes that can be completed in just a few minutes. At present, they are paying faculty between \$3,000.00 - \$5,000.00 to develop a course. However, 98% of their faculty are using release time to develop a course rather than receiving compensation. Approximately 40% of Rutgers’ online courses have been developed by adjuncts and 35 – 40% of their courses are taught by adjuncts. Novak stated that a typical faculty load for Rutgers is 2/2. Rutgers is a highly unionized environment and Novak is currently in negotiations for winter and summer faculty and instructors.
- How does Rutgers fund their distance education courses?
 - Novak responded that every activity at the university pays an overhead which can vary. If a particular school is offering an on-campus course, they would pay 45%, but if that same course is offered online, they would only pay 15%. Rutgers has varying rates. Rutgers cannot be compared with TTU in this area. Direct funding is derived from students paying an off-campus fee and Rutgers is looking at standardizing their online and off-campus courses in order to pay for the infrastructure of offering these courses.

Baker thanked Novak for coming and sharing with the members of the DLC. There being no further business to come before the DLC, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.