

MINUTES - DRAFT
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
QUALITY WORK GROUP
MEETING VIA CONFERENCE CALL
March 12, 2015

1. Call to Order

Dr. Felton convened the meeting at 9:30 am on March 12, 2015 with the following members present: Franzetta D. Fritz, FAMU; Robert Seniors, FAMU; Dr. Gary Perry, Provost-FAU; Harrison DuBosar, Student-FSU; Victoria Brown, FAU; Dr. Sally McRorie, Provost-FSU; Dr. Marcella David, Provost-FAMU. A quorum was established. Other attendees were: Susann Rudasill, Director of Distance Learning, FSU; Susan Clemmons, Associate Dean, FIU

2. Opening Statement

Dr. Felton reported the Online Task Force had a 35 minute conference call two weeks ago. Dr. Felton and Dr. Perry reported about the conference call. The Taskforce will meet again next Wednesday face to face in conjunction with the FLBOG meeting at FAMU from 9AM till 12PM. Dr. Felton informed the Quality Workgroup President Hitt is expecting a potential 45 min summary by each of the sub groups regarding Quality, Access and Affordability.

Dr. Felton had a few administrative updates: Associate Vice Chancellor McKee unable to make today's meeting; and wanted to know when the Quality workgroup would like to report out next Wednesday? President Hitt is expected to discuss at our Wednesday meeting that our work group papers be ready by the end of June. This would allow the FL BOG writer to have the common information ready by July.

3. Discussion

Dr. Felton asked the committee to identify the issues of Quality: How do we define Quality? How do we ensure Quality?

Dr. Gary Perry conferred that identifying the definition of quality includes the complete online courses/programs, student support and what will we be looking for in this definition. Dr. Perry expressed questions to the group: How does one design an online course? What will our approach be to hire instructional designers to work with faculty, delivering courses and the follow up? Support the technical portion of the delivery of the courses. We need a work plan to get this completed and suggested to meet next Wednesday.

Dr. Felton supports everyone examines the quality piece. The access and affordability seem straight forward. The quality has many layers to go through. Design of the course vs. the strategies needed for proper instruction; The Quality Matters Rubrics often only looks at the design of the course. We will need to investigate further the design of the course vs. the actual quality of the instructional strategies. Dr. Felton says that in the larger group he will lead off and solicit other ideas from the Taskforce Members to provide us further strategic direction.

Dr. Marcella David, Provost, explained her experience with Online Education. We want to have as much flexibility built in as possible. We have to consider all of the following: those who have already obtained degrees doing professional training; high school students; adult learners and students interested in a topic; Dr. David hesitant to have a rigid set of standards not flexible enough to respond to other kinds of environments.

Question: Related to Accreditation Beyond regional accreditation, there could be inconsistency to be too rigid standards and we wouldn't want that. Also, prefers not to have a requirement for an instructional designer – may price people out; or force people into products that are not the best products or products that come with instructional designer; Possible consultants; and course designers to help with the components in our courses in a checklist similar to the power point. Still up to the faculty member. Not every institution will have a design staff. We need to be flexible.

Victoria Brown states that if you are looking for a measurement for quality – look at the same measurement as on campus courses. A statewide measurement– graduation rates, retention rates just as important online as they are on campus. Posed the question: “Ultimately what is the purpose of Quality?”

Dr. Felton referred to the PowerPoint attached and invited Susan Clemmons to provide an explanation and share with the Workgroup.

Susan shared an idea that her team at FIU is currently working on to define the word “quality.” They wanted to make it clear for faculty and are establishing an Opt in motivation or incentive program to improve quality. Susan noted that this can generate enthusiasm. The units also give them compensation as well. Could take at a higher level – a unit, a college or even the institution. Looking at a state perspective. Opt In Quality standard – that faculty can use to build their courses. And then at the end, if faculty want to go through a peer and student review, a process potentially at the University and Chancellor Level they could be recognized for their outstanding contribution to the online sector. 75% of requirements are based on QM standard. 25% based on activity level content you want to see in an online setting. Slide one – talks about process (see attached). Institutions can opt in. Motivation factor. The system generates the standard. Generates a tremendous amount of enthusiasm. The 2nd slide – DRAFT as Gold Standard. Objectives and measurements to achieve the level.

Dr. Felton asked: How should we define the standard?

Victoria Brown asked in regards to looking at sharing QM between institutions- how can we look at quality courses online and can we build this into policy? A way to motivate faculty: 1) Building it into their peer review process 2) having that award come back to the state to add to their portfolio. The challenge is do you set a standard or not? FIU – Our opt in works. If there is no standard then it’s not as clear. Should have a public rubric to make it to the state level and how we state it will make a difference.

Dr. Perry agrees that this is a good idea to deliver quality and to motivate faculty. Start with the list we have here and it may be able to work the list backwards

Dr. Felton communicated that the supporting documentation will be sent out for review. We need to review what each institution is evaluating. Most of us have them. Dr. Felton agreed to use that as an Action Plan to bring together the Institutions Rubrics. What we are valuing Face to face should carry to online – graduation and retention rates, etc. We can learn from QM and aim for a higher standard. Can you pull data to look at quality that we could mine? The consensus of the group noted this is unlikely and limitation of QM. A subscribed member to the QM and my assumption is that they take courses through the current system.

Harrison DuBosar provided the student perspective. He found the master/graduate portions classes to be of higher quality. One thing that he pointed out that was needed was more open communication between the student and professor. No direct communication with instructor. Teacher communication is often lacking.

Dr. Perry questioned if there is any commonality or predictive parameters?

Harrison: At the end of the classes the surveys are given and these are very voluntary. A lot of student input gets lost because students cannot be forced to take the surveys. The students that usually respond to surveys are the ones that do really well or really bad. Is there a better way to collect that data? Dr. Felton shared that FGCU is looking at quality and a survey was distributed at FGCU to all faculty and students. He asked the group what they felt about a larger concept for surveys. He suggested that they ask the BOG staff to assist in the creation of the other survey. Create a culture of quality. Is that something we would like the BOG staff to help with what they have done with the other

surveys and get a statewide perspective?

Dr. Victoria Brown is working on a research study at FAU and looking at elements of Quality Matters from the faculty such as: faculty perspective, course instruction, and student perspective. They will be comparing that with the courses and Black board analytics – looking to see what classes their students are interested in. Some of the objectives in course design, we don't know. If we could look at the elements like Blackboard and Canvas to help guide our conversation. She suggests that we make sure what we are really asking for is quality.

Dr. Marcella David raised that this is an opportunity to ask for information, it could be from designer, prospective view, faculty member, review what they have done in the class, as to classroom discussion using the virtual tools. How much time was spent using the virtual tools? We need to find a sense of capacity and some hints to functionality and provide a sense of capacity and nature of the experience.

Susan Rudasill said it would be helpful if surveys and other instruments were shared with the group to compare other variables.

Dr. Felton: Bring the best practices across the state; analytics pieces; data to bring to the group. He will check with Nancy McKee for the group to have a data depot. We need to look at the cross over between what we are doing and the Florida Virtual Campus to share the same information. Put together a power point of what we have done, Angela will share and return with edits; to present on Wednesday. After the larger group, do we want to spend more time? Possibly meet in one of the smart classrooms to review the variations. It will be interesting to see what the other groups come together and what they provide.

Dr. Perry: In favor of our work group to meet a ½ hour after the meeting. We may need to notice the meeting. Felton will arrange the meeting with Nancy McKee.

4. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Dr. Felton informed the committee that the Task Force members will be meeting and he will make arrangements with Nancy McKee for a room. Each committee member affirmed the meeting. Committee members were asked to review the Power Point and submit edits to the report by the close of business. The meeting adjourned at 12:24 pm.



Dr. Felton, FGCU Faculty Senate President, Trustee

Angela Baerwalde, Recorder