

University of Alaska Distance Education Summit 2005

Meeting report

28-29 Mar 2005



Photo Captions

Top to Bottom, Left to Right

1. Charles Snare, Mat-Su, participating in Alternative Analysis of Critical Issues
2. Brainstorming critical issues - Cathy LeCompte, Ketchikan; William Butler, Cooperative Extension Service; Robert Perkins, UAF; Bob Briggs, GroupSystems; Karen Perdue, UA; Charles Snare, Mat-Su; Doug Desourcie, Prince William Sound; Heidi Simmons, Kuskokwim Campus; Roberta Stell, UAS; Melissa Brown, Tanana Valley Campus; Orson Smith, UAA.
3. Participating in the computer supported communication channel - Kathi Baldwin, UAA; Roberta Stell, UAS; Doug Desourcie, Prince William Sound; Karen Perdue, UA; Kate Gordon, UAA; Bob Briggs, GroupSystems
4. Beginning a Workgroup on equitable workloads for faculty - Mike Hawfield, Kenai College; Melissa Brown, Tanana Valley Campus; Katy Spangler, UAS; Margie Draskovich, Kodiak College; Robert Perkins, UAF.
5. Educational Technology Team joining the fray – Doug Desourcie, Prince William Sound; Randy Weaver, UA; Karen Perdue, UA; Steve Smith, UA; Pat Pitney, UA.
6. Combination of the computer mediated channel and open group discussion – Margie Draskovich, Kodiak College; Katy Spangler, UAS; Roberta Stell, UAS; Holly Royce, Interior-Aleutians Campus; Donna Schaad, UAA; Michael Sfraga, UA.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------------|
| WELCOME REMARKS | 1 |
| UAA CHANCELLOR ELAINE MAIMON | 1 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA PRESIDENT MARK HAMILTON..... | 1 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS CRAIG DORMAN..... | 3 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS CHANCELLOR STEVE JONES | 4 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA PROVOST ROBERTA STELL | 5 |
| COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA EXECUTIVE DEAN BERNICE JOSEPH | 7 |
| UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA DISTANCE EDUCATION STEERING BOARD CHAIR CURT MADISON..... | 8 |
| GROUPSYSTEMS MEETING FACILITATOR BOB BRIGGS..... | 10 |
| | |
| <u>1. DISTANCE EDUCATION WIN CONDITIONS ORGANIZED BY THEME</u> | <u>11</u> |
| | |
| 1.1 ADEQUATE FACULTY STRUCTURE AND SUPPORT | 11 |
| 1.2 ADEQUATE STRUCTURE AND SUPPORT FOR STAFF AND CENTERS | 12 |
| 1.3 EQUITABLE AND ADEQUATE RESOURCES AND FUNDING | 13 |
| 1.4 NEEDS ASSESSMENTS FOR STUDENTS, STATE, GLOBAL MARKET | 13 |
| 1.5 RESOURCE SHARING | 14 |
| 1.6 STUDENT CENTERED DISTANCE EDUCATION DELIVERY SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE | 14 |
| | |
| <u>2. DISTANCE EDUCATION ISSUES AND OPTIONS</u> | <u>15</u> |
| | |
| 2.2. CLARIFY THE ROLES AND COORDINATE THE EFFORTS OF VARIOUS DE COMMITTEES..... | 16 |
| 2.3. COMMON DEFINITION OF DE CONCEPTS ACROSS ALL UNITS | 16 |
| 2.4. COURSE OFFERING SEQUENCES AND SCHEDULES | 17 |
| 2.5. EASY STUDENT ACCESS TO ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES ACROSS MAUs | 18 |
| 2.6. EQUITABLE WORKLOAD FOR DE FACULTY | 19 |
| 2.7. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE FOR UNITS THAT PROVIDE SERVICES TO STUDENTS - A FINANCIAL MODEL FOR TUITION AND FEE SHARING | 21 |
| 2.8. WHO COUNTS THE STUDENT AS THEIR OWN? | 22 |
| 2.9. ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR DE FACULTY | 22 |
| 2.10. EQUITABLE COURSE DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND RESOURCES..... | 23 |
| 2.11. HIGH-QUALITY TECHNICAL INFRASTRUCTURE..... | 24 |
| 2.12. CURRICULUM AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT FOR DE | 24 |
| 2.13. SUPPORT FOR DE FACULTY AND STAFF..... | 26 |
| 2.14. INCENTIVES FOR COOPERATION AMONG MAUs THAT SERVES STUDENTS, WHILE ALLOWING FOR COMPETITION THAT PRESERVES LOCAL CONTROL AND QUALITY | 28 |
| 2.15. COMMUNICATION ACROSS MAUs AMONG DE FACULTY FOR RESOURCE SHARING AND WORKLOAD SHARING | 28 |
| 2.16. ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS AMONG MAUs | 29 |
| | |
| <u>3. NINETY-DAY WORKING GROUPS.....</u> | <u>29</u> |
| | |
| 3.1. WHO COUNTS THE STUDENT AS THEIR OWN? | 30 |
| 3.2. WORKING GROUP ON SUPPORT FOR DE FACULTY AND STAFF | 30 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.3. WORKING GROUP ON EQUITABLE WORKLOAD FOR DE FACULTY | 32 |
| TEAM MEMBERS | 32 |
| 3.4. WORKING GROUP ON ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS AMONG MAUS..... | 33 |
| UA SUMMIT 2005 PARTICIPANT LIST | 34 |
| UA SUMMIT 2005 AGENDA | 35 |

Summit Meeting Report

Welcome Remarks

UAA Chancellor Elaine Maimon

Good morning all. Welcome to UAA and to this really important conference. I am so pleased that we are talking together across the University of Alaska on the whole issue of distance education. I have long felt that in terms of being a student-centered institution, we need to help students transcend three C's – the clock, the calendar, and the car. And that's what distance education does. It allows students across this vast state where, as President Hamilton has said so eloquently, we might as well be an archipelago, where we really do need to be very creative, figure out ways that students can partake of higher education across these distances. This is really very important work, indeed.

I also want to mention that we also believe that all the University, all of our campuses, need to be fully integrated with the community. That is something that I call the public square, the University of the public square. Once again, distance education is key to that because it is the way that we truly break down even the virtual ivory tower by making sure that the university and higher education is everywhere. So this is very important work.

The other thing that is so important about this conference is that it is absolutely essential that we work together across all the MAUs to make this happen. When we are talking about virtual space it certainly brings to emphatic attention that we have to be cooperative because the student can be anywhere. The student needs to access courses from whatever we are offering across the University of Alaska. And so for us to sit together, and I am glad too that we can have our virtual connection. I know that traveling may not have been all that convenient today so the fact that we can be talking together, and it very beautiful outside the window, those of you have a window view, it is lovely, but this virtual connection if very important, too.

I would like to simply say, welcome, this is important work. I am very pleased UAA could host this. I want to thank our UAA people who have worked very hard on creative ways to deliver, Orson and Donna and our whole team here who have really, as I have come to understand during my months here, have worked very hard on the distance delivery. It is working great in Nursing and I am glad that we can be doing that and there is more to be done.

Without any further ado, I would like to turn this back to you Curt, and once again welcome.

Madison:

Thank you Chancellor Maimon. Next it will be President Mark Hamilton. I would like to turn it over to you.

University of Alaska President Mark Hamilton

Ok. I have a couple of thoughts I would like to share with you, and for some of you, especially some of the early advocates who have been with this program well before I got here and

certainly all the time that I have been here, doubtless heard at least one piece of this before. I do want to recommend to you this one little aspect that I have been carrying around with me vis-à-vis technologies and distance education for a long time.

Before I get to that, I think the way that we have made progress over only the last several years has been to get a whole bunch of people who decide to look at the problem in terms of how will this best benefit students. What do the students want? What will make their progress through our offerings easier? And many of you listening were a part of that kind of approach that has made some of the very modest steps that took years to get this composite listing of all the courses available across the system. It is so clear, as we watch for instance, as Elaine mentioned, the Nursing program, as we begin to look at Engineering, as we look at Geography programs in the future, as we look at Psychology, that we simply are stronger together. We are not so very, very far apart.

I have come to know over the past 18 months a very good description of Alaska that works for people that don't completely understand Alaska. My statement is that if you can't drive there, if you have to take an airplane or a boat, you're on an island. I don't care what it looks like. Alaska is an archipelago. And it needs to embrace the technologies that will allow that to come together, obviously distance being a huge one.

OK, so let me give you the one little piece of interest and concern that I have had for a very long time. And that is, when we get people together and start to talk to them about the benefits of putting a system together statewide, whether that is Statewide University or statewide politically, it does not make any real difference. And we come together and talk about how wonderful this thing is going to be, the real subject of discussion has got to be is the nature of what certainly will be Lose-Lose situation. And then ask yourselves, "Is it worth it?" And that's where you are going to come back to. Is it worth it to serve the student? Is it worth it to become a stronger faculty, in this virtual world than we can possibly be independently? Because the Lose-Lose is very real. Especially since our early advocates have come out when they had to start themselves. There wasn't a tremendous amount of institutional support. So we have people who have their own mechanisms, their own programs, their own Blackboard or not Blackboard preferences. And what ends up happening is you can't convince somebody like that that you've got a Win-Win. They have got something that they have used for years they are very comfortable with, and you have got to say that I want you to lose in this situation. I want you to use a product that will not serve you and your discipline at your campus as well as the one you have. But I want you to take that loss because you can. And then we appeal to some higher priority that is somehow set together. And the one that is absolutely clear to me is the student-centric approach. It has walked and talked us through thorny issues where people have accepted a Lose-Lose. That is to say, "Give up the individual applications so that we can put together a program to be offered homogeneously for the sake of the students so they only have to learn one program or two at most."

I really encourage you and I'm excited about what I have seen thus far. But I really want to encourage you to take that on as a guide for this set of discussions you are going to have for this Summit meeting. It is so much fun to identify the Lose-Lose. You get to extol the virtues of the system you are using and shed a little light on your own cleverness. At the end of the day I think

that you simply concede that you would probably be better off using the one you are doing if that is all we had to do. But we are bigger and better than that. The only other thing is, and this is something people do tend to run through pretty quickly when you run into the bureaucracy, I hope Elaine still has her button on, when you run into any kind of bureaucracy that is keeping you from doing what needs to be done, hey, we're the bureaucracy. Let's just get rid of it. So I will be looking forward to what you come up with. I am going to turn you over to Craig Dorman now.

University of Alaska Vice-President for Academic Affairs Craig Dorman

Thank you, Mark. Let me continue on along the same frame of thought that Mark mentioned. As you are all aware, we have struggled with the issue for distance ed or educational technology for years and years. It is only very recently that the recommendation from PACDE finally convinced us that we did need to face up to exactly the situation that Mark has mentioned with regard to the transitioning from systems that are optimized at the local level to programs that can offer the best opportunities from each of our facilities, each of our MAUs, to the larger student body across campus. This is, I'm sure you are aware, and what you are involved in today, just one of a variety of issues underway attempting to, you might say, optimize, differentiate, between programs that are offered, combine our skills and capacities, integrate where necessary. In particular I think the key word here is differentiation, and the fact that we can't afford redundancy. What that means is that we do indeed have to work together in new ways, in somewhat exciting ways.

The other programs that we are dealing with that go along more or less along the same line, that I think you are probably all aware of that has raised some contentions on the various campuses, is the need for common start dates. That might not be unmanageable from the distance perspective, nevertheless getting the calendars aligned to the degree we can does simplify things considerably from the student perspective. My sense is overall it will help us considerably. But that is going to mandate significant changes on each of the campuses.

Mark mentioned very briefly the joint PhD. There is a program between the University of Alaska Anchorage and Fairbanks that will cost us quite a bit of money to put together, but is meeting a very driving need for behavioral health in this state that we are deeply committed to and is going to mandate that we work together across the distances between not just these two cities but the rest of the state as well.

Nursing is another example he gave. And Education is one. What we are attempting to do there is we are supporting a joint meeting of the faculty. So as we go down the path of attempting to both differentiate and to integrate our capabilities, I would look forward to more meetings like the one we are starting in April with Education faculty where we can start to build communities of scholars between the MAUs identifying their own needs and issues and, hopefully therefore, better interfacing with the sorts of capacities that can be provided through the efforts you are talking about here.

Just one other comment. I would expect and hope that today you will raise tough issues. I know that is listed on your agenda. I know that has raised a certain degree of concern. But if we don't

know what is worrying you, we don't know where the problems are with the bureaucracy, it's not going to be easy for us to be able to solve them. So raise those issues. Talk about them. We are looking for your suggestions. I would remind you that there are two groups, one of which is your Distance Education Steering Board. The other one we put in place is what we have chosen to call with malice of forethought, the Education Technology Team that Karen Perdue chairs. The issues that you raise that have policy implications that are going to require additional changes and debates and discussions will come up through them up to your Chancellors and your Provosts to Mark and myself at Statewide. So we are looking forward to those discussions, I would also say that as you think about where we are headed, it was indeed educational technology that we chose to call that group because in addition just to distance what we are looking to be able to do is to take maximum advantage of the new information technologies that are accessible and available to us in the local classroom, as well as at distance. And we also need to remember that we are looking to enhance the faculty's capacity to be able to take advantage of say the Access Grid when they are at meetings in Washington to be able to continue to teach their classes in a relatively normal manner. There are all those implications as well as simply the distance stuff itself.

So I wish you luck and Curt back to you.

Madison:

Thank you Craig and Mark. Next on our speaking list is Steve Jones. After Steve we will hear from Robbie Stell and then Bernice Joseph.

University of Alaska Fairbanks Chancellor Steve Jones

Thanks, Curt. I'm going to put a little bit different spin on things, or give a little different spin and share with everybody what for me are several revelations relating to distance ed here in Alaska and in particular here at UAF. I think everyone has seen the literature that talks about our 360 million acre campus as the state's land, sea, and space grant university. It is a big chunk of territory and I have come to appreciate that as I note that we have faculty and staff and offices at 44 different locations in the state. It struck me how truly vast this state is in that I have been to more than a dozen of those locations already including the four community campuses, two of our rural learning centers, and some other places. It is just incredible what a vast and far reaching area of service this is. And remarkably if you lay the map of Alaska out on a table top, and look at the distance, or look at the tiny shot of geographic distance represented by Unalakleet on the Norton Sound all the way over through Kaltag and up the Yukon to Nulato. It looks like just, depending on the map, an inch and a half or two inches on the one I have. Relative to the entire state that is not much at all. As Curt knows, he and Bernice and I along with Paul Ivanof out of Unalakleet last Monday made that trek via snowmachine from Unalakleet over to Kaltag and then Nulato. That tiny distance on the map translates into a vast territory and it's just incredible that there are any number of thousands of these things as we go from one village or one community to another across the state.

Another revelation to me was as we talk about distance education is that in the lower 48 it is usually some high-tech stuff. But I went up to Fort Yukon last summer and talked to students who were taking calculus by telephone. I had a hard time with calculus when I sat right there in

front of the instructor. So we're talking about distance education that ranges from the high-tech mode all the way to something as simple as listening in on a telephone conversation with course materials in front of you.

Another thing that struck me is just the absolute and total commitment to place that many of our community and village students have. As I recall from visiting up at Kotzebue, the demographic of rural students most heavily represented is the 40-50 age group. Incredible difference from the kind of students we deal with on our major campuses.

Another kind of revelation occurred just recently. Our Interior Aleutians Campus is graduating seven students this year from the Aleutians end of that Interior-Aleutians Campus. Craig Dorman and I talked about finding a way to attend their commencement ceremony. I talked with Bernice and also with Clara Johnson about seeing if we could accommodate that but it turns out that all seven of those students are each from different islands in the Aleutian Chain. To get them all together would either have to have a commencement in Anchorage, or they would have to pass through Anchorage to get back to another central location. Just a vast, vast territory again.

When in January we went up to Bethel and then caught a small plane out to Kasigluk, It struck me that here we are attempting take higher education and apply 21st century distance education to students who are located in what for all practical purposes is a third world setting.

All that translates for me to a message to you that your task is not simple. We're asking you to look at how we can take education via distance to discrete locations across truly vast distances in some of the world's harshest environmental conditions where high technology is highly unreliable and where in many cases economic conditions are poor at best. Your task is how do we effectively, and in a manner that is fiscally responsible, extend the knowledge and research base of our universities to people of Alaska. I think it is timely that you are gathering to address this critical topic. I appreciate everything that everybody is doing and their commitment to this and I share with Craig in wishing you well.

Madison:

OK Steve, thank you very much. Now we will hear from Robbie Stell from UAS.

University of Alaska Provost Roberta Stell

Good Morning! When you're about fifth in line you start marking off on your little notes about things that have already been said so I will just say I reaffirm everything that I've heard said before and I try not to repeat that, but try to add a few thoughts.

It struck me that virtual commencements are something we're going to have to address, as Chancellor Jones mentioned. I think we are in our fourth year of doing a virtual commencement over UATV for the MPA program. That lent itself very well to having graduation ceremonies. We brought in our President to speak. We've had the Lt. Governor speak to students when we have to be on the road. It was phenomenal experience for those students who needed to bring closure to this experience. These students go through virtual Hell. To get their degrees at a distance they worked so hard. They have to learn new things. They have to adjust to the way

we're all using different ways we deliver our various programs to them. And we felt it was time to help them bring closure. Graduation is a very important thing and I hope we can continue to spread that experience to our students.

We are actively pursuing through the Registrar's office the names of the students who are from other campuses who are in the Anchorage bowl and would like to walk in the Anchorage ceremony, for example. Or they're in Juneau would like to walk in our ceremony. We were pretty used to sharing the stage because Fisheries, a UAF program, is on our campus. It's a wonderful addition to our ceremony to have PhD candidates hooded by the Fisheries faculty. It just really adds to that traditional ceremony if we can find some unique ways to help all of our students find a way to bring that celebration to the end of their experience and hopefully not the end of their involvement of the University, perhaps going on to other degrees.

It also struck me as I was looking at our catalog copy a few months ago that as we edit that copy, things start dropping off or maybe there's one little remnant that you can't quite drop off. I tried to drop off as a delivery mode UAS traditional correspondence and then I remembered there's one Ketchikan course and I'd better not take that out of there or I'd be in really big trouble with my campus. It is still available to students. One of the credential programs is still available by traditional correspondence and it is targeted to a group of educators who need to work in a little different rhythm than the rest of the calendar.

The richness of the multimedia technologies we're now using is phenomenal. It's a bit intimidating. I'm hoping to have a little help here when I get out my laptop. Everybody around this room has a laptop in front of them. Except Elaine and I are sitting here kind of out of it. [Chancellor Maimon: *I have a Blackberry.*]

I should have known you'd have a Blackberry. This group has already worked through one session of going through this GroupSystems. This is technology I think educators will be thinking about how do we apply this perhaps in some of our classrooms, right? I think that's pretty exciting.

I was looking at some of our data, this is kind of stale UAS data, but I'm thinking where are our students? How are we, how does that divide out when you look at the profile of our students that we're serving. The smallest number of enrollments in our 1800 enrollments per semester in distance courses, the smallest numbers of enrollments appears with the 05 to 099, the remedial courses. The largest enrollments appear in the 1-299, the 100 and 200 level, where lots of students need the GERs in order to get their applied science degree or their associate of arts degree. Then it falls into about half the numbers of 100 and 200's when you get to the 300 and 400's - typical pyramid, very large at the bottom and starts narrowing at the top. And at the graduate level, in my numbers I'm looking at, there are 15 in that first remedial group. There are 800 in the 100 and 200 level. There are 400 in the 300 and 400 level. And there are 200 at the graduate level. So there's very much a pyramid. But an interesting note is that are 300 at the professional development, which in our case is only teachers who are doing the in-service in 593 non-academic credit courses. So there are quite a variety of students being served and I think this is pretty typical in that profile of the other campuses' program.

We're also sharing students. Of the about 3500 students in Fall of '03, we had over 500 who are from UAA in UAS courses. And of the 3500 enrollments there were 400 students who are UAF. Very much a different picture than we were looking at a few years ago. We are serving each other's students big time.

The other kind of startling number that I discovered is very, very large proportion of those students are non-degree seeking. We need to find, and that's where this group could really help us, we need to get these students admitted and on track to earning a credential, a degree so that those credit hours the NDS students are earning becomes meaningful, helps them get a better job, helps them get a job. So I think that is our challenge. That kind of profile, in my thinking, exemplifies why we need to do this work. I am speaking this morning on the behalf of my Chancellor so I hope he agrees with what I said. And he sends his greetings as well.

Madison:

OK. Robbie, thank you very much. Now we've heard from the Chancellors, President, Vice-President. The next speaker is Bernice Joseph, Executive Dean of College of Rural Alaska. The College of Rural Alaska, as you know, serves the extended campuses. Every MAU has extended campuses. Some of the issues that she'll bring up probably can relate to the places that have sent most of the representatives to this meeting. Bernice let's turn it over to you.

College of Rural Alaska Executive Dean Bernice Joseph

I'd like to thank all of you for your services on this important committee. It's a real critical committee to moving the whole university forward with a plan on distance education. The first meeting back in November vetted some great action items and the working group did wonderful jobs of pulling information together on communication, quality assurance, best practices, information on building student centers, programming, and more. And I think Robbie made some good points with the efforts that we have to make towards students centeredness, so that it's really a seamless process for students to work towards a degree program. And I think the great thing that I like about this group is the diversity and the realization that one size does not fit all. Each the MAUs offer courses just in a little bit different way than the others. Many of the communities served by the College of Rural Alaska have a long ways to go before there's really good quality internet services to all of our communities. Our faculty, however, who have good access, have been engaged and fully participating in video, audio conferencing HorizonLive, ElluminateLive, and Blackboard.

And again I just want to reiterate the importance that each campus does it differently although coordination amongst the campuses is evidenced by the many reports that Craig mentioned earlier here. And he also mentioned that you will be addressing some of the tough questions surrounding distance education, course content, financial models, work loads, sequencing, among others. I hope that you will draw upon not only the expertise amongst yourselves, but once you get back to your campuses to have that discussion with the other folks at your campuses and MAU.

For example, the workload issue can be a complicated one that involves many people from across the campus so I hope that you will reach out and meet with other groups, have that

discussion and when you come back from this Summit to get a much fuller picture to help it move forward with solutions.

One of the groups I work with, Allied Health, which I co-chair along with UAA Dean Jan Gehler, and previously Karen Schmidt from UAS, has done a great job in coordinating distance education efforts for Allied Health. We're looking at developing gateway courses by distance. We put together a joint funding application and have been coordinating quite well I would say on the development of these courses for delivery across the state. And it's wonderful to see the MAUs moving forward in this effort. I look forward to continuing to work with all of you on other areas like education and other areas of health. I'll send that back over to you Curt and thanks for the great work that you are doing with the group as well.

University of Alaska Distance Education Steering Board Chair Curt Madison

Thank you, Bernice. That pretty much covers our welcome. I hope everyone feels welcome. It's amazing to me the interest that distance education has inspired in the upper administration and it really is very nice to see. We know that an effort like this would not even possibly get off the ground without the interest of the upper administration. We'll continue to keep that dialogue as open as we can. We'll give you reports and hope to hear from you if you have any concerns.

So what I'd like to do now is say a couple of things about how we're going to go through the next couple of days. And then we'll take a break after that. Bear with me for just a couple of minutes.

I want to remind you that we have not come to this place today on our own steam. The work designing distance education has been going on for a number of years. We have the results of the committees and work that's been done over the years on our website. You can see the work and that really has given us the opportunity to take this one step farther. We definitely have not come here under on our own steam. There have been many faculty, staff, and administrative problem solving groups and we make use of the work that they've done. We have to give our thanks to those people because they have labored in dark times and we're happy to see the understanding they have developed is now something that we can carry forward and implement.

Another thing that has changed is that we're now in a time of abundance. Our challenge is not scarcity. Our challenge is abundance, which is no easier to deal with but it requires a different kind of a mindset. Currently students, even after they make their first decision, their initial decision on what college to enter, still continue making decisions of what college they are going to take courses from because there are many possibility out there.

There are more degrees offered. There are more certificates. There are more different kinds of delivery modalities. And students have more kinds of academic goals. Some don't want a certificate, they just want a skill. There are a whole range of things. So now we're faced with an abundance of academic goals, and an abundance of venues for people to solve those goals. This is a very different situation compared to trying to fill gaps where there's a lot of scarcity.

Another one of those things that are abundant is the history of stovepipes with conflicting policy and unwritten policy and multiple agendas. We have that legacy as well in abundance.

Distance Education is accessed by choice, like higher education in general is accessed by choice. There is no difference. So we look at what are the barriers to access. It's time, geography and culture. We can use distance technology to overcome all three barriers.

We have to ask who our competitors are. Our competitors probably are not other campuses in the University of Alaska. Even though it's handy to look at ourselves and to think that UAF is in competition with UAA. Or UAS is in competition with Kodiak, or whatever. There may be some competition because we're humans and we like to compete, but our real competitors are probably outside that arena.

Another of our difficulties is that within academia there is an Argumentative Culture which suggests we look at a good idea that's 98% right, find the 2% that's wrong, and nail it. Then, further, as academics we must be sure that everyone understands that we're smarter than the guy that wrote the piece with 2% wrong. It's absolutely counter-productive because what happens with an Argumentative Culture is that 98% of good work is forgotten and the 2% gets remembered. The person who did the 98% of good work gets demoralized. So I'm hoping what we can do here today and tomorrow is to look for the ideas that people bring up to find what in their ideas is worthwhile. The things that are not worthwhile we just set aside. Pick out those things we want to keep and move forward. That's the only way we can keep good quality people working on these hard issues.

Then what can we accomplish in two days? We hope that we'll be able to surface some critical issues and take the next step forward from where we started in November. In addition, we'll elaborate the context of our collaboration. How do we work together? What will make a campus want to participate in distance education? How can we find those Win-Win solutions? And we'll start doing some work groups. I think we've made some really good progress. Work groups seem to be a mechanism that is very worthwhile. At the end of the two days, we'll establish some more work groups on the things that we think are really gripping, that we have a passion about.

Then one of the main things for our meeting is just get to know each other. In your packet you'll have a list of all participants and you'll have their phone numbers and their email addresses. We'll have breaks. We'll have long lunch periods. Get to know each other. Find out what everybody's kids are doing. These are the people that you're going to have to trust. And when things come down at some other campus and you think there's a strange conspiracy, that they're trying to undermine you, there's going to be one person on that campus you can call up and say what is going on? And that's the person that's going to be a representative here. So try to find out a little bit about what people are like. And just get to know each other.

There's something you need to know called the Fundamental Attribution Error, which states that the person who is on the other end of the communication channel is making their choices based on some sort of malevolent personal choice. But, all the choices you make are based on circumstances beyond your control. You have to think, well, maybe there are some circumstances that are altering the choices the other person has, too.

Again, Craig Dorman mentioned that there is the ETT group. We're having a joint meeting here and they get to be back there to throw spit balls. That is the group we report to. Our job is to make recommendations. We're going to make the things visible that are important for distance education to happen. And then we pass those on to see how they can be implemented into policy through the Education Technology Team.

Thanks to everyone who has put this meeting together. Donna Hertzler is from the Center for Distance of Education in Fairbanks Thank her for all the nice name tags and our booklets. She'll be here for two days. If you have any questions, logistical kind of questions, please feel free to ask her. Christen Bouffard in the back is one of the instructional designers in Fairbanks and has built the Steering Board website. You're going to see a bunch of things tomorrow. She also has a lot of technical expertise. If you have technical questions, feel free to ask her. And our meeting support person, Bob Briggs, who comes from Tucson. He has his Doctorate in handling mischievous groups who are in great conflict. We're hoping to make use of that expertise. Bob, I will turn it over to you and you can tell us how we're going to be handling software after we get into it.

GroupSystems Meeting Facilitator Bob Briggs

Today we're going to be working together to identify what it is that has to happen in order for each of you to come out of this distance education effort as winners. From that we will surface a set of key issues. We will prioritize them and then look back to your win conditions, raise issues and propose options. At the end of our meeting here tomorrow, we'll choose three of the key issues that emerge, form working groups around them, and pose some deliverables for the next 90 days for those working groups. So we'll be finishing up this session very much the way we finished up the one we did in November. We will be using the GroupSystems technology for a lot of our work.

[pointing at the projected image]

This is the GroupSystems II welcome screen. If you don't already have something like this running on your screen, then on the break please see me or Christen or Donna and we will get you going. We want to be sure that everybody has an opportunity to join the efforts. A lot of our work is going to be simultaneous online in addition to the eyeball-to-eyeball. Is there anybody who has not yet gotten connected into the GroupSystems setting? We will make sure we get you going during the break.

1. Distance Education Win Conditions Organized by Theme

Summit attendees brainstormed in response to the question, “What must happen for you and the people you represent to come out of this Distance Education initiative as winners? Then, they converged on a clean list of win conditions, and organized them under six key themes.

Next, the team evaluated each win condition on two criteria: “How Easy?” and “How Important?” Following the vote, each win condition was labeled with one of four tags:

- [LHF] Low Hanging Fruit – items that are easy and important
- [IWH] Important With Hurdles – Items that are difficult, yet important
- [MLR] Maybe Later – Items that are easy, but not important
- [FGT] Forget it – Items that are difficult and unimportant.

The organized, labeled win conditions appear below. Some are accompanied by clarifying remarks.

1.1 Adequate faculty structure and support

- 1.1.1 [IWH] Clarify and make explicit the conditions of faculty rights to intellectual property rights to the materials they prepare.
- 1.1.2 [IWH] Faculty will be well trained to know how the students can interact with the university
- 1.1.3 [IWH] Faculty Workload/Compensation/ownership issues
 - Distance education doesn't create undue workloads for faculty
- 1.1.4 [IWH] Policies that affect distance education faculty should be consistent statewide.
- 1.1.5 [IWH] Promote respect among faculty who teach at a distance and those who don't.
- 1.1.6 [IWH] Provide adequate and reliable infrastructure and equipment for faculty and students.
 - Especially bandwidth and connectivity
- 1.1.7 [IWH] Provide incentives for faculty to upgrade Distance Ed skills
- 1.1.8 [IWH] Standardized faculty development plan for organizational orientation and professional growth for distance faculty.

1.1.9 [LHF] Assure that faculty get credit for all students in their classes, not only those enrolled in UofAK. (e.g. students in joint programs with other universities)

- Important: If you're doing the work, you should get the credit. Rewards should follow effort and resources expended
- Not important: In the big scheme of things, its a grain of sand
- Important: Very productive faculty may look very unproductive.
- Important. Local faculty must support local students who are taking distance classes, and so should get credit for the effort

1.1.10 [LHF] Designate a distance education champion for each site

1.1.11 [LHF] Faculties and campuses should receive productivity-count credit, resources and recognition for non-credit classes they teach.

1.1.12 [LHF] Faculty retain control of educational decisions

- e.g. number of students in class - what technology to use, what support will be required

1.1.13 [LHF] Academic freedom for faculty to create courses with content they deem best for students in distance education.

1.1.14 [LHF] Equitable curriculum course standards among distance and on-site courses

- Currently, people who teach at a distance are held to a higher standard than local teachers

1.2 Adequate structure and support for staff and centers

1.2.1. [FGT] Find a way for the U to dissolve MAUs and become one large university

- Important: Lots of redundant costs could be eliminated
- Not important: This group has no power to do anything about it.
- Not important: Wouldn't help the problems of distance education
- Not important: Loss of local control
- Not important: To broad a brush. Must seek finer grained balance -- some things centralized, others not.

1.2.2. [IWH] Clarifying the roles of the various committee's with respect to making something happen. Identify overlaps, and establish communication, share that which is leaned among these committees.

1.2.3. [IWH] Create a common definitions for distance education concepts across all units

1.2.4. [LHF] A clearly articulated mandate by the board of regents and other levels of leadership for the creation of a student centered distance education program

1.2.5. [LHF] Designate a distance education champion for each site

1.3 Equitable and Adequate resources and funding

1.3.1. [IWH] Clear understanding about how the MAUs will cooperate on tuition structure, course development and resource sharing

1.3.2. [IWH] Create conditions and incentives across the system at each level to foster cooperation across the system

- i.e. what is the role of outstation faculty in various service commitments

1.3.3. [IWH] Long-term financial commitment for available competent, and adequate support for faculty

1.3.4. [IWH] Long-term financial commitment for available competent and adequate support for students

1.3.5. [LHF] Formal communication channels among the MAUs for resource sharing, mutual support

- e.g. libraries e.g. if one gets an on-line catalog system, all can share it, so others can buy another shared resource

1.3.6. [LHF] Provide technical training for faculty, students, and staff on tools used to deliver distance ed.

1.4 Needs Assessments for students, state, global market

1.4.1. [IWH] Support appropriate competition (where the student wins) and eliminate unhealthy competition (one site undercuts the investment of resources by another site).

1.4.2. [LHF] A PR initiative for distance ed to convince the public we are serious about it

1.4.3. [LHF] Develop the courses and programs with a view to the global market

1.4.4. [LHF] Document and clarify metrics for distance ed and project future trends for maintain quality and setting policy.

1.4.5. [LHF] Some mechanism for identifying student and state needs

1.5 Resource sharing

- 1.5.1. [IWH] Assure that faculty get credit for all students in their classes, not only those enrolled in UofAK. (e.g. students in joint programs with other universities)
- 1.5.2. [IWH] Establish an automated and equitable distribution of revenue for units that provide services to students.
- 1.5.3. [IWH] Establish who owns and/or serves a student and when.
- 1.5.4. [IWH] Faculty across MAUs can cooperate to reduce the burden on any given faculty

1.6 Student centered distance education delivery services and infrastructure

- 1.6.1. [IWH] A statewide student services agreement
- 1.6.2. [IWH] Creation of a seamless student services system that is integrated across MAUs
- 1.6.3. [IWH] Student support structures
- 1.6.4. [IWH] The university presents one unified administrative face to the students regardless of their mode of education
 - Shouldn't be a show-stopper -- don't wait for it
 - The students are asking for it
 - Important: Minimal barriers for students to access the university
 - Important because students are dropping classes that are too hard to register for
- 1.6.5. [IWH] Uniform high-quality internet access in outlying communities where students live
 - Important if you want to use high-bandwidth media like streaming video
 - Important because Internet access is assumed by course designers.
 - Not important if you believe that distance education is not important
 - Not important: Not the function of a university. Should be provided by someone else
 - Not important: Other modes (paper, mail) are adequate for many purposes.
 - Not important: Waiting for it to become uniform could create unnecessary delays
 - Important: Equity for the villages
- 1.6.6. [IWH] Unify start dates and class scheduling across MAUs

- 1.6.7. [LHF] A commitment by all players to serving students equally without distinguishing between local and distance learners
- 1.6.8. [LHF] A student services help desk
- 1.6.9. [LHF] An agreement that delivery technology choices will be based first on student needs.

2. Distance Education Issues and Options

Drawing from their win conditions, the notes from the previous meeting of the Distance Education Steering Board, and other sources, the team converged on a set of sixteen key issues that must be addressed in order to realize the University of Alaska's vision for Distance Education. They also identified significant sub-issues for some of the main issues. Then, the team proposed potential options for resolving these issues. These proposals were not evaluated in this Summit. They are not meant to be recommendations. Rather, they are meant to be food for thought for the working groups who meet to derive recommendations for resolving each issue.

The issues, along with the propose options for resolving the issues appear below:

2.1. Analysis and projection of stakeholder needs (In-state Students, out of state students, state...)

- Utilizing various data, how do students within the proximity of the various campuses compare with what students out of state are seeking. How does this match employer needs or expected needs? How does this relate with a world in which content becomes obsolete quickly? If this is the case, how important are the soft skills (e.g. interpersonal, teamwork, verbal communication, listening).
- As hard as we try to detail every aspect that needs to exist in a distance course, this is difficult and there are so many variables. Much of what needs to happen in a distance course a good instructor knows to include intuitively. Of course skills that require interpersonal skills, teamwork, "virtual" listening need to happen. It takes the clever instructor to figure how to seamlessly incorporate how students can use these skills.

2.1.1. Global reach for Alaska DE programs

- Marketing assistance is needed. I suggest CDE, eMedia, and UAS develop or hire expertise for online (and otherwise) marketing of online programs.
- Have an independent "expert" review proposals for nationwide and global marketing. (Some ideas sound good, but the "paying" students are not there.)
- Determine what programs, degrees, certificates, and courses would be marketable in the global world.

- Internally (with UA system) ascertain the level of awareness of the educational global market.
- Consider earmarking a share of DE generated income to support marketing.
- Is our university still a part of the Western Gov's Consortium?
Is this agreement providing us any Global reach?
- Anything put on a national or global market would need to be absolutely the best in terms of accuracy of content as well as mode of delivery.
- Many of us already have students dispersed all over. The fact that the courses should be "the best" should be a given.
- Peruse what other institutions have done in this arena -- some of which are very successful.

2.2. Clarify the roles and coordinate the efforts of various DE committees

- A list of committees has been gathered. Each institution should evaluate the roles and establish necessary committees to move the institution forward.
- Beyond a list, who do each of the committees report to? How are they related? What is the organizational structure, in other words?
- Meet with Mike Sfraga's and Pete Pinney's committees within the next month since their committees have been working on student services and tuition distribution issues.
- Every distance ed committee should have strong representation and input from the faculty involved in distance education. The decision making process on programming and course offering must go through the proper channels. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendations, March 4, 2005.)
- All distance education committees should have some connection through the steering committee; steering committee should help connect them, coordinate them
- UAS and I believe other campuses have a TLTR (Teaching, Learning, Technology Roundtable) - --these committees or membership thereof might be an appropriate group to review or be included in discussions on the topic of technology in teaching and learning.
- There need to be established connection points between the myriad of committees out there dealing with DE issues. At UAA we have ACDLIT (a faculty senate committee) that deals with many DE issues; we have a new subcommittee forming under the UTC which will look more specifically at Bb and elearning technologies and faculty/student issues; we have the ASCDE which has subcommittee groups looking into all kinds of policy issues dealing with DE. Would we be better served to have 1 DE committee that reports to this group? Does this group care about all these smaller groups? We need a more understandable structure, chain of reporting.
- Through MY UA Portal, there should be a place where minutes of all meetings and committees along with contact information on members be accessible.

2.3. Common definition of DE concepts across all units

- What needs to be defined? Who would decide?
- The IR units at UAA and UAS have a glossary of terms they have adopted for gathering data--- this group should consult that glossary to see if definitions in that environment (which translates data into Banner) is useful to purposes of this group.

- The copyright committee spent considerable time on defining terms for the UA system. A multicampus team could do this...sounds like the UAA glossary would be a good place to start.

2.4. Course offering sequences and schedules

- The University needs to have one set of numbers for classes. The marketing of the classes needs to be seamless. The start dates need to be acceptable for the communities the MAU or community campuses serve
- Because so many classes have deadlines for assignment completion, schedules have got to be coordinated. Some campuses stop registration so early that when I refer students to another campus for a course they have to pay a late fee, even though by UAF standards they have plenty of time to enroll.
- This becomes an especially bothersome issue when students at a distance site have two schedules to follow because their course is offered through a campus that is different from their location - esp. when meetings are required (labs/videoconferences) as part of the course.
- If we had one set of numbers for classes, then we could have blanket articulation agreements and would limit confusion. Many students shy away from courses at another UofA university because they do not want to go through the appeal process to have the course subside and then be denied.
- Instead of aligning all calendars, why not have a common distance course calendar?

predominately the UAS programs include both onsite and dist ed students---the dist ed students join into the onsite schedule---sections aren't large enough to have a separate section for all courses just for de---with web it doesn't matter if there are no synchronous requirements but few fall into this category at this time.

- With regard to comment #201, explore the possibility of a program having a common DE calendar.
- The issue of course offering sequences should be done with a program view across the MAUs.

2.4.1. Differences of academic calendar

- Do we really need to all start on the same date? Starting earlier, such as the proposed date of August 28th for Fall 2006, would greatly effect rural students, who use this time to hunt and wind up summer activities. Perhaps communicating dates more effectively and efficiently to students would be more effective.
- This issue would make it more convenient, but it can be worked out with better communication.
- Recognizing that there will probably always be differences in start dates, etc. does not eliminate the benefits that some coordination could offer.
- break the academic calendar down into manageable decision points. i.e. MAU constructs semester calendars to meet their requirements however, a start date for fall and spring for the 90% of the courses that are semester length and core to certificates and degrees use this start date. Vocational, remedial, 100 level GER courses (where more than one section is offered) to serve the later stating student body-- Sitka experimented with an "Alaskamester" talk to them about their pilot. spring breaks is another breakout decision point--
- Survey the faculty and respective programs regarding this issue. This would include asking questions such as would a common academic calendar result in some

unintended consequences? How does a common academic calendar impact the who may or may not enroll in a course or program?

- Is the idea of a semester or academic year calendar out-of-date with the current educational needs of the student?
- When talking to faculty about this issue they brought some great points on why each Univ should be allowed to set their own schedule: allowing for spring breaks of the university and school districts in the area to be at the same time, and how will effect students at all three MAUs wanting to travel at the same time.
- Identify centrally required services which need to be up 24/7 year-round. Purchase equipment to allow upgrades to servers/applications so that can be done seamlessly without downtime.
- The academic calendar needs to be designed to meet the needs of the communities in the service areas of the UA system. The start dates need to be established by the MAU or community campus.
- Can we have someone from UAS discuss the option of how they implement a 6 week schedule throughout the year? This works, but how? Do students get used to the varying schedule and just learn to ensure they don't miss important dates. Was there confusion when this was first started? How did you avoid it?
- Simply, the upper administration--President needs to set the same academic schedule dates and course time blocks as a mandate and everyone needs to follow it.
- I think we are missing the boat here. We are trying to sell DE classes as anywhere anytime learning opportunities, but that is not true. DE classes do free students from some time and place limitations. We still seem to be designing classes for the benefit of the instructors and administrative units. There are NO reasons based on learning theory that I am aware that DE classes have to follow the course schedule of academic units. The scheduling is there to serve the needs of instructors and administrators. If the learning is truly designed to be learner centered, the time factor needs to be dropped from the equation. Why should someone have to complete a course is a set number of weeks? If they can do it in two weeks or 20 why does it matter if you are committed to the concept of student centered learning. If the issues are instructor convenience, institutional costs, etc., then talking about a learner centered approach is lip service and it that quickly becomes apparent.
- The advent of distance courses makes common calendar more difficult to institute. If course start and end dates are CLEARLY communicated to students, this may not be such a big issue.

2.5. Easy Student access to administrative and educational services across MAUs

- Use the distance gateway as a jumping off point for students to get to each MAU to get access to administrative services.
- Creating common forms and educating registrars and advisors is a good start.
- Work with the administrative units at each MAU to make their site easy for students to navigate once they arrive from the gateway.
- Not all students or all villages have readily available access, we need not forget about those students. How do we get information to them? Perhaps providing more support to branch campuses and rural campuses/centers to provide outreach to outlying areas.
- This could be solved by having a "champion" at each campus.

- A statewide handbook for students registered for classes from multiple campuses...developed by the statewide student services group. For example, they could compile all of the important dates and create a table.
- Do we really need to recreate the wheel with a "Champion". For many rural and branch campus/centers many people already are champions. I think for many we need to find a way to more easy of access to the information. Many of the online sites for registration or financial or advising are hard to navigate, lets fix that first. Providing more resources and training to advisors, registrars and student services would help a great deal. This would help many by opening doors of communication.
- This topic needs to be informed by the MyUA portal work that is underway and duplicate what has already been decided or will be formed based on the features of MyUA portal software. UAOnline has moved this topic forward considerably in recent developments.
- Here is somewhere where standardization needs to occur. Because students are taking UA distance education courses across AK (and world) it does not make sense to have some many separate providers. If we want to capture market share, we will need to market ourselves better and part of better marketing is being user friendly--something our fragmented approach does not facilitate.
- Create special division of student services devoted to managing an integrated approach to student services for distance ed student that is seamless to the student. Every campus should be hooked into it and either be able to advise distance students or know where to send them.
- The distance gateway should be prominent on every UA website. I do not know where to find it on the UAS website.
- Perhaps it should be featured under "current students" on UAF and similarly on UAA and UAS websites. I know you can get to it through UAOnline, but how many others do. Also there are too many websites to go to gain info, and hopefully MyUA Portal will fix some of that.

2.6. Equitable Workload for DE faculty

- The ASCDE (UAA) subcommittee is working on a document regarding workload and distance education. When completed this might be a good starting point for this group to look at.
- Faculty should be given a workload credit for creating an on-line course or creating an on-line course before it is delivered. When it needs to have revisions or updates, they should be given additional workload credits during the semester it is delivered.
- The number of students enrolled should be considered as well as the number of sites. Especially when there is a component of video conferencing in the course. More students and more sites definitely impact faculty time constraints in these instances.
- This should be addressed by each institution and by governance. It would be helpful to know what each institution is proposing.
- Faculty must have control of class size for distance delivered classes. the department is the appropriate level for making such decisions. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendation, March 4, 2005.)
- Compensation for development of distance courses should be calculated at one unit of faculty time for each credit of coursework developed. Faculty must negotiate terms of course development and revision (i.e. overload or faculty release) with their dean or director. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendation, March 4, 2005.)
- Agree with #83 re current work of ASCDE which is advanced at this point.

- We are a research institution, but has there been research done here or at other institutions concerning what is involved in developing DE courses? To objectively determine what is a reasonable workload related to DE development and delivery, administrators and faculty needs some objective information to help them make decisions.
- There are two problems with workload assignments. One is the basic allowance for teaching a course and the other is the lack of understanding of the “non-distance” faculty for the work involved. Workload assignments for distance courses are not simple matters, but it is not that much more complicated than assignments for classroom courses. The faculty time required for distance course development is highly dependent on the distance mode. The faculty time for delivering a distance course is highly dependent on the mode and the number of students. The lack of understanding is a greater problem in the long run. Regardless of the number of units put on the workload, some faculty do not see any value in distance education. If an endeavor does not result in research contracts and summer salary, they can see no “academic” value in it. This will impact the promotion and tenure prospects of the instructor who expends efforts on distance education. Administrators, confronted by faculty attitudes which the administrators know they cannot change, simply mutter something about “community of scholars” or some other platitudinous nonsense, and ignore the situation. What is needed is a chancellor-level pronouncement that efforts expended to advance education by distance means are a worthy scholarly endeavor and will be looked upon favorably in the promotion and tenure process.

2.6.1. Incentive structure for DE faculty

- It would be nice to consider incentives that go beyond course release and cash. An incentive might be a laptop with software loaded that would help design and create distance ed (Products like Captivate, audio headsets etc.) and/or a student worker or access to an instructional design team.
- Leadership of academic programs must reside with faculty. Collaboration and planning for programs need to be faculty driven. Incentives should be provided for this collaboration. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendation, March 4, 2005.)
- Tripartite faculty must get credit for research when developing distance-delivered classes.
- Agree with # 95, but clear policies re pay, release-time, and tenure-promotion must be established.
- "Disincentives" should be minimized. One example would be to provide funding for development of courses from a source outside of the unit. If development funding comes from a unit that may be struggling financially, the development isn't going to happen.
- Release time and/or underwriting of faculty training would be a significant incentive.
- Setting some standards across MAU would be very nice. It is disheartening to work on a course and spend hours and hours and learn that somewhere else on campus (or on a neighboring campus) faculty were given \$8000 or \$10,000 to accomplish similar work. It isn't just an issue of money, or some programs paying people more money- it is more an issue of valuing people's time, their efforts and understanding the amount of work that goes into creating good courses. Equity issues like this are causing a lot of bad press for DE.
- On Distance Ed gateway, do a Photo page: honor faculty that teach via distance by showing their photo and short bio. Give nice pens that contain flash drives to teaching faculty or distance support staff. Consider additional pay for course development or free days off.

2.6.2. Equitable productivity and quality metrics for DE faculty and campuses

- Consider implementing the WCET student services audit. It's results would go a long way toward revealing issues of inequity re: productivity and quality metrics for DE as well as traditional teaching practices across the UA

2.7. Equitable distribution of revenue for units that provide services to students - a financial model for tuition and fee sharing

- I'm not sure there should be a standard financial model. Maybe a MOA negotiated according to need would be better.

Negotiated agreements between units is an excellent choice. For example, the UAA school of nursing and each of its campus hosts have a detailed agreement in place which addresses most of the financial and academic questions when units cross MAUs. The Early Childhood Ed programs at the AAS level share a degree program and UAF/UAS has written agreement for financial and academic provisions and the level of financial exchange and academic decision-making is different from the Nursing program. EACH program has to negotiate what services it needs for its students with its host campuses---and these many vary depending upon host resources or lack thereof. Deans of programs can usually sit down with key faculty leaders from each side and work out the agreements---once settled, they should be reviewed annually to accommodate changing environments.

- Perhaps we need to look at how UAS and CRA work out tuition distribution for the cross regionally courses that they share. 80% goes to the course campus and 20% goes to who, which campus, registers the student.
- There is currently an identified group of courses that are sharing on the 80%-20% split. Randy Weaver can provide data about this topic. %80 to dept delivering the course a20% of tuition to hosting campus or nearest campus to the location of the student---this assumes that the nearest campus is the site a student would naturally go to for assistance/support. This isn't necessarily true with online courses since the delivering campus usually provides the majority of the assistance the student requires---this does encourage depts to share courses across the state---if they register the student into their course they get 80% of tuition. this method is still experimental but the thought is to try and gather data to see if this works.
- How to distribute the cost was (still is) a challenge for telemedicine and that is an open-ended activity where fees grow as more providers get involved in the service provision and consultation process. However, there may be something we can learn from this related distance delivery activity, have the units and/or parties bill an account as they provide services. Set some standards like they do for fixing your car of billable hours for a particular service so for an on-line student consult a faculty member or unit could "bill" for X number of units. When the course ends it may accumulate Z number of billable units charged to it. Divide that total into the total income generated and that is the share of the income they would earn. What faculty or units would earn could vary from class to class even if they billed for the same number of units because the total number of units billed to a course will vary and the total income generated will vary. The process does provide a way to directly track how expenses are charged regardless of the source requesting payment for services provided.
- The current 80-20 split encourages unhelpful competition among campuses. Campuses hire adjuncts to teach distance classes that compete against distance classes offered by full-time permanent professors. Try a 70-20-10 split: 70 to dept or campus delivering the course, 20 to registering campus, 10 to statewide student services and/or CDE to provide revenue for technical development of courses.
- Response to #207 Does the suggestion of 70 20 10 split suggest dropping the existing DE fees students pay? Either way, some combination of the 10% and DE fees needs a systemwide

formula for distribution to ID at the campus or college specific level so ID is guided by the program/content areas not a centralized technical development approach.

2.8. Who counts the student as their own?

- Academic Campus should be the degree program in which the student is enrolled. Home Campus should be where the student lives, as they are the ones serving the student. As for NODS seeking students, who are not in a program, the Academic Campus should be the home campus, as they are the ones serving the student and advising them. Having a distance education department advise these student from a distance, as purposed, does not adequately serve our students. I think the Home Campuses are doing an excellent job. I think CRA is a good place to look at as a model.
- If students are taking courses from two campuses and an advisor sees this, they should take the initiative to contact a faculty member or advisor from that campus to ensure the student has heard all options available.
- Determine why "ownership" is so important - is it to serve the student better or is it about "headcount"? The answer to this question will drive the solution.

One of the factors for the student --- they aren't counted as full time students if they take courses from multiple campuses so they don't qualify for any one campus dean's list.

- A student should be able to choose which institution they wish to award a degree.
- The student who is taking distance education classes is a University of Alaska student. The student place of residence is providing the services for the student and needs to be considered as the primary support. The student is not own by anyone but is provided opportunities for higher education.
- Students own themselves. They choose from where they graduate. Admission to a program basically decides which degree from which campus they are awarded when they finish.
- Headcount is an important issue. It helps justify funding and obtain grants in order for us to serve our students properly. If we are unable to adequately count our student for IPEDS data this great effects some of our grants reporting that requires us to use IPEDS data. While this issue is about headcount, I think it is about use being able to justify why we need the funding we do to support our students. If we can't adequately count, the amount of funding is questioned.
- A student's email ID currently is used to authenticate access to licensed databases of the home campus library. Evaluate if the costs would be prohibitive to have all databases licensed for UA.
- The student "owns" the program in which she in enrolled. Incentives to meet her needs rather than compete for her tuition will best serve this student.
- comment - this is one of the many issues that a distance ed division of student services would address
- Committee needs to define what student means; there are various definitions that tie into degree and non degree seeking students.

2.9. Academic freedom for DE faculty

- In my experience, many on campus or non-rural faculty and/or department heads seem to have little knowledge of what it takes to deliver courses via distance, especially to rural students. Their expectations, etc, seem to be in the mindset of only face to face delivery. It seems we must work twice as hard as the face to face people, 1) to deliver our coursework and 2) to prove to others that we are indeed covering the material in our syllabi.

Perhaps if the people that deliver their course face to face were more educated and/or required to teach at least one course one time by delivery, they might see what challenges we face. Our planning must be precise, to have support materials ready/mailed, software loaded, materials uploaded, etc.

I also feel as though we are sometimes treated as second class citizens, as though we aren't quite up to the same standard as some of those that teach only face to face.

- The university needs to be production oriented at EVERY level. Just because a person has a butt in a seat doesn't mean they're doing anything meaningful. Faculty should outline what they will produce in specific terms, while at the same time conceding that alterations for the better will often need to be made throughout the process.
- If a workload/contract is agreed upon, give faculty the freedom to do what they promise to their full ability unless they prove otherwise at the end of a semester.
- Academic freedom issues for faculty teaching courses that are received away from the campus should be the same as those who are teaching courses on campus - shouldn't they?
- Administration generally has the final say as to what is best for faculty and students. Why aren't these decisions left to faculty and departments? Can this be changed?

2.9.1. Intellectual Property Rights for DE courses

- Faculty must retain control of course content. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendation, March 4, 2005.)
- I would recommend looking at the start created by Lynn Shepherd (UAS) as she chaired the Copyright committee. An excellent start at looking at ownership issues for distance education courses. There is a draft that could be used to start with. The committee has been disbanded now, but the working document would be a good place to begin.
- I'm not sure why this is an issue. According to at least one of the unions, faculty "own" the content they create unless there is a specific contract giving that ownership away.
- A clear policy from the BOR.
- Agree with #103, absolutely.
- One faculty concern is that they believe that UA owns material they have developed for distance delivery. They are concerned that this material (website, visual material, etc) might be used at a later time by someone else who might misuse it or take credit for it.
- This subject needs to be addressed by the BOR in a specific policy across the UA system.
- Is this an issue with faculty teaching face to face? This should be addressed and discussed across the MAU faculty groups and administrative groups as an issue common to ALL faculty.

2.10. Equitable course development costs and resources

- If UA is committed to DE, there needs to be financial resources devoted to development of such programs. Money is often difficult to obtain for publicly funded projects. Possibly consider a incubator approach where start-up public funding is awarded with the objective of it becoming self-sustaining from fees.

- Acquire feedback from the extended campuses and the main campuses of each MAU to better understand the similarities and differences in how equitable course development costs and revenues should be accomplished.
- Faculty at smaller campuses would appreciate access to new technology and services. Provision of in-service at a distance would help.
- Establish a formula for courses being developed, instructional design resources allocated to your "group" or "department". When a group is into heavy development, more resources are given to them; when their development slows, the resources are allocated to a different group. Department should not have to struggle or write zillions of grants to get the resources that they need to carry on.
- It would be nice to know system-wide why one group gets more resources than another-- what are the criteria? why does one group get the nod from statewide and not another group? Establish guidelines. If a faculty member or department follow the guidelines, they receive more resources. If the faculty get training they receive more resources. Whatever the formula follow it and adhere to it equitably across MAUs and programs.

2.11. High-quality technical infrastructure

- Bringing GCI (who provides access to most of the k-12 schools statewide) and AT&T (who provides access to UA) to the table would be most helpful. Right now, the two systems have incompatibilities that cause problems when trying to broadcast a videoconference from a campus (AT&T) to regional schools (GCI).
- The University must meet with the providers in the State to increase the amount of band width provided to each community it serves.
- Communicate in advance the distance course offerings with the IT department to allow planning for bandwidth upgrades (request per the UAA ITS CIO). Particularly for course offerings to the community campuses.
- Develop a simple data base to facilitate the sharing of courses.
- Faculty engagement, support and skill evolution are the core to success in distance education. Exciting courses that draw students back, enhance their learning occur because of faculty's work. We need to define what instructional design is, evolve it from its early & present form. It needs to be localized, close to faculty in their earlier stages of embracing DE but continued hands-on access as they build their educational tech repertoire. This means more resources spent on a newly created instructional media-type HR job family, housed within colleges or academic units so the content and student base are always the main guiders of instructional design work.
- Promote and support through the ITS program a village tech certification that will train local employees to work both at the local phone companies and village agencies to provide local tech help. Write grants to fund this in cooperation with the telephone carriers and university.
- Audio conference and written correspondence core classes and general education requirements will remain available for students lacking internet access.

2.12. Curriculum and course development for DE

- What is the cost to develop a "standard" DE course? It appears that the cost effectiveness of DE (cost per student) is very high. This can make it cost prohibitive to develop a DE class. Resources need to be available for faculty to consider developing DE classes, e.g., grant support, release time, etc.
- UAA is currently finalizing a Master Academic Plan. I hope this will help guide which new distance courses/programs are part of the strategic mission of the University. Having a

distance course/program be uniquely dependent upon a single faculty member's interest and aptitude is not ultimately the best long term planning model for sustained program offerings.

- Create a statewide team of instructional designers that have a centralized purchase and evaluation of the latest technology, but a decentralized service component - i.e. an instructional design person at each campus all the time to serve faculty on a just in time model.
- All course offerings, distance or classroom, must primarily be the responsibility of a department and an instructor within a department must do all instruction. Hence the departments at the various MAUs need to decide which courses should be distance and which are collaborated between MAUs. The departments must support the instructor. Since some departments are not supportive of distance education, if an educational need for distance is noted, someone at the college, MAU, or statewide level must encourage the department to provide the course and provide resources for the instructor. Too often it is the instructor that perceives the need, then, when departmental resources are not available, the instructor proceeds without the resources. A first step in this process is to designate who is responsible for identifying these needs and second, who is responsible for prodding the department.
- Comment #167 suggests that some departments or faculty may not be supportive of DE. Do we even know to what extent this is the case? Do we know how many courses use Blackboard? What purpose or function does Blackboard perform? If not, does a survey at each campus need to be conducted to find out? If a majority of faculty have no interest or too little time to pursue DE, we may spend a significant amount of money but have few interested faculty.

2.12.1. Quality Assurance for course design, Delivery, and Connectivity

- Establish a set of DE standards that must be met to have a UA approved DE class.

the term "best practices" instead of "standards".

- Any set of standards for course quality developed for distance education would be applied to on-site education.
- Colleges, Departments and Programs are ultimately responsible for QA. A set of standards for UA is a good way for them to implement review procedures. The scrutiny of online materials, delivery, and assessment should be applied also to conventional classroom instruction, where traditionally poor preparation and outdated materials, and overall low quality instruction can go on for years without question or correction.
- It would be nice to establish some guidelines that departments can apply. Often a department is clueless about the possibilities of distance education and thus it is difficult for them to measure success. If we could establish a guideline for good course components it would be a great first step towards better education. It should also be applied to face-to-face courses, but that, again, is up to a department.

The UAF Center for Distance Ed has a rubric w/guidelines we can use statewide.

- Years ago the 3 campuses labored long and hard on a transfer agreement that is still in place. DE classes belong within this agreement and should not be treated differently than on site courses.

is this referring to the Transfer Guide in each catalog covering the GERs?

- The "champion" concept could be applied within colleges and even departments. This would be a veteran distance educator, who probably has the responsibility by default.

2.13. Support for DE Faculty and Staff

- Create more useful documentation, web-streamed videos, and other training material that can be accessed on an as-needed basis.
- Create an on-line DE training class targeted at faculty. Part of the training should include professional instructional design support.
- All on-line training for faculty should also be available for staff.

Main campus--UAA, UAF, UAS training budgets should be re-configured so that they are required to offer 90% of all training with distance delivered components. Incentives for training: employees should receive small percentage--pay increase in steps based upon the professional growth training they have received. Other small incentives such as ability to travel to workshops (some campuses do not currently have professional development). A tiny incentive may be a "personal holiday" or discounts for university sports or event activities, or bookstore discounts.

- Board of Regents level commitment to and policy about creating a student-centered distance education system, complete with systems of accountability. The Board should ask at every meeting for a brief report on distance education process.
- A part of faculty self-evaluations should be to ask "what new thing did you learn this year?" I find it easier to learn about new technology and new software on my own when it comes out. Not after it's been around for a while and someone finally thinks to offer a workshop on it. Show recognition to faculty who learn new things on their own and implement them.

2.13.1. DE-Related Training for Faculty and Staff

- Create training documents, videos, etc. that can be accessed as-needed.
- This is another way institutions can share. Why not create a repository of distance delivered training available. Could the ID Network work on this?
- Create media technicians who know online technology well, can do the labor of uploading, formatting for faculty so they can use their time best with interactive content development
- The instructional design network group can provide the repository
- This addresses the issue of faculty development, which we are addressing at each MAU but not uniformly statewide. A comprehensive faculty development policy should be established statewide that applies to all faculty at all campuses (including adjunct faculty) regardless of the method of delivery - stand and deliver vs. the use of some technology. We would best serve our students if we had some form of evaluation that focused on learning outcomes and the achievement of them and was given at mid semester for corrective action.
- UAS Sitka Title III grant recently provided a DE workshop for interested faculty and staff. It was all expenses paid and very nicely appointed..made participants feel good. Instructional design was the focus, with technology only introduced to support good teaching strategies, such as discussion. It was very effective and gave us some ideas for ways to improve our classes. Suzie Feero was one of the workshop designers.
- Two levels of training are needed. First, all faculty should have a one-hour orientation in distance education methods as part of their orientation upon hire. Second, all faculty who want to teach distance should have a course release to take a 3-credit university course in distance education and UA should pay the fees for this course.

The course itself should be taught by distance, so all distance faculty see what it is like from the other side of the "podium."

- Two levels of training are needed. First, all faculty should have a one-hour orientation in distance education methods as part of their orientation upon hire. Second, all faculty who want to teach distance should have a course release to take a 3-credit university course in distance education and UA should pay the fees for this course. The course itself should be taught by distance, so all distance faculty see what it is like from the other side of the "podium."
- What does staff DE training encompass?
- Create a program of release-time for detailed training in DE course design to deepen skills of faculty and staff.
- Add course design staff, perhaps to the larger extended sites, to strengthen DE development capability.
- Main campus--UAA, UAF, UAS training budgets should be re-configured so that they are required to offer 90% of all training with distance delivered components. Incentives for training: employees should receive small percentage--pay increase in steps based upon the professional growth training they have received. Other small incentives such as ability to travel to workshops (some campuses do not currently have professional development). A tiny incentive may be a "personal holiday" or discounts for university sports or event activities, or bookstore discounts, lapel pins or small promotional awards for training received.
- A library of asynchronous online short courses, fully automated, could be developed to get faculty going. This would be a popular option.
- There is a Rural Sites Training Conference put on by statewide, perhaps we should expand on it and make a distance training component to it. This training provides hands on training to staff from sites that have limit access to training resources.
- At the point of hiring new faculty, an extra effort could be made to recruit those who have skills conducive to modern distance education. Over time this would create a more supportive environment for distance education pedagogy and skill development.

2.13.2. Technical support for DE stakeholders

- Build a 24/7 help center that is partially funded by DE income.
- Easily understandable documentation available on an as-needed basis should be created.
- Technical support should be a part of a Student Services Agreement. Why not join forces (funds) to create a 24/7/365 help desk?
- A distance education support system needs to be created to address the technology needs on a 24hr basis.
- 24 hr help desk that serves the entire state.
- All employees should have access to on-line training.
A campus hosting a course needs to ensure that their will be far (student) site support.

- Faculty and others should not be discouraged from developing or upgrading distance courses due to cost. If we want good DE, we have to have to pay for it.

2.14. Incentives for cooperation among MAUs that serves students, while allowing for competition that preserves local control and quality

- There should be some kind of recognition when faculty refer students to other campuses to take distance courses. When a person is looking out for the best interest of a student in referring them to another campus, this should be supported and encouraged - not looked down upon as if we're in competition. If we are all just cooperating members of UA and the greater good, then this should be easy.
- The recognition needs to include campuses or departments that work together to send students to the appropriate place.
- Establish academic service agreements and courtesy protocol that requires MAU/programs to contact the campus within the service area they are planning to offer courses. This is important in order to insure that students at the far site will receive the necessary local support and that the staff at this site have the resources to support the course.
- Give participants "choices". Make it worth their while to participate.
- Perhaps we need to look at how CRA rural campuses agree own course offerings. If we have a local course that another campuses students want to take that fine. But we do not go looking for another campuses students. If we think the course may be beneficial to another campus we communicate with the appropriate people.

2.15. Communication across MAUs among DE faculty for resource sharing and workload sharing

- Similar to the CRA forum, create a faculty conference folder for resource sharing/clearing house for workload sharing. Access the folder to either My UA Portal or/and the Distributed Ed. Gateway.
- We have a Instructional Design Network that meets monthly to share information. A similar forum could be established for DE faculty. There is a faculty list by MAU, but it doesn't address sharing across campuses.
- A comprehensive list of faculty who teach distance, their contact info. and what they teach should be at an easy to find web location.
- CDE should be responsible for maintaining the major statewide listservs and other forms of communication within the distance education community.
- Sharing resources is an excellent idea. However if a learning object has an associated cost, can we figure out a way to share in that cost? For example, if one department creates something at an expense of \$5000, should it be given freely or should others who use this pay in? Can we create a shared environment which addresses the inequity of program budgets so that those who "have" are not necessarily supporting those who "have not". There are many ways to come to the table with resources even if you don't have the cash-- can share content experts, can share design people, or programmers-- perhaps we're could look at a partnership where people come to the table with "stuff" or money. Other states have developed consortiums similar and it helps people feel more comfortable "giving" away or sharing products.
- The education faculty from 3 MAUs will be meeting in April. This type of meeting is invaluable for developing the connections and trust needed for cross campus programs. I would love to work on more statewide programs, but continued budget and infrastructure for working together is mandatory.

2.16. Articulation Agreements among MAUs

- Articulation agreements between MAUs need to be a collaborative effort between faculty (all academic issues) and administration (policy and cost sharing issues) and should be done programmatically on a case by case basis.
- Support system-wide coordination of academic faculty
- Departments and programs must decide how this is done in detail.

The overall issue of faculty Governance can be addressed through each Faculty Senate. A committee, perhaps combined from UAB & GAB veterans, could meet to develop procedures for accepting courses from the other MAUs.

I think residency requirements should be unilaterally and universally waived among the three MAUs.

Who delivers the degree should ultimately be the student's choice.

There is a BOR policy that waives the "residency" requirements if the courses are from UA.

- Support system wide coordination of academics and technology as long as it remains consistent and compatible with local control over the academic offerings and technology used by local faculty. (UAS Faculty Senate recommendations, March 4, 2005.)
- Faculty workload again needs to be adjusted if they are expected to participate in the local campus committees and projects when they "belong" to another campus in order to foster cooperation and allow them to be seen as an integral member of the campus & the community. It should be considered part of their service credits.
- Articulation agreements need to be a joint effort between departments.
- Create cross-MAU faculty groups and support with resources to help foster relationships & trust. Use these groups to discuss and develop a list of course equivalencies.
- More staff need to be involved in this process who actually make the paperwork happen. I'm not sure that the great folks we have working in student assistance on my campus have the contacts needed to carry a course over from another campus etc. Our campus serves students well because the people that make things happen for students know all the other people they need to know who "make things happen."

3. Ninety-Day Working Groups

The Team chose four of the sixteen issues to address in the next ninety days based on their passion for the topics and the degree to which they believed they could make significant progress in the short term. They formed a working group around each issue, and then provided guidance to each group, suggesting resources, offering insights, and making suggestions about the deliverables for each working group. Each group is charged to produce recommendations on its issue within the next 90 days.

The groups, their membership, and the guidance they received appears below:

3.1. Who counts the student as their own?

Team Members

Jason Ohler

Cathy LeCompte

Bill Butler

Holly Royce

Doug Desorcie

Donna Schaad

John Bruder (Will leave soon, but will find replacement.)

Guidance

- Go to minutes of UALC from mid 90's for beginning work on this issue.
- Tim Schroeder from the Sitka campus has some input to pass on to the group
- Mike Sfraga, Pete Pinney, and Jason Ohler are prime resources
- Suggest a comparison of the 3 catalogs, which represent deliberation of both faculty and administration.
- Jason Ohler and Mike Sfraga recommendations are a place to start, however what to do with NODS needs to be changed to home campus
- Perhaps include Ruth Evern from CRA
- Management and student services staff at extended sites have given this a great deal of thought and have much to add to the discussions.
- articulate clearly and get agreement on the different types of students we are dealing with
- definitions of the types of students
- This issue needs to include an assessment of how revenue from tuition and distance education fees is split and among whom; the issue of academic vs. home campus is still alive and needs resolution so a system can be developed.
- Involve the community campuses who are providing services for DE students
- Include all Student Service and Registrars for input--I'd recommend an AC with the existing subcommittees.
- include Colleen Abrams, UAF for a banner perspective
- Liz Downing at KPC would be an important source of extended site feedback.
- Remember our charge that we must be "student-centered" and consider the student's needs first.
- Outlying campuses and those with community college philosophy may have insights in this area. Kodiak College is shining example. Also UAA's Eagle River campus.

3.2. Working Group on Support for DE Faculty and Staff

Team Members:

Susie Feero

Curt Madison

Joe Mason, Northwest Campus/UAF

Tom Pennington

Mike Hawfield

Charles Snare

Kathi Baldwin (External volunteer)

Guidance:

- approach these two separately
- see Mike Sfraga for info and access to all student services folks
- the instructional design network group (from all 3 MAUs) is a good resource
- The UAA Distance Steering Committee has a working group on this now.
- UAA is developing a Technology Fellows weeklong training class to help with technology including distance teaching. See Lauren Bruce of CAFE.
- identify what exactly needs to be supported. What software, procedures, etc.
*ditto---and discover how this "support" might be different or the same as the support that f2f teachers require. let's not build two infrastructures.
Some programs have faculty with both workloads---de and on site and some have workloads where these are the same section.*
- Deans and directors
- Define support in terms of time, funding, equipment, etc.
Survey faculty/staff..see what they want?
Jason has a report, "Schrumm Report" from UAS with some info on faculty needs
- HDEP has created a lot of training materials for faculty including f2f, online, notebooks and CD materials. Might check with Sally Mead for more information
- At some point this has to involve administration, because administration will bless or not bless the support.
- Having a "champion" at each institution as well as a contact list posted on the DE Gateway would be a big help.
- Once what needs to be supported is identified, work to propose how best to deliver each type of support.
- Chris Lott at CDE could be very helpful
- find out who uses technology -- in and beyond the classroom. Does it vary by program, discipline, campus and so forth (e.g. adjuncts or full-time, number of years taught). What kind of support is desired?
- With respect to #735, uncover how administration views DE.
- What role should or does staff play?
- Following on #762, demonstrate various uses and methods to encourage the multiple ways things may be accomplished
- Make sure that other than just Student Service folks are brought into the support mix. Many rural campuses use other staff other than simply student service staff. Frankly student service staff and business office staff get the most attention.
- Support for staff can mean a great deal more than just technology. Training and informational groups would help fill in gaps.
- Remember that the needs of faculty are very individualized-- 1 shoe does not fit all. Build in personalized help and support.
- Perhaps look at what the Rural Sites Training Conference provides for staff and build on it.
- Not all faculty have access to the hardware/software that they need-- consider options where support may be new equipment or access to technology resources that they might not have
- Faculty showcases-- it really helps to see what other faculty have done or are doing. Set up some faculty showcases where we can share with each other.
- Faculty "interviews"-- let faculty talk about the difficulties they encountered, honestly, and the work-arounds. Let them talk about the things that really helped them. Interview people and learn from the results of the interviews.
- Find a way to have activity with distance ed NOT count against faculty.
When I see this comment it infers that the "unit" has not identified "serving distance students" as a mission, vision, or priority----once that is established, the value for that

activity flows---start with the mission---perhaps the mission of the MAU needs reviewed, mission of the academic unit, mission of the campuses delivering the MAUs mission---

- Training should allow for faculty to express themselves in the way that they are comfortable rather than molding their teaching style to the technology, we should find out how faculty like to teach, and fit the technology and the training needed to their styles.
- Do not forget about the staff who support the students. There are a lot of faculty issues, but staff support also needs to be addressed.
- Ascertain faculty views of learning and teaching and compare this with views with faculty views regarding the role of technology and DE.
- The HDEP has a solid working experience of putting support in place for faculty/staff. I would be glad to join this workgroup. Also, I think the evaluation plan we are using should be shared and considered/refined.
- Where does faculty and staff training converge and diverge?
- List all possible sources of support that are available.
- Survey business managers, student students, and so forth to find out their needs.

3.3. Working Group on Equitable Workload for DE faculty

Team Members

Bob Perkins
Margie Draskovich
Melissa Brown, TVC-UAF
Kathi Baldwin (External Volunteer)
Mike Hawfield
Susie Feero
Katy Spangler, Faculty, UAS

Guidance

- Dean and directors, and program/department chairs
- Draw on existing faculty groups
- work through the faculty groups at each MAU - community campuses are represented through their departments
- UAS Faculty senate has made a statement on this issue.
- Meet with faculty forums or other established faculty groups; offer opportunities to meet one-on-one with faculty.
- Draw upon expertise of faculty who have designed and taught distance classes.
- show samples of what has been done and what looks reasonable. Distance ed faculty should have workload agreements that are deemed as fair compared to other distance faculty.
- Research at the academic affairs offices what is currently in the system.
- Ron Illingworth has been working on ACCFT DE workload issues for some time
- Interview faculty about their perceptions of fair workloads for DE work.
- What has Ron come up with? When we're able to look at what others have developed, perhaps the best answers will show themselves.
- Remember that a faculty that is in-experienced using DE will need orientation & training and possibly mentorship so the learning curve should impact their workload as well as the workload of any mentors.

- That would have been nice when I started. Why should new people have that advantage- just kidding.
- UAA Academic Steering Committee on Distance Ed (UAA ASCDE) - Subcommittee on Workload Guideline for Distance Education - Kathi Baldwin chair.
- Does the development of a 3 credit class always mean a three credit release? Should the release depend on the quality of the course that's developed?
- Some courses need periodic upgrading, so we should consider not only development but upgrading as part of faculty workload.

3.4. Working Group on Articulation Agreements among MAUs

Team Members:

Heidi Simmons

Donna Schaad

Orson Smith

Guidance:

- Provosts' offices

Provosts and Deans are sources for articulation agreements ---

idea: develop some short questions to ask deans and provosts about "lessons learned" from the agreements they have been using. What would they do differently next time? what worked? didn't work? were the incentives (and punishment for noncompliance) appropriate?

- contact Curt Madison about how the statewide ITS faculty group worked on this issue
- This group needs to seek representation from the three MAUs as well as contacting the community campuses.
- Program Chairs & Director
- Be sure to find all existing agreements
- Talk to the faculty that work between two campuses
- identify a program that is willing to model or one (like Curt's) who has done this already
-
- Donna S has lots of good resources and experience in this area.
- Also look at statewide program agreements, such as ECE, Cindy Harrington.
- Check out another state university system: perhaps the relationship between U of Montana and Montana State would be enlightening
- Early Childhood Program has cross MAU program that is successful.
Ditto "M.Ed. in Reading Education" has programs on 3 campuses.
Educational Administration Program tried and failed to negotiate a 3 campus program.
- Transfer agreement for GERs was early model for articulation.
- Find a program that would be willing to work cross campuses and use as continuing model to identify issues, hurdles, processes, etc.
- Talk to Donna S. about the programs she worked with in Illinois

UA Summit 2005 Participant List

| Steering Board Members | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|
| Curt Madison | Center for Distance Education Director | 474-5197 | curt.madison@uaf.edu |
| Bill Butler | Cooperative Extension Associate Director | 474-7246 | fnwhb@uaf.edu |
| Cathy LeCompte | Ketchikan Assistant Director | 228-4523 | kfcald@mail.uas.alaska.edu |
| Charles Snare | Mat-Su Assistant Director, Academic Affairs | 745-9754 ext. 3 | pfces@matsu.alaska.edu |
| Connie Dooley | Kodiak Campus Interim Director | 486-1220 | cstrode@kodiak.koc.alaska.edu |
| Donna Schaad | UAA Director, Educational Media Svcs. | 786-4452 | donna.schaad@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Doug Desorcie | Prince William Sound Interim President | 834-1610 | ddesorcie@pwscc.edu |
| Heidi Simmons | Kuskokwim Campus Distance Education Coordinator | 543-4521 | lhls@uaf.edu |
| Holly Royce | Interior Aleutians Campus Enrollment Management Coordinator | 474-5207 | fnhas@uaf.edu |
| Jason Ohler | UA Presidents Professor for Distance Education | 465-6427 | Jason.ohler@uas.alaska.edu |
| Joe Mason | Northwest Campus Associate Professor | 443-8414 | nfgjm@uaf.edu |
| John Bruder | Bristol Bay Campus Associate Professor | 842-5109 | rfjab@uaf.edu |
| Katy Spangler | UAS Juneau Education Professor | 694-7019 | katy.spangler@uas.alaska.edu |
| Margie Draskovich | Kodiak Campus Assistant Professor | 486-1279 | dfmsd@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Melissa Brown | Tanana Valley Campus Associate Professor | 455-2871 | ffmcb@uaf.edu |
| Mike Hawfield | Kenai Campus Adjunct Professor of History | 235-6078 | inmch@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Orson Smith | UAA Professor School of Engineering | 786-1910 | afops@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Robert Perkins | UAF Associate Professor | 474-7694 | ffrap@uaf.edu |
| Susie Feero | Sitka Assistant Professor CIOS | 747-9477 | Susie.feero@uas.alaska.edu |
| Educational Technology Team Members | | | |
| Curt Madison | UAF CDE Director | 474-5197 | curt.madison@uaf.edu |
| Karen Perdue | UA Statewide Associate Vice President | 474-1970 | karen.perdue@alaska.edu |
| Karen Schmitt | UAS Dean of Career Education | 465-8773 | karen.schmitt@uas.alaska.edu |
| Michael Sfraga | UA Statewide Associate Vice President | 450-8140 | mike.sfraga@alaska.edu |
| Pat Pitney | UA Statewide Associate Vice President Planning/Budget Dev. | 474-5889 | pat.pitney@alaska.edu |
| Randy Weaver | UA Statewide Controller | 450-8070 | randy.weaver@alaska.edu |
| Renee Carter-Chapman | UAA Vice Chancellor | 786-6486 | anrmc@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Steve Smith | UA Statewide Chief Information Technology Officer | 474-6309 | steve.smith@alaska.edu |
| Guests | | | |
| Mark Hamilton | UA SW President | 474-7311 | sypres@alaska.edu |
| Craig Dorman | UA SW Vice President for Research | 474-7451 | craig.dorman@alaska.edu |
| Elaine Maimon | UAA Chancellor | 786-1417 | chancellor@uaa.alaska.edu |
| Steve Jones | UAF Chancellor | | fychanc@uaf.edu |
| Roberta Stell | UAS Provost | | roberta.stell@uas.alaska.edu |
| Bernice Joseph | UAF CRA Executive Dean | 474-7143 | bernice.joseph@uaf.edu |
| | | | |
| Meeting Support | | | |
| Christen Bouffard | UAF CDE Instructional Designer | 474-1128 | c.bouffard@uaf.edu |
| Donna Hertzler | UAF CDE Assistant to the Director | 474-5602 | fndmh1@uaf.edu |
| Bob Briggs | Facilitator | 800-368-6338 | Bob.Briggs@groupsystems.com |
| Joshua Kugler | System Administrator | 474-6458 | joshua.kugler@uaf.edu |

UA Summit 2005 Agenda

University of Alaska

Distance Education Summit 2005

Held at the University of Alaska Anchorage March 28-29, 2005

Sunday, March 27th

Informal, no-host, happy hour gathering at the Hilton hotel, 5:30-7:00 p.m. in Bruins (lobby media bar)

Monday March 28th

8:00 Leave Hilton by car pool to the meeting room at UAA. Parking arranged by Donna Schaad. Coffee and muffins provided.

9:00 Welcome-Elaine Maimon, UAA Chancellor
Importance of seeking system wide solutions-Mark Hamilton, UA President
Challenge to think boldly-Craig Dorman, UA Vice President Academic Affairs
Distance Education at UAF-Steve Jones, UAF Chancellor
Distance Education at UAS-John Pugh, UAS Chancellor
Distance Education in Rural Alaska-Bernice Joseph, CRA Executive Dean
Overview of meeting procedures-Curt Madison, Steering Board Chair

10:15 Break-coffee provided

10:30 Reports of three work groups with discussion

11:00 Defining the problem space for the most salient critical issues.
Financial model for tuition and fee sharing
Protected development of programs vs. health competition
Faculty workload compensation model
Equitable course development costs and resources
Course offering sequences and schedules

12:00 Lunch-provided in the Den

1:30 Further work on critical issues

4:30 Suspend operation until 9:00 a.m. Tuesday

6:30 Information of interesting places to go, on your own, in Anchorage provided by UAA

Tuesday, March 29th

8:00 Leave Hilton hotel for the UAA meeting room

9:00 Showcase

Chemistry
Biology
Arctic Engineering
Teaching Science
Distributed Ed Gateway
Steering Board

9:45 Further work on critical issues

10:30 Break-Coffee

12:00 Lunch-provided in the Den

1:30 Write Summit meeting report

3:30 Create and charge new working groups

4:30 Adjourn