

OLN Professional Development Committee Meeting

MINUTES

March 27, 2002 at OhioLINK

2455 North Star Road

Columbus, OH 43221

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Members present: Cathy Bennett, Sandra Crobar, Mary Lou Holly, Hans Houshouer (Chair; by conference call), Alan Kalish, Peggy Kasten, Dan Madigan, Susan Maslyk, Mark McBride, Harry Searles, Len Simutis, Jon Tafel.

Regrets: T.J. Arrant, Greg Bernhardt, Larry Fruth, Terry McCollum, Linda Wahn.

OLN staff present: Kate Carey, Sheryl Hansen, Andrea Wood.

Guests: none.

1) OLN Update

- a) The OLN Governing Board chose NCHEMS to do the OLN assessment. Karen Paulson from NCHEMS is in contact with OLN staff. She or other NCHEMS personnel may contact committee members and other OLN constituents for interviews.
- b) Task force on course quality is gaining momentum. First meeting: April 17th. About 12 members currently. Kate relayed who has been invited to be a part of this committee. Kate distributed the committee charge to PD committee for their review. Task force has the ability to alter this charge. *Discussion:* University of Toledo – Karen Rhoda may be a good addition considering her work at UT.

2) Learning Communities RFP

- a) Sheryl reported that she has received numerous inquiries about the RFP from a wide range of entities and institutions. *Discussion: Based on the conversations at BGSU, the FAQ may need to be expanded to address some questions about the RFP. For example: Refining the language about the relationship of hosts and learning communities. Some concerns about course release – generally institutions may not be willing to offer course release. May want to be more flexible and encourage creativity in incentives and awards for faculty. A smaller college or an institution who doesn't have a lot of money may opt to volunteer some of their time.*
- b) Houshouer pointed out that it is important that the PD Committee help Hansen formulate the RFP. Next governing board meeting is in May, Hans is expected to provide a report on the RFP –not just a summary. *Discussion: Kalish: With such an aggressive timetable, it could be useful we can go back to submitters and ask questions. People may rush these through. It is important that we look and anticipate the questions that folks out there are having and include in the FAQ. Additional examples within the RFP would be helpful (but will now have to go in*

the FAQ). McBride: *Want to be careful with examples so that they do not feel restrained or limited in their choices.* Holly: *Some may have difficulty finding when the Institute Proposal is due. Is it part of another proposal, or does it have a separate deadline?* Tafel: *Can NON-Institutions apply?* Hansen: *Yes, if they pulled colleges and universities together they are welcome.* Kalish: *Multiple institutions can join together.* Tafel: *Usually the non-institution types are left out of the mix, even if they may be invited. May want to address this in the FAQ.*

- i) **REVIEW PROCESS:** Hansen: *Randy Bass has expressed interest in facilitating a kick-off event for the Learning Communities (LCs). He may also be a “national reviewer” for the RFPs. Want at least 3 and hopefully 5 reviewers for proposals. Would be done electronically, OLN webmaster would create a web-based form with criteria. No reviewer will review their own campus’ proposal. Phone conferences and F2F meetings would probably be held in mid-May if necessary. Confidentiality and equity important part of the discussion – should the review be blind? General agreement on process as outlined by Hansen.*
- ii) **Readiness Grants:** *Staying focused on the Readiness portion initially and focus on the criteria part of the RFP. That should remain the priority.* Tafel: *suggests cutting down on the process as much as possible, this isn’t a LOT of money. Don’t need to get into the lengthy process issues.* Madigan: *Hopefully 2 yrs. From now the RFP process will be refined to sort by institution size or region – see this as a building year for this RFP.* **VOLUNTEERS:** Madigan and McBride (volunteered for all three reviews); Madigan, McBride, Houshouer, Kalish, Bennett, Maslyk, and Holly (Readiness Grant Review); Madigan, McBride, Kalish, Crobar (Implementation Grant Review).

3) TeachU Discussion

- a) TeachU grew out of a need for courseware training expressed by the community. Total trained is about 400 people. The number is fairly small compared to faculty untrained. **Discussion:** Crobar: *The majority of people who were initially trained are still teaching. Once train-the-trainer is done, is this kind of training really necessary? It might be helpful to identify campus trainers, identify those “mentors” and then identify some funds to pay for release time, etc. for those folks to support their ongoing work.* Kalish: *Given how much OSU does internally, I am surprised to see how many people from OSU went to TeachU training, but there are many campuses who do not have the kind of infrastructure needed. Some central support may be needed. Maybe we shouldn’t spend the money on institutions that don’t really need the training.* McBride: *At Miami we have reached a critical mass and may not need to do more training at Miami.* Tafel: *OLN should be the value-added, we should provide for those institutions that cannot do it for themselves.* Kalish: *The next step may be teaching how to use the tools more effectively, and not so much the tool training.* Kalish: *Folks using WebCT and Bb for science and math courses tend to be less satisfied with the products.* Hansen: *Issues of course quality may be the current direction.*
- b) Madigan: *OLN is in a position to look into the future about what the needs will be. That’s the value-added. Courseware companies are being held hostage. MSN,*

- Bb and WebCT are bad for universities. We need to look at open source (MIT) for example. There is no reason why we can't get more involved in open source – send some Ohio folks to meetings and explore. Carey: *David Barber and CIOs have been discussing open source, etc. Conversations are ongoing.* Kalish: *Whatever we do to help people learn about whatever tool is chosen, it is the pedagogy and the instructional design. Discussing open source should include novice instructors.* Carey: *The CIO conversations are mere conversations – it is an early response to the courseware issues.* Madigan: *Many people tried grow-your-own and it was too costly. We should explore different things, what is the possibility of using things like Dreamweaver or some other product. Macromedia may be a possibility.* Hansen: *LCs may bring some issues to the surface. ADA and Copyright issues have been a consistent request from the community.*
- c) Houshouer: *Overarching theme should be “enhancing pedagogy in the digital age”. Bluffton will be adding Dreamweaver as part of their software package. If OLN were to offer a creative service that would provide workshops on using Dreamweaver to creative pedagogically sound courses, our faculty would attend.* Crobar: *Trainers don't have much time to do any “additional above-and-beyond” kind of training.* Carey: *Maybe our strength is more of a “brokering of expertise” than providing traditional types of training.* Bennett: *Faculty who seem to be way out in front in this work tend to be overworked, and threatening to burn out. Is there a role for OLN in that sense?* Kalish: *Mid-career faculty tend to survive better if they take time to get some professional development. Rejuvenation communities for mid-career and senior faculty.* Madigan: *At BGSU our “rejuvenation community” is still growing. Formulating professional growth plans. Meet once a month at lunch.* McBride: *Miami uses a learning community model for faculty rejuvenation committies. We give them buy down of teaching time to free them. Costs \$25-30,000 per year for the entire community.* Holly: *Getting off campus and going somewhere together has been very positive for faculty at Kent.* Tafel: *May be worthwhile if we want to “future” as a state and pay “OLN Fellows” and share. Use OLN's web site to be a catalyst across Ohio for engendering conversations and recognizing the leaders in the state.* McBride: *We may want to have conversations about the impact of technology on professional development itself. There may be other models for PD that technology enhances that we are not aware of. Ken Graetz and Tom Skill and the Collaboratory is a possible example.* Holly: *Capella has hired someone who is soley responsible for online professional development.* Crobar: *May hire someone who will be non-teaching who will focus on course-development, etc. (will take some burden off me).* Madigan: *We often think about “online” when we could talk about “multi-media”. How is technology IN the classroom impacting teaching and learning. How do people learn? And does technology play a role?* McBride: *What is the role of Intellegent Agents and AI in higher education?*
- d) Bennett: *Is there some simple things we can identify that we can hand to campuses and say here are some simple things you can work on to elevate teaching and learning on your campuses or in your departments.* Holly: *Examples of Hybridization – have someone who does it do a brown-bag lunch. Make sure we aren't dwelling on the overly complex.* Bennett: *possibility of using LC*

communities as mentors for faculty who are new to tech.-enhanced teaching. Maslyk: One of the keys is that faculty thrive when they aren't forced to engage with each other. Houshouer: Will look to the LC grants as important input for our future work.

- 4) Academic Outreach Update
 - a) *Emerging needs grants moving along very well.*
- 5) Technopoli
 - a) *Hansen: We now have 16 organizations registered as providers. Have a number of events and the news is getting out. Working on a tighter marketing plan and build upon the project. Wood: We have about a 50-50 split between events in the calendar geared toward K12 and events geared toward Higher Ed.*
- 6) **PD Website Development**
 - a) ADA/508 Clearinghouse
 - i) *Does the committee recommend that we move forward in providing a clearinghouse of information in this area.*
 - b) Intellectual Property
- 7) **TECPD**
 - a) *New exciting learning environment. Ken Graetz is doing great. About 100 people on the TECPD lotus place list. Ken is offering a "same time" learning experience online on 3/28.*
- 8) **Round Robin: Member News**
 - a) *Kasten: redesigned web site for the Resource Center will be up on April 29th. A unique way to search and browse the offerings. Had an RFP for a needs assessment and an evaluation of the center.*
 - b) *Simutis: ENC recently launched a web site with digital resources that support undergraduate education in math and science. ENC's official foray into undergraduate education. Part of the NSF digital library.*
 - c) *Maslyk: Have been developing online courses for K12 teachers – webQuests online through online courses. Hoping this is a viable way for us to serve the 21 counties that we serve. Issue of time constraints and teachers' workloads. Also offered simple 1-2 hour "one shot deals" for teachers who have said they want quick training sessions. Ohiodl.org brochure and web site was developed by EdTech agencies. From ITSCO's web site you can get connected to the OhioDL.org site for K12.*
 - d) *McBride: We had a PD programs review by Eduprise.*
 - e) *Crobar: Crobar said she and 2 colleagues are writing their own performance review.*
 - f) *Kalish: Our statistics dept. has one of the PEW Center for Transformation grants. We are looking at the model that the PEW center provided which emphasizes saving money rather than costing money to use technology. This is the last set of grants because PEW Charitable Trusts will no longer be in higher education.*

TELR is using the model for some of OSU's internal grants. Big issues have been evaluation of faculty work and peer reviews. Just last week <http://osu.edu/education/ftad> launched an online evaluation tool/guidelines for teachers. We are holding an Academy of Teaching mini-conference on evaluation of teaching. Two topics are for individual faculty documenting their work and using student feedback. Others include interpreting data. Disability/ ADA: OSU is part of a partnership project on disabilities where faculty development technology support and ADA coordinator's office have been working together to create linkages for supporting students with disabilities and helping faculty address ADA. Teleconference on April 25th 2-4pm that will be in technopoli in the next day or so. There is a local site or watch online.

- g) Madigan: Digital Video Audio initiative on campus, partially merged with the Center for Teaching and Learning. Center has grown because of it. Center is growing again b/c the BGSU has decided to only support Bb, not both WebCT and Bb. Center will be coordinating the transition. We have 450 faculty and 6000-7000 students using WebCT. It means working with faculty to implement DVA into their teaching and learning. Goals of DVA: 1) Technology LCs. 16 people. \$200K in grants monies. Each faculty member gets up to \$13K, \$7K goes for support (hiring grad students, etc.) \$6K is for equipment relating to what they want to do (laptop, camera, etc.) but they have to be a part of a LC to share what they are doing. Having a profoundly positive effect. Next round's faculty will yield 25-30 total faculty. 2) Events Capture – working on ways college units can capture events and get them online in little time using a template. Running a series of events, such as President's Lecture Series, and translating to digital so it can be distributed by web, CD, etc. Doing LCs for students, and also developing a series of tutorials with the help of a Chicago Company called "Atomic Learning". Video tutorials for any department on campus (PowerPoint, etc.). McBride: Using "SmartForce" for the same kind of thing. Also "how to create your own tutorial."*
- h) Holly: Collaborative Technologists – Faculty Learning Community at Kent looking at the OLN RFP. What works and what doesn't and why, then experimenting. New media at Kent has looked at a TA licensing program where graduate assistants oriented toward teaching will be given time out of their assistantships of training, and FPDC is trying to inject pedagogy into that training. We also have another faculty LC just for Teaching Assistants. TA learning community will start in September or August.*
- i) Bennett: We are a very small school, so issues we face are different. We wanted to build into DL courses and degrees to have layers of support, in particular a library or IT degree. We invited employees at other state schools with the idea of bringing them in as adjunct faculty (about nine, we hired five in the fall). Then we put it into a team teaching cohort of about 50 students team-taught by that group. We've learned a lot, everyone brought a lot of strengths.*
- 9) Posting job positions: Carey: Should OLN offer a resource for posting job positions? Kalish: If people knew that there was a place where they could see positions offered on a state level, then it might work.*

10) Meetings for Next Year

- a) Hans suggested October, February, April. OLN staff will come up with dates for the regular interval Tuesday or Thursday (Wednesdays seem bad for Hans and others).

Adjourned at 1:15 p.m.