

Professional Development Committee Meeting – March 29, 2000
2455 North Star Road
Columbus, OH 43221
10am-2pm

MINUTES AMENDED 6/5/2000(ean)

Co-Chairs: Martha Garland, Jon Tafel

Members Present: Greg Bernhardt, Larry Fruth, Jeff Gordon, Bonnie Kroeger, Hans Houshower, Terry McCollum, Len Simutis, Ray Timlin, Zana Vincent, Kathy Wright

Members Absent: Tim Best, Harry Searles, Joffrey Jones

Guests: Mike Governanti

OLN Staff: Kate Carey, Sheryl Hansen, Elisabeth Nixon

Martha Garland called the meeting to order at 10:05am. The committee met for several purposes: to formally organize the Professional Development Committee into a recommending body for OLN Governing Board, to formally accept the committee charge, to finalize committee membership, to finalize member terms, and to begin the planning stages of committee activity.

Minutes from the February 23, 2000, meeting were accepted and approved as written by committee.

Updates

A. Governing Board Strategic Planning Retreat

The March 4th retreat provided an opportunity for board members and committee chairs to determine what projects OLN should concentrate on for the next six months. The Board charged OLN with the following activities:

- Explore how OLN should act as a brokerage/clearinghouse
- Place full degrees online in OhioLEARNS! catalog
- Professional Development Activities, including RFP's and creation of juried database of Professional Development materials and best practices.
- Catalog Development Phase II

B. Partnerships RFP

OLN received a total of fifty-seven proposals. Thirteen professionals were recruited from national and state business and industry, public and independent two-year and 4-year institutions to participate in the review. Each proposal was read by two different reviewers. First-round scores were received by March 22nd. OLN determined that a total of 35 proposals would move forward to the April 2-3 in-house review:

- 10 proposals from Category A (K-12);
- 17 proposals from Category B1 (Intra-University); and
- 8 proposals from Category B2 (Inter-University).

The thirteen reviewers will be placed into two teams. It is anticipated that by the end of the evening on Sunday, a priority list will have been established by both teams. Beginning Monday morning, Hansen plans to bring the two teams together to compare lists and ask for final funding recommendations. Funding recommendations from the in-house review will be forwarded to OLN Governing Board on May 8th. Notification of awards will be mailed May 10, 2000. Hansen plans to dedicate a portion of the review to ask reviewers for their suggestions on improving the RFP process. Hansen also presented the committee with a “Declaration of Principles” document which will be used in the April review. This document states that OLN, reviewers, and institutions working with OLN will maintain high standards of professional conduct in all OLN activities.

Hansen stated that a number of the proposals contained budget discrepancies. The FAQ connected with this RFP stated that no more than 25% of the match may be used toward hardware and software. A large number of proposals had dedicated in-kind match, well over 25%, to hardware/software needs. Hansen will ask reviewers to look at these budget issues more closely. Garland cautioned that OLN should not reject proposals solely because the budgets are inaccurate. Instead, OLN should alert the PI to this oversight and ask for a budget resubmission. Hansen agreed. Houshower shared that he submitted a proposal to this RFP. One suggestion he had to offer from the perspective of a PI was that the RFP needed greater clarity about the budget and the goals—OLN needs to communicate better what is or is not allowable. Garland suggested that OLN use this RFP process as a working model for RFP improvement.

Carey stated that the current RFP process is cumbersome. She proposed to the Governing Board a new idea in RFP's—venture capital. Carey stated that OLN could identify single products and invite those who produce those products to participate in a competition. The Governing Board would like OLN to concentrate on establishing associates, bachelors, masters degrees, and certificate programs in four disciplines: Engineering, Engineering technologies, Education, and Information Technologies. It was suggested that OLN work with institutions already offering degrees in these areas to partner and create additional or new online degrees in those same areas. OLN would like to move funds quickly—within the next 4-6 months. There is also a large need in PK reading and literacy, the development of 100-level general education online courses and these may be areas to explore in the upcoming RFP. Hansen asked the committee to think about how can we encourage people to think about learning in different ways and explore teaching/learning by incorporating technology into classes with large enrollments.

Gordon countered that his concern is the timeline—would OLN be able to accomplish these goals in such a short period of time? Carey answered that OLN has external pressures to get this done. The Higher Education Funding Commission advised how Technology Challenge funds are to be spent. The group is adamant about getting quality funds moved quickly to schools. Carey stated that there is never a “perfect” time to announce grant competitions. The Professional Development Partnerships RFP was announced in mid-November; proposals were due into OLN by January 31. This newest round of competitions will happen in the summer, when most faculty take vacations and/or are conducting their own research projects. Is a compromise point obtainable? Wright suggested that OLN give institutions notification 3 months prior to the start of the RFP so faculty can begin planning for the proposal. Gordon added that posting to various listservs would also help get the word out.

Garland expressed concern about OLN priorities. She sees PK-12 literacy as relevant to OLN, but questioned the development of 100-level undergraduate online courses. Carey answered

that OLN's role is to stimulate higher education and engage in new and emerging technologies. OLN is not about distance education per se, but about technology use in education—how to be more efficient in using technology in the classroom for increased learning. Carey recognized that seat time is a sticky issue, but we need to explore this issue.

Garland again expressed concern about OLN's ability to accomplish these goals. Tafel stated that OLN is about innovation. He sees OLN as creating new processes, finding new niches in education, and moving funds in unique ways to schools (e.g., 100-level online courses). Timlin agreed and stated that OLN should be seen as a catalyst for change. Simutis reminded committee members that innovation is great in alternative settings, but we should also think about innovation in traditional settings as well.

Carey reminded the committee that OLN funds are seed money with an eye on improving learning—a catalyst for change over time. Kroeger cautioned that OLN should remain clear on their goals. If OLN wants innovation, then more lead time is needed for the RFP process. True innovation from spark to implementation takes more time to complete. OLN should be clear about incentives—the clearer the incentive, the better the proposal. Gordon was surprised by the announcement of the PK-12 reading piece of the new RFP. PK-12 is not specialized and many federal funds are available for those programs—why spend OLN money here? Gordon also stated that large classes are an institution's cash cow. There may be a way to identify one or two large 100-level classes per campus, and develop a model that could be used at other institutions. Kroeger pointed out that such funding would not allow 2-year institutions to participate. Carey countered that OLN is trying to look at funding in a different light. OBOR funding opportunities tries to allow for the participation of all schools. OLN funds may be a one-time opportunity for certain institutions and not an on-going funding competition.

C. OLI Conference

OLN will host a conference focused on distance education, with an emphasis on pedagogy. Conference dates are October 23-24, 2000. A call for papers will be issued within the next two weeks. Carey stated that grant recipients from the OBOR/OLN Technology Initiative Grants will be asked to present their research findings at the conference.

Wright announced that the Ohio College Association, in cooperation with the East Central Colleges, Five College of Ohio, Inc., Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities, Northeast Ohio Council on Higher Education, Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education, and Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education will sponsor a one-day conference scheduled for October 27th on faculty development. This conference is open to all member institutions. Steve Gilbert of the Teaching and Learning Technology Center in Washington, D.C. will deliver the keynote address. There is an attendance limit of 150 people. Registration information will be made available in August.”

D. Degree Completion Programs Update

George Steele, Director of Degree Completion Programs for OLN, presented an overview of DLS and RAC (Regional Advisory Councils) activities. Timlin offered his help in recommending members of business and industry to serve on the various RAC councils. Wright also suggested the DLS contact higher education associations (i.e., SOCHE, NOCHE, HECC, etc.) for help in putting together their region's council.

Recognitions

Hans Houshower was awarded the Ryland Fellowship from Educause. Houshower promised to share a copy of his grant work with the committee (which is attached to this email message).

Professional Development Charge

Carey directed the committee to look at the revised draft of the charge. The draft charge read in part:

The Ohio Learning Network Professional Development Committee shall develop a statewide strategy to:

- *Assist colleges and universities with professional development of faculty in the use of technology via OLN as a clearinghouse*
- *Focus on connections among PK-12 educators and colleges/universities/alternative content providers*

Simutis had a concern with the first bullet—she asked if there were indeed other ways to accomplish the goal other than as a clearinghouse. Hansen stated that OLN thought of the term “clearinghouse” as something dynamic and as a process. Gordon suggested that the second bullet point be re-worded slightly, changing “Focus” to “Enhance.” Kroeger was also concerned that the second bullet did not include alternative content providers. He suggested that the wording be changed to read: “*Enhance connections among PK-12, colleges and universities, and alternative content providers.*”

The committee approved the charge as amended (see below):

The Ohio Learning Network Professional Development Committee shall develop a statewide strategy to:

- *Assist colleges and universities with professional development of faculty in the use of technology via OLN as a clearinghouse*
- *Enhance connections among PK-12, colleges and universities, and alternative content providers.*

Membership Terms

Members were asked to serve either a two- or three-year (calendar year) term. Hansen asked that members contact her if they wish to serve longer or shorter than what was assigned.

Meeting Dates

The committee agreed that meeting on the 4th Wednesday of every other month would be sufficient. Meetings were scheduled for the following dates:

- May 31st 10am-2pm
- July 26th 10am-2pm
- September 27th 10am-2pm

Sheryl will schedule committee meetings through June 2001.

Idea Session (see notes attached)

The meeting was adjourned at 2pm

PD Activities 2000 – Idea Session NOTES

Group 1 – What Could Our Website Include?

- Web forum for submitting sites
- Ability to set up forms/listservs – “my AOL” concept
- Databases of experts – e.g. www.PDONE.org

Assessment information validates (review of literature – it was suggested that graduate students possibly assist with validation of materials)

See site . www.PDONE.org for PK-16 Education model – group suggests doing something similar.

Group 2 – Ideas for Jurying Items for Website

- Existing Models of sites that are up
 - Discovery (not web base)
 - Eisenhower
 - Project Dragonfly (Miami)
 - SchoolNet
 - Virtual High School (Mass)
 - ERIC
 - Elect. Journals
 - PacBell
 - Horizon Research
 - COSI
 - Exploration SF
- Closed set with selected reviewers pass through panel of experts (guidelines applied by trained persons)
 - With guidelines
 - Without guidelines
- Establish criteria – funds to select curricula or RO that needs it
- Materials “accepted” by professional organizations
- List of questions including appropriateness for distribution method

Group 3 – Calendar of Events

- Resource People
 - IT contacts at campuses
 - Continuing Education Department
- Content/Networking

- Faculty development/tech component
- Higher education regional organizations
- OCLIS
- OCLC
- OhioNet
- ED-Techs - 8 in Ohio
- RPCD – 12 in Ohio
- SERCC
- SchoolNet
- Summit + Lorain Counties
- 2-year institutions
- Alternative providers such as: The Wilds, Zoos, COSI, Historical Centers

- Searchable by
 - Subject/discipline with short descriptions
 - Ninth-month occurring
 - Location – Regional, Ohio, US, World
 - PK, junior/high school, post-secondary
 - Cost

- Details we need about events (standard format)
 - Date, Title, Cost, Registration deadline
 - Short description
 - Intended audience (PK, junior/high school, higher ed)
 - Sponsoring organization
 - Contact info