

**MnSCU Center for Teaching and Learning  
Steering Committee Meeting  
September 14, 2005  
Office of the Chancellor, Board Room B, 30 7<sup>th</sup> Street E., St. Paul, MN 55101**

**Minutes**

**PRESENT:** Deena Allen, Cheryl Avenal-Navara, Michael Berndt, Nancy Black, Richard Brown, Mike Connelly, Zala Fashant, Janet Henquinet, Sue Howard, Louise Hoxworth, Debra Japp, Dick Johnson, James Kaplan, Larry Litecky, Raymond Lou, Chuck Lyons, Lynda Milne, Sharon Oliver, Larry Oveson, Stewart Ross, Martin Springborg, Carol Steimer Bailey, Keith Stover, Karen Thoms

**ABSENT WITH NOTICE:** Mary Rothchild

**MINUTES:** Mary Kne/Lynda Milne (▶ denotes action item)

**Minutes and Review of Agenda**

Minutes accepted as written.

Agenda accepted as modified to include discussion of D2L problems.

**Member Business**

New CTL Associate Director, Richard Brown, was introduced. The Committee had no objection to Mary Rothchild attending as Office of the Chancellor “non-voting resource” as well as Louise Hoxworth, Program Director for Program Collaboration (Transfer) who has been added to committee roster. Dick Johnson welcomed as new non-voting system resource in John O’Brien’s former position.

**Initiatives and Activities Update**

*Designed for Learning Pilot*

Nancy Black noted that recent D2L problems were very serious and should be discussed by this committee, especially in light of Designed for Learning project with National Center for Academic Transformation. If we can’t serve students now with current computer technologies, why are we talking about course redesign?

Stover moved agenda be amended to deal with D2. Lyons seconded. Ayes have it to add to agenda.

Dick Johnson reported that he had just checked on D2L and all seems to be running ok today. No one is happy with the performance, but IT is communicating with vendor to improve system. Normally works ok, but there are some usage spikes that cause real problems.

Debra Japp noted that faculty don't get adequate information in time to plan courses well. Information doesn't flow quickly. Asked that Office of the Chancellor find better ways to let faculty know sooner to make adjustments in the course.

Janet Henquinet noted that there is increasingly no time for faculty to get involved in professional development activities that might help them with the technology because technology doesn't work well.

Group discussed ways that communication from Office of the Chancellor can communicate better and more quickly and directly re D2L status.

Milne asked if anyone present is *not* having problems with D2L. Zala Fashant said that his online course at Bemidji State is not having serious problems, and that he finds as an instructor that he is getting good, timely local support.

Henquinet said communication at Metropolitan State is also very good.

Chuck Lyons said that at Hibbing Community College he gets good communication from local support staff, but they often say they haven't heard from IT yet.

Stewart Ross reported that the system and communication are slow at MSU, Mankato. He feels that he's in a terrible position because people regret getting involved with online instruction. He receives a lot of flack from instructors. He's rethinking putting his CETL teaching certificate program in a D2L format.

► **Milne will talk to Sr., Vice Chancellor Baer about the effect of these problems on faculty workload and time, on their sense of Office of the Chancellor credibility and their willingness to undertake other technology.**

Conversation continued about the reliability of D2L as a vendor. Black noted that our first need is to get the current situation stable.

Japp noted that St. Cloud State staff and support have been exceptional. She suggested to Dick Johnson that it might help to put Nancy Black and Larry Oveson in the first line of communication, and they can effectively get word out to the IFO and MSCF faculty.

#### *Discussion of NCAT*

Lynda Milne reported on the August 19 meeting on final details of the agreement with NCAT. She noted that by the end of September CTL would like to send call for participation to campuses; it will have a letter of introduction from Linda Baer.

Richard Brown shared the Call for Participation document and noted that the approach will be to promote redesign only as a solution to a need. For faculty who have such a need, this might be one strategy to help solve it. He called committee attention to the

work plan document that was finalized on August 9 (middle of page 5) listing other initiatives in the system with which this project might be aligned.

Henquinet asked about help available to prospective applicants

Milne answered that CTL may be able to learn good lessons from NCAT regarding the amount of pre-proposal support they provide to applicants. The day-long workshop on October 14 at which people can learn about redesign and about whole NCAT process is just the first experience in a two-phase education effort. At the second workshop in January, pre-qualified applicants (those who've submitted and had accepted their "course readiness instrument") will get hands on assistance in completing their proposals.

Regarding Designed for Learning, committee also discussed:

- Publicity plans: in CTL printed and Web calendars of fall events; also details provided in emails to CTL Campus Leaders
- Cost savings: where will they go? The agreement with NCAT says that faculty will be assured that savings are retained in the department or program
- Implications for CTL staffing: monitoring and supporting these projects may require a great deal of effort, especially if there's an expansion beyond the pilot
- Ownership of products: the agreement provides that NCAT owns whatever materials they bring to the project, but permit us to use them. The system owns whatever is developed explicitly for the project.
- Intellectual property of reusable learning objects and other specific products resulting from this project: CTL will use Board policy on intellectual property. We can add language to the application forms or project Web site that makes that clear.
- Post-project implications: will others be pressured to adopt approaches because they seemed to work at another institution? In dissemination it will be important to outline how an innovation worked where it did and why, and the limited extent of these few (5 or so) projects.
- Importance of distinguishing CTL and NCAT in the project, and emphasizing in reports that this project was a specific attempt to test the NCAT model within our system. Ray Lou cautioned that CTL should continue to be associated with improvements in teaching and learning and student outcomes, not cost savings.
- Requirement of campus match for all approved grants, and the importance of getting campus administration to be involved in and approve each application (for match, making required changes on campus, like space allocations, etc.). Brown pointed out that campus teams come to the second workshop—ensuring that the entire team is on board and committed.

The committee also reviewed the charge document for the Designed for Learning Advisory Committee and encouraged members to suggest names to union presidents.

**► Brown and Milne will get the charge document finalized so that Debra Japp can present it at the IFO Board meeting in October. Deena Allen asked whether it needed to go to Meet & Confer, and Japp replied that the board meeting was good.**

*Teaching Award (item was moved up on agenda)*

Milne reviewed history of task force, and discussed current recommendations, noting that

- Number of final awards is targeted now to be 3. Comments so far tended to converge on fewer awardees, higher award amount.
- Plan currently is for 3 awards at \$5000 each; no award of \$250 to nominees.
- Name changed to Board of Trustees Award for Excellence in Teaching.
- There is a problem with budget. Initial proposal was for no less than \$75,000; we seem to have about \$25,000 now. Won't fund enough.
- The gala awards banquet, which many task force members strongly recommended, might be at risk if budget can't be increased.
- All above items are still at recommendations stage—no formal approval sought yet.
- On Sept 6, CTL took recommendations to entire Leadership Council and to the Academic Affairs committee. All presidents agreed that a timeline for this year wouldn't work for their own campus timelines. Instead, they asked that the committee plan to announce the awards in spring of 2006. Recommended that current committee continue the work of taking the awards through a first cycle, since they are the most informed group. May extend or modify its charge.

Allen explained that the Office of the Chancellor's Labor Relations team was also working on contractual issues to be able to pay the awards. Letters of understanding would have to be agreed upon.

► **Japp will email IFO reps on the task force to see if they want to continue.**

*Ford Foundation*

We didn't get the grant, but North Hennepin Community College is planning to establish the faculty learning community and CTL will host a weekend seminar there on the topic of student diversity to support the group.

*Faculty survey*

Zala Fashant distributed latest data on participation levels, which are generally good.

**CTL Operations and Programs Report**

*Bush Learning that Lasts*

- ALAs and staff (Milne, Berg, Springborg) writing articles for the *New Directions in Teaching and Learning* journal issue in which editor Marilla Svinicki has shown interest.
- Professional Evaluation Services is completing their final report
- Committee discussed the need to better disseminate the impressive results of this grant program

*Events Fall 2005*

Fall Events Calendar was reviewed with little time for discussion.

*Leaders Workshop*

Committee members reviewed a sample leaders' report letter sent to leaders upon completion and review of their annual reports.

*CTL Biennial report*

Martin Springborg, who is compiling the report, walked members through the draft outline. Larry Litecky and Mike Connolly agreed to write an intro to the report.

- Mary Kne and Lynda Milne