

**Distance Learning Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Transcript – January 27, 1998**

The second meeting of the Distance Learning Advisory Committee Group was convened on January 27, 1998 in the CPE conference room.

Chair Lee Todd called the meeting to order and the roll was called:

Members Present:

President Kern Alexander  
Interim President Barbara Burch  
President John Shumaker  
Betty Olinger for President Mary Smith  
President Wethington  
Paul Gaston for President James Vortruba  
President Hanly Funderburk  
President Ronald Eaglin  
Jim Ramsey  
Jim Nelson  
Mike Clark for Virginia Fox  
Secretary Viola Miller  
Gary Cox  
Lee Todd, Jr.  
Merl Hackbart  
Steve Dooley  
Jack Moreland  
Norma Adams

Staff Present:

Ken Walker  
Sue Hodges Moore  
Larry Fowler

Lee Todd – Introduces George Connick of the Education Network of Maine, which is a statewide distance learning network. It extends the education opportunities to the people of Maine through a combination of off-campus centers and sophisticated telecommunications technologies.

I have a hand-out that has a list of publications that he has made and we will make this available to everyone. During his 31 year association with the University of Maine, George held various faculty administrative positions, including 9 years as the President of the University of Maine at Augusta, and three years as President of the Network.

George – I'll quickly give you some background on how Maine came to set up the education network. In 1985, when I was first appointed President of the University of Maine at Augusta, Maine ranked about 49<sup>th</sup> in the country in terms of adults going on for higher education. We ranked 50<sup>th</sup> in terms of high school graduates going on and we had a very low high school graduation rate. Clearly Maine had an access problem. In November of 1985, I was sitting at a Board of Trustees Meeting trying to be inconspicuous, since I was the newest president; and the chancellors suddenly proposed to the board that they would do a study of access for the state of Maine. They recommended that I be assigned that responsibility. I would come back with a plan to solve the problem. Although the board had been aware of the access problems for decades, they decided they needed to speed up the timetable so they gave us to April. A very interesting challenge and what we did was create a forum similar to this number of committees. Remember this was 13 years ago, essentially what we said at that time we said there is no labor intensive model, there's no campus model that can solve the problems that the very rural state like Maine, populations were too dispersed. Maine has the most dispersed population east of the Mississippi. We then said if there is no model of higher education---what exists out there that is really driving change and addressing a sort of broad issues of access and it quickly became apparent that it was technology. The corporate world offered some of the best examples so we asked which corporation dealt with large numbers of people who had never actually come to a physical location, that was LL Bean. In a period of 30 years this company had actually transformed itself without transforming its basic products. So we did a very extensive study of various corporate models on how they reached out to address mass markets. What I would like to do is show you the conceptual design that we came to after endless hours of meetings, retreats, and so on. The conceptual design is very important to understand because it was a major shift in the state of Maine away from the current traditional education structure. (SLIDE PRESENTATION) At the very beginning we said lets try to describe the characteristics of the educational structure. Essentially we said our structure has been created a 100 years ago, it is a campus-based structure and it is clearly based on place, in other words campus classrooms and a place where teaching takes place, it is based on time. Its content based in the sense that it has courses, degrees, and a great deal of print material which backs that up. This model is provider driven by the institutions, and the services historically provided to students and consumers are institution focused. Most importantly, this whole structure has been protected by regional accreditation associations and also by state statutes which has made it very difficult for competitors around the state. Also, of great importance is that this structure is synchronized and put together to ensure that it operates smoothly in its particular content. Maine went to a microwave system that blanketed the state, so that we could reach into every high school, every business, and so on. ATM and web wasn't discussed at that point in time. Remember that our mission was to create access—so we developed a consumer-centered model. We had to make education available basically everywhere—the home, the libraries, the schools, the workplace, campuses and it had to be available in such a way that it could be accessed by anybody. So the time in this case kind of went toward the LL Bean model (24 hours a day 7 days a week). The content we saw is changing and it began to change far more rapidly than we anticipated in those days because of the changes in technology. There are still courses and degrees and print materials but there is an

enormous amount being delivered electronically and increasingly being packaged in various formats. The control we felt would slip to the consumer and it would do so in a very subtle way as more providers began to provide educational access this consumer would suddenly have choices which they have not had because most consumers were place bound except for your very young students, recently high school graduates and those that were prepared to go to a campus full-time, be residential, or be commuters. These were the mobile students, but the bulk of the students for the future we felt did not have those kind of options, the market of the future was adults not 18 years old. It was adults constantly being re-educated, retrained. So we were not looking at a fixed pie of access here but an enormously expanding pie. The real question was how do you go about constructing that kind of institution. We recognized that the faculty was going to be major players however they were not the only major players in the future. Publishers would be, software companies, entertainment companies. If you aggregate higher education K-12 training programs, corporate investments in education you are approaching a trillion dollars a year. The services then had to be consumer focused. The existing structures were designed for a different era of campus-support structures. Finally, we tried to figure out what this would look like. We put the student in the center and then tried to figure out what the outside would look like. We said probably the major support for students is going to be state and regional virtual universities. If you are going to package your education from a variety of sources the question was how do you develop quality. The one thing over a period of almost ten years we feel became clear—adults didn't make decisions on the basis on prestige of institutions, they didn't necessarily make decisions based on cost—they based the decisions on the basis of convenience. Those virtual institutions made it most convenient for students. Brief video showed that described the Network. The importance was making the distance irrelevant.

George – Let me suggest a few issues that became hot-button issues as the network expanded. The network was highly successful from the day it opened in Sept. of 89. Maine has 31 institutions almost all of the small. It has 15 public, , 7 university campuses, 7 tech colleges, and 16 privates—when we opened we were the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest institution in the state—only the land grant university was larger. This is before web based courses, before creations of new forms of deliver, so students were still inconvenienced to some extent by having to go to some location like a high school, a library, or a community center to take courses. One of the big issues that emerged early to build a consumer-centric model you have to relook at all the administrative and student services. Beyond that, we had to look at the academic logistics. In essence, we had to go back and look at all the issues that an accrediting association would look at. This led us to create a hypothetical student that was nicknamed Amy. Amy was a student located on the coast of Maine who lived far to far from any of the campuses to commute, a single mother with several young children. The questions was how do you provide support for Amy. So we began to take Amy and try to enroll her in a specific campus, then multiple campuses then get her admitted and get her financial aid. It was a disaster, even registrars and admissions officers began to pale at the thought of how they were going to get Amy through the educational system. Then we began to look at how we solve those problems and I must admit they are not solved yet. Most states are addressing these

kinds of things. To give you an example, each campus had their own record systems, they were uniform, there is a uniform registration system called ICES. Each campus has proprietary control of the databases. The chancellor can pull in to aggregate them. You could register Amy at three campuses without going into three different databases. This finally led us to create what was called a teleservice center—which was a single point of contact like an LL Bean model—pick up the phone call them and they would solve all the problems for the students. The second thing we did was to create 800 numbers for students across the state. We created them on the administrative and academic side, so that no student across the state would have to pay a dime to connect to the network and the campuses. The transition from the campus-centric to the student-centric model is not easy because of the details. It is not presidents, governors and trustees that want to create these kinds of structures. It is the people in the trenches that have to create these types of resources.

The campuses in Maine did not pose opposition to a separate institution, the network started as a component part of the Univ. of Maine at Augusta but it was separated because leaders thought it was too important to have it housed within a single institution. In Maine there was much concern about a separately accredited, degree-granting virtual university that had no faculty. There was a desire to have an organization that would coordinate activities. I don't know that I should go much further at this point, I would be happy to answer questions that you might have about what Maine created here. Let me say one more thing, there was great pressure to use the home-campus model here and a modified home-campus model was used because they were not able to figure out how to award financial aid if the student didn't have a home campus. You have to have some campus that will award the degree. But the biggest challenge was that students could go through and pick courses from a variety of campuses, what we learned was convenience was critical so students would pick the courses from two, three, and four campuses then when they tried to get financial aid they ran into problems, because each institution would say they are not carrying 6 credit hours with us, so we can not award financial aid. Legislators and others found this very difficult to understand. We have a system although it doesn't operate like a system—it doesn't transfer credit so it raised a host of questions that have been lurking out there but not concentrated. I'll answer any questions, if you have any.

Pres. Funderburk – You indicated you have been in this business for 10 to 12 years of courses added technology all along and the purpose for getting into it was to prove access. What has this done to your enrollment percentage-wise in Maine, or increase in credit hour production. How does the cost of delivery compare with the convenience?

George – The network started as the highest cost per student when it opened because all of the costs were front-loaded. When I left in 1997, we were the lowest cost institution in the state in terms of cost per credit hour or cost per FTE. Because it is the only model that is scalable in the sense that once you have front-loaded those costs you can add enormous numbers of new students with only marginal cost. It was very clear that we could handle an infinite number of students without recreating the infrastructure or the organization. It was not labor-intensive it was technology-intensive and it flips on its

head how you spend your money where in Maine 85% of all of the operating budgets were people. Our operating budget had 40% people, the rest was in technology support structures. Even then it is comparing apples and oranges in some ways because most of the infrastructure the campuses is bonded and not included in operating budgets. All of our costs were included in our operating budgets.

Pres. Funderburk – How much did your enrollment increase?

George – Our enrollment increase was the most rapid in the state it increased between 10 and 15% a semester and it didn't matter which semester. The small campuses held there enrollment fairly well. The land grant has been declining in enrollment for probably six years and the universities surpassed Orano in numbers. Part of that is just a demographic shift that the campuses are experiencing or declining enrollments a major problem all across New England. The network itself increased from about 1800 students the very first semester to over 4,000 within about five years. The projection is given new expansion and technology and new approaches and within five years it could well be the largest institution in the state.

Lee Todd – Would you say to follow-up on Dr. Funderburk's question that those 1,800 students were primary non-traditional or what percentage of those would not have been attending an on-campus experience.

George – About 90%. We surveyed our students extensively studied them from the very beginning and one question we asked them essentially had they been diverted from a campus. When you went in and looked at these students they were all brand new, they were associate degree students in the beginning because that was the first degree offered was associate in liberal arts. They were students who had been bi-passed average age 35 and 75% were women and that number has held steady to the present day. Other states say the great impact is on women that need access.

Pres. Eaglin – I have several questions that I just don't really don't understand. You are using a lot of different technologies now: satellite, microwave, internet; is a lot of this coming from the campuses that you have in Maine. Do they come to you and say that here is something we want to put on this system, here are the times.

George – Actually what happened from the beginning the primary structure was microwave so the classes went out live. So what we did was replicate the system of faculty member. We made a decision in the beginning that we would not offer ad-hoc classes. We would offer only those classes that went into a degree. A campus had to come up with the degree. The campuses that put a degree on the table was given the first option of the courses that needed to go into that degreed semester. We tried to rotate times to make sure each campus had a shot at prime time, but that did not work very well because students that get into a program wants the courses offered at essentially the same time each semester because it fits there lifestyle. The bulk of it was microwave done in real time (synchronized time) in the beginning, since then we have begun to move much more toward the web, which is asynchronous they have not cut back it is a four channel

microwave system. The network is on the air about 350 hours per week. It starts at 7:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night, six days a week. There is a compressed video channel that is used during the day to interconnect campuses for meetings. From 4:00 on it is used for courses. Then things are imported from out of state by satellite and then fed over the network. So a lot of different technologies being used. The major role of the network is to serve as the coordinator of all of that. Probably its greatest value to students is that it publishes an integrated course guide that is mailed statewide directly to homes, so every home has access to information about all of the degrees, all of the courses, all of the offerings that are available over the network and the second thing it does is serve as the first point of contact for all students. In other words, they can call the 800 number and get the teleservice center or they can go to one of the off-campus centers and the off-campus centers serve all of the campuses. They are system or state centers not campus centers. People that provide the advising and counseling for the students work for the network not for campuses. So what you have in Maine has been a structure that is an advocate for students on one hand and it tends to represent them to campuses and then an advocate for campuses on the other hand by representing their degrees and their courses.

Pres. Eaglin – If I was a potential student in this and say I lived on one of these islands what would I have to have available to me in order to truly take advantages of all parts of this system. Do I have to access to internet? TV? What sort of things do I have to have?

George – At this point in time you could go down a couple of blocks and go to the community school and they are all wired and they would have access to everything. So one answer is you don't need anything they would have the computer lab for you to access internet and for you to get into courses. They would have the video tapes of all of these classes. They would also receive these classes live. Increasingly, if you are going to want web-base courses you are going to need to internet access at home. Part of the importance of the network in its early days was that we got some very large federal grants and we used that to leverage the fiber optics across the state of Maine. The live broadcast of courses will essentially go to video streaming and the technologies are going to change so fast as long as you have an internet connection and a computer at home. One of the major issues that we discussed was to make sure that people have universal access we began to refer to the computer as the pencil box for 21<sup>st</sup> century---get it in the hands of the families. Families will have to access to these kinds of resources. Technology changes==will probably make it possible for people to interconnect using cable television

Betty Olinger – Would you discuss how you solved the problem associated with the modified home campus you talked about it regarding the financial aid would you talk a little bit more regarding that aspect?

George – The intent was at the beginning was that each campus would put its degrees on the network and the student would choose a degree and that would be their home campus. They would then admit them and award the financial aid and so on. What became confusing was students that wished to take classes from multiple campuses, that made it difficult in awarding financial aid. There were are also concerns of campuses about

having to accept so many credits from other campuses. Although the board of trustees in Maine have agreed that every credit transfers from every campuses. The campuses always contend that this is true although it may not count in the program. It is the kind of thing that boggles the mind of legislators. The reason the network was separated and given degree granted power---If a student was very clear on what they wanted – that was easy home campus worked very well. The problem came when the student didn't know specifically what they wanted to do. Evidence is that students are going to piece degrees together. They are not going to take exactly what a particular institution offers. How do you then get them into the financial aid structure or how do you register them and who awards the degree. So if you look at the Western Governors University their approach is to give students multiple options. You can take it from a specific campus or the WGU can create those degrees and award it and it can be done by piecing together a whole variety of competencies. It is my understanding that some of you went to visit them. Did that answer you question.

Norma Adams – Do you have a breakdown of method of deliver and place of delivery and the correlation with successful completion of the course and successful completion of the degree?

George – Yes, we studied all of the students from the very beginning so that we could see their success rate. The first question you get is can anybody learn sitting in front of a television set? So the answer is that in every class studied and we offered over 100 classes. The students at a distance did as well or better than the student sitting in the classroom where the course was being offered. The persistence rate of distance students were greater than those on the campuses.

Norma Adams – I really meant within the system. In other words, how successful are students that remain at home and take the course through their computers as compared to students who go to a common meeting place with other students and take the classes.

George – That is so new I'm not for sure that comparison has been studied.

Norma Adams – The second question I wanted to ask—If you were starting today would you do some of the things the WGU has done such as the competency-based certificates. Also, would you purchase more from providers who are already providing?

George – Yes, let me give you my bias. I'm a great believer if your primary goal is to provide access for students that you need some sort of neutral organization separate from the existing institutions whose mission it is to ensure that's achieve. That can be done without having a separately accredited organization. But you better have an institution that has someone sitting at the table at the same level as the other presidents. You better have somebody with a voice to advocate for that particular new approach, because it is often difficult to understand. Beyond that the issues are so very different, I think a separate organization that has very clear responsibilities is very important. The other issue that has to be addressed in states whether there is going to be a controlled market or a free market. It seems to me what is emerging across the country is the free market

approach to education. Institutions are going to have to stand on their merits and they are going to have to make choices. Not every institution should not be in the distance learning business. I think the issue of duplication is going to disappear. Those who can compete are going to compete and others are going to get out of the business. To go back to the consumer model, within a couple of years the consumer is going to have a cornucopia of choices and the good programs are going to drive out the bad.

Gary Cox – We have a proposal on the table now before the general assembly (the commonwealth) to establish regional center. Let's take one in Southeastern Kentucky where we have community college activity, regional university activity, and private institutions. Lets say that regional center is developed, if we model after you how would that regional center in London KY operate? What role would you play in that center?

George – From our perspective, that center should be a state center. Whatever is delivered at a distance in the state of Kentucky. That should be delivered through that center, they should be able to talk to the students about all of the degrees being offered. They should serve as an agent for the institutions across the state who are delivering the things in the business, not advocating for any particular institution.

Gary Cox – Who would that person be employed by?

George – That's why I think you have to have a separate organization. That is why there has to be an institution that is concerned about what our essentially distance learning opportunities. We offered life classes at many of those off-campus centers, because we had part-time faculty. We sort of had a rule of thumb that we had 20 students that were going to go to a specific location, we would try to find an instructor instead of having 20 students sitting there in a virtual classroom. You then have a one-stop shopping centers, if you go back to the Amy example, Amy doesn't want to deal with 9 different centers, one each from the campuses. Amy wants to go to one place and have one phone number. So the purpose is to make a seamless kind of structure in the state. At least services have to be focused to a single organization. The academic offering can come from multiple providers, the campuses can make a decision as to what they want to offer. Academic integrity of the distance learning remains at the campus level, their faculty decide and the administration decides what they want to offer. However, the support structures are offered by an institution that is designed to do specifically that.

Gary Cox – Then you organization would be responsible for managing that center from a facilities point of view.

George – Yes

Gary Cox – If I came in as a student and I wanted to get a Bus. Admin. degree, you would advise me as to the courses that are available in these range of options.

George – Yes, and if there were 5 business degrees being offered, tell you the difference, one is over the web, one is live over TV, the other is by tape and so on. These are your options, these are the costs. This is what you are going to have to do.

Jim Nelson – This is kind of in the same vein, you mentioned that libraries are part of the initial infrastructure investments, there are on-going costs, our database licensing fees have gone up 139% this year and about 50% are still using traditional resources. Is this accounted for to that same separate organizational fees, or how do you support those ongoing library costs?

George – Library has been the really sticky issues, because librarians are facing exactly the same situation you are describing. We did discuss this particular library fee at a distance or all students. What Maine did was to address technology issues especially issues of rising costs of computers was put in a technology fee. It started at \$2 a credit \$3 a credit now for every student everywhere. That supported off campus computer labs and so on and upgrading campuses computer labs. Library problems have not been solved the costs continue to increase. The network paid the cost of shipping books across the state for distant students. But the students on campus were very savvy with the library system. You go in and you find the books where they are located and you just call for them. The network didn't pay to ship books between campuses. There were dramatically increase in costs, so we talked about essentially a warehouse concept for libraries. In other words, get away from every campus having every book sitting on a shelf but create a warehouse that is like a book store that provided support statewide (central point of contact) but it isn't solved yet.

Secretary Miller – Several years ago, I had an occasion to do a pretty extensive literature search on student learning in distance learning in the impact of delivery mode on student learning. I was amazed at how extensive that research base was even then. There were a number of studies that looked not only at overall student learning and mode of delivery but also discipline specific, there were many disciplines that were represented in that body of research as well. No one could find any significance in student learning which is very encouraging. With one caveat and I think that is the one we have to keep in mind. Historically and up to this date the distance student population has typically not been the traditional student population it is the older learner and we know that on campus those older learners have a high level of motivation. Most of those studies supported that method of delivery was not a significant factor in student learning which is a very positive thing for us to know as we move forward. The issue of faculty preparation and perhaps how you address to the engagement of faculty in this process. I think that is a major issue.

George – We addressed it by creating a faculty development center. We offered a two-day institute every spring for faculty before summer session began. For those who are interested anyone could come to it. It was put on ITV across the state as well but ran all source of workshops and then we had instructional designers that worked with faculty to help them prepare for class.

Secretary Miller – Did you essentially and your institutions allow faculty to self select?

George – No, well let me go back yes, nobody was told they had to teach at a distance. We required institutions to put degrees on so that the faculty of that particular degree program had to agree they were going to do it. Once they did that then they were committed to it. It was self selection in that sense. But, let me tell you, we also from the very beginning and this a major fight among presidents and the chancellor. We bought faculty, we paid them more and I will tell you how we did that—we said if you are really going to scale this the average class size of Univ. of Maine’s system is 16 to 1 and some campuses are 12 to 1. The networks average class size is 100 to 1 and we said if you are going to expect faculty to teach those number they have got to fundamentally reorganize how they teach and how they are going to provide support for students. So we double counted all courses so if you were teaching a 3 credit course it counted for 6 credits, if you taught 2 courses over the network that was your total load. We paid them, my provost used to call it a sign on bonus, we paid them \$500 for every course they taught. The assumption was because of some of the work they had to do. I was never convinced. The other thing we did was assign every faculty member a support person, so there was a technician assigned to every faculty member to help them develop materials on the web to help them develop the graphics and materials ours was heavily TV oriented. That technician was there every class providing that kind of support. So, we said if it is important to do then we better show the faculty that its important to support them. Then that was backed up by more sophisticated instructional designers.

Sec. Miller – Did you pay the sign-on bonus each time they taught that course or the first time they taught the course?

George – Well the intent when I initially approved it, a one time signing bonus as it worked out the provost just signed it every semester. He was in charge of that budget.

Pres. Shumaker – If you were starting over again would you see advantages or disadvantages to the separate institution?

George – The quick answer is I would create the separate institution, put a president over it, I would not initially give it degree-granting authority. I would ask it to work with the campuses, to respond to the needs of students across the state but I would ask that it be given the authority if the campuses didn’t respond to a particular need to go outside the state and import it. I would also place that organization with authority to export out of state to find markets on a much broader basis.

Lee Todd – Thank you.

Lee Todd – Lead staff at CPE regarding the CVU will be Larry Fowler. Larry will spend as much time as he can worrying about this particular issue. We have two new committee members—Merl Hackbart took Jim Miller’s place and Norma Adams was added by chairman Hardin. We appreciate both of them coming on board. Larry Fowler will do the roll call now.

Lee Todd – Minutes from the November 3 meeting there is one correction Mike Clark was present for Ginni Fox. Minutes approved by President Shumaker and seconded by President Funderburk. (Pres. Wethington just joined) I would just like to mention the Colorado trip report (summary of that trip was circulated at last CPE meeting). Pres. Shumaker, Barbara Burch, Ron Moore, Ken Nelson, Don Olsen, Jim Ramsey, Sue Moore, Ken Walker visited the WGU electronic community college. Does anyone have any questions about the trip? Part of that trip was an information gathering process. We will have a couple of the speakers at our next meeting, some of whom are associated with those institutions. I think it is extremely valuable for us to look at some of the models that are being used elsewhere, not that we have to implement those but it certainly doesn't hurt to hear about the process those people have gone through.

Lee Todd – Presentation (Model for discussion, decide how to appoint some committees and get something going before the March 8 meeting). Vision statement read.

*Mr. Todd's narrative presentation was not transcribed. The essence of his presentation is captured in the draft policy document that is to be discussed by the CPE and DLAC at March 9, 1998 meetings.*

Lee Todd – The CVU in the model I am suggesting would report to the CPE, because CPE is the one mandated to make sure the CVU works. CVU would be the one that develops and implements policies and access plan. You need some entity that worries about statewide access and if that is housed in a given institution then I think that is difficult because that institution has several things it has to worry about on a daily basis but, having the separate entity who says we are worrying about the access plan and we are worrying about faculty development grants—If someone doesn't wake up in the morning when they are putting their clothes on if that is not what they are worrying about then it doesn't get done. The policies to implement those and to look at the overall access plan and implement that has to be within this vessel which we will call the CVU. Then to develop and maintain the clearing house system, because that will be the focal point where students can gain access to student services and then they may be bounced out to a specific campus but they ought to be able to go someplace and get as much information as they possibly can. It could be a statewide catalog that provides student information as George was saying. Faculty development initiatives to get this rolling. Conduct the needs assessment to see what program and courses are really needed out there. Given that you have an individual institution out there trying to do that you might sense the needs in your region, which are important but given that you have a centralized body looking at it—you may such a broader need across the state that would cause you to really push harder to find out how to get that up on the network. This should be owned by the CVU with substantial input from the institutions. Determine the appropriate providers to meet those needs. You need the right to be able to go outside if you don't have the course to meet the need. I certainly believe that our first look should be inside to fulfill the need, but you have to be able to find the providers to meet the need in a timely fashion. Funding incentives if you decide to put something on this network.

Lee Todd – Let’s look at some consolidation of some low enrollment courses throughout the system where we can actually could be benefiting others. More in the technology arena where people in the two year technology programs will say we offer courses for limited students we wouldn’t mind sharing our expertise with others and that way we could offer even more courses than we presently do. I think you can make some decisions about what ones would you target? Procedures and policy to go after them and figure how we can impact the lower enrollment courses. Should be some efforts—I know there are some cooperative degree and certificate programs in the state already but there could be others. The virtual libraries---what is being done what has been done and what could be done. Competency-based credentials—I think we haven’t paid due attention to and need to. Cooperative course and program development when we look at the request this year for new programs—I said on the newly named academic affairs committee one of the things we have kicked back for is to ask have you looked elsewhere? Is anyone else offering things you can tie into. I think the CVU can be the clearinghouse for people who want to have new courses but you don’t want to offer every course maybe programs but not courses.

Lee Todd - Larry Fowler has requested to have each president name a point of contact person for the CVU that he can talk to. That wouldn’t really be a working committee, but say you want to get together and talk about connectivity issues then that point person could determine who would be the right person to send to the meeting. We have to build upon the work that is already done. The kinds of people that needs to be involved, finance will have to be involved and faculty will have to be involved, student services people involved. I guess the comment here is that we need several working committees combined of people who have the expertise. We are not going to sit here at this table and solve these problems. We need people who know about these issues and get them in a workgroup.

Lee Todd- We need to make a list of policies that need to be dealt with.

Merl – I think that was a nice overview and sort of summary of what we have learned so far, I think it builds on some of the conversation back in the taskforce back when the virtual university first began here in the state. I think you focus on the policy issues as being most critical, I think I agree with that very much, I think the council probably has some responsibility in the near future to lay out and to take some action on general policies so that there is a sense of direction. I think right now there is a set of whole different option that could be followed but in order for us to make progress in a variety of areas and tasks that you have laid out, I think we probably need to focus on the sort of policy model to begin with to the degree that this committee might be the originator of that and take to the CPE would be a positive step. Obviously, this is a pretty large body to come forward with a consensus view but possible if you could identify a small group of this committee to work with you to lay out some policy direction, I think would be a very important first step. Second reaction is a technical reaction. You talked about competency based credentialing and you focused on the KCTCS as possibly being the principal provider, I think I would expand that, particularly in the professional schools, business school, engineering, medical schools, I think competency based credentialing is

going to be a major effort in the future. I think we should expand the idea. You talked about the idea of abundance, I think there would be significant demand both statewide and nationwide in those areas. Certainly, as people move through their careers and some of the conversations we had on the taskforce that is becoming a very important aspect. If you look at an engineers resume you may be interested in an engineer but you are also interested in whether or not that person education and understanding is state of the art. You are not going to get that off of a traditional resume, but to a degree we can provide and ensure competency based credentialing in those areas as well as at the lower level in technical areas. I think we are certainly going to be making a major contribution. It does provide a tremendous market for a lot of our programs on our campuses and I think we should focus on that issue as well.

Lee Todd – On that slide KCTCS was put there cause we were thinking of piloting something fairly quickly, so it wasn't intended to be the only institution involved. I know that Pres. Votruba has expressed an interest in participating in those types of offerings as well. It is a hot topic right now. The point about the policy I guess, we are a policy board we are a recommender to the CPE and CPE has to put the policy forward, but I think CPE would love to have this group come forward with a set of policies they could recommend. I take your point well and probably need another organizational chart that has to be plotted. We might want to make a list of policies that have to be done (financial aid, tuition). That committee will have something to chomp on day one.

President Eaglin – I think this time Lee we can be fairly general in those policy statements. The key issue is a sense of direction so we feel that the consensus that this is the appropriate way that we are going to focus on the virtual university in the state of Kentucky, then I think some of the difficult issues that we maybe delay those for awhile. But in terms of finances and student processing, these kinds of things but at least we have a model to build on. So, the groups that work on those specific issues understand that will be part of the general framework and I think we could again pursue general policies to set the direction and then we can work in break out groups to deal with some of those more difficult issues.

Lee Todd - Before we leave, if I forget remind me to have us brainstorm a list of what policies we need to generalize.

Gary Cox – A couple things at the policy level that might ought to be stated early even though they may not be addressed for awhile. I don't think there is anything more fundamental than whatever is going to stand as a distribution model for funding in higher education down the road. The way those decisions are made will have a whole lot to do with whether a virtual university survives or it doesn't. If we tie dollars to headcounts then it is going to limit our effectiveness. Early on some kind of policy statement about the way we underwrite the financing of postsecondary education from a policy perspective to provide some guidance. It is inevitable that we are going to have to do that sooner than later. We shouldn't develop a funding distribution mechanism in the system that works against what we are trying to accomplish and might even promote what we are trying to accomplish. There might be a premium given to these kinds of courses and this

kind of activity and any kind of funding model. Secondly, it might be important as we report back to CPE to encourage the transferability effort to the four year institutions. The CPE has completed the transferability effort at the two year level.

Sue Moore – I am happy to report that the statewide transfer committee had there last meeting yesterday.

Gary Cox – That provides a really good framework for the transferability issue.

President Eaglin – On this issue of policy development, I agree with what you have said. There are models out there, what you have suggested is something in between but that doesn't mean that policy issues would be that much different. I know in Indiana, Maryland, Maine, Georgia mostly is on the web. It would seem that we would want to gather that type of information to help guide this. What I hope we wouldn't rush into, I know that all of the institutions are chomping at the bit to get some sort of organizational structure around which to move into this. All these institutions are moving there own agendas at the same time, I would hope that we would focus on policy and not let our focus on that fall into a structure why we are trying to get started. I think we should spend a good deal of time deciding is it really best to put it within CPE or should it stand outside of CPE for possibly good reasons. I hate to see us as we move forward to fall back into a model. I would just offer that kind of caution. I don't know about the types of issues in policy development mode. Certainly, other states had to make commitments on how to start these sorts of things, it takes start up money. You know the Governor is spending a lot of money on facilities right now, maybe some of that money would be better directed toward an entity like this. I know I am rambling here, but I think sometimes we move awful quick to a structure and I think that structure should come a little later on when we know what we really want to accomplish.

Nofflet Williams – See one of the problems with that approach is the fact that the legislation itself goes along way toward prescribing what can take place. Whoever is working on this is going to have to take a hard look at that legislation.

Lee Todd – Part of my personal bias is that the legislation was probably written prior to a lot of brain waves being spent on it and if that legislation needs to be changed to meet the right purpose then maybe that is what has to happen as well. I don't think that we have to be locked in necessarily if we find a better way to go back and say we have a new way to do things and let's go back and modify that.

Nofflet Williams – I don't have a real problem with that all I have to say is that I have read all 204 pages of that legislation and I can tell you that there is much prescription there.

Lee Todd – We will obviously have to weigh that in.

Barbara Burch – I guess I heard it or read it a little bit differently, when you back and look at the principles and the populations to be served and the purposes for being those

seem to be fairly consistent with most of the discussions that have gone on up to this point and when you said somebody has to wake up every morning worrying about this and keeping it on track. What I heard you saying is the way that this is going to develop is it is going to allow institutions in the state to maximumly involved in this to the extent that they want to be or willing to be. Rather than saying under CPE, I think technically everything is under CPE, we are all under CPE. But it is not being proposed as a separate institution under CPE it is being proposed as a separate coordinating unit which in effect would coordinate all the campuses and that the policy development and the next steps would engage CPE and institutions in answering those questions. Either I have misunderstood it but I didn't see it creating exactly how it is going to operate beyond the fact that we are all under CPE and this is a coordinating unit in effect.

Lee Todd – I really don't have any difference with that. The primary difference from the home model is that it is separate from a given institution but it is a coordinating body that is going to maximize utility of all institutions. I guess, I think about it being under CPE because as you say is going to have to pass through CPE for policy decisions anyway and I felt that having it residing we are getting into a discussion obviously, that we shouldn't get into till we decide policy yet. But, you know how this stuff goes, If you are going to have access for the independent colleges they would probably would feel better having it set out into a space that is not housed into any particular institution. I think that the institutions under this new HB1 has so much stuff going on. This is just a separate thing that someone needs to worrying about for everybody. I was not willing to go as far to say that it should be degree granting or separately credited because I think we will be chasing that rabbit quite a while because WGU is not accredited yet and they have been at it for a long time. Somebody has to own this issue and it needs to have the independence to move quickly and to deal with all the providers and deal with all the clients.

Secretary Miller – Let me a little bit of a trouble maker here. What we are talking about here is a huge job and I know from my association with this Governor, I think he anticipates our moving relatively quickly to begin to at least have something in place that we can identify as the CVU that we then grow. Are we looking at a situation where Larry Fowler is the staff of one for this huge initiative or when we ask the universities for a point person are we asking each of them to contribute a full-time person to this staff to develop this or are we willing to put some additional resources from somewhere. I don't see a CVU growing up from volunteers, I just don't see it. Although, I certainly hear what is being said here I think we have to make some sort of commitment or else come up with a relatively lengthy implementation timeframe. If we want an ambitious timeframe there is going to have to be some human resource capital invested in this and it needs to be invested pretty consistently and I absolutely agree with what you say with folks not just one person but people who get up in the morning and this is there number one focus. A couple of other issues that I though of – you mentioned the model that midground model there is no way to avoid major accreditation issues and I think that the coordinating body needs to provide the kind of support to the universities even particularly when you get into joint programs. In almost any professional or pre-professional discipline they have there own accrediting agency which whom you must

work. Faculty training and support is absolutely critical piece of what this coordinating body can assist the universities in finding ways to provide the training support.

Lee Todd – One of the challenges that we have there is a freeze on hiring personnel until we find a president for CPE and that is the challenge. We have talked about hiring some contractors to try to pull together some of this information. I think even before you hire staff there has to be some policy issues that we can lay out. I would like to see us go ahead and put out an RFP for someone to start doing web site development for this CVU. Regarding the accreditation issue, my points that under the home institution model you would have had that issue as well. This coordinating body is going to have to face that.

President Eaglin – The issue of quality I think has been overstated because our current model each institution has developed its own approach to all of these issues. All of us face accreditation even specific discipline accreditation so we have had to build in these training sessions and these training models, I think we are over reacting to that, I think what we currently have if you add it collectively every institution has quality built into it. We are not putting out just any faculty member to spout out over the network. But, we have our own systems there is not statewide system. We rely heavily on the UK and the programs that we cooperate on.

Lee Todd – What I see as one of CVU's early steps is to make some of the things that are going on right now more available. Just because we have a lot of things going on out there doesn't mean we don't continue but that we find some way to do some kind of coordination. We need to make sure that everything that goes on line is quality.

President Shumaker – I agree that there are policy organizational questions that have to be addressed but there is a lot of energy at the institutions that we could apply very effectively to some pilot efforts that might help conform the policy and organizational questions down the road. Does CPE has available to it any resources to seed some pilot things to get some things started.

Ken Walker – Yes, I think we do. Is there consensus on a list of pilot projects that you included in your presentation and if so, let's define the pilots and we will move ahead.

President Shumaker – I'm especially interested in the low enrollment issue. How we can work together on such things as Physics, and German and those vital programs that we offer that does not have critical mass on our campuses. Try to find out how we can share resources and programs.

Secretary Miller – Are we far enough along that we could discuss some specific proposals at the the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. I like the idea of piloting.

President Shumaker – We are working on the UPS initiative and part of that program is KY Tech and Jefferson Community College and UofL developing some specialized distance learning programs to focus on the UPS clientele.

President Alexander – The business deans throughout the state have been working together on a MBA program that serves as a prototype or a model on this issue. UofL has been very much involved in that and maybe we could pick that one up and it could be very instructive.

Lee Todd – I think if by the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, we could come up with a list.

Jim Nelson – Let me put a punch in for the virtual library because that has been worked on to. That is ready to go pretty much.

Pres. Wethington – I think the idea of pilot projects is good and we ought to pursue that, I think we really ought not get too far away from what you and Merl talked about, which is there needs to be policies in place that lets us know what we are trying to accomplish with the CVU. There should be some blessing for those policies by somebody and obviously that should be CPE. I think unless there is some entity or some group that is some central location that is overseeing what we are doing then this thing is not going to be what we are looking for overtime.

Gary Cox – That might be one place to use a contractor early on to look at what is out there and based on the policies that I presume you are going to take to the council to identify those projects that make the most sense to get started on so that you don't promote some controversy. You want to develop pilots that are moving in the direction of the policy that you ultimately want to develop.

Pres. Votruba – I think policies and the pilot projects can run parallel with each other, but we have to be careful because we don't have a strategic agenda yet. I certainly, hate to see us invent something---it is harder to un invent it than it is to create what you want in the first place.

President Eaglin – Take Physics, I know we graduate 2 one year and 1 the next. I have always felt if you set the Physicists together and let them come up with how they could share and come up with one program. I think that is not jumping too far ahead. That is where CPE could take a lead.

Merl Hackbart – Some subgroup of this committee put together a draft framework of how we are going to move forward. I think it is hard for a large committee to react piece meal unless we see something in black and white. I think CPE's approach has been to provide a draft and get reactions from other interested parties, make modification, and work though a process where you try to arrive as close as you can to a consensus view of direction and identifying guidelines. I guess I would recommend that you as chair of this group, could appoint a subgroup to work with the staff to come forward with a model or a draft that would be of the nature that would be appropriate for the council to recommend if they agreed with the recommendation.

Lee Todd – Two working groups 1) attacking the pilot projects and 2) policies and we have may two others in the meantime. Usually, if I got to solve a problem I like to see them all. How would the President's like to provide resources.

Pres. Wethington – I think this point person idea is a good one. There needs to be a person that can be pulled together to address these various kinds of issues.

Lee Todd – That would be helpful for Larry. Also, think about as you put that hat on this person that maybe you need to appoint someone to work on policy. I think that is where you distribute this load. Policy and pilot projects bubble up first and enlight of other suggestions maybe Larry should poll to see who you would want to point as your contact person on campus.

Pres. Eaglin – It would seem to me that having one president be a point president. This one on policy development is so critical I would feel more comfortably with having a point president.

Barbara Burch – We are going to run into when talking about policies that govern funding and financing the system they are not unrelated to policies that have to do with delivery of student services and all of the components within that and they are not unrelated to which programs and how people participate. There is a critical need for people that are strong in that area as the academic VP struggled with this and some of the presidents earlier was so clear is that you can't move on one part of the system until you answered a policy in the other area. So there is an interconnectedness I guess is what I am trying to say. Secondly, as you look at how we move forward and extend the fact of getting some outside help. I am going back to the whole base on what your system is about---it is a student centered, I think there are points of piloting. More importantly, I think we are still in the dark as to when we organize this party who is going to come and I think there is a serious needs assessment that maybe could begin soon.

Lee Todd – Survey of needs assessment. I think there is some internal things that can be addressed if we know the population.

Barbara Burch – Univ. of Phoenix---90 % of the tuition recovery from Phoenix is paid by corporate entities. So some of the things that we are talking about, people may want them but will they pay enough to get them.

Lee Todd – Maybe that is another part of the survey. Why don't we stop here. I think this has been very productive meeting. If we can get you to appoint a staff person, if we can put together a couple of these working committees together.