

Meeting Notes
NSHE E-Learning Task Force
April 16, 2014

Attendees: Dan Klaich (co-chair), Mark Fink (co-chair), Erika Beck, Carrie Bruno, Kevin Carman, Cynthia Clark, Paul Davis, Darren Divine, Lisa Frazier, Chris Fritsen, Richard Kloes, Ed Nagelhout, Terry Norris, Alex Porter, Tony Scinta, Jeffrey Wong, Robert Wynegar

Other Attendees: Vice Chancellor Crystal Abba, Renee Davis, Sheri Sanchez, Elaine Bunker

1. Briefing - Remedial Mathematics Work Group

Group lead Sheri Sanchez reported on the findings of the Remedial Math Work Group. The group examined states actively working on online courses, then further focused on Montana and Wisconsin. The organization NROC presented to the work group and Sheri had phone interview with Wisconsin. The group learned the Wisconsin program was developed by their faculty, specific to their situation, and not adaptive, but the NROC program is adaptive. NROC is a non-profit project funded by the Hewlett Foundation and the Gates Foundation that is focused on new models of digital content development, distribution, and use. The NROC objects are much more advanced, they are already in place, and while content is not as deep as the group may want, it allows the instructor to personalize. NROC objects also download directly into Canvas and Blackboard.

Next, the group reviewed Nevada's current programs. The most prevalent model is shortened courses, and co-requisite courses at UNR and TMCC are proving to be very successful. Finally, the work group examined vendors. All campuses have experience with Pearson and McGraw Hill. The group concluded those products are good homework platforms but are not good for courses. They remained impressed with NROC, where institutions can build an initial framework then let the instructor personalize the course for their program at their institution. However, NROC falls short on practice problems and the ability to improve content. An NROC homework module is in that organization's long term plan but does not exist yet. Thus, the group recommends that the NROC product be combined with a third-party homework platform, and it further recommends that NSHE seek a statewide vendor to get better service and a reduced price.

Sheri Sanchez then reviewed the two major recommendations from the Task Force.

Model 1 – offer stretch, co-requisite college level courses to students who place at the high end of the cut level of the placement exam. All NSHE institutions would need to consider putting stretch courses in place.

Model 2 – not-ready-for-college-math students who don't place into co-requisite class would enroll in a 7-8 week NROC course with a third-party homework platform. Content would be built by each institution from the basic NROC platform. The exit exam would be the institution's placement exam. The ultimate goal would be to offer the course every month. NROC costs \$1 per FTE student.

Placement exam – most institutions use AccuPlacer but UNLV uses its own. The work group did not recommend a common placement exam.

Fred Lokken asked if the group looked at WebWorks, which is open source. He noted that Portland State University is developing an ADA compliant program all the way up through Algebra. He suggested that TMCC could host this platform, and it might be a solution that doesn't involve a for-profit provider.

The Task Force will provide the work group with additional feedback/questions in writing.

2. Briefing – Remedial English Work Group

Group lead Elaine Bunker reported on the findings of the Remedial English Work Group. The group divided into subgroups to look at other state systems, but they did not find any states that they thought were worth further consideration. Most states/systems had no information about online remediation in English or had no data to support efficacy. The work group did not consider co-requisite courses to be remedial, so this model was not mentioned in their report.

Most models combine technology with face-to-face instruction. All Nevada schools except UNR offer online options, and UNR is developing one. The group concluded that there was no data to support expanding any current models in Nevada, although they believe it would be worthwhile to look at common learning outcomes.

In looking at vendors, the group found that products in English lag behind those developed for math. The group looked at NROC/EdReady but the English module is still in development, and the group found that the content did not fit well. In response to a question from Mark Fink, Elaine said the group was not aware of current efforts in South Dakota or data from the National Association of Developmental Education.

In summary, the work group could not recommend expanding any current Nevada model and was not satisfied with any vendor products it examined.

The Task Force will provide the work group with additional feedback/questions in writing.

Dan Klaich reiterated that the charge given to the Task Force is not to take over education in the System but rather to provide an optional path for students. If that path

demonstrates best practices that campuses want to incorporate into their lecture classes, great. If not, no problem. The goal is not to change curriculum at any campus. The solution recommended by the Task Force should be informed by best practices, but staying with the status quo for remedial education will not meet the charge.

3. Feedback on E-learning Provider Presentations

The Task Force was asked to send Nancy Flagg any comments on the recent presentations by e-learning providers.

4. Next Steps – Phase I Final Report

The Task Force discussed the next steps for producing a draft of the Phase I report to the Chancellor. Mark Fink asked if one RFP should be directed solely to remedial education with a separate RFP for tutoring services and/or learning analytics. Darren Divine thought that, in general, fewer RFPs worked better to avoid multiple vendors wherever possible.

Mark will begin working with Jeff Wong to work on the budget for Phase I. Mark and Nancy will start drafting the Phase I report based on the findings of the work groups. Mark asked if the Task Force was amenable to drafts of the Phase I report being shared by email rather than at meetings. The group was in agreement with this plan.

5. New Business

No new business was brought to the attention of the Task Force. The next scheduled meeting is Wednesday, May 21, 2014, via videoconference.