

# **A REPORT ON E-LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**Barbara McFadden Allen, CIC**

**Nicholas C. Burbules, University of Illinois**

**Frank Mayadas, Sloan Foundation**

**Wayne Smutz, Penn State University**

## **PREAMBLE**

We greatly appreciate the time taken by administrators, faculty, staff, and students to brief us on the various e-learning efforts now underway at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities and its Coordinate Campuses. We especially thank them for patiently dealing with our questions and enquiries. We want to express special thanks to Katherine Himes for all that she did in planning and coordinating a most productive and enjoyable visit.

Based on the approximately two days of our visit, we were left with a clear impression that there is good work going on at the main campus, and, allowing for proportional size, also at the other campuses. There is a degree of institutional support for faculty and departments to assist in course creation and delivery methods. Certainly, the Academic Health Center (AHC) activities appear to be quite advanced, and could qualify as an exemplar for other similar state universities. A more thorough evaluation of their programs would be needed for us to make this a firm conclusion.

Online education in the other units of the University of Minnesota, while of good quality, would not qualify as leading edge or an exemplar for others. At the same time, the University of Minnesota online effort cannot be classified as a laggard in this regard, as it appears to be quite typical of the position that most large public R1 institutions are in today.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Probably, Penn State's World Campus, University of Massachusetts' 5-campus UMass Online and University of Central Florida, among the larger campuses, would be seen as leaders and exemplars; among the smaller institutions, we see University of Illinois (Springfield) as a leader. All of these institutions have strong institutional support for their programs and each has a model and plan around which their online programs are organized. Their models are understandable and can be explained to those not at these institutions. All have a distinct organizational structure that drives and guides their online programs. In the case of Penn State and UMass, this is a formal organizational structure; for UCF and University of Illinois (Springfield), it is informal. In all cases, however, the structure is rather well understood within the various colleges and departments across the institution. (We should note in passing

These conclusions apparently were shared by the University's leadership, which appointed an E-Education Task Force that produced a report in February, 2009. But almost unanimously among those who produced it (albeit for different reasons), the report was seen as unsatisfactory. Nor were we convinced that the right people were at the table for such a report to be carried forth successfully and with a high degree of buy-in and support, particularly among the University of Minnesota faculty. One fairly high-level administrator in a relevant area of authority said during our interview that this was the first time anyone had asked about his/her views on e-learning!

Where does that leave the University of Minnesota and e-learning?<sup>2</sup>

## **CREATING A VISION OF E-LEARNING**

The University of Minnesota has a clear sense of where it wants to be as a university – one of the top three public universities in the world. That is a goal that members of the University refer

---

that the for-profits such as University of Phoenix, Kaplan, Capella, etc. have even more distinct organizational structures with attendant responsibilities embedded within the component organizations).

<sup>2</sup> We recommend using the terms “Online learning” and “Blended learning.” These are widely used in the community. “E-learning” can be seen as the encompassing term that covers both – though as one colleague noted, “Soon, e-learning will just be ‘learning’.”

An online course is usually defined as one in which 80% to 100% of the education process is conducted online. Roughly, the time spent in a traditional class for these kinds of courses ranges from 0% to 20% of the time spent for the same course in a classroom. Generally, it is external practice to call a course an “online course” if it is instructor- or professor-led, involves a total class size of 15-25, and if the classes are cohort-style, much like traditional classes. It is also widely accepted practice for these online courses to be fully or largely asynchronous, with the synchronous portions usually being optional for students.

Blended courses are courses in which a measurable portion of the traditional classroom time is off-set by online components. (e.g., a 3-hour course would qualify as a 33% blend if it meets face-to-face no more than 2x per week; the same course would be a 66% blend if it meets the equivalent of 1x per week). As a rule, blended courses are aimed at traditional campus students and/or at local and regional students. For an urban commuter campus like University of Minnesota, this could be a substantial cohort. Fully online courses can be useful for all students, but are the only viable option for students residing very long distances from a campus (say more than a few hundred miles). There is an active national community that is expert in blended course development and delivery (e.g., University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee).

We are not fans of terms such as “e-education” that compartmentalize these activities as a special or separate area of university effort. When on-campus students are demanding access to fully online courses; when many specific classes combine both on-campus and distant students; when faculty are infusing appropriate uses of technology into the classroom across nearly all subject areas, we believe that it is important to see these various areas of effort in close relation to each other. Hence we prefer terms such as “spectrum,” “hybrid,” “distributed,” or “ubiquitous” to emphasize the growing interrelations among on-campus, blended, and distance education programs. Traditional spatial and temporal distinctions are becoming anachronistic.

to often. Clearly the University has done a good job of articulating that goal and convincing the University community to embrace it.

It is interesting, therefore, that there is no clear set of goals, sense of purpose, or overall direction with regard to e-learning at the University of Minnesota. Some individual units have carved out their own directions and appear to be successful in doing so. Others have not. The result is considerable frustration as well as substantial conflict among the various units that have a potential role to play in e-learning. It has also led to the implementation of multiple systems, the development of an array of tools that are at times duplicative, a less than clearly functional infrastructure, a lack of understanding of who is to support whom and for what reasons, an apparent evolving scope creep (K-20, connections to the state universities, etc.), a fractured reporting structure in terms of IT and e-learning, and much confusion about who is doing what and who is responsible for what. Who is responsible for marketing? In what circumstances are blended courses appropriate and when are fully online courses appropriate? What do we know about exemplary scholarship and practices being developed elsewhere? And perhaps most of all: What exactly are we trying to accomplish? (Possible answers might be: gaining students in new markets and at a lower expense, improving access for existing students and thereby improving retention rates and graduation rates, etc.)

So what? Putting aside the issue of potential wastefulness of resources in these difficult financial times, does the lack of a guiding vision or orientation matter? Only the leadership of the University of Minnesota can ultimately answer that question. What we as outside observers can do, however, is point out what appears not to have been done yet. In this context, the University appears not to have confronted the question “What is at stake for the University when considering e-learning?” With the rather sweeping and dramatic changes that the Internet has brought to all of society as well as higher education within only the last seventeen or eighteen years, achieving clarity with regard to the University’s position on this question would seem to be paramount.

The suggestion that the University has not confronted the “What’s at stake?” issue derives from the observation that all of the effort to make progress has been focused internally – and even in a rather narrow fashion. To illustrate, the E-Education Task Force consisted solely of administrators who are close to the situation. There has been little effort to look outside the University context to evaluate systematically how the rapidly changing e-world is changing all kinds of behaviors and processes that are likely to impact the University. During our visit, we

heard little from faculty about their perspectives – whether they are satisfied or not – regarding the current state of affairs. And, perhaps most noticeably, there was little mention of students (current and/or future), their needs (increasingly their demands), or their learning as important issues that the University would like to address.

Most important for the University, then, is that it clearly determine what's at stake for it with regard to e-learning. It need not do anything. There is only an imperative to act if it determines there is a true need/demand that it wants to address. Otherwise, e-learning as a broad University initiative is simply a solution in search of a problem. We urge the University leadership to ask and answer this question in the context of the University of Minnesota. The answer must ultimately fit with the values and aspirations of this institution and at this point in time. Copying other institutions or seeking to move forward without being clear about the University of Minnesota's interests in this area is doomed to produce a less than satisfactory outcome, similar to what it is experiencing at the moment.

We collectively concluded that the university would benefit from the clearest possible objectives being articulated for its online and blended programs. This would be a necessary first step toward follow-on implementation actions: appropriate organizational restructuring, possible net new resources being made available, and creation of a faculty development program (whether internal to University of Minnesota or outsourced to a reputable organization such as Sloan-C and delivered online to Minnesota faculty, an option which might be tremendously cost effective). Some sort of organizational focal point (a central unit? a consortium of semi-autonomous "hubs?") would need to collaboratively develop overall objectives and guidelines, enlist the support of the top management at the university, and invite participation of all interested colleges, departments, and faculty.

Such a focal point could also collect and analyze data on the University's effectiveness, identify the learner populations being impacted by online and blended programs, develop guidelines for faculty compensation for course development, recommend priorities for courses and programs that need to be online, publicize effective practices being developed in the university and beyond, recommend changes in course management software, encourage faculty to develop metrics for assessing online programs, and encourage faculty and administrator participation in scholarship, publishing and conference attendance through connections with reputable external organizations. We sensed that the currently existing situation of parallel organizations, reporting up through different senior vice-presidential channels, is counterproductive. In the absence of a

focal point, accountability is everywhere and hence it is nowhere; no one organization rises above the others when it comes to online education, with the result that palpable rivalries and frictions actually hold back genuine progress.

The goals and objectives piece is key. For if the University of Minnesota merely has the objective to continue what it is presently doing, and the progress it is presently making, then obviously it already has in place a system to do that. We would suggest, however, that given such a status quo its relative position among large state public systems is likely to deteriorate, as we see signs that a number of others are looking for ways to accelerate their online programs.

## **MARKET NEEDS**

From an external perspective, there appear to be a variety of needs that could be addressed by e-learning. Some of these are indeed being addressed right now by different units. The Academic Health Center is working with a group of health-related colleges to address a clear professional and continuing professional education need. The College of Continuing Education uses e-learning to meet the needs of its unique (off campus) and not so unique (campus-based) students. Faculty use e-learning on campus to serve resident students although clearly there is no systematic effort in this area. The Coordinate Campuses appear to be increasingly ramping up their efforts because of the student populations they serve now or want to serve in the future.

Any one of these areas could be pursued in an active fashion if that is what the University decides it wants to do. Again, from an outside perspective, the issue is this: What makes the most sense if everything cannot be pursued? In other words, where might the University gain the most for an investment of resources, energy, and time? In this context, consideration should at least be given to focusing on blended learning – mixing online and face to face instruction. We offer this suggestion because of the University's primary setting in the metropolitan Twin Cities area with a large urban population in close proximity. This clearly represents a large market that in all likelihood could be better served through e-learning – increased educational efficiencies, more students, and perhaps even more effective learning. Using this urban platform as a base, the University of Minnesota could concentrate on developing significant experience and expertise serving students through this means.

There are several benefits to this approach. The urban context already mentioned is one. Another is that primary pursuit of a blended approach would not inhibit more limited excursions

into the fully online environment. Indeed, if there was an effort to create a more systematic approach in terms of the use of digital technology, including a digital infrastructure to serve blended learning, units like AHC with commitments to e-learning at a distance would benefit as well from a more rationalized system. The same would be true of the Coordinate Campuses and their efforts to grow e-learning. This approach also would provide an opportunity to address what appear to be a myriad of policy issues that currently work at cross purposes with the possibilities that e-learning makes attainable (which we will address later in this report). Finally, this approach would not necessitate a significant investment in marketing. The ability to market programs across many and diverse markets can be both daunting and costly. Given that the University of Minnesota does not currently appear to possess e-marketing expertise, waiting to develop such expertise only after it stabilizes e-learning in general seems to make the most sense.

## **POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS WITH PRIVATE PROVIDERS**

The digital technology explosion and the rapid growth of e-learning at all levels of education have created a fertile environment for entrepreneurs. This includes the advent and significant, growth of for-profit providers of postsecondary education as well as the emergence of companies focused on specialized elements of learning. In the latter case, these companies are in essence disaggregating the learning process. Some companies focus on providing content, some on tutoring, some on delivering exams at a distance, some on grading exams, some on advising and counseling, some on providing technical assistance to students, etc. The argument of all of these groups is that they can provide a service more efficiently and more effectively, and hence in a more cost effective way than a University that is trying to manage the whole process.

As the cost of higher education continues to escalate at most institutions, outsourcing particular services to private providers like Capella or to entrepreneurial companies with a more limited focus will become appealing and will have to be considered. When giving consideration to working with such entities, the University of Minnesota must decide what is core to it. That is, what elements of the postsecondary enterprise are so foundational to the University that it cannot outsource those to others? In most cases, those core or foundational elements are most likely to be tied directly to the teaching/learning process. But, they need not be that limited.

While this may appear in some ways to be a rather easily settled issue, the dramatically changing business context in higher education will ensure that that will not be the case.

Universities will want to maintain control and manage postsecondary education their own way as they always have. Financial cost factors are not likely to allow that to happen. Choices will have to be made. We suggest that the University of Minnesota make those choices wisely based on its values and based on how it can best make a contribution to student learning – and to whom.

## **STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

While our comments, of necessity, focus here on things that might be done differently, it is a significant strength that the University of Minnesota possesses many assets that, when aggregated and aligned, could contribute to a significantly expanded e-learning effort. However, as noted, it is a significant weakness that these assets are not federated, and sometimes appear to be managed by “silos” (a term we heard often) of offices or units that do not communicate with or coordinate with each other as they ought to.

### Strengths include:

- A broadly expressed eagerness and support for the establishment of a shared vision for e-learning.
- Pockets of faculty innovation and energy, particularly in the Academic Health Center (Public Health and Nursing), but also in colleges throughout the university and on its Coordinate Campuses.
- Expertise at the Crookston campus, AHC, and CCE in developing and delivering quality degree programs.
- Technology tools and support available through the Digital Media Center, the DEIT, and through the Coordinate Campuses (particularly Crookston) and some of the colleges.
- A Center for Teaching and Learning that could serve as the hub of a strategic faculty development program.

### Weaknesses include:

- Lack of an overarching strategy for the role of e-learning in the university’s mission.
- No clear imperative or incentives for faculty to engage.

- Multiple and sometimes competing offices that provide technology and/or guidance to faculty.
- Duplication and lack of coordination between different technologies and interfaces (e.g., the campus portal and “One Stop”).
- Faculty and administration do not share a common understanding about copyright and intellectual property in the e-learning environment.
- Policies that do not align with, and sometimes inadvertently discourage, e-learning initiatives (see below).
- Competition between the College of Continuing Education and other colleges for faculty time and energy, as well as multiple units devoted to “continuing education.”
- No central or clear point of contact: Faculty must be extremely dedicated and interested in order to maneuver through the existing array of offices, services, and policies in order to develop and deliver an online or hybrid course.
- Evident frictions between different campus units that need to be collaborating: OIT, CCE, DEIT, and the colleges.

## **BARRIERS**

Following on this outline of strengths and weaknesses, we want to highlight specific barriers that we think need to be addressed. Where appropriate, we will suggest ways of addressing them – though certainly these opinions come from partly-informed outsiders, and would need to be addressed through the University’s own policies and procedures.

### Policy issues:

- The University ought to address its multiple registration systems for credit and non-credit courses.
- The University ought to reconsider its policy that the last 30 hours must be taken in residence on one campus.
- The University must (in our view) reconsider its policy that no required liberal education courses can be taken online.

- The University's responsibility-centered budget model, as it is applied at Minnesota, seems to discourage and even disincentivize expansion into e-learning for some of the campuses, colleges, and departments, because they make increased enrollments a mixed blessing budgetarily. Additional enrollments are apparently taxed for central services that online students do not even use.
- The University needs a full-cost budgeting model for online education that takes into account consistent and sustainable levels of faculty support, course development costs, etc.

#### Perception issues:

- Despite evident quality programs at your University, many faculty still perceive online options as inferior quality. Even the successful AHC programs are viewed as taking quality and content control away from faculty.
- Faculty are highly mistrustful of campus IP policies, even though these apparently mirror policies implemented without dissent at other universities.
- Faculty are concerned that e-learning efforts will simply increase their workload, with or without compensation. (One informant said faculty are "frightened.") The incentives of expanding e-learning options do not easily mesh with the broader values of an R1 institution. Nor is it clear that salary or promotion and tenure evaluations adequately recognize or reward efforts in this area.
- Faculty perceive that the e-learning agenda is driven by financial considerations, rather than more intrinsic academic values such as innovative teaching, expanding access, improving graduate rates and time to completion, providing graduate students with support and professional training, etc.

#### Resource issues:

Although the University of Minnesota faces significant challenges with regard to e-learning, resources do not appear to be one of them. More often than not, those we met with talked about duplicative resources, uncoordinated resources, poorly utilized resources, and even wasted resources. The need appears to be one of how to most effectively aggregate the resources that exist. A more systematic and coordinated approach is likely to result in financial dividends as well. In a time in which most units of

the University would like additional resources, finding a way to generate savings through more effective coordination would appear to make some sense.

### Organizational issues:

The extensive but uncoordinated investment in digital technology for e-learning is not unrelated to the organizational issues that are limiting a more effective approach. As at many higher educational institutions, centralization is viewed skeptically. There was almost a uniform desire voiced to maintain a decentralized approach. Such an approach is more likely to foster experimentation and different approaches, something that can be very positive especially given the ongoing, continuous, and rapid evolution of digital technology in the education arena.

One of our clear overall recommendations (see below) is for greater organizational coherence among the disparate offices currently providing services and developing policy in this area. This was a major topic of discussion in our exchanges during the visit, and we heard many possible models. Everyone agreed that the way things stand is not working. But we heard a variety of alternative suggestions from the people we talked with: the creation of a new central unit; the growth and expansion of an existing unit; or a confederation of semi-autonomous units. As noted, some degree of decentralization can be an advantage; but with decentralization comes an even greater need for some locus where coordination and shared services can be negotiated.

There are many possible alternative models, ranging from:

Model 1 - Decentralized. Leave the existing decentralized offices, and strengthen the current Provost-level office to coordinate university-wide efforts, and to coordinate other efforts in the colleges. Clearly differentiate the e-learning missions of the different Coordinate Campuses.

Model 2 - Centralized. Consolidate all current university-level offices and services (regardless of current reporting lines) into one unit, with the central unit connecting/coordinating with the colleges and coordinated campuses. Identify a strong leader who can collaboratively create and articulate a compelling, shared vision of e-learning.

Model 3 - Confederated. Centralize the technology support and platform, policies and governance, and establish “hubs” built upon current areas of excellence and expertise in

the colleges/coordinated campuses for delivering degrees and programs. Form a system-wide E-learning Council that includes faculty and instructors.

Of course, some elements of these different models might be combined. The choice is not between a completely decentralized model versus the centralization of everything: it is where decentralization, diversity, and local control are advantages, and where some degree of common or standardized policies and resources are productive. The University should examine the several models through which the exemplar universities have organized their successful e-learning efforts (Penn State, UMass Online, and the University of Central Florida).

Our impression was that some sort of confederated approach (Model 3) made sense. Several people we spoke with seemed prepared to accept such a model. Right now, not even a coordinating council exists. Perhaps a first important step, then, assuming a clear direction can be posited, would be to create a coordinating board with representation from the various constituencies.

The primary organizational pieces that need to be brought into closer connection with one another include:

- The Office of Information Technology is perceived as more concerned with administrative technologies, and less with academic support. The Digital Media Center is widely praised, but is not always attributed to OIT. Technology support is viewed as divorced from academic expertise.
- The Vice Provost office for Distributed Education and Instructional Technology (DEIT) is not in fact the central clearing house for all these services that its name suggests. The current services are not perceived as supporting a coherent overarching strategy or framework for the university.
- The College of Continuing Education is a key resource for providing support to units wanting to develop online programs. However, its capacity to offer its own programs sometimes conflicts with its ability to serve as a partner in course and program development. The university budget system, we heard, exacerbates this competitive self-interest that sets potentially collaborative units against one another.
- The Center for Teaching and Learning does not appear to have a connection to e-learning issues.

It will be important, however, to create a system of incentives that encourage the individual groups to work together at the same time as incentivizing the coordinating council to produce results that serve the University well. Without these incentives as well as a sense of accountability, the potential for the various factions to revert to the status quo would seem to be high.

The establishment of an incentive system brings us back to who should be responsible for setting up such a system. As in the case of determining a clear, unifying direction for e-learning at the University of Minnesota, we believe the University's senior leadership must assume this responsibility. The various interest groups have not been able to work together when left to their own devices. Senior leadership must take a much more active and aggressive role to clearly set expectations that collaboration must work and that the parties will be held accountable for that. The alternative, one that no one seems anxious to embrace, is the centralization of the e-learning enterprise under a single senior leader.

## **MOVING FORWARD**

An appropriate model for achieving greater integration of these separate endeavors can only be identified after the university clearly articulates its goals and desired outcomes. But we believe that any model should include the following elements:

- *Clear goals shared at all levels of the university, with strong system-level leadership and engagement, and faculty buy-in.*
- *A reasonable list of measures of accountability and outcomes.* Such measures must be common across all the participating units and campuses in order to provide a clear picture of progress.
- *Faculty leadership.* There is a current perception (perhaps misperception) that the bulk of the efforts and energy in e-learning to date have been driven in a top-down manner by (1) economic considerations; and (2) technology interests divorced from academic expertise. This perception must be countered.
- *Fit with the University of Minnesota culture.* Any framework must fit within the existing culture, and come to be seen as part of the "core" mission of the University.
- *A single point of contact for faculty support and services.* There is no clearly defined process for a faculty member who is starting out to develop online teaching skills. To

some extent, we discovered, important and ordinary questions that might occur to a faculty member, or to a review committee or to a member of administration, did not have straightforward answers. By this we mean questions such as: Where can I get trained to teach online? What course management systems are approved for University of Minnesota online courses, and why these? What sort of faculty stipend or course release is recommended by the university for a faculty member who is converting a traditional course into online format?

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The University of Minnesota possesses a number of assets that could be aligned to give shape and energy to an e-learning initiative. If the University desires to place itself in the “top three” of e-learning initiatives nationally, it must first establish and articulate the vision that will drive this forward; align, consolidate, and coordinate the various administrative and technical support units devoted to e-learning; eliminate or change policies and administrative structures that hinder e-learning efforts; and engage faculty.

We suggest the university proceed in the following fashion:

- 1) Agree on a common vocabulary to describe this new learning environment. We recommend using the terms “Online learning” and “Blended learning,” as these are widely used in the community. “E-learning” can be seen as the encompassing term that covers both – though as one colleague noted, “Soon, e-learning will just be ‘learning’.” (See footnote 2 of this document for an expansion of this concept.)
- 2) The President and the senior university leadership must articulate the vision for online or blended learning at the University of Minnesota. As noted elsewhere in this report, the vision should focus *primarily* on student success and engagement, not on revenue; and it must have salience and credibility with the faculty. We see the Provost’s office as the natural center for these activities, emphasizing the academic motivations for expanding e-learning.
- 3) Appoint an academic leader to serve under the Provost for at least an interim period to fully develop the concept of online or blended learning for the university in the coming year. Additionally, the Provost might choose to appoint an outside expert to advise the principal during the study and implementation phase. Regardless of who is appointed, it will be essential that they have strong credibility with the faculty; they need to actively

engage faculty concerns and perceptions – whether accurate or not – that are impeding buy-in and engagement with e-learning opportunities.

Specific tasks for the year might include:

- a. Establish leadership and an organizational focal point for the effort in the office of the Provost.
- b. Analyze the existing models used to administer online or blended learning efforts at the three exemplar universities (Penn State, UMass Online and the University of Central Florida) in order to determine which model, or hybrid models, make the most sense and fit best with the culture of the University of Minnesota. (See footnote 1 of this document for further observations regarding exemplars.)
- c. Create the coordinating board, mentioned above, with representation from the primary stakeholders in the e-learning effort. Critically examine areas of uncoordinated activity that create unproductive duplications and/or conflicts of effort across different university offices and units.
- d. Develop common and standardized e-learning policies and resources to be adopted across the university (including at the regional campuses). A common portal for all on-campus and online offerings would make sense.
- e. Address existing policies that hinder efforts (intellectual property, budget models that provide disincentives to collaborate, and other policies mentioned earlier in this document).
- f. Establish measures of success and provide models for tracking and reporting them.

The analysis and recommendations in this report are supported unanimously by all members of the review team.

## **e-Education Peer Review Team Visit Schedule November 11-13, 2009**

### **November 11, 2009**

- 2:00-2:30 p.m.      Introductory meeting with Robert Bruininks, University of Minnesota President, and E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
- 4:00-5:00 p.m.      Meeting with Wendy Pradt Lougee, University Librarian, and Linda Watson, Director of Health Sciences Libraries
- 5:15-6:00 p.m.      Phone conference with Robert Kvavik, Associate Vice President for Planning and Professor
- 6:15                      Dinner with E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Administration; and Frank Cerra, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences

### **November 12, 2009**

- 9:15-10:15 a.m.      Meet with Barbara Brandt, Assistant Vice President, Academic Health Center Special Programs. Barbara brought a staff member with her.
- 10:30-11:30 a.m.      Meet with Mary Nichols, Dean, College of Continuing Education. Mary brought two staff members with her.
- 12:00-1:00 p.m.      Lunch with Steve Cawley, Chief Information Officer, Office of Information Technology; and Ann Hill Duin, Associate Chief Information Office, Office of Information Technology
- 1:15-2:15 p.m.      Time for reflection and discussion
- 2:30-4:00 p.m.      Meet with Billie Wahlstrom, Vice Provost for Distributed Education and Instructional Technology
- 4:00-5:00 p.m.      Meet with Cathy Wambach, Associate Professor, Post-secondary Teaching and Learning and chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP); Arlene Carney, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs; Robert McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education; Henning Schroeder, Incoming Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education; John Ziegenhagen, Director of Strategic Projects; and Steven Rosenstone, Vice President for Scholarly and Cultural Affairs

**November 13, 2009**

- 8:00-9:00 a.m. Breakfast with Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Administration; Charles Casey, Chancellor, UM Crookston; Jacqueline Johnson, Chancellor, UM Morris; and Tom Baldwin, Vice Chancellor, UM Crookston
- 9:15-10:15 a.m. Meet with Meredith McQuaid, Dean, Office of International Programs; John Finnegan, Vice President and Dean, School of Public Health; Connie Delaney, Dean, School of Nursing; Beverly Durgan, Dean and Director, U of M Extension; Jean Quam, Dean, College of Education and Human Development. Several additional deans were in attendance.
- 10:30-11:30 a.m. Meeting with various end-users to include faculty, staff, and students
- 11:30am-12:30pm Lunch and reflection / discussion time
- 1:00-2:00 p.m. Meet with Katherine Himes, Assistant to the Provost
- 2:00-3:00 p.m. Exit meeting with Robert Bruininks, University of Minnesota President, and E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost