

## Participant Observers Report Out from Day One Discussion Break Out Groups

Theme: **“Models of Delivery: Online vs. Brick and Mortar”**

<b>Moderator:</b>	<b>Dan Hosken:</b>	Associate Dean, Mike Curb College of Arts, Media and Communication, Cal State Northridge <a href="http://www.csun.edu/mike-curb-arts-media-communication/office-dean">http://www.csun.edu/mike-curb-arts-media-communication/office-dean</a>
<b>Panelist:</b>	<b>Elizabeth Adams:</b>	Associate Vice President of Undergraduate Studies, Cal State Northridge <a href="http://www.csun.edu/undergraduate-studies/elizabeth-adams">http://www.csun.edu/undergraduate-studies/elizabeth-adams</a>
	<b>Joyce Broussard:</b>	Professor, History Department, Cal State Northridge <a href="http://www.csun.edu/social-behavioral-sciences/history/joyce-broussard">http://www.csun.edu/social-behavioral-sciences/history/joyce-broussard</a>
	<b>Diana Guerin:</b>	Chair of Academic Senate of the CSU [ASCSU] Professor, Department of Child and Adolescent Studies, Cal State Fullerton <a href="http://hhd.fullerton.edu/cas/Faculty/Guerin.htm">http://hhd.fullerton.edu/cas/Faculty/Guerin.htm</a>
	<b>Darlene Yee-Melichar:</b>	Professor Coordinator, Department of Gerontology, San Francisco State, Member of the ASCSU <a href="http://edd.sfsu.edu/content/darlene-yee-melichar">http://edd.sfsu.edu/content/darlene-yee-melichar</a>

**Moderator Hosken:** Good morning. We had three different groups that got together in breakout sessions and we identified a series of broad topics that we thought that most groups talked on. So we are going to start with the very first line (refer to work chart) with is the “On-line vs. the Brick and Mortar” and that this is fundamentally about the false dichotomy, for instance it might be the wrong thing to join those two words.

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** I will chime in Dan, thank you. I observed the group that Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Maggie Shiffrar, who has been at CSU Northridge for only two months, facilitated. The group talked about how it is important for the CSU system to have better communication externally and get the word outside our system to let people know that since the early 1990s we have been offering both in class and on-line models for delivery. So we have CSU faculty who have taught fully on-line courses and even more hybrid, also known as blended or mixed courses for a long time. Consequently, our courses have not been an either—or, it’s both models for delivery. We need to let people know that so legislators and others can see what the CSU is doing on-line. We need to get that message out.

**Joyce Broussard:** We sometimes wonder, because so many of us already incorporate, modules of technology, we incorporate some sort of video, we incorporate all kinds of technology that may not be known on the campus necessarily unless someone takes your course. So for instance in the case of using the library as an information competency resource, or in making some of the things that are available known in a better way, as Darlene said, to those who are going to take our classes, those students we already teach. But it seems to me that Sacramento doesn’t have a clue what we really do on the CSU campuses. Maybe is time we are a little more vocal.

**Diana Guerin:** We also had a perspective from a student in our group that it was very important for students to have experiences on the campus and develop with the campus. That by doing that it also developed greater interest and engagement in their courses. So I thought that that was a very interesting point that by getting student engaged on campus in other activities that it would build their interest and engagement in the course work.

**Moderator Hosken:** There were several comments about the value of brick and mortar to engagement and other values that actually showing up and seeing people in class would have and I am wondering if any of you want to speak to this?

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** I will respond to that. The group that I was in was concerned about going fully on-line or going to the next wave of massive open on-line courses (MOOCs) for the very reason that most employers are seeking employees with good verbal skills, interpersonal skills, who have patience when working with customers, clients, and patients. They are fearful that if we went to totally on-line that students would not be in a situation where they would develop all those important, much needed skills without being exposed to other students and faculty. So they were hopeful that if there was an opportunity to do something on-line and hybrid, where they could perhaps see each other, they could perhaps interact with each other on-line too.

**Elizabeth Adams:** One of the interesting conversations in our group was between two of the Social Work faculty who posed a theoretical question: "*Would you want to work with a therapist who had never worked with a liver person?*" [ laughter ] To which I said, "**No!**" But then one cited a student of their in a on-line MSW in a remote village in Alaska and she has no access to higher education and she is doing it remotely and then she will then in turn serve her community, so all of a sudden my flip answer that "*No, I would not want to work with a therapist who had never worked with a liver person!*" became less sure because I do want someone to be able to provide social work services to the people of Alaska and if on-line is a way to do it, then on-line is a way to do it.

One of the questions that came up is whether or not on-line creates or enhances or exasperates the social economic divide that exists in the CSU where students who are relatively privileged have the technology and the skill sets to be able to do it, and those who don't.

**Joyce Broussard:** They have mentioned my session as well, that they are very concerned that we are creating an early tiered system if it becomes associated with on-line delivery in how you get access if you go to the CSU but it is going to be different if you go to USC. It can create a problem. There was some concern expressed that we moderate that in some way.

**Moderator Hosken:** And so the next broad topic was referred to from the speaker this morning from Coursera, Daphne Koller. This has to do with *MOOCs for credit*: yes, no, good idea, bad idea, what came up?

**Elizabeth Adams:** Generally an awful idea. [ laughter ] But then it's not an exclusively an awful idea. There were a number of issues that were brought up: one, *how do we measure student learning*. We cited the 170,000 people in it but had an 8% completion rate, Wayne can do the calculation on this, we have 13,000 who theoretically get credit, how would we know how those students would be evaluated? But even if you want to give some credibility to peer evaluation, it can't be the only way students are evaluated. So there is a real concern about *the quality of the measurement of the content*. This is the conversation in a few groups that there are a few MOOCs that are being geared toward a CLEP test: which is a test which accepts for credit various lower GE classes. So there is a possible external measure for a Cal student who took a MOOC to get the content and the CLEP test is not easy. And they can just pass the CLEP test just because they sit in front of a computer.

**Joyce Broussard:** Another concern that came up was the issue of MOOCs and FTES. If we do use MOOCs who will decide which subjects will be used and which subject will not? Are there going to be certain gateway courses that MOOCs will afford and are those going to be individual courses that may or may not affect certain departments more than others? For example, the issue came up about Title V. If you have a MOOC that is presented as satisfying that GE requirement for Title V then what does it do to the FTE with the history department? What do you do in a math department where that becomes an issue? There were also some good things cited about outcomes but that was primarily a concern for *who is going to make these decisions* and how is that going to be implemented?

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** The group I was in we were talking about MOOCs for transfer credit. A couple of items came up: One was when those courses they were taken would they be counted for credit? Would they be taken for transfer to the CSU? Would they be taken while they are enrolled in the CSU simultaneously to get transfer credit? Who

would monitor the courses they are taking, in other words who would do the faculty advisement? You know, if they wanted to take a MOOC course who would advise them as to the courses to take not knowing what the curriculum was in another institution? Other than this, we talked about the mechanism for the transfer credit. We talked a little bit about the transfer credit by AP Exam, the Advance Placement Exam and credit by exam. But basically we were concerned about faculty work load, staff work load, in terms of the transfer mechanism.

**Moderator Hosken:** Well a couple of the topics were the issues of the cult of personality and the singular voice that a MOOC might convey.

**Diana Guerin:** One of the things we talked about having a very homogenized, very vanilla curriculum, you know one curriculum for everyone regardless of who your students are, and who your faculty are, and the stiffening of academic freedom. So we thought that these were all important and wanted to put them out there. You know, the faculty have degree perspectives and in talking about those we can advance the field and also make teaching more relevant to our students.

**Moderator Hosken:** So if it were a largely negative take on MOOCS for credit, how can MOOCS be used? There were several ideas around that, notably MOOCS for content.

**Elizabeth Adams:** We talked about this a fair amount, that there is often, and this is about the flipped class room model, but done on a larger scale, that there are MOOCS that have content that faculty want to give to their students and not necessarily go over it in class, that it is OK to use it as a module. To view the MOOCS as somehow more like book publishers and less like competitors in education. One of the questions our folks asked was, "*Are the MOOC providers offering education or are they offering courses?*" I think in some ways they are often offering courses but even if you don't attend the course doesn't mean that you can't take the content.

**Joyce Broussard:** As MOOCS are brought up as supplemental then it is a question of faculty controlling that content much in the way you would use a streaming video if you decided to use additional content as an additional blurb on whatever you want to present. The question is, what kind of control would we have over these MOOCS? Would we be allowed to use part of them? Again, thinking of it as a book publisher, what are you actually buying, or like the library use of electronic resources once we buy this package what does that mean if we decide to keep using that will prices rise? There is a lot of unknowns right now with MOOCS.

**Diana Guerin:** In our group there was talking about the interest in evaluating, incorporating the content and then evaluating the content and how exciting that would be. And it just reminds me that faculty in the CSU already use a lot of technology and incorporate technology in their courses and are constantly trying to assess the effectiveness of that in working with our students, the very diverse students that we have. So I think of those facts from our first slide in terms of "On-line vs. Brick and Mortar" it's really technology that we are incorporating in helping our students to be more successful.

k

And the onus on our faculty to try and take advantage of the well produced materials that are out there and make them available to our students. Maybe then our students will go to the other content and augment their own learning beyond the course content which would be exciting.

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** The group I was in actually brought into the discussion about the potential use of MOOCS. And so what we talked about was not only credit by exam but we talked about how MOOCS are not so good for remediation, but that they could be a useful tool for self study in remediation courses. In-other-words, like our speaker this morning Daphne Koller said, you could go back and study on your own. So that is something that a MOOC might be good for. The other thing we looked at was how it could be used for teacher training in education courses, looking into peer grading in getting instant feedback was very helpful.

**Moderator Hosken:** We also had the topic of faculty intellectual property

**Joyce Broussard:** There is some concern in, I think, any kind of product that's being generated today, particularly online as to your intellectual property rights, and this came up a number of times in discussion, as to what your

arrangements are. I think Daphne answered this morning that it depends on the institution. I think at this point my understanding because of the digital world and our transfers on campus to digital, I know the library's going digital, what exactly if you create something do you own, or does... is it like the corporations where if you create it on their time, their server, they own it? And so there are concerns about for any of the product that we might create, is this going to be used in perpetuity long after we're gone? And these are issues that are larger issues for media and people that make this kind of product every day. So I think for some, probably most faculty members, it's kind of a new issue thinking of themselves as an entrepreneur, but if you're creating this material, it is your intellectual property. So it is a concern.

**Diana Guerin:** Well maybe something that we didn't put up there that we might want to talk about is keeping the content current, and who's going to do that? And we really didn't talk about that much in our group, but since you talked about using it in perpetuity, it does, you know, does beckon the question.

**Dan Hosken:** So most of the groups went from MOOCs as specifically to online teaching more generally, and by and large we talked quite a bit in our group about the hybrid in the flipped classroom as being positive developments.

**Joyce Broussard:** There was some conversation, we had one, a member from [inaudible] in our group who was talking about how they're assessing what they're doing. Her feeling was that they did not have yet enough assessment outcomes to know how it was all working, but that a lot of their programs, I believe, you said were blended, correct? So, again, it's the kind of issue in which we're going to have to get on in front of this in terms of if we are teaching and we are controlling the products, how are those going out, and how are they being used best to help our students, to help our particular campuses, and to help in some way preserve our curriculum, our sanctity as opposed to having it brought in from the outside? If somebody brings a MOOC in, that means somebody's packaged it and created it. So these were issues that we talked about to some degree as well in the group.

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** In the group that I was in, the group felt that it would be helpful to faculty if we as campuses, as we as a system, had operational definitions that we could all reference. What I mean by that is we sometimes think we know what a hybrid course is and we know what a MOOC is. The question is if you're talking about a hybrid course, what percentage of that course do you have to teach in person? And how much of it do you have to teach online? Are there set percentages for campuses, or is that something that we're going to talk about as a system?

The other thing is when we talked about the MOOC and the presentation from the speaker earlier this morning, she talked about reaching out to 100,000 people. And we in our group did not see us reaching out to 100,000 people. We thought maybe 1,000 people, and so we talked about SMOOCs, which is a small MOOC. [Laughter] Once those definitions have been kind of clarified and you know what you're wrestling with and what kind of animal you're playing with, we really felt like as we moved ahead as a system, as campuses looking at online education, it was really important to reiterate what we already know so well, and that is the importance and need for shared governance. Faculty have to be involved as well as staff, administrators, and students.

The other thing that we need to differentiate is looking at system-wide faculty oversight and looking at the statewide Senate resolutions that speak to faculty oversight of the curriculum review and approval process. Also recognizing the campus autonomy and the campus sovereignty in terms of their policies and procedures - that they may already have in place in terms of online education or intellectual property rights. And for those of you in the room who are not familiar with it, the statewide Senate under Diana's leadership last year did produce a white paper on on-line education, and if you haven't seen it already or if you already have, I would really encourage you to look at it because it really kind of goes over what campuses already have in place in terms of policies.

**Diana Guerin:** When we talked about the... I think there was universal agreement that flipped and hybrid courses were good things, but we did have an issue with that, and that is that it's difficult to schedule them on campus. That is, how do you set up and make efficient use of the facilities because we are set up on a Tuesday-Thursday mode or a Monday-Wednesday mode or whatnot, and so we did talk about the challenge of scheduling on a campus and still making effective use and making sure that the students know when they're online and when they're face-to-face. So the scheduling was... we spent some time talking about that in our group.

**Moderator Hosken:** So naturally at some point, we have to start talking about money. Among them were the need for faculty financial support and faculty development.

**Joyce Broussard:** In part a lot of what has come down lately for faculty have been largely unfunded mandates. So the issue is in terms of workload, in terms of how this will be incorporated into everyone's teaching, what everyone will be expected to do or not to do, those are all issues that we don't really seem to have much of a dialogue about yet, and so there was some concern about how we get one. How do we begin to address some of these issues before they're suddenly just imposed and then we really haven't talked about them? So that was one concern that came up in terms of funding. Where will the money come to make... Some of these hybrid courses can cost a lot of money to implement because you're going to be presenting multiple kinds of media, multiple kinds of educational experience. Where's that funding coming from when we're talking about this? Is the state going to provide it or is every campus going to be responsible? And these are issues that are largely unspoken right now.

**Diana Guerin:** I think we did have some agreement that, you know, what you'd like to do is match the faculty's preference for instruction and the students' preference for learning environment so that you maximize, you know, the satisfaction of both parties, if you will, and students' success, but to produce a course in multiple formats and modalities is an expensive proposition, and then when you layer onto that the cost of production and the cost of making materials accessible without, again, additional funding because it's clear that the governor and others think that these are no-cost items, that you just flip a switch and the students are learning, that makes it a little bit challenging. So the idea of, you know, online and incorporation of technology costing money seems to be a message that we need to communicate clearly to those who want to tell us how to deliver instruction.

One basic fiscal consideration that came up for us was the technology logistics. In other words, should the CSC build it, or should we buy it? You know, there are lots of organizations that would love to sell it to us. So the question is, do we want to build from within, or do we want to import something from outside and use it as is? A secondary question that came up is, if we do build or develop and grow our own MOOCS, the question would be, who would do it? If it is the faculty who are going to be expected to build this curriculum, how do they know how to do it? So a lot of concerns came up about faculty development opportunities. Who would attend? How would they attend? Would they have time to go and attend? And once they do get the training or the information to build these MOOCS, how will they be sustained? In other words, where will the technology support come from? Will it be staffed? That kind of stuff...

One final thing that the group really looked at was what about outside of the teaching? What about the faculty advising and the supervision? Where does that fit in on a one-to-one basis? You're going to work with people on-line, but will we be doing e-Advising, or will we be meeting with people on the phone or on-line? Those are things that came up and needed serious consideration because when you're doing academic advising and not so much teaching in the classroom, some confidential stuff comes up that you might not want online and accidentally land on a platform somewhere.

**Elizabeth Adams:** Students don't like e-Advising either. They won't come to it. Every time we've tried to do e-Advising, they just... they don't come, but one of the pieces that we alluded to earlier but that I want to sort of return to now is the issue of not only FTS but campus-to-campus coordination. We often have a tendency to think that the CSU isn't capable of doing coordination across campuses in any meaningful way, but if we don't figure out how to do this and do it effectively, then we are going to be stepping all over each other's toes, or we're going to be seating our responsibility on the campus to another campus to educate our students. Some of you are probably familiar with the current program that the CSU is running called "Intra-system Concurrent Enrollment." We're going to change the name of it, but... and there are currently fewer than 200 students statewide enrolled in ICE courses. CSUN actually has the largest number of students enrolled here, and we have 40, and there is one CSUN student enrolled in one course at Fullerton. Now, they're going to grow it, but, you know, one of my concerns about it, and I shared this with the group and the group seemed to share my concern, is that, you know, it would be easy to have this system set up in a way that the large campuses like Fullerton and Northridge and San Francisco State, which are the campuses represented up here, would end up having to do high cost, low yield courses for the small campuses that can't afford to offer those courses, and I think that's a real danger, and so I'm all for coordinating across the system, but only if we do it in a really thoughtful way, but the problem is all of our money is tied up in FTS. Diana point out that Brown wants to disconnect the money from FTS, but then what do we do? There, you know, there's not sort of magic floating money that we can

say, "Oh, well, you know, Northridge gets this much, and Fullerton gets this much," without having some way to measure it. So I think we really have some very, very big questions that we don't have good answers to.

**Joyce Broussard:** One other piece to that workload issue that comes up as you start talking about increasing or the potential of increasing these numbers, Daphne was speaking this morning about the, sort of, grading component. Well if you have 10,000 people taking your course, you have, of course, peer reviewers. Well we don't necessarily have those on... in any workable form. We might be able to get a grader or two occasionally, but by and large every time the numbers of your course goes up, even if you have a small MOOC at 400, let's say, that's 400 papers, 400 responses. So then do you end up because it's economy of scale limiting their experiences so you don't really teach them too bright? You give them short answers so that they're easier to then handle the grading or those response... In other words these are all factors that it's very easy to talk about this and to say, "Oh, we'll grant more access," but who ultimately becomes responsible for the day in, day out, not only designing, maintaining, and ongoing perpetuity of it, but who's doing the work? So, again, another issue that came up.

**Moderator Hosken:** Well, so the dollar sign paper here was largely concerns so we decided we needed a big old post-it note that had some positive aspects, and that is resistance is futile.

**Elizabeth Adams:** Which we meant ironically. [Laughter] Except for that we didn't because technology's here and we've got to figure out a way to incorporate it, but, you know, one of the things that is possible using technology is to work on saving small programs across the CSU. I know Beth Say is working on a project with some of her humanities dean colleagues across the system to try to save French. We don't have enough students at CSUN to support a French major, but there may be the possibility of doing on-line French instruction so that you can save the major on multiple campuses without having to hire new faculty, which is not something that we can commit to given the enrollment. So there are some positives to it. It's not the easiest thing to coordinate. They've been working on it for a couple of years, and it has pieces that are ready and then other pieces that are still in progress, but I know that they're talking about it again this fall. So, you know, there are some positives to taking smaller programs. You know, we have 23 campuses, and, you know, give or take 22 of them, try to be all-inclusive public comprehensive. Maritime doesn't try that, which is good because they're on a boat. [Laughter] But, you know, do we need to do that? Right? Do we need to have a geology program on every campus? Do we need to have a French program on other... on every campus? Is it possible to offer students the opportunity to major in those departments or programs without necessarily having the full range of courses on a campus to acknowledge. It may allow us to come up with new models.

**Diana Guerin:** And I think, you know, in our group we did talk about it from both sides of the, you know, interaction. We're going to be hiring new faculty, and whether you're younger or older, more seasoned faculty, there are faculty who are interested in technology, and we're thinking that as we bring in new faculty, they're going to be more interested and move savvy in using technology. As a student pointed out in our group, you know, his family members who are younger have never been without technology, and so although we say resistance is futile, yeah, I mean it is the case that people are interested. People want to use these technologies, and we can... and the technology is getting better and better. So we do, you know, I guess, you know, you could say that we're being somewhat facetious there, but it is the case that there's a lot of interest in it-internally and externally.

**Joyce Broussard:** An example of that, the history department in looking to its future and trying to help students figure out what they would do with a history degree, we hired this year a public historian who was brought in from USC. She's a digital expert, and she... her assignment is to create an entire program in which students will not only get all the components of history, but they will... she will facilitate digital learning, interfacing. She's working at establishing connections with the library because they also are going digital, and so there are ways creatively to do this if we all sort of accept resistance is futile, so how can we best control it on our campus? And Jolene used to speak to this all the time-how do you control it so it doesn't control you? And I think that's what a lot of us came away with, particularly today is okay, what do we do now?

**Moderator Hosken:** There were discussions of sustainability. Elizabeth, would you like to respond?

**Elizabeth Adams:** Yeah, we did mention that, but one of the things that came up, I think, in almost every



group was the notion that technology can help us contribute to a larger sustainable future. It's not just having the students commute to campuses, but it's also having part time faculty who are teaching on multiple campuses, and as I mentioned to Diana, I... the AVP at Fullerton once said to me "Fullerton and Northridge may as well be on different planets because there's no way a student could commute from one of them to the other," which is true. I mean, we're probably, what, 50 miles apart, but you know...

**Diana Guerin:** Sixty-seven.

**Elizabeth Adams:** Sixty-seven. Thank you, but you know, the possibility of being able to do that in an hour is, you know, not, and so we really do need to figure out ways to keep people from having to come every day, and that way we can still use the facilities and we can still have the face-to-face thing, but we can cut down on our greenhouse emissions and the like.

So, one of the things that I really liked that I want to mention that got said at the very end of our session was said by our CIO, Hillary Baker. I asked her what she thought technology was going to look like in 20 years, and she said, "*One of the things we worry a lot about right now is integration. How do we make it all fit together? How do we get the degree progress report to talk to PeopleSoft, and how do we get all of that to sort of seamlessly fit with Moodle?*" And she said that she thought that in 20 years or maybe less than that, we won't be talking about integration anymore. Integration will just have happened, and so the question then becomes back to what I think Joyce was saying, which is how do we use all of that stuff to help with our teaching and learning effectively?

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** And in the group that I was in it was pretty clear to us that public higher education institutions are being encouraged to increase capacity, reduce the time to degree, to increase our graduation rates, and also to manage costs. So looking at online education whether it be hybrid or MOOCS or SMOOCS is one way to perhaps address this.

**Moderator Hosken:** Great. Well, that's our summary of our breakout sessions. I don't know if we're getting on near the dinner hour, but if there's anything that we missed desperately that any of the participants in the discussions would like to bring up.

**Elizabeth Adams:** Or anything that we said that provoked further thought that maybe you didn't say in your discussion. We have 6 minutes, which is not to say we have to use it, just that we have it. Jerry?

**Jerry Schutte:** We didn't get to touch on this very much in our discussion, but I'm curious as to what your answers might be to this question. It seems to me that the reoccurring problem in technology is that you always have to wonder where you're going to step in the stream because the stream is just raging past you at all times, and whether it's Coursera or Udacity or edX or, to quote Harry, Schmedex, the idea is it's going to change. There's going to be something else tomorrow. So how do you think that we as an institution can take that into account in trying to deal with strategic plan?

**Elizabeth Adams:** That is a good question. I mean I think we've got to figure out ways, whether it's from the system or for the individual campuses, to put money behind developing these kinds of things for... from our faculty for our students because if we take the products from the elite institutions, you know, I think we're missing who our students are, we're missing who our faculty are. I mean, you know, I'm flabbergasted by the fact that the Stanford people are defending what happened at San Jose with the supposed MOOC in developmental math. I mean, anybody who knows anything about developmental math, and let me say that I'm a folklorist, so it's not exactly like this is my field, could've told you that wasn't going to work, and that the in person developmental math is going to work better. You know, why take somebody else's product? We have a product that works. Kate Stevenson does it every day. That could've been turned into an online product, but that's not what we did. We went and got somebody else's product. You know, the CSU is the largest public university system in the country. Why are we not trying to get ahead of it? We don't have to necessarily swim in somebody else's stream. We can create our own, but we have to have the money to do it, and we have to give faculty the time to do it and to make it about what faculty thinks should be in the curriculum because the minute we give that up, we've lost who we are.

**Joyce Broussard:** That was also the concern that was brought up about this sort of if we do take the outside product, aren't we, in fact, sort of defaulting to a personality cult? I mean it's so easy for young people now to sort of get caught up in a personality or star material. We have great teachers on this campus, on every CSU campus statewide. I was lucky to be in a history council with all 23 CSU's. They're marvelous. I really think maybe the faculty senate can push Sacramento on this. Why take outside product, and why not sponsor at least those interested within each and every campus to develop their own? If my understanding is that the CSU has a deal with Google because of our digital content because now we've got Scholarworks and we're putting up the theses and so forth. So all of this is going to become much more accessible. They're obviously willing to think about that sort of thing, so why don't we push the envelope on getting them to allow each campus to develop product or to have a committee that is brought together from all 23 campuses that takes charge of establishing this? Maybe it's they just haven't thought of it, or maybe somebody's cut a deal. Who knows? But that's... I come from media long before teaching, so it's kind of the way that works, right? So take it back. That's what I'd do.

**Darlene Yee-Melichar:** I think the CSU has a lot of talented faculty, staff, and students. What we need to sit down and collaborate and look to see how we can move forward on this online education endeavor. The statewide senate has taken small steps. As I said, under Diana's leadership, we have begun a White Paper on online education. In addition, this past semester, spring 2013 we did initiate a joint task force on MOOCS, and we are working on a report that relates to MOOCS. My hope is that we can perhaps do the research that identifies the faculty who are interested and willing to explore MOOCS. I'm hopeful that we can identify disciplines and students who want to be consumers of MOOCS and who have the option - I think the word option came up in my group a lot. It's sort of like going into a store, going into a restaurant, having a selection menu, and having a choice but not being told what you have to take and that you have to take it a certain way, but if we have options for our students in way of classes and we have options of ways in which our faculty can teach, I think we can succeed.

**Diana Guerin:** You know as to the state, the system, let's just say, the academic senate statewide has passed resolutions in the past many times on the primacy of faculty and the curricular process, and increasingly I think we are becoming concerned about the distinctiveness of campuses and the autonomy of campuses, and it was a full court press on Steinberg's 520 bill last year from all segments of public higher education including K12. So there is resistance, and we did, you know, I think we were all concerned that that appeared. I think that Senator Steinberg understands the strong feelings of the educational community, and we are ready to go again if necessary.

**Moderator Hosken:** Okay, I think we are at time now. What is the... for somebody that knows what's going on, what is our next step? [Laughter]

[Applause]

END