Members Present: Mr. Spencer Stewart  
Mr. Sam McCool  
Dr. Andy Kuniyuki  
Dr. Gwen Sharp  
Dr. Tony Scinta  
Ms. Clairin DeMartini  
Dr. Rho Hudson  
Ms. Tonya Buchan  
Mr. Brian Chongtai

Spencer welcomed the new members and summarized the objectives of Phase II. For the new members, he reviewed the completed work from Phase I and unfinished business.

Topics:
1. OLTF WebCampus Shell - for posting Notes, Exhibits, Phase History and providing a convenient communication forum for membership. Update membership
2. Add Gwen Sharp, Brian Chongtai, Clairin DeMartini, Rho Hudson, Connie Carpenter
3. The mission of the OLTF
4. Phase I - determine quality of online course offerings
5. Phase II - determine our standing in local market

Questions about mission and the next phase led to explanation of Eduventures membership, and a planned site visit. Spencer explained Suzanne Greenwald role in developing NSC's customized research agenda. Several discussions followed:

Discussion: Process of offering online degrees. Senator Reid is hoping to earmark of $300k for online education at Nevada State College—not necessarily for online degrees, but rather online education. NSC gets to decide how that money should be spent. Should we discover that we need to improve the quality of the courses, the earmarked funds will be used for resolving the Phase I issues. Spencer will check to see if all members of committee may have access to Eduventures database.

Discussion: Enrollment/Admissions -- the yield rate (currently very low) and how it affects budget, and relates to physical capacity.

Discussion of the Pilot Study
1. Raters from committee
2. Outside raters (who will be trained)
Because we will not know about the earmark until late spring, we probably have until March/April to complete the pilot study of selected online courses. Rough timeline for completing the pilot should try to get outcomes by then so we know where we should focus
when using the earmark.
3. Number of courses reviewed -- 6+6+10? Some express concern that number is too high for completing the pilot. Also, we may not have enough subjects.
4. What should the minimum enrollment for the sample courses? Full enrollment, over 20, was recommended.

Question about whether faculty will feel that they should have seen the rubric first before being evaluated:
The discussion led to a review of the purpose of the pilot: that of trying to get faculty buy-in for the rubric. The rubric to be piloted is still a work in process and the OLTF is hoping to get faculty buy-in through testing the rubric as an evaluation tool.

Next meeting: TBA
Spencer asked for members to send him their preferred dates/times. Pam will work on a schedule and then post it.