



**NCHEMS**

**Final Evaluation Report  
Oregon State University**

**Prepared for the  
Fund for the Improvement of  
Postsecondary Education Grant  
(Application Number 053599908)**

August 2003

**National Center for Higher Education Management Systems  
P.O. Box 9752 • Boulder, Colorado 80301-9752 • (303) 497-0301**

# Oregon State University FIPSE Grant

## Final Evaluation Report

### Introduction

In 1999 the federal Department of Education designated funds for the Distance and Continuing Education unit at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon through the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The original purpose of the grant was to develop a Distance Education Alliance that would “serve to provide access to higher education for Oregon citizens, regardless of where they live in the state” (original proposal, p. 1). The original goals of the grant were to:

- develop 99 new courses to be used in eight distance-delivered degree programs,
- develop and implement a comprehensive course development strategy, and
- Address faculty issues having to do with the new course development strategy as well as within the distance-delivered courses themselves.

Shortly after designation of the grant, the original principal investigator left the university. Once the university hired new administrators in the division of Distance and Continuing Education (now the Extended Campus or Ecampus), these individuals chose to re-visit the grant and—because it was a designated grant—adapted the direction to fit their collective vision for the unit. The new administrators eagerly accepted the challenge to use new approaches that might not be feasible at another institution where the problem of “that’s not how we do it” might happen. The result was a unique and positive convergence of a new administration, the evolution of e-learning at postsecondary institutions, and external funds to support change.

At the Oregon State University Ecampus they are actively working through and engaging the entire university to integrate online learning and traditional on-campus learning opportunities. Therefore, while the overall grant purpose remained the same, the means for achieving that end and the final goals changed. Practically this adaptation meant that the original project focus on multiple delivery modalities in the end focused predominantly on online delivery. See the checklist of original goals, adaptations, and accomplishments for the grant in Table 1.

Near the end of the original three-year grant period, the principal investigators asked for an extension year; grant personnel used this additional year to add to the inventory of programs and courses. This final evaluation report incorporates summary information from the first three reports in addition to new information from this year’s site visit and data gathering activities.

Table 1. Original Proposal Goals, Adaptations, and Accomplishments of the Grant

	<b>Original Proposal Goals</b>	<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Grant Accomplishments</b>
A	“Develop a long-term strategy for efficient course development”	Goal remained unchanged, but the methods used for achieving it changed	Done. Ecampus developed a course development process, which is currently in place.
B	Policy on “amount of release time for faculty”		In process
C	Develop 99 new courses – 27 web-based, 18 video, 54 interactive video	Focus was predominantly on online (web-based) courses	Done. 151 courses complete, with some in multi-media. Web-based, including Blackboard, was used in 138 courses, video was used in 25 courses, ITV in 4 courses, CD-ROM was used in 6 courses, and DVD was used in 1 course. In addition, 11 of the courses are also available in individualized-directed-learning (IDL).
D	“Choices for the media to be used will depend on the lesson content and the needs of the learner”	Original meaning was the choice of media for overall delivery of a course; final outcome is that within online courses, the choice of media is the faculty member’s.	Done. Faculty members (as subject matter experts) and the Course Production Team collaborate in the course development process.
E	“Accommodate a diverse faculty in the sustainment in the development of distance learning course delivery by balancing the uses of commercially -available development products while customizing some methods for specific faculty needs”	Online learning changed dramatically during the grant time frame. OSU standardized on the Blackboard course management system, customization happens within Blackboard.	Done.
F	“Staff will be hired with the Federal funds to increase the production team so the new demands can be met”		Done. The Course Production Team is staffed; funding streams have been identified to maintain staff for long-term effective

			functioning.
G	“External commercial vendor for 10 of 27 or 35 web courses—possible alternative to internal development of courses”	Dropped.	Not Done- conscious decision to stay with internal course development and course management system.
H	“An assessment tool will be developed to evaluate all developed courses, regardless of delivery modality, for effectiveness. This tool will check student satisfaction with the technology and methods used as well as retention of information.”	The Course Production Team focuses faculty on student learning outcomes and measurement. The redesigned OSU end-of-course evaluation instrument is now offered online.	In process, in collaboration with OSU Central Computing.
I	“Training of faculty in web-based instruction, interactive video, and in developing video-based courses. Ongoing support group for faculty with questions about how to effectively teach via distance education”	OSU overall is working on providing more and better forms of faculty development for instruction.	The Course Production Team works with faculty on course development and production.
J	Additional instructional servers for infrastructure		Done. The basic systems supported by this project consist of two Sun Enterprise 450 multiprocessor servers, a 420R and several T3 storage arrays.
K	“Develop policies for student services for online students. Implement student services online”		In process. A concerted effort is being made to actively work with e-learning students to make sure that they get the support needed.
L	“In order to make decisions about which of the planned programs to deliver to which locations and to assess educational needs”		Done. Ecampus now deliberately selects courses and programs for development where need is the greatest.
M	“Development of printed and web-based materials publicizing new and existing programs”		Done. Ecampus now has its own internal Marketing Group.
N	Provision of local resources for students in central Oregon.		Done, in collaboration with the new Cascades campus.

## Evaluation Methodology

Over the life of the grant—three years and an extension year—the evaluator visited Corvallis four times to interview Ecampus personnel, Oregon State University administrators, and faculty and staff. See Table 2 for the mix of Ecampus (formerly Distance and Continuing Education) personnel, Oregon State University administrators, and faculty or academic program coordinators interviewed during each site visit. The first two site visits happened shortly after the beginning of the fall term; the latter two site visits occurred before the end of the spring term. The first two site visits happened while the bulk of development was underway and emphasized data gathering from Ecampus personnel and faculty/academic program coordinators. During the final year of the original grant and the extension year, evaluation activities gathered feedback from Oregon State University administrators and faculty about the evolution of Ecampus. Repeat interviewees gave a longitudinal perspective of progress while single interviewees yielded a cross-sectional perspective of general knowledge across campus.

Table 2. Number and Percent of Interviewees Per Site Visit

Date Of Site Visit	Number Of Interviews And Percent Of Year Total				Percent of “Repeat” Interviewees
	Ecampus Personnel	OSU Administrators	Faculty Or Program Coordinators	Total	
October 9 & 12, 2000	9 (43%)	5 (24%)	7 (33%)	21	--
October 23 & 24, 2001	11 (61%)	2 (11%)	5 (28%)	18	50%
May 20-22, 2002	9 (33%)	10 (37%)	8 (30%)	27	52%
April 29 & 30, 2003	2 (17%)	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	12	67%
Total	48 different individuals				

In addition, the evaluator reviewed hard-copy documents, online documents including Faculty Senate minutes, Faculty Senate Distance Education committee minutes, as well as the Oregon State University ([oregonstate.edu](http://oregonstate.edu), previously [www.orst.edu](http://www.orst.edu)) and Ecampus ([ecampus.oregonstate.edu](http://ecampus.oregonstate.edu)) websites.

This final evaluation report begins with a discussion of the integration of Ecampus with the broader university. It then overviews eRAM, the resource allocation model, outlines the courses and programs developed and planned, and presents the Ecampus continuous assessment process. Finally, it provides input on continuing issues that Ecampus will likely have to confront in the coming months and years.

### Integration of Extended Campus with Oregon State University

The newly-hired Ecampus administrators adapted the grant to fit their vision for the unit. This vision differed considerably from how Ecampus had functioned previously—both internally and in tandem with the larger university. The new vision required more identification with and collaboration between the unit and Oregon State University.

Supported in their efforts by FIPSE funding, the Dean and Associate Dean have made substantial progress toward this new vision. From the Ecampus Strategic Plan, the current vision and mission are:

**Vision:** Oregon State University will become the recognized leader in the Western United States in the development and application of innovative teaching-learning strategies and information technologies to provide access to responsive, quality education and to provide “The OSU Experience” to learners for a lifetime, any time, any place in the state of Oregon, the nation, and the world.

**Mission:** The OSU Extended Campus provides institutional leadership for the development and delivery of Oregon State University educational programs for non-resident and non-traditional students and serves as the connection between the instructional resources of OSU and the needs of diverse learners statewide, nationwide, and worldwide.

(from “Strategic Initiatives, 2002-2007,” Oregon State University Extended Campus, February 2003, internal document)

To achieve the goal of better integrating the unit—previously known as Distance and Continuing Education—with OSU proper, the unit underwent a name change in September 2002. Ecampus administrators and personnel felt that the previous name—particularly the use of “distance”—created a psychological impact on people across campus that Ecampus was not part of the larger University. They feel that “extended” is a better descriptor of what the unit does: extending the Oregon State University across the state and beyond. Extended Campus, or Ecampus, is happy with its name change.

From the beginning of the grant, Ecampus made a concerted effort to engage faculty and deans across the University in conversations about online learning. These efforts have been instrumental in helping those in traditional academic units understand that Ecampus wants to partner with them in the learning process. Progress has been difficult at times for a variety of reasons. Some residual animosity lingered from the previous incarnation of Ecampus. Misconceptions remain prevalent about what Ecampus does and does not do, which services it provides, and how funding works. And, a previous president’s pronouncement about his desire for online learning enrollments to grow substantially in the next few years took many people (including some at Ecampus) off-guard leaving some negatively inclined toward Ecampus. Nevertheless, through persistence, repetition, and being open to criticism, Ecampus has advanced during the four years of the grant toward its goal of refashioning itself within Oregon State University.

Evidence of this progress includes the following examples from this year’s interviews:

- In previous years, the high turnover of personnel in Ecampus raised concerns among people interviewed. This year, however, no one introduced the issue of turnover. Instead they praised Ecampus administrators (Bill McCaughan and Mark Merickel) and personnel (in particular, Paula Minear and Jackson Cassady).

- The Acting Provost has funded Ecampus to help put four to six “BaccCore” classes—large enrollment undergraduate courses—online. He understands the utility of this approach for increasing access and easing short-term strains on physical facilities. In addition, online learning adds flexibility for both faculty member and student schedules.

Ecampus administrators find that the Provost’s Council understands the changes being made. University-wide discussions about online learning focus now on “all of us” rather than on pushing the activity to a single unit. Other evidence of the integration of Ecampus with Oregon State University presented below includes the new Faculty Senate committee dedicated to distance education and the increase in collaboration for better data that is ongoing.

#### Faculty Senate Committee on Distance Education

This committee largely focuses on issues within the university raised by distance education. One particular emphasis is on how to spread the concept—particularly a shared, positive conception—of “online learning” across campus. Committee members work to inform all faculty members about the appropriateness of online learning. They identify exemplars and refer interested instructors to Ecampus personnel. The Committee’s other focus this year is on intellectual property rights for online courses and programs.

The new Faculty Senate committee was welcome because it is a “legitimate forum for faculty to raise their concerns” about online learning. The point of the committee to many of its members is to keep the “locus of control with the faculty” in terms of the curricula and courses offered online. This stance may “slow things down to have faculty oversight of things that have an OSU brand,” nevertheless committee members feel that it is an “important quality measure.” There may still be tension created by some members of the faculty senate feeling that they “oversee” the Extended Campus; the reality is that while Ecampus values the input of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate does not *govern* Ecampus. The Chairperson and most of the members of the Faculty Senate committee understand this difference and are working to accurately represent Ecampus and its entrepreneurial activities to faculty on-campus.

Other issues that remain include whether courses developed and taught through Ecampus are in-load or out-of-load for academic departments and in the promotion and tenure process. The effort put into developing an online course can be significant. From their comments, many faculty and administrators still see the development of online courses as “other”—unrelated to either the teaching or research aspect of a faculty member’s job.

Academic units currently use a variety of approaches to determine course load and how online courses count within that load. Within the School of Education alternative workloads are welcome and accommodated. One College’s Dean grapples with determining how to fund the initial delivery of online courses as an overload and then transition those courses into regular faculty loads. Other deans have different requirements for faculty load depending on the type of appointment an instructor has:

tenure track, fixed term renewable, or adjunct. Another College approaches faculty load in terms of number of student credit hours generated—whether those credits accumulate via online instruction or in traditional face-to-face classrooms makes no difference. Schools and Colleges may choose to run their more entrepreneurial activities such as online learning with more flexible staffing patterns using both fixed term and adjunct faculty, which provides for more adaptability.

In terms of promotion and tenure, Oregon State University has had fairly liberal tenure guidelines in place since the early 1990s, although when asked, faculty and administrators are unable to give examples—even anecdotal examples—of how those more liberal guidelines have benefited any person specifically. No department gave evidence of evaluating course quality for an online course that has a full-time faculty member as the instructor of record but uses multiple graduate students to offer multiple sections of the course. Nevertheless, faculty work-load discussions have evolved over time; people now seriously consider the question of faculty workload, rewarding that work, and creating models for substituting lower-cost graduate students

Problem areas for the Faculty Senate committee are typical of start-up efforts. Due to the necessary internal focus required when beginning a new committee, little information has been shared externally to date. For example, deans have received no specific information, and many administrators did not know that the Faculty Senate committee existed. This situation should change substantially in the next year as the Chairperson implements his plan for the committee.

#### Student Information System and Data

Generally, the University has been working to better use data and information. In the past year the university decided to create a stand-alone, dedicated office of institutional research (IR), which is a departure from how OSU handled IR previously. The creation of an IR office may result in a stronger institutional commitment to developing standardized extraction routines from academic information systems that will allow for regular reporting about on-campus and online enrollments. Ecampus and the University are both interested in better data with regard to online, distance, and non-credit learning. Ecampus and Enrollment Management this year engaged in a memorandum of understanding to find workable solutions to several issues including the regular use of data. Work continues on completely integrating traditional and online courses in the Banner system. OSU is also planning to implement the non-credit module for Banner in the future.

Ecampus has made great progress toward its goal of integrating with the larger University. Via the Faculty Senate committee and the sharing of enrollment information with others it has made a commitment to working within existing institutional structures. The most impressive method Ecampus has used to weave itself into the fabric of Oregon State University is using a particularly salient lever—revenue sharing. The report presents the new revenue-sharing model next.

### **eRAM, the Resource Allocation Model for Ecampus**

Oregon State University's traditional Resource Allocation Model (RAM) consists of 66% of on-campus tuition distributed to the department and the remaining 34% to OSU for administrative functioning and costs. Similarly, under RAM, 66% of student credit hour monies from the state formula return to the department and 34% goes to OSU administration. Because the campus understands this distribution of revenues, Ecampus decided to use a similar revenue sharing model and named it eRAM (see Table 3 for a comparison of the two models).

Under the new University plan and funding, Ecampus no longer receives any state funding and is entirely self-supporting. The Ecampus eRAM model contains incentives for departments to become involved with online learning offered with Ecampus. For all courses offered through Ecampus, money generated by the student credit hour state formula returns in the same manner as those for on-campus courses: 66% to the department and 34% to OSU central administration. The fee charged on all courses offered through Ecampus (\$75/student credit hour) returns directly to Ecampus. However, the difference is in how tuition monies generated through Ecampus courses are distributed. Rather than 66% returned to departments, as is done with traditional on-campus courses, 80% of tuition returns to departments in the eRAM model. The remaining 20% of tuition monies builds a special fund for the development of new programs over the next five years. At the end of five years in 2008, the 20% of tuition monies from courses offered through Ecampus then disburses to the administrative central services pool of funds.

Table 3. Comparison of RAM and eRAM

		Until 2008			After 2008		
		Acad Dept	OSU Admin	EC	Acad Dept	OSU Admin	EC
Traditional RAM	Tuition	66%	34%	0%	66%	34%	0%
	Formula Monies (based on SCH)	66%	34%	0%	66%	34%	0%
eRAM	Tuition	80%	0%	20% (special fund)	80%	20%	0%
	Formula Monies (based on SCH)	66%	34%	0%	66%	34%	0%
	Ecampus Fee	\$75/SCH			\$75/SCH		

This revenue-sharing model for the Extended Campus is a change from an historical budgeting model to a productivity budgeting model. Both the Dean and Associate Dean are well aware that the pressure is on Ecampus to increase the volume of enrollments so that at the end of the five year introductory period Ecampus can be self-sustaining. Furthermore, they are aware that their efforts must result in *quality* courses and experiences for students in order to ensure that students return to take more than a single course online and that there is a good reputation which will encourage more students to enroll online.

Things are going well as the Dean and Associate Dean explain the new RAM model to administrators and faculty on campus. In the current tight budget situation and with the dismal fiscal outlook, any method that departments can employ to increase their revenues is of interest. Department chairpersons and deans are taking notice of this potential (and here-to-fore untapped) revenue source, which allows them to receive 14% more return of tuition monies. Savvy administrators are also now engaging in labor-for-labor substitutions to create more cost-savings, such as the department chairperson who is now using doctoral students as instructors for online classes that have been developed and piloted by full-time faculty. As the number of students taking the course has increased, this chairperson has been able to use graduate students to support that expansion with the original faculty member as the instructor of record.

One problematic aspect may be that in an attempt to simplify the explanation of the new eRAM model some people have told others that it is “basically like summer session,”

which has been used as an analogy because faculty are paid for their work. However, while faculty members are indeed paid, it is not the case that the distribution of tuition and student credit hours is the same as summer session. This difference led to some confusion during evaluation interviews.

In the words of one Dean, the new eRAM is “the right answer, a clear incentive, and a uniform one for participation” with online learning; the latter point—that the model is uniform across all units—may refer to past perceptions within departments of inequities or differences in monetary arrangements between the old Distance and Continuing Education had with different groups on campus. This respondent also noted that in the past an individual faculty member’s interest and initiative resulted in courses offered online, but the new revenue-sharing model is a reason for the college/school to look at online learning as a unit-level decision and activity to support, rather than it being a “boutique” activity for individual faculty members. Many deans are interested in the new revenue sharing model.

The relationship that a college or school has with Ecampus is largely dependent on what type of programming that college or school provides. For instance, the School of Education offers a number of programs off-site state-wide, and therefore, has a close working relationship with Ecampus. Others, such as the College of Science, are forging a new relationship based—not necessarily on programmatic delivery—but on delivery of large-scale courses to predominantly on-campus students.

Another policy receiving attention recently is the “plateau” in tuition that currently exists at Oregon State University. Students pay a differential tuition, increasing per credit hour for enrolling in from 1 to 11 credit hours, and then students may enroll for 12 to 18 credits for a single tuition price. Administrative discussions continue on whether to raise and/or narrow this window.

After much discussion and work during the early years of the grant, the final revenue-sharing model, eRAM, is simple, makes sense to a broad range of institutional constituents, and contains incentives for participation. Ecampus must now make it work so that in five years it is a successful self-sustaining model.

## Programs and Courses

While the initial FIPSE grant was for individual course development, and not specifically for program creation, now the focus of Ecampus is on programs. Previously Ecampus attracted individual instructors to work online by paying them to develop courses; faculty tended to focus on individual courses in specialty areas. Now, in order to build a long-term sustainable enrollment base, Ecampus is developing a range of programs in collaboration with different Colleges and Schools—a “focused inventory” of online degrees and certificates. The purpose of the inventory is to enhance and supplement Oregon State University’s presence within Oregon and beyond. The target is to have a catalog of seven baccalaureate degrees and seven Master’s degrees as well as a number of graduate certificates.

Due in part to the grant, but also due to a union of purposes, Ecampus is working with the Cascades campus to deliver learning. Plans are underway to develop a Bachelor’s degree in General Studies at the campus, which will be more defined than the currently available Liberal Studies degree. Another degree under consideration at Cascades is a tourism degree in conjunction with the College of Forestry that would incorporate online components. Another Cascades-specific degree would be a minor in international business. Currently there are two modes for the Natural Resources degree—online and face-to-face at the Cascades campus. Some on-campus students do take a few courses online, but predominantly they stay in their chosen mode of delivery.

Ecampus is also interested in developing other degrees including a Master’s degree in Public Health. In addition, it is interested in creating a minor with the Business School; together they offered a single course this term, which went well and may help facilitate more collaboration in the future with the Business faculty. The College of Agriculture is interested in developing an undergraduate certificate in Horticulture; this certificate has wide appeal and, because Oregon is the number one nursery state in the country, there are a number of jobs available in the horticulture industry. The College of Agriculture is also interested in offering an agricultural business management program, or agricultural economics. With the number of courses now available in Fisheries and Wildlife (a long-time partner of Ecampus), the department may soon be able to offer a minor online. The Extended Campus and Nuclear Engineering made an announcement in July 2003 that they would be offering master’s degrees and doctoral degrees in nuclear engineering and radiation health physics online.

Deans are discussing the requirements for graduate certificates at Oregon State University. Over the past two years the minimum number of credits that can comprise a graduate certificate is 24. The Graduate Council has decreased this minimum to 18 credits in order to make OSU more competitive nationally. The College of Agriculture is interested in offering graduate certificates, and administrators believe that graduate certificates—particularly online ones—will be able to generate revenue and be self-supporting.

Finally, with regard to courses, the Acting Provost provided \$50,000 to be managed by Ecampus to develop 4 to 6 online courses in the BaccCore in order to relieve pressure on

physical facilities and to give students more flexibility in scheduling these classes. Delivering these courses will begin to “legitimize [Ecampus] for resident students.” The courses they are considering developing are those with the largest number of sections, large section sizes, and large total enrollments: Geology 300 (Environmental Conservation), Writing 121 (English Composition), HHS 231 (Lifetime Fitness for Health), and Psychology 201 (General Psychology). Also under consideration are Health 312 (AIDS and Sexually Transmitted Diseases in Modern Society), Geology 106 (Geography of the Western World), and HDFS 240 (Human Sexuality). Other possible courses are Econ 101 and 102, which the department chairperson is currently redesigning and updating, and Math 111, College Algebra.

Ecampus has done an excellent job in leveraging FIPSE funds to develop a targeted catalog of courses and programs for Oregon State University.

### **Continuous Assessment Process**

Ecampus is working to set up a continuous assessment process for use internally. A Strategic Plan was developed by the Ecampus Administrative Team. They want to start gathering data regularly (every quarter or every six months) and make it public in documents. If they see a trend, they will follow up on it. By mid-August each unit within Ecampus will have developed its own unit goals aligned with Ecampus strategic goals and have specific measures associated with those unit goals. This work is ongoing and promising.

### **Remaining Issues**

Some respondents noted that despite the best efforts of Ecampus personnel, a minority at Oregon State will never warm to the idea of online learning. One person commented that while that position was not necessarily an informed opinion, it was a strongly felt position. There remains skepticism among some on campus, but the clarity with which the Dean and Associate Dean are approaching the rest of the campus in this “new era” of the Oregon State University Extended Campus helps them make their case. Some people still wonder what they will “get” out of working with Ecampus, but deans and department chairpersons who control revenues and expenditures are aware of and understand what is at stake. One respondent delineated this nicely, saying that the administration believes in Ecampus and is giving it a chance; Ecampus is “winning converts” among deans with eRAM; but among faculty, the response remains largely one of apathy and distain. Most suggestions about what Ecampus should continue to focus on in the future are meant to provide support to defend itself against critics.

- One dean noted that there was ample research indicative of “no significant difference” between online and traditional modes of delivering instruction. Despite this candid assessment, Ecampus should still design experimental or quasi-experimental research studies to evaluate the quality of learning that happens in online courses *at Oregon State University* to use as supporting evidence.

- The Faculty Senate Committee on Distance Education as an avenue for conversation and communication is critical to the future success of Ecampus as it moves forward and truly becomes a full partner with the rest of the academic structure of Oregon State University.
- OSU officials have put the course evaluation form online, and some departments are experiencing increases in the number of responses, but the evaluation form and the number of responses must be improved. Because of the perceived alignment of online learning and an online evaluation instrument and because of the utility of the online evaluation instrument, Ecampus should continue to be involved and lead in these efforts.
- Despite good progress in educating both deans and department chairpersons about Ecampus, there remains a need for a comprehensive communication strategy because key individuals (Faculty Senate president, etc.) are operating with out-dated, unsubstantiated, or incorrect information. Similarly, while many administrators now know of the “new and improved” Ecampus, only some students and a few faculty may be aware of its work. This situation is no different than much of the culture within any higher education institution, but is especially damaging when the previous “understanding” of the past Distance and Continuing Education unit was negative.
- For the new courses developed for the BaccCore, Ecampus should use a spreadsheet similar to that used by the Center for Academic Transformation ([www.center.rpi.edu](http://www.center.rpi.edu)) to show the decreased cost per student of the courses over time. It is important to provide open and accessible evidence to address the harshest criticisms.

## **Conclusion**

The Extended Campus at Oregon State University has done well with the funding provided by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Ecampus implemented a deliberate course development process, developed more courses than originally projected, and made substantial progress toward raising the profile of Ecampus and online learning within the broader University environment. The final proof will be over the next few years as eRAM is used and Ecampus seeks to build enough enrollments to sustain its work by 2008.

## **Oregon State University Ecampus**

### **2003 Site Visit**

#### **Interview Protocol**

1. What relationship does your College/School have with Ecampus?
  - a. If no relationship, do you have any future plans to work with Ecampus? Why or why not?
2. How do your College/School and its faculty members perceive the "new" Ecampus?
3. How is your College/School changing or adopting distance education as a part of your programs?
4. How is your College/School extending your programs beyond the Corvallis campus?
  - a. If not, why not? What are the issues keeping your College/School from extending programs beyond the Corvallis campus?
5. Why do you participate in distance education?
6. How are faculty members reacting to your College/School distance education plans and activities?
7. What part of your College/School's program is dedicated to serving non-resident students?
  - a. What are your projections on how much of your College/School will be dedicated to serving non-resident students?
8. How is your College/School addressing the faculty concern that distance education students add to their workload but are not counted in the reward system?

Thank you for your time and input.

## **List of Interviewees**

**2003**

Sherman Bloomer, Dean, College of Science  
Bob Bontrager, Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management  
Thayne Dutson, Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences  
Dan Edge, Chair, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife  
Bob Ehrhart, Member of Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee, faculty member  
Natural Resources program  
Leonard Friedman, Member of Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee, professor  
in Public Health  
Jeff Hale, Program Leader, Liberal Studies Program, Chair, Faculty Senate Distance  
Education Committee  
Bill McCaughan, Dean of Ecampus  
Mark Merickel, Associate Dean of Ecampus  
Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President  
Bruce Sorte, President, Faculty Senate  
Sam Stern, Dean, School of Education

## **Artifacts Collected**

**2003**

Governance Statement for Academic Staff, School of Education, Oregon State  
University, dated 7/25/02.

The Plan for a Path of Distinction, Oregon State University, [strategic plan], “adopted –  
May 21, 2003.”

Memorandum of Understanding Between the Office of Enrollment Services and the OSU  
Extended Campus, dated September 9, 2002.

Online minutes, Distance Education Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State  
University, 2002-2003.

Year One Interviewees:

Carol Babcock, Finance, Distance Education  
Barbara Balz, Registrar  
Bob Bontrager, Director of Admissions and Orientation  
Mark Dinsmore, Applications Manager, Course Production Team  
Paul Doescher, Degree Program Manager, Natural Resources  
John Dorbolo, faculty, Philosophy  
Rick Eckel, Associate Director of Distance Education  
Dan Edge, faculty, Fisheries and Wildlife  
Wayne Fanno, faculty, Agriculture  
Robert Frank, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts  
Jeff Hale, Director, Degree Program Manager, College of Liberal Arts  
Vince Lasnik, instructional designer, Course Production Team  
Beck Martinez, Financial Aid  
Bill McCaughan, Dean of Distance and Continuing Education  
Mark Merickel, Dean of Distance Education  
Ann Messersmith, faculty, Nutrition and Food Management  
Barbara Moon, Director of Continuing Education  
Pat Muir, Coordinator, Environmental Science Degree Program  
Kate Peterson, Financial Aid  
Larry Pribyl, Co-Director, Communications Media Center  
Brent Steel, faculty, Political Science

Year Two Interviewees:

Carolyn Banks, Director of Advising Center, Distance and Continuing Education  
Bob Bontrager, Director of Admissions and Orientation  
Allan Brazier, Degree Program Manager, Education  
Mary Cluskey, faculty, Nutrition and Food Management Program  
John Dorbolo, Faculty Development, Communications and Media Center  
Rick Eckel, Associate Director of Distance Education  
Jeff Hale, Director, Degree Program Manager, College of Liberal Arts  
Vince Lasnik, Instructional Designer, Course Production Team  
Bill McCaughan, Dean of Distance and Continuing Education  
Mark Merickel, Director of Distance Education  
Paula Minear, Distance Education Coordinator, Fisheries and Wildlife  
Barbara Moon, Director of Continuing Education  
Pat Muir, Coordinator, Environmental Science Degree Program  
Susie Nelson, Distance Education Advisor  
Nancy Rosenberger, Professor of Anthropology, President of Faculty Senate  
Lisa Templeton, Marketing Director, Distance and Continuing Education  
Lee Ann Thomas, Coordinator of Student Services, Distance and Continuing Education  
Pam Van Londen, Project Manager, Distance Education

Year Three Interviewees:

Mark Abbott, Dean, College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences  
Carol Babcock, Distance Education, Finance Officer  
Barbara Balz, Registrar  
Sherman Bloomer, Dean, College of Science  
Bob Bontrager, Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management  
Allan Brazier, Degree Program Manager, Education  
Bob Burton, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs  
Paul Doescher, Faculty, Rangeland Resources  
Rick Eckel, Associate Director of Distance Education  
Sally Francis, Dean of the Graduate School  
Jeff Hale, Director, Liberal Studies Degree, College of Liberal Arts  
Wayne A. Kradjan, Dean, College of Pharmacy  
Lorrie Lind, Distance Education Academic Program Assistant  
Melinda Manore, Department Head, Nutrition and Food Management  
Mark Merickel, Director of Distance Education  
Bryan Miyagishima, Distance Education Librarian  
Pat Muir, Coordinator, Environmental Science Degree Program  
Susie Nelson, Distance Education Advisor  
Larry Pribyl, Co-Director, Communications Media Center  
Paul Risser, President  
Nancy Rosenberger, Professor of Anthropology, President of Faculty Senate  
Fran Saveriano, Coordinator, Master's in Business Administration Program  
Kay Schaffer, Dean, College of Liberal Arts  
Bruce Sorte, President-Elect, Faculty Senate  
Sam Stern, Dean, School of Education  
Lisa Templeton, Marketing Director, Distance and Continuing Education  
Pam Van Londen, Distance Education Project Manager