



Management  
Analysis  
& Development

- **University of Minnesota  
Academic Health Center**
- 

# **Office of Education Customer Survey Results**

---

**February 2009**

# Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Method	3
Interprofessional Education and Resource Center	4
Learning Commons: Course Development Group	8
Learning Commons: 535 Diehl Hall	11
Conclusions and Recommendations	13
Appendices	15

# Executive Summary

The Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences is undertaking a pilot project to more systematically evaluate support service performance from customers' perspectives. This report summarizes customer surveys for three Academic Health Center – Office of Education programs:

- Interprofessional Education and Resource Center (IERC)
- Learning Commons: Course Development Group
- Learning Commons: 535 Diehl Hall (computer facility)

All survey results are very positive. Often a majority or more of respondents rated aspects as “excellent.” Staff’s technical skills and expertise ranked highest, and written comments were very complimentary of them. Customers also appreciate how well staff work with them collaboratively and as a team. However, both the IERC and Course Development Group could give more attention to communicating with a customer throughout a project, especially with someone who is a new user.

## *Interprofessional Education and Resource Center (IERC)*

It is clear that faculty value the IERC and view it as an important component of their students’ learning experience. Staff’s simulation expertise and event organization are highly regarded. Communication and responsiveness could be better, and some faculty are concerned about their ability to pay for the service. The loss of an administrator and conversion to an internal service organization are contributing factors.

## *Learning Commons Course Development Group*

Customers greatly appreciate staff’s creativity and technical abilities, as well as their responsiveness and “team” approach. These projects can be challenging; therefore, more emphasis should be placed on “project management,” especially in communicating to customers their roles and time commitment.

## *Learning Commons 535 Diehl Hall*

Users value the facility and appreciate being able to use it. Staff are considered helpful. Ensuring that the facility is always prepared before a customer arrives, making the scheduling process easier, and upgrading computer speed would promote more “excellent” customer experiences.

# Method

Three separate surveys were designed using the dean, staff, and customer interviews conducted for the evaluation plan's design. The Office of Education leadership and program directors and the AHC Planning and Analysis director reviewed and commented on draft surveys. Office of Education staff then provided three lists of customer names and e-mail addresses.

*IERC customers* were the 93 faculty members and teaching staff who used the IERC in 2008. This group received three e-mails: an initial one, a reminder, and a last request. Fifty-nine surveys were completed. Of the 93 survey recipients, one had an undeliverable e-mail and three people completed a survey with all "not applicable" responses (they are not counted in the 59 returned surveys). The response rate is 63 percent.

*Learning Commons Course Development Group customers* were the 49 faculty members who began projects in 2008. One e-mail was undeliverable. Twenty-six surveys were completed for a 54 percent response rate. This group received three e-mails: an initial one, a reminder, and a last request. One non-respondent said the project was in the discussion stage and then placed on hold. Three people completed a survey with all "not applicable" responses (they are not counted in the 26 returned surveys). Also, it was intended that videotaping service customers be excluded from the customer list, but a few of the written comments indicate they were included.

*Learning Commons 535 Diehl Hall customers* were the 33 faculty and staff who reserved 535 Diehl Hall in 2008. This group was sent three e-mail invitations: an initial one, a reminder, and a last request. Twenty-six completed a survey, for a 79 percent response rate. One non-respondent reported that she had not used the facility in two years, though her name was on a room reservation in early 2008.

Table 1. Survey response rates

Survey	Respondents and response rate
IERC customers	59 (63%)
Course Development Group customers	26 (54%)
535 Diehl Hall customers	26 (79%)

Statement	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor	Total respondents
How useful the evaluation and/or student outcome data was for helping you achieve your teaching/learning goals	53%	31%	8%	6%	2%	49
Our thoroughness and attention to detail	52%	38%	5%	5%	0%	58
Our responsiveness to your questions and requests	34%	41%	10%	7%	7%	58
The value of the service compared to the cost	29%	29%	19%	10%	13%	48

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding. "Not Applicable" and "no answer" responses are excluded.

### Written comments

The survey's three open-ended questions asked respondents to explain any lower ratings, to say what the IERC does well, and to offer suggestions for improvement or ideas for new services.

#### *Reasons for lower ratings*

Nineteen respondents explained their "poor" or "fair" ratings. Most concerned slow response times or being able to afford the service.

#### Slow response to calls and e-mails:

- "It is very difficult to get a team member to answer the phone, respond to an e-mail or return a phone call."
- "Many weeks, or even months, will pass without e-mail or phone response to request for equipment or space use."
- "Sometimes the communication can be difficult when it takes a long time to receive a reply."
- "There has sometimes been a significant delay before a reply, requiring us to follow up."
- "It is important to receive confirmation of proposed dates for booking rooms. Sometimes this step took longer than necessary; however, I realize there are many groups competing for rooms."

#### Cost concerns:

- "Price is prohibitive."
- "I have heard that the medical school GME programs are not able to use the IERC because of the expense."

- “Hiring, training, supervising standardized patients.”
- “Very organized and friendly. The rooms were excellent and everyone was prepared for the simulation.”

Several faculty find the student evaluation system very helpful, with one writing that it is a standardized way to compare “learners at a particular level.” Others said the student experience is very important (“There is no better way to learn.”) and that IERC staff are flexible in meeting their needs. One wrote that the IERC “is critical to the conduct of our activities and excellence in student skill development.”

#### *Suggestions for improvement*

Twenty-three respondents suggested improvements or ideas for new services. Several offered ideas for other training services or new student groups who could benefit: dental emergencies, serving people with chronic care issues, continuing medical education courses, and nurse practitioners. Several expressed concerns about the service’s cost, with one suggesting an endowment. A couple suggested quicker response to requests and the need for additional staffing. A couple also suggested more staff help with simulation case development or creating a repository of past cases. One said scheduling has to occur too far in advance of using the facility and another said the walls are not sufficiently soundproof for conducting student evaluations.

## Written comments

The survey's three open-ended questions asked respondents to explain any lower ratings, to say what the Course Development Group does well, and to offer suggestions for improvement or ideas for new services.

### *Reasons for lower ratings*

Four respondents explained why they chose "fair" or "poor." Three wrote that staff did not provide the work in a timely manner, describing them as "overwhelmed" or "overbooked." The fourth person was not informed of each project staff's role (designer versus technician) and wanted a "flow chart of where to direct requests for assistance to."

Another respondent rated almost all the statements "acceptable," explaining that he or she had "very positive experiences working with one team and minimally positive with the other team."

### *What the Course Development Group does well*

Most respondents (24) wrote positive comments to the question, "What do we do well?" Many praised the staff's technical, creative, and design skills:

- "Creativity, translating a variety of teaching strategies to engage online students, designing a whole course that is internally congruent."
- "[staff person] stretched my creativity and I really value the importance of her skills in improving and developing my courses."
- "The layout and artistry are effective."
- "The staff within the LC are very competent in terms of the technical expertise and know-how."
- "Most of the FLASH activities have worked out very well. Some were very creatively done."
- "Initial design is great."
- "Taking content and turning into online didactic materials."

Others said staff were responsive to their requests and needs and provided timely service. Respondents appreciated a collaborative working relationship and learning from staff. Some described staff as "motivated" and as having "energy" and "enthusiasm." Several highly complimented staff:

- "[Staff person] is great to work with, responds to questions and problems in a timely fashion and is always on time and prepared for each month's webcast."
- "[Staff person] was very responsive to my deadlines."
- "Sharing your exceptional knowledge of the learning process and how technology is a tool for furthering that process; you put the learner at the center!!"
- "My entire experience working with [staff person] was absolutely fantastic."

# Learning Commons: 535 Diehl Hall

The 535 Diehl Hall survey had five multiple-choice statements using a five-point “excellent” to “poor” scale with a “not applicable” choice. Most respondents chose “excellent” or “good” for each statement. Sixty percent of respondents said the staff’s helpfulness in scheduling the facility and using its equipment was “excellent,” the highest for any statement. The same number of respondents rated the facility’s readiness upon arrival as “excellent” or “good” (42 percent each).

For the statements concerning ease of scheduling the facility, its availability, and physical layout, half of respondents chose “good,” and one-third chose “excellent.” No respondents chose “poor” for any statement.

Table 4. 535 Diehl Hall survey ratings, sorted by “excellent” percent.

Statement	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Poor	Total respondents
Staff’s helpfulness when scheduling the facility and using the equipment 88	60%	28%	12%	0%	0%	25
The facility’s readiness upon your arrival 84	42%	42%	8%	8%	0%	26
Availability of the facility when you want to use it 89	35%	54%	8%	4%	0%	26
The ease of reserving the facility 82	32%	50%	14%	5%	0%	22
How well the facility’s physical layout and equipment support learning 81	27%	54%	12%	8%	0%	26

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding. “Not Applicable” and “no answer” responses are excluded.

85%

## Written comments

The survey’s three open-ended questions asked respondents to explain any lower ratings, to say what they value about 535 Diehl Hall, and to offer suggestions for improvement or ideas for new services.

### *Reasons for lower ratings*

Seven respondents explained their “fair” answers. Two had problems scheduling the facility. One of these respondents and two others said the facility’s layout did not support how they wanted to use it. Three mentioned equipment not working or the facility was not prepared upon arrival.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## *Interprofessional Education and Resource Center (IERC)*

It is clear that faculty value the IERC and view it as an important component of their students' learning experience. Staff's expertise in patient simulation and a well-organized simulation event are evident and appreciated. More attention is required to communicating with faculty and responding to their questions and requests promptly. The loss of an administrator position has been a contributing factor, but it is important to ensure that someone else assumes this responsibility.

The IERC converted to an internal service organization this year, so the cost issue is new to faculty members. The IERC director is aware of faculty's concerns. If not already planned or in place, a communication effort with faculty and deans should be developed to address their concerns. Examining the service's costs for potential low-impact reductions, identifying new revenue sources, and providing transition or "bridge" funding from a central source may mitigate the new financial burden on users.

## *Learning Commons Course Development Group*

A majority of customers rated the Course Development Group very highly, choosing "excellent" much of the time. Staff's creativity, design, and technical skills rated the highest, and respondents wrote positively about them, too. Staff's responsiveness and working as a team with the customer also rated high.

The one area for attention is communication with the faculty member about time commitment and his or her role, and how to effectively use the final product. The combination of faculty with little or no experience in online course development and the hard-to-accurately-predict nature of any custom project require ongoing communication with the customer. Additionally, a few respondents' comments indicate that the Course Development Group could benefit from having technical staff work with staff with strong project management skills to keep projects on schedule.

## *Learning Commons 535 Diehl Hall*

Most respondents rated the facility as "excellent" or "good." Staff's helpfulness rated the highest. Respondents were most likely to choose "good" for the other statements. Written comments show how much customers appreciate the facility and its staff. Efforts to give all customers an "excellent" experience could focus on ensuring that the facility is ready for them, simplifying the reservation process, and improving computer and laptop speed.

# Appendices

Interprofessional Education and Resource Center (IERC) Survey Results	17
Learning Commons Group – Course Development Services Survey Results	24
535 Diehl Hall Survey Results	30
Survey Instruments	34

## **Appendix A: Interprofessional Education and Resource Center (IERC) Survey Results**

This report excludes "Not Applicable" and "no answer" responses. Fifty-nine surveys were completed.

(1) Our knowledge of simulation for teaching and learning and ability to apply it to your project's goals		
Poor	0%	0
Fair	5%	3
Acceptable	2%	1
Good	26%	15
Excellent	67%	38
Totals	100%	57

(2) Our thoroughness and attention to detail		
Poor	0%	0
Fair	5%	3
Acceptable	5%	3
Good	38%	22
Excellent	52%	30
Totals	100%	58

(3) Our responsiveness to your questions and requests		
Poor	7%	4
Fair	7%	4
Acceptable	10%	6
Good	41%	24
Excellent	34%	20
Totals	100%	58

(8) The value of the service compared to the cost		
Poor	13%	6
Fair	10%	5
Acceptable	19%	9
Good	29%	14
Excellent	29%	14
Totals	100%	48

(9) Please explain any “fair” or “poor” rating (include the question number from above).

- The responsiveness to questions is lagging. Seems often that the staff is over worked to some degree.
- 1) No clinical faculty with simulation expertise. Most of the time, we knew more than the IERC staff.
- 2) Severely lacking in understanding of team training and transfer of tasks to clinical skills.
- 3) Many weeks, or even months will pass without e-mail or phone response to request for equipment or space use.
- 4) Evaluation does not validate the clinical training transfer or skill retention. It was basically just a bit better than powerpoint.
- 5) Given forms, but not told what to fill in, and how. Unclear expectations surrounding timeline.
- 6) Communication deficiencies within the organization. Different messages from different employees.
- 7) See 5.
- 8) Very expensive. Will not repeat. We will purchase our own SPs and simulators much cheaper.
- Lots of evaluations done by IERC staff, but I did not receive results.  
During sessions with students in exam rooms, staff in IERC sometimes seem to socialize more than work.  
The technology seems to drive how we teach at times. For example, the lack of Internet access in the exam rooms, so Bee Line can operate, gets in the way of providing teaching materials to students on the system.
- Getting cost quotes has taken too long. Price is prohibitive
- (3) it is very difficult to get a team member to answer the phone, respond to an email or return a phone call. I walked down to the IERC to actually try to reach someone.
- (8) I know this is a very expensive endeavor. How can we take best practices and evidence-based education and identify less expensive ways to teach and assess clinical skills across medical school departments and AHC schools?

- Great team approach to the development of and implementation of simulation-based exams for our students.
- organization of the event!
- Partner with me to develop the simulation as well as the "day of" logistics. Becky Harrison does a great job helping me develop realistic scenarios that assess the things I want to assess. Jane Miller does a great job with helping me develop clear goals for the training and then with debriefing. She helped me understand the value of debriefing to really allow students to derive the fullest benefit from the simulation experience and she is very helpful with the debriefing itself.
- schedule simulated patients
- Students move through in an orderly and timely manner. Always a fun experience for me.
- Collaboration, organization of the events
- Very talented.
- You make a tremendous effort to connect with the learner, the technology and the teacher.
- The staff provided excellent support to help us execute the exercise. Their expertise was invaluable.
- The coordination of the facilities.
- everything, especially working with the SP's
- good staff, good enthusiasm, good space and resources
- Collaboration with a diverse group. Attention to educational principles.
- Staff is personable to work with, and is very professional. Facility is great. Appreciate the staff's flexibility and willingness to make events happen.
- FOSTERING SIMULATION USE IN MEDICAL EDUCATION, VERY PATIENT.

JANE HAS AN EXCEPTIONAL ABILITY TO WORK WITH CONTENT EXPERTS WHO HAVE LITTLE EXPERTISE WITH SIMULATORS. EXCELLENT COLLABORATOR FOR OUR IMPORTANT SIMULATOR PROJECT, [project name], FUNDED WITH HER INPUT

- Helped me with ideas to meet my goals.
- I have heard that the IERC is very knowledgeable.
- The IERC has been helpful in accommodating requests for IERC usage. The IERC tries to be flexible and that is appreciated.
- SP are well trained.
- The IERC has been a fantastic facility and we feel very fortunate to be able to use it. The staff is very organized. We will miss Pat Rizzi--her attention to detail is amazing!
- OSCEs.
- Efficient and organized. Excellent communication before, during, and after the project. Reports generated after the CASE experience allowed faculty to better understand their learner's needs in the area of communication.
- Give students a chance to learn in a real life 'safe' environment.

The staff find the 'patients' for me and they train them. The sessions are really real to the students and they are able to see themselves in action. There is no better way to learn.

- Effective and enthusiastic partners in developing a learning experience that meets the needs of the customer. Creative in producing realistic and effective simulations.

Ask us if it is the same schedule as last year and mock up a schedule as our needs do not vary from one year to the next. It is daunting to create a schedule for more than a year ahead.

- My only concerns involve the physical space. When I'm in the IERC, I'm mainly there for evaluation purposes, and the movable walls are not sound-proof enough. (In teaching situations, I feel the rooms are often too small for groups of 10-12 students.) But overall my experience there has been excellent.
- Medical emergencies in the dental environment course for dental students.
- Cost is an issue in these times of tight budgets.
- Every student should be able to be expose to simulation early in the curriculum.
- cheaper!!!
- Would appreciate more prompt responses to phone calls and emails. Anticipate this will improve as staffing increases.
- DEDICATE SOME MORE OF JANE'S TIME TO WORK ON FUNDED PROJECTS
- I understand the real budget realities for the IERC but unfortunately, there is not enough support for our GME programs to use the IERC services as they would like.
- Would like to become more involved in possibilities for use of simulation for NP students' learning.
- There is such complexity in medicine today and a need to address management of chronic care in an effective yet efficient manner. There also needs to be training on management of medical issues for people with disabilities.
- Possible development of programs for CMEs or CEUs. This would be a great venue to make teaching videos.
- Better guidelines for faculty engagement - how to be helpful in the development process. Tips for effective simulations. Creative uses of simulation experiences. A library of resources for faculty to consult regarding the effectiveness or examples of simulations. A website demo of effective simulations here at the U.
- The Beeline evaluation process needs to be improved.
- Communication between faculty and IERC staff was not always timely and therefore I was not completely sure what my role in preparing the cases and facilitating the simulation. I believe that we have worked out the issues for this second year of IERC simulations.

(4) How well we explained the tool's effect on teaching and learning styles so that you can effectively use it		
Poor	0.0%	0
Fair	5.0%	1
Acceptable	20.0%	4
Good	45.0%	9
Excellent	30.0%	6
Totals	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>20</u>

(5) How well we explained your role in keeping the project on schedule and your required time commitment		
Poor	5.9%	1
Fair	11.8%	2
Acceptable	23.5%	4
Good	41.2%	7
Excellent	17.6%	3
Totals	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>17</u>

(6) How well we worked together as a "team"		
Poor	0.0%	0
Fair	8.3%	2
Acceptable	16.7%	4
Good	25.0%	6
Excellent	50.0%	12
Totals	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>24</u>

(7) The end result was a stimulating learning opportunity		
Poor	0.0%	0
Fair	4.5%	1
Acceptable	18.2%	4
Good	27.3%	6
Excellent	50.0%	11
Totals	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>22</u>

- Taking content and turning into online didactic materials.
- Technical skills are great. Attention to detail is good.
- You provide a structure for doing scripts and providing feedback on needed changes. Most of the FLASH activities have worked out very well. Some were very creatively done. Most were done as I requested. Self-quizzes were done appropriately for two of my courses.
- The services that Marshall Hoff provides are outstanding. He is very knowledgeable and excellent at troubleshooting any technical issues in the field. He also has done a good job of training the staff that works with him. His wisdom continues in his colleagues.
- I have only worked with Marshall Hoff on webcasts. Marshall is great to work with, responds to questions and problems in a timely fashion and is always on time and prepared for each month's webcast.
- Responsiveness, creativeness, and attention to detail
- sharing your exceptional knowledge of the learning process and how technology is a tool for furthering that process; you put the learner at the center!!
- collaborate across the AHC
- You were patient and knowledgeable in explaining some aspects of WebCT and the breeze presentation system.
- Paul Ceelen was very responsive to my deadlines
- my entire experience working with susan wolf was absolutely fantastic. it was a great partnership and i learned so much. she stretched my creativity and i really value the importance of her skills in improving and developing my courses. it was invaluable. i feel sad that funding has ended and i have to go back to developing very basic courses. we need these services! i am a great content expert---susan is a great teaching-learning expert. a good combination.
- Creativity, translating a variety of teaching strategies to engage online students, designing a whole course that is internally congruent
- staff are always a pleasure to work with. knowledgeable, approachable, friendly, fun to work with
- The layout and artistry are effective. Had the energy to take the risks and just do it! Motivated and could have even played a more assertive role.
- Wonderful ideas and energy. Also very realistic about how we might make the final product easy to maintain.
- Being available to video tape presentations and create product for our website
- Application of technical expertise.
- Communication.
- Enthusiastic service. Timely responses. Creative ideas. Good partnering on producing a product that meets the customer's needs. Excellent work effort/ quality product.
- The staff helped me several times with transferring DVDs to web-based content. They were extremely helpful, diligent, and the price was excellent.



- Not at this time.
- Creating guidelines or templates for faculty who are unfamiliar with the process to provide information in the best way possible. Tips for faculty to translate content into effective online material. Effective system for flagging and tracking edits. An advertised help desk function.

(4) Staff's helpfulness when scheduling the facility and using the equipment		
Poor	0.0%	0
Fair	0.0%	0
Acceptable	12.0%	3
Good	28.0%	7
Excellent	60.0%	15
Totals	100.0%	25

(5) The facility's readiness upon your arrival		
Poor	0.0%	0
Fair	7.7%	2
Acceptable	7.7%	2
Good	42.3%	11
Excellent	42.3%	11
Totals	100.0%	26

(6) Please explain any "fair" or "poor" rating (include the question number from above).

- 2. There has been some tension about us using the facility for student assessments, i.e. being told that it cannot be a quiet space. The previous person (Garrett) at the front desk was incredibly helpful. I have only just met the current person and cannot rate her performance. There was a scheduling problem one time, in which we were scheduled and another group was also scheduled, so there weren't enough computers for our group.
- It is not uncommon to have some technical problem at the time the conference is to begin. This could potentially be avoided if staff had the connection established 10min or so before the start time of 1:15pm as well as being present when the conference begins to confirm there are no problems.
- I have had some trouble reserving the room in the past. I filled out the form to reserve the room, never received a response and I then discovered that the room had not been reserved. Also the form, as I recall, is more complex than it needs to be. But this might be because I work for the [department name] and when I schedule a class for the learning commons most of the questions on the form are not applicable.
- We used the space for a couple of large meetings, layout is not ideal for conversation.
- No private "classroom" space with tower computers [only laptops]
- The laptops have consistently been problematic, especially for large groups. Since they are all on the wireless network, connectivity gets very slow and it adversely affects the hands-on learning experience. This might be solved by hard-wiring the laptops, if something could be worked out that still allowed room configuration flexibility. On the

- Please see #6 as ideas to better troubleshoot the connection difficulty
- Unless the learning commons can be expanded to allow for 50+ students, which physically doesn't seem like a possibility, I have none. I really appreciate the LC's and the staff I have worked with there--thank you!
- Streamline the submission for submitting a request to reserve time and space to teach a class.
- There is [a person] who has an office adjacent to the Learning Commons who non-verbally always looks unhappy when we are present - I consistently find that unhelpful and irritating. I can understand that it is annoying to have a presentation going on outside your office door so you might want to think about placing people's offices somewhere else - it's really not that ideal to have offices located where they are. Maybe you could also say something to the people officed there to be more tolerant and not make their displeasure so visibly obvious!
- Staff were noisy while coming and going during the 1 hour session, so our students couldn't hear part of the presentation. I was wishing for doors. It was also difficult to find the facility the first time. It may be helpful to provide explicit directions on your web site.
- See answer to #6 about the wireless connectivity. Also, easier access after normal business hours (8-4:30) would be helpful for classes that run later than that.
- Would be helpful to get the cords off the floor when using laptops by having wired tables. Also, the wireless could be faster. Form for reserving the space is a bit unwieldy and I don't always get a confirmation back. People get lost trying to find the Learning Commons. Better signage on the 5th floor would be helpful. Also, a couple times the big room has been doublebooked, with me conducting a class and people in the other half of the room taking tests. It really isn't reasonable to expect a class to be super quiet so that they don't bother the test takers.
- The center seems to have become run down lately and staff do not seem prepared.
- The services are wonderful. The person who helped me set up was able to give me the name and number of someone in another department who conducted similar classes. He just happened to remember the instructor's name, but it would be great if the Learning Commons maintained a directory of people who teach and the classes they teach. I would be happy to share the materials I have with others (Excel, Windows, Word). Sharing information might help those of us using the space to develop classes more efficiently. Also, if you can handle more users, you could advertise the facility more. Until I found out about the facility by accident, I didn't know there was such a place or a Learning Commons website.
- Faster wireless Internet connection

Notes for the Office of Education – Response to MAD Survey presentation (April 28, 2009)

The following are thoughts from the meeting of Barbara, Jane, and Lisa (April 14)

- Want to illustrate the history of the things the IERC and Learning Commons have taken over (i.e., Standardized Patient program); may occur through a chart that illustrates what was and what is
- Opened as innovation – now the IERC is core to programs
- Timeline of survey
- What things have been implemented within the past year
  - High/Medium/Low format in IERC
- These groups are ISOs; are not part of the cost pool and receive no tuition funds
  - Started with the tobacco endowment, which has since gone away
- What were the findings of the report; reference the letter drafted in response (see attached)
  - Address what has already changed and what is planned
- Create a “points of pride” slide – what notable things have happened?
  - Simulation Center collaboration with Oral Surgery – assessment/national presentations
- High-level budget – Issues and History
- IERC/LC – Histories
  - Embellish why we grew up the way we did
  - IERC moved from innovation to high stakes assessment
    - What impact has this had on finances
- Have a handout as a take away –
  - The way it was in 2003 and the changes/innovations that have occurred and when
  - Refining the way we communicate with faculty
- Challenges
  - Major hit in funding
- “No point in letting a good crisis go to waste” – **JANE – who’s is this?**

Other thoughts Barbara has shared about the report

- Timelines – this is what happened and what is going on
- Issues with external clients
- More about future
- Where are we at with the Academic Technologies
  - Homer, One45, e-folio
- Vision for other working groups