Distance Learning From A Faculty Perspective

Handout

Presented by

Dr. James Postma, Chair

Academic Senate of the California State University

ONLINE EDUCATION WHITE PAPER

JANUARY, 2012

Online Education White Paper Sub Committee:

Barry Pasternack

Pat Kalayjian

Buckley Barrett

Steven Filling

Academic Affairs Committee:

Andrea Boyle, Chair

Buckley Barrett

Steven Filling

Pat Kalayjian

Jim LoCascio

Ken Nishita

Barry Pasternack

Brian Wilson

Table of Contents

Section	Pages
Executive Summary	3-5
Section One: Introduction	6-9
Section Two: Review of Current Campus Policies	10-21
Section Three: Recommended Campus Policy Components	22-27
Section Four: Best Practices for Faculty Teaching Online	28-31
Section Five: A Brief Review of the Katz Reports	32-34
Section Six: Western Governor's University (WGU)	35-36
Section Seven: Conclusion and Recommendations	37
Appendices:	38-39
Appendix A: URL Links to Campus Policy Documents	38
Appendix B: Works Cited	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This executive summary addresses content provided in the seven sections of the Online Education White Paper.

Section One- Introduction notes that the CSU has been offering online classes since the 1990s and currently has over 60 online degree programs. Three resolutions drafted by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) since 2008 are cited, as are presentations on online learning in 2009 and 2010 and handouts developed by the Technology Steering Committee (TSC) and the Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC). Content of the following six sections of the paper is also briefly discussed.

Section Two-A Review of Current Campus Policies on Online Learning provides an evaluation of policies or proposed policies for 16 of the 23 campuses. Information from one campus policy draft was received following completion of the review process. No additional information is provided regarding the status of policies from the remaining six campuses. The policy review identifies twelve areas of concern/issues. **1. Definitions of online learning terminology** differentiating traditional and online classrooms as well as synchronous (content accessed at specific and predetermined times) and asynchronous (content delivered within a specific time frame) distance learning. **2. Faculty issues** such as instructor training, technical support, and intellectual property rights. **3. Student issues** such as access to technology and training, communication regarding the mode of instruction, student training, syllabi requirements, and student rights. **4. Technical issues** including technical support, the protection of student identities, student and faculty evaluation of existing technology, and the use of non-university hosting of course materials. **5. Miscellaneous issues** including student evaluations, the importance of developing comprehensive marketing plans, and the need for policy review cycles and updates. **6-12. Approval of online classes, academic integrity, course rigor and coverage, accessibility, class size, use of contractors and third party vendors, and assessment issues** are also noted in many policies.

Section Three- Recommended Campus Policy Components presents twenty-three components recommended for inclusion in individual campus policies. Ordering of the suggested policy components is left to individual campuses. 1. **Clear definition of terminology related to course delivery** requires policies to be explicit in defining both online instruction and the forms of instruction. It is noted that there is no universal agreement for these terms relative to online learning. **2. Curricular control** speaks to the issues of curriculum and course approvals. **3. Class size** is noted to impact course design and delivery and states the importance of identifying class size limitations for online classes. **4. Cross-campus acceptance of courses and programs** speaks to the importance of ensuring that online and hybrid courses are subject to the same policies as traditional classes. **5. Intellectual property rights** notes the clear delineation of rights for faculty members developing courses and instructional materials. **6. Use of outside contractors to provide course materials** asserts faculty control over the development of curricula and course materials as a baseline for quality education. **7. Faculty training and instructional design support** speaks to the need for faculty to have the skills necessary for online course delivery. **8. Student training in the use of course technology** identifies the need for adequate student proficiency in the use of the technology supporting online educational

programs. **9. Recognition of online instructional activities in performance evaluations** encourages the acknowledgement of these efforts in existing campus performance evaluation processes. **10. Tenure track and contingent faculty** speaks to the recognition of tenure track faculty as the primary custodians of curricula and programs, including online programs. **11. Faculty office hours and availability to students** suggests that the methods and frequency of office hours, virtual or in person, be clearly communicated to students. **12. Informed students** recognizes the importance of providing students with accurate information about modes of instruction. **13. Instructional support** asserts that students enrolled in courses should have adequate levels of technology support. **14. Non-instructional support** addresses the importance of student access to student support services and suggests that policies provide information as to how this access will be provided. **15. Student evaluations of teaching** notes that campuses should follow the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement in this area. **16-19. Assessment of courses and programs, course rigor, academic integrity, and accessibility** cites the need for parity between online and traditional course offerings. **20. Student right to take a class in a traditional format** identifies the need for informing students about choices in format for required courses. **21. Hosting of class material** speaks to the conditions (if any) under which hosting of university materials in non-university sites will be allowed. **22. Syllabi** should include the necessary information dealing with online course issues. **23. Deciding if an online program should be offered through state and/or self support** should be addressed by individual campuses.

Section Four- Best Practices for Faculty Teaching Online asserts that best practices should be developed by faculty on individual campuses. A review of the literature, however, provides input on both a number of assumptions underlying best practices as well as examples of such practices that can be considered in the development and implementation of online education. Assumptions underlying best practices include the following: (1) online courses are an effective means of providing accessible, high quality education to some students; (2) online courses should replicate equivalent traditional courses, and online faculty should have the same academic credentials as classroom instructors; (3) effective online teaching requires additional formal training in online technology and methods; (4) online course sizes should correspond to traditional course sizes; (5) students in online classes need access to support services necessary for the course; and (6) online courses require students to be more self-directed and better time managers than traditional classes.

A total of nine best practices are identified: **1. Creation of a student-centered learning environment by providing essential information in static form** addresses the need for a detailed syllabus including student support services, technical training, equipment needs, and explicit communication on course expectations as components of student-centered services. **2. Creation of an active and engaging learning environment with dynamic activities** is facilitated to promote interactions and engagement through what is identified as social, teaching, and content presence as well as the creation of online course communities. **3. Active presence in the course** enhances online education through faculty interactions with students and the maintenance of a constant presence in online courses. **4. Prompt response to student inquiries** is identified as especially important in online courses, with faculty advised to post response times for students both during the week as well as on weekends. **5. Promotion of student success through course organization and feedback** requires online courses that are well organized,

easy for students to navigate, are predictable, and provide ongoing student feedback. **6. Communication that is clear, polite, and wide** describes the importance of polite, precise, careful, constructive, and widely disseminated communication throughout online courses. **7-8. Use of technology to enhance pedagogy and technology knowledge** speaks to the significance of instructor knowledge and understanding of their system technology platform to enhance student experiences. **9. Quality assurance** is a best practice that needs to be started prior to initiation of the course and maintained throughout the course through the use of student evaluations and comments regarding online experiences.

Section Five- A Brief Review of the Katz Reports includes a review of the four papers prepared by Richard N Katz and Associates in 2011 (http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/documens.shtml.) **Online Learning Today: The Players** (May 23, 2011) provides a brief overview of 106 companies and organizations engaging in online learning activities. **CSU at a Crossroads** (May 30, 2011) presents an assessment of current online learning activities in the CSU and also offers suggestions for the CSU to move forward with online endeavors. The challenges of access and funding are identified as two long term, interrelated concerns for the CSU. The inherent ability and capacity of university systems to continually change and adapt are also highlighted. **Trends in Online Learning** (May 31, 2011) identifies a number of trends that will, in part, define online learning, including cloud computing, constant connectivity, smart devices, and the growth of digital media. **Options for the CSU in the Online Higher Education Market** (July 11, 2011) describes twelve different strategic marketing options for the CSU to consider and also maps the options to ten policy goals identified by consultants from TMC conversations. The report also provides information on program pricing and a research summary.

Section Six- Western Governor's University (WGU) provides a summary of this private, non-profit institution offering a competency based approach to online applied baccalaureate and masters degrees. WGU uses virtual communities to promote student group interactions, but the extent to which these interactions occur is not identified and some observers think of this organization as focusing on self-study for testing in a significantly independent environment.

Section Seven- Conclusion and Recommendations. This white paper is designed to inform readers about the data that exists regarding online education in the CSU. Readers are encouraged to carefully review existing surveys and reports, and to use this paper as a starting point for discussion, debate, and future dialog regarding both current and future use of technology in the provision of online learning in the CSU. The white paper offers four recommendations for future consideration:

Section One: Introduction

Online education has seen dramatic growth over the past fifteen years. The California State University (CSU) has been offering online classes since the 1990's and currently has over 60 online degree programs. A review of the background and past scrutiny of these efforts by various stakeholders is worthwhile.

Online education has been an issue of concern to the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) for several years. In 2008 the ASCSU passed AS-2871-08/AA (Rev) Quality Assurance in Technology Mediated Course Offerings (see http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2008-2009/documents/2871.pdf). This resolution stated in part "That the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) recognize the value of academic technology for enhancing access (especially geographic access) to the university and for adding to the array of teaching tools that can be used by faculty and students." It went on to state "That the Academic Senate CSU also recognize that the quality of courses can be enhanced through the use of technology, such as flexibility in time and space, course organization, content presentation, student-student and student-faculty interaction" and "That the Academic Senate CSU note that challenges exist when technology is used, for example: additional equipment, infrastructure and software costs; increased faculty workload, guarantee of academic integrity, and assurance of course quality." The resolution also stated "That the Academic Senate CSU reassert that the quality of the curriculum, including on-line courses and technology-mediated courses, is the purview and responsibility of the faculty, individually and collectively, and the systems for evaluation of courses and programs need to be structured in ways that are compatible with this responsibility," "That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the support services for the learning process, such as library resources; advising and career services, physical and mental health assistance and other extracurricular opportunities need to be incorporated into the learning process in these innovative settings" and "That professional development opportunities must be provided for faculty and staff in order for these tools to be used effectively and efficiently."

Also in 2008 the ASCSU passed AS-2824-07/TEKR (Rev) Response to a Board of Trustees (BOT) September 2007 Agenda Item - CSU Remediation Policies and Practices: Overview and Prospects (see http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2007-2008/documents/2824.pdf). In this resolution, Principle 7: "Use technology-assisted approaches where promising and feasible" stated that the "appropriate translation of 'promising and feasible' is not that technology-assisted approaches be feasible but merely promising. We need to determine the effectiveness of specific technology-assisted approaches before investing in any one approach. Technology, although feasible, may not be the best solution. Decisions about pedagogy and approach should be informed by results, not the promise of results."

In 2011 the ASCSU passed AS-2989-10/AA (Rev) Creation of a Task Force for Developing System Policies Regarding On-line Degree Programs (see http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2010-2011/documents/2989.pdf). This resolution urged "the Chancellor to convene a Task force to study and recommend guidelines for online degree programs proposed by CSU campuses." It further specified that the task force would "be charged with studying policies regarding online degree programs at other multi-

campus educational systems and other issues related to on-line education including the educational effectiveness of such programs, the impact of distance learning on maintaining a diverse student population, and the impact of distance learning on campus and system resources" and "identify ways in which CSU campus faculty can best collaborate on the development and delivery of such degree programs."

Issues related to online learning have also been of concern to campus Senates, Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, and Presidents, as well as Chancellor's Office staff, system-wide technology committees, the Commission on the Extended University, and members of the Board of Trustees of the CSU. For example, at the March 2009 Board of Trustees meeting a presentation titled "Online Education in the California State University" was made by then CSU Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard, and East Bay President Mohammad Qayoumi (see http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/mar09/EdPol.pdf). The presentation focused on how online learning could facilitate the CSU strategic plan, Access to Excellence. The work being done concerning online learning at several campuses -- Chico, Dominguez Hills, and East Bay was referenced. It also contained a section titled, "Design Principles for Accelerating Development and Delivery of Online Programs," that focused on "Pedagogy and Design, Access, Professional Development, and Management and Support."

Following up on this presentation, a Technology Steering Committee (TSC) handout concerning Online Education dated April 6, 2010 was prepared. The handout provided recommendations for online goals in the CSU that were developed by the Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC). These goals applied to online programs for master's and credential programs, undergraduate degree completion programs, undergraduate fully online programs that provide access to underserved populations in strategic disciplines, and online remediation programs.

In September 2010, Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim Smith and State University Dean of Extended Education Sheila Thomas made a presentation to the Board of Trustees titled "Opportunities to Expand the Role of Extended Education" (see http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/sep10/EdPol.pdf). While the presentation primarily focused on the role that Extended Education plays in the CSU, a section of the report presented was titled "What is our capacity in Extended Education for online programs?" It is also worth noting that Executive Order 811 (see http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-811.pdf) states "… extended education programs include all instructional programs designed and utilized to provide increased access to the educational resources of the system and to otherwise facilitate utilization of these resources. Extended education embraces all self-support and state-supported (i.e. General Fund) instructional programs that serve the purposes above. Examples include off-campus instruction, *distance education*, programs offered on irregular calendars or schedules…" (emphasis added).

On October 28, 2010 a Request For Proposals (RFP) titled, "Consulting Assistance for Online Learning Initiative" was released by the Chancellor's Office on behalf of the TSC. Following the review of firms that responded to the RFP, Richard N. Katz and Associates was selected to carry out this work. The Katz group developed four working papers on online learning. These are:

- Online Learning Today: The Players
- CSU at a Crossroads
- Trends in Online Learning
- Options for the CSU in the Online Higher Education Market

These documents can be found at: http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/documents.shtml. Following the work of the Katz group, the Technology Steering Committee developed a document titled, "TSC CSU Online/E-Learning Initiative Draft Implementation Plan." This can be found at the above website.

The Draft Implementation Plan authored by the TSC called for the development of a systemwide "CSU Online" effort. A description of the CSU Online program can be found at: http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/documents/Overview-CSUOnline.pdf. In November 2011 an Executive Director for CSU Online was selected and a Board of Directors established. Initial funding for this endeavor was to be approximately $1,000,000, with a goal of beginning operations in fall 2012.

In addition to the work that has taken place within the CSU, many other state and educational entities have been moving forward in the arena of online learning. One institution that has received attention over the past few years is Western Governors University (see http://www.wgu.edu/?&gclid=CIqs5dGx9qwCFWvptgod_Sr1Tg). For example, in February 2011, California Assembly member Brian Nestande introduced AB 851. This bill, which was not chaptered, would have, among other things, required "the Legislative Analyst's Office to convene a work group composed of the Legislative Analyst, specified staff of the Legislature, and the Department of Finance to evaluate whether it is necessary, or advisable, to establish the Western Governors University, California."

Given the growth of online programs in the CSU over the past 12 years and the intent to begin operations of the CSU Online Program in fall 2012, the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU was asked to develop this white paper dealing with issues related to online learning in the CSU. This paper is not intended to be a detailed examination of online learning in higher education as there has been much research and many studies in this area. Rather, the scope of this work involves looking at online education in the CSU and the specific issues that relate to the growth of this endeavor.

This paper is divided into six additional Sections, 2 - 7. Section 2 examines the 23 current CSU campus senate policies that relate to online learning. This is done in the belief that any increase in the number of online programs and classes will originate at the campus level and therefore current campus policies should be surveyed. All campuses should have policies that are as complete as possible. Based on the research done on current campus policies, Section 3 puts forward recommended policy topics that campuses should include when drafting or revising their policies on online learning.

In Section 4, issues related to online learning that may be specific to the CSU are addressed. In Section 5, a synopsis of the four papers written by Richard N. Katz and Associates is presented, while in Section 6 an overview of Western Governor's University is offered, as is an assessment of its appropriateness as a model for the CSU. Section 7 contains recommended next steps relative to policy issues on online learning.

Section Two: Review of Current Campus Policies on Online Learning

Introduction

The authors looked at the policies on online education on the 23 campuses of the CSU. The purpose of this work was not to be critical of any campus's policy, but rather to investigate what commonalities existed in policy documents and to highlight policy areas that campuses may wish to include when they revise or draft such a policy.

To undertake this work, a call went out from the ASCSU Office to local senate offices asking for links to their campus policies dealing with online education. In total, eight campuses responded. This was then followed up by an internet search of the local senate websites for the non-responding campuses and, in cases where there were difficulties ascertaining if policies existed, a call to the campus senate office was placed or an email to a statewide senator from that campus was sent. Finally, a call went out to the entire ASCSU asking if any of the campus policy documents had been missed.

Based on the responses received, it was noted that sixteen campuses either had approved policies or had proposed policies. A number of campuses that have policies also indicated that they were considering revising these policies.

The following is a listing of the names for the policy documents and year of latest revision (if known) for the documents found. These documents form the basis of the analysis contained in this section.

Campus	Name of Policy Document and Year of Latest Revision (if known)
Bakersfield	Distributed Learning Policy (proposed) 2011
Channel Islands	
Chico	
Dominguez Hills	Guidelines on Academic Technology and Distance Learning Classes (proposed) 2009
East Bay	Policy on Online Instruction 2009
Fresno	Interim Policies and Procedures on Technology-Mediated Courses and Programs 2004
Fullerton	Policy on Online Instruction 2006
Humboldt	General University Policy on Distance Learning 2005
Long Beach	
Los Angeles	Modes of Delivery (from the Faculty Handbook) 2007
Maritime Acad.	
Monterey Bay	
Northridge	Online and Hybrid Course Policy 2011
Pomona	Course Designation Standards 2010
Sacramento	e-Learning Policy 2010
San Bernardino	Distributed Learning Policy 2001
San Diego	Classes and Courses, Hybrid, and Distance Learning

San Francisco	*
San Jose	**Policy for Technology Mediated Instruction and Distance Learning 2001**
San Luis Obispo	**Distance Education Policy 2002**
San Marcos	**Online Instruction 2009**
Sonoma	
Stanislaus	**Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs 2011**

* San Francisco has a policy under consideration that we were not able to review as part of this work.

Appendix A contains links to the campus policies that were identified. For two of the campus policies, a link could not be identified, but the policy can be found by doing a key word search.

The following abbreviations are used when referring to campuses in this report:

Campus	Abbreviation Used	Campus	Abbreviation Used
Bakersfield	**BA**	**Northridge**	**NO**
Channel Islands	**CI**	**Pomona**	**PO**
Chico	**CH**	**Sacramento**	**SA**
Dominguez Hills	**DH**	**San Bernardino**	**SB**
East Bay	**EB**	**San Diego**	**SD**
Fresno	**FR**	**San Francisco**	**SF**
Fullerton	**FU**	**San Jose**	**SJ**
Humboldt	**HU**	**San Luis Obispo**	**SLO**
Long Beach	**LB**	**San Marcos**	**SM**
Los Angeles	**LA**	**Sonoma**	**SO**
Maritime Academy	**MA**	**Stanislaus**	**ST**
Monterey Bay	**MB**		

A review of existing policies found that they dealt with the following areas of concern:

- Definitions of online learning terminology
- Faculty issues: instructor training and support, intellectual property, faculty rights (including the right to teach the class), Retention/Tenure/Promotion (RTP), use of tenured and probationary faculty, office hours
- Student issues: notification in course schedule, syllabi requirements, student rights, student training in the use of online technology, library resources, advising, support services
- Approval of online classes and/or conversion of existing classes or programs to an online format: justification, grace period for conversion, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation issues, learning outcomes, quality issues
- Technical issues: support, protection of student identity, evaluation of technology by faculty and students, hosting of course materials
- Academic integrity
- Course rigor and coverage

- Accessibility
- Class size
- Use of contractors and third party vendors
- Assessment
- Miscellaneous issues: student interaction, student evaluations, department chair training, marketing, and policy review cycle and updating

In the following sections the information found in the campus policies is detailed and the campuses that reference the particular issue are cited. The purpose of this is to indicate how widespread the particular area of concern is and to present some suggested language a campus may wish to use. It is worth noting that while some of the campus policies on online education do not touch on specific topics delineated in the above list, these issues may be contained in other campus policy documents that were not reviewed by the authors.

Definitions of online learning terminology

In reviewing the campus policies it was discovered that the policies are referred to by several different names. It is worth noting that technology mediated courses and distributed learning are broader concepts than online learning. For example, technology mediated courses would include classes that are taught in a traditional format but utilize technologies such as a learning management system (LMS). Distance learning classes could include courses that are televised to a remote classroom. In this paper the focus is on courses that are being taught in an online format.

While online classes could be defined in many dimensions, the two most common ways to categorize such classes are a) the percentage of "seat time" that is replaced with online course work and b) whether the online work is conducted primarily in an asynchronous or synchronous modality.

In terms of the percentage of class work that is done online, campuses BA, SB and ST define a traditional class as one where no online technology is used. DH uses a similar definition, specifying that the course depends on face-to-face contact as the primary method of communication. NO defines such a course as one in which all or most of the class sessions take place on the CSUN campus. LA, PO and SLO define such a course as "face-to-face." A number of campuses (BA, SB, and SM) go into further detail, defining such a course as "web facilitated" if technology (e.g. a learning management system) is used to facilitate the course. ST calls such a course "technology-enhanced" and PO calls such a class "web-assisted."

A course where some, but not all, of the class meeting times are replaced by online learning is typically called a "hybrid" course (DH, EB, LA, NO, PO, SA, SD, SM, and ST). BA and SB refer to such a course as "blended," while FR refers to the class as "multi-mode." While there is relatively broad agreement as to what is a hybrid course, the specific definitions as to the time spent away from campus in a hybrid differ. The following table gives the amount of time spent away from campus in a hybrid course at various campuses.

Campus	Amount of Class Time Replaced by Online Learning
DH	1/3 to 2/3
LA	20% to less than 100%
NO	Approximately 50%
PO	25% to 75%
SA	20% to 67%
SD	20% to 50%
SM	Substantial proportion of time
ST	30% to 99%

BA, EB, FR, SB do not specify the amount of time a student spends away from class in a hybrid class. While the HU policy does not define a hybrid course, its policy only applies to courses "in which the majority of the course is to be delivered through distance learning."

An online class is one where most or all of the content is delivered in this format. BA, SB, and SM use this definition. DH, LA, and SD call such a class a distance education class. DH and LA indicate that sessions may require off site meetings and DH indicates that on site meetings may also be required. FR designates such a course as a web-based class and indicates that students may be required to come to campus for an in-class orientation and/or exams. PO denotes such a course as local online. NO makes a further distinction for online classes, denoting a class as a fully online class if all activities (including exams) are done online and campus online class if most of the course is done online, but allows for campus sessions for orientation and/or exams. SA defines an online course as one where more than 67% of the in-class instruction is replaced with online activities. ST defines an online course as one where 100% of activities take place online.

Four campus policies (PO, SD, SLO and ST) make reference to synchronous and asynchronous distance learning. PO defines online synchronous as an online course where some portions of the content will be accessed at specific predetermined times. Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required in such courses for orientation and student evaluation. SLO defines synchronous delivery mode as one where non face-to-face activities occur at regularly scheduled times. This could include televised broadcasts. Asynchronous delivery mode is one in which the student is self-paced in accessing instructional material. ST defines the synchronous delivery mode as one where course activities take place at a single scheduled time, while asynchronous delivery is such that activities take place within a scheduled time frame.

Faculty issues

The need for instructor training and support is referenced in nearly all of the policy documents. BA's document states "The university shall offer appropriate training and support services to faculty teaching distributed learning classes." Similar statements are made in policies from DH, EB, FR, FU, HU, SA, SB, SJ, SLO, SM, and ST. The BA policy further states that "All instructors desiring to teach courses through distributed learning will receive appropriate training or demonstrate proficiency in teaching and learning online." While we did not find any specific proficiency requirement for faculty who wish to teach an online course, SJ's policy does state "Departments shall insure that faculty assigned to teach DE Courses are appropriately qualified."

FU's policy states that the university shall "offer appropriate support, and training as required, for department chairs with respect to online courses, including ways and means of administering student evaluation of instruction forms for online students."

Ten campus policies (BA, EB, FU, HU, SA, SB, SD, SJ, SLO, and ST) reference intellectual property issues. Representative statements are contained in the policies of EB and SA. EB's policy states "Faculty shall have the same control and ownership of the substantive and intellectual content of their online instruction course-related materials that faculty have with respect to classes offered in classroom format, at the time of production, at any time during their use, and thereafter, in accordance with the provisions of the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement and CSU and CSUEB policies." SA's policy states "Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the University in accordance with the University's Copyright and Patent Policy and guidelines." HU's policy gives details as to how revenues will be allocated. It states "The University will not sell, rent, or otherwise knowingly permit another organization to use a distance learning class without a written agreement with the originator to that effect. In the case of an agreement to exploit the course through outside sales, the proceeds of a course created at HSU without extraordinary support will belong solely to the originator. For courses that received extraordinary support the net profits will be distributed as follows until such time as the institution is fully compensated for its investment. After that, the proceeds will be the property of the originator.

i. 50% to the originator of the course
ii. 25% to the originator's college, department, or University division
iii. 25% to the university."

Additional faculty rights are delineated in several policies. The DH policy states that each instructor is free to chose any approved mode of instruction for a course and "no institution or person shall sell, retransmit, modify, or otherwise reuse course related materials produced by a member of the faculty for any purpose without the written consent of the faculty member." The right to teach the class is spelled out in the HU policy, which states "The originator of the distance learning course material will have a 'right of first refusal' to teach the DL course provided that the instructor is still employed by the University in the department where the course was developed. If the instructor chooses not to teach the course, the department will be free to choose another instructor to teach the course. This condition exists as long as the course remains substantially the intellectual work of the originator as it is delivered."

Other faculty-related issues that are contained in the policies touch on RTP, the use of tenured and probationary faculty, and faculty office hours. SLO's policy makes specific reference to the impact on personnel decisions stating, "Faculty personnel decisions (hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) should value and reward course and curriculum development and professional development activities that result in improved instruction. However, no ranking of instructional methodologies or modes of delivery is to be used as a basis for personnel decisions. The role and value of DE should be made explicit in the personnel policies of departments and colleges."

SB and SJ have policies that specifically speak to the use of tenured and probationary faculty in offering online courses. SB's policy states, "Tenure-track faculty are essential to the academic integrity of any program including those offered via distributed learning," while SJ's policy states "The ratio of tenured and probationary faculty to temporary faculty teaching in a distance education program shall approximate that of the campus-based program. If there is no campus-based program, the ratio shall approximate that of other programs in the college."

The right of faculty to hold electronic office hours for online courses is discussed in SB's policy that states, "A faculty member may choose to offer office hours electronically after consultation with and approval of the department chair and dean."

Student Issues

All of the policies contain information on various student issues. BA's policy states that the University shall ensure that students have access to appropriate facilities and equipment, library resources, training to use the technology, and adequate technical support. It further goes on to state that students shall have access to program goals, requirements, academic calendar, and faculty, be provided with adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support the distributed learning courses offered by the University (including outreach and pre-admission advising, application for admissions, enrollment/registration, financial aid and payment arrangements, academic advising, tutoring, career counseling and placement, personal counseling, and disability services), be provided with adequate bookstore services for securing books, course-packs, course-related supplies and materials, be provided with an adequate means for resolving student complaints and grievances, and be provided with reasonable and cost-effective ways to participate in the institution's system of student authentication. Similar statements are made in the policies of DH, FR, HU, SA, SB, SLO, and ST.

A number of campus policies spell out that students need to be informed (normally in the class schedule) as to the mode of instruction for the course (BA, DH, EB, FU, LA, SB, SD, SJ, and ST). SD's policy specifies that the schedule also inform students of any software and hardware requirements necessary for participating in the class. LA's policy specifies that the class schedule include:

- The mode of delivery of each course offering that is distance education or hybrid;
- The need for specialized technical skills, computer hardware, and/or computer software for all modes of delivery, if applicable;
- Regularly scheduled on-line times for distance education classes, if applicable;
- The days, times, and locations of off-site meetings for distance education classes, if applicable.

Syllabi requirements are explicitly referred to in four policy documents (BA, DH, FR, and FU). BA's document also specifies that "students have unrestricted access to an online syllabus that is available 24/7." FR's policy specifies that if the syllabus is amended during the term, all versions must remain available to students so that they can track changes.

Items that are cited as required to be covered in the syllabi in the different policies include the

following:

- How will professors communicate with students and how will students communicate with each other?
- How is online participation assessed and graded?
- How will the instructor monitor the online activities of students?
- How will standards of appropriate online behavior be maintained?
- What level of technical competence is required of students?
- What are the minimum computer hardware and software requirements for the class, and what department, college, or University facilities are available to support these requirements for students who cannot afford to buy the technology?
- Who should be contacted in the event of technical problems?
- What are the alternative procedures for submitting work in the event of technical breakdowns?
- What are the on-campus meeting requirements, if any?
- How is academic honesty enforced?
- Weekly deadlines for posting and due dates.
- Whether the activities are synchronous or asynchronous.
- Office/contact hours.
- How quickly the instructor will respond to email?
- How often the instructor will be online?
- Safeguards as to how student work will be authenticated.

Other student-related issues include student rights relative to the course instruction mode, access to faculty, access to the library, access to advising, access to support services (e.g. career services textbook purchasing, and financial aid), and access to the grievance process (cited in the policy of DH, FR, HU, and ST). The FR document has a specific section that addresses the assignment of librarians to online classes based on student enrollments. The policy states, for example, "For sites with low enrollment (40 students), arrangements need to be made with the Madden Library of California State University, Fresno, to provide training in the use of the online system to librarians at the partner campus." and "For sites with 200 FTES, the university will need to fund a full-time equivalent librarian who will work in the library at the site."

Student training in the use of online technology is cited in the policies of BA, SB, and ST. For example, the SB policy states that there will be an instrument students can use to evaluate the technology while the ST policy specifically states that "the University will provide opportunities and resources for student orientation and training on the official campus LMS."

<u>Approval of Online Classes and/or Conversion of Existing Classes or Programs to an Online Format</u>

Nearly all campus policies have a section on or make reference to how online classes and/or programs are approved (BA, DH, EB, FR, FU, HU, LA, SA, SB, SJ, SLO, SM, and ST). Issues focused on in these decisions include justification, grace period for conversion, needed resources, course design strategies, faculty support and training, WASC approval, learning outcomes, educational effectiveness, assessment of student achievement, student retention, and

general quality issues. DH's policy allows a class to be offered for up to two semesters in an online format on an experimental basis with the approval of the department chair or department curriculum committee. Several of the campus policies (DH, EB) specifically cite additional review requirements for courses that are approved for General Education credit. The SB policy includes a "Distributed Learning Notification Form" which must be submitted to the University each time an online course is offered. The SJ policy states that "SJSU affirms the importance of face-to-face learning for the education of a well-rounded student. Any program that does not offer a substantial face-to-face component must justify the absence of such a component."

Technical Issues

The campus policies cite a number of technical issues. These include technical support for faculty and/or students (cited in the policies of BA, DH, EB, FR, FU, HU, SA, SB, SJ, SLO, SM, and ST), protection of student identity (cited in the policies of BA, SB), evaluation of technology by faculty and students, and non-university hosting of course materials (cited in the policies of BA, DH, SA, SB, SJ, SLO, and SM).

The EB policy states that "All online courses listed in the Class Schedule shall normally be hosted on California State University servers or other servers approved by the Dean and the Chief Information Officer." FU and SM have similar policies. The SB policy states, "Faculty choosing to use non-university-supported resources (e.g. third-party servers, non-university-supported software) must state in their syllabus that the university will not provide technical support for those resources and that the university does not endorse any products which may be advertised through those resources. These faculty are responsible for compliance with all principles of this policy, including, reasonable, technical support for students. Faculty who use university supported resources shall not be held responsible for technical support of these resources." The SJ policy states, "The University shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs without the prior approval of the relevant department or program." A similar statement is contained in the SLO policy.

Academic Integrity

Issues related to academic integrity are cited in policies from BA, DH, FU, HU, and SB. The BA policy indicates that "reasonable safeguards should be in place to prevent academic dishonesty" and states "The university will inform faculty involved in distributed learning about the variety of assessment tools, the relative level of security of these assessments and methods for limiting students' use of unauthorized resources." A similar statement is contained in the SB policy, but that policy goes on to indicate what procedures they will use for ensuring student identity. It also indicates that "reasonable safeguards shall be in place to ensure academic honesty." The DH policy states the following:

1. The academic integrity of a course is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty member. Reasonable safeguards shall be in place to ensure academic honesty regardless of the instructional mode.
2. The University shall maintain a variety of assessment tools designed to support faculty efforts to enforce academic integrity in hybrid and in distance education classes.

3. The University shall provide information for faculty involved in Academic Technology that describes the variety of assessment tools available for student work in non-traditional classes, the relative level of security of these assessment tools, and any existing methods for limiting cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty when using these tools.

Course Rigor and Coverage

That an online course should have course rigor and coverage equivalent to a course taught in a traditional format is cited in the policies of EB, FU, SD, SJ, SM, and ST. FU's policy states that "In courses where classes are offered online and in classroom settings, sections of online courses shall meet all course objectives normally covered in the classroom based course." SD's policy states, "Regardless of how they are offered, classes should be consistent in terms of purpose, scope, quality, assessment and expected learning outcomes with other classes bearing the same department code, number, and course title."

Accessibility

The policies of BA, DH, EB, SA, SB, SJ, SM, and ST make reference to the need for an online course to be accessible and the need for faculty support and training to accomplish this. BA's policy, for example, states, "The university shall provide appropriate information, support and training to faculty for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act." DH's policy states, "All online materials created for use in instruction at California State University, Dominguez Hills shall be accessible to all instructors, assistants, and students affiliated with the class regardless of ability or disability. Such materials must be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all California State University, Dominguez Hills policies on Internet Accessibility."

Class Size

The number of students who should be in an online class is touched upon in the policies of BA, DH, SB, SJ, SLO, and ST. BA's policy document states, "Class size and faculty workload will be determined following university standards after consultation with the faculty member and the department chair, and must take into account the level of interaction between faculty and students. All blended and online courses must provide for appropriate and personal interactions between faculty and students." The footnote for this section states, "The cap for the number of students in a class delivered through distributed learning should be the same as the corresponding traditional class except in cases where the traditional class is limited primarily by physical space."

The DH policy states, "To preserve academic quality, the class size must be appropriate for the student learning activities associated with the course. The presumption is that courses offered by hybrid, or distance education should have class size limits that do not exceed those of traditional sections of the same course. Exceptions to this principle may be approved on a case-by-case basis using the curriculum approval processes of the department and college." The SB policy states, "Class size and faculty workload will be determined by the college dean after consultation with the faculty member and the department chair, and must take into account the level of interaction between faculty and students. All blended and online courses must provide for

appropriate and personal interactions between faculty and students." SJ's policy states, "The number of students enrolled in a DE course shall not exceed the limits for the curricular classification of that course and shall be substantially the same as in comparable face-to-face courses."

SLO's policy states, "If DE results in increased class sizes or student-faculty ratios beyond traditional classroom and curricular standards, additional resources or workload adjustments necessary to maintain the quality of instruction must be provided in accordance with established collective bargaining agreements." ST's policy states, "Class size must take into account the level of expected interaction between faculty and students."

Use of Contractors and Third Party Vendors

The use of contractors and third party vendors is discussed in the policies of DH, FR, SA, SB, SJ, and SLO. DH's policy states in part, "Faculty choosing to use non-University-supported resources, such as third-party servers and non-University-supported software, shall state in their syllabi that the University will not provide technical support for those resources and that the University does not endorse any products which may be advertised through those resources."

FR's policy states, "The university shall not contract with any private or public entity to deliver credit-bearing courses or programs to off-campus entities or to California State University, Fresno students without prior approval." SA's policy states, "Prior approval by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs is required for any individual, department or program to contract with any private or public entity to design, transport, and/or produce content for e-Learning courses or programs on behalf of California State University, Sacramento." SB's policy states, "The university shall not contract with any private or public entity

- to deliver distributed learning courses or programs to that entity without the prior approval of the relevant department or program,
- for such entity to deliver distributed learning courses or programs to CSUSB without the prior approval of the relevant department or program, nor
- to deliver that entity's distributed learning courses or programs in place of or in addition to CSUSB courses without the prior approval of the relevant department or program.

SJ's policy states, "The University shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs without the prior approval of the relevant department or program." SLO's policy states "The University shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver or receive DE courses or programs for academic credit, or not for credit, without the prior approval of the relevant department and college. Ideally, the impetus for such a contract should originate with the Cal Poly faculty, who would decide whether there is an instructional need and how best to fill it."

Assessment

Assessment issues were discussed in the policies of BA, SJ, SB, SLO, and ST. The BA document has a section titled Evaluation and Assessment. In this section the following is stated regarding assessment:

"1. The Program Review process at CSUB shall be used to evaluate the educational effectiveness of distributed learning courses and programs. All academic program reviews will assess the achievement of student learning outcomes by mode of delivery.
2. The review and evaluation process will include assessment of student achievement, fulfillment of intended learning outcomes and student retention.
3. The review and evaluation process will compare the outcomes from distributed learning courses with those from similar campus-based courses.
4. The review and evaluation process will assure that the distributed learning courses at CSUB conform to prevailing quality standards in the field of distributed learning."

SJ's policy states, "Criteria for assessing technology mediated instruction shall be developed by appropriate committees of the Academic Senate and of the academic units from which the instruction originates. TMI courses and sections shall be held to the same standards as traditional classroom instruction when reviewed by department, college, and university curriculum committees." SB's policy states, "At the program level, periodic program reviews should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction of distributed learning courses. Care should be taken to abide by the standards established by the appropriate accrediting agencies."

SLO's policy states, "Criteria for assessing the quality of technology-mediated instruction shall be developed by the academic units from which the instruction originates. DE courses, sections, and programs shall be held to the same standards as traditional classroom instruction when reviewed by department, college, university curriculum, and program review committees." ST's policy states ,"OTM courses shall be considered in the department's academic program review and processes for assessing student learning."

Miscellaneous Issues

The policy documents had a number of other issues that were broached. These include student interaction, student evaluations, marketing, and policy review cycle and updating.
Interactions among students in online courses is cited in the policies of BA which states, "all distributed learning courses will facilitate meaningful interaction among the students," with a clarifying footnote that states, "For example, learning management systems have the appropriate functions to allow interaction between the instructor and students and among students. However, adequate interaction among students is normally not achieved in an email class." HU's policy requires course proposals for online classes to address student-to-student interaction.

Student evaluations are cited in the policies of EB, FU, HU, PO, SM, and ST. EB's policy specifies that there will be an online student evaluation for online classes using a Scantron evaluation tool. FU's policy specifies that "the department chair is responsible for ensuring that the student evaluation of instruction forms are administered." The policy then goes on to state, "Because of the online nature of the course, the procedures for evaluating the faculty may be different from those used by the institution for the evaluation of faculty teaching classroom-based courses, but the overall standards shall be equivalent." HU's policy states, "Course evaluation plans will have the option of using either an online evaluation process, or a traditional paper and pencil evaluation, at the discretion of the department and instructor." PO has a specific document titled, Student Evaluations of Teaching in Online Courses (April 19, 2006). SM's policy states ,"Faculty teaching a fully online course section will use the Student

Evaluation of Instruction Form for Online Courses," while ST's policy states, "The evaluation of OTM courses shall not vary from established University Policy."

Marketing guidelines were contained in the HU policy which states:

a. Advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials should clearly and accurately represent distance learning offerings, and be widely distributed via multiple methods of delivery, i.e. print media and online advertising that are easily accessible from HSU's main web page in order to increase the likelihood of success of these courses.

b. An online Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) page on costs, transferability, timing, and equipment, as well as information about online programs and how to contact an informed University representative who will answer any additional questions related to online and other distance learning offerings should be developed and maintained to improve the efficiency of DL offerings.

The policy review cycle and updating was cited by NO, SA, and ST. The NO policy states in relationship to terminology that "the Academic Technology Committee shall review these definitions at three-year intervals for as long as the Senate Executive Committee deems that such reviews are needed." The SA policy states, "Commencing with the approval of this policy, every three years the Curriculum Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate shall initiate a review process to ascertain the need for updates or modifications to the e-Learning policy. The committee conducting this review, the majority of whom will be faculty, will consist of representatives from Academic Technology and Creative Services (ATCS), the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the faculty who teach hybrid and online courses, the University Library and the Faculty Senate." ST's policy states, "The University Education Policies Committee and Administration shall jointly review the effectiveness of this policy periodically. At its own discretion the UEPC can delegate the review to the Technology and Learning Subcommittee." It was noted that while the SB policy does not specify a specific review cycle, an annual report on distance learning is mandated. The policy states, "The Distributed Learning Committee shall oversee the production of an annual distributed learning report. The Office of Distributed Learning shall produce the report. The report shall discuss the state of distributed learning at CSUSB, including campus trends for online courses. Specific topics and issues to be addressed are, among others, distributed learning growth trends, the nature of blended courses, department and program online activity summaries, faculty workload issues, student and faculty perceptions of quality, and future directions. "

Section Three: Recommended Campus Policy Components

Based on the policies reviewed in Section Two, in this section the important components of any campus policy on online learning are discussed. It should be noted that the ordering of inclusion of these components is up to the campus.

1.Clear Definition of Terminology Related to Course Delivery – The campus policy should contain a clear definition as to what online instruction is and the various forms it may take. While there is no universal agreement on all of the terminology used relative to online learning, examples of definitional terms are as follows:

A .Traditional Instruction
Courses offered in the traditional mode with an instructor holding scheduled class sessions where students are expected to be physically present. Traditional instruction is also synchronous, with both instructor and students engaging in activities simultaneously. Campuses may wish to specify a maximum percentage of such classes (e.g. 10%) that can be taught in an online fashion without the course becoming hybrid or fully online.

B. Synchronous Instruction
Instructional activities where both instructor and students are engaging in activities at the same time.

C. Asynchronous Instruction
Instructional activities where the instructor and/or some or all students engage in activities that are not necessarily occurring simultaneously.

D. Technology Mediated Instruction
A course that uses some form of technology in its delivery. This could be an online course (see below) or a traditional course that uses a learning management system.

E. Distance or Distributed Learning
Instruction delivered via televised lecture or in an online format using the internet.

F. Online Instruction
Instruction delivered via the internet.

G. Hybrid Instruction
Courses offered with a blend of traditional and electronically mediated instruction. Typically these courses are a mixture of online and physical class sessions. While the physical class sessions obviously are synchronous, some online sessions may be asynchronous in nature. The campus may wish to define the percentage of class time that is devoted to online learning in a hybrid class [typically the range between "traditional" and "fully online"]. These courses may be called "blended" or "multi-modal" on some campuses.

H. Fully Online Instruction
Courses in which nearly all student learning occurs in an online setting. Note that while such courses normally do not require students to be in a specific location, some fully online courses may require synchronous course sessions for an introductory lecture or for class examinations. Campus policies should be clear about the possibility of required introductory or exam sessions that require physical presence and, if so, the method(s) by which students will be made aware of this prior to registration.

2.Curricular Control - The policy should clearly spell out who controls the curriculum and how courses are approved. It should be noted that control of the curriculum rests with the faculty of the CSU campuses, whether courses are offered via state-supported venues or through self-support venues such as the Extended University.

Curricular control verbiage should also address the mode of instruction, using language that makes it clear faculty shall not be required to utilize a specific mode of instruction nor be prevented from utilizing the mode of instruction they deem appropriate for a specific topic or course.

It should also be noted that all courses, regardless of mode of instruction, are subject to the curricular approval and review process as established at the campus offering the course. The policy should make clear the process of shifting an extant course to a hybrid or fully online mode and should include details on the review by the appropriate campus curricular bodies. The policy should also clearly state any limit on the number of times an extant course may be offered in hybrid or fully online during any conversion process.

3.Class Size – The campus policy should address any class size limitations the university may have for online classes.

Clearly, the number of students in a class, traditional or online, strongly impacts the design and delivery of the course. Enrollment maximums for extant courses, as validated by curricular body approvals, should be respected when courses are modified for alternate modes of delivery. New courses proposed, regardless of delivery mode, should include enrollment caps commensurate with the delivery of quality education.

4.Cross-campus Acceptance of Courses & Programs – The campus policy should specify that hybrid and online courses are subject to the same policies as traditional mode courses with respect to the acceptance of those courses by campuses other than the campus offering the course.

5.Intellectual Property Rights – The campus policy should clearly specify the intellectual property rights of the faculty member(s) developing the course. It should be noted that instructional materials created by faculty without "extraordinary support" (e.g. financial or assigned time remuneration) are normally the intellectual property of the creator(s).

If campus or external support is provided for course development, there may be a requirement that a faculty member give up all or some of his/her intellectual property rights. The possibility

of such agreements should be spelled out in the policy. Examples of intellectual property agreements include the following:

"The University is granted an unconditional, non-exclusive right to make use of instructional materials created for online courses if and only if the University agrees that the creator of the materials is given "rights of first refusal" over online delivery of the course for a certain number of years pursuant to creation of the materials [if the creator is still an employee of the University]. If the creator is no longer an employee of the University property rights over the materials belong to the creator and usage rights must be negotiated."

"Instructional materials created for online delivery of a course are the intellectual property of the creator of those materials. Use of instructional materials created under this policy in courses other than those offered by the creator of the materials may be negotiated between the creator and the appropriate University department."

With respect to faculty rights, the California Faculty Association is the Collective Bargaining Agent for Unit 3 faculty, and agreements reached between faculty and university entities may not usurp its purview.

6.The Use of Outside Contractors to Provide Course Materials - Faculty control over and development of curriculum and instructional materials is the baseline of quality education. The policy should state that selection of course materials should be the purview of the faculty. It should also articulate any limitations or rules regarding using outside contractors to provide course materials.

7.Faculty Training & Instructional Design Support - Teaching online requires different and additional skill-sets than teaching a course in a traditional format. It is in the interest of both the University and faculty to ensure that faculty teaching online or significantly mediated courses have the appropriate skills. The policy should state that faculty should be provided with funded opportunities to develop the appropriate skills via internal or external workshops and/or programs of study [e.g., the C-Sloan Certification Program].

Campuses seeking to offer online courses should secure and provide assistance for faculty as they create instructional materials and experiences for online courses. It should be noted that provision of training and support should not constitute extraordinary support for purposes of determination of intellectual property ownership (see recommendation 5 above).

8.Student Training in the Use of Course Technology – The policy should recognize that students will need to acquire proficiency in the use of technologic tools [e.g., Learning Management Software, cloud-based applications, etc.,] before they can make successful use of technologic tools in the educational process. Campuses may wish to include policies concerning required training or demonstrated proficiency prior to enrollment in courses making use of those technological tools.

9.Recognition of Online Instructional Activities in Performance Evaluations - The policy should recognize that online instruction requires significant investment of time and energy on the

part of the instructor, and that such an investment should be valued and acknowledged in the performance evaluation process.

10.Tenure Track & Contingent Faculty – Tenure track faculty are the primary custodians of the curriculum and are essential to the academic integrity of programs, including those offered with hybrid or fully online modes of instruction. The policy should recognize that the ratio of tenure track to contingent faculty teaching hybrid or fully online courses shall be commensurate with that ratio for traditional mode courses.

11.Faculty Office Hours & Availability to Students - Access to instructors is an important part of any course offerings, whether they are taught in a traditional fashion or an online modality. The policy should spell out the method and frequency of office hours for online courses. It is not unrealistic to allow faculty teaching an online course to hold "virtual" office hours as a part of their instructional responsibilities. The mode of "virtuality" should be left to the discretion of the instructor.

The policy should also recognize the importance of timely information and it may wish to give guidelines as to the timeliness with which an instructor who teaches an online course will respond to student questions/requests. For example, the policy may suggest that an instructor will normally respond to student queries within 24 hours during the work week and by end of business on the following Monday for communications received over a weekend.

12.Informed Students – The policy should recognize that students have the right to accurate information about courses offered, including mode of instruction. Courses should be identified as "online", "hybrid", or "traditional" in the schedule of courses. Any requirements regarding the student attending class sessions on campus should also be noted in the course schedule. Technology requirements for participation in the course should also be included in the schedule.

13.Instructional Support – The policy should recognize that students enrolled in courses have the reasonable expectation of support for those courses. The University should commit to providing adequate levels of technology support for the platforms and software requisite to participation in hybrid and online courses.

14.Non-Instructional Support – Students have the right to access the panorama of student support services [financial aid, academic advising, technology support, tutoring, career and placement assistance, *inter alia*] whether they are physically present or attending virtually. The policy should indicate how the university will provide appropriate paths of access to those services.

15.Student Evaluations of Teaching - Student evaluations of teaching are important components of an assessment of educational effectiveness. Fully online courses should normally use online evaluation instruments. The policy should specify that evaluation instruments suitable for online use are comparable [in a technical sense] to extant evaluation instruments. The Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement should continue to be the canonical statement on evaluation of courses and faculty.

16.Assessment of Courses and Programs – The policy should provide for appropriate and adequate assessment of all courses and programs regardless of mode of instruction.

17.Course Rigor – Because there may be differences of perception concerning the rigor of hybrid or online courses in comparison with traditional modes of instruction, the campus should consider whether extant course approval and review policies are suitable to ensure academic rigor equivalent to traditional modes of instruction.

18.Academic Integrity – The campus policy should ensure that academic integrity issues arising from the non-physically present nature of hybrid and online courses are addressed.

19.Taking a Class in a Traditional Format – Not all students may be able to learn adequately in an online setting. The policy should consider whether a student who is not in an online program will be able to take a required class in a traditional format.

20.Hosting of Class Material - The campus policy should address if hosting of online instructional materials on a non-university site will be allowed and, if so, under what conditions.

21.Accessibility - Campus policies on accessibility of instructional materials should apply equally to hybrid and online courses. The policy should cite references to such policies.

22.Syllabi – The policy should delineate the necessary information contained in a course syllabus or link to a university policy that deals with this issue. Items that should probably be included are:

- Contact information for the instructor (e.g. office location, phone number, email address)
- How will professors communicate with students and how will students communicate with each other?
- How is online participation assessed and graded?
- How will the instructor monitor the online activities of students?
- How will standards of appropriate online behavior be maintained?
- What level of technical competence is required of students?
- What are the minimum computer hardware and software requirements for the class, and what department, college, or University facilities are available to support these requirements for students who cannot afford to buy the technology?
- Who should be contacted in the event of technical problems?
- What are the alternative procedures for submitting work in the event of technical breakdowns?
- What are the on-campus meeting requirements, if any?
- How is academic honesty enforced?
- Weekly deadlines for any posting and course work due dates.
- Whether the activities are synchronous or asynchronous.
- Office/contact hours.
- How quickly the instructor will respond to email?

- How often the instructor will be online?
- Safeguards as to how student work will be authenticated.

23.Deciding if an Online Program Should be Offered through State and/or Self Support – In general, there are no hard and fast rules that delineate if a program should be offered through state support or self support and this issue is currently in flux. Hence, while a campus may wish to include this in its policy, this document takes no position on the matter other than what is set forth in CSU policy documents such as Executive Order 1047 (see http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1047.pdf).

Section Four: Best Practices for Faculty Teaching Online

It seems appropriate that each campus should develop its own best practices for teaching online. Toward that end, the following are offered as guidelines drawn from a variety of sources. [1] Campuses should determine if their best practices are most effectively presented as guidelines, rubrics, tips, checklists, etc. Best practices begin with similar assumptions, including that

- Online courses are an effective means of providing accessible, high quality education to some students;
- Online courses replicate the equivalent traditional course in terms of student learning outcomes, course goals and objectives, and academic rigor (DoD S5.1; SO 16);
- Online instructors have the same academic credentials as classroom instructors;
- Effective online teaching requires additional, and different, skill-sets from those employed in the traditional classroom; thus faculty who choose to teach online should have formal training in online teaching practices and technology;
- Online course sizes correspond to traditional course size for the same or similar courses;
- Technical support and student services support are available to students in static or dynamic form 24/7/365;
- Online courses require that students be more self-directed and better time managers than do traditional courses; and
- Accessibility issues are appropriately addressed in all aspects of the course.

Best Practices for Faculty Teaching Online

1. Create a student-centered learning environment by providing essential information in static form.

Ensure that your course home page anticipates all the necessary information a student may require to be successful. Static information includes the detailed syllabus (including course policies, clear and precise assignments, due dates, etc.) but must be supplemented for online courses with information about (and/or links to) student support services, technical training and support, equipment needs, directions on use of the Learning Management System (LMS), how to turn in an assignment, etc. Boettcher also recommends that instructors share very clear expectations with students about communication strategies and the amount of time required for course work on a weekly basis. A list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) can also help

[1] Contributing sources include "Establishing Online Instructor Performance Best Practices and Expectations," by Lawrence C. Ragan, Ph.D.; "Designing for Learning: Ten Best Practices for Teaching Online: A Quick Guide for New Online Faculty," by J. V. Boettcher, Ph.D.; "Principles of Good Practice for Higher Education Institutions Providing Voluntary Distance Education Programs to Members of the U.S. Armed Forces and Their Families," Department of Defense (DoD); Chico State's "Rubric for Online Education" (CH); and Sonoma State's "Instructor's Manual: Teaching Online" (SO).

promote a student-centered learning experience by anticipating that some common questions inevitably arise.

2. Create an active and engaging learning environment with dynamic activities.

Sources agree that online course design and management should "encourage and facilitate" student to faculty, student to student, and student to content interaction" (DoD S6.1). Online instructors, in other words, want to develop "three types of presence: social presence, teaching presence, and cognitive/content presence" (Boettcher). Instructors should create "a supportive online course community" (Boettcher) through clearly stated course goals and expectations of student participation and preparation, as well as through assignments that promote interaction and learning. An effective online course is one in which students "are active learners in presenting, organizing, applying and constructing information, ideas and knowledge" Indeed, well designed courses "maximize the opportunities for regularized and ongoing interaction between student and teacher and among students" (SO 16).

3. Be an active presence in the course.

Frequent and effective faculty engagement in the life of the course is often number one on "Best Practices" lists. Authorities agree faculty need to interact with students often, both "mentoring and challenging" (Boettcher) student learners. "Ultimately, it is the role of the instructor to oversee the course from beginning to end. Not 'showing up for class' in the online environment leads to confused and frustrated learners" (Ragan 6). Online classes do not manage themselves; instructors "actively participate in all dimensions of the online classroom" (Ragan 7). Sonoma State requires that each "course provides [faculty] mediation strategies. Mediation as a means of intervention between the student and the subject matter, as a way to guide the learning process toward particular outcomes, and connect a body of knowledge with a student's cognitive framework" (Petrie qtd. in SO 16).

4. Respond promptly to student inquiries.

Timely response to student inquiries is an essential component of the online classroom. "Industry standards suggest a reasonable response timeframe of one business day (24 hours) during the week and 48 hours over a weekend" (Ragan 13). Many faculty "tell students that they can expect a response within 24 hours during the week. Often before a major test or assignment, faculty will agree to hold special office hours by computer, being available either by chat/live classroom or email, or phone" (Boettcher). Sonoma State requires that the "Instructor commits him/herself to a turn-around-time for normal student e-mail messages within 1-2 working days" (16). While this "habit of timely feedback" (DoD S7.5) requires much of the instructor, setting such parameters can serve to manage student expectations of near instantaneous responses from the instructor. Ragan also recommends that the instructor "Plan for the Unplanned" and anticipate an

emergency absence by providing an alternative contact when students cannot reach their instructor (11).

5. Promote student success through course organization and student feedback.

Courses are "well organized and easy to navigate" (CH 2). Student success is promoted when instructors "[e]stablish and maintain a predictable course pattern of course-related activities. This may include such activities as 'opening' new lessons, due dates and times for assignments, schedules for synchronous activities and self-assessment and online quizzes/exams" (Ragan10). Giving useful and timely feedback on assignments and tests also helps students move forward productively. Sonoma State urges that such feedback be "constructive and provided in a timely manner. Instructor commits him/herself to … communication of exam results within 7 working days unless students are informed otherwise" (16). Since many students enroll in online courses because their lives are busy and they need options that are both flexible and predictable, instructors should make minimal changes to the syllabus and only when accompanied by a clear explanation of the reasons for the alteration.

6. Use technology to enhance pedagogy.

Use the dynamic opportunities that technology provides, e.g., chat rooms, discussion sites, links, etc., to improve learning potential. "Focus on content resources and applications and links to current events and examples that are easily accessible from learner's computers" (Boettcher). Indeed, an exemplary course "offers a wide range of resources supporting course content and different learning abilities" and offers "a variety of multimedia elements" that optimize internet-based learning opportunities (CH 2, 6). Digital library access is a necessity (DoD 14.4).

7. Communicate clearly, politely, and widely.

Instructors should set an example of acceptable, i.e., polite, precise, and constructive communication ("Netiquette"). Ragan advocates that instructors respond with great care to student inquiries, realizing that no information but the words reach the student; where a classroom response may involve unspoken communication or be clarified by another question, the written response stands alone (15). Answering broadly applicable student questions by responding to all class members also promotes student success.

8. Know your technology.

Authorities agree that instructors should use a university-supported LMS, both for security and support reasons. Instructors should know and communicate (either on the course webpage itself or through a link to university specifications) the university's technology platform requirements for online students, e.g. high-speed bandwidth (Ragan 23). A useful exercise is for faculty to approach their course from a student-access mode (if available through the LMS) to see the course as students see it and be sure that all materials are easily accessible.

9. Ensure quality from the first day of class and beyond.

Prior to the first day of class, faculty should "test drive" their course site by asking an experienced colleague to visit it and/or by using the LMS's student access option to view the course from the student point of view and ensure that every aspect of the course is functioning. Offer students multiple opportunities to comment on both the course content and the "ease of online technology and accessibility of course" (Chico 7) and adjust the course appropriately if problems arise.

10. Include both synchronous and asynchronous activities.

The balance of such activities will depend on the audience of a particular course; distance learners, for example, need a greater asynchronous component than students local to the campus, but both groups can benefit from synchronous activities that create interactive opportunities.

Section Five: A Brief Review of the Katz Reports

As mentioned in the introduction, Richard N. Katz and Associates prepared four papers as part of its consulting activities for the California State University. In this section a brief review of these papers is offered. For the interested reader, one can find them online at: http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/documents.shtml. Two of them are labeled "draft" and two are labeled as "final draft," however we are unaware of any further work that is being done on these papers.

Online Learning Today: The Players

This seventeen page report, dated May 23, 2011, gives a brief overview of 106 companies/organizations engaged in online learning in some form or another. The listing is alphabetical and includes publishing companies, for profit and not for profit educational organizations, software companies, companies and organizations developing and/or hosting curricula, and organizations that supply assistance to the online learning community. Examples of organizations listed are Pearson, Wiley, Rosetta Stone, AIU Online, the Open University of the UK, MIT Open Courseware, Blackboard, Camtasia, MoodleRooms, Merlot, MindEdge, and the Open Courseware Consortium.

CSU at a Crossroads

This forty eight page report, dated May 30, 2011, gives an assessment of the current state of online learning in the CSU and ways in which the system can move forward in this endeavor. The paper states that CSU "confronts at least two long-term and interrelated challenges, both of which may reverberate for decades. These challenges revolve around access and funding." The paper points out that "universities are inherently innovative organizations that have demonstrated the capacity to continually change and adapt" and that while skepticism may exist regarding the benefits of online learning, this does not necessarily have to be a deterrent to the system's moving forward in this arena. The paper summarizes the questions framed by the TMC in laying out the initiative and describes the key issues that arose during meetings the consultants had with various interest groups across the system.

For faculty, these issues were characterized as being "advocates for students," "committed to educational quality," "anxiety and mistrust" on the part of some, "insularity and protectionism" on the part of others, and "qualified support" by most. Faculty expressed concerns about "workload, incentives, and accountability," "course design and delivery," in what academic fields degrees would be awarded, intellectual property, and with whom the university might be partnering.

The report presented the student perspective that touched on the issues of convenience, "technology as a way of life," "cultural issues," and the preference by many for the classroom experience. Other factors raised included the "course experience" and the registration process. The perspective of CSU leadership included "the need for online learning" and strategies for implementation.

Areas highlighted in the report where online learning might be particularly beneficial included "endangered and small enrollment programs," "degree completion," "high school bridge programs," "bottleneck courses," "professional programs," and the "U. S. Military."

The report called for CSU to take "bold action" built upon the legacy work done on the campuses. It noted that the system needed a clear and consistent definition as to what is online learning as its definition varied from campus to campus. The report also pointed out that "the infrastructure to support a distance learning 'value chain' of activities is, not surprisingly, uncoordinated and fragmented."

Areas which should be considered at the system-level include pedagogy, technology, administration/management, and the establishment of a central evaluation unit. The importance of transparency, as well as the support of faculty governance at both the campus and system level in making this project a success, were noted. Recognizing campus diversity and the need for administrative and financial structures to support online learning were also pointed out.

The report concludes with a discussion of readiness for such a project in terms of campus and system culture, finances, technologies (e.g. online platforms and tools, systems and networks, authentication, student support, mobility, and accessibility), academic readiness in terms of faculty (e.g. incentives, skills development, pedagogy, and support) and students (e.g. assessment and training) as well as the investments needed for course development. It also discusses business readiness in terms of administrative processes, support services, intellectual property issues, the program approval process, and the process for determining whether a program should be offered through self support or state support. Marketing readiness and leadership readiness are also touched upon.

The report notes that while there was general support across the system for an online learning initiative, such support was not blanket, but had conditions and constraints. These conclusions were drawn from the interviews of approximately 300 faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

Trends in Online Learning

This thirteen page report dated May 31, 2011 examines the future of education and the role that technology will play in this. It recognizes that students will be "empowered customers" who will have grown up using technology and be living in a connected world where computing is ubiquitous. Technology trends that will help define online learning are: constant connectivity, the advent of smart devices, cloud computing, virtualization, the growth of digital media, and improvements in media and display capabilities.

The paper states that online learning "demands technical and pedagogical skills that have not yet been incorporated into mainstream faculty training or practice, and that break with a tradition of learning to teach by observing masters at work." It points out that "for-profit universities have outperformed non-profits in online learning in large part because they have been agile enough to recognize unmet student needs, create programs to meet them, and commit unambiguously to online as a core mode of educational delivery." It is also notes that online programs can benefit from using outside vendors to provide services in which the institution may be lacking expertise

in areas such as student services and that the institution must "reshape faculty services and incentives" and "get better at assessment." The paper concludes with ten key points that the consultants feel are necessary for online learning to be a success in the CSU.

Options for the CSU in the Online Higher Education Market

This thirty page paper dated July 11, 2011 looks at twelve different strategic marketing options that the CSU can consider when moving forward in online learning. It maps these options to ten policy goals that were identified by the consultants from conversations with the TMC. The paper also details ten guiding principles that were identified by the TMC and eight different approaches for structure and governance. The report briefly touches on the issue of partnering in order to hasten progress in the development of a greater online presence and lists seven questions to ask before embarking on such partnerships. It includes details on the higher education online learning value chain.

The twelve marketing options listed in the report are:
CSU Online
CSU Online Masters
CSU Pacific Rim (or other)
CSU Quick Start
CSU Convenience U
CSU for Life (Life Enrichment & Professional Development)
CSU Accelerator
Fall Program for Freshmen
Developmental Ed I – Test, Assess, Place, Remediate
Developmental Ed II – CSU Foundations
CSU Academic Program Consolidator
CSU Back Office Incubator

In terms of these options, it should be recognized that they are not mutually exclusive and that some are subsets of others. For example, all but the last option listed can be thought of as special cases of the first option, CSU Online. However, each of the last eleven options has a special focus and direction upon which a marketing program can be built. Details of each of the twelve options are contained in the paper.

The report concludes with a brief discussion of program pricing and a summary of the research.

Section Six: Western Governors University (WGU)

Western Governor's University (WGU) is a private, non-profit institution which provides students with online opportunities to pursue various applied baccalaureate and master's degrees via what one might call "guided independent study". The institution describes itself as competency based," as opposed to one based on the completion of a series of courses or units, per se. It should be pointed out that WGU nonetheless also speaks of its "online courses". Hence, some evaluators and/or students could experience confusion when analyzing the institution.

Nineteen governors from the Western Governors Association founded WGU and aimed to incorporate extensive input from private industry in making WGU's programs and graduates workforce ready. It operates independently as a non-profit entity and not a public institution. Chartering occurred in 1996, and the first students enrolled in 1999. Fees/tuition cover certain costs but remain relatively low at around $3000 per 6-month term, but these charges do not connect specifically with the standard of "units" used to calculate tuition at traditional universities. WGU has its prime physical location in Salt Lake City, Utah, although the academic programs do not have a corresponding physical presence on any campuses.

California holds basic membership within WGU but has not fully developed policies and procedures to attain full membership. Significantly, students from California cannot receive State grants of financial aid to assist with WGU tuition. Current enrollment figures (2011) show about 2000 California citizens as enrolled in WGU programs out of around 25,000 nationwide. In 2010 WGU opened subsidiary units for the states of Indiana, Washington, and Texas.

Private enterprises involved in governance and monetary support for WGU include: AT&T, Dell Computer, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Google, Hewlett-Packard, Hospital Corporation of America, the Lumina Foundation, the J. Willard and Alice S. Marriott Foundation, Microsoft, Oracle, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Tenet Healthcare, and Zions Bank. Western Governors also receives grants from certain public agencies but claims to be self-sustaining via fees. Individuals within California have pointed to WGU as an online model possibly to emulate. Thus, it has received attention from the Legislature (AB 851: Nestande), the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO: "The Master Plan at 50…").

Online degrees from WGU include bachelor's and master's programs in Teacher Education, Business, Information Technology, and Health Professions (chiefly related to Nursing). WGU has received some national and regional accreditation, with the latter coming mainly from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

More specifically, the teaching "departments" grant degrees in such areas as: BA's with licensure in Early Childhood Education, a number of sciences (Mathematics, Chemistry, Biological Sciences, etc.), and Special Education. Post-baccalaureate licensure programs encompass Teacher Preparation for K-8, Math, Science, and Social Science. M.A. and M.S. Education programs include K-8, Science, Social Science, Special Education, ESL, Chemistry, Physics, Geosciences, Instructional Design, Educational Leadership, and more.

Business bachelor's programs include B.S. degrees in Management, Human Resources, Information Technology, Sales, Marketing, and Accounting. M.B.A.'s are available in I.T. Management and Healthcare Management. The Online College of Information Technology offers B.S. degrees in fields such as Networks Administration, Databases, Security, and Health Informatics. Students can pursue an M.S. in Information Security or an M.B.A. overlapping with that offered by the Business College.

In the area of Health Professions, one can study for a B.S. in Nursing (RN to BSN), Nursing (Pre-licensure), or Health Informatics. M.S. degrees include programs such as Nursing Education and Nursing Leadership and Management. The M.B.A in Healthcare Management overlaps with the one from Business.

Student applicants do not have to submit results of standardized tests such as the SAT or GRE. Instead, applicants take the WGU Collegiate Readiness Assessment test which aims to measure online-learning skills. Students may test out of some requirements through assessment examinations on pre-existing knowledge and/or skills.

Once enrolled, students consult with a Student Mentor who is typically a faculty member serving as a coach or advisor. This mentor creates a custom Personalized Degree Plan, and the mentor relationship is designed to continue throughout the student's WGU career, with contact scheduled generally on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. The degree plan might be considered a milestone map of sorts: it lays out descriptions of existing competencies, learning expectations for online courses, e- and print textbooks and other readings and resources, and various assignments and exams. Assessment success brings Competency Units (CU's), supposedly equating to one CU per one semester credit.

Within courses, students have the opportunity to engage with Course Mentors who have some level of subject expertise and provide more specified advice along with some tutoring and, to a variable degree, some "one-to-many … forums." Although a degree of student group interaction occurs at Western Governors via forms of virtual community, certain observers might more often think of WGU as an institution emphasizing "self-study to the test," in a frequently or significantly independent or isolated environment.

Construction of course competencies or assessment route maps with resource recommendations, on the other hand, lies within the "product management" group and comes from Program Faculty. These individuals work with so-called academic councils. Notably, Program Faculty do not teach. Thus, one might view this entire curricular area as more than somewhat hierarchical and perhaps more so than at many/most traditional institutions of higher education. More than 100 adjunct faculty work at WGU, with 75-95% of those at the mentor levels holding terminal degrees. Currently there is an excess of 700 FTE at WGU.

Section Seven: Conclusion and Recommendations

This white paper is designed to inform readers about the data that exists regarding online education in the CSU. Readers are encouraged to carefully review existing surveys and reports, and to use this paper as a starting point for discussion, debate, and future dialog regarding both current and future use of technology in the provision of online learning in the CSU. The white paper offers the following recommendations for future consideration:

1. Individual CSU campuses should be encouraged to develop (or revise as necessary) online education policies.

2. Recommended campus policy components should be integrated into individual CSU campus policies as appropriate.

3. Faculty engaged in the development or implementation of online courses should integrate best practices for faculty teaching such courses as appropriate.

4. Programs such as Western Governor's University should be critically examined for potential relevance to online education in the CSU.

Appendix A: URL Links to Campus Policy Documents

Campus	URL Links to Policy Document
Bakersfield	http://www.csub.edu/wasc/documents/EER/WASC%20IR%202011/Online.Distance%20Learning/Online%20Tast%20Force%20Report.2011.pdf
Dom. Hills	This is a Word Document which can be found by using a keyword search
East Bay	http://www20.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/files/documents/08-09/ Online-hybrid%20Instruction%20Policy.revised%2008-09.pdf
Fresno	http://www.csufresno.edu/aps/documents/apm/206.pdf
Fullerton	http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/documents/PDF/400/UPS411-104.pdf
Humboldt	This is a Word Document which can be found by using a keyword search
Los Angeles	http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/senate/handbook/
Northridge	http://www.csun.edu/senate/policies/onlinehybridcourses.pdf
Pomona	http://www.academic.csupomona.edu/senate/docs/aa004011ref.pdf
Sacramento	http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSD00010.htm
San Bernardino	http://senate.csusb.edu/docs/Policies/(FSD%2001-01.R2)%20DL%20Policy.pdf
San Diego	http://www.wascsenior.org/files/SDSU%20credit%20hour.pdf
San Jose	http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/s01-10.htm
San Luis Obispo	http://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate/files/Resolutions/2001-2002/AS-581-02-CC.pdf
San Marcos	http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/online_instruction.html
Stanislaus	http://www.csustan.edu/oit/LearningServices/docs/Policy%20for%20OTM%20Courses.pdf

Appendix B: Works Cited

Boettcher, J. V. "Designing for Learning: Ten Best Practices for Teaching Online: A Quick Guide for New Online Faculty." May, 2011. Web. October 24, 2011. http://www.designingforlearning.info/services/writing/ecoach/tenbest.html

California State University, Chico. "Rubric for Online Instruction." Spring 2003. Web. November 16, 2011. http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/roi/

California State University, Sonoma. School of Extended Education. "Instructor's Manual: Teaching Online. 2011-2012. Web. October 30, 2011. http://www.sonoma.edu/exed/flip-faculty-handbook/

Ragan, Lawrence C. "Establishing Online Instructor Performance Best Practices and Expectations." *Magna Publications.* n.d. Web. October 4, 2011. http://www.facultyfocus.com/free-reports/principles-of-effective-online-teaching-best-practices-in-distance-education/

United States Department of Defense. "Principles of Good Practice for Higher Education Institutions Providing Voluntary Distance Education Programs to Members of the U.S. Armed Forces and Their Families" (draft). n.d. Web. October 30, 2011.

http://www.immagic.com/eLibrary/ARCHIVES/GENERAL/US_DOD/D060810G.pdf