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23 May 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert A. Corrigan, President
San Francisco State University

From: Pamela Vaughn, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Online Education Policy, #512-264

The Academic Senate is in receipt of the above-named policy that was returned to us on May 21, 2012 with the following Presidential Action: *This recommendation includes provisions that appear to deal with issues that are subject to collective bargaining. As a result, I am obliged to return it to the Academic Senate.*

We are, of course, very disappointed in this decision, especially as it comes after several years of open discussion on various iterations of a policy governing online education and after passage of the above policy without dissent. Numerous approved policies deal as a matter of course with issues that are also subject to collective bargaining: the approved Chairs Selection and Review Policy being the most recent example. Indeed, as you know, one of the purposes of developing campus policy is to provide substance and process to issues - such as retention, tenure and promotion - that are dealt with only in the most general terms in the collective bargaining agreement. The Academic Senate is aware, of course, that it must not recommend policy that contradicts the CBA, but we do not believe that this policy does so.

I would also refer you to the January 2012 Online Education White Paper, issued by the Academic Senate CSU (copy attached), and in particular pages 22-27: *Recommended Campus Policy Components.* As discussed on the floor of the Senate here at SF State during the debate on the above-referenced policy, each campus in the CSU is expected to formulate its own policy governing online education; many other campuses have already done so. However, because of the expertise upon which we can draw on our campus - from Maggie Beers to Barry Rothman to Genie Stowers - we have been able to craft a policy that is even now being used as a model by other campuses.
Memorandum to Robert A. Corrigan
23 May 2012
Page Two

I will be advising the summer senate, under the leadership of Chair-Elect Larry Hanley, to schedule a meeting as soon as possible to review this policy with University Counsel Patricia Bartscher, so that she can elucidate for us the specific points where our policy conflicts with the CBA. We would, of course, welcome your participation in that meeting as well. Thank you.

cc: Lawrence F. Hanley, Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Robert Collins, Vice Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    David Rourke, Secretary-Elect, Academic Senate
    Patricia Bartscher, University Counsel
    Sue V. Rosser, University Provost
    Genie Stowers, Chair, Curriculum Review and Approval Committee
    Maggie Beers, Director, Academic Technology
    Wei Ming Dariotis, CFA Chapter President
ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

#S12-264

ONLINE EDUCATION POLICY

Rationale

SF State recognizes that most university classes use the Internet to some degree and some university courses (or classes) are conducted entirely online. This policy has been created to promote the continuation of a high quality educational experience for students, faculty members, and the SF State community through the use of online resources.

Policy

General Assumptions

• The goal of online education is to expand educational opportunities for SF State students by offering courses with high quality and convenience and flexibility. SF State is dedicated to providing all students with an accessible education.
• The addition of online classes, content, and activities to SF State’s curriculum has been a positive contribution to SF State’s academic environment and is consistent with its present mission and role as a public educational institution.
• Regardless of mode of instruction, all courses shall abide by the same academic policies and laws.

Definitions

• In a Traditional Class, students attend all class sessions and faculty member office hours in an assigned face-to-face environment.
• In a Technology Enhanced Class, students attend all class sessions in an assigned face-to-face environment. Online technology is primarily used to engage the students with the curriculum and learning process.
• In a Hybrid Class, students attend some of the class sessions in an assigned face-to-face environment, and some of the class sessions in an online environment, as determined by the faculty member. Online technology is primarily used to create a substitute for some classroom experiences, and may be used to communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.
• In a Hybrid Flexible (HyFlex) Class, students can choose to attend class either in an assigned face-to-face environment or in an online environment, synchronously or asynchronously. Online technology is primarily used to provide students with flexibility in their choice of educational experience, and to communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.
• In an Online Class, students attend all class sessions in an online environment. Online technology is used to create the entire course experience and to communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.

Quality and Educational Effectiveness

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus
Recognition and Compensation

- All classes are subject to the same principles of peer review and student evaluation for purposes of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion processes. All courses shall be equally recognized and rewarded when considering curriculum and professional development.
- Faculty members who create and/or facilitate Hybrid, HyFlex, or Online Classes shall be compensated properly for their investment of effort, as determined by their department and/or college. Online course material may require a greater amount of development time compared to that of traditional course material, especially in the early stages of course development.

Scheduling

- A degree, certificate, or credential program with online courses must indicate the technological requirements in the SF State Bulletin.
- The official Class Schedule shall clearly indicate the mode of instruction, technological requirements and schedule for each class offered by SF State. Departments are responsible for reporting this information to Academic Resources in a timely fashion.
- The SF State Bulletin and official Class Schedule shall provide guidelines for students considering taking online courses.
- It is the responsibility of the student to take into account the instructional mode, to review the guidelines on online courses, and to have access to required technological resources.

Workload

Refer to the CSU policy on credit units (Coded Memorandum AA-2011-14 CSU Definition of Credit Hour) for guidance on student workload.

Class size and corresponding faculty workload will be determined by the department chair and faculty member, taking into account the level of interaction between faculty and students in the course environment, as well as the physical class sizes common on the campus.

Accessibility

- All classes shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, and with California Government Code 11135.
- All students shall have access to the course evaluation process.

Intellectual Property and Copyright

- Intellectual property created during the development of online courses shall follow the Intellectual Property Policy that SF State has in place at the time the materials are created.
- In the event that a faculty member is not able to complete a course due to unforeseen causes, such as sickness or relocation, the university administration may grant another faculty member access to the class roster, class syllabus, and points or grades earned by students up to the time the original faculty member stopped teaching, and any other class materials available to the administration. While the new instructor may use this material to complete the class for that semester, the new instructor must honor the intellectual property rights of the original instructor.

This policy should be reviewed every five years.

***Approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting on March 13, 2012***
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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
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:
campus educational systems and other issues related to online 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:
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.
San Francisco
San Jose
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

* Policy for Technology Mediated Instruction and Distance Learning 2001
Distance Education Policy 2002
Online Instruction 2009
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:

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

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

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.”
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
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.
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:
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.”
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
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.
• 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).
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
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.
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.
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.
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.
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