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Executive Summary

This report partially fulfills the Online Education Committee’s (OECs) role to “annually review and recommend compliance between current and proposed online education efforts and existing Online Education Policy (F12-264)”. Although there is a history of online learning at SF State, online education is a relatively new and growing phenomenon. Over two-thirds (68%) of the instructors responding to the OEC’s survey reported that they taught their first partially or fully online class within the last six years (since 2010). Moreover, students appear to desire additional online learning opportunities. Nearly two-thirds (59%) of respondents stated that they had received requests from students for more online classes.

Most of the students taking online classes are primarily undergraduates (98%) in classes with 100 or more students. This is despite the reality that over half of the SF State’s online classes in fall 2014 had fewer than 30 students.

The online educators that responded to the OEC’s survey communicated that course design (redesigning interaction <33%> and finding time to redesign <33%>) were the most difficult parts of adapting to teaching in an online environment. However, only 7% of respondents indicated their department provided release time or other support to facilitate the transition to online teaching.

Communication with students is a major part of SF State’s online education policy. The most frequent methods that instructors indicated they used to communicate with students were iLearn features and email. Two-thirds (65%) of instructors reported responding to student emails daily, while the other third were split between responding hourly or more frequently and a couple of times per week or less frequently. Classically, office hours have served an important role in instructor communication with students. A complementary practice to online classes is virtual office hours where students can access instructors remotely via video conferencing (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate) or other distance technologies. Although there may be administrative reasons for wanting faculty to physically be on-campus, 95% of respondents felt it was not appropriate to insist that fully online instructors be on campus for their virtual office hours. The most frequently mentioned methods of communicating class technology requirements are the syllabus and learning platform (e.g., iLearn). Faculty are preparing students to learn online primarily via a pre-semester email or links to online academic support services.

One area of concern in online learning is maintaining academic integrity in student assessments. Forum contributions, quizzes, and essays were the three most frequently reported methods of assessing students’ online learning. Almost all (98%) of instructors reported grading individual work; moreover, a strong majority (86%) also reported providing written comments. Open book exams (63%), low-stake assessments (53%), and turnitin.com (53%) were the methods used by the majority of respondents to maintain academic integrity.

Accessibility is a concern for students in all SF State classes and modes of communication (e.g., websites); however, the results of this survey indicate that nearly half (44%) of instructors reported that students have experienced challenges accessing their fully or partially online classes. This finding may be more of a matter of challenges with the technology rather than being a disability related issue.
Academic freedom and intellectual property rights are two faculty concerns covered by the online education policy. All or almost all faculty reported they had a choice over selection of course material (100%), the syllabus (100%), and structure of class (95%). A minority of respondents (31%) reported not having a choice for what technology was used in their partially or fully online courses. Instructors were split over whether they felt they have “full intellectual property rights” over their course.

The results of the survey have implications for the SF State online education policy. These implications are limited by the survey sample (n=43, 38% response rate). This is a survey of individuals that are teaching classes coded as online in Campus Solutions. Instructors teaching hybrid or hyflex classes that are assigned a classroom were not part of this sample. The responses of this group of early movers into online education may differ from faculty that have not (yet) chosen to teach online.

The Senate may consider clarifications about expectations and best practices around the method and frequency of communication between faculty and students in online classes. While students may desire rapid responses to their messages there are academic freedom and other concerns that should also be part of any policy development. Whether faculty should be required to physically be in their office for virtual office hours is superficially a question of communication between faculty and students, but is really about how departments will define expectations around faculty physical presence on campus. Therefore, the conversation should be about faculty presence and should not be distracted by the issue of virtual office hours.

Results from this survey also suggest possible future research and development activities for the OEC in AY2015-16. Faculty reported that it was not the technology, but developing and adapting curriculum that was the most difficult part of moving online. OEC in conjunction with Academic Affairs should consider ways to provide specific curriculum development support to faculty teaching online through investigations of faculty motivations for not teaching online, the needs of faculty adapting to teaching online, workload issues for current online educators, and the impact of online education in the RTP process.

The OEC in conjunction with Academic Affairs should also develop a CSU online education best practices manual. Beyond best online teaching practices, such an online manual could also educate faculty about important ways that online education is perceived as differing from in-person courses. For example, intellectual property concerns is a factor that may limit which faculty choose to start or continue teaching online. Almost half (44%) of the instructors in this sample did not feel they had full property rights over their online courses. Such an online manual could help clarify online educators’ intellectual property rights.

The OEC, similar to online education itself, is a new committee with a vast charge. The Committee hopes that this report establishes a baseline for understanding current SF State online faculty’s perspectives on online education. The Committee will continue to investigate online education at SF State and welcomes suggestions about what information would best continue supporting faculty excellence through shared governance.
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Introduction

Academic Senate Policy #F13-269 (Appendix B) formed the Online Education Committee to “annually review and recommend compliance between current and proposed online education efforts and existing Online Education Policy (F12-264).” This report communicates the results of a survey conducted by this committee to partially fulfill this responsibility. After a brief discussion of the methods, the report presents the results of a survey of online educators at SF State and then discusses the implications for online education policy.

Since this committee was newly formed in AY2014-15, this is the first such report from the Online Education Committee. The intention of this report is to inform the senate about the overall state of online education at SF State and to prompt further reflection about what information the Academic Senate needs to make policy decisions about online education at SF State.
Methods

Sample

The sample included 117 individuals that taught AY2014-15 classes listed as online classes in Campus Solutions. If classes were hybrid or hyflex and assigned to a room, then the instructors would not have been included in this sample (for that class). For example, although the Graduate School of Education currently has some classes that currently teach partially online classes, none of the courses are listed as online classes in Campus Solutions. This sampling frame issue will be resolved in the future when a mode of instruction code is added for every class starting Fall 2015.

Four of the 117 emails were no longer valid emails. Out of these 113 possible educators, 43 responded to the survey (38%).

Data Collection

The survey (Appendix C) was created by the Committee to collect information regarding Academic Senate Policy F12-264 (Appendix B). On Monday March 16, 2015 online educators were sent an email informing them about the survey (Appendix D). The next day, email invitations to respond to the survey were sent through Qualtrics (Appendix E). A reminder was sent on March 30, 2015. The survey was closed on April 1, 2015.

Data Analysis

MS Excel and Word were used to analyze the qualitative and quantitative data. The purpose of this mixed-method approach was to reveal faculty user preference and usage frequency and user behavior. Given the variation in qualitative responses, additional analysis on the dynamics and sources of this variation is possible.
Results

Online Classes at SF State

Before the presentation of the results of the survey, a few charts are presented about online classes and the students in those classes to give a context for the results of the survey. Fully and partially online classes are some of the largest classes at SF State; however, there are many smaller classes taught partially or fully online at SF State. During the Fall 2014 semester, over half of the classes that were indicated as online classes in CS had fewer than 30 students (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Number of Online Classes by Class Size, Fall 2014

However, over two-thirds of the students who took online classes were in classes that had at least 100 students (Figure 2).
It is also important to consider that almost all of these students are undergraduates (Figure 3).

**Online Education Experience of Respondents**

All of the respondents in this survey were currently teaching or indicated they had previously taught a fully or partially online class at SF State, some reporting teaching online as early as 2000. Two-thirds (68%) reported that they had started teaching online since 2010.

The survey asked respondents about the largest and smallest fully or partially online classes that they had previously taught. The results illustrate that the number of students in a
class varies between fully online, hybrid, or hyflex courses (Figure 4). Responses indicated that one-half to three-quarters of the smallest classes ever taught by the instructors were 1 to 24 students. In contrast, instructors communicated that one-fifth to one-third of the largest classes they ever taught online were 1 to 24 students. A comparison between the numbers in Figure 4 and the previous data from CS, show that the sample of instructors includes both the large number of instructors teaching classes with relatively few students and instructors from the few classes that teach large numbers of students.
Figure 4. Smallest and Largest Class Size by Modality

Half as many respondents (15 vs. 34) reported class sizes for hybrid classes compared to fully online courses. Many fewer (5) respondents indicated that they had taught a hyflex
course. The largest size taught for hybrid classes tended to be smaller than the largest class size taught for fully online or hyflex courses.

Most (81%) of the respondents indicated that there was a synchronous element to their class. What is less clear is the regularity of this synchronous class element. For example, the survey did not gather information about whether there is a single synchronous portion or if it is a weekly or bi-weekly part of class? Respondents to this survey indicated that they used web conferencing (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate) and iLearn for the synchronous parts of their online classes. Where a synchronous element was mentioned, student choice determined frequency.

There will be a new Campus Solutions code assigned to all classes for Fall 2015 that will give additional information about the different types of fully and partially online classes and enable further research into how online classes differ by the percentage of class that is online and the synchronicity of the online experience.

Teaching Online

What was the most difficult part of adapting to teaching in an online environment? The two most difficult parts reported for transitioning to online teaching were redesigning interaction (33%) and finding the time to redesign (33%) (Figure 5). In contrast, learning technology (2%), redesigning assessments (2%), and finding content (2%) were found to be difficult by very few respondents. It may be important to reiterate here that this is a survey of people currently teaching online. Therefore, it may be that people who are more comfortable with online learning technology have self-selected to be early movers onto teaching online and this question may have very different results if all faculty at SF State were teaching at least one online class.

Responses also indicated that it took more time than expected to transition to and assess online classes. Learning how to engage students and integrating non-digital research materials into the new format were reported as equally challenging and time consuming. Few reported that the transition to online teaching resulted in less time for teaching course content. Although this question required respondents to indicate the most difficult part of the transition, multiple individuals stated that all aspects of the transition had challenges.
Figure 5. Challenges of transitioning to teach online

Does your department provide incentives or compensation for teaching fully or partially online classes, such as release time or additional WTUs? A small number of respondents (3) shared that their department gave incentives or compensation for teaching online classes (Figure 6). Text responses indicated that there are some incentives for teaching large classes, but this was about class size rather than format. Multiple respondents indicated that they were lecturers and believed that they were not eligible for such benefits.

Figure 6. Incentives for Teaching Online

Communication & Preparation

Primary method used to communicate with students. Nearly half (47%) of respondents primarily used iLearn features to communicate with students (Figure 7). Slightly fewer (40%) of
the respondents indicated that they primarily used email to communicate with students. However, there may have been some confusion about how to respond to this survey item if the instructor used the email function within iLearn to communicate with students. Amongst the other options, the most common response was Blackboard Collaborate.

**Figure 7. Primary Method Used to Communicate with Students**

In general, how often do you respond to online students’ emails and other messages? Obviously this question has some degree of inherent social desirability. No respondents indicated that they respond “Not very often” to students’ messages (Figure 8). However, there is variability in the responses. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they respond “Daily” to student emails and other messages. Only twelve percent (5) of respondents indicated that they respond immediately or hourly to student messages. Other strategies for addressing student inquiries include using forums within iLearn for public Q&A sessions.
Should instructors that teach only fully online classes and hold virtual office hours be required to physically be in their campus office for office hours? Almost all (95%) of the respondents believed that instructors should not be required to be in their office for virtual office hours (Figure 9). Responses particularly noted that the source of this unpopularity is the lack of consistency between when respondents could schedule office hours and the times when students could or wanted to meet. There are many reasons why administration and departments may want faculty to be on campus; however, compelling online instructors to be on-campus for virtual office hours is clearly an unpopular requirement that may be difficult or impractical for some faculty.

Responses in the optional text box associated with this item highlighted a few issues. First, they indicate that it is not a uniform requirement for SF State faculty to be present in their
campus offices for virtual office hours. Moreover, some faculty question whether office hours are atavistic considering that most student communication that was formerly done in office hours now takes place via email or though other electronic media. Instructors indicated that using Blackboard Collaborate for office hours was more comfortable for some students than in-person meetings and provided similar functionalities to share documents or other materials.

Multiple comments highlighted that many, if not most, students that attend virtual office hours do so because they cannot get to campus. Therefore, if the point of virtual office hours is to provide students’ access to faculty, then a requirement to be on campus misses the point.

**How do you communicate the technology requirements of your class to students?**

Almost all (95%) instructors indicated that they use their syllabus to communicate technology requirements to students (Figure 10). iLearn (88%) and email (65%) were also popular methods. Other options that individuals chose were the in-person or web conferencing portions of class, videos, and office hours or individual appointments.

![Figure 10. Methods Used to Communicate Class Technology Requirements to Students](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLearn or other learning platform</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How do you prepare students to learn online?** Most instructors indicated that they send a pre-semester email (70%), provide links to online academic support services (67%), and/or created an introductory video (56%) (Figure 11). Less commonly, instructors provided a self-assessment readiness test (19%). Some additional methods that instructors used to prepare students for online learning included face-to-face or web conferencing lessons, forums, manuals, and peer-to-peer mentoring.
Assessment

How do you assess students' online learning? The most popular methods for assessing online students are through forums (81%), quizzes (81%), essays (77%), or exams (60%) (Figure 12). Relatively few instructors used videos (23%) or automated exercises (21%). Some of the other assessments that instructors indicated that they use included online presentations, video games, ePortfolios, peer reviews, discussions, and participation. Once the new codes get implemented in CS it will be interesting to see if assessment type differs by class size, the portion of the class that is online, and the degree of synchronicity.

Figure 11. Methods for Preparing Students to Learn Online

![Bar chart showing methods for preparing students to learn online]

- Send a pre-semester email
- Provide links to online academic support services
- Create an introductory video
- Provide a self-assessment readiness test
- Other

# of Respondents

Figure 12. Methods for Assessing Students' Online Learning

![Bar chart showing methods for assessing students' online learning]
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What kind of feedback do you provide to your fully or partially online students on their performance throughout the duration of a course? The most common methods of providing feedback to students about their performance are grades (98%) and written comments (86%) on individual assignments (Figure 13). Less popular ways of providing feedback include one-on-one (56%) or group or class consultations (37%). Some of the other methods of providing feedback include peer-to-peer and responses to forum posts.

**Figure 13. Performance Feedback Methods**

![Graph showing performance feedback methods with grades on individual assignments being the most common, followed by written comments on assignments, one-on-one consultations, group or class consultations, and other.](image)

What methods do you use to increase academic integrity in your fully or partially online classes? Open book exams (63%), low-stakes assessments (53%), turnitin.com (53%), and instructional design techniques such as ePortfolios and video assignments (40%) are all relatively popular methods used to intentionally or inadvertently increase academic integrity (Figure 14). In contrast, remote in-person (5%) and virtual proctoring (5%) is relatively rare. It may be that more instructors would use alternative proctoring techniques if this option was easier for faculty to access.

Respondents stated that quizzes are timed or the questions on each question are randomly drawn from a larger set of questions. They reported giving oral exams via web conferencing or providing credit for in-class participation. Instructors also expressed that they felt that their tailored, open-ended assignments would be difficult to plagiarize. Grammarly.com and Google were two other tools that instructors reported using to detect cheating.
Figure 14. Academic Integrity Methods

Have students reported any accessibility difficulties accessing or working on your fully or partially online course? Respondents were split on this question, but a significant portion (44%) said that there were accessibility issues (Figure 15). However, the text responses to this question suggest that respondents interpreted this question as referring primarily to all students rather than specifically to those with disabilities. Most of the text comments referred to technology issues with Blackboard Collaborate, iLearn, emails, and videos. There was one response that indicated that the pain associated with her or his disability was exacerbated by the technology requirements of the class. Another comment indicated that captioning was not always effective for a deaf student. These concerns suggest the need for an examination of whether or not the principles of universal design in learning might be better integrated into online teaching practices to ensure that technology continues to be improved for all students and faculty.
Figure 15. Any Access Issues Reported by Students?

Academic Freedom

For your fully or partially online courses did you make most of the decisions about the following? All of the respondents indicated that they made the choice about selection of course material and syllabus (Figure 16). There were two (5%) of the instructors that did not feel like they made most of the decision about the structure of the class. More troubling, was that a significant minority (31%) of the individuals reported that they had little choice about the course technology they were using.

Figure 16. Perceived Choice of Aspects of Class

Do you feel like you have full intellectual property rights over your fully or partially online courses? Almost half (45%) of respondents did not feel like they had full intellectual property rights over the content they created for their fully online, hybrid, or hyflex courses.
Respondents provided a number of explanations in the text box associated with this question. Multiple individuals felt that the course they create belongs to the university. Another respondent reported that multiple instructors share material; therefore, it is held in mutual ownership. Other responses indicated that in the modern era of technology it is nearly impossible for an intellectual to defend intellectual property rights.

**Figure 17. Perception of Intellectual Property Rights**

![Pie chart showing 55% Yes and 45% No]

**Desire for Online Learning**

*Have you received requests from students for more online or hybrid classes?* A slight majority (59%) of respondents reported that students had requested more fully or partially online classes (Figure 18). This is an indirect indication that students want the option of learning online.

**Figure 18. Requests for More Online Classes**

![Pie chart showing 59% Yes and 41% No]
Implications for San Francisco State University Online Education Policy #F12-264

General Assumptions

- **Desire for online learning**: The policy starts by stating, “The goal of online education is to expand educational opportunities for SF State students by offering courses with high quality and convenience and flexibility.” This study found that 59% of instructors received requests for additional partially or fully online classes. This is an indirect indication that online learning is an attractive option for SF State students and opportunity for interested faculty to enhance pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Definitions

- **Virtual office hours**: The policy states that for hybrid or hyflex classes “online technology... may be used to communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.” For fully online classes the policy states, “online technology is used to... communicate with the faculty member inside and outside of office hours.” There seems to be little disagreement whether instructors should make themselves available during office hours via electronic means (e.g., Blackboard Collaborate, email, phone, forum). However there is more disagreement about whether faculty should be required to be physically present in their office during virtual office hours. Nearly all (95%) of the respondents felt that it is inappropriate to require faculty to be in their office during virtual office hours.

Quality and Educational Effectiveness

- **Academic freedom**: The policy states that, “The selection of course material is the purview of the faculty member teaching the course.” This study found that 100% of respondents felt like they had a choice over the selection of course materials.

- **Professional support**: “Faculty are expected to seek the professional development and support necessary to ensure a successful educational experience for their students. Departments shall ensure that faculty assigned to teach online courses are appropriately prepared.” This sample of online educators stated that finding the time to redesign courses and actually redesigning interaction in an online environment were the most difficult parts of transition to teaching online. The SF State Senior Exit Survey issued by the Academic Institutional Research group found that the primary reason students were not satisfied with online courses in their major was due to too little interaction. Students want more interaction, but it takes time and skill for instructors to design this level of interaction. Considering that 93% of these instructors stated that there were no incentives to teach online, SF State may consider increasing support, including release time and targeted support from Academic Technology, to help instructors transition to teaching in an online environment.
Communicating 

*Primary method of communication:* About half (47%) of faculty reported that they primarily used iLearn features to communicate with students. This was followed by 40% of instructors that used email as the primary medium for communication. Although some instructors have suggested that we may want to focus more on the use of mobile technology to communicate with students (e.g., texting), any such moves should be based on the knowledge that most instructors are primarily relying on iLearn and email. We should continue to explore how we can further support these methods for communicating with students in fully or partially online classes.

*Reasonable response time:* The policy requires that “Faculty members shall define a reasonable response time with respect to answering student communications.” This study found that two-thirds (65%) of the respondents have decided that responding daily to student inquiries is the reasonable response time. The remaining respondents were split between responding hourly or more quickly and a couple of time per week or more slowly. There appears to currently be a disparate interpretation of what is a “Reasonable response time”.

*Communicating expectations:* “Faculty members shall make clear the standards of conduct that are expected in all class and university environments, such as classroom or Internet etiquette… participation in online class activities, access to specialized hardware, software, or virtual environments, or technical skills required to succeed… The course syllabus shall indicate the course's technological requirements and sources and contact information for technological support.” Almost all (95%) of the respondents stated that they communicated class technology requirements in their syllabus. Moreover a majority (88%) of instructors stated that they use iLearn or some other learning platform to communicate these expectations. Moreover, instructors prepared students to learn online using pre-semester emails (70%), links to online academic support services (67%), and/or introductory videos (56%). While the current survey gives information about how instructors communicate expectations, it does not provide information about the content of those expectations.

*Choice of course technology:* About two-thirds (69%) of respondents indicated that they made most of the decisions about course technology. The policy states that, “Opportunities should be provided for faculty to offer input on major changes in course technologies.” Out of the four aspects of the course that were part of this survey question (course materials, syllabus, structure, and course technology), this was the aspect that instructors reported that they had the least choice about.

Student Assessment

*Assessment strategies:* The policy requires that, “Assessment strategies will be consistent with course goals and objectives and clearly stated for students.” Currently, the most popular forms of assessment are forums (88%), quizzes (81%), essays (77%), and exams (60%). Almost all of instructors provide grades (98%) and/or written comments (86%) on assignments.
• **Academic integrity:** “Students are expected to follow the academic integrity policy that SF State has in place at the time the work is created. This is a rapidly changing field; the University and faculty shall work together to provide and implement tools and processes to ensure academic integrity.” Faculty use a mix of classic and technology-based methods to increase academic integrity. Classic methods include open book exams (63%), low-stakes assessments (53%) and ePortfolios and/or video assignments (40%). Other than turnitin.com (53%) other tools, such as remote in-person (5%) or virtual proctoring (5%), are not used very extensively.

**Course and Program Approval**

• **Offered in an online format:** “Departments, in consultation with college councils, are responsible for deciding which courses (or sections) as well as which degree or certificate programs will be offered in an online format.” It appears that faculty perceive they have a fair amount of autonomy about the technological aspects of their courses.

• **Intellectual property:** The respondents were split as to whether they had, “ownership of the substantive and intellectual content of their courses.” Only 55% perceived that they had ownership, with many expressing that they believed that the CSU owned their work. The Senate may consider strategies for educating faculty about who holds the property rights for courses designed by faculty.

**Recognition**

• **RTP:** Although some partially or fully online classes can be some of the largest classes in the university, this is not true for all online classes. Most (93%) of respondents report not receiving incentives for teaching online classes. A follow-up study is necessary to fully understand if departments are following the “same principles of peer review and student evaluation for purposes of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion processes” for partially or fully online courses as they do for other courses. There are some questions about what the role of QOLT should be and the validity of being evaluated by colleagues that have never previously taught online.

**Accessibility**

• **Electronic or disability?** Almost half (44%) of instructors reported that students had reported accessibility difficulties in their fully or partially online classes. However, the comments on this question were primarily focused on technology issues for students of all abilities rather than the online medium affecting students with disabilities. The only potential disability related issue was the limitations with captioning.

**Overall Policy Recommendations**

Although all of the results in this report have possible policy implications, multiple findings suggest that the Senate may consider evaluating policy addressing the communication
between faculty and students in online classes. For example, two-thirds (65%) of faculty reported responding to students’ messages daily. Is daily frequent enough in this current era of instant communication or are the 12% of faculty respondents that indicated they respond immediately or hourly to students’ emails and other messages following best practices? Is it acceptable that 14% of faculty report that they respond to student messages once or twice a week? While students may desire rapid responses to their messages, there are academic freedom and other concerns that should also be part of any policy debate.

Virtual office hours may at first appear to be a communication issue associated with online education, but is actually a more general question of faculty members’ on-campus presence. There appears to be little disagreement that virtual office hours are a positive thing. Anecdotally, most people agree that online students may be more likely to not be able to physically come to campus; therefore, allowing them to use electronic media to access faculty during office hours is a good thing. However, there is more debate about the need for faculty to be in their on-campus office during those office hours. In contrast to the expectations of some deans and department chairs, 95% of respondents felt that it was inappropriate to require faculty to be in their offices for virtual office hours. Given that this is an issue faculty presence rather than online education, it is outside the charge of the committee.
Online Education Committee 2015-2016 Recommendations

Results from this survey also suggest possible future activities for the OEC in AY2015-16. In contrast to some expectations, only 3% of faculty reported that learning the technology was the largest challenge in transitioning to teach online. In contrast, 66% reported that finding the time to redesign courses or redesigning interaction were the most difficult parts of adapting to teaching online. The OEC should work in conjunction with Academic Affairs to help gather information and develop resources to help faculty that choose to teach online. Studies could include:

• **Differences between types of partially and fully online classes**: Starting in the Fall 2015 semester, all classes will be assigned one of nine codes classifying the percentage of class that is online versus face-to-face and whether the online portion that is synchronous or asynchronous. This new Campus Solutions code will give us the information to further understand how online education varies across different types of partially or fully online classes.

• **Faculty not teaching online**: Conduct a mixed method (i.e., qualitative and quantitative) study identifying the reasons faculty are not teaching online. This can help identify what faculty motivations, constraints, and perceptions of when fully or partially online education is perceived to not be the best option. A comparison of those perspectives could be compared to the extant research literature and experiences and perspectives of faculty teaching fully or partially online classes.

• **Process of adapting to teaching online**: Conduct a needs assessment of beginner and advanced pedagogical tools that help faculty effectively adapt to teaching online.

• **Workload**: Examine the relationship between the workload of online educators and the support they receive.

• **Online education and RTP**: Examine how online curricula are assessed at SF State and how that and other aspects of online education impact individual faculty member’s RTP process.

The other potentially beneficial product the committee could work on with Academic Affairs would be a CSU online education best practices manual. This process could work with the current QOLT practices to understand how the committee can complement the good work Academic Affairs is doing to support faculty to deliver high quality online courses.

Beyond best online teaching practices, such an online manual could also educate faculty about important ways that online education is perceived as differing from in-person courses. For example, intellectual property concerns is a factor that may limit which faculty choose to start or continue teaching online. Almost half (44%) of the instructors in this sample did not feel they had full property rights over their online courses. Such an online manual could help clarify online educators’ intellectual property rights.
The OEC, similar to online education itself, is a new committee with a vast charge. The Committee hopes that this report establishes a baseline for understanding the experience and perspective of SF State faculty that are currently teaching online. The Committee will continue to investigate online education at SF State and welcomes suggestions about what information would best continue supporting faculty excellence through shared governance.
Appendix A. San Francisco State University Online Education Policy #F12-264

ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY
#F12-264
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.

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

- All online education programs and courses shall be consistent with the educational mission of the University.
- Tenured/tenure-track faculty are essential to the integrity of any academic program.
- Faculty members shall use teaching practices that are appropriate to the mode of instruction. The selection of course material is the purview of the faculty member teaching the course. Faculty are expected to seek the professional development and support necessary to ensure a successful educational experience for their students. Departments shall ensure that faculty assigned to teach online courses are appropriately prepared.
- Courses with the same course prefix, number and title shall adhere to the same learning outcomes.

Communication & Support

- Faculty members shall designate a primary method or methods of communication for use in each class.
- Faculty members shall define a reasonable response time with respect to answering student communications through the designated method and provide adequate and appropriate opportunities for timely interaction between the faculty member and students.
- Faculty members shall make clear the standards of conduct that are expected in all class and university environments, such as classroom or Internet etiquette. Students shall abide by the official Student Code of Conduct.
- Faculty members shall define student expectations including, but not limited to, participation in online class activities, access to specialized hardware, software, or virtual environments, or technical skills required to succeed.
- The course syllabus shall indicate the course’s technological requirements and sources and contact information for technological support.
- Support details and user expectations shall be defined by the responsible university administrative unit(s) in service level agreements or similar public documents.
- Opportunities should be provided for faculty to offer input on major changes in course technologies.
- Student Assessment
- Assessment strategies will be consistent with course goals and objectives and clearly stated for students.
- Students are expected to follow the academic integrity policy that SF State has in place at the time the work is created. This is a rapidly changing field; the University and faculty shall work together to provide and implement tools and processes to ensure academic integrity.

Course and Program Approval
• Departments, in consultation with college councils, are responsible for deciding which courses (or sections) as well as which degree or certificate programs will be offered in an online format.
• Faculty members teaching online courses have the same control and ownership of the substantive and intellectual content of their courses that faculty have with any other course.
• Colleges are responsible for communicating to Academic Affairs the degree to which their courses are online so that the course may be properly described in the Class Schedule.
• Any degree, certificate, or credential program, new or existing, in which 50% or more of the course delivery occurs through an online course format must consult with the Office of Academic Planning and Development (APD) to obtain WASC approval.
• No individual, program, or department shall agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver courses or programs on behalf of SF State without prior university approval.

Recognition

• 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.

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.

As is the case with face to face modality, 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.

***Approved by the Academic Senate at its Meeting on Tuesday, October 2, 2012***
Appendix B. San Francisco State University Online Education Policy #F13-269

ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY #F13-269
All-University Online Education Committee

Rationale

Our campus is developing online education efforts that make sense for our students and faculty, but in a climate profoundly influenced by system-wide and state-wide initiatives and policy directives. SFSU needs an online education committee which will closely monitor outside developments in online education (including CSU, CA government, and private industry efforts), disseminate these efforts to appropriate bodies on campus, help create appropriate policy responses, and proactively guide on-campus online education initiatives.

* * *

I. The all-University Online Education Committee is charged to:
   a. advise the Senate on current online education efforts and developments in online education emanating from outside SFSU (e.g. the intrasystem Online Concurrent Enrollment initiative implemented by the Chancellor’s Office and SB 520 currently being considered in Sacramento);
   b. evaluate and advise the Senate on the impact of CSU and legislative initiatives and mandates on SFSU curriculum;
   c. disseminate information to, and consult with, appropriate technology committees on campus;
   d. annually review and recommend compliance between current and proposed online education efforts and existing Online Education Policy (F12-264);
   e. biennially review the Online Education Policy (F12-264);
   f. review and advise the Senate regarding new or revised policies and faculty issues such as workload related to online education;
   g. gather annual reports from relevant on-campus technology committees and documents describing system or state-wide initiatives concerning online education to be put in a compendium with an executive overview written by the committee; and
   h. create, as appropriate, “best practice” guides for the campus.

II. The Online Education Committee shall consist of the following members:
   a. one faculty member elected from each of the University’s colleges;
   b. one faculty member elected from the University library;
   c. one CSU-wide Academic Senate member appointed by the Academic Senate;
   d. chair of the Educational Technology Advisory Committee (or designee);
   e. AVP for Academic Operations (or designee);
   f. AVP for Information Technology (or designee);
g. AVP/Dean of College of Extended Learning and International Affairs (or
designee);
h. Director of Undergraduate Advising (or designee);
i. one student designated by the Associated Students

III. Elected members of the committee will serve for two years and one-half years
beginning Spring 2014.

IV. The committee shall choose its chair from among its faculty members at its first meeting
of each academic year. The first meeting of each academic year shall be called by the
chair of the academic senate.

V. The committee will review its efforts in Spring 2016 and make recommendations to the
Senate regarding continuation of the Online Education Committee.
Appendix C. Spring 2015 Online Educator Survey

Default Question Block

${m://FirstName} you have been sent this survey because you taught a class in Academic Year 2014-2015 that was either partially or fully online. Your input is critical to help inform the SF State Academic Senate about online education at San Francisco State University.

Thank You,
Jackson Wilson, Online Education Committee Chair
Brian Beatty
Maggie Beers
Francisco Castillo
Rob Collins
Kirill Chernomaz
Don Danner
Pat Donohue
Jose Galvan
Mira Foster
Robert Moutlon

Have you previously or do you currently teach any fully or partially online classes at SF State?

- Yes
- No

How many of the following classes have you previously or currently teach at SF State in the different modalities (fall, winter, spring, and summer sessions)?

- Fully online
- Hybrid (Instructor defines when the students are face-to-face or online)
- Hyflex (Students choose when to attend face-to-face classes and when to attend online)
- Face-to-face

What year did you start teaching fully or partially online?

What are the smallest and largest classes that you teach in the different modalities?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Smallest</th>
<th>Largest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyflex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do the online portions of your classes include any synchronous elements?
- No, students can access and submit class elements at any time of day
- Yes, there are class meets using distance technology (e.g., BB Collaborate)

What is the primary method that you use to communicate with students in your partially or fully online classes?
- Email
- iLearn Features
- Video
- Other

In general, how often do you respond to online students’ emails and other messages?
- Immediately
- Hourly
- Daily
- A couple of times per week
- Weekly
- Not very often
- Other

Should instructors that teach only fully online classes and hold virtual office hours be required to physically be in their campus office for office hours?
- Yes
- No
How do you communicate the technology requirements of your class to students? (Choose all that apply)
- Syllabus
- Email
- iLearn (or other learning platform)
- Other

How do you prepare students to learn online? (Choose all that apply)
- Provide a self-assessment readiness test
- Send a pre-semester email
- Create an introductory video
- Provide links to online academic support services
- Other

How do you assess students' online learning? (Choose all that apply)
- Exams
- Quizzes
- Automated Exercises
- Essays
- Forum contributions
- Videos
- Other

What kind of feedback do you provide to your fully or partially online students on their performance throughout the duration of a course? (Choose all that apply)
- Grades on individual assignments
- Written comments on assignments
- One-on-one consultations (either in person or online)
- Group or class consultations (either in person or online)
- Other
What methods do you use to increase academic integrity in your fully or partially online classes? (Choose all that apply)
- turnitin.com
- Remote virtual proctoring (e.g., Respondus)
- Remote in-person proctoring (e.g., testing center)
- Low-stakes assessments to reduce the pressure to cheat
- Instructional design techniques, such as ePortfolios or video assignments
- Open book exams
- Other

Have students reported any accessibility difficulties accessing or working on your fully or partially online course?
- No
- Yes

Have you received requests from students for more online or hybrid classes?
- No
- Yes

Why did you start teaching online?

For your fully or partially online courses did you make most of the decisions about the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you feel like you have full intellectual property rights over your fully or partially online courses?
- Yes
- Maybe
- No

What was the most difficult part of adapting to teaching in an online environment?
- Learning the technology
- Finding content
- Redesigning interaction
- Redesigning assessment
- Finding the time to redesign
- Other

How did transitioning to an online format affect the educational quality of your course?

How is the quality of your online teaching assessed?

Does your department provide incentives or compensation for teaching fully or partially online classes, such as release time or additional WTUs?
- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like the Academic Senate to know about your online teaching experience?
Appendix D. First Email to SF State Online Educators

Good morning,
Tomorrow you will receive a link to a survey about online education at SF State. You are being given a chance to respond because records show you taught an online class at SF State this academic year. Your and other online educators’ anonymous experiences will be presented to the SF State Academic Senate as they consider changes to the current online education policy.

You will receive a link to the survey tomorrow. We appreciate your contribution to the future of online education at SF State.

Online Education Committee
Jackson Wilson, Chair
Brian Beatty
Maggie Beers
Francisco Castillo
Rob Collins
Kirill Chernomaz
Don Danner
Pat Donohue
Jose Galvan
Mira Foster
Robert Moulton
Appendix E. Second Email to SF State Online Educators

<Instructor Name> as mentioned in the email sent to you yesterday, you are being contacted because you taught an online class at SF State this academic year. The Academic Senate wants to know about your experience teaching online.

Your response to a survey about your experience will influence Online Education Policy at SF State.

Please click here to access the survey.

Thank you for contributing your perspective to faculty self-governance.

Online Education Committee
Jackson Wilson, Chair
Brian Beatty
Maggie Beers
Francisco Castillo
Rob Collins
Kirill Chernomaz
Don Danner
Pat Donohue
Jose Galvan
Mira Foster
Robert Moulton

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
Click here to unsubscribe