

To: Faculty Senate

From: Laura McGrath, DLAC Chair

Date: April 13, 2015

Subject: DLAC Annual Report, AY 2014-2015

SUMMARY

The Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. This document is being submitted alongside the required Standing Committee Annual Report Form to provide additional information about DLAC to the new Faculty Senate and to the new DLAC members whose terms will begin August 2015. It describes the work completed by DLAC during AY 2014-2015 and lists issues that require Senate action.

DLAC WORK COMPLETED

- \$50 per student incentive for online teaching:
 - During fall semester 2014, DLAC members reviewed scholarly literature on incentivizing online teaching and gathered input from their constituents about the \$50 per student incentive that KSU faculty currently receive for teaching online. The Committee produced a recommendation with supporting materials. On December 8, 2014, the recommendation was presented to Faculty Senate. At the January 12, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate approved a resolution to support DLAC's recommendation to continue the incentive.
- Additional online teaching incentive options:
 - At a February 24, 2015 meeting, the Committee discussed a proposal written by Dr. Elke Leeds that had previously been shared with FSEC. Following the meeting, DLAC members solicited feedback from their constituents.
- Testing Center:
 - On January 20 and 21, 2015, DLAC members toured KSU's new Testing Center.
 - DLAC members discussed and solicited feedback from their constituents regarding models for scheduling online course final exams in the Testing Center.

FACULTY SENATE ACTION ITEMS

The following items require Senate action or consideration:

- **Facilitate DLAC Elections** – According to the Procedures information in the committee description, “Until consolidation, the elected members of the existing Distance Education Task Force will serve as members, with next elections for 2015/16 and 2015/17 members to be held in Spring 2015.”
- **Respond to the Incentive Options Proposal** – DLAC solicited feedback about Dr. Leeds’s proposal (see Appendix A). This feedback can be found in Appendix B. DLAC encourages the Faculty Senate to consider this feedback and provide Dr. Leeds and Dr. Jim Cope with the Faculty Senate’s official position on the Incentive Options Proposal.
- **Consider Testing Center Online Course Exam Scheduling Model** – Appendix C describes the proposed approach for Summer 2015 to scheduling final exams for online courses in the KSU Testing Center. DLAC advises Faculty Senate to review the document and send any feedback to Mr. Darrin Theriault, Director of Academic Testing. Note that “If this model works, [the Testing Center] will gather faculty and student feedback and refine [their] methodology for the Fall and subsequent semesters.”

DLAC members reviewed the document, discussed exam scheduling prioritization, and solicited feedback from constituents. Only one concern has been voiced at this time, and it was in response to this language: “With an average exam time of 1.5 hours, and limiting capacity to 75%, we can test approximately 4,000 students.” A faculty member explained, “My only concern is that exams are 2 hours, not 1.5 hours and that should be considered.”

- **Discuss Online Course Enrollment Caps** – It has become apparent that policies are needed regarding enrollment caps for online courses. DLAC’s perspective is that departments should establish their own policies on course enrollment caps for their online courses. DLAC urges the Senate to take up this issue.
- **Add DLAC to *University Handbook* and Faculty Senate Website--** DLAC needs to be added to the list of standing committees in the *University Handbook* and to the Faculty Senate website. If Senator White’s “Distance Learning Advisory Committee Clarifications” document (see Appendix D) has been fully approved, it should replace the earlier committee description and should appear in the *University Handbook* in the future.

APPENDIX A: Dr. Leeds's *Online Teaching Faculty Incentive Program Proposal*

Dr. Elke Leeds presented the following proposal to FSEC at their March 2015 meeting. On February 4, 2015, Dr. Leeds sent the proposal to DLAC for review. See highlighted items:

Background

In July of 2007, an Implementation Plan for Online Course Quality Review was submitted and subsequently approved at Kennesaw State University. It provided:

Goal 1 of the 2007-2012 Kennesaw State University Strategic Plan is "To enhance and expand academic programs and delivery." Further, Action Step 10 calls for an increase in "the proportion of courses and programs that are offered off-site and on-line," with Action Step 11 indicating that KSU's strategic marketing should "emphasize academic quality, faculty and student success, and University strengths."

Dr. Papp has indicated a close connection between Action Steps 10 and II. That is, as we increase the proportion of online courses and programs, we must also have a concomitant expectation of high quality because our online courses provide a strong public face (regionally, nationally, and internationally) that goes beyond that of our on-ground courses. In recognition of the stronger external public face of online courses, Dr. Papp has recently approved a special tuition rate of \$50 per credit hour for all totally on line undergraduate courses. That is, the course must meet 95% of its total instructional time on line, which excludes hybrid courses. This increased fee is available for "stand-alone" online courses as well as courses offered as part of a total online degree program. Assuming a 3-hour course, faculty who teach the course receive \$50 per student, with the remainder (\$100 per student) distributed to the college and IT for increased technology resources to support on line course development and delivery.

In order to qualify for the special tuition rate, Dr. Papp has set two prerequisites. First, the proposed on line course must pass a quality review process that addresses quality standards for online course organization and structure. Second, faculty teaching the courses with the special tuition rate must complete a faculty development course that provides specialized training for online course development, delivery, and teaching in the

online course environment. Department Chairs will continue to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of individual faculty through end of course evaluations.

The Quality Matters™ rubric for assessing quality online courses was defined as the course quality design standard.

In 2009, the Online Course Quality Review Program was revised to specify:

Faculty who have completed CETL-sponsored or approved training for teaching online courses will be paid \$50 for each student who is registered in their course after eligibility for pro-rata refunds upon dropping a course has passed. Additionally, any course that has not been submitted for the CETL Course Approval Process by the published deadline for a particular semester must not be open to enrollment during preregistration. If a course is submitted late and is unable to be approved by one week before the start of “final registration” for a semester, it will be deleted from the schedule of courses. Faculty who are teaching a CETL-approved course but who have not completed CETL-sponsored training in online teaching by the end of the second week of the semester will not receive the \$50 per student stipend.

In fall of 2010, the Distance Learning Center was established to support and oversee the Online Course Quality Review Program and faculty support for the design and delivery of online courses and programs.

Context

The Online Course Quality Review program has been an exemplar incentive program that has contributed to Kennesaw State University’s growth in online course and program offerings. Notably, Kennesaw State has increased the number of fully online degree programs from three to more than 40 fully online degree and certificate programs. Online courses enroll more than 10,000 students each semester accounting for an overall enrollment impact of 36,000 credit hours generated (spring 2015).

The program has remained largely unchanged though faculty and advisory committee input has fostered the expansion of the definition of “peer” in the peer-review process and encouraged innovation and excellence within the colleges through customized faculty development programs that embed the required university’s components. Additionally, through activities related to consolidation, OWG-24 on Technology Enhanced Learning

has re-affirmed the Online Course Quality Review and Incentive Program, subsequently approved by the CIC. Please see OWG-24 CIC Approved Recommendations for a full listing: <http://www.ksuspsuconsolidation.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/OWG-24-Approved-Recommendations3.pdf>

As implementation of the program begins at the newly consolidated university, opportunity exists to further improve the program through offering faculty additional options. A question was raised in the December Faculty Senate Meeting, in response the FSDLAC's recommendation to maintain the current \$50 per student monetary compensation program, inquiring about the option of extending the program to include travel and professional development. A further question was raised about the impact of the \$50 model for courses that were more than or less than the standard 3 credit hour course. As such, a request is offered for review on potential program modifications prior to the functional consolidation of the university effective fall 2015.

Proposed for Review by the Faculty Senate Distance Learning Advisory Committee

1. Delineation of the Online Teaching Faculty Incentive Program to specify the incentive is applicable to both graduate and undergraduate courses*
2. Address the language that "assuming a 3-hour course" applies proportionally to courses of between 1-5 credit hours using the following: 1-2 credit hours courses (\$25), 3 credit hour courses (\$50) and 4-5 credit hour courses (\$75)
3. Add a travel/professional development option for faculty based on the calculated amounts above**
4. Consider a release time option for faculty based on the calculated amounts above***

*This practice has been in effect but not captured as inclusive to the program

**This has been made available on an ad hoc or by request basis. It has not been formalized

***Release time will require additional input from Faculty Affairs and the Chairs and Director's Assembly to operationalize a model based on varying faculty salary and replacement costs as well as available part-time faculty and workload issues. This may not be feasible prior to functional consolidation by may offer a valuable alternative in subsequent semesters.

**APPENDIX B: Summary of DLAC & Faculty Feedback on Items in Dr. Leeds's
*Online Teaching Faculty Incentive Program Proposal***

1. *Delineation of the Online Teaching Faculty Incentive Program to specify the incentive is applicable to both graduate and undergraduate courses*

Feedback: No concerns were expressed by DLAC members or their constituents about this item.

2. *Address the language that "assuming a 3-hour course" applies proportionally to courses of between 1-5 credit hours using the following: 1-2 credit hour courses (\$25), 3 credit hour courses (\$50) and 4-5 credit hour courses (\$75)*

Feedback: A faculty member asked for the following clarification. In the faculty member's department, a Master's program includes a 6-hour capstone course, and this individual wanted to know whether, if added to the list in item 2, it would be "6 credit hour courses (\$100)." In a March 19 e-mail, Dr. Leeds stated, "A six credit hour course is in essence two 3-cr. hour courses. I think extending the model to repeat so that a 6 credit hour course is compensated at (\$100) makes absolute sense."

Some feedback suggests that "the proportional dollar amounts appear to be reasonable," but a few DLAC members as well as faculty in at least two colleges expressed concerns about 1-2 credit hour courses. Specifically, a faculty member stated, "Lab courses which are now online may only be 1 credit for the student but represents 3 hours for the faculty. I would rather see the compensation based on the contact hours assigned rather than the credit hours assigned since it is the instructor doing the work, not the student. Let's reflect on the 3 hours of contact time rather than the 1 credit to the student." Another faculty member wrote, "this is disconcerting because, as I have encountered, a 1-credit course . . . took as long for me to create as other 3-credit courses -- and this is only the syllabus! Converting this to an online course will take every bit as long as my 3-credit courses, if not longer."

3. *Add a travel/professional development option for faculty based on the calculated amounts above*

Feedback: Some saw this as an attractive option, though not as attractive as the \$50 incentive. Also, this may not be a viable option for part-time faculty.

4. *Consider a release time option for faculty based on the calculated amounts above*

Feedback: Some DLAC members and faculty expressed concern about the idea of “banking” credit toward release time and whether this could be implemented in all colleges and departments for all faculty (part-time, full-time, tenure-track, tenured).

Additional feedback on items 3 and 4 included the following: “I like the PD/Travel/release time options, but it should be the faculty member's choice whether or not they receive monetary compensation or PD, Travel, or release time.”

APPENDIX C: Proposed Model for Scheduling Online Final Exams in the Testing Center

On March 31, the following draft policy was sent by Mr. Darrin Theriault, Director of Academic Testing, to DLAC for faculty feedback:

1. Final Exam Conflict Period is:

- Friday, May 24, 2015, 8:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, June 24, 2015, 10:30 a.m - 12:30 p.m.
- Thursday, June 25, 2015, 10:30 a.m - 12:30 p.m.
- Monday, July 20, 2015, 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.
- Friday, July 24, 2015, 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.
- Saturday, July 25, 2015, 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.
- Sunday, July 26, 2015, 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.
- Monday, July 27, 2015, 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

- The testing center will match the final exam conflict period hours, which in this case is a total of 16 hours.

- With only two hours per testing period, I think we can schedule two to three classes into our lab for each of the days above using the block time concept. We will revise the faculty request form to make it specific to final exams, and use that form to gather instructors' preferences and to determine which classes get scheduled based on first come, first served. During this period using the block time concept, I project us testing up to 712 students.

2. Additional final exam days/hours are:

- * 22 May, 8:00am - 8:00pm (12 hours)
- * 24 June, 8:00am - 10:30pm (14.5 hours)
- * 25 June, 8:00am - 10:30pm (14.5 hours)
- * 20 July, 8:00am - 5:30pm (9.5 hours)
- * 21 July, 8:00am - 5:30pm (9.5 hours)
- * 26 July, 10:30am - 10:30pm (12 hours)
- * 28 July, 8:00am - 10:30pm (14.5 hours)

- This gives us 86.5 hours of testing available. With an average exam time of 1.5 hours, and limiting capacity to 75%, we can test approximately 4,000 students.

- We can make the testing center available for online students whose instructors want to use our services during these windows. We will close the testing center to all other exams on these days and match these hours of operation. Although we will not block these dates/times for specific classes like above, we will need faculty's input for capacity management. We will create a Final Exam Room in Appt Plus and enter each class by course number and instructor's name in our drop down menu so

our students can schedule their exams specifically for their class(es). This will allow the testing staff to communicate students' exam appointments accurately to faculty members.

- It appears to me that this approach does not violate the university's policy for online final exams since we will only block exams for classes during the final exam conflict period. Outside of that, students will schedule appointments individually within the final exam window. The added benefit to our online students is that this approach provides maximum flexibility - a valuable factor for our distance learners.

Please let me know your thoughts to this approach. I am confident that we are close to providing a solid plan to execute for Summer Semester. If this model works, we will gather faculty and student feedback and refine our methodology for the Fall and subsequent semesters. Thanks so much for your time and your input.

APPENDIX D: Distance Learning Advisory Committee Clarifications

Faculty Senate meeting minutes from February 15, 2015 read, “A first reading of changes to DLAC was proposed by Ken White, and passed 20 – 0.”

Distance Learning Advisory Committee — assigned to the Faculty Senate and advisory to the Assistant Vice President of Technology Enhanced Education and the VPAA through the Faculty Senate

- a. Purpose:

This committee reviews all KSU and USG distance education policies and may make recommendations for revisions to existing policies or practices to the Faculty Senate. The committee makes and hears policy change proposals/recommendations to distance education policies. All future distance education policy or practice changes are first reviewed by this committee (at its behest or at the behest of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or the entire Senate) and then, second, by the Faculty Senate for feedback before being implemented.
- b. Membership:
 1. TF 14: (This number will change to 20 when new colleges are added upon consolidation) tenured, tenure track, or full-time permanent faculty; two elected from each degree-granting college, serving two year staggered terms. Faculty elected to serve on this committee should have demonstrated previous involvement and commitment to Distance Education. Faculty serve staggered two-year terms.
 2. AD 1: One administrator: AVP of Technology Enhanced Education or designee (ex-officio).
 3. SF 1. Representative chosen from instructional designers (ex-officio).
 4. Until consolidation, the elected members of the existing Distance Education Task Force will serve as members, with next elections for 2015/16 and 2015/17 members to be held in Spring 2015.
- c. Procedures:
 1. A faculty member, chosen by the committee, serves as the chair of this committee.
 2. This committee meets as needed to review distance education program proposals and changes.
 3. Elections are facilitated by the Faculty Senate President.
 4. Annual report due May 1st of each year to the Vice President/President-elect of the Faculty Senate.