



STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM  
of FLORIDA  
Board of Governors

## AGENDA

Joint Meeting of the Steering and Implementation Committees  
for the 2025 *Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
FAIRWINDS Alumni Center, Flannery Conference Room (2<sup>nd</sup> floor)  
University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida  
June 21, 2016  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks Dr. Joe Glover  
Chair, Steering Committee
2. Action Items Dr. Glover  
Dr. Pam Northrup
  - a. Cost of Online Education  
Distance Learning Fee
  - b. Professional Development Dr. Cindy DeLuca
    - Instructional Designers
    - Institutional Leaders
  - c. Board Regulations Dr. Nancy McKee
  - d. UF Online Dr. Andy McCollough
3. Report on May Deliverables: Data Workgroup Dr. Susann Rudasill
4. Status Reports Dr. Elam
  - a. Online Program Workgroup Dr. McCollough
  - b. Quality Workgroup Dr. Elam
  - c. Infrastructure Workgroup Joseph Riquelme
  - d. Student Services Dr. Vicki Brown
  - e. Professional Development Dr. DeLuca
  - f. Learning Management Systems Dr. McKee
  - g. Research Consortium Dr. McKee
5. Refining the Implementation Plan Dr. Elam
6. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment Chair Glover

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Cost of Online Education**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Discussion

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

*Materials Forthcoming*

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Pam Northrup, Chair of Affordability Workgroup**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Distance Learning Fee**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Discussion

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

*Materials Forthcoming*

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Pam Northrup, Chair of Affordability Workgroup**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Quality 1.2.1 – Professional Development – Instructional Designers**

---

Create a statewide professional development network for instructional designers in order to share best practices and provide guidance in designing and developing online education.

**PROPOSED ACTION**

**Current Deliverables:**

***May 2016:** Professional Development Workgroup will make recommendation to Implementation Committee for approval by the Steering Committee. Such recommendations should address funding requirements, if any.*

Instructional designers were recently listed in The Chronicle of Higher Education's *2016 Trends Report* as one of the 10 key shifts in higher education. The report stated that "as online learning and new classroom technologies spread, the demand for instructional designers — who develop courses that others may teach — is growing". In a separate report, The Chronicle (2016) reported that "colleges are increasingly using instructional designers to improve the quality of teaching, whether in online, in person or hybrid courses" (p.5).

The Board of Governors highlights that "a blend of talented, well-prepared faculty members, modern learning technologies, and well-designed online courses and programs creates opportunities to improve pedagogies, engage faculty in the scholarship of teaching and learning, increase student academic success, and accelerate time-to degree" (p.7). Based on the information provided in the *2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education* and recent survey data, we believe the State of Florida is aware of the growing need to provide our instructional designers with the latest methodologies and technologies to stay on the cutting edge of the design of quality online learning experiences. Therefore, the Professional Development Workgroup unanimously recommends the following:

In collaboration with the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC), the workgroup will establish an **instructional designer network** (community) that provides access to resources and educational content to instructional design professionals across the State of Florida. SUS and State Colleges will collaborate using a variety of materials, communities and support systems to share best practices, current research and upcoming events to support instructional designers in developing their skills and knowledge to assist faculty in incorporating new technologies. These materials will be available via listservs, discussion board, webinars, and blogs.

At this time, no additional budget will be requested to implement this recommendation.

## **Future Deliverables:**

**December 2016:** *Subject to approval by Steering Committee and availability of funding, the recommendation will be implemented so that the professional development network for instructional designers will be operational by the end of 2016.*

Action items for December, 2016 implementation:

- a) Survey and identify the instructional designers across the State University and Florida College Systems;
- b) Create of a network directory;
- c) Develop of listserv – managed through the FLVC website;
- d) Appoint of co-coordinators (voluntary)- one State College instructional designer (ID) and one SUS ID to work with FLVC leadership in building and maintaining network;
- e) Launch the live version of network by the end of 2016; and
- f) Link to the Teaching Online Preparation Toolkit (Quality 1.2.3).

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **Professional Development Workgroup Charge:**

Quality: Strategy 1.2 – Expand support for professional development

Craft the best approach for creating and maintaining an Online Instructional Designers Community of Practice that will be a statewide forum for ongoing collaboration and sharing of best practices in designing and developing online education. Propose a funding mechanism.

---

### **Supporting Documentation:**

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2016, March). *The Trends Report: 10 Key Shifts in Higher Education*, 62 (25). Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/issue/2016/03-04/supplement>

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2016). *Instructional designers in higher ed: Changing the course of next-generation learning*. Huron Consulting Group, Inc. Retrieved from: <http://results.chronicle.com/instructionaldesigners>

Intentional Futures. (2016). *Instructional Design in Higher Education*. Retrieved from: [http://intentionalfutures.com/reports/instructional\\_design/files/Instructional%20Design%20in%20Higher%20Education%20Report.pdf](http://intentionalfutures.com/reports/instructional_design/files/Instructional%20Design%20in%20Higher%20Education%20Report.pdf)

State University System, Board of Governors. (2015, November). *2025\_SUS Strategic Plan for Online Education*, Retrieved from: [http://www.flbog.edu/about/taskforce/\\_doc/strategic\\_planning\\_online\\_ed/2015\\_11\\_05%20FINAL\\_StrategicPlan.pdf](http://www.flbog.edu/about/taskforce/_doc/strategic_planning_online_ed/2015_11_05%20FINAL_StrategicPlan.pdf)

---

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Cynthia DeLuca, Professional Development Workgroup Chair**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:   Quality 1.2.2 – Professional Development – Institutional Leaders**

---

Enhance professional development opportunities offered by the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) for institutional leaders in online education.

**PROPOSED ACTION**

**Current Deliverables:**

***May 2016:** Professional Development Workgroup will make recommendation to the Implementation Committee, for approval by Steering Committee, on how FLVC can best assist in providing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education. Such recommendations should address funding requirements, if any.*

In collaboration with the Professional Development Workgroup, FLVC will develop and host a resource tab on their website titled “professional development for online leaders”. This tab will be monitored by an appointed representative of the FLVC Members Council. In addition to monitoring and posting relative professional development opportunities (i.e. conferences, workshops, research), a coordinated statewide half-day session will be held in conjunction with one of the three annual FLVC meetings. A professional development opportunity will be offered on the day preceding the standing meeting. This professional development opportunity will be designed to coincide with one of the SUS/State College initiatives focusing on Quality, Affordability, and Access.

The Professional Development group did not identify additional funding; however, according to the tactic, the FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services could propose a budgetary need.

**Future Deliverables:**

***December 2016** Subject to approval by the FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, as well as the availability of any needed funding, FLVC will implement recommendations for providing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education.*

.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **Professional Development Workgroup Charge:**

#### **Quality: Strategy 1.2 – Expand support for professional development**

Solicit proposal from FLVC for enhancing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education. Proposal should include the cost per participating SUS institution.

---

### **Supporting Documentation Included:**

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Cynthia DeLuca, Professional Development Workgroup Chair**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Board Regulations**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For approval

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education contained tactics to review and modify as necessary four Board Regulations to increase access to online education. A workgroup consisting of the following members was created and made recommendations for consideration:

Nancy McKee (Board of Governors)  
Elizabeth Bejar (FIU)  
Andy McCollough (UF)  
Cindy DeLuca and Todd Chavez (USF)  
Dorothy Russell (FAU)  
Kristie Harris (Board of Governors)

**Access 2.2.1:**

Board Regulation 6.016 Summer Session Enrollment: The attached edits will clarify that nine credit hours are required to be earned in summer sessions, *regardless of the modality in which the hours are earned*. (See attachment). If approved for further exploration, this revision will begin the Board's process for amending regulations.

**Access 2.2.2:**

Board Regulation 7.006 Limitation on Non-Resident Student Enrollment. Currently, systemwide non-resident enrollment is limited to 10% of total enrollment. The attached edits will exclude from the calculation the number of non-resident students who are enrolled solely in fully online programs. If approved for further exploration, this revision will begin the Board's process for amending regulations.

**Access 2.2.3:**

Board Regulation 7.001 Tuition and Fees: Both statutes and regulations require out-of-state fees to offset the full instructional cost of serving out-of-state students. The



Workgroup recommended no changes to Regulation 7.001 at this time.

**Access 2.2.4:**

Board Regulation 7.003 Fees, Fines and Penalties. The Workgroup recommended that no changes to the Materials and Supply Fee subsection be made until work has been completed by (1) the Textbook Affordability Workgroup that has been created to address the requirements of CS/HB 7019 and (2) the Online Programs Sub-workgroup that is addressing issues related to textbooks/instructional materials.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Draft Board Regulations 6.016 and 7.006

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Nancy McKee

## 6.016 Summer Session Enrollment

6.016 Summer Session Enrollment. All students entering a university in the State University System with fewer than 60 semester hours credit shall be required to earn at least 9 semester hours during summer sessions prior to graduation, regardless of the modality in which the credit hours are earned. ~~by attendance at one or more summer sessions.~~ University presidents or their designees may waive the application of this regulation in cases of unusual hardship to the individual.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const., History--New 6-12-75, Amended 6- 25-80, 8-11-85, Formerly 6C-6.16, Amended 1-8-92, 8-19-92, 9-23-93, 11-27-95.

#### 7.006 Limitation on Non-Resident Student Enrollment.

~~The State University System of Florida will accept non-resident students as defined in Regulation 7.005 in numbers not to exceed 10 percent of the total systemwide enrollment. This does not imply that the enrollment of non-resident students at any single university in the system will be limited to 10 percent of that university's total enrollment as long as the total number in the University System does not exceed 10 percent of the total systemwide enrollment.~~

Enrollment of students who are classified as non-residents for purposes of in-state tuition shall not exceed 10 percent of the total systemwide enrollment across all state universities. ~~The State University System of Florida will accept non-resident students as defined in Regulation 7.005 in numbers not to exceed 10 percent of the total systemwide enrollment. This does not imply that~~ This limitation is not intended to limit the enrollment of non-resident students at any single university ~~in the system will be limited to 10 percent of that university's total enrollment~~ as long as the ~~total~~ number of non-resident students in the ~~University~~ System does not exceed 10 percent of the total systemwide enrollment. ~~This limitation shall not apply to non-resident students who are enrolled solely in fully online programs.~~

Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const., History—Formerly 6C-2.52(1), 11-18-70, 12-17-74, 12-13-77, 8-11-85, Formerly 6C-7.06, 11-9-92.

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: UF Online**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For approval.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Access Tactic 1.1.4 is “Support the development and delivery of affordable, high quality, fully online baccalaureate degree programs by UF Online in accordance with section 1001.7065, Florida Statutes.” The following areas of support are proposed:

1. **Support to expand engagement across the state in the deployment of labs for the online student:** “Virtual” labs can take many forms in 2016 to serve online students pursuing a bachelor’s degree: ranging from fully online labs, to hybrid online and residential instruction, to fully in person bootcamp lab intensives. Greater work is needed in this area to deploy academic offerings for the fully mobile student. We recommend the formation of an expert consortium in the design and deployment of STEM labs for online students in support of UF Online efforts and those across the SUS. This Virtual Labs Taskforce, comprised of SUS faculty experts, would be charged with evaluating options for deployment systemwide in the areas of Chemistry, Biology, and Physics for undergraduates.
2. **Support for greater synergies between existing mechanisms that promote education options for prospective students:**
  - a. **Support to improve UF Online and Complete Florida linkages:** Integrate UF Online into the offerings and strategic plan for Complete Florida to reach the greatest number of prospective students with a fully accredited and affordable online bachelor’s degree program
  - b. **Support to integrate UF Online and other reduced tuition options into public-facing Florida Prepaid program information.** Are we promoting UF Online as yet another option for visitors learning more about the Florida Prepaid program? How can we better ensure awareness of this incredible option at 75% tuition for in state students? One option is to update Florida prepaid calculators and web offerings to give users the ability to calculate total tuition if they were to attend

UF Online at 75% discount. We'd like it on their radar wherever we may reach the greatest number of prospective students that would benefit from a more affordable option.

- c. Support to integrate Florida higher education value – including UF Online - into existing programs that bundle State incentives to recruit or retain large employers in the state of Florida. Include the value of SUS higher education degree granting programs, including UF Online bachelor's degree at a reduced tuition rate for in state students and in particular the option to work with UF Online to pursue direct UF and employer partnerships to serve their employee needs.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Andy McCollough, UF

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Data Workgroup Deliverables and Survey Results**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

**Current Deliverables**

**May 2016:** The Data Workgroup will coordinate with ~~FLVC staff~~ [BOG and FCS IR Managers](#) to obtain data on current methods and processes used to certify quality of online courses. Report to be given to the Quality Workgroup. [This information is in the June 2, 2016 Data Workgroup Survey Report, page 12, tables 14–16.](#)

**May 2016:** Data Workgroup will determine the availability of data elements and data collection timelines for potential inclusion in the 2015-16 Accountability Report for Online Education. [The Data Workgroup determined that most of these data elements are available in BOG State University System database \(SUDS\). Additional information is in the June 2, 2016 Data Workgroup Survey Report, page 5, tables 2–3. The Data Workgroup recommends that the Accountability Report for Online Education be presented to the Board each year when the System Accountability Report is presented](#)

**May 2016** The Data Workgroup will make recommendations to the Board of Governors Workgroup on Metrics for Online Education on revisions to the definitions to be used for fully online and primarily online degree programs. Definitions will be used to inform a statewide inventory of such programs. [The Data Workgroup recommends using the Appendix A definitions contained in the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education. It was suggested that the current method of counting programs could be expanded to distinguish between upper- and lower-level undergraduate and graduate programs. There may need to be further clarification regarding distance programs that are off-site, at a distance, but the instructor and student are not separated by time and space, e.g., a social work cohort that meets at an off-site location for field-study.](#)

**May 2016:** Data Workgroup will coordinate with ~~FLVC staff~~ [BOG and FCS IR Managers](#) to determine processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach online. [This information is in the June 2, 2016 Data Workgroup Survey Report, page 19, tables 22–23.](#)

**Future Deliverables**

**December 2016:** Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC staff and the Infrastructure Workgroup to obtain data about current processes used by SUS institutions to ensure that their respective institutions have the technology needed. Survey provided to Infrastructure Workgroup. [Are we interested in FCS data? Should the survey question\(s\) be coordinated through the BOG and FCS IR managers as was done with the first Data Workgroup Survey?](#)

**December 2016:** Using data definitions proposed by Data Workgroup and approved by the BOG Workgroup on Metrics for Online Education, BOG staff will publish and maintain an inventory of SUS fully online and primarily . . .etc., [The Data Workgroup recommends using the Appendix A definitions contained in the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education and the current SUDS database and reporting timelines. There may need to be further clarification](#)

regarding distance programs that are off-site, at a distance, but the instructor and student are not separated by time and space, e.g., a social work cohort that meets at an off-site location for field-study.

**December 2016:** The Data Workgroup will coordinate with ~~FLVC staff~~ [BOG and FCS IR Managers](#) to define and determine the availability of “need and demand data.” The Data Workgroup will obtain data on how SUS institutions are using “need and demand data” in planning programs online. A report with recommendations will be prepared for the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. [Are we interested in FCS data? Should the survey question\(s\) be coordinated through the BOG and FCS IR managers as was done with the first Data Workgroup Survey?](#)

**December 2016:** Based on report produced by the Data Workgroup on processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach, the Professional Development workgroup will make Best Practices recommendations to Implementation Committee. Upon approval, Best Practices will be shared with all SUS institutions. [This information is in the June 2, 2016 Data Workgroup Survey Report, pages 19–20, tables 21–22.](#)

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **Data Workgroup General Purpose**

1. Determine the best approach for annually obtaining data to track performance on each of the performance indicators in the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education. If such data are not available in the Board of Governors databases, draft surveys to annually collect such data.
2. Determine data that needs to be collected to track implementation of the tactics in the 2025 Plan and if that data already resides in the BOG databases.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Data Workgroup Survey Report

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Susann Rudasill, Data Workgroup Chair

# DATA WORKGROUP SURVEY REPORT

Submitted to the Steering and  
Implementation Committees for the  
2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education

by

Dr. Susann Rudasill, Data Workgroup Committee Chair

June 1, 2016



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY	P. 2
DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS	P. 2–3
DATA SOURCES	P. 4

## SURVEY RESPONSE

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES	P. 5–22
--------------------------------	---------

## DATA TABLES

<i>Table 1</i>	SURVEY SOURCE	P. 4
<i>Table 2</i>	REPORT FREQUENCIES	P. 5
<i>Table 3</i>	DISTANCE LEARNING INDICATORS	P. 5
<i>Table 4</i>	STUDENT SUCCESS FREQUENCIES	P. 6
<i>Table 5</i>	FCS STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS	P. 6
<i>Table 6</i>	SUS/BOG STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS	P. 7
<i>Table 7</i>	STUDENT SUCCESS GRADES	P. 8
<i>Table 8</i>	STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS FCS	P. 8
<i>Table 9</i>	STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS SUS/BOG	P. 9
<i>Table 10</i>	STUDENT WITHDRAWAL RATES	P. 9
<i>Table 11</i>	STUDENT WITHDRAWAL INDICATORS FCS	P. 10
<i>Table 12</i>	STUDENT WITHDRAWAL INDICATORS SUS/BOG	P. 10
<i>Table 13</i>	STUDENT SUCCESS VARIABLES	P. 11
<i>Table 14</i>	ONLINE COURSE QUALITY STANDARDS	P. 12
<i>Table 15</i>	ONLINE COURSE QUALITY SYSTEMS	P. 12
<i>Table 16</i>	ONLINE COURSE QUALITY INTEGRATION	P. 12
<i>Table 17</i>	ONLINE STUDENT SATISFACTION	P. 16
<i>Table 18</i>	ONLINE STUDENT SATISFACTION REPORTING	P. 16
<i>Table 19</i>	ONLINE STUDENT SATISFACTION INDICATORS	P. 16
<i>Table 20</i>	ONLINE STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	P. 18
<i>Table 21</i>	ONLINE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	P. 19
<i>Table 22</i>	ONLINE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS	P. 19
<i>Table 23</i>	NUMBER OF FACULTY TEACHING ONLINE	P. 20
<i>Table 24</i>	ONLINE MENTOR/TEACHING ASSISTANT PROGRAMS	P. 20
<i>Table 25</i>	DISTANCE LEARNING FEE CHARGE	P. 21
<i>Table 26</i>	DISTANCE LEARNING FEE CHARGE INDICATORS	P. 21
<i>Table 27</i>	DISTANCE LEARNING FEE REVENUE REPORTS	P. 21
<i>Table 28</i>	TYPES OF DISTANCE LEARNING FEE REVENUE PROGRAMS	P. 22
<i>Table 29</i>	DISTANCE LEARNING FEE REVENUE REPORTING ENTITIES	P. 22

## PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of this survey was to determine the best approach for annually obtaining data to track performance on each of the performance indicators that determine Quality, Access, and Affordability in the *State University System of Florida Board of Governors 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*.

Identifying the data elements that are needed to track implementation of the tactics in the 2025 Plan and determining what institutions are currently collecting was the primary goal of this survey. The results are encouraging and provide clear indicators of items that can be standardized across institutions and used to measure progress toward achieving the goals set forth in the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education.

## Demographics of Respondents

### PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Chipola College  
 Eastern Florida College  
 Florida A & M University  
 Florida Atlantic University (2)  
 Florida Gulf Coast University  
 Florida International University (2)  
 Florida Polytechnic University  
 Florida State College at Jacksonville (2)  
 Florida State University  
 Hillsborough Community College (2)  
 Lake-Sumter State College (3)  
 Miami Dade College (2)  
 Northwest Florida State College  
 Pasco Hernando State College (2)  
 Pensacola State College  
 Polk State College  
 Seminole State College of Florida  
 St. Johns River State College  
 St. Petersburg College (2)  
 University of Central Florida (3)  
 University of North Florida

## Demographics (continued)

University of South Florida

University of South Florida System

## YOUR DEPARTMENT/UNIT AT YOUR INSTITUTION

Academic and Curriculum Support

Academic Technology & Innovation/Center for Instruction & Research Technology

Assessment, Compliance, and Grants

Center for Distributed Learning

Compliance

Distance and Continuing Education

Distance Education

eLearning (3)

FIU Online

IEA

Institutional Advancement/Open Campus

Institutional Analytics and Research

Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Research (4) (and) Institutional Research or ODL

Instructional Technology & Online Education (1) ELearning (1) Services (1)

Library

Office of Decision Support (2)

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Office of Instructional Technology

Office of the Provost/Center for ELearning

Online Learning

Planning and Effectiveness

Research and Institutional Effectiveness

Student Development & Enrollment Services (2)

## YOUR TITLE/ROLE AT YOUR INSTITUTION

Assistant Director

Assistant Provost

Assistant Vice President (3)

Associate Director

Associate Vice President (3)

AVP (no distinction)  
 Cataloger ILL Librarian  
 Compliance Specialist  
 Data Analyst  
 Dean of Assessment, Compliance, and Grants  
 Director (11)  
 ED  
 Institutional Research Coordinator/Data Administrator/Officer (3)  
 Provost  
 State and Federal Reports Specialist  
 Vice President (2)  
 Vice Provost

## DATA SOURCES

Please indicate the source from which you received the link to this Survey.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The Florida Board of Governors (SUS/BOG)	19	39.6	46.3	46.3
	FLVC (FloridaShines)	3	6.3	7.3	53.7
	The Florida College System	19	39.6	46.3	100.0
	Total	41	85.4	100.0	
Missing	System	7	14.6		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 1**

Out of the 48 responses recorded, 39.6% each received the survey link from the Florida Board of Governors (SUS/BOG) and the Florida College System (FCS), while 6.3% received their link to the survey from FloridaShines. Seven (14.6%) of the 48 reporting institutions did not provide an answer to the question.

## SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES









**Question 1. Does your institution currently submit reports to the Florida College System (FCS) or the State University System of Florida Board of Governors (SUS/BOG)?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	FCS	16	33.3	47.1	47.1
	SUS/BOG	18	37.5	52.9	100.0
	Total	34	70.8	100.0	
Missing	System	14	29.2		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 2**

Out of the 48 responses recorded, 70.8% of the institutions indicated they report data in some capacity to a governing board such as the FCS or the SUS/BOG. Fourteen (29.2%) of the 48 reporting institutions did not provide an answer to the question.

**Question 2. Most institutions use a variety of indicators to identify distance learning courses. Which of the following indicators does your institution use? Please check all that apply.**

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Special attribute or marker in your registration system</a>		10	71%
2	<a href="#">Student location</a>		3	21%
3	<a href="#">Origin of instruction/Course location</a>		5	36%
4	<a href="#">Technology indicator</a>		6	43%
5	<a href="#">Delivery mode percentage (80% or &gt; online)</a>		10	71%
6	<a href="#">Instructor/student separated by time</a>		4	29%
7	<a href="#">Instructor/student separated by distance (such as ITV)</a>		2	14%
8	<a href="#">Other</a>		1	7%

**Table 3**






It is encouraging to see that 71% of participants use the standardized definition of what constitutes a distance learning course to identify online courses in their systems. Likewise, using a data marker or attribute makes data aggregation easier and standardizes IR data pulls. Establishing a set of criteria across all institutions will make course information easy to compare.

**Question 3. Does your institution currently measure student success within your distance programs?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	28	58.3	87.5	87.5
	No	4	8.3	12.5	100.0
	Total	32	66.7	100.0	
Missing	System	16	33.3		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 4**

**FCS Student Success Indicators**





#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Course completion with a passing grade</a>		14	100%
2	<a href="#">Program completion with a degree or certificate conferred</a>		7	50%
3	<a href="#">Employment in the area of study within a _____ time period (enter time period below)</a>		2	14%
4	<a href="#">Any employment within a _____ time period (enter time period below)</a>		1	7%
5	<a href="#">Other measures of student success</a>		4	29%

**Table 5**

*Additional measures of student success as listed by FCS participants:*

Withdrawal rates (2)  
Grade distributions in online courses and on-campus courses  
Student success is measured in specific distance learning courses using outcomes measured by rubrics, specific questions on exams, projects, and portfolios.

**SUS/BOG Student Success Indicators**

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Course completion with a passing grade		9	100%
2	Program completion with a degree or certificate conferred		3	33%
3	Employment in the area of study within a _____ time period (enter time period below)		0	0%
4	Any employment within a _____ time period (enter time period below)		1	11%
5	Other measures of student success		1	11%

*Table 6*

*Additional measures of student success as listed by SUS/BOG participants:*

Retention (academic progress rates)









Across both the FCS and the SUS/BOG, a passing grade in a course constitutes student success. While that is an accurate measure, it is the most basic level of measurement and provides no additional standardized quantified measures that describe or contextualize what “success” is. The SUS/BOG may want to consider additional measures of student success to include skill mastery and application, integration of knowledge gained in the course, or other related measures that would provide additional information that would offer insight related to the 2025 Strategic Plan. Subsequent questions in this survey could potentially be the starting point for identifying student success markers, and it is recommended they be examined in greater detail for potential inclusion in SUS/BOG reporting.

**Question 4. Does your institution currently report student success rates based on grades to the FCS or SUS/BOG?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	16	33.3	61.5	61.5
	No	10	20.8	38.5	100.0
	Total	26	54.2	100.0	
Missing	System	22	45.8		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 7**

*How does your institution report these data? Please check all that apply (FCS).*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Percentage of student population</a>		5	63%
2	<a href="#">Student group</a>		5	63%
3	<a href="#">Program type</a>		5	63%
4	<a href="#">College</a>		4	50%
5	<a href="#">Department</a>		2	25%
6	<a href="#">Lower division undergraduate</a>		5	63%
7	<a href="#">Upper division undergraduate</a>		4	50%
8	<a href="#">Graduate</a>		0	0%
9	<a href="#">Other</a>		1	13%










**Table 8**

*Other:*

We report all student grades in all programs at all levels. We do not identify success, nor do we pull out distance learning students in this report. College-wide grades indicate success of our students and we routinely submit a report with all grades.



*How does your institution report these data? Please check all that apply (SUS/BOG).*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Percentage of student population</a>		5	63%
2	<a href="#">Student group</a>		5	63%
3	<a href="#">Program type</a>		4	50%
4	<a href="#">College</a>		4	50%
5	<a href="#">Department</a>		3	38%
6	<a href="#">Lower division undergraduate</a>		4	50%
7	<a href="#">Upper division undergraduate</a>		4	50%
8	<a href="#">Graduate</a>		4	50%
9	<a href="#">Other</a>		3	38%

**Table 9**

**Other:**

Each semester IR submits various files (e.g., student instruction files, hours to degree files, etc.) to the BOG and from these files student success rates can be derived.

**Headcount**









We report all grades and the BOG can derive any needed data.

**Question 5. Does your institution currently report student withdrawal rates to the FCS or SUS/BOG?** (Please note: Emphasis is on in-term withdrawal rates, NOT withdrawal rates taking place during drop-add.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	17	35.4	63.0	63.0
	No	10	20.8	37.0	100.0
	Total	27	56.3	100.0	
Missing	System	21	43.8		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 10**

*How does your institution report these data? Please check all that apply (FCS).*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Percentage of student population</a>		4	40%
2	<a href="#">Student group</a>		3	30%
3	<a href="#">Program type</a>		3	30%
4	<a href="#">College</a>		3	30%
5	<a href="#">Department</a>		3	30%
6	<a href="#">Lower division undergraduate</a>		6	60%
7	<a href="#">Upper division undergraduate</a>		5	50%
8	<a href="#">Graduate</a>		0	0%
9	<a href="#">Other</a>		3	30%

**Table 11**










**Other:**

We identify all students who have withdrawn from online courses. We run several reports through attendance reporting cycles and then one comprehensive report at the end of the term.

Course ID

As part of the grades for classes

*How does your institution report these data? Please check all that apply (SUS/BOG).*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Percentage of student population</a>		4	67%
2	<a href="#">Student group</a>		4	67%
3	<a href="#">Program type</a>		4	67%
4	<a href="#">College</a>		3	50%
5	<a href="#">Department</a>		2	33%
6	<a href="#">Lower division undergraduate</a>		3	50%
7	<a href="#">Upper division undergraduate</a>		3	50%
8	<a href="#">Graduate</a>		3	50%
9	<a href="#">Other</a>		2	33%

**Table 12**

*Other:*

IAF File

Headcount

**Question 6. Does your institution currently collect student success data for use on other surveys (internal or external) that are not currently required by the FCS or SUS/BOG?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	19	39.6	70.4	70.4
	No	8	16.7	29.6	100.0
	Total	27	56.3	100.0	
Missing	System	21	43.8		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 13**

*Please describe how student success is operationalized and quantified at your institution and the variables and/or questions used to measure it.*





1. Common variables
2. QEP Plan
3. Focus groups, surveys, and special projects
4. Student Satisfaction Inventory (survey)
5. Cohort tracking on demographic markers such as ethnicity, gender, and other identifiers such as full-time and part-time student status
6. SAS Business Intelligence, which provides raw data for headcounts, percent grades, withdrawal rates, GPA
7. National Community College Benchmark Project
8. Grade analysis and breakdown in addition to withdrawal rates for at-risk students

**Question 7. Does your institution currently use an established system of criteria to certify that online courses meet a quality standard?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	43.8	77.8	77.8
	No	6	12.5	22.2	100.0
	Total	27	56.3	100.0	
Missing	System	21	43.8		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 14**

*Which course quality system does your institution use? Please check all that apply (FCS and SUS/BOG).*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Quality Matters</a>		14	67%
2	<a href="#">Online Learning Consortium (formerly SLOAN) Quality Scorecard</a>		5	24%
3	<a href="#">iNACOL (K-12 National Standards for Quality Online Courses)</a>		0	0%
4	<a href="#">Your own institutional model</a>		9	43%
5	<a href="#">Other</a>		3	14%

**Table 15**

*Is this course quality system integrated into your training for instructional designers and/or faculty?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	18	37.5	94.7	94.7
	No	1	2.1	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	39.6	100.0	
Missing	System	29	60.4		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 16**

*If yes, please briefly describe how course quality systems are integrated into your training for instructional designers and/or faculty. (See free-form comments below.)*

1. In-house peer review based on QM rubric.
2. Given to each new faculty and is included in the online "Faculty Survival Kit."
3. Instructional designers and designing faculty have to take 2 courses: (1) Applying QM Rubric and (2) Developing for online/blended courses.
4. E-Certification at PHSC Teaching and Developing E-Courses: In order to teach online or develop an e-learning course at Pasco-Hernando State College, you must complete the "E-Certification for Online Teaching and Model Course Development" 10-week, 30-hour synchronous training in myPHSC. This course provides you with the skills necessary to develop, facilitate, and manage your own online courses, while at the same time providing you with the experience of an online learner. The emphasis of the course is online teaching, but best practices for online design are covered as well. The course is open to all PHSC faculty, adjuncts, and staff. Full-time faculty hired after June 30, 2013, must complete this course to be considered for placement on continuing contract (Board Rule 6Hx19-2.55). Recertification: In order to maintain your e-certification, you must complete the New Technologies for Teaching and Learning course. The course will cover topics ranging from new technologies to use in online and face-to-face courses to techniques on how to incorporate technology in these environments. This four-hour online, self-paced professional development course and one-hour, on-campus lab must be taken at least once every two years through the Academic Technology Department to meet recertification requirements for teaching online. The on-campus one-hour lab will be offered on the West Campus on specific dates throughout the semester.
5. Instructional designers become certified in QM and renew as required.
6. All instructional designers are QM certified and both our faculty training and our DL course template are based on QM standards.
7. All instructional designers receive formal QM training and updates when scheduled.
8. IDCC, the Instructional Design Core Curriculum, is FIU Online's comprehensive, ongoing professional development program. In the IDCC, instructional designers and instructional design assistants engage in opportunities for professional growth in the strands of Instructional Technology, Instructional Design Theory and Practice, Project Management and Leadership, and Faculty Collaboration and Service Excellence. The IDCC is designed to promote expertise in these four strands in a way that leverages areas of individual strength, potential, need, and interest.

Instructional designers and instructional design assistants can earn IDCC credit through face-to-face trainings, webinars, MOOCs, books, or they may design their own experience in collaboration with their program managers. New ID Training: All new instructional designers and instructional design assistants undergo a two-week, seven module simulation-based training program. Each day, new employees meet with one of the members of the training team, who will introduce the employee to that module's topics. Then, they are presented with tutorials and other self-paced training materials each day, followed by typical communications from a faculty member and other stakeholders. New employees are responsible for executing any necessary course development tasks and providing any necessary communication to the faculty member. At the conclusion of each day's session, one of the Training Team members meets with the employee to discuss that session's assignment and to provide feedback. By the end of the training period, the new employee will have developed an entire semester-long three-credit course.

9. We conduct internal training/professional development with our instructional designers in the following ways: 1. Monthly staff meeting – IDs demo courses, or elements in a course, that exemplify quality standards based on the USF rubric. IDs explain the process of creating these elements and share struggles of what it took to get there. We then share ideas of how to improve the process and give feedback on the course. 2. In-service professional development training – IDs present on a tool or process that exemplifies elements of the rubric. If an ID displays expert knowledge of a tool or process, they provide in-service training sessions to the group. 3. Innovative Education Instructional Design Canvas Course – this online Canvas course is designed for ongoing training of instructional designers. Based on best practices and up-to-date research and technology, we use this course for ongoing training and onboarding. The course is based on best practices and Innovative Education standards and processes for developing online courses, which is all based on the quality rubric. IDs and PMs are required to not only take the course each year, but to also contribute to the development of new modules based on current trends and innovative techniques and tools.
10. Instructional designers are required to complete Quality Matters training and apply the standards throughout the course design. Prior to implementation, each designer assesses the course using the QM Standards as part of the course review. Faculty are required to complete online training before teaching these QM-reviewed courses. Additionally, instructors are provided guidelines that contain specific

implementation advice and instructor tasks to help ensure Standards are met in every section.

11. Faculty are trained to design courses to Quality Matters standards. Instructional designers are certified by Quality Matters.
12. Faculty evaluate their course materials against our quality rubric as part of their required training to teach online. This is done as both a self and a peer assessment.
13. All UWF Academic Technology Center Instructional Designers complete the following Quality Matters courses: (1) Applying the QM Rubric, (2) QM Peer Review Certification, (3) Improving Your Online Course. Quality Matters (QM) Rubric standards for online course design are built into the UWF Academic Technology Center's (ATC) Online Course Design Template. When UWF faculty designated to develop an online course choose to attend ATC's six-week fully online "Designing a Quality Online Course," those faculty are instructed to develop their new online course utilizing the ATC Online Course Design Template, which has the QM Rubric built into the template. UWF faculty with prior experience developing or teaching online may choose to attend QM's two-week fully online "Improving Your Online Course," which also instructs online course development based upon the QM Rubric.
14. All Center for eLearning instructional designers are certified QM peer reviewers; many are master reviewers. All instructional designers are cross-trained to build courses that meet QM standards and to deliver professional development training to FAU faculty.
15. The course quality system is included in the training for designers and faculty through the completion of the Online Instructor Certification module. Once the training is completed, designers and faculty attend ongoing webinars and Learning Management Training throughout the course of an academic year.
16. High-quality course development is incorporated into our online faculty certification program.
17. PAL Certification ([www.polk.edu/palcert](http://www.polk.edu/palcert)) Description Level 1 LMS Training: This is a self-paced training that instructors can register via the self-registration tool in PAL. This is a certification course that will teach you the technical tools in PAL via video-based instruction. You will also have practice assignments and quizzes. Level 2 Online Delivery: This is a training delivered as a cohort with an initial face-to-face/synchronous meeting. It lasts seven weeks online and the content is on best practices in online teaching. Level 3 Instructional Design: This is a training delivered






as a cohort with an initial face-to-face/synchronous meeting. It lasts five weeks online and the content is on developing a Quality Matters course.

**Question 8. Does your institution currently collect data to measure student satisfaction?**

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Yes</a>		26	100%
2	<a href="#">No</a>		0	0%
	<b>Total</b>		26	100%













**Table 17**

*For which of the following student groups do you report? Please check all that apply.*

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Fully distance learning students (100%)</a>		9	35%
2	<a href="#">Primarily distance learning students (80–99%)</a>		7	27%
3	<a href="#">Hybrid students (50%–79%)</a>		5	19%
4	<a href="#">Primarily classroom students (0%–49%)</a>		6	23%
5	<a href="#">All categories above are currently reported together</a>		17	65%

**Table 18**

**Question 9. How does your institution measure student satisfaction? Please check all that apply.**

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Student evaluation of course</a>		24	92%
2	<a href="#">Student evaluation of faculty</a>		24	92%
3	<a href="#">Anonymous student surveys</a>		18	69%
4	<a href="#">Standard faculty evaluation</a>		13	50%
5	<a href="#">Administrative reviews</a>		8	31%
6	<a href="#">Online orientation class</a>		6	23%
7	<a href="#">Course monitoring</a>		6	23%
8	<a href="#">Student help-desk reports</a>		5	19%
9	<a href="#">External rating entities</a>		1	4%
10	<a href="#">Social media</a>		2	8%
11	<a href="#">No formal method(s)</a>		0	0%
12	<a href="#">Other</a>		3	12%

**Table 19**



### *Other:*

Key elements present in supplemental materials provided by institutions to measure satisfaction:

1. **One item of note:** In one of the surveys, each item was tied to two Likert scales, one for “level of importance” and the other “level of satisfaction.” Using two scales for each item allows for differentiation between items of low importance and high satisfaction and high importance and high satisfaction and vice versa, providing a more robust perspective of the student experience.
2. **Decision to enroll:** Availability of financial aid, application process, cost, location, size of campus, appearance of campus, personalized attention
3. **Aspects of educational experience:** Major, availability of services, quality of services, intellectual challenge, availability and use of resources
4. **Critical skill development:** Knowledge of chosen field, critical analysis skills, communication skills, understanding and appreciation of liberal arts, cultural diversity, scientific process
5. **Advising:** Access, interactions, quality, time, information accuracy, delivery of information
6. **Out-of-class experiences:** Internships, co/op, field experience, student clubs/organizations, residence life, recreation/sports/extracurriculars
7. **Factors delaying graduation:** Major change, part-time employment, course scheduling conflicts, study abroad, family issues/emergencies, personal issues/emergencies
8. **Sense of belonging:** Belonging to university community, professors/administrators care, faculty staff are knowledgeable and helpful, feel safe on campus

Overwhelmingly, surveys of student satisfaction are predominantly completed through evaluations of courses and faculty in both the FCS and SUS/BOG systems. Student evaluations of courses and faculty comprise 92% of all satisfaction measures, followed by anonymous surveys at 69%. Identifying standardized questions related to various aspects of satisfaction across all institutions and ensuring they are measured using the same scale instrument or other quantifiable construct would provide a good baseline for future measures and could easily be used to track improvements over time. It also may be useful to include some out-of-class satisfaction measures for internships or experiential learning that may be required. In addition, if the data will be standardized or compared to any face-to-face satisfaction measures, out-of-class experiences and sense of belonging may be worth exploring.

**Question 10. All institutions offer support services as a requirement of SACS. Are there support services below that are NOT available at a distance? Please check all that apply.**

#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Registration for classes</a>		1	7%
2	<a href="#">Transfer credit evaluation</a>		0	0%
3	<a href="#">Course listings</a>		0	0%
4	<a href="#">Class schedules</a>		0	0%
5	<a href="#">Student handbook</a>		0	0%
6	<a href="#">Orientation class</a>		2	13%
7	<a href="#">Virtual campus tour</a>		9	60%
8	<a href="#">Academic advising</a>		0	0%
9	<a href="#">Accessibility services</a>		1	7%
10	<a href="#">Course mentoring</a>		5	33%
11	<a href="#">Virtual library</a>		0	0%
12	<a href="#">Virtual tutoring</a>		2	13%
13	<a href="#">Virtual counseling</a>		6	40%
14	<a href="#">Victim's advocate services</a>		8	53%
15	<a href="#">Graduation application</a>		1	7%
16	<a href="#">Career planning</a>		2	13%
17	<a href="#">Other services offered on campus but not available to distance students</a>		2	13%

**Table 20**

**Question 11. Does your institution currently operate (or use an external form of) a faculty/instructor development program for online instruction?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	43.8	84.0	84.0
	No	4	8.3	16.0	100.0
	Total	25	52.1	100.0	
Missing	System	23	47.9		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 21**

*Is it required for all online faculty/instructors?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	15	31.3	71.4	71.4
	No	6	12.5	28.6	100.0
	Total	21	43.8	100.0	
Missing	System	27	56.3		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 22**

*Please provide a brief description of the program in an uploaded syllabus or other document that outlines structure, form, and content (materials included, short description below):*

1. Four module program over two weeks with assignments and due dates
2. Ten-week asynchronous orientation to the pedagogical and technological skills required for teaching online courses. Includes graded assignments, meetings, and a shadowing experience.
3. Distance Learning Academy comprised of four modules delivered through LMS that takes approximately four weeks to complete
4. Online course in teaching online courses
5. PAL Certification. Self-paced training with three levels that incorporate LMS training, online delivery, and instructional design.

**Question 12. Do you collect data on the number of faculty who teach at least one online course for reporting to the FCS or SUS/BOG?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	13	27.1	52.0	52.0
	No	12	25.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	25	52.1	100.0	
Missing	System	23	47.9		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 23**

**Question 13. Does your institution currently operate (or use an external form of) a mentor or teaching assistant development program for online instruction?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	12	25.0	44.4	44.4
	No	15	31.3	55.6	100.0
	Total	27	56.3	100.0	
Missing	System	21	43.8		
Total		48	100.0		

**Table 24**

*Please provide a brief description of the program in an uploaded syllabus or other document that outlines structure, form, and content.*

Two handouts included for mentor materials: (1) one outlining the PHSC Faculty Mentoring Program and (2) the Virtual College Instructional Designer. It appears the question was taken as new faculty mentoring rather than TA or teaching assistant mentoring. Data provided do not match the intent of the question.

**Question 14. Does your institution currently charge an additional per credit hour fee for distance learning programs and courses?**



#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Yes</a>		20	74%
2	<a href="#">No</a>		7	26%
	Total		27	100%

Table 25

**Question 15. How do you determine your distance learning fee per credit hour?**  
Please check all that apply.







#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Set amount for all programs/courses</a>		16	76%
2	<a href="#">Variable by each program/course</a>		2	10%
3	<a href="#">Cost recovery model</a>		8	38%
4	<a href="#">Variable by student level, undergraduate or graduate</a>		1	5%
5	<a href="#">Variable by student location</a>		0	0%
6	<a href="#">Variable by course location</a>		0	0%
7	<a href="#">No formal method</a>		1	5%
8	<a href="#">Other</a>		2	10%

Table 26

*Other:*

Florida Polytechnic uploaded a page indicating they do not offer online courses, and UCF provided one sheet front and back with an overview of expense guidelines, determination of course fee level, budget requests, and documentation of expenses.

**Question 16. Does your institution currently report distance learning fee revenues and expenditures?**



#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">Yes</a>		18	69%
2	<a href="#">No</a>		8	31%
	Total		26	100%

Table 27

*Which of the following program/course types are included in your distance learning fee revenue and expenditure report(s)? Please check all that apply.*





#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">State-supported FTE-generating programs/courses</a>		16	100%
2	<a href="#">Market tuition programs/courses</a>		6	38%
3	<a href="#">Grant or privately funded programs/courses</a>		2	13%
4	<a href="#">Non-credit programs/courses (such as CEUs)</a>		3	19%
5	<a href="#">Open non-revenue-generating programs/courses (such as MOOCs)</a>		0	0%

Table 28

**Question 17. To which entities has your institution reported distance learning fee revenues and expenditures? Please check all that apply.**











#	Answer		Response	%
1	<a href="#">The Florida Legislature</a>		7	37%
2	<a href="#">The Florida Governor's Office</a>		4	21%
3	<a href="#">The State University System of Florida Board of Governors (SUS/BOG)</a>		6	32%
4	<a href="#">Florida's Auditor General</a>		11	58%
5	<a href="#">Your local Board of Trustees</a>		13	68%
6	<a href="#">SACS/COC or other accreditation entity</a>		8	42%
7	<a href="#">Your internal budget/finance entity</a>		13	68%
8	<a href="#">Your internal auditor</a>		6	32%
9	<a href="#">Other private or public entities</a>		1	5%
10	<a href="#">The Florida College System</a>		9	47%

Table 29

**Other:**

Information shared with other private or public entities as requested.

**Please enter any additional comments or concerns associated with the SUS/BOG 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education.**

1. At this time, Florida Polytechnic University does not offer Online Education. Therefore, our answers to this survey reflect this fact.
2. We are concerned about our ability to support DL on our campus and to realize the goals for the BOG's 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education if the state cap on DL Fee goes below \$30 per credit hour.

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Online Programs Workgroup**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For information.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Members:**

Meredith Babb, UF Press  
Kelley Bailey, FAMU  
Naomi Boyer, PSC  
Tom Cavanagh, UCF  
Cathy Duff, FGCU  
Brian Harfe, UF  
Angela Lindner, UF  
Andy McCollough, UF, Chair  
Brian Marchman, UF  
Nathan Neuman, PSC  
Pam Northrup, UNF  
Jennifer Smith, UF  
Karen Rasmusson, UWF  
Mike Ronco, UF  
Kendall St. Hilaire, IRSC

The Workgroup assignments included:

Tactic 1.1.2	Listing of Current and Desired Programs
Tactic 1.2.2	Shared Master Courses
Tactic 2.1.1	Open Access Textbooks and Educational Material
Tactic 2.1.2	etextbooks
Tactic 2.1.3	Funding for Innovative Projects
Tactic 3.1.1	Shared Programs
Tactic 3.1.2	Competency Based and Adaptive Learning Programs
Tactic 3.1.3	Prior Learning Assessment
Tactic 3.1.4	Incubation Pilots

The workgroup has had two face-to-face meetings and several member-to-member conversations. The group decided to assign the individual tactics to subgroups to obtain simultaneous development of the action steps consistent with the due dates.

The assignments were:

Tactic 1.1.2      Current Programs and Gaps

Mike Ronco, Chair

Cathy Duff

First Deliverable - December 2016

Tactic 1.2.2      Master Courses

Kendall St. Hilaire, Chair

Cathy Duff

Brian Marchman

First Deliverable - May 2017

Tactic 2.1.1      etextbooks  
and

Tactic 2.1.2      Open Access Materials

Meredith Babb, Co-Chair

Brian Harfe, Co-Chair

Nathan Neuman

Angela Lindner

First Deliverable - December 2016

Tactic 2.1.3      Funding for Experimental Innovative Projects  
and

Tactic 3.1.4      Incubation Pilots

Tom Cavanagh, Chair

Jennifer Smith

Naomi Boyer

Pam Northrup

First Deliverable - December 2016

Tactic 3.1.1      Shared Programs

Pam Northrup, Chair

Kendall St. Hilaire

First Deliverable - May 2017

Tactic 3.1.2      Competency Based and Adaptive Learning Programs

Pam Northrup, Co-Chair

Tom Cavanagh, Co-Chair

Naomi Boyer

Nathan Neuman

First Deliverable - May 2017



### Tactic 3.1.3 Prior Learning Assessment

Cathy Duff, Chair

Naomi Boyer

Karen Rasmussen

Kelley Bailey

First Deliverable - December 2016

Each subgroup submitted for workgroup consideration a write-up in response to the following request:

1. Description of the central issue that is the focus of the assigned tactic.
2. Description of the action called for and the work plan to be followed.
3. Description of the timeline and resources needed.

The workgroup will meet again in July (conference call) for a status report from the subgroups and a discussion of plans and problems.

The subgroup responses are attached.

---

<b>Supporting Documentation Included:</b>	Subgroup responses for current and desired programs; shared master courses; open access textbooks and educational materials; etextbooks; innovative projects; incubation pilots; shared programs; competency-based and adaptive learning programs; and prior learning assessments.
<b>Facilitators/Presenters:</b>	Dr. Andy McCollough, Chair of Online Programs Workgroup

# Online Programs Workgroup

## Tactic 1.1.2: Current and Desired Programs

### *Subcommittee:*

Mike Ronco, UF, Chair  
Cathy Duff, FGCU

### *Assignment:*

"Review current offerings of fully online degree programs by CIP codes and make recommendations to address gaps."

### *Inventory Scope:*

Tactic 1.1.2 was initially defined as being limited to *Fully Online Degree Programs*. The Online Programs Workgroup recommends that this be expanded to encompass fully and primarily online programs including degrees as well as for credit certificates. Fully online degrees will remain an identifiable subset of the inventory. Online degree programs will represent distinct majors while online certificate programs should represent distinct offerings as identified by the name of each certificate.

### *Gap Analysis Scope:*

The gap analysis will primarily identify gaps for fully online degrees. However, other gap reports will be generated based upon the complete listing of online offerings. This will paint a broader picture of the current SUS online landscape.

## **Work Plan**

### **Online Program Data**

1. Create a relational database to support the SUS Online Program Inventory and Gap Analysis.
  - a. Import all of the *SUS Online Program Survey* responses into the database.
  - b. Import and cross reference the entire list of 2010 CIP codes.
  - c. Import and cross reference the list of CIP codes with "Strategic Emphasis".
  - d. Import and cross reference the list of CIP codes with at least one "SUS Approval".
  - e. Import Florida College System data if available.
  - f. Add ~30 attributes to enable filtering and searching.
2. Format data for use with Tableau, Excel, and other reporting tools.
3. Review existing data fields and add new ones as required for potential reports.
4. Generate a data dictionary and other documentation.

### **Online Program Inventory**

1. Generate and populate the Boolean field "Offered by an SUS Institution" for every CIP code.
  - a. Currently, this field is populated to "Y" if either a degree or certificate is offered allowing only for a global inspection of current offerings.

- b. Filter for "Y" to see current online inventory.
  - c. Filter for "N" to find CIP codes without any SUS online offerings.
2. Create the draft report *Any Online Degree or Certificate* Inventory in Tableau for review by members of the workgroup.
3. Reconcile any newly identified or existing discrepancies.
4. Add additional attributes to allow inventory reporting with finer levels of granularity. For example: *Fully Online Degrees, Any Online Degree, Any Online Degree or Certificate, etc.*
5. Modify survey data to limit survey degree responses to only the "Online Majors".
  - a. Create a separate track field to store specializations and concentrations.
  - b. Populate the track field from the major column.
  - c. Purge tracks out of the major column.
  - d. Remove any duplicate major rows from the database.
6. Create an updated version of the Online Program Inventory report integrating the enhancements.
7. Have members of the workgroup review the final version of the inventory.
8. Make any needed final adjustments to the inventory.
9. The Online Programs Workgroup approves and submits the inventory.

### **Online Program Gap Analysis**

1. Add the Boolean field "Strategic Emphasis" to the dataset.
  - a. Filter for "Y" to see only CIP codes identified as having strategic emphasis.
  - b. Use this setting to limit the scope of the gap analysis.
2. Add the Boolean field "Approved in SUS" to the dataset.
  - a. Filter for "Y" to see only CIP codes with existing approval in the SUS.
  - b. Currently, this flag is set to true if any SUS institution has approval at any level.
  - c. Use this setting to limit the scope of the gap analysis.
3. Create a draft Online Programs Gap Analysis report in Tableau for review by members of the Online Programs Workgroup.
4. Reconcile any existing or newly identified discrepancies.
5. Add additional attributes to allow reporting of gaps with finer levels of granularity. For example: *No Fully Online Degrees, No Online Degrees, No Online Degree or Certificate, etc.*
6. Gap Identification
  - a. Large gaps
    - i. Some gaps will show no current SUS offering and should be easy to identify.
    - ii. Some gaps may be present for undergraduate but not graduate or vice versa.
    - iii. Some gaps may be present for degrees but not certificates or vice versa.
  - b. Small gaps
    - i. Some CIP codes that have SUS offerings may still be underserved.
    - ii. Since these will not readily stand out in the reports, it will require the expertise of individual members of the workgroup to identify them.
7. Assignment of Priority
  - a. Not all gaps in the system offerings will deserve the same level of consideration.
  - b. For example, some minor gaps may present a larger strategic interest than some major gaps.
  - c. Input from members of the Online Workgroup with a strong knowledge of the SUS priorities will be essential in pinpointing the most critical gaps.
8. Final review of prioritized list of the Online Program Gap Analysis.
9. The Online Programs Workgroup submits their recommendations.

## Timeline

1. **May 2016:** Review of Initial Online Program Inventory and Gap Analysis.
2. **June 2016:** Update the Online Program Inventory degree data to reflect the "Online Majors" definition of "Online Program".
3. **July 2016:** Provide updated Online Program Inventory and Gap Analysis reports to the workgroup members for review.
4. **August 2016:** Gap Identification and Assignment of Priority.
5. **August 2016:** Second round of modifications to both reports.
6. **September 2016:** Final review of the reports by the workgroup.
7. **December 2016:** *"Online Programs Workgroup to review current offerings of fully online degree programs by CIP codes and make recommendations to address gaps."*

## Current Status

Online Program Data: All initial data collection and processing steps have been completed with the exception of creating the data dictionary.

Online Program Inventory: The column "Offered by an SUS Institution" has been generated and populated for every CIP code. Initial draft reports have been generated and were disseminated for review. The current reports reflect both degree and certificate activity as it was reported to SUS. Reconciliation of discrepancies has begun. The workgroup has approved interpretation of an "Online Program" for degree programs to mean the "Online Major". For certificate programs, the term "Online Program" will refer specifically to the certificate name. The current inventory report is accurate but program counts will continue to be skewed until multiple tracks for a single major are removed at the university level.

Gap Analysis: The initial Boolean columns have been generated and populated for every CIP code. Draft reports have been generated and are available for review. Reconciliation of discrepancies has begun. The workgroup has approved interpretation of an "Online Program" for degree programs to mean the "Online Major". For certificate programs, the term "Online Program" will refer down to the level of the certificate name. Conversion of the inventory data to use the "Online Major" interpretation has begun but will require additional data filters as well as some data cleansing. Initial identification of gaps has been completed. However, since those gaps are based upon both degrees and certificates, the current inventory only provides a global picture of what is offered (or not offered). Gaps specific to degrees or certificates must currently be identified manually rather than having a definitive list automatically generated. New flags are to be added to the data to enable identification of gaps for degrees or certificates independent of each other.

## **Support Needs/Problems**

### Data Issues

1. A handful of issues exist in the data where CIP codes either do not exist in the CIP 2010 listing or have not been approved by SUS. These need to be resolved prior to approval of the final inventory.
2. There are some discrepancies between the [Approved Program Inventory](#) from the SUS Website and the Excel document, [Programs of Strategic Emphasis Effective Fall 2014 \(by CIP\)](#) . These need to be reconciled.
3. Concentrations and specializations were reported by some universities while other reported programs only down to major. Duplicate majors within each university need to be consolidated.
4. Four Post-Bac certificates were reported. The original data model did not account for that option. Currently, these are grouped with graduate certificates. These need to be categorized and cataloged.
5. Florida College system has so far been unable to provide comparable survey data at the major level. There is some FCS data on the Florida Shines website. However, the "information on Florida Shines lists concentrations in programs separately". We are pursuing this with FCS. We may need to consider the option of initially completing the Gap Analysis for SUS alone, then having FCS provide input as to their current offerings for any SUS online program gaps.
6. Initial review of the Gap Analysis data has revealed the need for at least two new data properties: "No Degree Offered" and "No Certificate Offered". Currently, the online inventory functions properly. The gap analysis, however, will not display all of the expected gaps when only degree is selected. This should be a minor fix and does not require any additional resources.

## **Florida Statewide Master Course Initiative**

### **BOG Strategic Plan, Tactic 1.2.2**

#### ***1) Master course concept***

##### **Why are master courses beneficial to students?**

- The finest, most engaging, student-centered courses available throughout the system may be featured
- Quality assurance processes may be more consistently and uniformly applied
- Content may be more efficiently accounted for
- With a master course template, it is easier for students to navigate.
- All course items are in the same location for all courses (syllabi, course messages, etc.)
- Student is able to focus on the instructional content rather than navigation
- As familiarity with course layout grows, student confidence grows (assurance they are accessing all content, no guessing game)
- Transfer student is familiar with structure/layout of the course

##### **What are the drawbacks to master courses?**

- Perceived loss of faculty autonomy
- Infringements on academic freedom
- New model of online instruction- is it scalable?

##### **Developing a master course (Design, Development and Implementation)**

###### **Concept one: Assemble team to create master course**

- Director of statewide programs (administrative capacity)
- Faculty members to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)
- Instructional designers
- Course developers
- Accessibility Services (Closed captioning, ADA compliance)
- Peer review team (QM) to ensure Quality Assurance
- Students (feedback/formative & summative evaluation)

###### **Concept two: Design master course model**

- Flexible model: content and assessments located in library (Canvas Commons) & pulled down into shell by instructor
  - Need multiple version of the course, due to Grade Center and analytics

### Concept three: Master course maintenance

- Curriculum maintenance (statewide level)
- Technical maintenance (institution level)
- Project management (institution & state level)

### Concept four: Training

- Faculty/TA understanding of the Learning Management System (technical)
- Faculty/TA understanding of the master course process (systemic & systematic)
- Rolling out of master courses each semester
- Upkeep of Grade Center, file naming convention, analytics
- How to teach the master course (Instructor Resource folder)

### Concept five: The Power of Analytics & Power Users

- Success coach (Complete Florida model): catching at-risk students
- Faculty: using analytics to inform instruction/curriculum design, prediction models, etc.
- Students: using analytics to change behaviors within online class (time management, etc.)

	University System	College System
Institutional Needs: What problem are we are trying to solve?	Many versions of same course; are online success rates a problem?	Online success rates well below face-to-face rates; retention in online courses
Master course model	Flexible model- Master template houses vital course content in same location, but instructional content is housed in a library	Is there a need for a flexible <b>and</b> a more “rigid” model (for adjuncts)?
Push versus pull model	Pull	Pull/Push

## **II) Funding Considerations**

- Stipend to Subject Matter Expert for creation of master course (\$2,000/course)
- Instructional designer (\$90,000)
- Course developer (\$60,000)
- Trainer (\$60,000)
- Training/Professional Development (TBD)
- Subscriptions (OLC, QM) (\$5,000/license)
- Publisher content/resources (TBD)
- Software (TBD)
- Hardware (TBD)
- Servers for self-hosting the LMS (\$10,000)
- Managed Hosting Services (\$100,000)
- Accessibility services department (closed captioning) (TBD)

## **III) Proposed Timeline**

**Area of Focus:** General Education courses, which have high enrollment.

- 12 courses, totaling 36 credit hours should be designed using the master course concept.

12 courses should take one academic year to develop: **July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018**

**July-October:** Statewide design meetings to discuss design and development of master course (Project Director, SMEs, designers & developers)

**October- February:** Courses are designed and developed (SMEs, designers, developers, and accessibility services department)

**March-May:** Quality Assurance process begins (QM reviews) (SMEs)

**June- July:** Courses are deployed to institutions via the pull model

**\*\*Training on the process should occur at various times throughout the July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018 project year.\*\***





## Online Programs Workgroup

### Tactic 2.1.1 Open Access Textbooks and Educational Materials

#### *Subcommittee:*

Brian Harfe, UF, Co-Chair  
Meredith Babb, UF Press, Co-Chair  
Nathan Neuman, PSC  
Angela Lindner, UF

#### *Assignment:*

Determine and promote methods to increase the use of open access textbook and educational resources to reduce costs to students.

#### *Timeline*

Draft proposal outlining recommendations, a strategy to implement the recommendations, and budget is due December 2016.

A survey of students done by Florida Virtual Campus in 2012 noted the rising costs of textual materials as a barrier to successful degree completion. The survey found that perceptions of open access texts had changed little since the first survey was conducted in 2009 (a follow-up survey is proposed below). Faculty were found to be using more digital interactive products, which may suggest a growing comfort with digital texts. The survey found that commercially produced products were seen as superior to non-profit produced texts. Conversations in the spring of 2016 with University of Florida and Polk State College faculty were consistent with the 2012 FVLC report.

In the 2012 report, students were found to have little awareness of the availability of OER materials but continue to find innovative ways to obtain less expensive course materials. The report found that students required that all course materials continued to be available after a given course ended and that students preferred that all course materials be accessible during the entire time they were registered at their College/University. Ideally, students would like to have lifelong access to course materials. In addition to digital textbooks, the report found that students request that digital study aids be provided

#### Work Plan

- a. Complete an updated Florida Virtual Campus Textbook and OER survey similar to the 2012 survey. The new survey will be completed by October 2016.
- b. Develop a one page, digital, OER informational sheet by February 2017. This sheet should include locations of OER resources, a brief description of what OER encompasses, and the benefits that OER provides to both students, faculty, and staff. This resource should be provided to faculty and staff developing new courses and teaching current courses.
- c. Disseminate information regarding OER resources and funding opportunities to all faculty and staff in the Florida College and University systems in the spring 2017 term. In particular, the information outlined in this proposal should be presented at faculty senate meetings and University/College-wide forums.
- d. Mandate that all new courses that lack OER material justify why the use of OER is not possible, prior to approval from the College/University Curriculum Committee (for all new courses)

- beginning in the spring 2017 term).
- e. Develop incentives for faculty to incorporate OER material into courses. The incentives plan will be implemented in the spring 2017 term.
  - Provide one time payments (overloads) to faculty to incorporate OER material into their courses.
  - Provide course release to faculty to incorporate OER material into their courses.
- f. Provide on campus workshops to 1. Inform faculty/staff about OER and 2. Aid faculty in incorporating OER into their courses. Workshops will begin in the spring 2017 term.
- g. Perform a survey of students' satisfaction of OER material in courses. Survey questions will be incorporated into the standard course evaluation form. Survey questions will appear in courses using OER beginning in the spring 2017 term.
- h. Create a system-wide repository for all College/University OER textbooks and supplemental course materials.
  - Repository containing OER textbooks and supplemental materials must be searchable.
  - Repository must deliver OER materials electronically to students.

#### Current Status

#### **Tactics to achieve an increase in the use of OER throughout the Florida College and University systems.**

- a. Develop OER materials that have the same ancillary as commercially produced products. For example, teaching guides, problem sets, and review materials must be included.
- b. Ensure that courses that use OER material have the same student outcomes as courses that use commercial course material.
- c. Produce OER material that is peer reviewed.
- d. Provide an inexpensive print option of OER material for students.
- e. Provide access to OER material to students during the entire time they are registered as a degree seeking student. Ideally, OER material in all courses that a student takes in the Florida College/University systems should continue to be available after graduation.
- f. Provide access to updated OER material to students after they have completed the course.

#### Support needs/Problems

#### **Measuring Tactic outcomes:**

- a. Determine the number of courses that have incorporated OER material with a goal of 60% of the general education courses taught at Florida Colleges/Universities having incorporated OER material by 2020.
- b. Demonstrate that student learning outcomes, measured by final grades in a course, is similar or exceeds learning outcomes prior to implementation of OER material in a course.

## Online Programs Workgroup

### Tactic 2.1.2 eTextbooks

#### *Subcommittee:*

Brian Harfe, UF, Co-Chair  
Meredith Babb, UF Press, Co-Chair  
Nathan Neuman, PSC  
Angela Lindner, UF

#### *Assignment:*

Research mechanisms associated with reducing costs of texts through e-Textbooks.

#### *Timeline*

Draft proposal outlining recommendations, a strategy to implement the recommendations, and budget will be completed by December 2016.

#### Work Plan

- a. Negotiated agreements with legacy publishers to provide an e-textbook option for Florida general education courses (start December 2016 and complete initial negotiations by February 2017). Example:
  - McGraw Hill ([www.mheducation.com](http://www.mheducation.com)): An analysis of four high enrolment UF courses indicated that e-Textbooks from McGraw Hill would decrease textbooks costs between 28%-46%, depending on the course.
- b. Identify education startup companies that provide e-textbooks and negotiate with these companies to ensure the greatest financial benefit for students (start December 2016 and complete initial negotiations by February 2017. Continue to re-access as new companies are identified).
- c. Work with non-profit companies to develop OER e-textbooks in high enrollment state-wide courses. Example:
  - OpenStax ([openstax.org](http://openstax.org)): 23 open source, peer reviewed free e-Textbooks are currently available in higher education general education courses.
- d. Provide students access to e-text book options through the student record system (start December 2016).

#### Current Status

Textbook costs in some courses are placing a huge burden on students in the higher education system in Florida. The 2012 Florida Student Textbook Survey (Florida Virtual Campus, Florida Student Textbook Survey. Tallahassee, FL) reported that fifty-four percent of students spent >\$300 on textbooks during the Spring 2012 term and 19% spent >\$500. Both free textbook options (see Tactic 2.1.1) and fee-based services that provide e-textbook options at a lower cost than current hardcopy-based textbooks are available in the marketplace.

#### **Recommendations for the desired characteristics of e-Textbooks:**

- a. e-Textbooks need to have the same features as commercially produced products.
- b. Courses that use e-Textbooks must have the same student outcomes as courses that use only

- hardbound textbooks.
- c. An inexpensive print option of e-Textbooks is recommended.
- d. e-Textbooks must be available to students during the entire time they are registered as a degree seeking student. Ideally, e-Textbooks in all courses that a student takes in the Florida College/University systems should be available after graduation.
- e. Updates to e-Textbooks must be available to students after they have completed the course.

#### **Tactics to achieve a reduction in the cost of textbooks.**

Identify mechanisms to reduce the costs of textbooks for Florida's College and University students.

- a. Use OER material (see also Tactic 2.1.1).
- b. Develop e-Textbooks in high enrollment courses.
- c. Negotiate with legacy publishers for reduced cost e-Textbooks.
- d. Investigate e-Textbook products produced by education startup companies.

#### Support needs/Problems

##### **Measuring Tactics outcomes:**

- a. Quantify the amount of money students save using e-Textbooks by comparing the cost of e-Textbooks that have been incorporated in courses to the cost of textbooks used in these courses prior to implementation (this analysis needs to be done at the level of course sections).
- b. Quantify student outcomes in courses that use e-Textbooks compared to the same courses that use only hardbound textbooks.
- c. Determine if students in which >50% of their courses incorporated e-Textbooks had a lower amount of student debt upon graduating than students who took fewer e-Textbook enabled courses.

# Online Programs Workgroup

## Tactics 2.1.3 and 3.1.4 Incentive Funding and Incubation Pilots

### *Subcommittee:*

Tom Cavanagh, UCF, Chair  
Jennifer Smith, UF  
Naomi Boyer, PSC  
Pam Northrup, UWF

### *Assignment:*

2.1.3: Seek **incentive funding** to encourage institutions to implement **innovations** in online education.

3.1.4: Develop a series of experimental incubation pilot projects to support new and emerging online education innovations through institutional partnerships, lead institution, or other methods to support collaboration with the purpose of building affordable, innovative approaches and models that work.

### Work Plan

Develop a proposal for funding and implementing innovative pilot projects in online education. Proposal elements will likely include:

- Innovative Projects Process
  - Survey the SUS and FCS systems
  - Convene a brainstorming session during an FLVC meeting (or a special meeting)
  - Proposal process (e.g., institutional co-investment)
  - Identifying and selecting projects
  - Selection process, governance, accountability,
  - Evaluation plan
  - Plan for learning from pilots and scaling success across SUS and FCS
  - Potential Examples:
    - Adaptive Learning
    - Microcredentials
    - Next gen ePortfolios
    - Predictive analytics and dashboards
    - MOOCs for credit
    - eText and digital materials strategies
- Funding

- Tiers of funding and potential return on investment in numbers of projects by scale of pilots
- Sources
  - LBR
  - System
    - FLBOG
    - FCS
    - ICUF
  - Institutional
  - Grants
  - Fees
  - Other?

### Timeline

- **September 2016**
  - Draft of proposal for committee review.
- **December 2016**
  - **2.1.3:** Online Programs Workgroup will submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for innovative projects along with ideas for incentive funding.
  - **3.1.4:** Online Programs Workgroup will submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for experimental incubation pilot projects.
- **May 2017**
  - **2.1.3:** Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, implement the proposal.
  - **3.1.4:** Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, implement the proposal.

### Current Status

- Proposal outline in development
- Discussed at June 2015 FLVC quarterly meeting with good support

### Support needs/Problems

Highly variable potential pilot projects will require discussion related to funding. Complexity, scale, and technology maturity will impact potential costs.

## Online Programs Workgroup

### Tactics 3.1.1 Shared Programs

#### *Subcommittee:*

Pam Northrup, UWF Chair  
Kendall St. Hilaire, Indian River State College

#### *Assignment:*

In support of goal 3, the State University System will adopt innovative instructional models to create instructional efficiencies, this group will be working on a specific innovative instructional model, shared programs as a means to support affordability in Florida

Tactic 3.1.2 Develop or co-develop shared programs that would be available, but not required, for use in areas of high demand while maintaining quality and increasing efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.

### Work Plan

Develop a proposal for expanding the implementation of shared programs in Florida. Using the state of Georgia eMajor as a model, shared programs have the potential to create affordable solutions for students at a reduced PRICE to students and a reduced set of COSTS to institutions. We will be visiting the University of West Georgia on Monday, June 6 and upon return will be able to put in place a framework for the proposal. UWG serves as lead institution for the Georgia system around shared degree programs.

- Funding
  - TBD

### Timeline

- **September 2016**
  - Draft of proposal for committee review.
- **December 2016**

Online Programs Workgroup will submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for shared programs along with ideas for incentive funding.



- **May 2017**
  - Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, implement the proposal.

#### Current Status

- Proposal outline in development
- Discussed at June 2015 FLVC quarterly meeting with good support
- Visit to University of West Georgia for more detailed study of system level program.

#### Support needs/Problems

TBD

## Online Programs Workgroup

### Tactics 3.1.2 Competency-Based and Adaptive Learning Programs

#### *Subcommittee:*

Pam Northrup, UWF Co-Chair  
Tom Cavanagh, UCF Co-Chair  
Naomi Boyer, Polk State College  
Nathan Neuman, Polk State College

#### *Assignment:*

In support of goal 3, the State University System will adopt innovative instructional models to create instructional efficiencies, this group will be working on a specific innovative instructional model, competency-based and adaptive-learning as a means to support affordability in Florida

Tactic 3.1.2 Develop or co-develop competency-based and adaptive learning programs that would be available, but not required, for use in appropriate areas of high demand, primarily around adults and workforce needs, while maintaining quality and increasing efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.

#### Work Plan

Develop a proposal for expanding the implementation of competency-based and adaptive learning programs (for all institutions, currently being tested with Complete Florida partner institutions) that promote reduced costs for students in Florida. Initial work has been completed through a series of convenings of Complete Florida partner institutions. Proposal elements will likely include:

- Host a series of competency-based convenings to uncover issues, policies and practices to host competency-based education using the lens of affordability in Florida.
  - Consider how to set tuition at a reduced price to students
  - Consider data systems integration to support off-cycle admissions
  - Consider financial aid implications
  - Build on the effectiveness of findings from successful implementations of competency and adaptive learning in Florida colleges and universities through Complete Florida.
  - Continue collaborations with Lumina Foundation, FBOG and FCS to identify and build policy and practice for the full implementation of competency-based education as a model to reduce costs, increase quality and align to target audience needs.

- Adaptive learning definitions and major practices, including how it complements/overlaps with competency-based education
  - Explain why adaptive learning is of interest for Florida
  - Identify current activity within the state
  - Curate a list of major initiatives nationwide
  - Suggest possible strategies for piloting and implementing adaptive learning across the state
- Funding
  - Tiers of funding and potential return on investment in numbers of projects by scale of pilots
  - Sources
    - LBR
    - System
      - FLBOG
      - FCS
      - ICUF
    - Institutional
    - Grants
    - Fees
    - Other?

### Timeline

- **September 2016**
  - Draft of proposal for committee review.
- **December 2016**

Online Programs Workgroup will submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for competency and adaptive learning along with ideas for incentive funding.
- **May 2017**
  - Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, implement the proposal.

### Current Status

- Proposal outline in development
- Discussed at June 2015 FLVC quarterly meeting with good support

### Support needs/Problems

Institutions that have been able to move forward with competency-based learning have Complete Florida partnership funding or other federal and state level funding to work through the process to launch. To be able to launch system wide and meet some areas of direct affordable education in Florida, it will be important to collaborate and build a process that will yield reduced PRICE to students and COSTS to institutions that are able to be supported through initial launch with supplemental dollars to support the early stages of the innovation.

# Online Programs Workgroup

## Tactic 3.1.3 Prior Learning Assessment

*Subcommittee:*

Cathy Duff, FGCU, Chair  
Kelley Bailey, FAMU  
Naomi Boyer, PSC  
Pam Northrup, UWF  
Karen Rasmussen, USF

*Assignment:*

Present a model for assessing prior learning.

### Work Plan

Central Issue: Prior learning assessment (PLA) has multiple definitions and means of assessment. Some versions of PLA are not directly related to academic credit, which means that the institutions need to take extra care to follow regional and professional accreditation guidelines.

The issues involved in developing a model for assessing prior learning are similar to the issues involved in Competency Based Learning, including:

1. Cost; the person power needed for activities that do not align with the traditional institutional practices and policies; scalability issues
2. Fees and assessment costs are different from the tuition charged for traditional in-person or online instruction
3. Faculty involvement and acceptance
4. Accreditation
5. Transfer issues
6. State practice and policies
7. Federal practices and policies
8. Accreditation practice and policies
9. Student Information System tracking and technology issues
10. Quality concerns
11. Culture—how can we build PLA so that is compatible with the culture of higher education, individual institutions, and faculty

The work plan will be for the committee to continue reviewing relevant materials and efforts taken by institutions to implement PLA. The committee will develop frameworks or models that institutions can adapt to their circumstances.

### Timeline

Timeline from Implementation Schedule and Action Steps document for Tactic 3.1.3 stated that this item was to be completed by fall 2017. The document also included the following information: Date? FLVC Members Council will propose a model to the Implementation Committee for assessing prior learning for the award of credit.

The resource wish list could include funding for faculty effort used to develop assessment models that could be adopted statewide or at the institutional level. The state core general education courses might yield the most return on investment. These models could be similar to what is used for CLEP.

### Current Status

In early stages of grasping the complexity of the issue and the overlap with other topics such as Competency Based Education.

### *Definitions and Descriptions for Assessing Prior Learning*

*From The Status of Prior Learning Assessments in Florida Colleges and Universities, updated July 7, 2015 (thanks to Karen Rasmussen)*

Prior learning assessment (PLA) is the process of evaluating and awarding college credit for knowledge and competencies that students have learned outside of the classroom to accelerate the student's course of study allowing him/her to achieve their desired certification or degree quicker and advance in today's workforce. In Florida, PLA as determined by each College or University, may include awarding college credit to students through a combination of the following:

- *National Examinations* including *International Baccalaureate (IB)/Advanced Placement (AP)/College Level Examination Program (CLEP)/Defense Activity Test and Examination Services Subject Standardized Tests (DSST)/Excelsior (ECE) exams/Advance International Certificate of Education (AICE) from Cambridge International Examinations; Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Exams (CAPE);*
- *Challenge Examinations* developed by individual departments and faculty to test a student's ability to fulfill the expected outcomes for a particular course through learning obtained outside of the classroom (may include elements of experiential portfolios or competency-based assessments and may be called credit by examination);
- *Military-Related Credits* earned through American Council on Education and DSST Program and documented on SMART/AARTS transcripts;
- *Prior Learning Assessments, or Experiential Portfolios*, developed by students to showcase their experiences as aligned to course or program competencies; and

- Credit by Certification validated by licensure, graduation, or industry certifications.

From American Council on Education <http://www.acenet.edu/higher-education/topics/Pages/Credit-for-Prior-Learning.aspx>

Many nontraditional students can demonstrate college-level knowledge and competencies. Such learning—gained from experiences outside postsecondary education—often merits academic credit. *Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)* provides a range of options from recognition of military and workforce training to national examinations and portfolio development. With more options comes the increased likelihood for greater numbers of learners to complete credentials.

Credit for prior learning goes by different names including prior learning assessment, experiential learning, and alternative credit. It has different meanings and options: credit by exam, evaluation of workplace training, individualized assessment, portfolio, for example. It is housed in different areas: transfer/advising departments, adult learner/prior learning assessment programs, and veterans' programs, for example.

From *A Resource Guide for State Leaders, State Policy Approaches to Support Prior Learning Assessment*, 2015 Update, Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL):

Individualized student portfolios or portfolio assessments, conducted by individual colleges or a third party like CAEL's LearningCounts.org, a national online prior learning assessment service;

Evaluation of corporate and military training by the American Council on Education (ACE); ACE publishes credit recommendations for formal instructional programs offered by noncollegiate agencies, or the ACE Guides;

Program evaluations done by individual colleges of noncollegiate instructional programs that award credit for those who achieve recognized proficiencies, also known as local evaluation of training;

Challenge exams or customized exams offered by some colleges to verify learning achievement; these may be current course final exams or may be other tests developed at the department level for assessing general disciplinary knowledge and skill; and

Standardized exams such as Advanced Placement Examination Program, or AP Exams, offered by the College Board; College-Level Examination Program, or CLEP Exams, also offered by the College Board; Excelsior College Exams (formerly Regents College Exams or ACT/PEP Exams); and The DANTES Subject Standardized Tests, or DSST Exams, conducted by the Chauncey Group International, a division of Thomson Prometric.

From SACSCOC Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs Policy Statement definitions <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/o81705/DirectAssessmentCompetencyBased.pdf>

Competency: A competency is a clearly defined and measurable statement of the knowledge, skill, and ability a student has acquired in a designated program.

Competency-Based Educational Programs: A competency-based educational program is outcome-based and assesses a student's attainment of competencies as the sole means of determining whether the student earns a degree or a credential. Such programs may be organized around traditional course-based units (credit or clock hours) that students must earn to complete their educational program, or may depart from course-based units (credit or clock hours) to rely solely on the attainment of defined competencies.

<u>Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs</u> (direct assessment programs)	<u>Hybrid Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs</u> (hybrid programs)
Federal regulations define a direct assessment competency-based educational program as an instructional program that, in lieu of credit hours or clock hours as a measure of student learning, uses direct assessment of student learning relying solely on the attainment of defined competencies, or recognizes the direct assessment of student learning by others. The assessment must be consistent with the accreditation of the institution or program using the results of the assessment.	A hybrid competency-based educational program combines course-based competencies (clock and credit hours awarded) with non-course based competencies (no clock or credit hours awarded).

#### Characteristics of Direct Assessment Programs (SACSCOC)

1. It does not subscribe to conventional notions of the clock hour, seat time, term length, or the credit hour; rather, it relies on the student's ability to demonstrate clearly defined and measurable competencies in a designated program.
2. It is designed and delivered within the framework of the program's defined knowledge, skills, and competencies as demonstrated by students, rather than in terms of prescribed courses.
3. A student may acquire the requisite competencies from multiple sources and at various times other than, or in addition to, the learning experiences provided by the institution. As such, the length of time it takes to demonstrate learning may be different for each student.
4. It often allows for alternative approaches to teaching and learning.
5. It may rely almost exclusively upon students using direct assessment testing models to demonstrate their mastery of program and degree content.



### Support needs/Problems

This is a really complex issue facing numerous challenges (see above). Faculty will need to be involved to develop validated assessment tools appropriate for course content. Funding will be needed for faculty effort used to develop assessment models that could be adopted statewide or at the institutional level. The state core general education courses might yield the most return on investment. These models could be similar to what is used for CLEP.

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Quality Workgroup**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

Provide an update on the work of the Quality Workgroup.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Quality Workgroup of the Implementation Committee (QW/IC) has held two conference calls since the creation of the workgroup and held one joint face-to-face meeting with the FLVC Distance Learning & Student Services Members Council (FLVC DLSSMC) Quality Workgroup at the June meeting of the FLVC DLSSMC meeting. The QW/IC affirmed the importance of working in tandem with the Quality Workgroup of the FLVC DLSSMC and determined to rely on that group's work with developing a set of standards specific to Florida for use in reviewing courses for quality. The QW/IC also engaged the Quality Workgroup of the FLVC DLSSMC to assist with decision making relative to what standards, rubric(s), and processes to recommend for course review as well as recommendations for the coding system and award system.

In an effort to be ready by early Fall 2016 to draft the recommendations the QW/IC is charged to do as its deliverables for 2016, discussions among members of both quality workgroups occurred at the June FLVC DLSSMC meeting. The following decisions were made and recommendations will be drafted during the summer for a face-to-face working meeting of both Quality Workgroups in August.

- The proposal for a quality review process will include the use of Quality Matters or a newly developed set of standards, complete with a rubric and process to support it, specific for Florida colleges and universities. In addition, institutions with a process already in place will be able to provide a matrix of how their standards /process meet the Florida standards.
- The current draft of standards developed for Florida will be revised to combine similar areas and reduce the overall number of components.
- A process will be developed as well as a rubric to support the Florida standards and a platform/tool will be needed to support the endeavor.
- Both workgroups feel it is critical to include the review of course delivery if we

are truly to determine quality, and especially high quality courses. Current thinking is to tie the review of course delivery online to the high quality designation and perhaps the awards to be developed.

- A new badge or seal to represent Florida Quality Courses (and perhaps one additional for High Quality courses) will be developed and used in the FLVC catalog to identify the quality courses. Any course that meets either the QM or the Florida standards will therefore earn that seal.

The QW/IC has two deliverables for December 2016. The first is a proposal to the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee for a review process for quality courses. The proposal would include identification of standards, recommendations for use of third party processes. The second deliverable is a recommendation for a coding structure for use to identify courses that are determined to be quality or high quality courses. The workgroup will meet face-to-face in August to review and revise drafts of both sets of recommendations. We are on target for completing the two deliverables by the due date.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Joyce Elam, on behalf of Dr. Len Roberson, Chair of the Quality Workgroup

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Infrastructure Workgroup**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

*Materials Forthcoming*

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

**Facilitators/Presenters: Joseph Riquelme, Chair of Infrastructure Workgroup**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Student Services Workgroup**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

*Materials Forthcoming*

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Vicki Brown, Chair of Infrastructure Workgroup**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Professional Development**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Attachments provide updates for the following two tactics:

**Quality 1.2.3:** Provide an online toolkit and annual workshops for institutional staff who are responsible for professional development activities for faculty who teach online courses. The content will include, but not limited to, designing courses that will comply with the American Disabilities Act.

**Quality 1.2.5:** Encourage faculty participation in professional development before teaching online. Consider certifying faculty to teach online.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Progress reports for Quality Tactics 1.2.3 and 1.2.5

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Cindy DeLuca, Chair of Professional Development Workgroup

Professional Development Workgroup  
Progress report

**Quality 1.2.3:** Provide an online toolkit and annual workshops for institutional staff who are responsible for professional development activities for faculty who teach online courses. The content will include, but not limited to, designing courses that will comply with the American Disabilities Act.

**Current Deliverables:**

*January 2016: The Steering Committee presented the professional development program to provide an online toolkit and annual workshops as indicated in the above tactic.*

On January 20, 2016, the CAVP unanimously agreed to support funding for the Professional Development program as identified in UCF's response to the Board of Governors ITN 2015-11. Year one funding (FY 2016-2017) for that program will come from the Florida Virtual Campus for. Thereafter, for the following four years beginning July 1, 2017, the universities in aggregate will contribute \$60,912 each year. The pro rata share of that total will be based on the institutions' reoccurring base funding, as calculated by the BOG staff.

Progress to date:

- Florida Online Faculty Development Advisory Board was appointed;  
Charge to Advisory Committee:  
Proposal Document (contains three main components of the project):
  - Online Faculty Development Toolkit (first item to be worked on)
  - Florida Online Faculty Development Workshop (two-day annual workshop at UCF for next five years)
  - Online Learning and Faculty Development Community of Practice (COP).  
It will be housed within the toolkit.Purpose: The purpose of the Advisory Board is to advise and advocate.  
Goals: Provide input and feedback on design; promote toolkit and workshop; participate in community of practice (COP).
- Kickoff meeting held April 15, 2015;
- Determined final name for the toolkit: Teaching Online Preparation Toolkit (TOPkit);
- Domain name TOPkit.org has been secured;
- The advisory board met on May 16, 2016 and reviewed the preliminary design for the toolkit content, which is now in development
- Pre-launch page is live at: topkit.org.

### **Future Deliverables:**

*June 2017: Professional Development Workgroup made recommendation to CAVP, who agreed to fund recurring costs for four years after the first year startup. FLVC agreed to fund first year start-up, nonrecurring costs.*

---

The project is on track for successful completion of the online toolkit by Feb 1, 2017. The pre-launch page gives visitors the opportunity to sign up for regular updates along with a bi-monthly TOPkit Digest, which provides a brief preview of some of the content you can expect to see in the toolkit. It also has a countdown clock to our go live date of Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> and acknowledges the advisory board members. The next advisory board meeting on July 18, 2016 will be a review of the marketing plan and community of practice design.

On the technical side --the final home page is developed and the wordpress site is ready to go. Project managers continue to seek content submissions in the following areas:

- Faculty development models
- Questionnaires & decision guides
- Tools, techniques, strategies, & practices
- Checklists, rubrics, & guidelines
- UDL, accessibility, copyright & FERPA
- Resources

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

#### **Professional Development Workgroup Charge:**

#### **Quality: Strategy 1.2 – Expand support for professional development**

Solicit proposal from FLVC for enhancing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education. Proposal should include the cost per participating SUS institution.

Seek FLVC and CAVP financial support for implementing an online toolkit and annual workshop for institutional staff who are responsible for professional development activities for faculty who teach online courses

#### **Supporting Documentation Included:**

Florida Online Faculty Development Advisory Board Members

Flyer of TOPkit

**Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Cynthia DeLuca, Professional Development Workgroup Chair**



**Florida Online Faculty Development Advisory Board  
Membership List**

**Victoria Brown**

Interim Assistant Provost for eLearning  
Florida Atlantic University  
[vbrown22@fau.edu](mailto:vbrown22@fau.edu)

**Cynthia DeLuca**

Assistant Vice Provost  
University of South Florida  
[deluca@usf.edu](mailto:deluca@usf.edu)

**Laura Dinehart**

Assistant Professor, College of Education  
Florida International University  
[dinehart@fiu.edu](mailto:dinehart@fiu.edu)

**Robin Donaldson (Chair)**

Director, Member Research and Services  
Florida Virtual Campus  
[rdonaldson@flvc.org](mailto:rdonaldson@flvc.org)

**Shawn D. Felton**

Assistant Professor - Rehabilitation Sciences  
Florida Gulf Coast University  
[sfelton@fgcu.edu](mailto:sfelton@fgcu.edu)

**Arifa Garman**

Director of E-Learning  
Gulf Coast State College  
[agarman@gulfcoast.edu](mailto:agarman@gulfcoast.edu)

**Wendy Howard**

Instructional Designer  
University of Central Florida  
[wendy.howard@ucf.edu](mailto:wendy.howard@ucf.edu)

**Brian K. Marchman**

Director, Distance Learning  
University of Florida  
[marchman@ufl.edu](mailto:marchman@ufl.edu)

**Deb Miller**

Director, Center for Instruction & Research  
Technology  
University of North Florida  
[deb.miller@unf.edu](mailto:deb.miller@unf.edu)

**John Opper**

Executive Director, Distance Learning and  
Student Services  
Florida Virtual Campus  
[jopper@flvc.org](mailto:jopper@flvc.org)

**Mike Petroski**

Director of Faculty Development and Academic  
Assessment  
Lynn University  
[mpetroski@lynn.edu](mailto:mpetroski@lynn.edu)

**Kendall St. Hilaire**

Director of Virtual Campus  
Indian River State College  
[ksthilai@irsc.edu](mailto:ksthilai@irsc.edu)

**Vicki Westergard**

Executive Director, Instructional Design and  
Development  
St. Petersburg College  
[westergard.vicki@spcollege.edu](mailto:westergard.vicki@spcollege.edu)

**Other Resources**

**Tom Cavanagh**

Associate Vice President of Distributed Learning  
University of Central Florida  
[cavanagh@ucf.edu](mailto:cavanagh@ucf.edu)

**Pam Northrup**

Executive Director, Innovation Institute  
University of West Florida  
[pnorthru@uwf.edu](mailto:pnorthru@uwf.edu)

**Nicole Nichols** (*Administrative Support*)

Executive Specialist  
Florida Virtual Campus  
[nnichols@flvc.org](mailto:nnichols@flvc.org)  
(850) 922-3190

Professional Development Workgroup  
Progress report

**Quality 1.2.5:** Encourage faculty participation in professional development before teaching online. Consider certifying faculty to teach online.

**Current Deliverables:**

*May 2016: Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC staff to determine processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach online.*

Received data from the Data Workgroup on Friday, June 3, 2016. Professional Development Workgroup will begin reviewing the information and developing recommendations in order to meet the December 2016 deliverable.

**Future Deliverables:**

*December 2016: Based on report produced by the Data Workgroup on processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach, the Professional Development workgroup will make Best Practices recommendations to Implementation Committee. Upon approval, Best Practices will be shared with all SUS institutions.*

*December 2016: Professional Development Workgroup will investigate different approaches for certifying faculty to teach online and will make recommendation to the Implementation Committee on which approach(es) should be used if a SUS institution decides to certify faculty to teach online.*

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Professional Development Workgroup Charge:**

**Quality: Strategy 1.2 – Expand support for professional development**

Solicit proposal from FLVC for enhancing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education. Proposal should include the cost per participating SUS institution.

Research and recommend a program for certifying faculty to teach online courses

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Learning Management Systems**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Affordability Tactic 1.2.5: Encourage institutions to opt into the selected common Learning Management System.

At this point:

Five universities are using Canvas: UF, USF, UCF, FGCU, FPU

Five universities are transitioning to Canvas: UWF, NCF, UNF, FAU, FSU

Two universities are in the evaluation process: FAMU and FIU

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Nancy McKee

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Status Report: Online Education Research Consortium**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Two Quality tactics address the need for research in online education:

Tactic 2.1.1: Create a statewide online education research consortium with members from Florida institutions interested in sharing and presenting research, determining research needs in online education, and identifying collaborative research projects.

Tactic 2.1.2: Develop a process to share research-based best practices that are occurring across the different institutions.

The Implementation Plan stated that UF Online would lead the creation of the consortium, with Board of Governors staff obtaining membership names from provosts and FLVC. Dr. Carole Beal, head of UF's Online Learning Institute, has agreed to chair the consortium and will meet with workgroup chairs from the Implementation Committee on June 27 via conference call to obtain input and share ideas for the consortium.

Board staff has solicited names from provosts, which are due by June 15.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Nancy McKee

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Joint Meeting of the Steering Committee and Implementation Committee for the  
*2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*  
June 21, 2016

**SUBJECT: Refining the Implementation Plan**

---

**PROPOSED ACTION**

For Information

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

At the joint meeting of the Implementation and Steering Committees on December 16, 2015, one of the Guiding Principles agreed upon was:

The Implementation Committee has leeway to interpret and expand on the specific language associated with each tactic in order to better meet the overall goals. Any substantive changes will be cleared with the Steering Committee.

The attached Implementation Plan was edited to more accurately reflect the flow of activities.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Updated *Implementation Schedule and Action Steps* (Draft)

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Dr. Joyce Elam, Chair of the Implementation Committee

# IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND ACTION STEPS FOR STRATEGIC GOALS AND ASSOCIATED TACTICS FOR ONLINE EDUCATION: 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

(updated June 15, 2016)

This document identifies the action steps to be taken to address each tactic in the 2025 SUS Strategic Plan for Online Education, the time by when the action step will be completed, and the group responsible for completing each action step. Most of the responsibilities for completing the actions falls to specific workgroups that are part of the Implementation Committee. Members of each workgroup include not only members from the Implementation Committee but also members from the FLVC Member Council, faculty representatives, and other stakeholder groups as appropriate.

~~Four~~ Seven workgroups have been established: Quality Workgroup, Professional Development Workgroup, Affordability Workgroup, ~~and~~ Data Workgroup, Student Services Workgroup, Infrastructure Workgroup, and Online Programs Workgroup. The membership in each of the Implementation Committee's workgroups can be found on the Board of Governors Online Education Online web site , [http://flbog.edu/about/online\\_education.php](http://flbog.edu/about/online_education.php).

~~It is anticipated that three additional workgroups will be established: Student Services Workgroup, Infrastructure Workgroup, and Online Programs Workgroup.~~

The Implementation Committee will have regularly scheduled in person meetings three times a year – March, June, and January – in conjunction with the Board of Governors meetings. Other meetings, by teleconference or in person, will be scheduled as needed.

The Steering Committee will be invited to join the Implementation Committee meeting ~~in June~~ when the committee meets in person.

## TACTICS RELATED TO QUALITY METRICS FOR ONLINE EDUCATION

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>1.1.3</b>	Ensure implementation of Quality Scorecard, Quality Matters, <u>Course Rubric</u> , and/or <u>other</u> course <u>quality</u> certification <u>processes-systems</u> for all universities offering online education.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> The Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC staff to obtain data on current methods and processes used to certify quality of online courses. Report to be given to the Quality Workgroup.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> The Quality Workgroup <u>will prepare will recommend to the Implementation Committee for approval by the Steering Committee</u> a proposal for using one or a limited set of quality rubrics(s) statewide in order to enable identification of quality and high-quality courses across SUS institutions. The proposal may recommend the development of a new, SUS-specific <u>quality certification system with its own</u> rubric, or the approval of a set of 3<sup>rd</sup> party <u>quality certification systems with associated</u> rubrics that have been shown to be equivalent in terms of measuring quality.</p> <p><u>January 2017: The Quality Workgroup will present its proposal for discussion and subsequent approval by the Steering Committee at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in January 2017. If approved, implementation will begin spring 2017.</u></p>	
<b>Affordability</b> <b>1.2.1</b>	<p>Either co-develop a <u>quality certification system with its own</u> rubric to measure course quality or invest in state-level licensing agreements for Quality Matters, Quality Scorecard, or a similar quality <u>rubric-certification system</u> to measure course quality for the system.</p> <p>Using the same quality <u>rubric(s) quality certification system</u> -will enable identification of best-in-class courses, programs,</p>	<p><b>May 2017:</b> In the case that 3<sup>rd</sup> party <u>quality certification system(s) rubrics</u> are recommended, state-level licensing agreements will be negotiated. The Quality Workgroup will work with the Board's Director of Shared Services and FLVC staff to facilitate this agreement.</p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> In the case of a proposed SUS-specific <u>rubric quality certification system</u>, the Quality Workgroup will develop a <u>rubric-plan for implementing this system</u>.</p> <p><u>January 2018: The Quality Workgroup will present its proposal for discussion and subsequent approval by the Steering Committee at the joint meeting of the</u></p>	

	<p>faculty, etc. for incentives and recognitions. Based on the quality <del>metric</del><u>certification system</u> selected, identifying the <del>model</del><u>criteria</u> to measure, including the selection of a statewide review team, will reduce costs of quality <del>measures</del><u>certification systems</u> such as Quality Matters, the Quality Scorecard, or similar <del>rubrics</del><u>quality certification systems</u>.</p>	<p><u>Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in January 2018 so that implementation can begin in spring 2018.</u></p> <p><del>for approval by the Steering Committee for use in Spring semester 2018.</del></p>	
--	---	--	--



TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b>  <b>1.1.2</b>	Create a coding system in the Florida Virtual Campus course catalog that allows the identification of <del>QM or QS</del> <u>quality</u> certified, President's Award, Florida's Quality Award, and Chancellor's Quality Award courses.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> The Quality Workgroup will <del>recommend-develop a</del> <u>recommendation for</u> a coding structure for quality and high quality courses to FLVC staff for implementation. Coding plan should accommodate existing <del>rubrics-quality certification systems</del> that have been selected for statewide as well as a SUS-specific <del>rubric-quality certification system</del> when and if such a <del>rubric-system</del> is developed.</p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> <u>The Quality Workgroup will present its recommendation for discussion at the joint January 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval, c</u>Codes should be in place for spring 2017.</p> <p><b>May 2017:</b> The Quality Workgroup will <del>recommend-develop a</del> <u>recommendation for</u> a coding structure to identify courses that will receive statewide awards to FLVC staff for implementation.</p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> <u>The Quality Workgroup will present its recommendation for discussion at the joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval, c</u>oding should be implemented in time to recognize the first set of award-winning courses in spring 2019.</p>	

<p><b>Quality</b></p> <p><b>1.1.1</b></p>	<p>In conjunction with the Florida College System (FCS), create a statewide award system for exceptional online courses.</p> <p>System-level awards for online courses may be based on jointly developed or selected <a href="#">rubricsquality certification systems</a>, such as the Quality Scorecard (QS), an expanded Quality Matters (QM) <del>rubric</del>, and/or similar <a href="#">rubricsquality certification systems</a>. The first level will be a President's Award given at the university level. The second level, the Florida Quality Award, will be a state-level award given by a statewide evaluation committee on quality. The third level will be a Chancellor's Quality Award that represents the best of breed throughout the state.</p>	<p><b>May 2017:</b> The Quality Workgroup will <del>develop recommend to the Implementation Committee for its approval</del> a detailed proposal for implementing a statewide award system for exceptional online courses.</p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> The Quality Workgroup will present its proposal for discussion at the June 2017 joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee. Upon approval by the Steering Committee and to the extent funding allows, the proposal will be implemented.</p> <p><b>May 2019:</b> Upon approval by Steering Committee and <del>to the extent funding allowsavailability of funding</del>, the first awards will be given at end of spring semester 2019.</p>	<p>✓</p>
---	--	--	----------

## TACTICS RELATED TO DATA COLLECTION AND SHARING

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>1.1.3</b>	Ensure implementation of Quality Scorecard, Quality Matters <del>Course Rubric</del> , and/or <u>other</u> course <u>quality</u> certification <del>processes</del> <u>systems</u> for all universities offering online education.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will work with FLVC staff to obtain data on current methods and processes used to certify quality of online courses. Report to be given to the Quality Workgroup.</p> <p><b>May 2017:</b> Data Workgroup to work with FLVC in updating its information about the current <del>methods and processes</del> <u>systems</u> used to certify quality of online courses.</p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> Report to be presented to the Implementation <u>Committee</u> and the Steering Committee <u>at its June 2017 joint meeting</u>. <u>Further action steps will be discussed and identified.</u></p>	✓
<b>Quality</b> <b>2.2.1</b>	Using Quality Scorecard or a similar process, ensure that each institution has the technology needed to provide quality online education.	<b>December 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC staff and the Infrastructure Workgroup to obtain data about current processes used by SUS institutions to ensure that their respective institutions have the technology needed. Survey provided to Infrastructure Workgroup.	✓
<b>Quality</b> <b>1.1.4</b>	Annually compare the success of students enrolled in online courses with the success of students in primarily classroom courses.	<b>May 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will determine the availability of data elements and data collection timelines for potential inclusion in the 2015-16 Accountability Report for Online Education.	

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.1</b>	Establish and maintain an inventory of SUS fully online and primarily online programs, as well as online courses.  Ensure consistency of the FLVC distance learning catalog with the Board of Governors Inventory of Online Programs.	<p><b>May 2016</b> The Data Workgroup will make recommendations <del>to the Board of Governors Workgroup on Metrics for Online Education</del> on revisions to the definitions to be used for fully online and primarily online degree programs <del>that will inform the BOG process for modifying data elements</del>. Definitions will be used to inform a statewide inventory of such programs.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> Using data definitions proposed by Data Workgroup and <del>approved by in alignment with the BOG Workgroup on Metrics</del> <u>process for modifying data elements, for Online Education</u>, BOG staff will publish and maintain an inventory of SUS fully online and primarily online programs. The Inventory will be maintained on the BOG web site.</p> <p><b>May 2017:</b> FLVC will ensure consistency between the Board of Governors Inventory of Online Programs and the FLVC database.</p>	
<b>Affordability</b> <b>4.1.1</b>	Review and recommend revisions to current system-wide terms and definitions related to online education to ensure consistency and relevancy of data collection.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will review and recommend these revisions.</p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> <del>The Data Workgroup will and</del> present to the Implementation Committee <del>and the Steering Committee</del> for approval <u>at the June 2016 joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</u>.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will work with the BOG Workgroup on Metrics for Online Education to make recommendations official.</p>	

<b>Access</b>  <b>3.1.2</b>	<p>Ensure universities are using need and demand data when considering programs for online delivery.</p>	<p><b>December 2016:</b> The Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC to define and determine the availability of “need and demand data.” The Data Workgroup will obtain data on how SUS institutions are using “need and demand data” in planning programs online. A report with recommendations will be prepared.</p> <p><u><a href="#">January 2016: The Data Workgroup will present report to January 2016 joint meeting of for the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Further action steps will be discussed.</a></u></p>	
-----------------------------------	--	--	--

**Note: In addition to the responsibilities outlined above, the Data Workgroup will also have responsibility for compiling the data needed for the Performance Metrics dashboard and the annual Accountability Report.**

## TACTICS RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY AND STAFF

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>1.2.1</b>	Create a statewide professional development network for instructional designers in order to share best practices and provide guidance in designing and developing online education.	<p><del>May 2016: Professional Development Workgroup will make recommendation to Implementation Committee for approval by the Steering Committee. Such recommendations should address funding requirements, if any.</del> May 2016: <u>The Professional Development Workgroup will develop a plan for creating a statewide professional development network for instructional designers.</u></p> <p><u>June 2016: The Professional Development Workgroup will present its proposal for discussion and subsequent approval by the Steering Committee at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee in June 2016.</u></p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> Subject to approval by Steering Committee and <u>to the extent funding allows</u><del>availability of funding</del>, the recommendation will be implemented so that the professional development network for instructional designers will be operational by end of 2016.</p>	✓

<p><b>Quality</b> <b>1.2.2</b></p>	<p>Enhance professional development opportunities offered by FLVC for institutional leaders in online education.</p>	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Professional Development Workgroup will <del>make develop a recommendation to the Implementation Committee, for approval by Steering Committee,</del> on how FLVC can best assist in providing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education. Such recommendations should address funding requirements, if any.</p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> <u>The Professional Development Workgroup will present its recommendation for discussion and subsequent approval by the Steering Committee at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee in June 2016.</u></p> <p><b>December 2016</b> Subject to approval by the FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services <del>and, as well as the to the extent funding allows availability of any needed funding,</del> FLVC will implement recommendations for providing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders in online education <u>by the end of 2016.</u></p>	<p>✓</p>	
--	--	---	----------	--

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>1.2.2</b> <b>(cont.)</b>	Encourage faculty participation in professional development before teaching online. Consider certifying faculty to teach online.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Data Workgroup will coordinate with FLVC staff to determine processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach online.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> Based on report produced by the Data Workgroup on processes currently used for ensuring faculty are prepared to teach, the Professional Development <del>W</del>orkgroup will <del>make-develop</del> <u>Best Practices</u> recommendations.</p> <p><u>January 2017: Professional Development Workgroup will present report at the January 2017 joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. to Implementation Committee.</u> Upon approval, <del>Best Practices</del><u>recommendations</u> will be shared with all SUS institutions.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> Professional Development Workgroup will investigate different approaches for certifying faculty to teach online and will <del>make recommendation</del><u>develop recommendations.</u></p> <p><u>January 2017: Professional Development Workgroup will present recommendations at the January 2017 joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee for discussion and agreement on which to the Implementation Committee on which</u> approach(es) should be used if a SUS institution decides to certify faculty to teach online. <u>Further action steps will be discussed.</u></p>	✓



<b>Quality 1.2.3</b>	Provide an online toolkit and annual workshops for institutional staff who are responsible for professional development activities for faculty who teach online courses. The content will include, but not be limited to, designing courses that will comply with the American Disabilities Act.	<p><del>June 2017</del><b>March 2016:</b> Professional Development Workgroup made recommendation to CAVP, who agreed to fund recurring costs for four years after the first year startup. FLVC agreed to fund first year start-up, nonrecurring costs. T</p> <p><a href="#">Online tool kit will be available by June 2017. Annual workshops will commence academic year 2017-18. Toolkit will be available by June 30, 2017.</a></p>	✓
<b>Quality 1.2.4</b>	Integrate the Quality Matters Course Rubric, the Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard, and/or similar rubrics into the professional development processes for instructional designers, professional development staff, and faculty who teach online courses.	<p><b>June 2017:</b> Quality Workgroup will work with UCF to integrate the most commonly used rubrics by SUS institutions into the online tool kit.</p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> Quality Workgroup will work with UCF to integrate approved state-wide <del>rubrics</del><a href="#">quality certification system(s)</a> into professional development material, <a href="#">if such an approved system is approved.</a></p>	

## TACTICS RELATED TO UF ONLINE

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access 1.1.4</b>	Support the development and delivery of affordable, high quality, fully online baccalaureate degree programs by UF Online in accordance with section 1001.7065, Florida Statutes.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> The Implementation Committee and UF Online will work together in identifying the support needed to continue development of UF Online in the delivery of affordable, high quality, fully online baccalaureate degree programs.</p> <p><a href="#">June 2016: Recommendations will be presented at the joint June 2016 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for consideration by</a></p>	

|

|

		<a href="#">the Steering Committee.</a>	
--	--	---	--

## TACTICS RELATED TO CHANGING REGULATIONS

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access</b> <b>2.2.1</b>	Clarify that the requirement in the Board of Governors Regulation 6.016 for taking nine credit hours during the summer may be fulfilled by taking such courses online.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> BOG staff will obtain clarification and propose new wording of regulation to recognize availability of online courses.</p> <p><b>December-June 2016:</b> Upon approval by the Steering Committee <u>of new wording at the joint June 2016 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</u>, BOG staff will <u>initiate-complete</u> the standard institutional review process for the creation or modification of regulations.</p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>2.2.2</b>	Amend Board of Governors Regulation 7.006 to exclude enrollments in online degree programs from the limitation on the percentage of non-resident students in the system.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> BOG staff will propose new wording for regulation for approval by Implementation Committee and Steering Committee.</p> <p><b>December-June 2016:</b> Upon approval by the Steering Committee <u>of new wording at the joint June 2016 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</u>, BOG staff will <u>initiate-complete</u> the standard institutional review process for the creation or modification of regulations.</p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>2.2.3</b>	Provide flexibility for universities to eliminate the non-resident fee for online students who live out of state.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> BOG staff will conduct research on the flexibility to establish non-resident fees that is currently permitted by BOG regulations or state statute. As appropriate, BOG staff will propose revisions to regulations. <u>to be approved by Implementation Committee and Steering Committee.</u></p> <p><b>December-June 2016:</b> If changes are needed and upon approval by the Steering Committee <u>at the joint June 2016 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</u>, BOG staff will <u>initiate-complete</u> the standard institutional review process for the creation or modification of regulations.</p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>2.2.4</b>	Review and modify as necessary regulations related to instructional materials fees that limit the ability to adopt new approaches to providing digital educational materials to students.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> BOG staff will review regulations for consistency with statutes and Board policy and will propose new wording <u>for approval by Implementation Committee and Steering Committee.</u></p> <p><b>December-June 2016:</b> If changes are needed and upon approval by the Steering Committee <u>at the joint June 2016 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</u>, BOG staff will <u>initiate-complete</u> the standard institutional</p>	

|

		review process for the creation or modification of regulations.	
--	--	---	--

## TACTICS RELATED TO A COMMON LMS

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<i>Afford- ability</i> 1.2.5	Encourage institutions to opt into the selected common Learning Management System.	<b>May 2016:</b> Steering Committee is responsible for encouraging members of the CAVP to adopt common LMS.	✓

## TACTICS RELATED TO THE COST AND FINANCING OF ONLINE EDUCATION

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access</b> <b>2.1.1</b>	<del>Determine means to optimize use</del> Review the intent and use of the distance learning course fee to enhance the design, development, and delivery of online education.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Affordability Workgroup <u>will prepare a report on the intent and use of the distance learning fee.</u></p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> The Affordability Workgroup will present its report at the <u>joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in June 2016 for discussion.</u> <del>to make recommendations to the Implementation Committee, which will be discussed at June meeting.</del> During this meeting, future action steps will be <del>identified</del><u>discussed</u>.</p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> <del>Implementation Committee presents a plan to the Steering Committee.</del></p>	
<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>4.2.1</b>	Determine and define the elements that should be <del>captured for the</del> <u>included in a model for determining the distance learning fee.</u> Obtain and analyze data from institutions.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> Affordability Workgroup <u>will develop a preliminary model that includes the elements that need to be considered in determining the distance learning fee.</u></p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> The Affordability Workgroup will <del>presnt</del><u>present its preliminary model at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in June 2016 for discussion.</u> <del>to make recommendations to the Implementation Committee, which will be discussed at June meeting.</del> During this meeting, future action steps will be <del>identified</del><u>discussed</u>.</p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> <del>Implementation Committee presents a plan to the Steering Committee.</del></p>	

<p><b>Afford- ability</b></p> <p><b>4.2.2</b></p>	<p>Develop <del>models-proposals</del> to achieve cost savings and cost avoidances in the development and delivery of online education.</p>	<p><b>May-December 2016:</b> Affordability Workgroup, <u>working with the Online Programs Workgroup, to make recommendations will develop proposal(s) to achieve cost savings and cost avoidances in the development and delivery of online courses.</u></p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> <u>The Affordability Workgroup will present its proposal(s) for discussion at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in January 2017. to the Implementation Committee, which will be discussed at June meeting. During this meeting, future action steps will be identified.</u></p> <p><b>June 2016:</b> <u>Implementation Committee presents a plan to the Steering Committee.</u></p>	
---	---	---	--

## TACTICS RELATED TO COLLABORATIONS

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>2.1.1</b>	Create a statewide online education research consortium with members from Florida institutions interested in sharing and presenting research, determining research needs in online education, and identifying collaborative research projects.	<p><b>May 2016:</b> UF Online will lead the creation of the consortium. BOG staff will obtain membership names from provosts and FLVC.</p> <p><b>December 2016:</b> UF Online will host the first meeting of the consortium.</p>	
<b>Quality</b> <b>2.1.2</b>	Develop a process to share research-based best practices that are occurring across the different institutions.	<p><b>May-June 2017:</b> Online Education Research Consortium will recommend a process to the Implementation Committee <u>and Steering Committee</u> for <del>its</del> approval <u>at its joint June 2017 meeting.</u></p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.3</b>	<p>Increase 2 + 2 collaborations between SUS institutions and institutions in the Florida College System.</p> <p>Increase strategic collaborations between SUS institutions, as well as between SUS institutions and other universities, to meet the statewide goals for providing access to online instruction.</p>	<p><b>May 2017:</b> Online Programs Workgroup to <u>make develop</u> recommendations on the process for identifying and creating these collaborations, <u>to the Implementation Committee.</u></p> <p><u>June 2017: Online Programs Workgroup to present recommendations at the joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for discussion. Further action steps will be discussed.</u></p>	



## TACTICS RELATED TO INFRASTRUCTURE

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Quality</b> <b>2.2.1</b>	Using Quality Scorecard or a similar process, ensure that each institution has the technology needed to provide quality online education.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Data Workgroup surveys institutions to determine current processes used by SUS institutions for ensuring their respective institutions have the technology needed. Survey results provided to the Infrastructure Workgroup.</p> <p><b>May 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup <del>recommends to the Implementation Committee will develop recommendation for</del> the best process(es) for conducting technology reviews and the timeframe the reviews should be undertaken at each institution. <del>Institutional reviews begin after approval by the Steering Committee.</del></p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup presents recommendation at the joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval, institutional reviews begin.</p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup compiles results of institutional reviews, including the costs of additional resources needed.</p> <p><b>January 2018:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup <del>and</del> presents findings to the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee <u>at the joint January 2018 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee.</u></p>	✓
<b>Quality</b> <b>2.2.3</b>	Using Quality Scorecard or a similar process, ensure universities review their infrastructure to confirm that students, including students with disabilities, can easily access their online instruction.	<p><b>May 2017:</b> The Infrastructure Workgroup will <del>recommend-develop recommendations for the</del> best process(es) for conducting the review and the timeframe the reviews should be undertaken. <del>Workgroup will make recommendations to the Implementation Committee to carry forward to the Steering Committee.</del></p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup will present recommendation at the joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval, institutional reviews begin.</p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup will compile results of institutional reviews.</p> <p><b>January 2018:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup will present results for discussion at the joint January 2018 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. <del>Further action steps will be discussed, and provide report to be discussed at the summer meeting of the Implementation Committee.</del></p>	✓


<b>Quality</b> <b>2.2.2</b>	Develop a structure to facilitate collaboration system-wide in evaluating, recommending, and purchasing software to ensure cost efficiencies and effectiveness.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> The Infrastructure Workgroup to work with the Board's Director of Shared Services and FLVC staff to facilitate collaboration.</p> <p><b>May-June 2017:</b> <u>The Infrastructure</u> Workgroup will report findings/recommendations <u>at the joint June 2017 meeting of the</u> Implementation Committee <u>and to carry forward to</u> the Steering Committee. <u>Further action steps will be discussed.</u></p>	
--------------------------------	---	--	--

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>1.1.1</b>	Expand the online marketplace to enhance current shared services using statewide buying power and building economy-of-scale drivers. Develop Florida SHINEs as a point of contact for students at all levels, including students with disabilities, to gain access to vital services, including financial aid, scholarships, and library resources.	<p><del>December 2016</del><b>January 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup to work with FLVC staff to make recommendations to <u>joint January 2017 meeting of the</u> Implementation Committee <u>and the Steering Committee.</u></p>	✓
<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>1.1.2</b>	Explore additional items for potential sharing to expand the quality of the student online learning experience while reducing costs through efficiency, such as a Proctoring Network, Tutoring Network, and expansion of Florida Orange Grove shared resources.	<p><u>January 2017: Infrastructure Workgroup to work with FLVC staff to make recommendations to joint January 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee.</u><del>December 2016: Infrastructure Workgroup to work with FLVC staff to make recommendations to Implementation Committee.</del></p>	

<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>1.2.4</b>	Develop means to collect data from learning management systems, student information systems, and other appropriate sources to create predictive analytics tools and interventions to increase student persistence and completion.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup will review capabilities of LMS and other systems currently in use <del>to collect such data and share results and recommendations with the Implementation Committee and make recommendations.</del></p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup to make recommendations to joint January 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Further action steps to be defined.</p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.7</b>	Provide multiple, accelerated terms to allow students to begin and finish their online programs in a more timely manner. Address technology, workflow, and financial aid processes to allow implementation of these models.	<p><b>May 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup to survey SUS institutions to determine availability of multiple, accelerated terms. Identify the technology and processes that need to be altered. <del>Provide report with recommendations to the Implementation Committee</del>Develop report. at its June 2017 meeting. Present the report to the Steering Committee.</p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup to make recommendations to joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Further action steps to be discussed.</p>	

## TACTICS RELATED TO SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
-------------	--------------------	----------------------------	--

<b>Quality</b> <b>2.3.1</b>	<p>Ensure that universities use Quality Scorecard or a similar process to confirm that online students, including online students with disabilities, have access to services equivalent to those used by campus-based students.</p>	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Student Services Workgroup, in conjunction with the FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, will <del>recommend to the Implementation Committee</del> <u>develop recommendations for</u> best practices for confirming all online students have access to services equivalent to those used by campus-based students. The Workgroup will also recommend the timeframe in which the confirmation should occur. <del>Institutional reviews begin.</del></p> <p><u>January 2017: Student Services Workgroup present recommendations to the joint January 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval, institutional reviews will begin.</u></p> <p><b>May 2017:</b> Upon approval of <u>the proposed</u> process <del>by Implementation Committee</del>, the Student Services Workgroup will conduct an assessment of each SUS institution and <del>provide report to the Implementation Committee who will forward to the Steering Committee</del> <u>compile results, etc.</u> <del>The Student Services Workgroup will compile the results of institutional reviews and provide a report to the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee.</del></p> <p><u>June 2017: The Student Services Workgroup will present the results of institutional reviews and provide a report to the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee at its joint June 2017 meeting. Further action steps will be discussed.</u></p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.6</b>	<p>Retain fully online students by implementing best practice strategies such as academic coaches, success coaches, analytics, and early alert interventions.</p>	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Student Services Workgroup, in conjunction with the Innovation Institute at UWF and FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, will review and confirm best practices. Student Services Workgroup will prepare a report detailing best practices to be shared with SUS Institutions.</p>	
<b>Affordability</b> <b>1.2.3</b>	<p>Review and recommend data analytic tools and methods to predict student success in online education.</p>	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Infrastructure Workgroup will review and evaluate current data analytic tools and methods on the market and provide information on which data analytic tools and methods are being used by each SUS institution.</p> <p><u>January 2017:</u> A report will be delivered to the Implementation Committee <u>and the Steering Committee</u> for its discussion <del>in at</del> its January 2017 meeting. <u>Further action steps will be discussed.</u></p>	

<b>Access</b> <b>2.1.4</b>	Secure student support resources to ensure students have access to technology required for online education.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Student Services Workgroup, in conjunction with FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, will make recommendation on resources needed – and their respective <a href="#">costs, costs – to the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee.</a></p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> <a href="#">A report will be delivered to the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for its discussion at its January 2017 meeting. Future action steps will be identified.</a></p>	✓
-------------------------------	--	--	---

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.8</b>	Provide a robust set of student support services to support the delivery of multiple, accelerated models.	<p><b>December 2017:</b> Based on report created by the Infrastructure Workgroup describing processes used by SUS institutions that have implemented multiple, accelerated terms, the Student Services Workgroup will <a href="#">develop</a> <del>recommendations concerning to the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</del> the student support services needed to support this new delivery method, as well as their costs.</p> <p><b>January 2018:</b> <a href="#">The Student Services Workgroup will present its recommendations to the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for its discussion at its January 2018 meeting. Future action steps will be discussed.</a></p>	✓

## TACTICS FOR PROGRAM/COURSE DEVELOPMENT

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access</b> <b>1.1.2</b>	Offer a broad range of fully online degree programs in most Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes reflected in the Board of Governors Approved Academic Program.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup to review current offerings of fully online degree programs by CIP codes and make recommendations to address gaps in providing a broad range of degree programs online.</p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will present recommendations presented to the Steering Committee and the Implementation Committee in its joint January 2017 meeting. <del>Upon approval, recommendations sent to Steering Committee for their approval.</del> After approval by the Steering Committee, the recommendations are sent to the CAVP.</p>	✓
<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>1.2.2</b>	<p>Develop or co-develop shared master courses that would be available, but not required, for use in specific high-demand areas.</p> <p>The Florida Orange Grove could be refined for master course availability throughout the state. With additional standards around the best-case use of a master course, the Florida Orange Grove could be a shared resource for all Florida institutions to exchange content.</p>	<p><b>May 2017:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <u>develop a proposal for funding, selecting, developing and delivering master courses.</u> <del>submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for funding, developing, and delivering master courses.</del></p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> <u>The Online Programs Workgroup will present its proposal for discussion and subsequent approval by the Steering Committee at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and Steering Committee in June 2017.</u> Upon approval, <u>implementation of the proposal will begin to the extent funding allows.</u> <del>by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, implement the proposal.</del></p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> Master course(s) will <u>begin being</u> available.</p>	✓

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Affordability</b> <b>3.1.1</b>	Develop or co-develop shared programs that would be available, but not required, for use in areas of high demand while maintaining quality and increasing efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.	<p><b>May 2017:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <del>submit to the Implementation Committee</del><u>develop</u> a plan for how shared programs could be funded, developed, and delivered.</p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> <u>Online Programs Workgroup will present the plan for discussion at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee.</u> Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and <del>with available funding</del><u>to the extent that funding allows, begin to pilot the plan.</u></p> <p><b>December 2017:</b> First shared program <del>would will</del> be available <u>to the extent funding allows.</u></p>	✓
<b>Affordability</b> <b>3.1.2</b>	Develop or co-develop competency-based and adaptive learning programs that would be available, but not required, for use in appropriate areas of high demand, primarily around adults and workforce needs, while maintaining quality and increasing efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.	<p><b>May 2017 :</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <del>submit to the Implementation Committee</del><u>develop</u> a plan for how competency-based and adaptive learning programs could be funded, developed/co-developed, and delivered.</p> <p><del>December-June 2017:</del> <u>Online Programs Workgroup will present the plan for discussion at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee.</u> Upon approval <del>by the Steering Committee, by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, pilot the plan.</del><u>begin to pilot the plan to the extent funding allows.</u></p> <p><u>December 2017: First competency-based and/or adaptive learning program(s) will be available to the extent funding allows.</u></p>	✓

<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>2.1.1</b>	Determine and promote methods to increase the use of open-access textbook and educational resources to reduce costs to students.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <u>submit to the Implementation Committee prepare</u> a plan for increasing the use of open-access textbooks and educational resources.</p> <p><u>January 2017: Online Programs Workgroup will present the plan for discussion at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Upon approval by the Steering Committee, begin to pilot the plan to the extent funding allows.</u></p> <p><u>June 2017:</u></p> <p><del>May 2017:</del> Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and with available funding, pilot the plan.</p> <p><del>December 2017:</del> Online Program Workgroup will review the results of the pilot program and report to the Implementation Committee <u>and the Steering Committee in at its joint June-January 2018</u> meeting.</p>	✓
---------------------------------------	--	---	---

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Afford-ability</b> <b>2.1.2</b>	Reduce the costs of eTextbooks for students through mechanisms that could include negotiating lower pricing with vendors and providing an enhanced repository for educational material.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will research such mechanisms, including opportunities within the new Unizin consortium.</p> <p><u>January 2017: Online Program Workgroup will discuss report, and submit to the Implementation Committee information on how a university could use these mechanism with the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee at its joint January 2017 meeting. Further action steps will be discussed.s. Report will be distributed to SUS institutions.</u></p>	
<b>Access</b> <b>2.1.3</b>	Seek incentive funding to encourage institutions to implement innovations in online education.	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <u>develop proposals submit to the Implementation Committee a proposal for innovative projects along with ideas for incentive funding.</u></p> <p><u>January 2017: Online Programs Workgroup will present proposal to the joint January 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for</u></p>	✓



		<p><a href="#">discussion.</a></p> <p><del>May 2017:</del> Upon approval by <del>Implementation Committee and</del> the Steering Committee and <del>with available funding</del> to the extent that funding is available, <del>implement the proposal.</del> <a href="#">begin to explore ideas on obtaining funding.</a></p> <p><b>June 2017:</b> <a href="#">Online Program Workgroup will review the results of these efforts at the joint June 2017 Implementation Committee and Steering Committee meeting.</a></p>	
<b>Afford-ability</b>  <b>3.1.4</b>	<p>Develop a series of experimental incubation pilot projects to support new and emerging online education innovations through institutional partnerships, lead institution, or other methods to support collaboration with the purpose of building affordable, innovative approaches and models that work.</p>	<p><b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <a href="#">submit to the Implementation Committee</a> <del>prepare</del> a proposal for experimental incubation pilot projects.</p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> <a href="#">Online Programs Workgroup will present the proposal for discussion at the joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee in January 2017. Upon approval by the Steering Committee, begin to pilot the proposed project(s) to the extent funding allows.</a></p> <p><del>May 2017:</del> Upon approval by <del>Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee</del> and <del>with available funding</del>, <del>implement the proposal.</del> <b>June 2017:</b> <a href="#">Projects will be pursued to the extent funding allows. Online Program Workgroup will review the results of the pilot projects and report to the Implementation Committee in its September 2017 meeting.</a></p>	✓

**TACTIC  
CODE**

**TACTIC DESCRIPTION**

**ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES**

**IMPLEMENTATION:  
POTENTIAL FUNDING  
IMPACT**

<b>Access</b> <b>3.1.1</b>	Encourage universities to work with employers in their respective regions to identify unmet continuing education needs that could be addressed through online opportunities and collaborate with colleges to develop those opportunities in an efficient and effective manner.	<del>May-December</del> <b>2016:</b> University liaisons will be asked to share this request with academic units in their institutions.	
<b>Affordability</b> <b>3.1.3</b>	Implement a model to assess prior learning for the award of academic credit.	<b>December 2016:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will <del>present</del> develop a model for assessing prior learning <del>to the Implementation Committee at its January meeting.</del> <b>January 2017:</b> Online Programs Workgroup will present a model for assessing prior learning to the Implementation Committee at its January meeting. Further action steps will be discussed.	✓

## TACTICS FOR THE MARKETING OF ONLINE PROGRAMS

TACTIC CODE	TACTIC DESCRIPTION	ACTION STEPS AND DUE DATES	IMPLEMENTATION: POTENTIAL FUNDING IMPACT
<b>Access 2.1.2</b>	Obtain funding for statewide marketing and recruiting to expand online enrollments.	<p><del>May-December 2016:</del> FLVC staff will present to the Implementation Committee <del>a plan for their</del> statewide marketing <del>of online programs and recruiting plans for online education.</del></p> <p><b>January 2017:</b> <del>The If additional efforts are required, the</del> Implementation Committee, <del>in collaboration with FLVC staff and institutional marketing staff,</del> will present <del>this a</del> plan, with funding requirements, to the Steering Committee for consideration and direction.</p>	✓
<b>Access 1.1.5</b>	Provide a statewide marketing campaign to build awareness for fully online degree programs and courses offered throughout the state by the SUS and the Florida College System.	<p><b>May 2017:</b> Marketing campaign approved by Steering Committee in Access Tactic 2.1.2 launched, <del>to the extent funding allows</del> <del>subject to availability of funds.</del></p>	✓