STATE
UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM
of FLORIDA
Board of Governors

AGENDA
Steering Committees
for Implementation of the *2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education*
Innovation, Science and Technology Building, First Floor Conference Room
Florida Polytechnic University
Lakeland, Florida
January 25, 2017
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

1. **Call to Order and Opening Remarks**   Dr. Joe Glover, Chair

2. **Action Items**   **Dr. Glover**
   a. **Quality Workgroup**   Dr. Len Roberson, UNF
      i.   **Quality Course Review**
      ii. **Quality Course Designation**
   b. **Online Programs and Courses**   Dr. Andy McCollough, UF
      i.   **Inventory and Gaps:**   Mr. Mike Ronco, UF
            Fully Online Undergraduate Programs
      ii. **Shared Programs/Courses**   Dr. McCollough
      iii. **Open Access Textbooks and Resources**   Dr. Jennifer Smith, UF
            a) **Increasing Usage**
            b) **Reducing Costs**
      iv. **Innovation in Florida Online Learning**   Dr. Tom Cavanagh, UCF
   c. **Infrastructure**   Mr. Joseph Riquelme, FIU
      i.   **Facilitating Collaboration**
      ii. **Proctoring Network**
   d. **Student Services: Ensuring Access to Services**   Dr. Vicki Brown, FAU
   e. **Student Services: Securing Resources**   Dr. Brown
   f. **Professional Development: Certification**   Dr. Cindy DeLuca, USF

3. **Item for Direction:**
   a. **Continuing Education Needs**   Dr. McCollough
   b. **Inventory and Gaps: Fully Online Graduate Programs**   Mr. Ronco

4. **Items for Information**   **Dr. DeLuca**
   a. **Instructional Designer Network**
   b. **Professional Development for Online Leaders**
   c. **Online Education Research Consortium**
   d. **Date Changes for Deliverables**
   e. **Workgroup Memberships**

5. **Concluding Remarks and Adjournment**   **Chair Glover**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education**
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Quality Course Review

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Quality 1.1.3 - Ensure implementation of Quality Scorecard, Quality Matters Course Rubric, and/or course certification processes for all universities offering online education.

Deliverable, December 2016: The Quality Workgroup will prepare 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 quality certification system with its own rubric, or the approval of a set of 3rd party quality certification systems with associated rubrics that have been shown to be equivalent in terms of measuring quality.

Recommendation(s):

(1) In an effort to identify both quality and high-quality online courses across the State University System of Florida, it is recommended that a course review process be established with two levels of recognition: quality and high-quality. The course review process will make use of the Quality Matters standards, higher education rubric, and process as the basis of the overall review. The QM standards and rubric focuses on the design of the online course and not the content or the delivery. Both review processes will use the MyQM portal of Quality Matters and the MyCR tool (the course review tool) and will be at the course section level (i.e., not a master course but for each section

or instructor). Submission of courses for review will be voluntary.

Quality and High Quality Courses

To receive a **Quality Course** designation, a course must successfully complete a QM *Internal Course Review* process, and satisfy all of the *Essential* standards (currently, there are 21) as identified in *The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition, 2014*. This will be referred to as the **Florida QM Fundamentals Course Review** and is a baseline review conducted by the instructor and one additional reviewer, who has been trained as a QM reviewer. Courses that are successful in meeting all of the *essential* standards have measurable objectives aligned with assessments and are presented in an organized and consistent format. The courses that satisfy all of the *essential* standards will be considered Quality Courses and will be designated as such in the FLVC catalog.

To receive a **High Quality Course** designation, a course must successfully pass an *Official QM Course Review* using the Quality Matters standards, as identified in *The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition, 2014*, in either a QM-managed or Subscriber-Managed official course review, as described by Quality Matters. This review process will use the Quality Matters standards, rubric, and scoring criteria (e.g., all essential, 3 point standards must be met **and** an overall point value of at least 84 out of 99 points).

(2) It is recommended that, because some institutions may have a quality course review process that they developed and would like to use, a formal process be developed by which institutions may elect to provide evidence that their internal quality review system is based on a documentable set of standards, is of comparable rigor, and adheres to a similar review process as those outlined above. In so doing, an institution's specific quality review standards and process could be approved to also meet the quality and/or high quality designation.

(3) It is recommended that, as part of the Quality course review process, one or more course design templates be developed and shared system-wide for faculty to use, at their discretion, in the design of their online courses. The course design templates will be developed based on the QM Standards and when used will satisfy a significant number of the standards. In addition, use of course design templates provide key aspects of effective practices such as consistent navigation, organization, and student usability. The course design templates will be developed by a cross-institutional team and shared throughout the system. Additional benefits of using course design templates include saving development time on behalf of the faculty, and allowing for easy reuse of key elements of design and development.

(4) It is recommended that a statewide, shared service agreement be negotiated and obtained for a system subscription to Quality Matters. It is also recommended that FLVC be the system centralized agency to manage the QM subscription.

Supporting Documentation Included:
*The hyperlinks below connect to each document.

1. The Principles of QM
2. QM Standards, Fifth Edition
3. QM Course Review Process

Facilitators/Presenters: **Len Roberson**

SUBJECT: Quality Course Designation in FLVC Catalog

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Quality 1.1.2 - Create a coding system in the Florida Virtual Campus course catalog that allows the identification of QM- or QS-certified, President's Award, Florida's Quality Award, and Chancellor's Quality Award courses.

Deliverable, December 2016: The Quality Workgroup will develop a recommendation for a coding structure for quality and high quality courses to FLVC staff for implementation. Coding plan should accommodate existing quality certification systems that have been selected for statewide use as well as a SUS-specific quality certification system when and if such a system is developed.

Recommendation(s):

(1) It is recommended that the "More Detail" section of the course description for each course in the FLVC catalog be modified to include a descriptive statement and possibly an appropriate logo/graphic (e.g., a unique seal or logo be developed for each designation) that identifies courses determined to be quality and/or high quality courses in accordance with the Florida Quality Course Review process to be developed as part of Tactic 1.1.3. The designation would be displayed for all courses identified by institutions as having met the criteria for Quality or High Quality courses as set out in the final process related to tactic 1.1.3. A standard statement or key would be provided to explain the designation and the review process.

   According to the proposal for tactic 1.1.3, the following describe the two categories:

To receive a **Quality Course** designation, a course must successfully complete a QM *Internal Course Review* process, and satisfy all of the *Essential* standards (currently, there are 21) as identified in *The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition, 2014*. This will be referred to as the **Florida QM Fundamentals Course Review** and is a baseline review conducted by the instructor and one additional reviewer, who has been trained as a QM reviewer. Courses that are successful in meeting all of the *essential* standards have measurable objectives aligned with assessments and are presented in an organized and consistent format. The courses that satisfy all of the *essential* standards will be considered Quality Courses and will be designated as such in the FLVC catalog.

To receive a **High Quality Course** designation, a course must successfully pass an *Official QM Course Review* using the Quality Matters standards, as identified in *The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition, 2014*, in either a QM-managed or Subscriber-Managed official course review, as described by Quality Matters. This review process will use the Quality Matters standards, rubric, and scoring criteria (e.g., all essential, 3 point standards must be met **and** an overall point value of at least 84 out of 99 points).

(2) It is recommended that, in addition to the designation identified above, the FLVC staff revise the information collection process to include the opportunity for institutions to include in the submission of course data for the catalog courses that have been reviewed and identified as either Quality or High Quality courses and modify the filtering functions of the catalog to enable students to filter courses by courses with one of the quality rankings.

Supporting Documentation Included:　　　　**None**

Facilitators/Presenters:　　　　**Len Roberson**

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Fully Online Undergraduate Programs

_____

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Access 1.1.2 (Part I – Undergraduate) - 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.

Recommendation(s):

(1) Create "Fully Online" baccalaureate degree programs to address the 8 "Primary Gaps" as identified in the gap analysis. [1]

(2) Create additional "Fully Online" baccalaureate degree programs to provide additional capacity for the 11 "Secondary Gaps" as identified in the gap analysis. [2]

(3) Explore the possibility of converting the 2 existing "Primarily Online" undergraduate programs to "Fully Online" programs. [1]

(4) Explore the possibility of converting the 11 existing "Fully Online Upper Level" undergraduate programs to "Fully Online" programs for all four years. [2]

(5) Target the 12 STEM programs and 1 language program for "Fully Online" bachelors' degrees. Technical hurdles will need to be overcome to successfully deliver these online

for all four years. [1]

[1] Universities offering these programs on campus should determine the feasibility of offering them online.
[2] Institutions listed should determine the feasibility of expanding the identified programs to be fully online.

Supporting Documentation Included:
See attachments:

- *CIP Code Gaps*
- *Data Definitions.xlsx*
- *Gap_Analysis_Undergraduate_SUMMARY.docx*

- *Note: This "SUMMARY" document includes only the identified gap recommendations and the basic methodology. Full SUS and FCS Inventories and Gap Analysis documentation is available at http://tnt.aa.ufl.edu/sus-online-inventory.aspx.*

Facilitators/Presenters: Mike Ronco, University of Florida

SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Program CIP Code Gaps

The high priority gaps represent a subset of the following 208 CIP code primary gaps identified by comparing SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Degree offerings with 227 CIP codes currently identified by the State University System as having "Strategic Emphasis". The strategic emphasis designation was used to reduce the pool of 1,839 CIP 2010 codes to a more reasonable number for review.

Fully Online Undergraduate Programs	Distinct Count	Distinct Count Strategic Emphasis
ALL Possible CIP 2010 Codes	1,839	227
CIPs without SUS Fully Online Undergrad Degree	1,795	**208**
CIPs with SUS Fully Online Baccalaureate Degree	44	19
SUS Fully Online Undergrad Degrees Programs	52	24
FCS Fully Online Undergrad Degrees Programs	51	18
CIPs with Fully Online Baccalaureate Only in FCS	7	7

SUS Fully Online Graduate Program CIP Code Gaps

The high priority gaps represent a subset of the following 169 CIP code primary gaps identified by comparing SUS Fully Online Graduate Degree offerings with 227 CIP codes currently identified by the State University System as having "Strategic Emphasis". The strategic emphasis designation was used to reduce the pool of 1,839 CIP 2010 codes to a more reasonable number for review.

SUS Graduate Summary	Distinct Count	Distinct Count Strategic Emphasis
ALL Possible CIP 2010 Codes	1,839	227
CIPs without Fully Online Graduate Degree	1,759	**169**
CIPs with Fully Online Graduate Degree	80	58
Fully Online Graduate Degrees Programs	148	102

Note: To identify CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) gaps, the SUS Online Program Inventory data was cross-referenced with and validated against the CIP 2010 listing, the Approved Program Inventory as well as *Programs of Strategic Emphasis Effective Fall 2014 (by CIP)* document.

Tactic 1.1.2 – Current Online Offerings and Gaps

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." *Note:* While the original assignment did not specify distinct undergraduate and graduate listings, reporting these programs separately provides a clearer picture of online activity.

Access *1.1.2*	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.	**December 2016:** 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. Recommendations presented to Implementation Committee in its January meeting. Upon approval, recommendations sent to Steering Committee for their approval. After approval by the Steering Committee, the recommendations are sent to the CAVP.

Gaps in State University System Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Programs by CIP Code

The following gaps have been identified as being the highest priority for Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Programs.

PRIMARY GAPS – No Fully online offering currently in the SUS under this CIP code and major.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
01.1001 Food Science	Food Science	Bach.	STEM	N/A
09.0702 Digital Communication and Medi …	Digital Communication and Multimedia	Bach.	STEM	N/A
09.0900 Public Relations, Advertising, and …	Public Relations and Advertising	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	N/A
14.0901 Computer Engineering, General.	Computer Engineering	Bach.	STEM	N/A
27.0101 Mathematics, General.	Mathematics	Bach.	STEM	N/A
27.0301 Applied Mathematics, General.	Applied Mathematics	Bach.	STEM	N/A
27.0501 Statistics, General.	Statistics	Bach.	STEM	N/A
52.0803 Banking and Financial Support …	Financial Services	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	N/A

SECONDARY GAPS – Fully online offering in the system under this or another closely related CIP but there may be additional capacity.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
03.0103 Environmental Studies.	Sustainability and the Environment	Bach.	STEM	FIU
05.0107 Latin American Studies.	Latin American Studies	Bach.	GLOBAL	UCF
11.0101 Computer and Information Scien …	Computer Science	Bach.	STEM	UF
13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, …	Exceptional Student Education-Elem-ESOL-Reading	Bach.	EDUCATION	UWF; IRSC
13.1311 Mathematics Teacher Education.	Mathematics Teacher Education	Bach.	EDUCATION	IRSC, SPC
13.1316 Science Teacher Education/Gene …	Science Teacher Education	Bach.	EDUCATION	SPC
26.0101 Biology/Biological Sciences, General.	Biology	Bach.	STEM	UF, SPC
52.0801 Finance, General.	Finance	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	FIU
52.1001 Human Resources Management/	Human Resource Management Personnel Administration, General.	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	FIU
52.1101 International Business/Trade/Co …	International Business	Bach.	GLOBAL	FIU
52.1201 Management Information Systems …	Logistics and Supply Chain Management	Bach.	STEM	FIU, SPC

PRIMARILY ONLINE PROGRAMS - Explore the possibility of expanding these Primarily Online Programs to Fully Online Programs.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
09.0101 Speech Communication and Rheto …	Human Communication	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	UCF
26.0908 Exercise Physiology.	Applied Physiology and Kinesiology	Bach.	STEM	UF

FULLY ONLINE UPPER LEVEL - Explore expanding these degrees with Fully Online Upper Level offerings to Fully Online Four Year offerings.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
11.0101 Computer and Information Scien …	Computer Science	Bach.	STEM	FSU
11.0103 Information Technology.	Information Studies	Bach.	STEM	USF
11.0103 Information Technology.	Information Technology	Bach.	STEM	USF
26.0503 Medical Microbiology and Bacte …	Microbiology and Cell Science	Bach.	STEM	UF
43.0107 Criminal Justice/Police Science.	Law Enforcement Operations	Bach.	No Strategic Emphasis	FSU
50.0102 Digital Arts.	Digital Arts and Sciences	Bach.	STEM	UF
51.0000 Health Services/Allied Health/ …	Health Science	Bach.	HEALTH	FGCU

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
51.0201 Communication Sciences and Dis …	Communication Sciences & Disorders	Bach.	HEALTH	USF
51.0204 Audiology/Audiologist and Spee …	Communication Sciences and Disorders	Bach.	HEALTH	UF
51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered …	Nursing	Bach.	HEALTH	FAU; FIU; UF; UNF
52.0301 Accounting.	Accounting	Bach.	GAP ANALYSIS	FAU

*Note: 50.0102: The Digital Arts program could also be placed under the following "Delivery Challenges" category.

*Note: 51.0000: UWF offers four Fully Online Baccalaureate degrees under this CIP code.

*Note: 51.3801: UCF, UWF, CC, FSSC, NFSC, PBSC, PSC, IRSC, and PHSC offer Fully Online Baccalaureate degrees under this CIP code.

*Note: There are a number of other programs which offer fully online upper level courses that were not included because they did not fit into one of the strategic emphasis categories.

DELIVERY CHALLENGES - Gaps which may require innovative approaches to overcome online delivery challenges. For example, STEM labs.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
14.0801 Civil Engineering, General.	Civil Engineering	Bach.	STEM	N/A
14.1001 Electrical and Electronics Engineering	Electrical Engineering	Bach.	STEM	N/A
14.1901 Mechanical Engineering.	Mechanical Engineering	Bach.	STEM	N/A
14.3501 Industrial Engineering.	Industrial Engineering	Bach.	STEM	N/A
16.0905 Spanish Language and Literature.	Spanish Language and Literature	Bach.	GLOBAL	N/A
26.0301 Botany/Plant Biology.	Botany	Bach.	STEM	N/A
26.0701 Zoology/Animal Biology.	Zoology	Bach.	STEM	N/A
31.0505 Kinesiology and Exercise Science.	Kinesiology	Bach.	STEM	N/A
40.0501 Chemistry, General.	Chemistry	Bach.	STEM	N/A
40.0801 Physics, General.	Physics	Bach.	STEM	N/A
43.0106 Forensic Science and Technology.	Forensic Science	Bach.	STEM	N/A
50.0409 Graphic Design.	Graphic Design	Bach.	STEM	N/A

Methodology - SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Inventory

The **SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Inventory** is a subset of a larger **SUS Online Program Inventory**. The complete inventory was compiled using the survey responses received from each of the SUS institutions in 2015. The Online Program Survey data for all SUS institutions was merged into a single data source. Rows with concentrations or specializations were identified and consolidated so as to represent the agreed upon definition of an Online Degree Program being an "Online Major". Only degree programs reported as being fully online for all four years were included in this undergraduate inventory.

The SUS Online Program Inventory data was cross-referenced with and validated against the CIP 2010 listing, the Approved Program Inventory as well as *Programs of Strategic Emphasis Effective Fall 2014 (by CIP)* document. In addition to the Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Programs, inventories at both the graduate and undergraduate level are able to be generated for Primarily Online Degrees, Fully Online Certificates, Primarily Online Certificates, and Fully Online Upper Level Undergraduate Degrees.

Note: The Florida College System Online Program Inventory is being maintained separately from the SUS Online Program Inventory. Both inventories will be made available for review.

Methodology - SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Gap Analysis

Tactic 1.1.2 required gaps to be identified at the CIP code level. Since there are roughly two thousand CIP codes in the CIP 2010 listing, there needed to be a way to reduce the list down to a more manageable number. Fortunately, the SUS has identified 227 codes as currently having strategic emphasis. This subset was used as the starting point for the gap analysis.

Primary Gaps: The SUS Fully Online Undergraduate Degree Inventory was compared to the strategic emphasis CIP list and it was found that 208 CIP codes did not have a corresponding program. For the purpose of this report, CIP codes with no offering are labelled as "primary gaps". The primary gap list was reduced to a priority listing and majors were specified based upon the institutional knowledge of several members of the workgroup.

Secondary Gaps: Some CIP codes may not appear on the primary gap listing but may require expansion due to the need for extra capacity or additional majors. These are being termed "secondary gaps" and were identified by members of the workgroup reviewing the existing inventory.

Primarily Online and Fully Online Upper Level Programs: A number of programs across the system already exist as Primarily Online Undergraduate Degrees or Fully Online Upper Level Undergraduate Degrees. A listing of these has been provided with the suggestion that some may be good candidates to become Fully Online Undergraduate Degree programs.

Primary Gaps with Challenges: The final listing of gaps represent those which may require innovative approaches to overcome online delivery challenges. For example, STEM programs with labs and foreign language programs with spoken language requirements.

Note: The Florida College System Online Program Inventory was used to modify the identified gaps in the final step of this gap analysis.
Note: See http://tnt.aa.ufl.edu/sus-online-inventory.aspx for complete online program inventories and CIP code gap listings.

Data Definitions

		Current Definitions for Delivery Method	
Excel Code	**Description**		**Definition**
AD	**Full Distance Learning Course**		100% of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space, or both. All special course components (exams, internships, practica, clinicals, labs, etc) that cannot be completed online can be completed off-campus.
PD	**Primarily Distance Learning Course**		80-99% of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space, or both. There is a requirement for the student to attend campus or another explicit geographic location for a portion of the course.
HB	**Hybrid Course**		50-79% of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space or both.
CL	**Primarily Classroom Course**		Less than 50% of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space or both. This designation can include activities that do not occur in a classroom (ie, labs, internships, practica, clinicals, labs, etc).

	Description	**Definition**
	Fully Online Program	100% of the direct instruction of the program is available using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space or both. All program requirements that cannot be completed online can be completed off-campus.
	Primarily Online Program	80% - 99% of the direct instruction of the program is available using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time, space or both. There is a requirement for the student to attend campus or another explicit geographic location for a portion of the program.
	Degree Program	A program is uniquely identified by the CIP code and the degree level. A program may have multiple tracks, majors, and areas of concentration. A program may have multiple degree titles.
	Online Program	For the purpose of these inventories and gap analyses "online program" was interpreted to mean a program major. That is a major under a program, which is available online to some degree. The academic inventory reflects only degree programs, not program majors. In many instances, some majors within a degree program are available online, but not other majors within that program. If the online programs inventory did not specify which majors were available online, it would be misleading to students and to institutions interested in filling gaps.
	Online Degree Program	For this report: The unique combination CIP code, level, and major.
	Online Certificate Program	For this report: The unique combination of CIP code, level, and certificate name.

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Shared Programs/Courses

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactics:

Affordability 1.2.2: Develop or co-develop shared master courses that would be available, but not required, for use in specific high-demand areas.

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.

Affordability 3.1.1: 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.

Recommendations:

(1) Master Courses (Affordability 1.2.2)

Recommendations:
1) The Committee will propose to the Board's Innovation and Online Committee a University to establish, maintain, and manage a Repository for the State General Education Core (SGEC) courses.
2) The materials in the Repository will be available to all SUS institutions for use in their local curriculum. The adopting institutions will have searchable access to full courses, modules, videos, and/or other ancillary materials to establish, supplement or enrich the resident course in the SGEC.
3)   Establish a faculty oversight committee with system-wide membership to maintain oversight to assure quality and accessibility.
4)   This collection of "master" courses will be available on an "opt-in" basis.

Institutions may use entire courses or faculty may use any part of a SGEC course to supplement, replace, or enrich his/her lesson plan. The goal of the plan is not to standardize course content, but rather to provide access to high quality content that can be used to supplement and/or fill course gaps in their General Education program.

5) Provide/recommend provision of appropriate resources with an ROI metric to build and maintain this collection of courses which will converge on "Master" over time.

(2) Shared Programs (Affordability 3.1.1)

Recommendations:

1) Establish a complete portfolio of General Education Master Courses that constitute the State General Education Core (program).

2) Authorize a Shared Degree Program Task Force with appropriate SUS representation. This task force would be charged with considering a variety of models, including Georgia's eCore and eMajor programs, as possible models for SUS Shared Programs. This task force will be assigned a time limited task, "Provide a recommendations for the Steering Committee as to the viability of such models for the Shared Programs tactics." The report should include implementations details and relevant cost and cost/benefit estimates.

Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Andy McCollough

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Increasing Usage of Open-access Textbooks and Educational Resources.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Affordability Tactic 2.1.1: Determine and promote methods to increase the use of open-access textbook and educational resources to reduce costs to students. (NOTE: These recommendations also support Tactic 2.1.2)

Recommendation(s):

1) Improve adoption of existing OER/eText material through the selection and implementation of an OER/eText catalog tool.

2) Implement state-wide PR and marketing efforts to increase faculty awareness as well as coordinate usage, training, and technical support.

3) Develop and implement a process to fund, create and vet new OER.

4) Select and implement a repository tool to support sharing and adoption of new OER.

Supporting Documentation Included: Supporting Documentation Tactic 2.1.1

Facilitators/Presenters: Jennifer Smith, University of Florida

(1) Establish a state-wide steering committee to determine how best to leverage OER repositories available through SUS libraries, Unizin, and FLVC's Orange Grove.
(2) The steering committee will provide guidance for the development of an OER/eText catalog tool.
   a. Develop or identify an existing OER/eText catalog tool that will facilitate the process of selecting appropriate course material.
   b. Potential tools include, but are not limited to, the Unizin Content Studio Suite (creation and discovery tools) as well as <u>Orange Grove Texts</u> and <u>Lumen</u>.
(3) Implement and coordinate state-wide awareness, training and technical support for OER adoption and usage.
   a. Each institution identifies an eText/OER Coordinator.
      i. Works with faculty to help identify potential OER to meet course needs.
      ii. Coordinates the campus OER Champions (see below.)
      iii. Coordinates with efforts at other state institutions.
   b. Identify OER Champions at each state institution.
      i. OER Champions meet virtually to share strategies and resources.
      ii. OER Champions seek guidance and recommendations from institutional PR and marketing groups.
      iii. OER Champions support PR efforts at their institution.
   c. Create informational materials for dissemination throughout the state.
      i. Description and benefits of OER.
      ii. How to use the OER Catalog and Repository tools.
   d. Mandate all new courses investigate OER usage prior to course approval from the College/University Curriculum Committee (beginning in spring 2017 term.)
      i. Require justification if the use of OER is not appropriate.
(4) Create a grant process to encourage the development of OER and ancillary materials.
   a. Develop a brief grant application.
   b. Size and scope of resources to be developed will be dependent upon funding.
   c. Projects will be chosen based upon:
      i. Impact
      ii. Scope
      iii. Scalability
      iv. Innovation and potential improvements in student learning will be considered as well.
   d. All successful applications must contain a plan to disseminate newly developed OER material throughout the State College and University systems.

(5) Develop or identify an existing OER repository that will facilitate the creation and vetting of new OER.

    a. Create a state-wide faculty committee to review and rate existing and new materials.

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Reducing the Costs of Textbooks and Educational Materials throughout the Florida College and University System

---

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Affordability Tactic 2.1.2: 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.

Recommendation(s):

1) Recommend adoption of eTexts which can be made available more cheaply than print texts.
2) Negotiate volume pricing through the state system or other consortiums such as Unizin (through its Engage eText platform.)
3) Aggregate eText and OER options into one catalog tool as described in tactic 2.1.1.
4) Leverage and expand library resources to support appropriate use-cases.
5) Implement PR and marketing efforts to support eText adoption. These should be combined with OER strategies listed in tactic 2.1.1.

Supporting Documentation Included: Supporting Documentation Tactic 2.1.2

Facilitators/Presenters: Jennifer Smith, University of Florida
                                 Brian Harfe, University of Florida
                                 Meredith Babb, University Press

Supporting Documentation for Tactic 2.1.2

1) E-Text Adoption

Today's eText options include collaboration and interactive elements that can enhance the student learning experience. eText platforms are available for tablets and mobile devices making learning available anytime, anywhere. Generally, eTexts can be made available to students at a lower price than printed textbooks.

2) Volume Pricing

Negotiate volume pricing for textbooks and other educational materials used in the State general education core. Leverage the buying power of the state system or other consortium such as Unizin to garner the lowest possible pricing.
1. Unizin provides publisher content through its eText tool, Engage.
    a. Currently, Unizin has agreements with 16 publishers including:
    b. Cengage
    c. Macmillan (Bedford Freeman & Worth) (Includes Launchpad)
    d. McGraw Hill
    e. Pearson (includes MyLab and Mastering Products)
    f. SAGE
    g. Wiley
    h. Negotiations are ongoing with additional publishers.
2. Identify education startup companies and open source platforms that provide e-textbooks and negotiate with these companies to ensure the greatest financial benefit for students.

3) Catalog Tool

Lower-cost eTexts and OER should be combined into a catalog tool that allows efficient discovery and selection of appropriate course material (see tactic 2.1.1.) The following two initiatives are currently underway: Unizin is developing a catalog tool that will work with Engage, its eText platform, and FLVC is working toward integrating the Orange Grove repository with the new Integrated Library System through its digital repository component, Vital.

4) Library Resources

Build on existing library licenses, additional course materials can be place in e-Reserve in the University/College libraries for use by large enrollment courses.

5) Faculty Awareness

A communication plan to inform both faculty and students of the advantages available through the use of eTexts should be developed and implemented. eText marketing should be combined with the OER efforts listed in tactic 2.1.1.

1. Each institution identifies an eText/OER Coordinator.
   a. Coordinators collaborate across the state.
2. Create informational materials for dissemination throughout the state.

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL)

<u>PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION</u>

For approval

<u>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</u>

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic:

Given their similarity and overlap, the following two tactics are being addressed via a single set of recommendations.

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

> *Affordability: 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.

Recommendation(s):

(1) **Establish** a coordinating body at the system level to be called **the Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL) Steering Committee**. This steering committee will manage the selection and oversight of proposed innovative projects. Specific roles of the steering committee are defined in the attached proposal.

(2) **Convene an annual Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit** where all awarded projects will present their programs and results to foster and accelerate the dissemination of innovation throughout the SUS (and potentially the FCS). Other innovations may also be presented.

(3) **Provide recurring funding adequate to support true innovation with the potential for scale and impact**. Note that several other implementation plan tactics can be supported through the innovative projects framework. Requested amount: $5 million per year.

Supporting Documentation Included:
                            Proposal for Tactics 2.1.3 and 3.1.4

Facilitators/Presenters: Thomas Cavanagh, Ph.D.
                                     University of Central Florida

PROPOSAL

for

**Implementing Experimental Projects to
Support New and Emerging Online Education Innovations
["Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL)"]**

Addressing Implementation Tactics 2.1.3 (Access) and 3.1.4 (Affordability)
From the 2025 SUS Strategic Plan for Online Education

December 1, 2016

Programs Committee:
Innovative Projects Subcommittee

Prepared by:

Thomas Cavanagh (University of Central Florida)
Naomi Boyer (Polk State College)
Jennifer Smith (University of Florida)
Pam Northrup (University of West Florida)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This document offers a potential process for proposing, delivering, and ultimately scaling innovative and experimental pilot projects in online education across Florida. It also includes funding considerations and a draft implementation timeline.

Introduction

In November 2015, the Florida State University System published its Online Education 2025 Strategic Plan. Given the growing ubiquity of online education across both Florida and the world, it is critical that we, as a state, articulate a vision for leveraging the unique attributes of online education to impact quality, access, and affordability.

In support of the 2025 Strategic Plan, the resulting Implementation Plan included a number of tactics designed to advance the effective application of online learning to advance those three domains of quality, access, and affordability. Two of those tactics relate specifically to the power of technology to innovate and place Florida in a leadership position to support online students.

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

Given the direct connection between these two tactics, this proposal presents a plan for addressing both of them simultaneously.

Definition of an Innovative/Experimental Project

For the purposes of this proposal, the terms innovative and experimental will be used interchangeably to describe projects being implemented across the state to advance the state-of-the-art in online learning. These are projects that seek to push the boundaries of current technology and practice in order to disrupt existing models and positively impact the constraints of the "iron triangle" of quality, cost, and access for students.

Examples of potential innovative and experimental project categories include:
- Adaptive Learning
- Microcredentials / Digital Badges
- Next generation ePortfolios
- Predictive analytics and dashboards
- MOOCs for credit
- eText and digital materials strategies
  - Homework systems

- Competency-Based Learning
- Immersive Video Environments
- Creative use of open source materials
- Learning analytics
- Content repositories for sharing digital resources

Process for Selecting Pilot Projects

It is assumed that innovative and experimental projects will be funded through a centralized investment mechanism. This SUS Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL) funding is intended to improve the quality, ease of access, and cost of education for students. Proposals that address significant needs and have the ability to scale will receive special consideration. The emphasis will be on potential impact over niche or boutique programs. All projects must meet ADA requirements.

In order to manage the selection and oversight of proposed innovative projects from the SUS and FCS systems, an ad hoc body will be established. Below are the preliminary characteristics for such a selection and oversight committee, to be called the Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL) Steering Committee:

<u>Innovation in Florida Online Learning (IFOL) Steering Committee</u>

- Managed at the system level (e.g., by the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC))
- Include faculty, staff, and other expert representatives from both SUS and FCS
- Develop IFOL project selection rubric
- Issue a Call for Proposals (CFP)
- Review end-of-project reports
- Help facilitate the Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit
- Possibly survey the SUS and FCS systems for existing pockets of innovation
- Identify projects that are already underway
- Leverage existing partnerships/tools (e.g., Unizin)
- Convene a brainstorming session (such as during an FLVC meeting or a special meeting)
  - What are the challenges we seek to solve?
  - What solutions are already in place in limited implementations across the SUS and FCS?

Proposal Process

All individuals and institutions wishing to propose an innovative pilot project will do so through a standardized proposal template. The elements of this template are included in Appendix A. However, the following is a summary of some key components of the proposal template:

- Name
- Title
- Institution
- Senior Administrative Sponsor (Dean level or above)
- Project Goal / Intended Outcome
- Brief Project Description
- Evaluation Plan
- Project Timeline
- Sustainability
- Project Budget / Required Resources
- Partners
- Institutional Co-Investment
- Potential for Widespread Scale
- Key Personnel

The IFOL Steering Committee will determine the timing and frequency of proposal submissions, reviews, and decisions. An initial project timeline is included later in this document.

At a high level, it is expected that the IFOL Steering Committee will issue a call for proposals. Once the proposal deadline has passed, the committee will review candidate projects against a to-be-established rubric. The top scoring projects will receive funding for one-year pilots.

Selection Rubric

The IFOL Steering Committee will develop an evaluation rubric for proposed pilot projects, allowing for an objective review and selection of the most worthy projects within available funding. This committee will determine the appropriate weights for each rubric element, but key consideration should be given to the following attributes:

- Significance of need being addressed
- Level of innovation
- Underserved population(s) being impacted
- Reduction in cost of instruction

- Scale potential
- Benefit to state
- Quality of plan
- Potential impact
- Partnerships between institutions

Process for Pilot Project Oversight

Each project that is awarded funding for a pilot will be required to provide information in three primary categories: *Reporting* (both during the pilot and after its completion), *Evaluation* (results and impact), and *Plans for Scaling or Discontinuation* (should the work continue and, if so, how can success be scaled to other institutions across the state).

Reporting Expectations
- Progress/Status during pilot implementation at milestones
- Upon completion of pilot (see Appendix B for a sample reporting format)

Evaluation Expectations
- Data collection and analysis as outlined in proposal
- Were outcomes as expected?
- What is the principal investigator's analysis of the results?

Plan for Scaling or Discontinuing
- Is revision or redesign needed?
- What is the rationale that would indicate discontinuation?
- What further funding is needed to support scaling?
- What support is needed for sustainability?
- What is a sustainability plan and timeline?
- How can the project and its results be shared through an annual innovation summit?

Annual Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit

As part of the IFOL strategy for scaling the impact of potentially-isolated pilot projects, awardees and other institutional representatives will be expected to attend an annual Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit, hosted by a state institution. The goal of the annual innovation summit is to disseminate information about each funded project to help foster the scaling of high-impact innovations across both college and university systems.

The summit logistics will be coordinated at the system level (for example, by the Florida Virtual Campus). If possible, the summit will also include innovative projects from statewide institutions that were not part of IFOL funding but that would still be of benefit to students in both state systems. It is also possible that representatives from non-state institutions (e.g., ICUF) could participate in the summit, especially if they had innovative

projects to share.

As modeled loosely on the Penn State University TLT program (listed below), attendees could "vote" on the most innovative or impactful project and the winner could receive an appropriate recognition. Sessions could potentially be recorded and a summary of project presentations could be archived online for wider distribution to interested parties who may not be able to attend the summit.

Funding Considerations

The size and scope of potential projects will be entirely dependent upon the available funding. The goal of the IFOL Steering Committee will be to award as many high-impact projects as possible within funding limits. Since each potential experimental project is so unique, it is not recommended that any particular budget be placed on each proposed project. This will allow for IFOL Steering Committee discretion to consider both high-cost and low-cost projects, always weighing the relative potential for statewide impact.

However, in order to maximize the diversity of projects funded (including types of projects and institutions represented), it is recommended that no more than three projects be awarded to any single institution and that the following general caps be placed on project funding:

Total IFOL Program Funding	Maximum Individual Project Budget
Up to $500,000	20% of total funding
$500,001 - $1,000,000	15% of total funding
$1,000,001 - $5,000,000	10% of total funding
Over $5,000,000	5% of total funding

Note that the budget above includes expenses associated with travel support for a minimum ten-member IFOL Steering Committee and logistics support for hosting the annual Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit.

The source and amount of IFOL funding is yet to be determined. However, the timing of the availability of funds will be the determining factor in the start of the program.

It is assumed that the source of IFOL funding will be through legislative budget action. However, other potential/supplemental sources include:

- System Funding
- Institutional
- Grants
- Philanthropy
- Student Fees

The preferred option for funding the IFOL program would be a systemwide legislative budget request (LBR) for $5 million recurring to be distributed via the Florida SUS Board of Governors. This level of funding and governance would permit the state to make a significant impact on student access, cost, and success.

Draft Timeline

The following timeline is speculative based upon availability of funding. It is also aggressive and assumes availability of participants and venues.

If funding is available in January 2017:

> December 2016: Online Programs Workgroup submits to the Implementation Committee a proposal for innovative projects along with ideas for incentive funding.
>
> January 2017: Upon approval by Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee and **with available funding**, implement the proposal.
>
> January 2017: Establish IFOL Steering Committee.
>
> February 2017: IFOL Steering Committee issues statewide survey on the state's most pressing higher education needs (to inform proposal solicitation and selection).
>
> March 2017: IFOL Steering Committee meets and develops both the proposal evaluation rubric and call for proposals.
>
> April 2017: Call for proposals is issued.
>
> May 2017: Proposals are due.
>
> July 2017: Proposals to be funded are selected.
>
> August 2017: Project work begins, likely aligned with the start of the Fall semester.
>
> Summer 2018: Host the Florida Higher Education Innovation Summit.

If funding is not available in January, then this proposed timeline will be adjusted accordingly.

Other Models and Examples for Review

The following examples represent other initiatives nationwide that may inform the IFOL planning process.

Institution	Initiative	Objective
University System of Maryland	Center for Academic Innovation	Touts itself as the first system-level center to conceptualize, promote, study, and disseminate groundbreaking innovations aimed broadly at transforming higher education.
University of North Carolina System	Learning Technology and Innovation	System-level office designed to promote innovative use of technology across all UNC institutions, with a particular emphasis in online learning.
University of Texas System	Institute for Transformational Learning	A catalyst for innovation, the ITL guides development of next-generation programming models, high impact, technology-enhanced pedagogies, and robust data analytics.
University of Texas at Austin	Longhorn Innovation Fund for Technology	Innovative academic technology projects that leverage information technology in order to improve quality of instruction, create a differentiator for attracting higher caliber students to the University.
Penn State	Open Innovation Challenge	Innovative ideas about anything that enhances teaching and learning in higher education.
Next Generation Learning Challenges	Assessment for Learning Project	Catalyze new and scale existing innovations in assessment for learning design.
Gates Foundation/Online Learning Consortium	Digital Learning Innovation Award	The funding supports digital courseware to improve student success, especially among minority, first generation and other disadvantaged student groups.
U.S. Department of Education	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary	Evidence-based innovations that expand access, affordability, and success to communities that are not

	Education	currently well served, such as students who would be the first in their families to go to college, those from low-income families, and students of color.

Conclusion

The two tactics supported within this proposal exist within a larger set of tactics contained in the Florida online learning implementation plan. Other tactics in that plan have considerable overlap in the area of "innovation" and could potentially become part of this initiative. For example, tactics related to the following implementation plan topics could serve as the basis for experimental pilot projects: open educational resources (OER), adaptive learning, master course templates, competency-based education (CBE), shared program development, e-textbooks, and new faculty development models. As those tactics are developed and operationalized, opportunities should be pursued to align activities whenever possible.

In order to break higher education's "iron triangle" of dependencies (cost, access, and quality), the state of Florida must invest in innovation. As online learning continues to grow in popularity, it is appropriate that this technology serve as the catalyst for disruptive innovation across the state's higher education sectors. This proposal has presented a plan for funding and implementing innovative pilot projects across the state that have the potential for substantive positive impact on students. In addition, implementing the plan offered in this proposal will help contribute to a statewide culture of innovation and a sustainable ecosystem of technology-based breakthroughs, further cementing Florida's leadership in online education.

Appendix A

Draft Experimental / Pilot Project Proposal Template

Name
Title
Institution
Senior Administrative Institutional Sponsor (Dean level or above)

Project Goal / Intended Outcome
This section should provide details on how the project will benefit students in the state of Florida. What challenge will this project solve? How will it improve learning? Who will the users be?

Brief Project Description
How is the project innovative? Does the project have the potential to decrease costs, increase access, or improve quality?

Evaluation Plan
What metrics will be used to determine if the project is successful?

Project Timeline
What is the schedule are what are the key milestones? What deliverables are due when?

Sustainability
Once the project has been piloted, how will it be supported? Is there a long-term sustainability plan to eliminate state support?

Project Budget / Required Resources
    Staff
    Materials
    Travel
    Other

Partners
    Other institutions
    Commercial

Government

Foundation

Other

Institutional Co-Investment

Will your institution (or partners) be contributing funding or in-kind resources towards the project?

Potential for Widespread Scale

What is the potential impact of your project? How does it address quality, cost, access, or other major educational challenges across Florida?

Key Personnel
Who are the major contributors to the pilot project and what are their qualifications?

Appendix B

Draft Final Report Format

(Required 60 days after conclusion)

Project Goals

What were the project's objectives?

Project Description

What did you do?

Project Duration

How long did the project last?

Key Personnel

Who worked on the project? Include any partners who were involved.

Outcomes

What were the results? Was the project successful?

Evaluation Methodology

How do you know if the project was successful or not?

Implications

What did you learn? What did the project and the evaluation teach you? How likely is it that the project will have a significant impact on students statewide?

Recommendations

- Abandon further research
- Adjust and expand
- Adopt and plan for widespread scale
- Other

Data

Include any raw data that you compiled as part of your evaluation (complying with IRB, data security, FERPA, and all other requirements).

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: **Facilitating Collaboration**

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Quality 2.2.2 Develop a structure to facilitate collaboration system-wide in evaluating, recommending, and purchasing software to ensure cost efficiencies and effectiveness.

December 2016: The Infrastructure Workgroup to work with the Board's Director of Shared Services and FLVC staff to facilitate collaboration.

June 2017: The Infrastructure Workgroup will report findings/recommendations at the joint June 2017 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Further action steps will be discussed.

Recommendations:
The infrastructure workgroup recommends the formation of the State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) to enable discussions via quarterly meetings regarding the exploration, evaluation, and procurement of technology, software, and/or shared services to assist in the delivery of online education to help reduce costs and/or promote quality. The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will organize and hold quarterly meetings to facilitate communication regarding technology, software, or services for adoption through a master contract at the state system level to help reduce costs.

Schools often work independently to explore, test, and implement educational technology. The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will promote collaboration through discussion so that schools can reduce duplications of efforts in technology adoption and selection processes.

The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will consist of members selected

through the Florida Virtual Campus Executive Committee, a member of the FLVC staff, and the Board of Governors Director of Shared Services.

The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will identify technology, software, or services that are most commonly used or needed in the SUS and FCS and will establish operating procedures, including those procedures for working with the Director of Shared Services to manage the procurement process and communication strategies for collaboration. A time slot will be allocated to the State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) at each quarterly FLVC meeting. The newly formed State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) may establish additional meeting and collaboration procedures.

Additional considerations:
1) The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) should equally represent the SUS and FCS with a recommendation of 6-8 representatives total.
2) The FLVC Executive Committee will communicate with all institutions to explain the role and purpose behind the State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) and will seek nominations from schools for representatives. Once nominations from schools are received, the FLVC Executive Committee will make the selection to determine the 6-8 representatives of SUS and FCS.
   a) Representatives should identify alternate representatives in the event that an individual is unable to participate at an event or meeting.
   b) The FLVC Executive Committee will identify an individual to lead the efforts of the State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC).
3) The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will establish its operating procedures.
4) The State Educational Licensing Committee (SELC) will annually establish its 3-year work plan for exploration, evaluation, and procurement of technology, software, and/or shared services.
   a) Examples:
      i) Tutoring Network
      ii) Proctoring Network
      iii) Accessibility

Facilitators/Presenters: Joseph Riquelme
Supporting Documentation: None

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Proctoring Network

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Affordability 1.1.2 - 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.

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. Further action steps will be defined.

Recommendations:
The workgroup recommends establishing the Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) to create and support a statewide proctoring network.

A statewide proctoring network allows for the establishment of a centralized location to provide education, procedural information, and resources on academic integrity. This effort will facilitate the ability to achieve high standards of academic integrity in online courses. This recommendation is broken into two phases and a financial considerations piece below:

1. Initial Phase:
    a. The FLVC Executive Committee will communicate with all institutions to explain the role and purpose behind the Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) and will seek nominations from schools for representatives.
    b. The Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) should equally represent the SUS and FCS with a recommendation of 4-6 representatives

total. Once nominations from schools are received, the FLVC Executive Committee will make the selection to determine the 4-6 representatives of SUS and FCS.

c. The Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) will establish its operating procedures.

d. The PNSC will develop a formal process by which institutions may elect to provide evidence that their internal online proctoring tool is based on a documentable set of standards, is of comparable rigor, and adheres to a similar review process as those outlined by the selected vendor. In so doing, an institution's specific online proctoring tool and process could be approved to also meet the best practices identified by the PNSC.

2. Implementation Phase:

a. Implement a statewide proctoring website to provide students, faculty and staff information on proctoring services and processes, such as the one used by the [University of North Carolina](#).

i. Include proctoring service instructions, guidelines, and procedures.

1. Assess the status of current resources across the FCS and SUS and make recommendations as to which to include on the statewide proctoring website.

2. Create a proctoring network of qualified proctors that will be responsible for proctoring exams for online courses across the FCS and SUS. Examples of approved proctors could be librarians, K-12 teachers or administrators, employees of a local testing site, etc.

ii. Create resources to assist in the development of an academic integrity culture. Examples below:

1. [Faculty facing video](#)

2. [Student facing video](#)

iii. Identify and include best practices on course design and how a variety of assessment modalities can reduce incidents of academic misconduct, and offer students more opportunities to demonstrate content mastery.

iv. Develop and provide example statements and policies related to academic misconduct.

v. Include "Frequently Asked Questions" with answers.

b. The Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) will establish evaluation criteria and complete an RFP to find a vendor that can provide

proctoring services at an affordable cost to students and the university and college system. Requirements for selected proctoring provider should include:

    i. Flexible payment options where students can pay directly for the cost of the exam or an institution can cover the cost of the exam at the course level.

    ii. The ability to offer a service platform that provides options for institutions to define the proctoring model which impacts overall cost:

        1. Vendor is responsible for proctoring the exam
        2. Faculty is responsible for proctoring the exam
        3. Institution assigns staff to proctor the exam
        4. Technology platform provides notifications of potential misconduct.

3. Financial Considerations

    a. Funding is needed to support the development of the website and acquisition of additional resources to support this initiative. The Proctoring Network Steering Committee (PNSC) will identify resources needed and provide information to the Board of Governors. Funding can be provided to the FLVC or awarded to an institution that is selected to develop and maintain the website.

Supporting Documentation: None
Facilitators/Presenters: Joseph Riquelme

SUBJECT: Student Services: Ensuring Access to Services

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Quality 2.3.1-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.

> **Deliverable, December 2016:** Student Services Workgroup will recommend to the Implementation Committee 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. Institutional reviews begin.

Tactic: Access 1.1.6 - Retain fully online students by implementing best practice strategies such as academic coaches, success coaches, analytics, and early alert interventions.

> **Deliverable, December 2016:** Student Services Workgroup, in conjunction with the Innovation Institute at UWF, will review and confirm best practices. Student Services Workgroup will prepare a report detailing best practices to be shared with SUS Institutions.

Recommendations:

The goals of the Tactics Access 1.1.6 and Quality 2.3.1 were tied together with the scorecard evaluation of the areas that effect off campus students access to student services and the guidebook for the scorecard provided suggestions for improving access to services in each area evaluated. Two groups worked together to identify the areas to evaluate the equivalency of the services provide online as compared to the on ground students. One group was the workgroup within the Implementation Committee which consisted of leaders providing student services

at the different public universities and colleges throughout Florida. The other group was the Access Committee at FLVC which had a broader representation of distance learning leaders from public universities and colleges in Florida who are interested in providing access to their institutions beyond the traditional college student. Once the areas were identified, the recommendations were gathered and placed into the guidebook that accompanies the scorecard. The recommendations were a combination of strategies published through journals and other sources, the Education Advisory Board recommended strategies from their research request work, and strategies that public institutions in Florida used that are effective.

The Off-campus Student Support Scorecard is designed as an easy-to-use process for evaluating the support services at postsecondary institutions for students taking most or all of their courses off- campus. The purpose of the scorecard is for an institution to evaluate whether the student services offered to off-campus students are comparable to the services available to on-campus students. Institutions can use the results of the scorecard to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of various services essential to the success of this subset of students. The scorecard has been tied to the Southern Association of College and Schools Commission of Colleges 2012 SACS-COC Edition of the Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement Core Requirements (SACS-COC, 2011). With the close association to the Core Requirements, the Off-campus Student Support Scorecard may be used as supporting documentation for SACS-COC visits.

The scorecard has 44 quality indicators within 11 different categories. Each of the indicators is worth 2 points. The 11 different categories include admissions, financial aid, preenrollment advising, veterans' services, career counseling, orientation, postenrollment services, library, students with disability services, and technology support. Each category has a broad description of the activities.

The guidebook gives a description of the areas followed by the indicators used to measure the quality of the service provided. That is followed by a list of suggested practices in meeting the needs of the online students. Examples are then provided from research, as to possible ways to implement services in that area to meeting the needs of off-campus students.

Timeframe for Implementation:

February 15, 2017:	Submit Application for IRB
February 30, 2017:	Electronic Access to the Scorecard will be ready
March 30, 2017:	Messaging for participation begins
April 2017:	First round of data collection will be gathered
May 2017:	Analysis of results
December 2017:	Present findings to Steering committee
In 2018:	Present scorecard at Online Learning Consortium Conference

Supporting Documentation:

Student Services Scorecard Rubric
Student Services Scorecard Guidebook

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Vicki Brown

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Student Services: Securing Resources

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For direction

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Access 2.1.4 - Secure student support resources to ensure students have access to technology required for online education.

Deliverable, December 2016: Student Services Workgroup, in conjunction with FLVC Members Council for Distance Learning and Student Services, will make recommendation on resources needed and their respective costs.

Recommendations:

Three factors contribute to the digital divide (a) access to broadband, (b) socioeconomic status, and (3) primary language other than English.

a) Broadband serves as a gateway to a highly connective world. Although Florida is ranked as the ninth most connected state, three counties have no access to internet. According to BroadBandNow, 1.2 million Floridians are without access to a wired connection capable of 25 Mbps download speeds.

b) Individuals with low socioeconomic status do not have the resources to either own a computer or to pay for broadband to access the full range of educational resources. Across Florida in the 2013-2014 academic year, 188,590 undergraduate students received some form of grant aid. Of that number, 102,288 received grant aid from Pell, and another 111,115 were awarded a federal student loan to apply to the cost of their education. Not counted in these statistics are those who attempted and did not finish the admission process or did not try to attend a post-secondary institution.

c)   Individuals whose primary language is not English often place owning the technology as a low priority. In Fall 2014, 77,633 Hispanic students enrolled in Florida's public universities, which is 24% of the total student population. These students face similar challenges in applying to post-secondary institutions as individuals from low socioeconomic status.

Regardless of which of the above issues leads to the lack of access, individuals without access to Internet struggle as they begin the pre-enrollment processes at any postsecondary institution. High-achieving, low-income students often fail to enroll in a postsecondary institution that is comparable to their level of achievement. Of this group, 15 to 40 % do not enroll in college after acceptance. Overestimating the cost of attending the institutions, difficulty in filling out the complex financial aid forms, and lack of guidance through the application process are cited as common reasons for this failure. To navigate the pre-enrollment process requires digital literacy skills developed over time using Internet resources. For example, being able to locate digital resources with advice about applying to a post-secondary institution

and navigating college-search websites can pose a challenge with few digital competencies. Without extensive knowledge in evaluating information provided on the Internet, these students also struggle in determining the credibility of the information they are viewing. No access to technology prohibits basic online communications within online courses and participation in class discussion. This digital struggle results in a continuous cycle with the students not obtaining a post-secondary degree and earning lower salaries.

As the students begin their academic studies, the lack of broadband access and adequate hardware, which are accessible, poses new challenges. Increasingly, websites and educational applications are becoming more readily available for smartphones. The ownership of mobile devices is providing wider accessibility by students to instructional materials outside of the classroom. In 2014, 98% of 18-to 29-year-olds and 97% of 30-to 49-year-olds owned a cellphone. Students who are using a mobile device as the only means to access the course content can miss critical aspects of the course. Not having access to technology impacts students' ability in utilizing research databases in libraries, organizing the research, and writing about research.

Several myths exist as to methods students can use to access technology. Students taking courses online or through video streaming delivery methods require extended use of technology over several years to successfully complete their degree programs. The solutions for this group of students need to be long-term.

Myth 1: Students can use their financial aid money to purchase computer equipment and Internet access. Economic socially disadvantaged students often do not have the luxury to spend their financial aid money on technology. The money is often spent on transportation, housing, and food. These students often forgo the purchase of textbooks in order to meet basic needs.

Myth 2: Students can go to a public library to complete their homework. Due to the limited resources at public libraries, the computers availability often does not meet the demands of the community. As a result, the computer use is limited to 30 minutes. Public libraries have limited hours. Students also need to have transportation to the library or the students' neighborhoods are unsafe for other means of travel.

Myth 3: Students can use the campus library. This assumption is counter intuitive to taking courses online. For this option to work, the student must live on campus or have transportation to the campus, which is their home institution on a regular basis. To gain access, students are frequently going to a campus near their home to access course materials and library resources.

Statewide Level Recommendations

- Lend support to federal and state initiatives to expand broadband in rural areas by creating anchors from FLR Florida LambdaRail sites into rural communities and supporting the efforts of the Broadband Florida Initiative.
- Make students aware of the availability of low cost internet services provided through the ConnectHome and Lifeline Broadband partnerships within local communities for those on federal assistance as part of the information processes at Florida Shines marketing and admission website.
- Continue support for the Florida Completes academic coaching program which supports the returning students through enrollment into the first semester to ensure the student has the resources and support services required to complete their degree.

- Recommend CIOs throughout the system explore ways to authentic and/or to grant open internet access to students so if they must visit another college or university in their region to gain access to online course materials and library resources from their home institution so they are able to fully participate in their online courses.
- Recommend financing a scholarship/grant fund for 100% distance learning students identified as at risk through financial aid to purchase broadband monthly while attending classes. The goal would be to increase the enrollment of Pell eligible students in distance learning courses by 5% by 2025. In addition, explore possible options for the identification of students and distribution of the scholarship funds.

Institution Level Recommendations

- Include information about local Lifeline Broad partnerships to provide low cost broadband in local communities such as Comcast's Internet Essentials program on marketing and admission websites.
- Create responsive, mobile-first websites for the library to promote full access to resources rather than several quick lookup tools (Farkas, 2016).
- Create or continue support for short term laptop and/or tablet rentals for students taking classes on campus and distance learning. These students can connect to high speed internet while on campus but still have the convenience of completing course work at home or other convenient locations (Domonell, 2014).
- Link distance learning students, who are not part of the Florida Completes program, to on campus services and support while taking online courses to academic coaches.
- Provide the minimum technology requirements for their degree programs in highly visible informational locations on the institutions websites.
- Embed librarians into the online courses with the ability to quickly navigate to library resources and assistance.

Potential Recommendations for Statewide Shared Services through FLVC

1. Provide financial literacy solutions which allow students to evaluate the potential cost for the degrees they are interested in, explain the difference between taking full- and part-time courses in future earnings, and how to manage their present financial resources.
2. Explore possible authentication barriers in accessing the large statewide online library resource collection. If barriers are identified, explore possible solutions to improve that access.
3. Explore ways to share subject or course specific libguides access is very open through the public library system.

Supporting Documentation: [Technology Access to Distance Learning in Florida Report](#)

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Vicki Brown

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Faculty certification to teach online

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic:

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

Deliverable, 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.

Recommendation(s):

UCF/FLVC are working on TOPkit (Quality 1.2.3) to be   TOPkit contains an online faculty development sample course (https://webcourses.ucf.edu/courses/1246849). This course is integrated into the online toolkit and will be modified (i.e. TOPkit Sample Course Lite) that is a baseline, 5 week self-paced version. A preliminary review of the sample course indicated that the UCF/FLVC (Topkit) certification course is built on a solid foundation of theory and covers all necessary topics for preparing faculty to teach online. In an effort to support their efforts so that the deliverable (Quality 1.2.3) will be on time, the **Professional Development Workgroup recommends that we seek approval from the Steering Committee to use this course as the "certification" course associated with the implementation plan (deliverable for December, 2016 for Quality 1.2.2).**

The Professional Development Workgroup will re-evaluate the faculty certification course after the first TOPkit workshop is held. (TOPkit site launches on February 1,

2017. The first workshop will be held March 22-23, 2017 at the University of Central Florida). At the conclusion of the first workshop, the Professional Development Workgroup will assess the tool and survey SUS participants for best approaches. An update and recommendation will be provided to the Steering Committee by June, 2017.

The recommendation delivered in June will assess potential funding and project management to make this a facilitated course (or not) as well as determine the organization/institution who will have the responsibility for facilitating and maintaining the certification course going forward. For those institutions that have a certification course in place and would like to continue using it, a formal process will be developed by which institutions may elect to provide evidence that their internal online faculty certification course meets the same rigor and quality of the recommended course.

Note: In March, 2016, Professional Development made a 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, non-recurring costs.

Supporting Documentation: None

Facilitators/Presenters: **Cynthia DeLuca**

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Continuing Education Needs

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For Direction

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Access 3.1.1. 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.

Deliverable: December 2016: University liaisons will be asked to share this request with academic units in their institutions.

Recommendation(s):

(1) The Workgroup recommends changing the deliverable to read: University Provosts will be asked to share this request with academic units in their institutions.

Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators/Presenters: Andy McCollough

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Fully Online Graduate Programs

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This issue is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors Innovation and Online Committee during its meeting in March 2017.

Tactic: Access 1.1.2 (Part II – Graduate) - 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.

Recommendation(s):

(1) Create "Fully Online" Master's degree programs to address the 7 "Primary Gaps" as identified in the gap analysis. [1]

(2) Explore the possibility of converting the 20 existing "Primarily Online" graduate programs to "Fully Online" programs. [2]

(3) Target the 5 STEM programs and 2 language intensive programs with "Delivery Challenges" for Fully Online Master's degrees. Technical hurdles will need to be

overcome to successfully deliver these online for all four years. [1]

[1] Universities offering these programs on campus should determine the feasibility of offering them online.
[2] Institutions listed should determine the feasibility of expanding the identified programs to be fully online.

Supporting Documentation Included:

See attachments:

- *Gap_Analysis_Graduate_SUMMARY.docx*

- *Note: This "SUMMARY" document includes only the identified gap recommendations and the basic methodology. Full SUS and FCS Inventories and Gap Analysis documentation is available at http://tnt.aa.ufl.edu/sus-online-inventory.aspx.*

Facilitators/Presenters: Mike Ronco, University of Florida

Tactic 1.1.2 – Current Online Offerings and Gaps

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." *Note:* While the original assignment did not specify distinct undergraduate and graduate listings, reporting these programs separately provides a clearer picture on online activity.

Note:

While the original assignment did not specify distinct undergraduate and graduate listings, reporting these programs separately provides a clearer picture of online activity.

| *Access* 1.1.2 | 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. | **December 2016:** 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. Recommendations presented to Implementation Committee in its January meeting. Upon approval, recommendations sent to Steering Committee for their approval. After approval by the Steering Committee, the recommendations are sent to the CAVP. |

Gaps in State University System Fully Online Graduate Degree Programs by CIP Code

The following gaps have been identified as being the highest priority for Fully Online Graduate Degree Programs.

PRIMARY GAPS – No Fully online offering currently in the SUS under this CIP code and major.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
01.1001 Food Science	Food Science	Masters	STEM	N/A
09.0702 Digital Communication and Medi …	Digital Communication and Multimedia	Masters	STEM	N/A
09.0900 Public Relations, Advertising, …	Public Relations and Advertising	Masters	GAP ANALYSIS	N/A
27.0301 Applied Mathematics, General.	Applied Mathematics	Masters	STEM	N/A
27.0501 Statistics, General.	Statistics	Masters	STEM	N/A
52.0301 Accounting.	Accounting	Masters	GAP ANALYSIS	N/A
52.0801 Finance, General.	Finance	Masters	GAP ANALYSIS	N/A

PRIMARILY ONLINE PROGRAMS - Explore the possibility of expanding these Primarily Online Programs to Fully Online Programs.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
13.0301 Curriculum and Instruction.	Curriculum and Instruction	Doctorate	EDUCATION	UF; USF
14.0801 Civil Engineering, General.	Civil Engineering	Doctorate	STEM	UCF
14.0901 Computer Engineering, General.	Computer Engineering	Masters	STEM	UCF
14.1001 Electrical and Electronics Engineering	Electrical Engineering	Masters	STEM	UCF
14.1401 Environmental/Environmental He …	Environmental Engineering	Doctorate	STEM	UCF
14.1801 Materials Engineering.	Materials Science and Engineering	Doctorate	STEM	UCF
15.1501 Engineering/Industrial Management.	Engineering Management	Masters	STEM	UCF
26.0702 Entomology.	Entomology and Nematology	Masters	STEM	UF
26.9999 Biological and Biomedical Sciences,	Medical Sciences (Athletic Training)	Masters	STEM	USF
30.0601 Systems Science and Theory.	Modeling and Simulation	Doctorate	STEM	UCF
30.0601 Systems Science and Theory.	Modeling and Simulation	Masters	STEM	UCF
31.0505 Kinesiology and Exercise Science.	Exercise Science and Health Promotion	Masters	STEM	FAU
51.0204 Audiology/Audiologist and Spee …	Communication Science and Disorders	Masters	HEALTH	FSU
51.0204 Audiology/Audiologist and Spee …	Speech-Language Pathology	Masters	HEALTH	USF

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
51.2001 Pharmacy.	Pharmacy	Doctorate	HEALTH	UF
51.2099 Pharmacy, Pharmaceutical Scien …	Pharmacy	Masters	HEALTH	UF
51.2099 Pharmacy, Pharmaceutical Scien …	Pharmaceutical Sciences	Masters	HEALTH	UF
51.2501 Veterinary Sciences/Veterinary …	Veterinary Medical Science (Forensic)	Masters	HEALTH	UF
51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered …	Nursing	Masters	HEALTH	FAMU; UF
52.0301 Accounting.	Accounting	Masters	GAP ANALYSIS	FAU

Note: For CIP code 26.9999 USF has two tracks, one which is fully online and one which is primarily online.

Note: For CIP code 51.2501 UF has two concentrations that are fully online and one that is primarily online.

Note: There are a number of other primarily online graduate degree programs that were not included above due to there already being equivalent offerings at the same level in the SUS.

DELIVERY CHALLENGES - Gaps which may require innovative approaches to overcome online delivery challenges. For example, STEM labs.

CIP Detail	Major	Degree Type	Strategic Emphasis	Offered
05.0107 Latin American Studies.	Latin American Studies	Masters	GLOBAL	N/A
16.0905 Spanish Language and Literature.	Spanish Language and Lit …	Masters	GLOBAL	N/A
26.0301 Botany/Plant Biology.	Botany	Masters	STEM	N/A
26.0701 Zoology/Animal Biology.	Zoology	Masters	STEM	N/A
40.0501 Chemistry, General.	Chemistry	Masters	STEM	N/A
40.0801 Physics, General.	Physics	Masters	STEM	N/A
50.0102 Digital Arts.	Digital Arts	Masters	STEM	N/A

Methodology - SUS Fully Online Graduate Degree Inventory

The **SUS Fully Online Graduate Degree Inventory** is a subset of a larger **SUS Online Program Inventory**. The complete inventory was compiled using the survey responses received from each of the SUS institutions in 2015. The Online Program Survey data for all SUS institutions was merged into a single data source. Rows with concentrations or specializations were identified and consolidated so as to represent the agreed upon definition of an Online Degree Program being an "Online Major".

The SUS Online Program Inventory data was cross-referenced with and validated against the CIP 2010 listing, the Approved Program Inventory as well as *Programs of Strategic Emphasis Effective Fall 2014 (by CIP)* document. In addition to the Fully Online Graduate Degree Programs, inventories at both the graduate and undergraduate level are able to be generated for Primarily Online Degrees, Fully Online Certificates, Primarily Online Certificates, and Fully Online Upper Level Undergraduate Degrees.

Methodology - SUS Fully Online Graduate Degree Gap Analysis

Tactic 1.1.2 required gaps to be identified at the CIP code level. Since there are roughly two thousand CIP codes in the CIP 2010 listing, there needed to be a way to reduce the list down to a more manageable number. Fortunately, the SUS has identified 227 codes as currently having strategic emphasis. This subset was used as the starting point for the gap analysis.

Primary Gaps: The SUS Fully Online Graduate Degree Inventory was compared to the strategic emphasis CIP list and it was found that 169 CIP codes did not have a corresponding program. For the purpose of this report, CIP codes with no offering are labelled as "primary gaps". The primary gap list was reduced to a priority listing and majors were specified based upon the institutional knowledge of several members of the workgroup.

Secondary Gaps: Some CIP codes may not appear on the primary gap listing but may require expansion due to the need for extra capacity or additional majors. These are being termed "secondary gaps" and were identified by members of the workgroup reviewing the existing inventory. No secondary gaps were identified for Fully Online Graduate Degrees.

Primarily Online Programs: A number of programs across the system already exist as Primarily Online Graduate Degrees. A listing of these has been provided with the suggestion that some may be good candidates to become Fully Online Graduate Degree programs.

Primary Gaps with Challenges: The final listing of gaps represent those which may require innovative approaches to overcome online delivery challenges. For example, STEM programs with labs and foreign language programs with spoken language requirements.

Note: See http://tnt.aa.ufl.edu/sus-online-inventory.aspx for complete online program inventories and CIP code gap listings.

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Instructional Designer Network

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Quality 1.2.1: Create a statewide professional development network for instructional designers in order to share best practices and provide guidance in designing and developing online education.

Deliverable: 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.

In collaboration with the Professional Development Workgroup, FLVC has developed and will host a resource tab on their website titled "Instructional Designer Resources". This tab will be monitored by an appointed representative of the FLVC Members Council. The objective is to create and host a resource site for instructional designer resources. The site will provide updates on professional development opportunities (i.e. conferences, workshops, research) and resources. The site is scheduled to go live in December 2016.

FLVC will be responsible for the *Website -* Create a new navigation area for *Instructional Designers Resources* on the College and University section of the site. Monthly update of content or as needed/identified by lead institution content provider; and *Communication* - sending a monthly reminder to the leads requesting updates to the page. The c*ontent* will be provided and monitored through a shared leadership consisting of one ID from the SUS and one from the State Colleges.

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

Supporting Documentation:	**None**
Facilitators/Presenters:	**Cynthia DeLuca**

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Professional Development for Online Leaders

___

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactic: Quality 1.2.2: Enhance professional development opportunities offered by the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) for institutional leaders in online education.

Deliverable: 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.

The Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) will host a resource tab on their website titled "professional development for online leaders". This tab will be monitored by the FLVC Members Council. In addition, 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 first scheduled workshop is June, 2017 at the FLVC Members Council meeting in Tampa.

The Professional Development group did not identify additional funding; however, attendees may be charged a small registration fee to attend.

Recommendation:
Institutional leaders should be defined as Distance Learning Leaders within the SUS and State College System of Florida and should include, but not be limited to, Directors, Assistant/Associate Vice Provosts/Vice Provosts, and Assistant/Associate Vice Presidents/Vice Presidents.

___

Supporting Documentation Included: None
Facilitators/Presenters: Cynthia DeLuca

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Online Education Research Consortium

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Tactics:
Quality 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.

Deliverable for December 2016: UF Online will host the first meeting of the consortium.

Status:

The Online Education Research Consortium has been established and met virtually in August. The Consortium is being chaired by Dr. Carole Beal, UF Professor of Educational Technology and Director of the Online Learning Institute.

Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators/Presenters: Cindy DeLuca

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education

January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Request to change deliverable dates

Tactic 3.1.3: Implement a model to assess prior learning for the award of academic credit.

Deliverable: December 2016: Online Programs Workgroup will develop a model for assessing prior learning. January 2017: 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.

Status: The request is to have Tactic 3.1.3 Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) be presented at the same time as Tactic 3.1.2 Competency Based Education (CBE) and Adaptive Learning Programs. The reasoning for this request is that documents dealing with PLA consistently discuss the close relationship with CBE. The Council for Adult and Experiential Learning has a document titled "PLA and CBE on the Competency Continuum." Having these two related areas come forward at the same time should help presenters explain similarities and differences in these topics to the BOG committee and should also help ensure that recommendations are coordinated.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to May 2017

Access 1.1.1: Establish and maintain an inventory of SUS fully online and primarily online programs, as well as online courses.

Deliverable: December 2016: Using data definitions proposed by Data Workgroup and in alignment with the BOG process for modifying data elements, 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.

Status: The Board Office compiled an inventory of online programs in 2015, capturing majors offered in each program, using the programs' CIP codes to organize the inventory into fully online and primarily online programs. Both universities and state colleges annually submit online program data to FLVC for the distance learning catalog, and conversations have begun among the three entities to agree on common program definitions, and to alleviate duplicate work while obtaining needed system-level data. The deliverable may need to be changed, depending on the outcome of these discussions.

Also, the Higher Education Coordinating Committee (HECC) has "Common Definitions" on its draft agenda for its March 2017 meeting to discuss the development of common cross-system terminology and definitions for distance education courses and programs.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to May, 2017

Affordability 4.1.1: Review and recommend revisions to current system-wide terms and definitions related to online education to ensure consistency and relevancy of data collection.

Deliverable: December 2016: **Data Workgroup will work with the BOG Workgroup on Metrics for Online Education to make recommendations official.**

Status: In June 2016, the Data Committee recommended continuing to capture data for fully and primarily online courses and programs as they are currently defined, and separately capturing fully and primarily online program data offered just at the upper level. Subsequent to that conversation, workgroup chairs have started discussing whether there is a need to capture additional data and, as mentioned above, HECC has "Common Definitions" on its draft agenda for March 2017 to discuss the development of common cross-system terminology and definitions for distance education.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to July 2017

Access 3.1.2: Ensure universities are using need and demand data when considering programs for online delivery.

Deliverable: December 2016**:** 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.
January 2016**:** The Data Workgroup will present report at the January 2016 joint meeting of the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee. Further action steps will be discussed

Status: We are re-wording the deliverable associated with this tactic to establish a process that would encourage conversations among institutions when they are exploring the feasibility of offering programs online that are currently offered face-to-face. Such conversations could be similar to those required for the addition or termination of programs in Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination, which "facilitates collaboration, articulation, and coordination of academic program delivery across the State University System" and would provide opportunities for the development of shared programs, while ensuring increased efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to July 2017

Affordability 1.1.1: 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.

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.

Status: The Infrastructure and Affordability workgroups are working together to gather additional information regarding the enhancement of the online marketplace.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to May 2017

Affordability 1.2.3: Review and recommend data analytic tools and methods to predict student success in online education.

December 2016: 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.

January 2017: A report will be delivered to the Implementation Committee and the Steering Committee for its discussion at its January 2017 meeting. Further action steps will be discussed.

Status: Due to the large number of available data analytic tools, a change in deliverable date is requested. It is also recommended that this tactic be considered in tandem with the learning analytics efforts addressed in Affordability 1.2.4.

Recommendation: Change deliverable date to May 2017

Supporting Documentation: None

Facilitators/Presenters: Cynthia DeLuca

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STEERING COMMITTEE
SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education
January 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Workgroup Members for Papers in this Agenda Packet

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Quality Workgroup:

Len Roberson, Chair	University of North Florida
Kevin Celebi Miles	New College of Florida
Vance Burgess	University of West Florida
Dave Jaeger	Florida Gulf Coast University
Brian Marchman	University of Florida
Arifa Garman	Gulf Coast State College
Brenda Vose	University of North Florida
Deb Miller	University of North Florida
Joe Clark	Florida State University
Dennis Walpole	University of South Florida
Kelvin Thompson	University of Central Florida
Sid Beitler	Palm Beach State University

Online Programs Workgroup:

Andy McCollough, Chair	University of Florida
Kelly Bailey	Florida A&M University
Cathy Duff	Florida Gulf Coast University
Kendall St. Hilaire	Indian River State College
Naomi Boyer	Pensacola State College
Pam Northrup	University of West Florida
Tom Cavanagh	University of Central Florida
Mike Ronco	University of Florida
Jennifer Smith	University of Florida

Professional Development Workgroup:

Cindy DeLuca, Chair	University of South Florida
Kelley Bailey	Florida A&M University
Victoria Brown	Florida Atlantic University
Kevin Celebi	New College of Florida
Laura Dinehart	Florida International University
Cathy Duff	Florida Gulf Coast University
Franzetta Fitz	Florida A&M University
Shawn Felton	Florida Gulf Coast University
Arifa Garman	South Florida State College
Joel Hartman	University of Central Florida
Melanie Jackson	South Florida State College
Melissa Rizzuto	Florida Southwestern State College

Infrastructure Workgroup:

Joseph Riquelme, Chair	Florida International University
Mike Sink	University of South Florida
Francisca Yonekura	University of Central Florida
Robert Seniors	Florida A&M University
Vance Burgess	University of West Florida
Douglas Guiler	Lake Sumter State College
Kendall St. Hilaire	Indian River State College

Student Services Workgroup:

Victoria Brown, Chair	Florida Atlantic University
David Brodosi	University of South Florida
Kendall St. Hilaire	Indian River State College
Lynn Drees	State College of Florida
Bob Reed	University of Central Florida
Javier Reyna	University of West Florida
Michael Dieckmann	University of West Florida
Mary Myers	Florida SouthWestern State College
Gladys Arome	Florida Atlantic University
Drew Golburgh	Florida International University
Geri Genovese	University of West Florida
Kerry Welch	University of Central Florida
Kris Klann	University of Florida
Franzetta Fritz	Florida A & M University
Josh Strigle	College of Central Florida

Supporting Documentation Included: None
Facilitators/Presenters: Dr. Cindy DeLuca