

### AGENDA

Steering Committees for Implementation of the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education Room 3605 Student Union Complex University of North Florida 1 UNF Drive Jacksonville, Florida 32224 March 29, 2018 7:45 - 9:30

1.	Call to Order and Opening Remarks	Dr. Ralph Wilcox, Chair
	a. Summary agendas for 2018 meetings	Chair Wilcox
	b. Clarification from 1/24/2018 Discussion: STEM Labs	Dr. Nancy McKee
	c. Follow-up from 1/25/2018 IOC Meeting: Data Privacy	Joseph Riquelme, FIU
2.	Consideration for Approval	
	<ul><li>a. Online Student Support Scorecard Report</li><li>b. Addressing Unfunded Items in the LBR</li></ul>	Dr. Vicki Brown, FAU
	i. Innovations in Florida Online Learning (IFOL)	Dr. Tom Cavanagh, UCF
	ii. Master Courses	Dr. Andy McCollough, UF
	iii. Proctoring and Licensing	Mr. Riquelme
	iv. eTexts and OER	Dr. Cindy DeLuca, USF
	c. Merger of Tactics for Data Analytics	-
	and the Research Consortium Mr. Riqu	elme and Dr. McCollough
3.	For Discussion: Draft Regulation -Academic Online Program	
	Coordination P	rovosts Furton and Ellenberg
4.	Updates/Guidance	
	a. FLVC Coding Structure for Quality and High Quality Co	urses Dr. DeLuca
	b. Student Support for Multiple Start Models	Dr. Brown
5.	Concluding Remarks and Adjournment	Chair Wilcox

### **SUBJECT: Opening Remarks**

### PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION

### (1) For approval; (2) For clarification; and (3) For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1. The workgroup chairs and Board staff have developed a work plan for 2018 that has proposals being discussed and approved by the Steering Committee before moving forward to the Board's Innovation and Online Committee. The attached document reflects dates the proposals would be considered by and updates given to both committees for the rest of the year. While adjustments will most likely need to be made throughout the year, the attached document provides targeted due dates for Steering Committee deliverables in 2018.
- 2. The minutes from the January 24, 2018, Steering Committee meeting are attached. The Steering Committee agreed that the STEM lab would be available for a fee to those SUS institutions not participating in the pilot. State colleges have asked if they will also have access to the lab after the pilot has been completed. What is the Steering Committee's response?
- **3.** The Board approved a motion during its January meeting to require each university as a part of the Technology Scorecard evaluation to assure that the access to the data collected in the process complies with the laws that protect the privacy of such data. The Steering Committee will consider for approval the proposed addition to the Scorecard (see attached).

Supporting Documentation Included:	2018 Summary Agendas; Minutes from 1/24/2018 Meeting; Data Privacy (Technology Scorecard Revision)
Facilitators/Presenters:	Chair Wilcox

### Summary Agendas\* Based on the 2018 Work Plan for the Implementation of the SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education

Meeting	Steering Committee	Innovation and Online Committee
January	<ol> <li>Approval: Funding Proposal for online STEM labs (Andy/Evie)</li> <li>Approval: Plans for Shared Programs Task Force (Pam)</li> <li>Approval: Report on use of data analytic tools (joseph)</li> <li>Approval: Report on technology and processes needed for multiple, accelerated terms (Joseph)</li> <li>Discussion: Student Services Scorecard report (Vicki)</li> <li>Update: Inventory of online programs/Academic Online Program Coordination (Nancy)</li> <li>Update: Technology Scorecard Follow-up (Joseph)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Report: UF Online Annual Report (Andy/Evie)</li> <li>Approval: Online Labs Task Force (presented to Steering Com on 11/30/2017) (Andy/Evie)</li> <li>Approval: Technology Scorecard Report (presented to Steering Com on 11/30/2017) (Joseph)</li> </ol>
March	<ol> <li>Approval: Student Services Scorecard Report (Vicki)</li> <li>Approval: Plans for moving forward with issues not funded in LBR –Master Courses, IFOL, Proctoring, OER (Andy/Tom/Joseph/Cindy:)</li> <li>Approval: Draft regulation for Online Prog Coordination (Nancy)</li> <li>Update: Use of data analytic tools for Student Success (Steering Comm on 1/24/2018)</li> <li>Update: Quality Coding Structure in DL Catalog (Cindy)</li> <li>Update: Merger of Research Consortium tactic with data analytics tactic (Andy and Joseph)</li> <li>Clarification of participation in STEM Labs (Nancy)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Approval: 2016-17 Annual Report for Online Education (Nancy)</li> <li>Workshop on institutions' online programs</li> </ol>
June	<ol> <li>Approval: Statewide Marketing Report (Joseph)</li> <li>Approval: Report on Student Services needed for multiple, accelerated terms (Vicki)</li> <li>Update: Expanding Shared Services on FloridaShines (Pam)</li> <li>Update: Licensing (Joseph)</li> <li>Update: Proctoring (Joseph)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Approval: Student Services Scorecard report (Steering Comm on 3/2018) (Vicki)</li> <li>Notice regulation for Online Program Coordination (Steering Comm on 3/2018)</li> </ol>

\* Dates/issues may be adjusted throughout the year.

### Summary Agendas\* Based on the 2018 Work Plan for the Implementation of the SUS 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education

Meeting Date	Steering Committee	Innovation and Online Committee
September	<ol> <li>Approval: Report on Shared Degrees (Pam)</li> <li>Update: Report on Adaptive Learning/CBE (Tom/Pam)</li> <li>Update: Research Consortium process for sharing best practices (Andy)</li> <li>Update: Master Courses repository (Andy)</li> <li>Update: IFOL (Tom)</li> <li>Update: Use of data analytic tools for Student Success (Steering Comm on 1/24/2018 and 3/2018) (Joseph/Andy)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Approval: Statewide Marketing (Steering Com 6/2018) (Joseph)</li> <li>Approval: Report on technology, processes, and student services needed for multiple, accelerated terms (Steering Com -Tech- 1/24/2018 and Guidance –Student Svcs - 3/2018) (Joseph/Vicki)</li> <li>Update: OER/e-texts initiatives (Steering Com 6/2018) – (Cindy)</li> <li>Update: Expanding Shared Services on FloridaShines (Steering Com 6/2018) (Pam)</li> <li>Update: Licensing (Steering Com 3/2018) (Joseph)</li> <li>Update: Proctoring (Steering Com 3/2018) (Joseph)</li> <li>Update: Quality Certification System (Steering Comm 3/2018) (Cindy)</li> </ol>
November	Review of performance indicators and goals for mid-term adjustments of 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education.	<ol> <li>Approval: Report on Shared Degrees (Steering Com 9/2018) (Pam)</li> <li>Approval: Report on Adaptive Learning/CBE (Steering Com 9/2018) (Tom/Pam)</li> <li>Approval: Use of data analytic tools for Student Success (Steering Comm on 1/24/2018 and 9/2018) (Joseph/Andy)</li> <li>Update: Master Courses Repository (Steering Com 9/2018) (Andy)</li> <li>Update: Research Consortium process for sharing best practices (Steering Com 9/2018) (Andy)</li> <li>Update: IFOL</li> </ol>
2019	<ol> <li>Update: High Quality Awards (Cindy)</li> <li>Update: IFOL Projects Funded (Tom)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Update: High Quality Awards (Cindy)</li> <li>Update: IFOL Projects Funded (Tom)</li> <li>Approval: Review/revision of performance indicators and goals (Steering Com 11/2018)</li> </ol>

\* Dates/issues may be adjusted throughout the year.



### AGENDA

**Steering Committees** for Implementation of the 2025 Strategic Plan for Online Education **Room 205 Turnbull Conference Center** Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida January 24, 2018 1:00 p.m. **Outcomes of Meeting** 

- 1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks
- 2. Consideration for Approval
  - a. Funding Proposal for Online **STEM Labs**

**Outcome:** UF will fund the chemistry faculty for three years and other costs will be covered by partner institutions. Faculty at other universities will be engaged throughout the pilot period. Upon completion, the lab will be available to other interested SUS institutions for a fee.

b. Shared Degree Programs

Outcome: Move forward with the creation of the task force. Request 1 or 2 nominees, including language faculty, online designers, and registrars.

c. Use of Data Analytic Tools

**Outcome:** Andy McCollough and Joseph Riquelme will discuss merging the Research Consortium with the Data Analytics initiative.

- d. Technology and Processes for Multiple, Accelerated Terms Mr. Riquelme **Outcome:** Find solutions on individual campuses. Conduct annual survey of the status at each institution to stay on top of whether any institutions have figured it out, so solutions can be shared with others.
- 3. For Discussion: Student Services Scorecard Outcome: Move findings to each institution. Come back for "meaty" discussion at next Steering Committee meeting.

### **Evie Cummings, UF Online**

#### Dr. Pam Northrup, UWF

#### Joseph Riquelme, FIU

#### Dr. Vicki Brown, FAU

Dr. Ralph Wilcox, Chair

4. Updates

a.	Technology Scorecard Follow-up Outcome: Accepted.	Mr. Riquelme
b.	Inventory of Online Programs and Academic Online Program Coordination	Dr. McKee

Academic Online Program Coordination <u>Outcome:</u> Nancy will work with George Ellenberg and Ken Furton to draft a regulation for discussion by the Steering Committee in March.

### 5. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Chair Wilcox

### SUBJECT: Data Privacy Addition to Technology Scorecard

### PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### Tactics:

Quality 2.2.1 - Using Quality Scorecard or a similar process, ensure that each institution has the technology needed to provide quality online education.

Quality 2.2.3 - Using Quality Scorecard or a similar process, ensure universities review their infrastructure to confirm that students, including students with disabilities, can easily access their online instruction.

Privacy	Exemplary	Meets Criteria	Insufficient
	The university is in compliance with FERPA privacy and security policies and regularly audits technology services and software to ensure the privacy of student information.	The university is in compliance with FERPA privacy and security policies. A privacy policy is available on the university website.	The university has a FERPA privacy and security policies.
	A privacy policy is available on the university website.		

### Supporting Documentation Included: None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** 

Joseph Riquelme, FIU

### STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Steering Committee March 29, 2018

### **SUBJECT: Online Student Support Scorecard FL SUS Results**

### PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### Tactic:

Quality 2.2.3 – Using the quality scorecard to ensure that universities review their infrastructure to confirm that students, including those with disabilities, have adequate access to online support services.

The Florida Board of Governors for the State University System adopted the 2025 SUS Online Education Strategic Plan on the recommendation of the Innovation and Online Committee. One of the tactics within the plan was to develop a scorecard to measure the level of online student support services at the universities in the state system. Each institution received the scorecard and guidebook with detail descriptions for scoring and examples of best practices for the different categories of support services. The institutions that utilized the scorecard conducted a self-study of the services provided to 100% online students and self-reported their results. This report contains the results of the scorecard surveys of 10 universities in the system delivering distance learning programs. Each of the universities received a report with the institution's self-reported results with a comparison to the SUS average score.

### **Description of the Scorecard**

The scorecard instrument included eleven categories of services: admission, financial aid, preenrollment advising, veteran services, career counseling, post-enrollment services, orientation, library, disability, technology support, and graduate support services. Each category included several criteria with three possible choices: 2 signifying exemplary service, 1 signifying the service is available, and 0 signifying limited or no service. The scorecard had 5 criteria for admission support services for a total of 100 maximum attainable points; 2 criteria for financial aid support services for a total of 40 possible points, 5 criteria for pre-enrollment advising for a total of 100 points, 2 criteria for veteran support services for a total of 40 points, 5 criteria for career counseling for a total of 100 points, 4 criteria for orientation for a total of 80 points, 9 criteria for post-enrollment support services for a total of 180, 5 criteria for library support for a total of 100 points, 4 criteria for disability services for a total of 80 points, 3 criteria for technical support services for a total of 60 points, and 7 criteria for graduate support services for a total of 140 points

### **Scorecard Results**

### State University System (SUS)

The State University System achieved an 80% or better on most of the service categories. Overall, the universities are doing a good job at providing services to their distance learners. The category with the highest score was access to disability services at 100% (Figure 1). While, the area with the lowest score was post-enrollment services at 73% of the maximum attainable score (see Figure 1).

**Recommendation:** To administer the scorecard again in two years to track improvement in providing support services for online students. For institutions to effectively improve support service requires time. Two years will provide time for the institutions to develop and begin to implement strategies for support of online students.

### **Figures**





Across the 51 criteria, the system scored well with 100% on 5 items, 90% to 99% on 12 items, 80% to 89% on 19 items, and below 80% on 15 items. For a snapshot of the results across the different criteria for each category, see the graphs on the following pages.

**Figure 2:** SUS Post-Enrollment Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



Figure 3: SUS Admission Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



Page 3 of 8

**Figure 4:** SUS Pre-Enrollment Advising Services Results as a percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



**Figure 5:** SUS Career Counseling Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



Figure 6: SUS Orientation Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



Figure 7: SUS Library Services Results as a percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



Figure 8: SUS Disability Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



**Figure 9:** SUS Technical Support Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



**Figure 10:** SUS Graduate Support Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score



**Figure 11:** SUS Financial Aid Services Results as a Percentage of the Maximum Attainable Score







Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators/Presenters:

Dr. Vicki Brown, FIU

Page **8** of **8** 

### SUBJECT: Unfunded LBR: Innovations in Florida Online Learning (IFOL)

### PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The 2018 Legislative Budget Request included \$650,000 for grants for innovative programs. If funded, proposed projects would have been submitted to a system-wide coordinating committee for selection, and awardees and other institutional representatives would have been expected to attend an annual summit hosted by a state institution. The goal of the summit would have been to disseminate information about each project to help foster the scaling of high-impact innovations across both college and university systems.

Although the Legislature did not provide funds for the program, the workgroup proposes to go forward with an annual innovation summit to provide a venue for sharing innovative projects, with registration fees helping to offset the cost of the summit. It is possible that the existing TOPkit annual workshop infrastructure can be leveraged as a foundation to help minimize additional costs associated with the innovation summit.

Potential innovation summit tracks could be Faculty Professional Development Design (the current TOPkit focus), Innovations in Online Learning, and Research in Online Learning. Best practices could be shared on the TOPkit web site.

### Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators/Presenters:

Dr. Tom Cavanagh

### SUBJECT: Unfunded LBR: Master Courses

### PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The SUS 2018-19 LBR contained a request for \$667,000 for a repository of Master Courses for use by faculty throughout the SUS who are creating or enhancing their courses, with an initial focus on general education core courses.

The issue was not funded by the 2018 Legislature. However, the University of Florida, as lead institution for this effort, is planning to pilot a course preparation and review process on its campus using Canvas Commons as a repository, as explained in the attached document. Upon successful completion of the pilot, the initiative could be scaled up to the State University System and beyond.

Supporting Documentation Included: Master Courses

**Facilitators/Presenters:** 

Dr. Andy McCollough and Jennifer Smith, UF

# Master Courses

### Lead Institution: University of Florida

### Overview

The Online Education 2025 Strategic Plan, tactic 1.2.2 recommends, "Develop or co-develop shared Master Courses that would be available, but not required, for use in specific high-demand areas." As the lead institution for this tactic, the University of Florida proposes to pilot a course preparation and review process using Canvas Commons as a repository. Upon successful completion of the pilot, the initiative could be scaled up to the State University System and beyond.

# What is a Master Course?

A Master Course is the collection of digital course elements that can be used in part or in its entirety to provide a high quality and economical starting point for course development. The Master Course repository within UF's Canvas Commons will include:

- Full courses
- Course modules
- Ancillary materials such as quiz and exam questions
- Audio recordings
- Lecture outlines, transcripts and/or PowerPoint slides
- Open Educational Resources (OER) if they were included in the course design

Some types of content are not housed within Canvas and will not be included in UF's Canvas Commons at this time:

- Lecture video
- Laboratory simulations
- Homework systems
- Institutionally licensed content
- Publisher content



# Repository

Canvas Commons supports content sharing within a single institution, consortium or to the full Canvas community. As the Master Course process is developed and tested, these materials can move to the Unizin Canvas Commons or to other repository services.

To support effective searching, contributed materials must be correctly tagged and listed using a consistent organization schema. UF library staff is currently developing appropriate guidelines to support search needs.

Canvas commons includes:

- Options to search by content type (quizzes, pages, documents, etc.)
- Searches can also use:
  - o Tags
  - o Institution
  - o Name of resource
  - o Outcome
- A five star rating system

### **Course Preparation**

Courses selected for inclusion in the repository must earn a **High-Quality** designation through the *Official Florida QM Course Review* using the UF + QM Standards. The statewide **High-Quality** course designation currently requires:

- Use of the *Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition, 2014* (UF + QM Standards include the full QM rubric)
- An internal review conducted by the instructor and additional reviewers

It will be necessary to address the intellectual property concerns of University of Florida faculty. Course content developed as part of this program will be licensed through *Creative Commons*. This will provide appropriate credit to the faculty contributors as well as allowing remix and transformation of the material.

Grants will be available to support Master Course development or revision. A call for proposals will be sent to faculty and departments who teach and deliver the General Education Core courses. Where it is feasible, the Master Course initiative will integrate with OER and eText affordability efforts.

UF instructional design staff will play a critical role in preparing materials for submission to the repository. Recommendations for Master Course setup and teaching will be included within the Canvas Commons contribution. Instructional design team contact information will be made available to support use of the material.



# Impact Tracking

The Canvas Commons does not currently identify who is using a resource. A mechanism for tracking usage will be developed. This will make it possible to provide instructors and developers with updates and improvements as well as determine the usability of the resource. During the pilot stages, a survey request can be included as part of the course content. The Canvas Commons five star voting feature will provide general information about the usefulness of the resource.

## Timeline

A majority of the State Core General Education courses were part of the initial course development for UF Online and are now due for update or redesign. These 37 courses are currently being reviewed to determine a development schedule for revision. Once a course has successfully completed the Quality Matters review process, courses will be eligible for submission to the repository.



### SUBJECT: Unfunded LBR: Proctoring & Licensing

### PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<u>**Tactic:</u>** 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.</u>

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

### Update:

To move forward without state funding, the Infrastructure Workgroup and volunteer committees will collaborate with the FLVC in the development of a website for proctoring and related resources, and in the development of a portal for licensing, software, and services to minimize the duplication of efforts in technology adoption and selection processes.

Currently, both the Infrastructure Workgroup and volunteer committees are discussing plans for the proctoring and licensing projects and are in the process of developing the technical specifications to aid with implementation.

At the upcoming June meeting, the workgroups will provide an update on their progress.

Supporting Documentation: None

Facilitators/Presenters: Joseph Riquelme

### SUBJECT: Unfunded LBR: Open-Educational Resources (OER) and e-Textbooks.

### PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For approval

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### Tactic:

Affordability Tactic 2.1.1: Determine and promote methods to increase the use of openaccess textbook and educational resources to reduce costs to students.

Affordability 2.1.2: Reduce the costs of e-Textbooks for students through mechanisms that could include negotiating lower pricing with vendors and providing an enhanced repository for educational material.

The created four subgroups will meet independently of the workgroup and report at the monthly meetings. The groups are: OER, e-textbooks, library licensed content and ancillary materials (Courseware).

The workgroup has also proposed developing a Community of Practice within the already established and university supported Teaching Online Preparation Toolkit (TOPkit) website.

The workgroup unanimously voted to continue the work with the understanding that any costs identified for particular projects or products would be available to each institution as opt-in and absorbed by those participating institutions.

Supporting	Documentation	Included:	None
	Documentation	Inciancat	110110

**Facilitators/Presenters:** 

Cynthia A. DeLuca, USF

SUBJECT: Merger of Tactics for Data Analytics and the Research Consortium

### PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For Approval.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### Tactic:

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

Affordability - 1.2.4 - Develop means to collect data from learning management systems, student information systems, and other appropriate sources to create predictive analytics tools and interventions to increase student persistence and completion.

### Status of Analytics in the SUS and FCS

As Florida institutions continue to digitize their processes and advance their online course offerings, sources of educational data continue to advance and expand. Many Florida institutions are acting on available data to help inform their student success strategies, to positively impact student persistence and completion.

A variety of systems are in place across the SUS and FCS for data analytics, gathering, and reporting. To identify and gain insight on the systems in place, the infrastructure workgroup distributed a survey and collected information on current capabilities and processes across the SUS and FCS.

### **Survey Results**

Of the survey respondents, approximately 70% have systems and processes in place

that enable analysis on drivers around student success. There is variance in analytics implementations and processes, with some schools using tools built into their respective learning management system or student information system(s), whereas others are contracting with third party partners to uncover meaningful student insights to enable and assist with student interventions. Of the third party partners, Civitas is the most popular in adoption, though several schools are using EAB's Student Success Collaborative.

To supplement what is available from third party partners, some institutions are conducting additional data analysis in house with tools like Tableau, Microsoft Power BI, Pulse BI, and Pyramid BI. These tools enable institutions to create custom reports, dashboards, and visualizations with relative ease as they are able to combine data from a myriad of sources to find relationships within data to steer and guide student success operations.

### **Recommendation for Collaboration**

While there are differences in the software and platforms that are utilized across the colleges and universities, there is commonality in the data analysis approach and practices employed to visualize and draw inferences from available data. Because of this commonality, there is an opportunity for collaboration. The Infrastructure Workgroup proposes that the Research Consortium include in its mission leading an initiative to do research in areas that advance student success through the use of analytics. Findings and sharing of information may flow through the UCF IFOL initiative which will work in collaboration with the Research Consortium to identify research topics and disseminate best practices.

### Supporting Documentation Included: Analytics Tool Survey

Facilitators/Presenters: Mr. Joseph Riquelme

### SUBJECT: Draft Regulation - Academic Online Program Coordination

### PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For discussion

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

A new Board regulation has been drafted to create a process to ensure that system-wide conversations are held whenever universities are considering creating or terminating online programs (i.e., online majors); in concert with the new Online Programs Database, such conversations would benefit universities by reducing the potential for unnecessary duplication of online programs; identifying unmet needs system-wide; and recognizing opportunities for the development of shared programs.

After approval by the Steering Committee, the draft would go through the Board's regulation review process (internal Board Office review and review by institutional staff) before going to the Innovation and Online Committee for consideration.

The draft regulation should assist in the implementation of the following tactics:

Access Tactic 1.1.2: Offer a broad range of fully online degree programs in most Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes...

Access Tactic 1.1.3: ...Increase strategic collaborations between SUS institutions, as well as between SUS institutions and other universities, to meet the statewide goals for providing access to online instruction.

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

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.

Affordability 3.1.2: Develop or co-develop competency-based and adaptive learning programs that would be available, but not required, for use in appropriate areas of high demand, primarily around adults and workforce

needs, while maintaining quality and increasing efficiencies through an innovative, shared model.

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Draft Regulation

Facilitators/Presenters:

Dr. McKee and Provosts Furton and Ellenberg

#### 8.0-- Online Program Coordination

- For the purpose of this regulation, online program means a program major as defined in Board Regulation 8.011(2)(b) that is offered fully or primarily online as defined in the Strategic Plan for Online Education.
- (2) To facilitate collaboration, articulation, and coordination of online program delivery across the State University System, the Office of the Board of Governors shall coordinate with the Council of Academic Vice Presidents to discuss university plans regarding the addition or termination of any online program. The discussion shall be designed to inform both institutional and System level strategic planning and shall include (a) the need and demand for proposed online programs; (b) opportunities for the collaborative design and delivery of online programs; and (c) potential impacts of any proposed online program closure.

SUBJECT: FLVC Coding Structure for Quality and High Quality Online Courses

### **PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

For update

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<u>**Tactic:**</u> <u>Quality 1.1.3</u>: Ensure implementation of a course certification system at all universities offering online education</u>

<u>Status</u>: The Quality Workgroup, in conjunction with the FLVC, developed a coding structure for quality and high quality online courses. The coding plan will accommodate existing quality review processes that are in use in the state as well as a SUS-specific quality review process based upon the Quality Matters standards.

The proposed codes are: Q (quality), HQ (high quality) and NR (not reviewed). The NR category will be available to institutions for a period of two years after implementation. This was added to accommodate institutions that have a large volume of online courses to be reviewed and coded.

Currently, the FLVC is working with a developer to increase the capacity of their existing website to accommodate the quality coding system. Coding will begin in late Fall 2018 and the information will be visible for the Fall 2019 semester.

<u>Costs</u>

No additional costs; however, there will be a need for significant administrative effort to manage the process. (i.e. extra instructional designers, faculty and other reviewers to conduct the review and to code their courses and upload to FLVC course catalog).

### Supporting Documentation Included: None

**Facilitators/Presenters:** 

Drs. DeLuca, Miller and Thompson

### STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Steering Committee March 29, 2018

### SUBJECT: Student Support for Multiple Start Models

### PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION

For Guidance

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Tactic Access 1.1.8:** Provide a robust set of student support services to support the delivery of multiple, accelerated models.

The Infrastructure Workgroup surveyed the State University System to determine the number of institutions using accelerated models and the types of models.

- 1. **Subdividing traditional semesters:** Fall, Spring, and Summer Semesters into A, B, C, & D for five, six, or eight-week sessions. This model is the most common one used throughout the system. The model provides students with multiple starts throughout the traditional semesters.
- 2. Additional intersession classes: Two institutions are allowing students to enroll in intersession classes. These extremely short semesters fit between fall to spring, spring to summer, and summer to fall. The courses are frequently 1-week to 3-week intensive courses.

Would it be helpful to institutions for the student services workgroup to develop and distribute a white paper describing student support services and required resources for different types of multiple, accelerated models such as: (a) multiple start programs, (b) intercessions, and (c) rolling enrollments?

Supporting	Documentation	Included:	None
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

**Facilitators/Presenters:** 

Dr. Vicki Brown, FAU