Online Learning Advisory Committee (OLAC) Notes

October 3rd, 2013:

A. Discussed committee’s role:
   1. Forum for faculty feedback
   2. Vehicle for communication

B. Shared information about current faculty resources and support:
   . Instructional Technologist, Learning Systems Manager, Online Learning Technician

C. Shared overall picture of online learning at SUNY Canton:
   . Data posted to ANGEL
     a. Will request IR to attend a meeting to explore additional data needs
        i. Possibilities raised: Introduction to Finance, correlation between high school preparedness and those doing well in online courses
           a. See University of Maryland College and University of Minnesota Morris for best practices http://onlinelearning.morris.umn.edu/pseo/

D. Shared upcoming challenges for the campus:
   1. Transition to Blackboard-Learn
   2. Open SUNY
      a. Focus is to help students graduate on time (degree completion and transferability)
         • FAQ posted to ANGEL

E. Gathered tentative discussion points for future meetings:
   • Online Learning Policies and Procedures Manual
      a. Michelle will do initial editing, prior to committee review
   • Three-year course review process
      a. Not being done
      b. Lack of communication, faculty not aware their courses are up for re-review
      c. Cumbersome process- is it effective?
      d. Thoughts on improving
   • Stipends for shared intellectual property rights
      a. Complexities
      b. Current process and other ways (some colleges use a work for hire model with increased compensation)
   • Academic Integrity
   • Open SUNY requirements
   • SLN Education Services
   • BB Transition
   • Other

October 17th, 2013:

-Shared best practices spreadsheet from Regional Meetings-
Discussion:

1. **Issues with the re-review process:**
   - Not being done
   - Lack of communication, faculty not aware that their courses are up for re-review
   - Difficult to scale (not enough faculty to support the process)

**OLAC feedback:**
- Felt purpose of the re-review is to give feedback to faculty on quality; facilitate updating course organization
- Believes process needs to be streamlined
  1. Place courses needing re-review on a cycle
     - Send to dept. chairs and deans
  2. Establish an Online Course Re-review Committee (much like curriculum committee)
     - Set up in the summer
     - Participation stipend?
     - Committee make-up (10 members)
     - Use same rubric but with a scaled down team
       - 2 individuals per team: content and ‘objective’ faculty (one who is unfamiliar with the course/subject) in order to capture a fresh set of eyes & pick up navigation needs; perhaps adjuncts should be the objective person; objective person reviews outside the discipline; add to adjunct orientation and ask for volunteers?
       - Average review time per course: approx. 1 hour
       - Each department should develop a pool of content experts that they approve of
       - Note: I would like continue the discussion on the content person at our next meeting, as there may be at least 40 courses needing to be re-reviewed which would require 40 content people—is this feasible? Other options for meeting the rubric’s standard relating to content/learning outcomes for a re-review?
  3. Random sample (quality control)- good idea, may need to get through backlog first; perhaps after process established for some time
  4. Fast track? Exempt those who routinely teach online? Problems noted: political, who is to decide?

**Notes:**
- Currently Molly is reaching out to SUNY FIT, Farmingdale, and Broome (they have been identified as institutions with best practices re: online course reviews).
- Potsdam: Uses a committee to reviews new online courses, make recommendations for improvement and for approval; team members are appointed by the Provost/based on recommendations from deans
- Private institutions- Molly will reach out to

2. **Stipends for shared intellectual property rights for courses requested by the college:**

**OLAC feedback:**
- It was brought up that faculty may not be aware of the policy or what it means
- It was brought up that faculty may not choose stipend so they maintain control of their course and no one else can teach it.
- Molly will reach out to other schools to see how they manage this- work for hire model/compensation higher?

**November 21st, 2013:**

**Notes:**

1) Molly is meeting with Sarah on data requests mentioned in our earlier meeting:
   a. Grade distribution for French
   b. ENGL 100 and 101 online vs. face-to-face grade distribution and withdrawal rates

2) We continued our discussion on the re-review process:
   a. Larger institutions and online accredited institutions (i.e., Walden) hire for development; it is not a faculty process. Therefore, there is no re-review process. Empire State College has a model for course development; they create a single version of each course. Essentially, the more you scale the number of courses, the less faculty-centered the process.
   b. We agreed we should keep the 3 year review process for quality purposes. It is what makes us different (PR).
   c. To handle the 3 year review cycle (those courses needing re-review), we recommend that the college establish an Online Course Re-review Committee
      - Set up in the summer
      - Use the same rubric but with a scaled down team
      - Team made-up of 10 volunteer members:
        o 2 individuals per team: discipline-related and ‘objective’ faculty (one who is unfamiliar with the course/subject in order to capture a fresh set of eyes & pick up navigation needs; encourage adjuncts to participate)
        o Must have training on the course review process
        o Participation stipend? Molly will ask for recommendation from Deans
   d. We discussed clarifying ‘significant revisions’ for faculty (faculty repeatedly ask for a better understanding and examples of what this means).
      i. **Current Policy:** Courses are reviewed based on the standards of good practice detailed in the [course review rubric](#) (emailed to course developers). Review teams are comprised of faculty volunteers trained in evaluating online courses. A review team is comprised of three teaching faculty, one of which is an instructor/content expert in the discipline or a related field, and one resource person (a non-voting member proficient in instructional design). The purpose of the review team is to provide recommendations to the appropriate Dean on the ability of a proposed online course to meet the general and specific standards of the rubric. The review process is repeated every three years. A course may be reviewed more frequently if requested by the Dean or if the course undergoes significant changes. Final course approval rests with the appropriate Dean.
ii. Suggested that we mirror Middle States’ approach to substantive changes for institutions: *Changes that affect the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the course.* These include:

- *Revisions affecting the ability of the course to meet intended student learning outcomes.* For example: Did revisions to the course content clarify the material or change the ability of the course to meet the intended student learning outcomes?

- *Revisions affecting the ability of the course to meet the expectations of quality as established by the course review rubric, with emphasize on meeting the rubric’s essential standards of best practice.* For example:
  - Where there changes to the organizational (navigation) structure of the course? Did such revisions clarify the navigation or affect the ability of the course to meet the essential standard: 1.1 *Navigational instructions make the organization of the course easy to understand.* (3 pts.)

3) Other suggestions:
   - Post the document *Approved Online Courses* to the Faculty Assembly webpage in addition to Provost>Faculty Resources> Approved Online Courses webpage.

4) Spent some time on Open SUNY: Focus is on transferability, degree completion and collaborative programs. Discussed an example: What would be the possibility of participating in a joint program in literature, in which students could transfer credit; credit that would count as an elective in their major? ***Open SUNY Information posted to ANGEL, go to Content> Open SUNY

**December 12th, 2013:**

1. Discussed updates: Molly will be sharing feedback and suggestions from OLAC (re-review process, significant changes) to the upcoming Dean’s Cabinet
2. Discussion on compensation policy:

   Questions brought up by the committee:
   - How does the campus pay for a collaborative effort, very similar to the dilemma/concept with team teaching?
   - Work for hire: Is it compensation for course development or shared rights or both?

   Discussed implications of work for hire on courses that outdate quickly (such as a course like Electronic Commerce) vs. courses on “lasting subjects” (such as a History course). With work for hire, one is paying for the ability of the course to meet the student learning outcomes, so one would not need to be paying again in the future for revisions to update the content

   Discusses exploring changes to the current stipend (compensation) policy. Committee felt that there is much misunderstandings on the current policy, such as:

   - Stipend is for shared intellectual property rights for 3 years; it is not for course development
The culture has been to honor any request for a stipend; this semester, Molly forwards requests to the appropriate Dean so the Dean can make a decision on whether or not the academic department needs to share the rights. Courses now are ‘leased’ for strategic reasons (such reasons being the need for course flexibility that allows others to teach the course, and the ability to teach the courses if the instructor leaves, especially on short notice-no time for course development).

The committee suggested that during the spring division meetings that Deans discuss what the current policy means (and doesn’t mean) and then discuss work for hire. It is believed there will be better input on any proposed changes if there was a better understanding of the current policy.

Molly shared feedback from the math department; they prefer to keep the current policy.

Next semester plans: (Molly will be sending Doodle pool to capture meeting dates for next semester)
- Review Online Learning Policies and Procedures Manual (Molly will update over break, incorporating OLAC suggestions)
- Discuss Open SUNY: institutional readiness and opportunities for campus and faculty

**January 23rd, 2014:**
*Shared new Stipend Request Form*

Form does several things:
- Puts the approval in the hands of the academic dean
- Documents the request
- Provides information about the current policy and what significant changes means

*Shared information on SUNY’s intellectual property rights, Open SUNY, and winter session:*

1) Copyright and Faculty Ownership of Intellectual Property: [http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/FacultyOwnership.cfm](http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/FacultyOwnership.cfm)
2) Open SUNY [http://open.suny.edu/courses/tutoring/](http://open.suny.edu/courses/tutoring/) Students taking courses in online degree programs powered by Open SUNY will have free access to tutoring programs through their learning management system (LMS).
3) Colleges that participated in our winter session: We drew from 120 different colleges. Our highest online enrollments came from:
   - Binghamton University -157
   - Syracuse University-113
   - Stony Brook University-33
   - University of Maryland -32
   - SUNY Potsdam-32
   - Clarkson University -27
   - University at Albany -23

*Discussed compensation policy; extending shared rights, paying more:* Molly will collate comments and questions from the Math and Humanities dept. (no names, will send to OLAC prior to submitting to Provost Office by Feb 1, 2014) Schools of Health and Engineering did not have any comments at the time
Feb 6, 2014:

1. Molly gave an update on the compensation policy:
   - Dean’s cabinet is drafting a Q & A on intellectual property rights (which clarifies answers to faculty questions on the current model or a work-for-hire model)
   - Molly will share the final Q & A with OLAC when finished

2. Discussed Open SUNY:
   - Chancellor stated in a recent meeting: “Open SUNY is the priority and everything aligns with Open SUNY”
   - Molly shared an Open SUNY cheat-sheet that collates key points of Open SUNY into a user-friendly table
   - All Open SUNY documents, including the cheat-sheet, are posted to ANGEL
   - Question: How do we proceed? How do we engage faculty in the possibilities? Committee suggested we share with faculty what we know and what we don’t know.
   - Discussed the measures that SUNY used to select the online programs to launch Open SUNY. The committee asked: Is participation in the institutional readiness program one of them?

   Open SUNY Institutional readiness website:
   http://commons.suny.edu/opensuny/institutional-readiness/

   Follow-up comments and information since our meeting: Open SUNY’s Institutional Readiness focuses on assessing an institution’s ability to participate in Open SUNY and deliver quality online programs. SUNY Canton (in 2003-5) assessed its institutional readiness to offer online courses and programs when it had to submit documents and evidence to Middle State’s in order to receive permission to offer fully online degrees.

   Many of these same benchmarks (e.g., faculty and learner support) are used in Open SUNY’s Institutional Readiness project. **SUNY Potsdam is currently participating** in this (*subsequently we know that participating in the readiness project is not a criterion for being selected as one of Open SUNY’s showcase programs)*

3. Discussed the Open SUNY Library Content Specialist group. Here is some follow-up information from Michelle:

   - Originally McKinsey requested that librarians provided course support without financial arrangement: “If a campus does not have the right [librarian] skill set on their campus, is it possible for librarians from other campuses to allocate some resources towards librarian course support for Open SUNY as a pilot process (without any financial arrangements)?”
   - The SUNY Council of Library Directors’ responded: **The SUNY Council of Library Directors fully supports the vision and efforts of the Open SUNY Course Support Library Team, on behalf of the Open SUNY Center for Online Teaching Excellence (COTE), in ensuring Open SUNY students have access to the library resources they require for**
academic success. Additionally, SCLD endorses the COTE plan to pilot a program designed to assist Open SUNY campuses in need of additional library expertise and experience. Further, the SCLD encourages library directors to support their staff who have the skill sets and interest, to participate in the COTE pilot to provide resources to other campus libraries that do not have these skill sets.

April 3, 2014:

1) Congratulations to our Open SUNY Fellow: Janice Robinson!

2) Discussed the Q & A document on shared rights:
   - Document provides clarity on questions related to shared rights or a work-for hire model
   - OLAC is not deciding policy; only collecting faculty input
   - Committee did not feel comfortable proposing one model (current or work for hire) over the other, rather, they believed it would be best if the recent clarification (Q & A document) was shared with faculty (Deans should promote understanding with faculty). The committee felt that the Q & A document answered many faculty questions; the committee did not have any questions on its content.
     - Will post the Q & A document to the Online Learning website, please see http://www.canton.edu/ol/faculty.html (this webpage links off the College’s homepage)
     - Will share the committee’s feedback with administration
     - Will develop a grid to improve understanding of different models of compensation and share at next meeting

3) Discussed the College’s transition to Bb:
   - Reviewed a PPT that provided an overview of the transition
   - Emphasized the need for staffing to support the number of courses that need to be converted and training for the campus community
     - A “Transition” icon is now on the College’s homepage (replaces the Presidential search icon)
     - This icon links to http://www.canton.edu/ol/faculty.html where information on the transition, as well as other faculty resources (policies and procedures), are provided
     - A campus email formally announcing the transition will be sent shortly

4) Open SUNY Institutional Readiness brought up. Although the College initially went through this exercise when it was originally approved as an institution to offer programs online, it still would be good to pursue participating in it, as the review could highlight any gaps in online learning that we need to fill, as well as educate the campus community on needs related to teaching online. Molly will reach out to SUNY on the possibility of participating, and find out details and discuss with administration. Below are notes on this issue from an earlier OLAC meeting:

Open SUNY Institutional readiness website:
http://commons.suny.edu/opensuny/institutional-readiness/
SUNY Canton (in 2003-5) assessed its institutional readiness to offer online courses and programs when it had to submit documents and evidence to Middle State’s demonstrating that it could meet Middle State’s benchmarks for quality (this had to be done before we were allowed to offer any of our fully online degrees).

Many of these same benchmarks (e.g., faculty and learner support) are used in Open SUNY’s Institutional Readiness project. SUNY Potsdam is currently participating in the Open SUNY Project (***subsequently we know that participating in the Readiness project is not a criterion for being selected as one of Open SUNY 8 showcase programs)

5) We did not get to the discussion on the Online Course Re-review (summer 2014) Committee-save for next meeting on Thursday, April 24th at noon in FOB 222

April 24th 2014:

(1) Reviewed comparison table of different compensation models (see below). Committee believed that the table helps clarify the similarities and differences between our current model for 3 years shared rights and a work for hire model. Molly suggested that any next steps should involve the new President; the committee agreed, and subsequently Molly will put it on Dr. Szafran’s radar when he comes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested by the College</th>
<th>Stipend</th>
<th>Work for Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 for 3 years</td>
<td>Higher, for perpetuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Rights</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor selection</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assignments rest with the academic dean</td>
<td>Teaching assignments rest with the academic dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course selection</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated through the department chair</td>
<td>Coordinated through the department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to 3 year review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of the compensation model, significant revisions to a course require re-review.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Molly shared that the faculty stipend for the re-review summer process was confirmed by the Provost. The stipend will be $35/course (per Dr. Hoffman this year). There are 40 courses scheduled for re-review this summer (2014):
   a. Four teams (1 faculty member/team)
   b. Each team has 10 courses
   c. Faculty must be experienced course reviewers. Molly asked the committee if they had any guidance on selecting the faculty. Jan suggested that the Deans recommend faculty (great idea).

3. Bb transition:
   a. Online Learning has been given permission to hire a 1 year temporary position to help with the Bb transition. Molly asked if there were suggestions for the search committee membership; Jan suggested there may be individuals capable of filling the position that the OL staff will know. Molly will inquire.
   b. Molly will be sending an email to interested Phase 1 faculty during the 1st week in May.

4. The second round of Open SUNY degree submissions are due April 30th, 2014. Hopefully, SUNY Canton will be chosen (as our policies and processes are well-developed); yet Molly noted that SUNY is looking for campuses to contribute resources (staffing time) to “Open SUNY Teams.” This is a concern for us, as we do not have the staffing infrastructure to “give away.” Emily suggested we consider grant funding (Perkins) as a venue to pursue support for Open SUNY initiatives.

5. Molly thanked the committee members for their dedication and commitment to the Advisory Board and their feedback. The feedback from the committee has been invaluable. Molly asked committee if they would be willing to review the OL faculty resource webpage over the summer electronically and provide feedback. When the site is ready for review, Molly will send an email. Additionally, at the start of the fall semester, Molly will meet/communicate with Dept. Chairs regarding helpful information on online learning (i.e., course review process, etc.)

Thank you!