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Relevance to participants/guests

A faculty member interested in the process and best practices in online course development

A trainer supporting faculty at a university just getting started in online course development

An instructional designer working with faculty new to online course development

An administrator interested in starting an online program

Lessons learned can be taken back to your institution
Institutional Background

• Oldest HBI in Maryland
• Centrally located between DC & Baltimore
• Approximately 5400 students / 225 FT faculty
  – 23 undergraduate majors
  – 19 master’s degree programs
  – 2 doctoral programs
  – 9 advanced certificate programs
Defining the Need - External

- Online education is more likely to be considered as necessary for survival by public institutions & distance education enrollment is growing very fast. (Sloan-C, 2010)

- Distance education provides positive alternatives to the rapidly growing population of non-traditional students. (Folkers, 2005)
Defining the Need - Internal

• Declining market share
  – African-Americans comprise 36% of enrollment at UMUC (primarily online).

• Lack of facilities
  – BSU residence halls can only house 1400 students.
  – Classroom space maximized between 9 am and 2 pm.

• Student need for alternative formats
Defining the Need - Internal

- About 1200 sections offered per semester
  - 90% of our students want online access
  - 74% of faculty want to teach online/hybrid
Further challenges...

• Any instructor could offer an online or hybrid course

• However...
  – No office responsible for monitoring
  – No department approval or awareness
  – No development required
  – No evaluation before/during/after
  – No training required
What we saw in the early years in “online” and “hybrid” courses...

- **Fully developed**
  - Robust, full of content & assessments

- **Partially developed**
  - Pieces here and there

- **Absolute chaos**
  - All over the place, no organization, rhyme or reason

- **Nothing at all**
DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning)

Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Regional accreditation

• BSU Decennial Self-Study (2011)
  – Internal - Identified the institution’s multi-year goal to have a program available online.
  – Team Recommendations:
    • Establish clear lines of authority for the direction of distance education.
    • Assure the development and approval is the same for distance education and traditional courses.
    • Online program development follows the MSCHE Nine Hallmarks of Quality.
Regional accreditation

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education – Standard 13 *Related Educational Activities*
  - Courses meet *institution’s standard of quality*
  - Planning includes *legal and regulatory* requirements
  - Adequate and appropriate learning resources
  - Ongoing *training and support*
  - Adequate *technical and hardware support*
  - Assessment of learning and impact on institution
Our approach

Technology

Education

Assessment

Monitoring

TEAM
Our TEAM approach
Technology

• Update SIS coding for better tracking
  – Delivery modes (OL, HY, IP)
    • Previously: Sometimes or none
  – Section numbers (500s, 600s)
    • Previously: 190s, 280s, 800s, 900s
  – Use notes to indicate orientation dates, etc.
**SIS Example**

**BUIS 462 - 555 Decision Support Sysstes**  
Bowie State University | Spring 2012 | Lecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Number</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>16 Week Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>3 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Mode</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days &amp; Times</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>On-Line Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Bin Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Dates</td>
<td>01/25/2012 - 05/23/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>Buisness &amp; Information System 462 Prerequisites: BUIS 361, BUIS 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Attributes</td>
<td>Course offered as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Availability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Capacity</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait List Capacity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait List Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Seats</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

OnlineCourse: this course is delivered online. Students must have Internet access & basic computer skills. A mandatory orientation session will be held on Wednesday, January 25, 2012 at 6:00 PM in CBGS 3203.

**Description**

Prerequisite: BUIS 361 and BUIS 362. This course is an introduction to the analysis, design, and application of information systems used in the direct support of managerial decision-making. This course will cover the design and construction of specific management support tools such as Decision Support Systems, Executive Support Systems, Group Decision Support Systems, and Expert Systems. Laboratory work will include construction of prototype support systems and expert systems.
Technology

• Centralize services around LMS (Bb)
  – Learn, Community, Content (delivery)
  – Collaborate, Connect (communication)
  – Outcomes (tracking)

• University email
  – Exchange (faculty/staff)
  – Live @ EDU (students)
Standardize Bb Template
Add Alignments

Memorandum Assignment – due 9/27

Write a one-page memo to the department head of your major asking him or her to consider changing some aspect or requirement of your major.

You may wish to review your major’s requirements (as outlined online or in the catalog) so that you can be as specific as possible. Identify one aspect of the program that you think needs to be changed (a course, a schedule change, number of electives, etc.).

Remember, this is a persuasive memo that is addressed to a superior in your organization; it should be organized and written appropriately.

Document formatting details:
- 1–3 pages with 1” margins
- double-spaced between paragraphs
- 12 point Times New Roman or Cambria font

Please submit your assignment electronically. Do not copy/paste the essay — upload an attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Goals</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Goal Set Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEC3-CAR2</td>
<td>2. Apply skills in analysis, synthesis and problem solving.</td>
<td>General Education Program</td>
<td>3. Critical Analysis and Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEC4-TC1</td>
<td>1. Create a document using word processing software.</td>
<td>General Education Program</td>
<td>4. Technological Competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Use Rubrics

### Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Memorandum Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Levels of Achievement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 30.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>The context of the memo is unacceptable. The memo does not meet the objectives of the assignment, or fails to fully respond to the requirements of the assignment. The objectives are not identified or are not relevant to the assignment. The memo is shorter than the memo is expected to be. The memo is not written in complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>The context of the memo is disappointing. The memo may or may not meet some of the objectives of the assignment. The objectives may or may not be outlined in the memo. The memo is written in complete sentences, but the context is not fully developed. The memo may or may not provide the information and analysis the audience needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>The context of the memo is adequate. The memo meets some of the objectives of the assignment, but is less sophisticated in its writing. The memo is written in complete sentences, and the context is adequately developed. The memo provides the information and analysis the audience needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>The context of the memo is good. The memo meets some of the objectives of the assignment, but in a less sophisticated manner. The objectives are outlined in the memo and the main ideas clearly presented. The memo provides the information and analysis the reader needs; the memo is comprehensive and short, and does not contain extraneous material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The context of the memo is excellent. The memo meets all of the objectives of the assignment. The objectives are outlined in the memo and the main ideas clearly presented. The memo provides the information and analysis the reader needs; the memo is comprehensive, short, and does not contain extraneous material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 6.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>The memo has an incomplete header that fails to include all of the prescribed elements: the date, the memo number, to, from, date, and subject is not displayed. It is evident that this document was not formatted as a memorandum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The memo has an incomplete header that includes most of the prescribed elements: the date, the memo number, to, from, date, and subject are present, but may be misspelled or displayed incorrectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>The memo has a complete header that includes all of the prescribed elements: the date, the memo number, to, from, date, and subject are present and displayed correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>The memo has a complete header that includes all of the prescribed elements: the date, the memo number, to, from, date, and subject are present and displayed correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The memo has a complete header that includes all of the prescribed elements: the date, the memo number, to, from, date, and subject are present and displayed correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Line</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 6.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>The subject line contains one or two words that fail to announce the memo’s content and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The subject line does not effectively announce the memo’s content and purpose. The writer fails to use the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>The subject line announces the content and purpose of the memo. The writer uses the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>The subject line announces the memo’s content and purpose. The writer uses the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The subject line effectively announces the memo’s content and purpose. The writer uses the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 5.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>The organization of the document is confusing or disorganized. Either the paragraphs are not separated by indentation or by use of a paragraph that follows the main idea, or there is no organization or coherence that relatively affects the flow and readability of the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The organization of the document is confusing or disorganized. The sequencing is inappropriate, and the memo demonstrates a lack of structure or coherence that relatively affects the flow and readability of the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>The organization of the document is coherent but is not effective. The sequencing is inappropriate, and the memo demonstrates a lack of structure or coherence that relatively affects the flow and readability of the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>The organization of the document is clear. It is apparent how ideas are related and organized, and the sequencing is good. The ideas in the memo are effective and appropriate. Sequential transitions exist between ideas and paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The organization of the document is clear. It is apparent how ideas are related and organized, and the sequencing is good. The ideas in the memo are effective and appropriate. Sequential transitions exist between ideas and paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Appeal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 5.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>The memo contains a visual appeal, headers and other design elements are either lacking or poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The design elements are unsatisfactory. Paragraphing and line spacing are incorrect. Subsequent page headings and copy rotations are missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>The memo includes some design elements that guide the reader, but the overall design needs work. Paragraphing and line spacing are used correctly and subsequent page header and copy rotations may be missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>The memo has visual appeal and includes some design elements that guide the reader. Paragraphing and line spacing are used correctly, subsequent page header and copy rotations may be missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The memo has a visual appeal and includes some design elements that guide the reader. Paragraphing and line spacing are used correctly, subsequent page header and copy rotations are accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 10.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Memo not submitted or the writer does not provide enough information for an accurate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>The style is unsatisfactory. The writing, tone, word choice, and sentence structure are inappropriate, ungrammatical, inappropriate, or unorganized. The memo exhibits various problems with syntax, which may be revised in short, simple sentences and reflexive, sentence structure insights needed. The overall, the memo displays a passive voice style that does not engage the audience’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>The style is disappointing. The writing is inconsistent or undeveloped, and the tone and form are inappropriate or unorganized. The writer uses subordinate words, and the sentence structure tends to vary. Overall, the writer uses an ineffective style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>The style is appropriate. The writing is consistent and the tone, form, and form. The content is accurate, and the writing is appropriate or organized. The memo displays a mixture of sentence patterns that may be rewritten in short, simple sentences and reflexive, sentence structure insights needed. Overall, the writer uses a reflexive style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>The style is above average or good. The style is readable and the writing is clear and concise. The tone and form are effective. The sentence structure is varied and appropriate. Overall, the writer uses a style that is appropriate for the intended audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The memo presents a superior style. The writing is clear, concise, fluent and exact. The tone is appropriate and word choice is meticulously chosen. The sentence structure is varied and appropriate. Overall, the writer uses a superior style that is appropriate for the intended audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight: 5.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Memo not submitted or the writer does not provide enough information for an accurate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>The document displays major or excessive errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The document displays significant errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>The document requires improvements in grammar, usage, or mechanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>The document requires minor improvements or may have a few correctable errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The mechanics, usage, and grammar are correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Run Reports

Rubric Analysis
Copy of Grading Rubric for Writing Assignments

- Reasoning and Analysis: 20.00 (Possible), 16.18 (Actual)
- Focus on Topic: 20.00 (Possible), 16.18 (Actual)
- Accuracy of Facts and Citations: 20.00 (Possible), 16.47 (Actual)
- APA Citation: 20.00 (Possible), 15.00 (Actual)
- Mechanics/Organization: 20.00 (Possible), 16.18 (Actual)

Average Score per Criteria: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

Possible
Actual

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY
Prepare For Life
**Education**

- Development of DE policy
- Ensure training & support
  - LOTTO
  - Faculty Institute
  - Weekly sessions
  - Walk-in clinics & One-to-one
  - Online tools
Education: DE policy

- Definitions
- Organization & Management
- Types of Instruction & Learning
- Processes
  - Planning & Development
  - Curriculum & Instruction
  - Administrative Provisions
    - Training
    - Delivery
    - Copyright
    - Marketing
    - Evaluation
    - Intellectual Property

---

QM
Quality Matters Program

Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning)

American Association of University Professors

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Bowie State University
Prepare For Life
Education: Management Oversight

• Transferred Academic Computing functions from IT to Provost’s Office.
  – Establish clear path for proposing, developing and reviewing online/hybrid courses
  – Centralize support for developing/reviewing
  – Evaluate existing courses
  – Track progress
  – Communicate updates about processes, updates, training, documentation, etc.
Education: Management Oversight

- TEAM – Academic Comp and DIT
- Established areas of responsibility between Academic Computing and IT

**IT**
- Infrastructure/network support
- Base LMS file development

**Academic Computing**
- Daily feed
- Trouble shooting

BSU Online

Responsibility reduced due to Bb MH
Education: Training

• TEAM – Academic Computing, CETL & Faculty
• Learning Online, Teaching with Technology

Online Institute
  – 1-week program every summer (started 2010)
• Faculty Institute
  – 2xs per year (January/August)
• Weekly sessions
**Education: Support**

- Walk-in clinics
  - Central location (lab)
  - Academic Computing offices
- By appointment (one-to-one)
- Online tools
  - Bb Help Center (user guides)
  - Bb On Demand Videos
Assessment

• TEAM – Academic Comp, OPAA and Faculty
• Student Course Evaluations (OPAA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Very High or High</th>
<th>Online Classes</th>
<th>F2F Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with the instructor's teaching performance</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall course satisfaction</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

• Grade Distribution Comparisons (OPAA)
• Intensive course assessments
  – Academic Computing (based on DE policy)
  – Faculty
  – OPAA
  – Course Redesign PSYC 101
Assessment: PSYC 101

• Course Redesign Project
  – Integrated technology to improve student learning outcomes
• Initial evaluation of DFW rates
• Applied rubrics and standardized exams
  – Analyze data
• Evaluate DFW rates
Monitoring

• TEAM – Academic Comp, OPAA and Academic Departments

• Academic Computing
  – Reviewing previously offered distance education courses to ensure alignment with DE Policy
  – Ensure that new courses meet DE Policy requirements
  – Communicate with OPAA, faculty & departments
Monitoring

• OPAA
  – Work with Academic Departments to code course/sections appropriately
  – Monitor course schedules to flag distance education courses not in the inventory
Review course schedule for upcoming term

Identify online/hybrid sections
- If online section does not have proper section number, contact department.
- If online section does not have proper mode of delivery, contact department.

Check file for Intent to Teach Online form.

Check for training.
- If no training, contact instructor and provide training schedule or set up appointment(s).

Check course shell for content, lectures, assessments, etc.
- If no content, contact instructor and department chair.

Check for peer course review
- If no peer course review, contact instructor and schedule meeting.

Sufficient time? Develop the course.
- Not enough time? Reschedule the course as F2F

OPAA

Depts

Academic Computing

Faculty & Depts
Faculty completes intent to teach an online/hybrid course

Faculty obtain training
  - 12 workshops (or)
  - Summer institute

Faculty develops course during 1 full semester (or more)

Peer Course Review
  - Revise course, if recommended

Deliver course

Revise course
  - Unanticipated technical errors
  - Curricular/instructional needs
Lessons Learned: Assessing Needs

• Course development approach
  – Old
    • Driven by grant funding and faculty interest
  – New
    • Driven by course redesign, program development, student demand

• Understanding MSCHE guidelines
Lessons Learned: Technology & Training

• Think outside the box
  – Not everything requires buying a new license, software or product

• Know what LMS can do for you
  – Ex. Bb Learn SP10 provides built-in tools for goals & rubrics
  – Master course shells enable service courses to share content, assessments, etc.
Lessons Learned: Technology & Training

• Include training that reflects
  – Accreditation standards related to distance education
  – Peer course review (Quality Matters)
  – Improvements in technology
  – New ideas in pedagogy

• Provide ongoing support
Lessons Learned: Program Design

• Include online programs when developing institutional strategic plans
  – Ownership, technology, budget, needs analysis, evaluation, governance, academic oversight, etc.
Lessons Learned: Program Design

• Ensure course content & curriculum is comparable to F2F programs

• Provide effective, available student/academic support services
  – Library, academic advising, counseling, etc.
Lessons Learned: Funding

- Establish a budget for operations and functions linked to planning
- Develop a software/hardware chart with multi-years costs and funding sources
Lessons Learned: Program Assessment

• Outcome measures
• Short-term vs. long-term
• Traditional instruments not applicable to the online environment
• Link to institutional goals and objectives
QUESTIONS?

Gayle Fink
gfink@bowiestate.edu

Mariann Hawken
mhwaken@bowiestate.edu