BGSU Distance Programs Task Force Report

Introduction

The Distance Programs Task Force was commissioned by Senior Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs, Rodney Rogers, under the direction of BGSU President Mary Ellen Mazey.

The Distance Programs Task Force was chaired by Vice President for Enrollment Management, Albert N Colom, and met weekly from April 19, 2012, through June 15, 2012, under this charge:

> This task force will undertake to create a series of recommendations for the development of new or enhanced online programs that would facilitate progress toward the achievement of BGSU's Strategic Plan, Objective #2, *"Expand the student populations for BGSU enrollment and implement programs to recruit them and retain them to successful program completion."*

The task force consisted of a diverse and collegial group of administrators, including two line deans, faculty, and support staff. In response to our charge, the task force offers the accompanying document that delivers twenty-seven succinctly stated recommendations with supporting rationale and expected outcomes.

We believe these recommendations outline the necessary and sufficient conditions for the successful development and support of new and/or newly enhanced high-quality distance programs (e.g., suitable degree completion, bridge/post-baccalaureate certificates, niche graduate programs).

Three main themes guided our deliberations:

1. *Demonstrating appropriate linkage* between the development of new distance programs and the BGSU Strategic Plan, specifically Objective #2.
2. *Proposing a sustainable revenue sharing plan* between the central administration and component units of the institution, including colleges, departments, schools, and individual faculty who choose to participant in the expansion of online programs;
3. *Insuring a commitment* to faculty and department incentives and to high quality faculty and student support services that will undergird existing and future program development.

The twenty-five recommendations of the task force are grouped under these four main rubrics, with some overlap of topic and coverage:

1. Creation of a sustainable revenue sharing model for new and existing programs and development incentives for varied stakeholders

2. Needed enhancements for online student services delivery
3. Informed and targeted marketing and outreach for online programs
4. Related conditions or policies integral to sustainable growth of online programs

To be useful and pertinent, the task force determined that recommendations must each in some way advance the Strategic Goal #2 of increasing enrollments and degree attainment at BGSU, expanding BGSU programs to new populations, and *not merely redistributing current enrollments to another modality of instruction.*

Further, it was the strong sense of the Task Force that faculty committed to quality online instruction must participate in appropriate training, collaborative design and development of program course work, and be willing to submit both peer and student evaluations under a continuous improvement model within their collegiate structures.

It was also the conviction of the Task Force that line deans consider a staffing model that appropriately balances the participation of both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in individual programs.

These principles are reflected throughout the set of recommendations:

1. Address the goal of attracting and retaining new populations for enrollment and for their successful educational attainment;
2. Create new revenue streams for BGSU -- that are
3. Built upon flexible, creative, and equitable revenue sharing models that provide faculty, department units, and colleges meaningful incentives for participation, while
4. Ensuring that our students will be educated and supported by best practices in online student pedagogy and services delivery; who have been drawn to these programs
5. By skillful marketing and outreach plans that maximize the "value added" provisions of the BGSU brand.

Respectfully submitted by the Distance Programs Task Force, June 15, 2012:

Albert Colom, Vice President for Enrollment Management – Task Force Chair
Savilla Banister, Associate Professor, Division of Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human Development
Bruce Edwards, Professor, English and Africana Studies, and Associate Vice President, Academic Technology and e-Learning
John Folkins, Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Health and Human Services, and Chair, Faculty Senate
Larry Hatch, Professor, Visual Communication Technology and Learning Design, College of Technology
Lee Ann Koenigbauer, Academic Advisor, College of Arts and Sciences

Steve Lab, Professor and Chair, Human Services, College of Health and Human Services

Faris Malhas, Professor and Dean, College of Technology

Melissa Miller, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Arts and Sciences

Simon Morgan-Russell, Professor and Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Sue Mota, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Department of Economics, College of Business Administration

Terry Rentner, Professor and Director, School of Media and Communications, College of Arts and Sciences

Donald Schumacher, Programmer/Analyst, Information Technology Services

Charles Spontelli, Associate Professor, Department of Visual Communication & Technology Education, College of Technology

BGSU Distance Programs Task Force Recommendations

1. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CREATION OF A SUSTAINABLE REVENUE SHARING MODEL FOR NEW AND EXISTING PROGRAMS AND DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES FOR VARIED STAKEHOLDERS**[1]

   RECOMMENDATION #1.1: The task force endorses the development of a revenue sharing model based upon the "Auburn model" that permits variable risk and reward shared between the central administration and the participating unit, including both new and already existing programs who opt to participate. This model includes coverage of expected "start up costs." [2] For example:

   - **Level One:** The Provost's office assumes all financial risk and guarantees recovery of offering unit costs. Offering unit receives 20% of gross revenue; Central Administration retains 80%.
   - **Level Two:** The offering unit funds instructional costs including new, dedicated instructional support staff. Offering Unit receives 50% of gross revenue; Central Administration retains 50%.
   - **Level Three:** The offering unit assumes all financial risk and guarantees recovery of costs. Offering unit receives 80% of gross revenue·; Central Administration retains 20%.
   - **Level Four**: Program proposals that do not fall within levels 1-3 may be proposed by the offering unit or a funding unit. (See Appendix D)

   RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME: Depending upon implementation, this revenue sharing plan will provide the basis for sustainable growth, including staffing and technology,

   RECOMMENDATION #1.2: The task force recommends that any revenue sharing must be indexed to net gains in new student enrollment.

   RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME: The goal of new distance programming is to grow the student body at BGSU. Without setting such an expectation/requirement, it would be

---

[1] Appendices (A-H) represent submissions from individual members that informed Task Force deliberations. In some cases, as indicated, they extend or illustrate models or principles suggested by our recommendations.

[2] Appendix E, sketches a model for an RFP process by which programs can be proposed and suggested criteria by which they should be evaluated.

possible for programs to shift current "brick and mortar" students/classes to a distance platform simply to obtain a share of the revenue.

RECOMMENDATION #1.3: The task force endorses the creation of a revised set of metrics for distance program success that focuses on such things as enrollment, degree attainment, return on investment, and other quality measures, etc., as determined by central administration's strategic goals.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Depending upon implementation, this revenue sharing plan will provide the basis for sustainable growth, including staffing and technology.

RECOMMENDATION #1.4: The task force endorses a flexible 3-year review process to chart progress toward strategic goals and agreed-upon metrics; programs wishing to accelerate program review due to perceived success may initiate the process with their respective line dean. This review would include the option of switching to another revenue/risk sharing model.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Regularly scheduled reviews allow for both course correction and more agile shifts to take advantage of new growth patterns and online population needs.

RECOMMENDATION #1.5: The task force endorses a variable tuition proviso, i.e., adjustable upward, not including discounting, that permits qualified programs to offer their degrees, certificates, etc., at a premium rate in view of the market.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Flexibility to address unique circumstances that arise in order to adjust to changing markets and/or unanticipated costs in recruitment, retention, etc.

RECOMMENDATION #1.6: The task force recommends centralized oversight, i.e., a single coordinating office within the division of Enrollment Management, to provide support and counsel for distance program development and attendant e-learning services for students in an arrangement that permits its participation in the revenue sharing model to sustain its own staffing, design, and technological needs.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: A central office will allow new inquirers and ongoing participants (faculty, administrators, staff) a sustainable, well-supported entity to coordinate distance development and evaluation of success with prescribed metrics.

RECOMMENDATION #1.7: The task force endorses the development of a faculty development model that rewards the development and continuous improvement of courses within a new or refurbished online program.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Faculty who develop courses for online delivery within an online program will receive compensation, as negotiated with the chair or dean of their respective programs, for the successful completion of and teaching of a new course, and for any significant revisions to the course, e.g., revised updated content, inclusion of new learning technologies, or specialized pedagogy for the course, etc. This compensation may come in the form of an agreed-upon direct stipend or in a more generalized expensing arrangement under appropriate university policy.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEEDED ENHANCEMENTS FOR ONLINE STUDENT SERVICES DELIVERY

RECOMMENDATION #2.1: Online students must have access to student services staff (e.g., admissions, financial, tutoring, advisors, technology counselors, etc.) 24/7 via email, text, chat, or phone.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Online students live, work, and study in many time zones and diverse hours of the day (regionally, nationally, internationally) and must be able to consult with courteous and well-informed staff at their convenience. This level of accessibility will increase yield of matriculation for inquiring students and enhance our reputation as an institution responsive to the needs of online populations. (See Appendix C.)

RECOMMENDATION #2.2: Staff delivering services in BGSU's online program must have the training and resources to assist the distance student population through both low-tech and cutting edge technology and software.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Online students are often customer oriented. Therefore, recruiting and retaining a distance student population will be significantly impacted by satisfaction of the student services provided to them. Connecting the online student to BGSU can be greatly enhanced by the training and use of cutting edge technology and software by the student services staff. However, some students will continue to prefer to make their connections via low-tech options. While all distance students must have an acceptable level of computer literacy, students preferring to connect via low-tech options must be accommodated.

RECOMMENDATION #2.3: Dedicate and prioritize resources to develop online service portals for the distance students. For example: online forms directly submitted to service offices, self-registration with permission codes, short "How Do I" video/podcasts for student self-service.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** It should be the rare occasion when an online student or student service staff member for online programs would need to utilize mail or fax delivery of any kind of document or process. If the student is expected to complete their course work in an online format, BGSU must be able to deliver services in the same modality. Uniformity of services for all online programs must also be a goal when developing the service portals to reduce confusion for students (and the campus community) in different degree programs.

RECOMMENDATION #2.4: Educating and informing the BGSU community regarding the processes and programs for the distance programs; effectively, making the BGSU community culturally competent for the distance education students.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** The expansion of distance education at BGSU can only be effective with education and collaboration across the entire campus. An organized program to educate the entire BGSU community will be required to maximize best practices procedures for the online degree programs.

RECOMMENDATION #2.5: Resources for additional online course development and staffing.

> **RATIONAL AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** Ample online course offerings are critical to the success of any online degree program that BGSU decides to offer. Particular attention needs to be given to the BG Perspective course offerings as they can be utilized by several of the online programs. Course fatigue with the current online course offerings is a very real issue in the Liberal Studies area as well. Providing a wide range of online courses contributes significantly to student satisfaction and carries over to the "word of mouth" marketing.

RECOMMENDATION #2.6: Resources for appropriate dedicated student services staff that provides services exclusively to the online community.

> **RATIONAL AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** BGSU must not simply add online advisees to the caseload of the current staff serving the seated population. The needs of the online students are different

and need to be addressed by trained staff. Dedicated student services for online students are pivotal to retention and growth.

RECOMMENDATION #2.7: A robust centralized Student Services Staffing Model for Distance Programs must be created, as suggested in the model below.

1. Two Front Desk Administrative Assistant Online Specialists – Personnel in these positions must be able to handle appointment setting and paperwork support but must also be trained to assist in marketing and recruiting functions. i.e. phone inquiries, email inquiries, following-up on inquiries and marketing campaigns.
2. Advising staff – 250 students per advisor, as recommended by National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) standards.
3. Three technology assistance staff, for course design by faculty and academic advisors in addition to assisting students with software and hardware difficulties.
4. Personnel or hired services for Learning Commons/writing center/tutoring/placement tests.
5. The following positions could initially start part-time or they could remain in their individual departments as dedicated contacts for the distance program:
   a. Student Financial Aid Online Specialist
   b. Registrar Online Specialist – possibility for this person to handle student registration for this student group
   c. Bursar Online Specialist
   d. International Program Online Specialist
   e. Multicultural Affairs Online Specialist
   f. Student Life Online Specialist
   g. Admissions/Marketing and Communications
   h. Non Traditional and Transfer Student Services Online Specialist
6. Development of a BGSU Online Student Services Specialist Certificate.
7. Non-traditional work weeks for all staff would need to be implemented to accommodate a 24/7 service model. For example, 4 ten hour days, Saturday and Sunday hours and second and third shifts as well. If we are offering a true 24/7 model all student services would need to be available all of the time.

RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME: These and other additional staff and training needs must be addressed to insure that new programs will have the student services delivery strength to sustain expected growth.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INFORMED AND TARGETED MARKETING AND OUTREACH FOR ONLINE PROGRAMS

RECOMMENDATION 3.1: The task force endorses the development of a standardized process for identifying the viability of newly proposed programs through the judicious use of marketing data provided by BGSU's IR or Marketing and Communication office and/or assisted by such national, third party vendor such as Eduventures.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Proposed programs must meet certain thresholds of expected markets and enrollment in order to be green-lighted for development for Ohio, regional, national, and/or international delivery.

RECOMMENDATION #3.2: The task force endorses the development of a standard "start up" package that identifies a basic starting place for launching new or refurbished programs, including the development of a marketing and recruitment plan that identifies and addresses target audiences with the skillful use of *multi-channel marketing* (i.e., web, Email, print, video), as well as mailing lists obtained from sources such as professional organizations or associations.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Proposed programs must be given access to up to date tools for bringing new programs before the audiences that they target as well as sustainable budgets to continue the outreach as the program matures.

RECOMMENDATION #3.3: The task force recommends that greater attention should be focused on the potential for national/international marketing of its online programs, with the proviso that this may mean using external providers with proven expertise and success.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: The potential growth in BGSU's distance enrollment is not limited to Ohio, and there is great opportunity nationally and internationally, and our future success may dependent on opening these markets.

RECOMMENDATION #3.4: The task force acknowledges the need for greater "internal marketing" to the BGSU campus, to articulate the quality, the opportunity, and the technological advances within distance pedagogy, as well as the development opportunities available. This endeavor will enhance both enrollment gains and increase interest in exploring and variety of instructional modes available to BGSU's faculty and current and future students.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Some of our best advocates will be BGSU students, faculty, and staff who understand and recognize the quality, convenience, and accessibility of degree programs but need to be better informed to do so.

RECOMMENDATION #3.5: The task forces acknowledges the need for more campus-based, resourceful use of web-based tools for marketing and innovation in web site development for visitors looking for crucial information and for breaking news on opportunities for degree attainment.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: Web sites at BGSU will need to become more agile and intuitive in order to attract public attention and user-friendly inquiries.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OTHER CONDITIONS OR POLICIES INTEGRAL TO SUSTAINABLE GROWTH OF ONLINE PROGRAMS

RECOMMENDATION #4.1: The Task Force endorses the idea that all faculty should design and deliver their course work with Quality Matters™ recommended standards.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** Quality Matters™ is an outcome based, national standard for quality online course design and delivery that faculty to which should adhere, and in which they should receive training during the development phase of program

RECOMMENDATION #4.2: BGSU should immediately work toward a 100% redundant on-line delivery system that can be immediately enabled in the event of a system outage in the primary system.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: This undertaking, which is presently under development by ITS, addresses continuity and sustainability issues that impact not only distance but also face to face course work and insure the ability of faculty and students to continue and complete their work in the case of unexpected interruptions in their virtual classroom space.

RECOMMENDATION #4.3: Expand the SOAR coverage through the development of virtual orientation, program specific sessions for new distance students to benefit those who will not be attending existing orientation and registration programming.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** Online students do not currently receive the benefit of the on-campus orientation and registration process, which provides valuable information and advising to first semester students. An inclusive online, interactive process should be developed that provides students with all of the pertinent information they need to know about BGSU (e.g. financial aid, requesting transcripts, My Class Schedule, applying for graduation, updating personal information, junior audit, student ID's, dropping/adding classes, eligibility for tuition refunds/, taking courses pass/fail).

RECOMMENDATION #4.4: The task force endorses the idea of variable course start and finish dates off the typical face-to-face semester grid, e.g., 6, 8, or 12 week courses that permit flexible enrollment and completion of course requirements.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME**: The goals of online students reflect a variety of motives and incentives for pursuit of course work. Flexible scheduling recognizes that degree attainment can be inhibited by residential student norms that may not apply to subject matter or program goals. This flexibility will thus permit more students to find convenience and enrollment in multiple course throughout a term.

RECOMMENDATION #4.5: The task forces recommends that departments and programs require online faculty to post syllabi and make the course shell available two weeks in advance.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** All faculty should design and deliver their course work with Quality Matters recommended standards. And so, this particular recommendation is a minimum standard that all faculty should be required to meet. Online students are often working part-time or full-time and want to see well in advance what the course requirements and due dates for assignments will be so that they can plan ahead. Given that students are eligible for only a 90 percent tuition rebate on the first day of class, it is essential that they have sufficient time to make a knowledgeable decision about each course for which they register.

RECOMMENDATION #4.6: The task force endorses the policy change that would allow students to take a semester off without penalty.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** This seems an essential policy when the population served is non-traditional and online-only. Making them reapply-- even if it's a single, simple form-- sends the wrong message. Online students do not want to have to jump through proverbial hoops. BGSU needs to convey that we will accommodate students and be flexible in terms of policies and procedures in order to help students smoothly progress to their degree.

RECOMMENDATION #4.7: The task force recommends that the campus streamline the registration process for developing a more student-centered, experience, making this and all processes for new and returning distance students more navigable and free of frustration.

> **RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME:** There should be a straightforward, 1-stop self-registration process to serve all online students.

RECOMMENDATION #4.8: The task force recommends that the campus address the unique challenges but also the opportunities that accrue to the College of Arts & Sciences in staffing and scheduling courses for online degree completion programs:

1. Adding additional BG Perspective courses to adequately provide for the "First Year in a Box," Fire Administration, Technology, and Advanced Technology programs. An intense need exists in the area of natural science and quantitative literacy courses.
2. Adding Arts & Sciences 3000/4000 level courses, specifically for the Liberal Studies program. There is also significant course fatigue for the Liberal Studies program.
3. Adding course offerings have the potential for some of the online degrees to become more than degree completion, i.e., full baccalaureate degrees offered online. Existing and new programs may be designed to offer more than "degree completion," and offer the possibility of full degrees online in the future.

RATIONALE AND EXPECTED OUTCOME: Increased availability of needed electives as well as required course lead to earlier time to degree attainment.

Appendix A

Sample EMBA Faculty Stipend Contract
(Submitted by Dr. Sue Mota, College of Business)

Executive MBA Faculty Stipend

Teaching in the Executive MBA program involves added responsibilities, a demanding student population, and a format that involves faculty members before and after the semester in which they are scheduled to teach. In addition, Executive MBA is a cohort-based program, which means the class dynamics can be substantially different from the typical teaching experience. In addition the MBA program is now web-centric, and each faculty member is required to offer web-enhanced courses.

To compensate you for the additional workload associated with teaching in the Executive MBA program, Graduate and Executive Programs in Business will provide a stipend to you only upon successful completion of all stipend prerequisites.

Stipend:_____ Course stipend of $1,500

To qualify for the stipend, you must agree to:
- Provide your textbook selection(s) and other study materials to the Graduate and Executive Programs in Business office by December 4, 2009 in order to facilitate distribution of those materials to the students.
- Provide your completed course syllabus to Graduate and Executive Programs in Business by December 31, 2009 in order to provide students with adequate time to prepare for your course. Please include office hours that will be convenient to executive students.
- Cooperate with the GEPB staff to establish or update the *My*BGSU web site for the MBA course you are teaching. The web-centric course materials are to be posted and available to your EMBA students at the end of the previous semester.
- Prepare and grade any pre-session and/or post-session assignments.
- Meet with faculty members and GEPB staff members during the semester preceding, the semester of your teaching assignment, and semesters after your teaching assignment, to discuss your cohort, and integration issues.
- Participate in the scheduling of class meeting times for your cohort's courses and meet the teaching schedule as assigned.
- Attend at least one lunch with students from your cohort during the semester preceding your teaching assignment. GEPB will cover the cost of your meal. For faculty members teaching in the first session, attend the EMBA orientation. The staff of Graduate and Executive Programs in Business also encourages you to have lunch with your students as often as possible during your session and to attend other program-related events, such as leadership lectures.
- Contact your students by e-mail at least once before the end of the preceding semester's executive courses. Consider the possibility of a conference call or on-line chat with students prior to the beginning of your course.

- Communicate with executive students in a *timely* manner prior to, during, and following the semester in which you teach. You should anticipate contact from executive students as soon as they receive your course materials. Many executive students plan well ahead in order to balance work demands and course demands. If you will be unavailable for student contact for a period of time, please let your students know ahead of time if at all possible.
- Accommodate the administration of the EMBA program's student evaluation of teaching form to the class.
- Allow BGSU to videotape your class and make it available through your Blackboard course shell to supplement your teaching materials.

Please indicate your agreement to meet these additional responsibilities by signing and returning this form to the Graduate and Executive Programs in Business office.

_____
Signature

Appendix B

Sample Course Revenue Breakdown

(Submitted by Steve Lab, Professor and Chair, Criminal Justice, College of Health and Human Services)

ESTIMATES OF INCOME FOR DIFFERENT SCENARIOS

(Note: The SSI subsidy is included as an "average" subsidy and will vary from program to program. The average was based on suggestions from Dr. Joseph Frizado, Vice Provost, for illustrative purposes. We also need to recognize that the SSI subsidy received for completed degrees would go on top of these figures.)

The following are estimates of income generated for different scenarios at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. There are several guidelines and assumptions in the calculations:

- BGSU receives SSI only for <u>in-state</u> undergraduates.
- BGSU receives SSI for ALL graduate students, both in-state and out-of-state.
- The SSI figures included here are <u>average</u> SSI subsidy amounts and the actual amounts will vary depending on the degree program and subsidy levels. Joe Frizado suggested I use these to give an idea of what the amounts would be.
- SSI subsidy is paid for every 30 credit hours generated (so, for example, 20 students taking 12 credit hours generate 240 credit hours, divided by 30 gives 8 SSI subsidy units)
- We also receive SSI subsidy for degree <u>completions</u> and those are not reflected here. Again, the figures can vary a great deal.

<u>Graduate Estimates</u>

$424	per credit hour cost
X 12	assumed 12 credit hour enrollment per term
5,088	
X 20	assumes 20 students in program
101,760	tuition income from one semester
+ 54,048	SSI subsidy
155,808	gross income from one semester
X 2	AY terms
$311,616	gross income in one AY from 20 students taking 24 credit hours each

An 80/20 split (program/central admin) would be $249,292.80 for the program, $62,323.20 for central

Altering the scenario to have 30 student taking 9 credit hours per term gives:

$424	per credit hour cost

X 9 assumed 9 credit hour enrollment per term
3,816
X 30 assumes 30 students in program
114,480 tuition income from one semester
+ 60,804 SSI subsidy
175,284 gross income from one semester
X 2 AY terms
$350,568 gross income in one AY from 30 students taking 18 credit hours each

An 80/20 split (program/central admin) would be $280,454.40 for the program, $70,113.6 for central

Undergraduate Estimates

$359 per credit hour cost
X 12 assumed 12-18 credit hour enrollment per term (same tuition cost)
4,308
X 20 assumes 20 students in program
86,160 tuition income from one semester
+ 24,560 SSI subsidy (assuming 100% are in-state)*
110,720 gross income from one semester
X 2 AY terms
$221,440 gross income in one AY from 20 students taking 24 credit hours each

An 80/20 split (program/central admin) would be $177,152 for the program, $44,288 for central

Altering the scenario to have 50% in-state students:
$ 359 per credit hour cost
X 12 assumed 12-18 credit hour enrollment per term (same tuition cost)
4,308
X 20 assumes 20 students in program
86,160 tuition income from one semester
+ 12,280 SSI subsidy (assuming 50% are in-state)*
98,440 gross income from one semester
X 2 AY terms
$196,880 gross income in one AY from 20 students taking 24 credit hours each

An 80/20 split (program/central admin) would be $157,504 for the program, $39,376 for central

Altering the scenario to have 25% in-state students:
$359 per credit hour cost
X 12 assumed 12-18 credit hour enrollment per term (same tuition cost)
4,308
X 20 assumes 20 students in program
86,160 tuition income from one semester

<u>+   6,140</u> SSI subsidy (<u>assuming 50% are in-state</u>)*
    92,300 gross income from one semester
   <u>X   2</u>   AY terms
$184,600 gross income in one AY from 20 students taking 24 credit hours each

An 80/20 split (program/central admin) would be $147,680 for the program, $36,920 for central
*the SSI subsidy estimate is based on 12 credit hour enrollment per undergraduate. Enrollment in more credit hours will not change the tuition generation but will increase the SSI subsidy.

Appendix C

Sustainable Student Services for Distance Education at BGSU
(submitted by Lee Ann Koenigbauer, Academic Advisor, College of Arts and
Sciences)

As the Distance Program Task Force adopts the charge to connect the online
programs to the university's strategic plan, a parallel discussion that must be
considered is student services to the online student population. Following are
discussion points centered on student services for the distance population that are
broken down into three critical challenges: relational, structural, and resources.

Relational Challenges
1. The distance student connection to BGSU is sketchy and dependent on
   technology.
2. Communicating with online students via technology is much more time
   consuming than communicating with face 2 face (F2F) students.
3. Online students tend to act like customers and expect high level, expedient
   service (Finley & Chapman, 2011).
4. We must be able to be different than the proprietary schools by creating a
   community for the distance education students so they are retained. Some ideas
   are as follows:
   4.1. Even though we are a brick and mortar institution; we can and do connect
        the distance learner virtually.
   4.2. We are as close to a traditional experience as an online student can get and
        we can maximize this in our branding to the online student population.
   4.3. BGSU provides a bigger bang for the buck, proprietary schools are more
        expensive.
   4.4. Data driven changes (Betts & Lanza-Gladney, 2010), gained through surveys
        and feedback from the distance student population at periodic intervals.
5. BGSU needs a Distance Student Organization. This is both particularly difficult
   and important for this student population as they swirl in and out of enrollment
   at BGSU.

Structural Challenges
1. Considering that the online student often expects customer service, as noted
   above, these students tend to be much more time consuming than the F2F
   student population and extra consideration needs to be given to their
   administrative functions. Utilizing/negotiating a proprietary service to provide a
   majority of these functions for all of our distance programs makes economic
   sense. Following are a few of the questions we need to consider:
   1.1. How will the students be targeted, marketed, and admitted?
   1.2. How is this student population going to be identified, oriented, and
        registered?
   1.3. How will the student get help with advising, academic issues, dropping
        courses, financial aid, grade issues, tutoring, technology issues, academic
        standing, etc.?

2. Are we going to expect the online learner to adjust to us or will we alter our systems to accommodate them and their needs?
   2.1. Train a staff member in every service office/department/program to be an "online specialist" to advocate for and develop systems to assist the distance student population.
   2.2. The structure of services and policies developed for the distance student population must be good for both BGSU and online student population, i.e. win/win.
3. 6-8 week course offerings would provide easier course add and drop in addition to more choices for full-time enrollment.
4. We need to make sure that the distance processes are understood throughout the BGSU campus community.
5. Many distance students are registered for online courses individually through student requests submitted to student support staff. This system is cumbersome and could become unmanageable as distance programs grow. Utilizing a permission code system for distance students to register themselves for distance courses; available through PeopleSoft, would assist in alleviating this bottleneck.
6. Create a Distance Faculty/Student Mediation Council for quicker resolution of student/faculty disputes while classes are being conducted. A best practice example of this kind of a faculty mediation procedure is being utilized at Washington State University. Two distance faculty members rotate their service on this council in an effort to quickly resolve issues that occur between distance faculty and students before they reach the formal college grade dispute level.
7. Encourage a standard format for online course shells. For example: student profiles, syllabi, assignments, communication could all be found in the same place for all distance courses. Utilizing common practices for the course shell designs are not intended to infringe on individual faculty practices for pedagogy or course standards.
8. FERP A "best practices" for distance communication, creating a standard for all who serve the online student population to use in communication with distance students. For example: requesting BGSU email and BGSU ID number for electronic communication or BGSU ID number and the last four digits of the social security number for a phone conversation.

Resource Challenges
1. BGSU is predominantly a F2F campus culture and we need to think inclusively in regard to students participating in online degree delivery programs. For example, in the course of the computer replacement cycle, faculty and staff serving online students should be offered the opportunity to order a computer with web cam capabilities.
2. We have made great strides in creating online forms and services and we should continue to expand on these opportunities, making the information more widely available to students and staff at BGSU.
3. Create a bank of short videos (under 60 seconds) for program/degree/procedure information and "how to" instructions that accompany each.
4. Create an "Online Specialist" certificate for training BGSU staff and personnel in

department/programs/offices as noted in Structural Challenges.
5. Greater choices of online offerings for F2F students.
6. Taking steps to ensure that our existing distance programs are as strong as they can be as we expand distance degree program choices is critical.
    6.1. Course fatigue is an issue for some degree programs and a greater variety of distance course offerings is needed.
    6.2. 3000/4000 level courses are at a premium.
    6.3. Larger choices of online BG Perspective courses.
    6.4. BG Perspective quantitative literacy courses are needed on the schedule of classes each semester.

References

Betts, K., & Lanza-Gladney, M. (2010). Academic advising: Ten strategies to increase student engagement and retention by personalizing the online education experience through online human touch. *Academic Advising Today,* 33(1),

Finley, S., & Chapman, J. (2011). Actively including online students in the college experience. *Academic Advising Today,* 34(2),

Appendix D

Sample Revenue Sharing Plan
(Derived from the "Auburn Plan"; adapted by Dr. Bruce L. Edwards, Associate Vice
President for Academic Technology and E-learning Services)

A Sample Model of Revenue Sharing for Distance Programs

A clear and equitable revenue-sharing model must be implemented to support the development of new distance education programs. Net revenue will be distributed to units that invest in and/or provide support for program/course development, and provide support for the general university budget.

An administration team will review program proposals to determine the appropriate level for revenue distribution. Here is a sample starting place:

- **Level One:** The Provost's office assumes all financial risk and guarantees recovery of offering unit costs. Offering unit receives 20% of gross (or net) revenue; Central Administration retains 80%.
- **Level Two:** The offering unit funds instructional costs including new, dedicated instructional support staff. Offering Unit receives 50% of (or net) revenue; Central Administration retains 50%.
- **Level Three:** The offering unit assumes all financial risk and guarantees recovery of costs. Offering unit receives 80% of gross (or net) revenue·; Central Administration retains 20%.
- **Level Four**: Program proposals that do not fall within levels 1-3 may be proposed by the offering unit or a funding unit.

For general program integrity and ongoing assessment of student success, all of BGSU's distance education programs will benefit from ongoing institutional assessment. Student evaluations of instruction and related support services should be reliably collected for each distance course in a degree completion program. The Office of Institutional Research (IR) and distance education unit will work with offering units to ensure that this is being accomplished and documented in a variety of ways. Nationally-recognized quality rubrics (e.g., Quality Matters) and other guidelines for best practices in distance education such as the WCET standards and the Sloan Consortium's quality framework will continue to be adopted as standards.

Sample Department/College Incentive Proposal for Distance Education Undergraduate Courses

1. When differentiated distance students (non-residential students who are enrolled in a fully-online program) take distance courses, the generating unit will receive $140 per credit hour generated by those students (all semesters).

The $140 per credit hour is the result of an 80%/20% split with the central administration keeping $35 per credit hour (total revenue available is $175/credit hour).

2. For each residential student (not enrolled in a fully-online program) enrolled in a distance education course above the predetermined historical enrollments of the equivalent on-campus course per semester the generating unit will receive 33.33 % (max. $58.33) per credit hour, the college will receive 33.3e% (max. $58.33) per credit hour and the central administration will receive 33.33% (max per credit hour (max. 58/33) (this is a three-way split of the available $175 per credit hour).

    In order to receive this benefit, the offering unit, offering college, and distance education unit will adhere to a predetermined historical level (negotiable and renewable each academic year prior to registration for each course).

    Program faculty would either teach the course in-load or be compensated at the college overload rate (to a maximum of $5,000) for 9 month faculty for Fall and Spring semesters, The cost of the overload is subtracted from the original total revenue ($175 per credit hour), thus lowering the amounts of the 3 way split accordingly. For summer terms, the revenues must be adjusted according to faculty compensation for the course, thus lowering the amounts of the three-way split accordingly.

Appendix E

Sample RFP Process
(Derived from "Auburn Plan"; adapted by Dr. Bruce Edwards, Associate Vice
President for Academic Technology and E-learning Services)

A sample model of an RFP Process for New or Refurbished Distance Programs

One possible strategy for implementation of any new revenue sharing plan is an internal Request For Proposal [RFP] process for developing new online programs.

One such model is described below that focuses on niche 2+2 distance programs and selected graduate distance programs.

In this scenario, priority is given to *undergraduate programs that promote or enhance degree-completion,* as appropriate linked to existing or new 2+2 and/or 3+1 agreements with area two-year campuses, as well as programs that address emerging Ohio workplace skill-set needs.

Also foregrounded are the development of *graduate programs that enhance student employability* and/or the achievement of additional professional credentials while promoting the acquisition of new technological skills will likewise be prioritized.

Programs selected through the RFP process would receive significant institutional support. The components of institutional support to promote the success of online and blended program development would include the following:

- A net revenue sharing model will coincide with the implementation of the RFP.
- Developing and planning support for course instructors and developers.
- Marketing and recruiting services.
- Stipends for faculty and department course design or redesign for each faculty member and for the department developing the new program.
- Stipends will be available for faculty member for the first time offering the course.
- Supplementing instructional design support to assist instructors with planning and implementing consistent, high-quality online course design.
- Provision of an Apple iPad or other relevant technological tool for each participant faculty member to facilitate instruction and engagement with student learners.
- Ongoing enrollment management, retention strategy, and program assessment support.

Programs seeking to take advantage of this RFP will have the opportunity to migrate and/or repurpose the courses needed to fulfill program needs with the help of BGSU distance education expertise and targeted faculty development. Departments and

faculty receiving support under this RFP agree to work with the appropriate administrative support units to insure high-quality course design, consistently course scheduling and delivery, program marketing, and strategic enrollment management.

Participating faculty will be expected to complete training addressing online pedagogy on BGSU's LMS platform as appropriate, and to invest time in re-development of their face-to-face courses using consistent templates and uniform standards. Specific training details are outlined in faculty and/or department contracts, which will be provided upon selection of programs to participate in the initiative. All course and program development will be covered under a joint ownership intellectual property policy as defined in the faculty contract.

Other RFP Features

An RFP process could represent significant steps toward an integrated University strategy for expanding online and blended learning by providing additional support to develop exemplary online courses that are of high-quality, engage learners, and have potential for attracting new online learners. Significant support and expertise will be provided to participating programs to ensure success with developing, launching, and growing the program. The institutional goals for this RFP model would include the following:

- Improving the coordination of online and blended program development campus-wide
- Ensuring consistency in the e-learning course environment as experienced by students already enrolled in BGSU
- Maintaining a consistent high quality of educational experience in online courses and programs using nationally peer review platforms such as Quality Matters™.
- Developing complete and marketable degree completion programs for online delivery as well as selected niche masters degrees.
- Attracting new students to the University and/or increasing retention of learners currently enrolled

Appendix F

Motivation and Incentives for Distance Faculty
(submitted by Dr. Savilla Bannister)

Motivation and Incentives for Distance Faculty

Dr. Angie Parker   Yavapai College *Distributed Learning*   angie_parker@yc.edu

Abstract

Colleges continue to offer growing numbers of courses and programs of study through distance education technologies. Yet despite this growth, relatively little is known about what inspires faculty to teach with a technology-mediated approach. The current study was designed as an exploration into the incentives that faculty perceive as motivating. The analysis of over one hundred articles lead to the conclusion that faculty generally teach in distance education programs for the same reasons (incentives) they teach traditional courses; for intrinsic rewards. The study identified self-satisfaction, flexible scheduling and wider audience as the intrinsic rewards and stipends, decreased workload, release time and new technology as the extrinsic motivators. A profile of the distance educator was developed to assist administration assigned the task of motivating faculty toward distance delivery.

Introduction

At the millennium, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges estimated that one-third of all colleges and universities would be closing within ten years. Peter Drucker, a management theorist, recently predicted that higher education institutions as we know them today, will be relics in a matter of a few short years (Lenzer, 1997). The message was to change or die. The source of the change is digital technology and distance education. Whether faculty see distance education as a positive pedagogical venue or not, they tend to recognize the fiscal value of distance delivery in higher education.

In addition to the need for change, is the need to work within new budgetary constraints being set forth by legislatures across the nation. These budget cuts are threatening to derail many traditional programs in higher education, forcing colleges and universities to look to faculty for cost saving distance delivery alternatives. Distance delivery has proven to be a means of recouping lost revenue, but without willing faculty, the programs are destined for collapse. If distance education is not only to sustain itself but to grow in upcoming years, it is imperative for administrators to understand the motivation that entices faculty to transition to alternative delivery modes. A number of authors have taken on the task of investigating incentives which translate into the distance learning paradigm (Betts, 1998; Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz, & Marx, 1999; Willis, 1994; Wilson, 1998). The success of any future distance education program is hinged on enticing faculty to move their courses to distant formats.

Purpose of this Study
The current study was undertaken for two reasons: first to establish a profile of today's distance educator and second to identify motivators that entice faculty to teach at a distance. Over one hundred articles were reviewed. The following is a synopsis of those articles.

Literature Review
While colleges around the globe offer growing numbers of courses through distance technologies, few studies have clearly delineated the motivators that propel faculty to teach at a distance. On-campus faculty excel in pedagogical activities due mainly to their desire for intrinsic rewards such as personal satisfaction, a sense of accomplishment, and watching students succeed (Betts, 1998). The question then becomes, do faculty receive these same intrinsic rewards from distance teaching? And are the rewards sufficient to motivate additional faculty to move to alternative delivery methods?

Before academic leaders can began enticing faculty to transform their lectures to electronic format, it is important for administrators to have a general picture of their faculty. Statistics from the U.S. Department of Education illustrates that 52 percent are male and 38 percent are senior faculty. Not surprisingly, 54 percent are tenured and 82 percent are full-time faculty. The academic disciplines most often utilizing distance education are business, commerce, agriculture, and education. Although these facts offer a limited picture of the today's distant faculty, they give little assistance in determining the motivators that persuade faculty into the distance arena. The next step in this study was to identify both the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that might be used by administrators to augment their current programs.

Intrinsic motivators
In a recent study, Miller and Husman (1999) asked faculty to rank a series of intrinsic motivators, those that are internal and individual to each instructor, that were most important in their desire to teach at a distance. The results indicated that while faculty appreciate stipends and reduced teaching loads, the items that ranked highest were those related to self-satisfaction. McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, & Waugh (1999) concurred with this finding and listed a series of intrinsic motivators. Their list included such things as flexible working conditions, ability to reach new audiences, and the opportunity to enhance technical skills while planning and delivering online courses. Table 1 offers an overview of the intrinsic motivators that were identified throughout the literature and their frequency.

Table 1. Intrinsic motivators and frequencies.

Motivator	*Frequency (# of times item appeared in the 102 articles)
Self-satisfaction	90
Flexible schedule	81
Wider audience	79
Intellectual challenge	51
Flexible location	48
Ability to use new technology	46
Ability to develop new ideas	39
Sense of empowerment	38
Responsibility	38

Although the list of motivators is lengthy, only three of the variables were consistently addressed in the literature and are statistically significant to this study: self satisfaction, flexible scheduling, and wider audience. The remaining motivators appeared in less than half of the articles and illustrated limited influence in motivating faculty.

Given the fact that the research strongly supports these three factors, administrators might question how best to access these motivators with today's faculty. Rose & Collison (1997) propose that colleges provide forums for distance instructors to detail their successes. Round tables and mentoring programs allow seasoned faculty to share their skills with novices and to enhance personal self-satisfaction. Additionally, by allowing faculty to be in complete control of their virtual classrooms, within the realm of "best practices", instructors gain a sense of self-satisfaction (Stockeband & Althoff, 1997).

Distance education faculty often site flexible scheduling as one of the core motivators for transitioning their classes to the virtual world. This incentive offers a sense of empowerment that is impossible to achieve within the brick and mortar campus. Student services, registration, and even the community calendar often dictates on-campus schedules and instructors are expected to conform. Distance learning allows that same calendar to be molded and revised to correspond to the needs of the individual students and faculty.

Flexible scheduling also allows a wider audience of potential learners to access instruction. Technology-mediated instruction can be accessed 24/7 from nearly any location, opening the potential for working students, parents of young children, and those with disabilities to reach their educational goals. Moore (2001) relates that the advent of interactive media and flexible scheduling has also brought forth a new generation of distance faculty who are now able to teach while pursuing other interests.

Finally, the literature (Moore, 1995: Brown, 1999) indicates that reaching a wider audience is a strong motivator for transitioning coursework to electronic formats. Faculty, often apprehensive that a class may be cancelled due to lack of enrollment, are seeking ways to cast a "wider net". Marketing of classes to rural areas of the United States and internationally increases the chance that classes will have a continual source of students. Additionally, institutions of higher education are being rewarded with a steady stream of new revenue.

Extrinsic motivators   While a number of intrinsic rewards appear to positively influence faculty participation in distance learning, it is important to note that a recurring list of extrinsic motivators was also extrapolated from the literature. Table 2 provides an overview of those findings.

Table 2. Extrinsic rewards and frequencies

Motivator	*Frequency (# of times item appeared in the 102 articles)
Monetary stipends	98
Decreased workload	95
Release time to develop and teach	86
New technology for personal use	51

If the literature is correct, then the assumption might be made that encouraging faculty through stipends, reduced class loads, and new technology might be enough to increase the number of faculty willing to move to a distant format, but at what cost to the institution? Stipends, the most requested extrinsic reward, are frequently addressed in the literature but not supported by over half of the nation's colleges. A recent survey by the National Education Association (NEA) reports that 63 percent of America's college instructors develop and teach distance courses with no financial remuneration. The report goes on to state that even though development time is greatly increased in distance education, most colleges see that as a part of the standard faculty workload. Although monetary rewards are uncommon, Brown (1999) and Betts (1998) point out that many colleges are offering development support through other means. Distributed Learning departments are providing instructional and graphic design support while Instructional Technology staffs often assist with technical questions.

The literature points out that less rigorous workloads is the second most requested extrinsic reward but due to budget restraints, few colleges have responded to this request. Workload in this case is defined as the number of courses taught per semester. The NEA report indicated that 84 percent of today's higher education faculty have similar teaching loads regardless of the delivery mechanism. Consistent teaching loads are perhaps the case because today's colleges are faced with the task of closing the ever-widening gap between income and expenses.

Workload was also addressed from the perspective of class size. Class size policies are widely diverse and have a direct tie to the budget. Although numerous studies (Bower, 2001: McKenzie, Mims, Bennett & Waugh, 2002) present the incentive of smaller class sizes, colleges are reluctant to limit registrations. Faculty, on the other hand, question the quality of instruction with class loads exceeding twenty-five students. Draves (2000) suggests that class size policies remain consistent between online and traditional, while Miller (2000) suggests a sliding scale of stipends for faculty who teach courses in excess of twenty-five students. The question of class size remains unanswered and a topic of heavy controversy throughout the academic world. Administrators seeking new cadres of distant faculty should address this concern with faculty and determine an equitable solution. Without stringent policies in place, faculty are hesitant to transition to distance delivery.

The third most popular incentive was that of release time for course development. McKenzie, Mims, Bennett & Waugh's (2001) research shows that development time for distance courses is nearly double that of traditional. Although this is the case, colleges nationwide are balking at release time and instead are providing teams of designers and technical support staff to assist with the development. The additional monies needed for this support strategy have proven to be less than the cost of the release time and benefits both traditional and distant faculty (Marriott, 2003).

It is no surprise that one of the largest monetary items on a college budget is technology. The need for constant upgrades and new hardware can have negative connotations for fiscal responsibility. What appears to be current technology to one instructor may be "old hat" to another. New technologies such as personal laptop computers, and PDA's are frequent requests. While colleges are rushing to keep up with the ever-changing office machines and classroom technologies, portable technology is finding its way into the offices and classrooms. Distance faculty, in particular, want laptops with Internet connections, allowing them to teach 24/7 from any location.

Dillon (1989) and Dillon and Walsh (1998) add to the literature on this subject by stating that faculty who are comfortable with technology may lack the pedagogical skills that marry the technology to the content. Training is needed to support the instructional transition from instructor-centered to student-centered. Likewise, training is needed to assure that the technology is secondary to the content. Teaching at a distance is not for every faculty but it should not be relegated to those with high levels of computer literacy. Providing faculty with personal technologies removes the fear of computer-mediated instruction. Providing the technical and instructional design support capitalizes on the delivery of the requested extrinsic rewards.

Summary
Colleges continue to offer growing numbers of courses and programs of study through distance education technologies. Yet despite this growth, relatively little is known about what inspires faculty to teach with a technology-mediated approach. The current study was designed as an exploration into the incentives that faculty

perceive as motivating.

The analysis of over one hundred articles lead to the conclusion that faculty generally teach in distance education programs for the same reasons (incentives) they teach traditional courses; for intrinsic rewards. The study identified self-satisfaction, flexible scheduling and wider audience as the intrinsic rewards and stipends, decreased workload, release time and new technology as the extrinsic motivators.

Furthermore, the study found that community college faculty tend to see distance delivery of education as a part of their job. Those same faculty view distance teaching as an integral part of the college culture, whereby they teach remote students as a part of their teaching obligations and professionalism.

This article has summarized the work of many authors and researchers in an attempt to develop a valuable profile of the distance educator. Realizing what motivates faculty to teach in distant formats provides clues as to how to increase the number of courses offered to students in rural areas, on a 24/7 rotation, and to those seeking specialized instruction. Regardless of the reward system, distance education has provided the opportunity for literally thousands of students to receive instruction who prior to technology-mediated instruction would have been overlooked.

References
- Betts, K. S. (1998). Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study. (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International: UMI.
- Bower, B. (2001). Distance education: Facing the faculty challenge. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration 2(1). Retrieved November 12, 2002 from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer42/bower42.html.
- Brown, K. (1999). Incentivizing faculty to transition to online. Informational Technology Journal, 8(9), 19-24.
- Dillon, C. (1989). Faculty rewards and instructional telecommunications: A view from the telecourse faculty, The American Journal of Distance Education, 3(2),35-43
- Dillon, C. & Walsh, S. (1999). Faculty: The neglected resource in distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education, 6(3), 5-21.
- Draves, W. (2002). Teaching Online. River Falls, WI: LERN.
- Lenzer, R. (1997) Seeing things as they really are. Forbes, 159(5), March 10, 1997, 122-129.
- Marriott, M. (2003, January 12). Technology; Beyond the Blackboard. The New York Times, p. 4A-19.
- McKenzie, B. K., Mims, N., Bennett, E., & Waugh, M. (1999, Fall). Needs, concerns, and practices of online instructors. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 2(3). Retrieved

from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall33/mckenzie33.html

- McKenzie, B. K., Mims, N., Bennett, E., & Waugh, M. (2002, March 19). Course Preparation for Online Learning: What Faculty Should Know. Presented at the SITE Conference, Nashville, TN.
- Miller, J.T. (2000). Administrators, faculty and the final outcome in distance learning. The University of Houston Journal of Distance Learning (2)1, 13-19.
- Miller, M. T., & Husmann, D. E. (1999, Fall). Faculty incentives to participate in distance education. The Michigan Community College Journal, 5, 35-42.
- Moore. M. (2001). Distance Education in the United States: the State of the Art. Retrieved from http://www.uoc.edu/web/eng/art/uoc/moore/moore.html
- Rockwell, S. K., Schauer, J., Fritz, S. J., & Marx, D. B. (1999, Winter). Incentives and obstacles influencing higher education faculty and administrators to teach via distance. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 2(4). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall33/rockwell24.html
- Rose, R. M., & Collison, G. (1997). A comparison between web-based and notes-based professional development netcourse delivery. Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education Annual, 1997, 151-154.
- Stockeband, W., & Althoff, C. (1997). Graduate degrees: The time is now, the place is anywhere. Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education Annual, 1997, 163-165.
- Willis, B. (1994). Distance Education - Strategies and Tools and Distance Education - A Practical Guide. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. Wilson, C. (1998, Fall). Concerns of instructors delivering distance education via the WWW. Online Journal of Distance Education Administration 1(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall33/wilson13.html

Appendix G

Sample RFP for Enhancement to Existing Program
(Submitted by Dr. Chuck Spontelli, College of Technology)

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL
Advanced Technological Education (ATE)
& Learning Design (LRND)

Proposal Committee:
Mr. Robert Huckleberry – Lt. Col. U.S. Air Force (retired) – Chair
Dr. Michael Bankey – Owens Community College
Mr. Herminio Hernandez – First Solar Corp.
Mr. John Mallin – Owens Corning Inc.
Mr. Benjamin Randolph – Terra Community College
Mr. Terry Relue – Whirlpool Corp.
Dr. Ernie Savage – BGSU (retired)

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this proposal is to describe the market for undergraduate and
graduate distance students and the opportunity for increased enrollment and
earnings for BGSU. A case will be made for increased resources required for
marketing and recruiting this unique demographic for the ATE & LRND Programs.
Research suggests that programs for adult online students require:*

- Unique marketing and recruiting strategies
- Unique support services
- Unique retention strategies

The following data and narrative will illustrate the opportunities for enrollment
growth, earnings, profits and return on investment of additional marketing and
recruiting resources invested in the ATE & LRND programs. Prior to the tuition
adjustments implemented in the summer of 2011, the ATE & LRND programs had
been two of the fastest growing majors in the College of Technology. ATE is the
model degree completion program at BGSU, providing working adults the
opportunity to complete a Bachelor of Science Degree totally online. LRND carries
that success forward and grooms students as technical trainers and instructional
designers for a variety of public and private sector opportunities.

To achieve their growth potential, ATE and LRND should be managed as Growth
Programs.

ENROLLMENT GROWTH: **

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2014
.78	.99	1.26	1.54	1.78	2.14	3.97 (est.)

ATE & LRND majors (individual students)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2014
ATE	128	157	181	171	300 (est.)
LRND	25	48	58	53	80 (est.)

2011 Enrollment numbers were impacted by a Tuition increase for online students.

*University of Maryland University College UMUC (According to Sloan-ALN, in 2010)

**Growth forecast for online enrollment in millions nationwide (The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 10, 2010)

SUPPORTING DATA: **

➢ 4.6 million students in the U.S. took at least one online postsecondary course (up 17% from the previous year - 2010).
➢ 20% of all U.S. Higher Ed students took at least one online course - 2010.
➢ Online has grown at 19.7% annually (on average) over the last 5 years (by contrast, overall growth was 1.6 %)
➢ ATE & LRND student demographics primarily consist of working adults and active military personnel; which is consistent with Ohio State Accountability Measures.
   • Over 40% of ATE & LRND graduates are female.
   • The average age of students in these programs is 35.
   • BGSU is a "Service Friendly" University and 30% of ATE's last 75 new students are active military personnel.
   • Anecdotal evidence suggests many ATE students are the first in their respective families to attend college.
   • Adult students start with clearer, more pragmatic goals, and are highly motivated.

➢ ATE & LRND growth is consistent with BG's Strategic Plan to "Expand the student population and to implement new recruitment and retention programs."
➢ As 100% online programs, ATE/LRND also align well with the Accountability Measures established by the University System of Ohio.
➢ BGSU has the academic brand name and the academic programs (ATE & LRND) to be competitive in this rapidly growing market.
➢ If ATE and LRND grow at one half the industry average, they will grow at 10% per year.
➢ Therefore, every new ATE student represents incremental earnings to BGSU.
➢ ATE/LRND students would not normally attend BGSU in person. Given this, any student credit hours (SCHs) associated with these programs are beyond those that BGSU would normally be able to capture.

➢ Instructional Cost for online delivery of education is likely lower than traditional face-to-face classroom delivery (intuitive judgment). If this is true, tuition and subsidy for distance students could be lower than for residential students and still generate profitable earnings for BGSU. Financial models for cost analysis have been requested to justify the above assumption.

➢ Distance Education tuition = $374.00 per credit hour. Based on internal survey data this tuition rate is at the high-end of costs relative to other Ohio public 4-year universities. A reduced tuition rate for distance students would allow BGSU to compete more effectively with other state universities

➢ If managed effectively the ATE/LRND programs are in a position to become major growth engines for BGSU. Given the history of these two programs and the strength of

the now-combined ATE/LRND Advisory Board (Military and Civilian), we believe it is

feasible to double or triple enrollment in both programs within 24 months. Air Force students (CCAF) comprise 25% of total ATE enrollment. Air Force Board members have declared an unlimited upside potential for Air Force enrollment.

OBSTACLES / RISKS:

➢ **Inertia:** The education field is rapidly moving in this direction (online): BGSU risks finding itself behind the curve if it does not engage in this market more aggressively.

➢ **Marketing and Recruitment support:** There is no marketing activity for the ATE or the LRND Programs. There appears to be no marketing dollars set aside for distance education at BGSU.

Prior attempts at getting specific marketing initiatives approved have been unsuccessful.

Neither ATE nor LRND benefit directly from the University's traditional recruitment processes.

➢ **Culture***:* Although the new president of the university seems to support distance education, the larger university community seems to be ambivalent, at best, toward distance education. As an educational institution BGSU retains a "brick and mortar" culture which is less than welcoming of non-traditional programs such as ATE and LRND. Most University policies and practices have been designed and implemented for a traditional residential student population. Therefore, there are administrative policies and practices that conflict with the needs of non-traditional students and create obstacles for successful student recruitment and program implementation.

SUMMARY:

ATE and LRND have contributed to the success of the College of Technology and Bowling Green State University through improved enrollments. BGSU has an opportunity to increase revenue by marketing BGSU's involvement in the Air Force Consortium and by supporting the growth of distance education. Recruitment and enrollment efforts have placed ATE/LRND in a position to become major growth engines for student enrollment at BGSU. The emphasis on adult education and the

concept of "Life-long Learning" places ATE/LRND in unique strategic roles for the university. The supporting data in the appendix suggests a large population of potential students for the ATE and LRND programs.

We believe additional resources should be extended to those academic programs that are a good fit with the university's strategic plan and the state of Ohio's accountability measures.

We also believe that the university should support programs that have demonstrated a successful track record of growth, earnings and return-on-investment. ATE and LRND are different than traditional on-campus, instructor-led courses and therefore need to managed differently if they are to be successful.

The ATE and LRND programs warrant additional support for marketing and recruiting. It makes good business sense for BGSU to pursue a growth strategy for these programs. This student demographic would not otherwise be considered potential BGSU students. They are above and beyond the traditional student population.

Based on the above case, we are requesting consideration of the following:
1. BGSU should reconsider lowering distance learning tuition rates to be more competitive in the marketplace.
2. In order to compete effectively for distance students BGSU needs to market, advertise and recruit for ATE and LRND more aggressively.
3. Short-term requirements (90 days):

Postcard mailing to Community College Alumni	$10,000
Online Advertising (Facebook, Military, Education Websites)	$6,000
Military Education Center visits	$6,000
Promotional items	$3,000
Total	$25,000

4. Long-term resource requirements (3-5 years):
   ➢ For ATE and LRND to reach the national growth average, we will likely need to invest at least
   10-20% of our gross revenue on marketing, recruiting and general promotional activities each year for the next 3-5 years.

APPENDIX

RESEARCH SUPPORT:
1. ***Class Differences: Online Education in the United States* by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities** (A♦P♦L♦U)-Sloan National Commission on Online Learning and The Babson Survey Research Group. November 2010. 2010_class_differences [1]
   sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/class_differences.pdf

Class Differences: Online Education in the United

Growth of Online Learning:

➢ 63% of all reporting institutions said that online learning was a critical part of their institution's long term strategy…

➢ Online enrollments have continued to grow at rates far in excess of the total higher
education student population, with the most recent data demonstrating continued substantial growth. The 21% growth rate for online enrollments far exceeds the less than 2% growth rate of the overall higher education student population.

➢ More than 5.6 million students were taking at least one online course during the fall 2009 term;
an increase of nearly one million students over the number reported the previous year. Nearly 30% of higher education students now take at least one course online.

  - A majority of institutions continue to report that there is increasing competition for online students.
  - Public institutions report more pressure from the for-profit sector than do the private
    nonprofit institutions.
  - Virtually all recent growth in online enrollments has come from the growth of existing
    offerings, not from institutions new to the online environment starting new programs.

Online Learning Outcomes:

➢ Over three-quarters of academic leaders at public institutions report that online is as good
as or better than face-to-face instruction (compared to only 55.4% of private nonprofits and 67.0% of for-profits) .

Financing:

➢ The Sloan Commission maintains that upfront funding for online programs is essential for the development of robust strategic online initiatives. Further, institutions must provide the necessary resources to sustain and to grow established online initiatives. This ongoing need for funding holds true for institutions that are in "startup mode" or "re-start mode" with their online learning efforts, as well as for those running more mature programs.

➢ Three-quarters of institutions report that the economic downturn has increased demand for
online courses and programs.

2. ***Online Learning as a Strategic Asset by* the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities** (A♦P♦L♦U)-Sloan National Commission on Online Learning and The Babson Survey Research Group, August 2009. *Volume I: A Resource for Campus Leaders*
2010APLU_online_strategic_asset_-vol2-1[1].pdf:

The Paradox of Faculty Voices: Views and Experiences with Online Learning
2010APLU_online_strategic_asset_vol2-1[1]

Leadership:
➢ "The Institutional Leadership Imperative in Online Learning
Initiatives…..Many Institutional Interview participants said a key element of
successful online initiatives was
the strength of the campus leaders' commitment. In particular… active
support from the president and chief academic officer are essential
ingredients to making
online learning programs work."

Online Learning as a Strategic Asset:
➢ One example of online learning being seen as a strategic asset is The
University of Montana's strategic plan for UMOnline; a large-scale,
branded effort to integrate online learning into the fabric of the university's
academic operations and support campus and state strategic plans. The
campus strategic plan also tasked the institution to "develop the capability
and infrastructure for use of information technology to increase the
efficiency and productivity of the campus and the state.

Student Preferences:
"For a growing number of students, enrolling in a prestigious college means
simply choosing an online program from a well-known brick-and-mortar
institution, like the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, over a for-profit
online college".

3. **The Chronicle of Higher Education, Jan. 7, 2012.**
   Good Reputations, Reflected, By Brock Read, May 9, 2006
   "An article in The Wall Street Journal points out that enrollment is skyrocketing
   at most online institutions in part because public universities have helped bring
   credibility to distance education. For a growing number of students, enrolling in
   a prestigious college means simply choosing an online program from a well-
   known brick-and-mortar institution, like the University of Massachusetts at
   Amherst, over a for-profit online college".

4. ***Workforce Management,* December 11, 2006, p. 1, 27.** This article illustrates
   the importance of online education to the private sector and that much of the
   future growth in online enrollment will be the result of partnerships between
   universities and private corporations.

   Three corporations are cited: ***Home Depot, Consolidated Edison and Ingersoll-
   Rand.***
   All 3 companies identify the following factors as critical drivers:
   ➢ ***Favorable pricing***
   ➢ ***Customized programs***
   ➢ ***Easy access***

5. ONLINE STUDENT RETENTION: ASSESSING WHY STUDENTS STAY AND WHY THEY LEAVE,
   Mark L. Parker, Associate Professor/Academic Director, UMUC. An overview of
   the large online student segment of

The University of
Maryland. http://www.innovativeeducators.org//v/vspfiles/V4_Backup/02_16_390_Retention.ppt

6. Johnson, Nick, *Accredited online colleges on the rise,* http://www.accreditedonlinecolleges.net/
    Johnson discusses the adoption of accredited online courses and programmes in higher education institutions in the United States.
    "In 2010, enrollment for accredited online college courses rose by 10%, which far exceeds the less than 1% growth in the overall student enrollment in higher education institutions generally. In the fall term of 2010 alone, 6.1 million students took at least one course online, an increase of 560,000 students — or 9.2% — over the previous year. These students accounted for 31.3% of total student enrollment in postsecondary education for the term. The proportion is even higher amongst older students. With an average U.S. unemployment rate of 9.64% for 2010, many working adults are returning to school for additional education to both increase job security and future career opportunities.

    "As many of these individuals already have work and family commitments, the flexibility of online programmes provides an opportunity not available through traditional college programs."

    Consequently, surveys indicate that 42% of students who are thirty or older are taking entire programs through distance education.
    Recent research conducted by the Babson Survey Research Group indicates that 67% of chief academic officers reported learning outcomes for virtual environments, compared with in-classroom experiences, were "the same", "somewhat superior", and "superior". This is a notable increase from the 57% reported in 2003.

    Certain faculty members such as Dr. Clayton Christensen, professor at Harvard University, have been instrumental in educating others on the benefits of online learning. He advocates that the "rise of online learning carries with it an unprecedented opportunity to transform the schooling system into a student-centric one that can affordably customize for different student needs by allowing all students to learn at their appropriate pace and path, thereby allowing each student to realize his or her fullest potential."
    ....with online learning, customising education for every student is no longer beyond the scope of possibility.

    Accredited online colleges have also been gaining increasing acceptance by educators as well as employers. A 2010 survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management found that 87% of 449 randomly selected HR professionals viewed online degrees more favorably than they did five years ago, and 79% said that they had hired a job applicant with an online degree over the past year. In the present recession, as more professionals seek to further their education to improve job security and prospects, and as more prestigious higher

education institutions begin offering degrees online, online learning will become an even more integral part of the worldwide education system.

"Online learning promises to make education more engaging, more accessible, and more effective, so that anyone can learn from anywhere at any time and master the material better than if they were to attend a brick-and-mortar institution."

7. **ONLINE SCHOOLS:** Hundreds of universities offer online degrees. For a sample of top-tier Colleges and Universities that offer online degrees visit the following site: http://www.college-scholarships.com/ssac.htm

Appendix H

Envisioning a Pathway to BGSU'S Global Growth in Distance Education:
"BGSU Global"
(contributed by Dr. Bruce L. Edwards, Associate Vice President for Academic
Technology and E-Learning Services)

BGSU GLOBAL

2012-2020

❑ Seizes the moment, extends the expertise, multiplies the access points, insures the quality, enlarges the market **regionally, nationally, globally for BGSU course work.**

❑ Delivers the educational attainment sought by the public to initiate, enhance, lengthen their careers and satisfy aspirations **in a timely, economical, convenient framework.**

❑ Transforms time/place bound models of learning and instruction into a **dynamic, interactive transaction** between well-qualified teachers and active learners.

❑ Re/allocates resources to campus leadership who understand and embrace **these new dimensions of education**

BGSU GLOBAL is

2012-2022

❑ The once and future campus that is built on **"a legacy of excellence,"** but truly affirms a meaningful **"future without limits"**

❑ Built upon **a sustainable growth model** of efficiencies of scale, access & dedication to innovation of content & delivery, nimble responsiveness to career + workplace needs.

❑ Prudent about technology's strengths and weaknesses, adamant that **quality not quantity drives the marketplace**, and committed to promoting lifelong learning among BGSU alumni.

2012-2020

BGSU GLOBAL

- Goes where the learner is -- **not vice-versa.**
- Administers its programs and delivers its services **with the learner's needs and expectations at the center**, and not the convenience of the organization
- **Prizes diversity and difference in all its forms**, encourages innovation, & celebrates continuity while challenging conventional wisdom & previous norms.
- Builds a coalition of faculty, staff, and administration who together **maximize the outlets & access points** for their collaborative expression of knowledge and practical insight before a worldwide audience.

Strategies & Tactics

Simplicity in design, consistency in application, & collaboration in oversight will be the hallmarks of BGSU GLOBAL.

BGSU GLOBAL: *transitional points*

Jump Starts: strategic initiatives that take advantage of existing assets

Leapfrogs: by-passing benign or not-so-benign barriers to the launch of new programs and services

Quick Fixes: streamlining data mining and gate-keeping functions to advantage eager student learners and reward early adopters.

Strategies & Tactics

BGSU GLOBAL: *Jump Starts*

❑ **Degree re-purposing:** survey and scale existing online course inventory and, by repackaging and resourceful advising and staffing, deliver new degrees indexed to Ohio workforce needs.

❑ **Maximize 2+2 agreements:** pursue and project 2+2 options in every BGSU discipline and subject matters in which there is a match anywhere in Ohio/regionally.

❑ **Create new consortial graduate degrees:** leverage BGSU strengths among "centers of excellence" graduate disciplines to propose partnerships with USO institutions to offer needed degrees and certificates

Strategies & Tactics

BGSU GLOBAL: *Leapfrogs*

❑ **Platform diversity:** institute multi-platform degree delivery and oversight:
- ❑ college-sponsored
- ❑ college-partner
- ❑ college-independent

❑ **Maximize PLA and other non-classroom based credit:** promote, expand, and streamline review of aptitude and life experience assessment for all adult learners

❑ **Course inventory expansion:** Remove redundant approval processes by declaring already approved BGSU course work available for online design/delivery indexed to Quality Matters™ best practices standards.

Strategies & Tactics

BGSU GLOBAL: *Quick Fixes*

❑ **Course design:** require all future materials to be designed with cross-platform mobility and instructional capture in mind for delivery to all platforms: F2F, rich media web and mobile devices.

❑ **Faculty and staff hiring practices:** privilege candidates who exemplify and embrace understanding of digital culture and possess the requisite skills to teach well.

❑ **Resourcing growth areas:** allocate faculty and staff positions and operating budget to units who directly impact new populations for student enrollment.