

Loyola University New Orleans

Report of the Online Education Task Force

March 2011



Members of the Online Education Task Force, AY 2010-2011

College, Faculty, and Administrative Representatives

- Mary Brazier College of Humanities & Natural Sciences
- Dane Ciolino College of Law
- Mehmet Dicle College of Business
- David Myers College of Social Sciences
- Deborah Poole Monroe Library
- Vicki Vega College of Music & Fine Arts
- Lydia Voigt Senior Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs

Online Program Representatives

- Ann Cary School of Nursing
- Tom Ryan Loyola Institute for Ministry
- Enzo Sainato Department of Criminal Justice

Resource Support Team Members

- Terrell Fisher Institutional Advancement/ Marketing
- Sal Liberto Enrollment Management/Admissions
- Leon Mathes Business and Finance
- Melanie McKay Faculty Development
- Jan Moppert Student Affairs
- Brad Petitfils Curriculum Developer

Chair of Online Education Task Force

- Bret Jacobs Vice-Provost for Information Technology, CIO

Introduction

As a result of its work during the 2009-2010 academic year, the Online Education Task Force made several recommendations to the Provost regarding the support, financing and marketing of online programs at Loyola. The following is a summary of the recommendations made by the Task Force as well as the Provost's response.

Recommendation One:

To centralize resources including staffing, equipment and facilities required for the support of Loyola's online initiatives wherever possible. Additionally, the OETF recommends that innovative teaching spaces be created and shared and that the university explore investment in additional tools in support of online instruction.

This recommendation was accepted. Careful coordination between the OETF and the Deans as well as the Directors of any impacted areas must be in place. Opportunities exist for the creation of innovative teaching spaces with the proposed renovation of several classroom buildings which should be considered by the OETF when making any recommendations regarding new or renovated teaching spaces.

Recommendation Two:

To establish identifiable revenue accounts for each program so that a program's impact on the university's budget is easily measured. The OETF also recommends that the university establish a "startup pool" from revenue generated by all online programs in support of new programs and initiatives. Key to the OETF's recommendations is the development of a pro-forma financial analysis for each proposed online program. This analysis will help to standardize the financial analysis of each proposed program so that all areas of revenue and expense are identified and quantified. Additionally, the OETF recommends that Loyola adopt standard levels of faculty compensation for the development and maintenance of replicable learning objects used in online education as well as development of a methodology to distributed shared and program specific costs to each online program. The details of these and other associated recommendations may be found on page 21.

The recommendation to establish identifiable revenue and expense accounts and to develop a pro-forma financial analysis was accepted. The recommendation to adopt standard levels of faculty compensation for the development of replicable learning objects and the establishment of a "startup pool" is still under consideration by the Provost.

Recommendation Three:

Transform the OETF into the University Standing Committee on Online Education. The OETF also recommended that a clear path be identified for the review and approval of new online programs. Additionally, the OETF recommended the development of a précis to be used during the program review process.

This recommendation was accepted. The OETF has been directed to work with the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee to establish the OETF as a handbook committee.

Recommendation Four:

To establish a new position for an Executive Director of Online Education, which will provide ongoing management and enhancement of online education at Loyola. This new position, which will report to the Provost, will be responsible for the coordination of faculty development and training, credentialing and accreditation, business planning and marketing as related to online programs. The Executive Director will provide a focal point for online learning within the forthcoming Office of Online Education.

This recommendation was accepted in principle. Creation of the position has been deferred due to budgetary constraints. In the interim, the OETF will act as the coordinating body for all online initiatives.

Recommendation Five:

Establish instructional design and quality standards for all online programs and courses. To this end, the OETF researched best practices in course design and quality control with an emphasis on Jesuit education and developed models for course design and teaching methods. The OETF has developed both a course design rubric and template to guide course development and production.

This recommendation was accepted.

Recommendation Six:

Develop measures and a plan for the assessment of Quality Online Learning. This includes the development of a framework for a comprehensive assessment plan for online learning. The framework serves to identify the critical components of online learning and associated operationalizations /measures/ indicators and assessment instruments and provides a sample online course evaluation.

This recommendation was accepted.

Recommendation Seven:

Develop and support faculty teaching in an online environment. Results of a faculty survey conducted by the OETF found that there is a high level of interest in hybrid teaching and, therefore, the OETF recommends that the university continue to search for successful hybrid teaching models and expand faculty development opportunities in this area. Additionally, the OETF found that the faculty is very supportive of enhancing Loyola's support structure for online education.

This recommendation was accepted. The OETF's work in the area must be coordinated with the Center for Faculty Innovation.

Recommendation Eight:

Enhance marketing, recruitment and retention efforts related to online education. The OETF recommendations include building a pricing model for online programs based on market sensitivity and competition and establishing a clear model for enrollment and management of all programs at the university. An increase in marketing budgets for newly established programs is also recommended. Additionally the OETF recommends that the university re-evaluate its current model of outsourcing certain components of online program marketing as well as the acquisition of specific online courses from outside providers to determine whether or not such practices are in the best interest of the university.

Additional work in this area has been requested. A determination as to the best marketing methodology must be made.

The approved recommendations, along with the feedback from the Provost, formed the guiding principles for the work of the Online Education Task force for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Guiding Principles of the Online Education Task Force – AY 2010-2011

To direct the work for the Task Force in AY 2010-2011, the recommendations approved from the prior year's report were grouped and prioritized into the following guiding principles.

- Develop the subcommittee structure of the Standing Committee on Online Education.
- Develop protocols for the Standing Committee on Online Education including procedures and operations.
- Develop clear voting rules and procedures for program approval.
- Develop a strategic vision for the role of online and hybrid courses / programs at Loyola.
- Review individual program proposals as needed.
- Review individual course proposals as needed.
- Operationalize communication and feedback responsibilities of the members in the Standing Committee on Online Education.
- Address whether summer online courses should be institutionalized as a program.
- Review updates and recommendations of the workgroup on hybrid courses/technologies.

Other priorities were organized by topic. Continuing the committee organization developed during the prior year, four workgroups were formed and charged with addressing specific areas of online education at Loyola.

- ***Workgroup on Finance: Leon Mathes, Leader***
 - Establish a model for identifiable revenue and expense accounts for all current and future online programs
 - Operationalize the expense/revenue model for individual courses, summer online courses, and programs.
 - Develop a pro-forma financial analysis model to be used for all proposed online programs
 - Continue development of a standardized model of faculty compensation for the development and maintenance of replicable learning objects
- ***Workgroup on Centralization & Support: Deborah Poole, Leader***
 - Develop a set of protocols for resource sharing to support the centralized model.
 - Operationalize the centralized model vis-à-vis staffing, equipment, and facilities.
 - Operationalize the protocol for technology fees.
 - Maintain an ongoing inventory of resources that support online and hybrid education across the university and develop a protocol for university-wide resource sharing and faculty development.

- ***Workgroup on Recruitment, Retention, & Student Life: Sal Liberto, Leader***
 - Develop a web portal for online education at Loyola.
 - Establish short-term marketing plans for current programs.
 - Establish comprehensive long-term marketing, recruitment, and strategic planning for the future.
 - Establish long-range marketing and recruitment plans for online education at Loyola.

- ***Workgroup on Teaching & Learning: Tom Ryan, Leader***
 - Operationalize what is meant by “content delivered online” in terms of “contact hours” in online courses.
 - Address guidelines, procedures, and limits for course enrollment/caps.
 - Review student course evaluation instruments and evaluation processes.
 - Develop online metrics and dashboard indicators.
 - Develop and implement review processes for programs and courses.
 - Develop an internal marketing plan for faculty development.
 - Address Department of Education requirements for student identification in online education.
 - Address how the university might support proctoring services for exams.
 - Develop standards for consistency across program/course review documents.
 - Develop and implement an approval process and numbering system to reflect the different levels of online and hybrid courses in LORA.
 - Address whether there should be a maximum number of courses students are allowed to take simultaneously in a given semester.
 - Address expectations for student attendance and participation in online courses (including drop dates and withdrawals).
 - Develop model to fund “startup pool” from the return of online programs to be used as startup funds for new online programs

Summary of Recommendations for AY 2010-2011

1. Establish stipends ranging from \$3,500 to \$7,500 depending on demand, expertise and the replicable nature of the course, or consider course creation as a service to the University that results in eligibility for reduced teaching load as described in page 7-3 of the Faculty Handbook. In either case, compensation shall be considered as work for hire. (see details on pages 10-17)
2. Oversubscription of courses shall not be allowed. When necessary additional course sections should be created or enrollment capped when additional course sections are not feasible. In short, additional pay for excess class enrollment will not be acceptable. (see details on pages 10-17)
3. Only Ordinary Faculty will supervise adjunct faculty, and compensation for supervision will be handled through the merit process and not by stipend. (see details on pages 10-17)
4. Online support staff be centralized in the Monroe Library, effective August 1, 2011. (see details on pages 18-24)
5. The Instructional Resources Coordinator in the College of Law should conduct a needs assessment of the faculty and staff of the College of Law and submit a training plan to the Center for Faculty Innovation for implementation in AY 2011-2012. (see details on pages 18-24)
6. Dedicate financial resources from the online support technology fee to transfer the DLP equipment from Communications 303 & 304 and install in Multimedia Rooms 1 & 2 in the Monroe Library. (see details on pages 18-24)
7. Dedicate financial resources from the online support technology fee for the selection and implementation of a university-wide synchronous web conferencing solution. (see details on pages 18-24)
8. Utilize the same protocol for management of the online support technology fee as is currently in place for the student technology fee. (see details on pages 18-24)
9. Create our own highly sophisticated online learning enrollment and delivery options, which could utilize partners to perform various functions of the whole, but maintains control over all of those functions. (see details on pages 25-28)
10. Inform enrolled students of career and professional development resources, as well as job and internship opportunities, through communication campaigns. (see details on pages 25-28)
11. Require third party service providers to provide timely reports on the enrollment metrics and other performance indicators for online students. (see details on pages 25-28)
12. The provost, the online committee, and the eventual new director of online learning should ensure that future contracts we enter into must align with our vision for third party service providers. (see details on pages 25-28)
13. Establish budgets for all existing programs, and start up costs for new ones. Longer term planning will require the agreement of an expense and revenue model, especially as it relates to fixed and variable costs with anticipated (upward) shifts in enrollment. (see details on pages 25-28)
14. Only fully online courses need to go through the Online Education Task Force approval process. Fully online courses have their own evaluation instrument, which should contain questions that address how effectively fully online courses reflect the university mission. Similar consideration should be given to traditional courses as well. (see details on pages 29-30)
15. All traditional and hybrid courses should include questions related to online learning in their evaluation instruments. (see details on pages 29-30)
16. The Online Education Task Force should receive and review the anonymous, aggregated results of all questions from student evaluations related to online education. (see details on pages 29-30)
17. The Online Education Task Force should compare GPAs, grade distribution, dropout rate, class breakdowns (1st year, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate, etc.), demographics, etc. from fully online courses to courses that are not fully online. (see details on pages 29-30)
18. Online courses may not exceed 20 students per section. Any decrease in enrollment caps below 20 should be a result of departmental decision, approved by the dean, and grounded in pedagogical best practices. (see details on pages 29-30)
19. The workload for full-time online faculty shall not exceed that of traditional on-campus faculty. This means that no faculty member shall teach more than four (4) online sections per traditional 16-week semester or more than two (2) online sections per shortened semester (e.g. 8-week semester). (see details on pages 29-30)
20. The following statement needs to be appended to the SCAP Criteria for Evaluation of New Academic Program Proposals: **For online programs, please attach an appendix that addresses the criteria required by the Online Education Task Force.** (see details on pages 29-30)

Creation of a Standing Committee

The Online Education Task Force forwarded its recommendation that it be transformed into a standing committee of the University to the Chair of the Faculty Senate in October, 2010. The recommended committee description is included in Exhibit One.

Additionally, the chair of the Online Education Task Force was invited to present the recommendation to the Faculty Senate at its November 2010 meeting.

The Faculty Senate is continuing its discussions of the Online Task Force recommendation as of the writing of this report.

Exhibit One – Description of Standing Committee

Description of Standing Committee on Online Education

Mission of Online Education

Loyola University New Orleans, a Jesuit and Catholic institution of higher education, welcomes students of diverse backgrounds and prepares them to lead meaningful lives with and for others; to pursue truth, wisdom, and virtue; and to work for a more just world. Inspired by the Ignatian vision of education, the university is grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, while also offering opportunities for professional studies in undergraduate and selected graduate programs.

Loyola provides online and hybrid learning opportunities to enrich the university as a whole and help it extend its mission. Online learning at Loyola University New Orleans will be rooted in our traditions and will be held up to the same standards of excellence, accreditation, and sustainability. Faculty and staff who work with these programs, and the students enrolled in such programs of study, will receive the support they need to succeed.

Online and hybrid education at Loyola will:

- Respond to the expansion of digital information and tools that increasingly shape modern life
- Be integrated into the portfolio of educational strategies and comprehensively supported to maximize effectiveness
- Diversify learning venues and opportunities that can attract a host of diverse students, all engaged in the mode of learning that best suits their learning styles and situations
- Use the experience and expertise of our faculty and staff, guided by the Ignatian traditions of distinctive, accessible modes of learning and teaching, to create a niche in higher education
- Engage faculty and students in meaningful learning and innovative pedagogies

- Explore learning modes and delivery systems that can inspire pedagogical and intellectual innovation as well as provide greater access, flexible scheduling, and choice to students who live on and off campus, those that live at a distance, and to address the needs of traditionally underserved student populations
- Be integrated in the university infrastructure and decision-making processes

Constitution of Standing Committee on Online Education

Chairperson: Appointed by Committee

Secretary: Appointed by Chairperson

Voting Members:

1. Faculty Representative from College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
2. Faculty Representative from College of Social Sciences
3. Faculty Representative from College of Business
4. Faculty Representative from College of Music and Fine Arts
5. Faculty Representative from College of Law
6. Faculty Representative from University Library
7. Faculty Representative from Units with Approved Online Programs (1 member)
8. Instructional Designer, University Library (ex officio)
9. Director of Online Education (when appointed will join the committee) (ex officio)
10. Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ex officio)
11. Vice Provost for Information Technology (ex officio)
12. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (ex officio)
13. Associate Vice President of Business and Finance (ex officio)
14. Vice President of Enrollment Management (ex officio)
15. Associate Vice President of Marketing (ex officio)
16. Student representative

Terms:

Members are appointed by the Provost to three-year terms, (staggered and renewable), on recommendation of the vice presidents/deans, based on division/college protocols. Members from departments offering online programs serve for one-year appointments on a rotating basis.

Purpose:

This committee is responsible for overseeing the implementation of online education initiatives that grow out of college and university planning. The committee will recommend and oversee policies and procedures related to online program/course development, quality standards, pedagogy, delivery, course/program assessments/reviews, and administration of all online offerings at the university.

Duties:

1. Each member of the committee shall be responsible for routinely and regularly reporting back/providing updates on the work of the committee to his or her respective college or unit; and for continuously gathering input from that college or unit to ensure wide faculty and staff representation in the work of the committee.
2. The committee as a whole shall communicate to the campus community, on an ongoing basis, about national trends in online teaching and learning; pedagogical best practices;

existing online programs at Loyola; and opportunities for expansion of online education at Loyola.

Committee Tasks:

1. Approve and oversee policies for the design, production, delivery, and learning assessment of online programs and courses, credit and non-credit, undergraduate and graduate. Approve guidelines, templates, and methods based on best practices for online education in the context of Jesuit education, including pedagogy, course design, faculty support, technical support, and delivery.
2. Review proposals for new online programs, courses and hybrid courses.
3. Review the current status of online courses and programs (i.e., quality and range of offerings) including an evaluation of the impact of online courses/programs on traditional campus curricula, assessment of students currently supplementing their degree requirements with online courses, and future projections of online demand for courses/programs.
4. Review current third party vendor relationships and recommend policies for administration of online offerings, including guidelines for partnerships with external service providers, marketing, enrollment management, and accreditation compliance. In conjunction with the university attorney, review and approve agreements with external service providers, including RFPs, proposals, and contracts.
5. Review budgetary processes and recommend funding formulas for online program development and expansion (including consideration of faculty course load issues and faculty development needs).
6. Review forms and protocols for course evaluations. Review aggregated quality learning outcomes for online programs/courses.
7. Develop and review accounting metrics/headcounts/retention indicators.

Workgroup on Finance

Workgroup leader: Leon Mathes

Workgroup members: Adrienne Blanco, Ann Cary, Vincenzo Sainato

The workgroup on Finance was asked to establish a model for identifiable revenue and expense accounts, develop a pro-forma financial analysis model to be used for all proposed online programs, and develop of a standardized model of faculty compensation for the development and maintenance of replicable learning objects. Once developed, these models can inform the development of new program proposals and ensure the financial success of existing programs.

Recommendation #1

Establish stipends ranging from \$3,500 to \$7,500 depending on demand, expertise and the replicable nature of the course, or consider course creation as a service to the University that results in eligibility for reduced teaching load as described in page 7-3 of the Faculty Handbook. In either case, compensation shall be considered as work for hire.

Recommendation #2

Oversubscription of courses shall not be allowed. When necessary additional course sections should be created or enrollment capped when additional course sections are not feasible. In short, additional pay for excess class enrollment will not be acceptable.

Recommendation #3

Only Ordinary Faculty will supervise adjunct faculty, and compensation for supervision will be handled through the merit process and not by stipend. Supervision entails: serving as the point of contact for resources identified by the adjunct, orienting the adjunct to the course syllabus, grading and grade report processes, regularly contacting the adjunct to determine the status of the course, student issues and faculty concerns to assist in solving problems, reviewing the adjunct course ratings and making recommendations for further employment based on ratings and serving as a backup faculty member should the adjunct be unable to complete the teaching needed for the course.

The workgroup was asked to recommend levels of faculty compensation for development and maintenance of replicable learning objects (RLO). In essence, this compensation is for the authoring faculty member to allow their intellectual capital to be replicated by others without a “royalty” each time it is offered. Such courses are expected to be utilized for a minimum of three years. It is understood that the usual maintenance and enhancement efforts will exist during the life of the course. As such, compensation for the development and maintenance of “single-use” courses, such as summer-school, will be less than the development and maintenance of RLOs. The workgroup limited its efforts to courses delivered 100% online and did not consider compensation for hybrid courses involving less than 100% online components.

The workgroup noted the absence of online education in the faculty handbook and the need for consideration of the same. To date, the majority of Loyola's online courses were created for the Summer 2009 session with a stipend of \$1,000 per course. A Doctor of Nurse Practitioner Program and a Master of Criminal Justice Program are in progress and compensation arrangements for the development of the respective online courses have not been established. Recognizing that faculty handbook revisions will require a deliberate process the workgroup included "interpretations" of the faculty handbook to allow for quick decisions about compensation to avoid the stifling of online course development.

A survey of Jesuit and non-Jesuit schools concerning compensation for online course preparation showed a distinction between compensation for conversion of existing courses to the on-line format versus compensation for development of new courses in the on-line format. The workgroup agreed that new, replicable courses would be at the top of the compensation scale and non-replicable conversions of existing courses to the on-line format would be at the bottom of the compensation scale.

The workgroup gave careful consideration to both equal levels of faculty compensation across all programs as well as a model which provides flexibility across programs. Although the workgroup is recommending a flexible compensation model, concerns were raised that such an approach can create disparity for the value of work among our faculty at the university. Compensation recommendations include stipends, course release(s) and interpretation of the faculty handbook to include on-line course development as part of the "adoption of new teaching methods" and "community service" as described in page 4-3 and 4-4 of the Loyola University New Orleans Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook). The course release would be a separate course reduction as described in page 7-3 of the Faculty Handbook.

Recommendations #1, #2 and #3 relate to the different views of compensating for on-line course development. The compensation discussion assumed Fulltime Faculty would be the creators of the online courses. Recommendations #1, #2 and #3 represent the proposals to the OETF.

Cost Model

The Cost Model for online programs is relevant only to graduate programs as the revenues and expenses of graduate programs are captured in unique accounts. The unique accounts allow for comparison of budget to actual revenues and expenses.

The Cost Model is illustrated in Exhibit Three. The Cost Model includes example amounts (for illustration only) and prompts the user to show supporting details for the development of revenues and expenses. The template includes a five-year illustration of revenues and expenses to facilitate the start-up phase of the program. The revenue template details the program track with cohort size, tuition rates and enrollment activity by semester. The expense template includes a variety of expense categories and is not intended to be the only expenses that might be identified by a program proposer. The expenses allow for a University Share to contribute to the

University's indirect costs such as utilities, plant maintenance, administrative support and debt service as well as a "net to the program" for program enhancement.

The University Share is a negotiable amount and is expected to be "soft" during the start-up phase of the program. Tolerance for unfunded deficits will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Unfunded deficits reflected in the template are not an indication of benchmarks for the net return of the program.

Expense categories are not intended to be a complete list or used by all programs. The list of expense categories is intended to assist the creators of online programs in their effort to capture all expenses related to online program creation and operation. All online program budget assumptions should be presented to a panel of at least two faculty members who are experienced with the creation of online programs. The program proposal must include the completed five-year template with documentation of assumptions.

Items to consider –

1. Salary amounts include a 30% fringe benefits factor.
2. Third-party provider costs such as Deltak, on-line consortiums
3. Instructional design costs.
4. Library – virtual reference/research services.
5. Marketing/student recruitment.
6. Specialized software/hardware.
7. Course revisions
8. Library resources available – databases, DVDs, online resources.
9. Video production facilities, software, hardware.

Exhibit Two - Compensation Survey Results

On September 22, 2010, Dr. Ann Cary with assistance from Dr. Kathleen Synder from AJCU conducted an online education compensation survey. The survey was emailed to twenty-three AJCU Deans of Adult & Continuing Education (DACE) and six AJCU Deans of the School of Nursing. In addition, the survey was emailed to all 20 Jesuit Schools of Nursing as well as the Director of Online Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (UMA). Of those surveyed and who responded by October 7, 2010, their unduplicated responses are summarized below. Respondents included Boston College, Creighton, Fairfield, Marquette, Regis, St Louis U., St. Peters, Spring Hill, Wheeling, Gonzaga, UDMercy, Research College and UMA.

1. What is the compensation paid to convert an existing course to an online format?

- (1) \$3500-5000
- (1) \$4000
- (1) \$3000 UMA
- (1) \$2500
- (1) \$2130-2400
- (1) \$500
- (1) We are creating the policy now to use either course buyout or a lump sum.

(6) NA

2. What is the compensation paid to develop a new course?

- (1) \$3900 - \$5100
- (1) \$5000 UMA
- (2) \$4000
- (1) \$2130 - \$2400
- (2) \$2000 - \$2500 or release time
- (1) \$1420 (assuming 42 hours to create a course)
- (1) \$1000 per credit
- (1) Compensation is dependent on faculty salary
- (1) Workload credit is given
- (2) NA

3. What is the compensation paid to adjuncts who teach online courses?

- (1) \$6276
- (1) \$5242 for 25 students
- (2) \$3000-5000 but will pay more for prominent scholar/specialist
- (1) \$3900 (DNP courses)
- (1) \$3000-\$3250
- (1) \$2130- \$2400
- (1) Varies depending on level of preparation/experience
- (3) Same as salary for teaching classroom courses
- (2) NA

4. Are faculty members compensated for supervising adjunct faculty who teach online courses or sections?

- (1) \$2500
- (1) \$1000
- (1) Faculty receive workload credit
- (8) Not at this time
- (2) NA

5. If adjuncts develop online courses what is their compensation?

- (1) \$2000-\$2500
- (2) Same as full-time faculty
- (6) Only full time faculty develop courses
- (4) NA

6. Are faculty (full time or adjuncts) compensated for other activities related to the delivery of online programs? Please explain.

- (8) No
- (1) We pay faculty an extra \$100 for more than 20 students (up to \$500). If faculty members teach a cross-listed course they receive an extra \$250

- (1) Faculty receive a per/student bonus for more than 15 students
- (1) Full time faculty are compensated for course redesign after they teach a course 5 times
- (1) We compensate faculty who TEACH a new course for the FIRST time as a pilot \$2000
- (1) We pay extra above the base of \$3500 for 3 credits for more than 10 students.

Dr. Vincenzo Sainato reported the following –

CUNY Response

Faculty members are paid (strictly limited to full-time faculty) to create an online course based on the cost to teach the course 2 times. The compensation amount varies based on the technical complexity of the course and the rank of the faculty member, \$4800-7500.

Exhibit Three - Cost Model

Loyola University New Orleans							
Cost Model Example							
	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	
Revenue	(See Revenue worksheet for details.)						
Tuition	\$ -	\$ 543,600	\$ 1,114,080	\$ 1,147,680	\$ 1,182,240	\$ 1,217,280	
Total Revenue	\$ -	\$ 543,600	\$ 1,114,080	\$ 1,147,680	\$ 1,182,240	\$ 1,217,280	
Expenses	(See Expense worksheet for details.)						
Deltak 50% of revenue	\$ -	\$ 271,800	\$ 557,040	\$ 573,840	\$ 591,120	\$ 608,640	
University share *							
Faculty salary	\$ 25,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 320,000	\$ 330,000	\$ 335,000	
Staff salary	\$ 20,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	
Adjunct faculty		\$ 20,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 30,000	
Course dev & constru	\$ 17,500	\$ 28,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 3,500	
Books, periodicals		\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
Professional dues		\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	
Accreditation			\$ 5,000				
Computer hard/soft		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	
Marketing	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	
Faculty develop travel	\$ 2,500	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	
Total Expense	\$ 67,000	\$ 609,800	\$ 989,540	\$ 1,017,840	\$ 1,047,120	\$ 1,069,140	
Excess Revenue *	\$ (67,000)	\$ (66,200)	\$ 124,540	\$ 129,840	\$ 135,120	\$ 148,140	
The Summary worksheet is linked to the supporting Revenue and Expense worksheets. NO amounts NO dollar amounts should be entered directly on the Summary worksheet.							
Dollar amounts are populated via the supporting Revenue and Expense worksheets.							

Loyola University New Orleans On Line Program Revenue Model

Provide the program track with cohort size and credit hours per semester

Example: 36 credit hour track (Cohort 1)

Fall 2011	6								
Spring 2012	9								
Summer 2012	3								
Fall 2012	6								
Spring 2013	9								
Summer 2013	3								
Total	36								
				Total	Cost per	Total Tuition			
Fiscal Year	Cohort	Students	Credit Hrs	Credit Hrs	Credit Hr	Revenue			
Fall 2011	1	20	6	120	\$ 744	\$ 89,280			
Spring 2012	1	20	6	120	\$ 744	\$ 89,280			
	2	20	6	120	\$ 744	\$ 89,280			
Summer 2012	1	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	2	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	3	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920	\$ 543,600	2011-12	
Fall 2012	1	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	2	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	3	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	4	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
Spring 2013	1	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	2	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	3	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
	4	20	6	120	\$ 766	\$ 91,920			
Summer 2013	1	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	2	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	3	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	4	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680	\$ 1,114,080	2012-13	
Fall 2013	2	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	3	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	4	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	5	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
Spring 2014	3	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	4	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	5	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 789	\$ 94,680			
Summer 2014	4	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	5	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	7	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560	\$ 1,147,680	2013-14	
Fall 2014	5	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	7	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	8	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
Spring 2015	5	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	7	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
	8	20	6	120	\$ 813	\$ 97,560			
Summer 2015	5	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	7	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	8	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440	\$ 1,182,240	2014-15	
Fall 2015	5	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	6	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	7	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	8	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
Spring 2016	7	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	8	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	9	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
	10	20	6	120	\$ 837	\$ 100,440			
Summer 2016	8	20	6	120	\$ 862	\$ 103,440			
	9	20	6	120	\$ 862	\$ 103,440			
	10	20	6	120	\$ 862	\$ 103,440			
	11	20	6	120	\$ 862	\$ 103,440	\$ 1,217,280	2015-16	
						\$ 5,204,880	\$ 5,204,880		

Loyola University New Orleans On Line Program Expense Model			
Show all assumptions by fiscal year as per below.			
Fiscal 2010-11		Explanations/Assumptions	
Preparation for program start during Fall 2011.			
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$ 20,000	(1/2 year)	
On-line course development & construction	\$ 17,500	5 courses @ \$3,500 per course	
Faculty training	\$ 2,500		
Marketing	\$ 2,000	Assumes a yield of 1 student per \$2,000	
Faculty salary	\$ 25,000	2 full-time faculty adjunct status	
Total	\$ 67,000		
Fiscal 2011-12			
2 full-time faculty w/ fringe (12 month)	\$ 200,000		
Adjunct faculty	\$ 20,000		
Faculty development, travel	\$ 25,000		
Marketing	\$ 2,000		
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$ 40,000		
Computer hardware and software	\$ 15,000		
On-line course development & construction	\$ 28,000	8 courses @ \$3,500 per course	
Books, periodicals, publications	\$ 5,000		
Professional dues	\$ 3,000		
	\$ 338,000		
Deltak	\$ 271,800		
Total	\$ 609,800		
Fiscal 2012-13			
3 full-time faculty w/ fringe (12 month)	\$ 310,000		
Adjunct faculty	\$ 22,000		
Marketing	\$ 2,000		
Faculty development, travel	\$ 25,000		
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$ 42,000		
On-line course development & construction	\$ 3,500	Course refresh/update	
Computer hardware and software	\$ 15,000		
Books, periodicals, publications	\$ 5,000		
Professional dues	\$ 3,000		
Accreditation	\$ 5,000		
	\$ 432,500		
Deltak	\$ 557,040		
Total	\$ 989,540		

Fiscal 2013-14				
3 full-time faculty w/ fringe (12 month)	\$	320,000		
Adjunct faculty	\$	25,000		
Faculty development, travel	\$	25,000		
Marketing	\$	2,000		
On-line course development & construction	\$	7,000	Course refresh/update	
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$	42,000		
Computer hardware and software	\$	15,000		
Books, periodicals, publications	\$	5,000		
Professional dues	\$	3,000		
	\$	444,000		
Deltak	\$	573,840		
Total	\$	1,017,840		
Fiscal 2014-15				
3 full-time faculty w/ fringe (12 month)	\$	330,000		
Adjunct faculty	\$	27,000		
Faculty development, travel	\$	25,000		
Marketing	\$	2,000		
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$	42,000		
On-line course development & construction	\$	7,000	Course refresh/update	
Computer hardware and software	\$	15,000		
Books, periodicals, publications	\$	5,000		
Professional dues	\$	3,000		
	\$	456,000		
Deltak	\$	591,120		
Total	\$	1,047,120		
Fiscal 2015-16				
3 full-time faculty w/ fringe (12 month)	\$	335,000		
Adjunct faculty	\$	30,000		
Faculty development, travel	\$	25,000		
On-line course development & construction	\$	3,500	Course refresh/update	
Marketing	\$	2,000		
Administrative Assistant w/ fringe	\$	42,000		
Computer hardware and software	\$	15,000		
Books, periodicals, publications	\$	5,000		
Professional dues	\$	3,000		
	\$	460,500		
Deltak	\$	608,640		
Total	\$	1,069,140		

Workgroup on Centralization & Support

Workgroup leader: Deborah Poole

Workgroup members: Mary Brazier, Susan Brower, Brad Petitfils, Phil Rollins, Vicki Vega

The workgroup on Centralization and Support was asked to recommend a model that focuses efficiencies re: staffing, equipment, and facilities to better serve the needs of the campus community. A centralized model can ensure that expertise and skills be developed and shared, and that standard best practices are understood, implemented, and maintained. The intent of centralization is to foster communication, dialogue, collaboration, innovation and planning across campus.

Recommendation 1:

Online support staff be centralized in the Monroe Library, effective August 1, 2011.

Centralization will ensure that resources are used in the most efficient and effective way possible, expertise and skills are developed and shared, and standard best practices are understood, implemented, and maintained. The intent of centralization is to foster communication, dialogue, collaboration, innovation and planning across campus. The addition of new positions will allow the Online Learning Team to (1) support the anticipated rollout of new online courses at the graduate and undergraduate level, (2) support the revision and re-development of courses that have previously been taught, (3) support the creation and maintenance of on-campus reusable learning objects for hybrid teaching, (4) support the technology training needs of faculty, staff, and students, (5) support creativity and innovation among individual faculty, staff, and departments / units.

Year 1 (2011-2012):

1. Repurpose the Nursing (Multimedia Specialist) position for staffing the centralized model. This position would be responsible for the support of all university-wide online course development initiatives.
2. Add one newly funded position – Blackboard Specialist – from the tech fee pool.

Year 2 (2012-2013):

Transfer resources identified for tech support positions from program proposals to the centralized support model for a newly funded position:

- a. LIM: \$25,000 per year¹
 - b. Criminal Justice: \$76,200 per year²
 - c. Nursing: \$4,000 per year³
- Total: \$105,200 per year**

¹From LIM Online Degree Proposal (revised budget) – technology consultant and support (\$13K), server space for course videos (\$2K), and library (\$10K).

²From CJ MS Degree Online Program Proposal (dated fall 2009) – page 64: indirect costs to the program (\$76,200).

³From School of Nursing DNP Proposal (dated spring 2009) – page 26, library (\$4,000).

Year 3 (2013-2014):

Create one additional staff position from tech fee pool to absorb the part-time DNP grant-funded position, which will support all university-wide online course development initiatives.

Recommendation 2:

To meet the need for the support of hybrid teaching within the College of Law, the Instructional Resources Coordinator in the College of Law should conduct a needs assessment of the faculty and staff of the College of Law and submit a training plan to the Center for Faculty Innovation for implementation in AY 2011-2012.

Recommendation 3:

Dedicate resources from the tech pool to transfer the DLP equipment from Communications 303 & 304 and install in Multimedia Rooms 1 & 2 in the Monroe Library. The transfer of this equipment will make the technology available to all faculty members during the regular day session and would free CM 303 & 304 for the evening session. These shared spaces for instructional design and delivery will be developed in order to maximize resources, facilitate communication, and support best practices in production. In addition, the centralization of support staff in the Monroe Library will solve proximity and redundancy issues pertaining to the use of these rooms. The repurposing of Multimedia Rooms 1 & 2, however, would mean that no particular college or unit would have first priority in booking these rooms for classes; instead, priority for booking would be given to those who have a demonstrated need for access to equipment. The protocol for booking these rooms will be developed by the Monroe Library and will be available for fall 2011.

Recommendation 4:

Dedicate financial resources from the online support technology fee for the selection and implementation of a university-wide synchronous web conferencing solution.

Recommendation 5:

Utilize the same protocol for management of the online support technology fee as is currently in place for the student technology fee. Recommendations for expenditures from the fund should be made by the Workgroup on Centralization and Support to the Vice Provost for Information Technology/CIO for consideration and tracking.

A. Current situation & projected growth

As seen in the chart below, since the fall of 2007 (10 semesters):

- The number of online sections has grown from 30 to 57 per semester, or 90% growth.
- FTE has grown from 536 to 1147 per semester, or 114% growth.

- Online support staff in the Monroe Library has grown by 0.5 positions (support staff in the Monroe Library are dedicated 50% to online courses and 50% to traditional / on-campus courses).
- Online support staff external to the Monroe Library has grown by 1.5 positions (support staff external to the Monroe Library are dedicated 100% to the departments / programs to which they are responsible).

Historical support figures:

	AY 2007-2008			AY 2008-2009			AY 2009-2010			
	2007F	2008S	2008M	2008F	2009S	2009M	2009F	2010S	2010M	2010F
Non-program sections	3	4	18	3	2	41	6	4	34	6
FTE	72	56	198	36	24	430	98	56	353	67
Program sections	27	38	32	47	45	28	50	60	34	51
FTE	464	649	579	779	906	649	1003	1005	744	1080
Total sections	30	42	50	50	47	69	56	64	68	57
Total FTE	536	695	777	815	930	1079	1101	1061	1097	1147
Library support staff	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2	2	2
External support staff	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.5
Total support staff	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	4.5

Course offerings in online programs and supporting courses⁴:

	Fall	Spring	Summer
RN-BSN	384, 452, 482, 486	379, 483, 485	364, 468
HCSM	704, 716, 735, 744, 752	709, 712, 724, 740, 752	700, 709, 732, 748, 752
DNP	910, 925, 935, 950, 955	915, 920, 930, 960	900, 905, 940, 945
BSN-DNP	805, 810, 815, 835, 840, 845	820, 825, 830, 850, 855	800
CJ	701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710	701, 702, 703, 704	701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706
LIM	701, 703, 712, 714, 715, 716, 844, 845, 870, 876	703, 704, 713, 722, 809, 819, 820, 833, 834, 861, 866	701, 809, 810, 813, 814, 827, 828

Over the next five years, the following growth is estimated in online programs and supporting courses (including undergraduate common curriculum courses in summer and fall/spring). **Note:** this **does not** include anticipated growth in hybrid courses:

⁴These courses were taken from program proposals as presented to the Online Learning Task Force.

Projected support figures:

	2010-2011		2011-2012			2012-2013			2013-2014			2014-2015		
	11S	11M	11F	12S	12M	12F	13S	13M	13F	14S	14M	14F	15S	15M
Non-program sections ⁵	5	40	8	8	43	10	12	46	15	17	50	18	20	55
FTE ⁶	85	680	136	136	731	170	204	782	255	289	850	306	340	935
Program sections ⁷	55	38	64	66	40	70	71	44	73	76	49	80	85	55
FTE	935	646	1088	1122	680	1190	1207	748	1241	1292	833	1360	1445	935
Total sections	60	78	72	74	83	80	83	90	88	93	99	98	105	110
Total FTE	1020	1326	1224	1258	1411	1360	1411	1530	1496	1581	1683	1666	1785	1870

Recommended staff support ratios: 1 support position per 20 sections

B. Staffing for online course support in the Monroe Library:

1. **Curriculum Developer** – Brad Petitfils – 50% time and effort. The original position, Instructional Technology Support Specialist, was created from a grant-funded project, “Blackboard at Loyola,” in 2002 and was made permanent, full-time, in April 2003. The position changed in 2006 to Instructional Technologist, and again in 2010 to Curriculum Developer.
2. **Learning Technologies Developer** – Phil Rollins – 50% time and effort. The original position was created with new funding from the Office of the Provost under Brenda Joyner in Fall 2007.
3. **Blackboard Manager** – Jon Gallaway – 50% time and effort. The original position was created with new funding from the Office of the Provost under Brenda Joyner in Fall 2007.
4. **Online Learning Librarian** – Brian Sullivan – 50% time and effort. This is a tenure-track library faculty position. The original position, Library Instruction Coordinator, was created in 1996. The librarian in this position left after Hurricane Katrina, and the position was frozen from Spring 2006 until Spring 2009. The library was given permission to hire in Spring 2009, when the position was repurposed and became Online Learning Librarian.

⁵Courses not related to online degree programs – e.g., undergraduate common curriculum courses.

⁶Assuming 17 students per section.

⁷Section count includes multiple sections of individual courses.

C. Online courses supported exclusively in the Monroe Library – 2007 to 2010:

	AY 2007-2008			AY 2008-2009			AY 2009-2010			
	2007F	2008S	2008M	2008F	2009S	2009M	2009F	2010S	2010M	
# of sections*	3	4	18	3	2	41	6	4	34	6
FTE	72	56	198	36	24	430	98	56	353	67
# of courses in development	3	17	1	1	22	1	1	6	1	2
# of courses being refreshed	1	1	2	1	19	2	8	28	10	7
Support staff	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2	2	2

* Courses taught:

2007F – 2 UG English, 1 UG Music

2008S – 4 UG English

2008M – 1 GR Criminal Justice, 1 UG Business, 1 UG Biology, 2 UG Criminal Justice, 2 UG English, 1 UG History, 1 UG Math, 1 UG Marketing, 2 UG Music, 1 UG Physics, 1 UG Political Science, 2 UG Psychology, 1 UG Religious Studies, 1 UG Visual Arts

2008F – 1 UG English, 1 UG Music, 1 GR Music

2009S – 1 UG English, 1 UG Music

2009 M – 1 MBA, 2 GR Criminal Justice, 1 GR Music, 2 UG Accounting, 1 UG Business, 1 UG Biology, 1 UG Communications, 4 UG Criminal Justice, 3 UG English, 1 UG Finance, 2 UG History, 1 UG Language, 1 UG Math, 2 UG Management, 1 UG Marketing, 4 UG Music, 1 UG Physics, 2 UG Political Science, 3 UG Psychology, 3 UG Religious Studies, 3 UG Theatre, 1 UG Visual Arts

2009 F – 1 UG English, 1 UG Library, 2 UG Music, 1 GR Music, 1 MBA

2010 S – 1 UG English, 1 UG Library, 2 UG Music

2010 M – 2 MBA, 2 BR Criminal Justice, 1 UG Accounting, 1 UG Business, 1 UG Biology, 2 UG Criminal Justice, 5 UG English, 1 UG Finance, 2 UG History, 1 UG Math, 2 UG Management, 1 UG Marketing, 4 UG Music, 1 UG Physics, 2 UG Political Science, 3 UG Psychology, 1 UG Religious Studies, 2 UG Theatre

2010 F – 1 UG English, 1 UG Library, 3 UG Music, 1 MBA

Note: *during summer sessions, the support staff has more time to dedicate to online courses, as there are fewer on-campus courses to support.*

D. Hybrid courses⁸ supported exclusively in the Monroe Library – 2007 to 2010:

	AY 2007-2008			AY 2008-2009			AY 2009-2010			
	2007F	2008S	2008M	2008F	2009S	2009M	2009F	2010S	2010M	2010F
# of courses	543	602	146	621	602	140	654	651	168	727
FTE⁹	9231	10234	2482	10557	10234	2380	11118	11067	2856	12359
Support staff	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2	2	2

E. Library support expenses (equipment, subscriptions, resources, & 50% time and effort) – 2007 to 2010:

	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
<i># of newly developed courses</i>	21	24	8
<i># of revised courses</i>	4	22	46
<i># of total courses</i>	25	46	54
<i>Budgeted library expenses</i>	\$97,637	\$100,406	\$126,055
<i>Budgeted per course (expenses divided by total courses)</i>	\$3905	\$2183	\$2334

Library costs per online course (development, support, and implementation):

On average, library material = \$250 - \$2500 per course

Program subscriptions range from \$1,500 - \$5,000 per year

F. Staffing for online course support outside of the Monroe Library:

1. **Associate Director, Instructional Technologies (LIM)** – Todd McMahon – 30% time and effort online; 70% time and effort for LIM extension. The original position was created around 1983 to support the LIM extension program. Todd works from Tampa, Florida, and has an office in Stallings Hall.
2. **Multimedia Specialist (Nursing)** – Patrick Chriss – 50% time and effort online (RN to BSN program, RN to MSN program, & HCSM program); 50% time and effort Distance

⁸Hybrid courses represented here were on-campus courses that included over 500KB of material in Blackboard or included streaming media in courses.

⁹FTE assumes 17 students per course / section.

Learning Program. The original position was created with new funding in 2008. Patrick's office is located in Communications 303.

3. **Online Instructional Support Technologist (Nursing)** – Eric Wiltz – This is a part-time position funded through the DNP HRSA grant, funded August 2010 – July 2013. The position is 100% dedicated to the support of the DNP program. Eric works out of the library, Room 106.

G. Online program¹⁰ courses supported by Monroe Library & external staff – 2007 to 2010:

	AY 2007-2008			AY 2008-2009			AY 2009-2010			
	2007F	2008S	2008M	2008F	2009S	2009M	2009F	2010S	2010M	2010F
# of sections	27	38	32	47	45	28	50	60	34	51
FTE	464	649	579	779	906	649	1003	1005	744	1080
# of courses in development	3	0	3	2	0	4	5	5	5	7
# of courses being refreshed	7	4	7	8	4	5	6	5	7	9

¹⁰ Nursing: RN-BSN, Health Care Systems Management (HCSM), DNP; LIM; and, in 2010F, 2 courses in development for MS Criminal Justice Administration.

Workgroup on Recruitment, Retention, & Student Life

Workgroup leader: Sal Liberto

Workgroup members: Terry Fisher, Ann Cary, Jan Moppert

The workgroup on Recruitment, Retention, and Student Life was charged with developing short and long-term goals to address the success and viability of the university's online programs. Two central concerns of students who are enrolled in Loyola's online programs is that they feel connected to the university and that they have, indeed, benefitted from the Jesuit tradition of education. To this end, the workgroup considered best practices for recruiting students, but also on the student-centered nature that informs our Ignatian model in an effort to ensure online students have access to the same services as traditional students.

Recommendation 1:

It seems to be in the best interest of the university to create – for the long-term – our own highly sophisticated online learning enrollment and delivery options, which could utilize partners to perform various functions of the whole, but maintains control over all of those functions. This would seem to be the most efficient route to take in terms of resources and maintaining creative control and brand integrity.

Recommendation 2:

Inform enrolled students of career and professional development resources, as well as job and internship opportunities, through communication campaigns.

Recommendation 3:

We have asked our partners to provide timely reports on the enrollment metrics and other performance indicators of online students. This is consistent with our new efforts to review retention data in all programs, and be extremely deliberate about who remains and who leaves the institution at all levels of higher education and all methods of delivery. That is to say: retention is a “one Loyola” initiative, even if standards and measurements vary.

Recommendation 4:

Any long-term considerations, by virtue and definition of the contracts that we enter into to, must be aligned to our vision for partnerships. The provost, the online committee, and the eventual new director of online learning can assist with crafting this for the university.

Recommendation 5:

It will be important to establish budgets for all existing programs, and start up costs for new ones. We need to make sure that appropriate budget planning is performed so that plans can be created.

Recommendation 6:

Longer term planning will require the agreement of an expense and revenue model, especially as it relates to fixed and variable costs with anticipated (upward) shifts in enrollment.

Develop a web portal for online education at Loyola.

This has been achieved and the portal can be accessed here:

<http://www.loyno.edu/jump/online/>

While in some ways it duplicates the function of <http://www.loyolaneworleansonline.com/>, it was important for the university to host on its website an online portal. This is often the students first point of contact with our online programs if their inclination was to search first for them from our website.

The portal serves to underpin the “one Loyola” concept. Online learning is not somehow divorced from what we all do and the portal – by offering consonant branding and helpful links to life at Loyola – reinforces this theme.

The online programs page incorporates many of the features suggested by the committee last year, such as blackboard tutorials, computer requirements, etc. It also includes marketing of courses and summer school programs. The first part has been done but there will need to be additions. This work continues and remains in progress as the web portal is an evolving enterprise to both recruit and retain students, and to cement a sense of connection for our on-line learners.

Establish short-term marketing plans for current programs.

Recruiting campaigns are in place for and funded by the respective departments for DNP (Nursing), BSN (in discussion), and LIM. We do not yet know what Deltak's marketing programs are specifically for criminal justice and HSN, but they are contracted to perform that work.

Summer courses are funded by academic affairs and the strategy and budget for this year are in place. IA is working with the office of continuing and professional studies and promotion will begin in late January.

Establish comprehensive long-term marketing, recruitment, and strategic planning for the future.

Our move to *Intelliworks* software for customer data management will assist us in monitoring all graduate and professional data. This centralization will allow all programs standardization in the reporting of admissions, enrollment, and retention data. The common language will allow us to build out goals and work. It is also possibly true that this new system will increase expertise across the campus and perhaps reduce the need for the “complete” partnerships we now have with enrollment and delivery vendors.

The software will serve to respond to several of the recommendations made in the original report and so this step is a key component in implementation.

We have begun reporting graduate and online enrollments to the Board of Trustees, as a means of underscoring the importance of the graduate and online contribution.

Other matters:

Recruitment and enrollment partners.

We simply have to take a long, hard look at our arrangements with partners as we pursue the online world, which is a swiftly changing universe rife with opportunities for investment and enterprise.

We posed this question in our original report and it remains in play: **What do we want to be?**

We pose this philosophical question because it is at the heart of the debate on outsourced courses and processes. As we look to our Jesuit peers, we have to ask this question: do the very best Jesuit universities outsource their services in the ways that we currently outsource to DELTAK and Regis? Over the long term, is it best for us to continue outsourcing? Does it matter, philosophically, if we perform tasks in house or contract them out? Is continuing to outsource these functions consistent with what we would expect Loyola to be five or ten years from now?

Example: in 2010-2011, we are budgeted to earn \$2,224,000 in revenue from the on-line MSN nursing program after having paid Deltak \$2,224,000.

We need to test if an annual \$2,224,000 could cover the marketing of that program, and the staff salaries and operating costs to support it. Our position is that as online learning becomes more popular in the marketplace, knowledge of these processes will increase and the one stop services of a Deltak can be broken up into several parts. The university can assume these responsibilities under the auspices of a combination of enrollment management, graduate programs, and a newly established director of online learning. The expertise exists in the marketplace. There is no reason to believe that we cannot do some of these services in house, or have multiple vendors competing to perform elements of each. 10 new online enrollment/recruitment/retention/advising staff would cost the university less than \$700,000 annually.

The current Deltak contract calls for “an online delivery system.” Right now this includes marketing, a personal support center, program development, delivery and support, operations management, and support services. We would do well to discern which of these could be performed in house, and which, if any, need to be outsourced.

Certainly, the *selective* use of partners remains an important element of any good enrollment program.

Example: the office of undergraduate admissions has several software partners which help it interface with hundreds of thousands of potential students each year. The office also utilizes several companies to assist in its “search process,” the mean by which many high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors are engaged in the application and enrollment processes. But the office of admissions oversees all of these processes and in most cases is aware of every moving part and decision that is made. Compared to the revenue earned from each enrolling class, the investment is small.

Contrast this to our existing arrangement with Deltak and it is clear that the current contract is unwieldy. The work that Deltak does for us can be performed in new ways, with tighter institutional oversight and through less cost than the 50% share of Loyola revenue. Imagine if such an arrangement existed in our undergraduate programs, after we applied financial aid discounts.

True enrollment partnerships are far more transparent. Deltak functions as a for-profit partner with their proprietary black box, which is not in the best interest of the university.

Retention

Deltak does not offer a retention component to their plan – it is strictly based on a revenue and recruitment model. So, the university has to find ways to measure and improve persistence when working with existing contracts, in the short term.

In our stand alone programs, we have to begin accessing retention and persistence rates and study where we can improve.

There is some encouraging news. For example, there are several initiatives that the Career Development Center is doing to encourage strong retention:

Virtual Career Service: All online students have full access to the Career Development Center's website, which is a virtual career center including EMPLOYOLA, the Career Development Center's web-based job management system and job board featuring positions from employers searching for Loyola talent. The website also offers information on resumes, cover letters, interviewing, networking, personal statements, and other key processes of a job and graduate school search.

EMPLOYola_Surge: We also recently launched a multi-level social media campaign called EMPLOYola_Surge using a blog, Twitter, and Facebook with updates several times each week that feature articles, videos, alerts, and much more on career information, jobs/internships/fellowships, programs and events, and advice. We will want to specifically target the online population with these communications to meet their specific needs.

Skype Consultations: We recently piloted resume consultations using Skype and Skype documents. Our first experience was successful with a study abroad student in Spain to make edits and recommendations simultaneously for a resume and cover letter. The CDC is researching ways Skype is being used in other centers to meet the needs of long-distance students.

Certainly, the move to the *Intelliworks* software will assist us in our retention work with online programs and we look forward to updating the group shortly after its implementation.

Workgroup on Teaching & Learning

Workgroup leader: Tom Ryan

Workgroup members: Ann Cary, Melanie McKay, David Myers, Brad Petitfils

The Teaching and Learning Workgroup was charged with collecting online metrics and dashboard indicators that have to do with evaluation of courses/programs/teaching. By collecting the data noted in the recommendations, the Online Education Task Force will be able to judge the success of online programs, including how effective a course is in maintaining quality reflective of the university's Jesuit traditions. It will also allow for early intervention and deployment of resources to address any problems that are identified.

Recommendation 1:

Only fully online courses need to go through the Online Education Task Force approval process. Fully online courses have their own evaluation instrument, which should contain questions that address how effectively fully online courses reflect the university mission. Similar consideration should be given to traditional courses as well.

Recommendation 2:

All traditional and hybrid courses should have the following questions added to their evaluation instruments.

- Quantitative: Did this course have an online component that substituted for conventional classroom interaction (e.g. interaction with professor and/or students via discussion board, blog, wiki, virtual world, game, v-cast, podcast, webinar, etc.)?
- Quantitative: Were online components well designed?
- Quantitative: Was this online component effective in achieving learning goals?
- Qualitative: If this course used online components, which were the most and least effective?
- Suggestion: All course evaluations should evaluate the extent to which courses flow from the university mission.

Recommendation 3:

The Online Education Task Force should receive and review the anonymous, aggregated results of all questions from student evaluations related to online education.

Recommendation 4:

The Online Education Task Force should compare GPAs, grade distribution, dropout rate, class breakdowns (1st year, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate, etc.), demographics, etc. from fully online courses to courses that are not fully online.

Recommendation 5:

To maintain and emphasize Loyola's commitment to student-centered learning, we recommend that online courses may not exceed 20 students per section. Any decrease in enrollment caps below 20 should be a result of departmental decision, approved by the dean, and grounded in pedagogical best practices.

Recommendation 6:

The workload for full-time online faculty shall not exceed that of traditional on-campus faculty. This means that no faculty member shall teach more than four (4) online sections per traditional 16-week semester or more than two (2) online sections per shortened semester (e.g. 8-week semester).

Recommendation 7:

The following statement needs to be appended to the SCAP Criteria for Evaluation of New Academic Program Proposals: ***For online programs, please attach an appendix that addresses the criteria required by the Online Education Task Force.***