

# **Ecampus Task Force Report**

**June 8, 2011**

## **Executive Summary**

Over the past five years, there has been a significant increase in the number of educational programs delivered through Ecampus. In the context of Extended Campus' growth, course access issues, and the desire of many units to increase the reach and impact of their programs, it is important that the University ensures that the future Ecampus agenda is aligned with the institution's educational priorities and goals for access, affordability, and quality of education programs and student experience.

To explore key questions and make recommendations regarding the role of Ecampus in the University, a task force was appointed jointly by Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President, and Leslie Burns, President of the Faculty Senate.

The task force met 12 times between December 2011 and June 2011. The task force included representation from instructors, professors, and administrators with experience delivering Ecampus courses and from the OSU community at large. In February, the task force solicited input from the OSU community via a secure web site. That input further informed the task force. Wherever possible, the task force chose to focus on guiding principles rather than attempt to create policy. As the task force worked its way through the charge, some themes emerged that permeated throughout our discussions. Perhaps most importantly, we continually reaffirmed that Ecampus is part of OSU. Wherever possible, students, faculty, advisors and others who come in contact with Ecampus should have a seamless experience between Ecampus and on campus courses and supporting activities. We also acknowledged that the Ecampus model that has been developed at OSU over the past few years is a good model for OSU that, with minor adjustments, can become even better.

Overall, the task force felt that Ecampus is working well. The policies and procedures in place are generally appropriate and represent a good working model for the delivery of on-line courses. Nonetheless, some issues were brought to the attention of the task force. However, when we examined those issues in detail they often were a result of lack of compliance with or understanding of policies and procedures rather than systemic or policy issues. In that regard, it is useful to recognize that Ecampus instruction is a joint venture of Extended Campus (providing infrastructure and administrative support) and the Department, Program, or School that is responsible for the content and quality of the instruction that is delivered. The task force considered in some detail the budget model used by Ecampus and concluded that model is roughly right.

In light of this overall assessment of Ecampus, the task force has the following specific recommendations:

- Ecampus should be allowed to grow to meet demand, provided the quality of the courses and the educational experience is high, there is capacity (e.g. instructors, advisors) to support the

growth, growth is financially viable, and growth is consistent with strategic directions outlined for the University.

- The University should move forward with development of hybrid courses (defined as courses that place a substantial portion of the current on-site format into online learning), giving consideration to several issues including the financial model, incentives, and faculty workloads.
- The task force evaluated a funding model to improve the development of creative and often multi-disciplinary coursework at locations off the main campus. The task force recommends review of the proposal by the Provost's Council and approval by the Provost for implementation beginning Fall, 2011 (201201).
- In a preliminary analysis, student success rates for Ecampus courses were found to be somewhat lower than for on-campus courses. However, success rates for students taking ONLY Ecampus courses were somewhat higher than for on-campus students. The Task Force recommends the following actions for follow-up:
  - 1) Conduct a deeper analysis of the student data to identify which (if any) student subpopulations have the more significant success challenges in the Ecampus platform than the general student population
  - 2) Fall 2011 share the expanded data set with the Undergraduate Education Council (UEC) for additional feedback and discussion.
  - 3) Research possible interventions to bolster Corvallis campus student success rates in Ecampus courses, implement a pilot support program and assess results, reporting back to the UEC and Faculty Senate Distance Education committee.
  - 4) Track this (or a similar set of Ecampus course success metrics) annually and discuss with Ecampus and Academic Success and Engagement.
- The task force strongly encourages the University to find a mechanism to allow graduate students to "count" Ecampus courses towards the GTA/GRA minimum course load requirement.
- Compensation for a given Ecampus course should not be substantially different than for a comparable face-to-face course, albeit with allowances for different levels of effort for different instructional delivery methods, for different disciplines, and for differences in rank and experience of the instructor.
- Regardless of the mechanism of delivery of instruction, students paying Corvallis on-campus tuition and fees should have the ability to fulfill degree requirements without being expected to enroll in an Ecampus course.
- The task force proposes development of a scholarship program (funded with current Ecampus fees and managed by the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships) where on-campus students can apply for scholarships to cover the cost of Ecampus courses. Criteria for awarding

scholarships could include financial need, course required for timely program advancement, and number of courses previously funded by Ecampus scholarships.

- Ecampus should have representation on the UEC and other appropriate University standing committees. Ecampus should establish an Advisory committee that includes faculty with Ecampus experience and is responsible for advocating for and facilitating the integration of Ecampus into the University's learning environment.

## **Ecampus Task Force Full Report**

- I. Charge and Membership**
- II. Process**
- III. Responses to each item in the charge**
- IV. Appendices**

### **I. Charge and Membership**

Over the past five years, there has been a significant increase in the number of educational programs delivered through Extended Campus. The growth includes the development of over 700 credit courses as well as many full degree programs delivered online to learners around the state, country, and throughout the world. There are also many on-campus students opting for online classes as a solution to course access issues, the need for flexible schedules, and/or because of their preference for technology-based/online learning opportunities.

Many academic units are in the process of assessing their degree programs in the context of the University's educational priorities as defined in our updated Strategic Plan. Continuous increases in enrollment is also adding pressure on units to effectively deliver their educational programs to large student audiences and more clearly define the role of providing courses via Extended Campus for on-campus students.

In the context of Extended Campus' growth, course access issues, and the desire of many units to increase the reach and impact of their programs, it is important that the University ensures that the future Extended Campus agenda is aligned with the institution's educational priorities and goals for access, affordability, and quality of education programs and student experience. The task force appointed jointly by Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President, and Leslie Burns, President of the Faculty Senate, will explore the following key questions and make recommendations to effectively incorporate and expand Extended Campus' role in the overall strategic direction of the University. It would also be helpful to get the Task Force input on what office makes final decision or provide oversight on academic policies related to Extended Campus.

- How large should Extended Campus grow over the next 3-5 years (programs, students, student credit hours) and where should the growth occur (e.g. signature programs, programs relevant to regional needs, on-campus programs/courses)?
- What is the role of technology-delivered and hybrid courses for on-campus students? How do we ensure that those courses provide a meaningful engaged experience for students taking Extended Campus courses and what oversight is needed? How can Extended Campus work with the Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment to promote the development of hybrid courses?
- How do we ensure faculty development for effective delivery of distance education courses? How does compensation for Extended Campus instruction compare to

compensation for on-campus instruction and how do ensure that compensation plans for Extended Campus align with the new overload policy?

- How do we address intellectual property issues surrounding distance education?
- What type of internal organization is needed to support the growth and leverage other available campus resources?
- What business model will incent appropriate growth yet avoid the development of an “underground economy?”
- What is the role of OSU’s Extended Campus vis-à-vis the Oregon University System (e.g. ability to deliver courses/modules for other universities, particularly regional institutions)?

The Offices of Extended Campus and Budget and Fiscal Planning will provide background information to assist the Task Force, including an overview of current Extended Campus programs and operations, a description of Extended Campus’ business model, and strategic goals for the Division of Outreach and Engagement in context of Extended Campus. The Task Force may also want to review the portfolio and growth trends for similar programs at OSU’s peer and aspirational universities.

Timeline: The task force will commence its work as soon as membership is confirmed in October with the report and recommendations due to the Provost and Faculty Senate President by April 15, 2011.

#### **TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP**

Dan Arp, University Honors College, (Chair)

Sherm Bloomer, College of Science

George Boehlert, Hatfield Marine Science Center

Susie Brubaker-Cole, Academic Success and Engagement

Armelle Denis, French Instructor

Bruce Dugger, Fisheries and Wildlife (& Chair FS Distance Education Committee)

Dave King, Outreach and Engagement

Roger Nielsen, Geosciences (& member of FS Distance Education Committee)

Kate Mactavish, Human Development and Family Studies (& member of FS Curriculum Council)

Tom Maness, Forest Engineering, Resources and Management

Brian Meara, Budget and Fiscal Planning

Brent Steel, Political Science

Lisa Templeton, Outreach and Engagement

Jessica White, Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership and Center for Teaching and Learning (& member of FS Graduate Council)

#### **II. Process**

The Task Force began their work on December 3, 2010 and met 12 times up to the end of May 2011. We began by focusing our work from all of Extended Campus (which also includes Summer Session and Lifelong Learning) to just Ecampus. We organized our charge into those issues that involved considerations of strategic direction and philosophical approach for

Ecampus and those issues that were largely operational. For the operational issues, we considered whether current operational approaches were appropriate. We called upon Institutional Research and staff from Ecampus to provide data and information as necessary. The task force met once with the University Budget Committee. We worked through each item in the charge, and cycled back as necessary to complete discussions.

On February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011, we distributed a call to the OSU community for input. We shared our charge with the community and asked for input via a secure web site. We requested input by February 25<sup>th</sup>. The input was considered by the task force and used to inform our discussions. A copy of the email that was sent to the community is included in the appendix. A summary of the comments is also included (Appendix 1, 2).

Early in our discussions, we made the decision to focus wherever possible on guiding principles, rather than attempt to define policy. Changes in policy require action by the responsible administrators or Faculty Senate committees. We have, where appropriate, recommended where we think policy changes or additions are in order.

### **III. Responses to each item in the charge**

#### **1. How large should Extended Campus grow over the next 3-5 years (programs, students, student credit hours) and where should the growth occur (e.g. signature programs, programs relevant to regional needs, on-campus programs/courses)?**

We discussed the question of “how large” and concluded that it was not necessary to set a specific target or cap with regard to programs, students, or student credit hours. Any decisions about growth should be within the context of growth and enrollment management for all of our academic programs. However, we did conclude that growth should follow these four guiding principles (also referred to as “drivers of growth”):

**1.A. Capacity.** There should be capacity available to develop and deliver the courses. Capacity in this context refers to the need for qualified instructors to develop and deliver the courses, for the technological infrastructure and personnel to support the electronic delivery of the courses, for the advising and academic support to ensure student success, and for the administrative support to register the students, pay the instructors, etc. With regard to instructors to deliver the courses, the committee felt it was appropriate to build capacity using tenured and tenure-track professors and instructors. Following this recommendation, participation in e-campus activities (course development, oversight, and instruction) could be explicitly built into position descriptions for tenure track faculty (i.e. as a formal expectation of the job).

**1.B. Quality.** Courses delivered via Ecampus should follow the same standards for high quality that are expected of on-campus courses. The continued success of Ecampus, as well as the reputation of OSU in general, requires that courses delivered via Ecampus be of the highest quality possible and of comparable quality to courses delivered on campus. To ensure quality and foster a continuous cycle of improvement, all Ecampus offerings, like all on-campus offerings, should undergo a robust assessment including Student Evaluations of Teaching and

peer review. Faculty should have access to support for development of Ecampus courses, assessment of offerings, and improvement of Ecampus teaching. Ecampus provides instructors/course developers with support from instructional designers with expertise in online pedagogy as well as multi-media experts. Ecampus provides Departments funds to support course assessments and peer-reviews at the Department Chairs request. Ecampus has also become certified in Quality Matters (QM). This is a faculty-centered, peer review process that is designed to certify the quality of online and blended courses. QM is a leader in quality assurance for online education and has received national recognition for its peer-based approach and continuous improvement in online education and student learning.

**1.C. Financial Viability/Sufficient Market.** Any program offered through Ecampus needs to be financially viable. While financial viability of a program can and should be considered in the larger context of a unit's financial plan, Ecampus programs should be contributing to the financial viability of the unit. Related to the need for financial viability is the need for the program to have a sufficiently large market to warrant the investment of faculty and Ecampus resources. There are occasions when it will be determined that low enrollment courses should be developed or maintained. Examples include courses that enrich the breadth of options in an online program, or at times an experimental or highly innovative course. In such cases, the unit offering the courses or program needs to articulate the strategic reason for the offering and must be responsible the costs of delivery.

**1.D. OSU Strategic Plan.** Courses and programs offered through Ecampus should be consistent with the strategic plan of OSU. Our three broad focus areas (healthy people, healthy planet, healthy economy), along with the foundation of arts and sciences, provide a wealth of opportunities for the development of courses and programs. When Ecampus began, development of new courses and programs was essentially ad hoc and driven by the initiative of faculty and unit leaders. As Ecampus has evolved, courses and programs are, appropriately, being developed more as part of unit plans and consistent with and integrated within their curricula. As Ecampus continues to evolve and especially with the addition of more on-line degree programs, the need for broader strategic discussions that cross unit and college boundaries will increase (e.g. the biology requirement for the Fisheries and Wildlife on-line degree). There are also opportunities to more strategically align our Ecampus offerings in areas that are consistent with OSU's strategic plan and meet current marketplace demands.

**2. What is the role of technology-delivered and hybrid courses for on-campus students? How do we ensure that those courses provide a meaningful engaged experience for students taking Extended Campus courses and what oversight is needed? How can Extended Campus work with the Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment to promote the development of hybrid courses?**

The Task Force approached this bullet as two separate issues: hybrid courses and Ecampus courses for on-campus students. In addition, we added a discussion of courses delivered off campus, generally at sites managed by OSU (e.g. Hatfield Marine Science Center, H.J. Andrews

Experimental Forest, Agricultural Experiment Field Stations), and the mechanisms to fund those courses.

**2.A. Hybrid Courses.** There was broad support for the development of hybrid courses, defined as courses that place a substantial portion of the current on-site format into online learning. One driver for the development of hybrid courses is to free up classroom space. As OSU's enrollment grows, there will be continued pressure on classrooms for instruction. While space is a driver, the task force concluded that the more important driver is the opportunity to foster student success. According to published studies (see Appendix 7), students generally have greater success in hybrid courses than in either entirely on-site or entirely electronically delivered courses. In developing hybrid courses, the following issues need to be considered:

**2.A.a. Hybrid Course designator.** It will be necessary to identify a course designator for hybrid courses (much like the "DSC" for Ecampus or "H" for Honors courses) to indicate to students that a course is hybrid. It will also be necessary to make clear to students that the expectations for students are different than for either entirely Ecampus or entirely on-site courses.

**2.A.b. Faculty support.** Support for faculty to develop hybrid courses is essential. Support can include incentives for development of hybrid courses, opportunities for training, and access to a learning community of faculty offering hybrid courses. The proposal to have an Instructional Designer for hybrid course development was viewed as an important support piece. An ideal situation would be to provide a course buy-out to allow faculty to develop a hybrid course. Support in the way of faculty development has already been put in place with the hiring of a new Instructional Designer, a joint endeavor between Ecampus and the Center for Teaching and Learning, funded by Ecampus.

**2.A.c. Financial model.** The University will need to identify a sustainable financial model to support and incent the development of hybrid courses and to incent (or at least not discourage) students to enroll in hybrid courses.

**2.A.d. Incentives or mandates.** The task force concluded that development and acceptance of hybrid courses would progress most smoothly and efficiently if they were driven by incentives and followed the lessons learned from pilot programs, rather than creating mandates requiring units to transition some percentage of their course offerings to hybrid courses.

**2.A.e. Information Technology.** There was not a concern that development of hybrid courses would place a substantial additional demand on the information technology resources currently in place.

**2.A.f. Faculty work loads.** The task force concluded that development of hybrid courses needed to proceed in such a way that it did not lead to increased work loads for faculty.

**2.A.g. Lower division vs. higher division courses.** We discussed whether it seemed more appropriate to offer hybrid courses in lower division or upper division courses. The argument was made that upper division students might be more ready to take on the additional



responsibility of self-directing the electronic version of the hybrid course. On the other hand, it was acknowledged that students coming out of high school are increasing technology savvy, comfortable, and expect the use of technology for instruction. We did not come to a specific conclusion that either was better.

**2.A.h. Materials for feeder schools.** The point was made that selected electronic materials developed for hybrid courses could easily be made available to our feeder schools (community colleges in particular) to be used as teaching modules in their classes. Sharing of teaching materials in this way could help ensure that community college courses serve as effective prerequisites to upper division courses at OSU, and count as credit courses when the students enroll at OSU. Providing these materials would provide a mechanism to help ensure the quality and content of the courses while allowing our community college partners to design and deliver their own courses, but would likely take faculty-to-faculty interaction to be successful.

**2.B. Ecampus courses for on-campus students.** Increasing numbers of on campus students are electing to take Ecampus courses. Currently, about half of Ecampus enrollment is on campus students and about one fourth of on campus students take at least one Ecampus course. The following issues/concerns were addressed for on campus students electing to take Ecampus courses.

In considering the issues for on-campus students taking Ecampus courses or hybrid courses, we started with confirmation of a guiding principle for delivery of instruction for on-campus courses: Regardless of the mechanism of delivery of instruction, students paying Corvallis on-campus tuition and fees should have the ability to fulfill degree requirements without being expected to enroll in an Ecampus course. While there may be pedagogical reasons for delivering instruction to on-campus students via hybrid or on-line approaches, the costs of these experiences should be included in the on-campus tuition and fees. Corvallis campus students should have access to all needed courses at the Corvallis campus pricing structure. Students, of course, may choose to complete degree requirements by taking Ecampus courses and opt to pay extra for an Ecampus course.

**2.B.a. Seamless experience.** Students on campus should not feel like they have left OSU to attend Ecampus. Their experience should be fully integrated with the rest of their college experience, including academic support, advising, etc.

**2.B.b. Ecampus by choice.** We discussed the fact that students elect to take Ecampus courses. There are many drivers to cause students to elect Ecampus courses rather than take the same course on campus. These include convenience, scheduling, learning styles, instructor choice, and fully enrolled on-campus versions. Whatever the reason, it is helpful to remember that this is a choice the student makes.

**2.B.c. Quality.** The quality of Ecampus and on-line courses should be indistinguishable. Instructors should be equally knowledgeable and prepared. Students completing an Ecampus or on campus course should be equally well prepared to continue with a curriculum that uses that course as a prerequisite or foundation. Primary responsibility for measuring and assessing the quality of courses (regardless of the method of delivery) falls to the individual units who deliver

courses. This includes the assessment of student learning and the assurance that the learning outcomes for all courses are consistent - regardless of the method of delivery. All courses, Ecampus and face to face alike, “belong” to the units.

**2.B.d. Convenience fee.** The task force addressed the issue of whether or not on campus students should be expected to pay an additional tuition for the convenience of taking Ecampus courses. This issue was discussed in connection with the budget model (see below). Briefly, we concluded that the budget model is roughly right and should be largely left in place. However, we do recommend that a scholarship program be implemented to assist on-campus students with need who are taking Ecampus courses (see page 16 for details).

**2.B.e. Graduate students.** There are issues regarding tuition remission and course-load credit for Ecampus courses for graduate students that need to be resolved. The Faculty Senate Distance Education Committee and the University Budget Committee are considering these issues. The task force strongly encourages the University to find a mechanism to allow graduate students to “count” Ecampus courses towards the GTA/GRA minimum course load requirement. As for undergraduate students, graduate students paying Corvallis on-campus tuition and fees should have the ability to fulfill degree requirements without being expected to enroll in an Ecampus course.

**2.B.f. Student Success.** The task force did a preliminary analysis of student success rates (% receiving grades of C- and above and average GPA) for Ecampus courses relative to on-campus courses. Institutional Research examined data for courses where both an on-campus and Ecampus version are taught (see Appendix 3). The preliminary results are quite interesting. Viewed in the aggregate, success rates (both in terms of the average GPA and pass rates) for students taking Ecampus courses are lower than the success rates for students taking on-campus courses. However, when we drilled down deeper into the data, some interesting trends emerged. When students taking ONLY Ecampus courses were compared with on-campus students who take most of their courses on campus and one or more Ecampus courses, the “only Ecampus” students had higher average success rates than the on-campus students (and higher success rates than on-campus students taking on-campus courses). In other words, students committed to the Ecampus approach, on average, appear to do well in this environment. Students accustomed to the more guided and structured on-campus courses (or with different motivations or distractions) may be less likely to succeed in Ecampus courses. Further, this discrepancy is greatest for freshmen and decreases for seniors. The Ecampus Task Force speculated on several potential explanations for these observations, which, unfortunately, remain speculations. Two other universities with similar Ecampus programs were queried and they have not collected a similar data set so we do not know to what extent OSU’s experience is unique. Neither institution was surprised at the results we saw.

The Task Force recommends the following actions for follow-up:

2.B.f.i. Conduct a deeper analysis of the student data to identify which (if any) student subpopulations have the more significant success challenges in the Ecampus platform than the general student population

2.B.f.ii. Fall 2011 share the expanded data set with the Undergraduate Education Council (UEC) for additional feedback and discussion.

2.B.f.iii. Research possible interventions to bolster Corvallis campus student success rates in Ecampus courses, implement a pilot support program and assess results, reporting back to the UEC and Faculty Senate Distance Education committee.

2.B.f.iv. Track this (or a similar set of Ecampus course success metrics) annually and discuss with Ecampus and Academic Success and Engagement.

**2.C. Off-campus courses: Developing an appropriate funding model.** The task force also evaluated a funding model that has been proposed to improve the development of creative and often multi-disciplinary coursework at locations off the main campus. Originally proposed as part of the Hatfield Marine Science Center's (HMSC) strategic plan, the model has been used for over 5 years for the Marine Biology class (BI 450/451) offered at the HMSC in spring. This application has used a variant of extended campus funding model, but requires special coding and handwork that limits its utility for broader implementation.

The task force considered the model to be beneficial to a broad range of off-campus sites, including the HMSC, the Andrews Experimental Forest, Geosciences Field Station, and Agricultural Experiment Stations. It recommended several changes to the existing model, and using the funding mechanism from the Summer Session model (86/14) but with selected changes in course coding. Also suggested was having the campus online schedule of classes search function have a primary default to an "all locations" category. This change would allow students to see all delivery modes (including Ecampus) and various locations that courses would be offered. Implementation would be during fall through spring quarters. The full proposed model, as modified by the task force, is presented in Appendix 9.

The task force recommends review of the proposal by the Provost's Council and approval by the Provost for implementation beginning Fall, 2011 (201201).

### **3. How do we ensure faculty development for effective delivery of distance education courses?**

Extended Campus has in place a process and staff to assist faculty with the development of distance courses including course design, production, delivery, evaluation, and revision. This process has been in place for some time and has been effective for the faculty members who have used it. Key elements of the process include:

**3.A. Design.** When the instructor is chosen by the Department for a new distance course, the Ecampus Course Development Team works with him/her to define the scope, delivery methods for the course, and media needs. A sample module is created to discuss, refine, and approve before production begins. Instructors begin learning more about Blackboard and best practices in online course design at this stage.

Production: Once the prototype has been agreed upon, the Ecampus Course Development team collaborates with the instructor to produce the remaining materials and media. All components are assembled in Blackboard. At each step in production the materials are reviewed looking at scope, structure, and components to ensure compliance with OSU, OUS, and Federal standards. Blackboard and media training continues during this stage. The development is a collaboration between Ecampus and the Instructor. Department Chairs are offered an opportunity to review the course before it is offered.

**3.B. Delivery.** The Ecampus Department and Learner Services team works closely with instructors to ensure Banner input is accurate, textbooks and materials are ordered, and student concerns are addressed. In addition, the Ecampus Course Development team continues to support instructors with Blackboard training and other media needs.

**3.C. Evaluation.** The OSU Student Assessment of Teaching forms are distributed online for distance students during the 10th week of a course, via the Blackboard or InfOSU portal. The results of the evaluation are provided to the Department Chairs.

**3.D. Revisions.** When the content or structure of a course goes out of date, the Ecampus Course Development Team assists the instructor with a continuous improvement process to ensure accurate and current courses.

Ecampus employs a three year ‘refresh’ cycle for all online courses: we invite faculty teaching courses that have been offered online for three years to: perform a peer [assessment](#) of the course with technical support/input from Ecampus course development staff, and based on that assessment perform revisions/updates to the course content and delivery strategies. Both assessment and revision processes are supported financially through incentive grants to the faculty/department.

**3.E. Additional Support.** Ecampus also supports faculty development through grant programs incentivizing faculty’s [research](#) efforts in distance education topics, and [professional development](#) opportunities to share research findings and to hear those of other distance education professionals. Professional development grants are also made available to academic advisors whose focus is on distance students.

Professional development for faculty is also provided through an annual Faculty Forum, hosted by Ecampus, where faculty and others present on best practices in online learning. Academic Advisors are invited to an Ecampus hosted quarterly Advisor Meeting, to share/discuss/collaborate on advising issues specific to distance student needs.

This information, and more, is consolidated in a continuously updated [Instructor Manual](#), made available to all new and existing faculty teaching Ecampus courses, and is available online as a PDF.

Ecampus is also funding a new Instructional Designer position in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

#### **4. How does compensation for Extended Campus instruction compare to compensation for on-campus instruction and how do we ensure that compensation plans for Extended Campus align with the new overload policy?**

The issue of compensation for on-campus instruction was in considerable flux during the time period of the task force's work. Prior to winter 2011, the academic department could choose to both hire and pay course instructors directly or elect to have Ecampus pay instructors who have been approved by the department (see Appendix 8). Ecampus pay to instructors was based on the number of SCH delivered (number of students in class x credit hours for the class) up to a limit of 180 SCH.

Effective winter, 2011, [Ecampus no longer pays any faculty](#) directly for online instruction; all payroll is now managed through the academic department in collaboration with the College's Dean's Office and their affiliated Business Service Center staff. Colleges and departments are responsible for ensuring instructor pay arrangements abide by OSU overload policy. In addition, individual Colleges and departments are responsible for formulating 'equitable' pay policies for instructors teaching Ecampus courses. The Colleges and departments coordinate with Academic Affairs and Human Resources offices to ensure compliance with these policies. This change grew out of the efforts to be in compliance with Oregon Administrative Rule 580-021-0025 regarding overload compensation and the recognition that fair and equitable compensation (whether overload or in-load) should not be based solely on the number of students in the course.

Examples of two college-based policies and one department-based policy on instructor pay for Ecampus courses are included in the appendix (See Appendix 4, 5, 6).

This issue continues to be in flux as colleges and units develop and refine their policies. The task force offers the following guiding principles in considering fair and equitable compensation for Ecampus instruction:

**4.A.** Compensation for a given Ecampus course should not be substantially different (higher or lower) than for a comparable face-to-face course, albeit with allowances for different levels of effort for different instructional delivery methods (e.g. Ecampus courses often require more effort per student than face-to-face courses) and for different disciplines.

**4.B.** Load considerations should be similar for Ecampus and face-to-face. For example, 12 Ecampus courses in a year should not result in a 0.49 FTE load (to avoid benefits) any more than 12 face-to-face courses should.

**4.C.** Ecampus courses should be managed and staffed in a manner consistent with the assignment of load of face-to-face classes. Mode of delivery, class size, credit hours, and other factors may all be appropriate for assessing the appropriate enrollment and workload assigned to particular sections.

**4.D.** Similar work should lead to similar compensation for similarly qualified instructors.

**4.E.** Rank of instructor, class size, complexity of the course, and discipline are among the considerations used to establish compensation.

We believe these principles are consistent with the Statement issued by the American Association of University Professors on Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession. <http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/47A00141-3691-41C0-8621-83974185600B/0/ContingentAppointmentsandtheAcademicProfession.pdf>

**5. How do we address intellectual property issues surrounding distance education?**

Extended Campus online courses follow OUS intellectual property policies. These are the same policies that apply to all OUS courses (see appendix).

The below link connects to the Faculty Senate report on intellectual property policy and Distance Education.

<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/other/ippde/report/index.html>

**6. What type of internal organization is needed to support the growth and leverage other available campus resources?**

Extended Campus is organized to provide a smooth pathway of access to OSU learning opportunities for non-residential/distance/online learners. Ecampus' internal organization consists of various units that focus on:

- Market analysis and development
- Student recruitment and retention/prospective student communications
- Course and program design, development and delivery.
- Student, faculty, and department support services.

Ecampus works closely with the academic units offering the courses and programs, and supports the funding of course development and advisors and program coordinators for all undergraduate degree programs delivered through Ecampus.

Ecampus also collaborates with various campus entities including Center for Teaching, Learning and Advancement, Media Services, Curriculum Council. Ecampus advocates for the distance learners in order to make OSU accessible in all needed capacities. OSU has made great strides over the past 10 years and continues to modify policies and processes to make campus resources available to distant/online learners.

We recommend that Ecampus has representation on the UEC and any other appropriate University standing committees. Ecampus is also planning to establish an Advisory committee when the Provost's task force completes its work. The advisory committee will be responsible for advocating for and facilitating the integration of Ecampus into the University's learning environment.

**7. What business model will incent appropriate growth yet avoid the development of an “underground economy?”**

**7.A. Is the current business model roughly correct?** We started with a consideration of whether the current business model is roughly correct. The model consists of an 80/10/10 model for tuition (\$160/credit UG, \$386/credit, G) where 80% of the tuition is returned to the unit teaching the course, 10% is set aside for new course development, and 10% goes to central administration. Another \$75/credit is charged to students and goes to Ecampus for operations and student advising. The general consensus was that the current business model is indeed roughly correct. The reasons cited:

**7.A.i. Predictability:** The current model allows units to predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy the costs to deliver a course and the potential income from that course. There is a predictable and easily understood connection between the number of students taught and the resources available to provide the instruction.

**7.A.ii. Incentive:** Because there is a clear, predictable, and adequate income stream associated with successful Ecampus offerings, there is an appropriate incentive to offer quality courses.

**7.A.iii. Growth:** The current model allows for growth that is scalable. As numbers grow, the resources needed to provide and support the courses also grow. A concern with the growth is whether it is sustainable. Decreasing SCH leads to decreasing revenues, so it must also be possible to manage these decreases. The predictability also enhances growth in that “profit” from one course can be used to offset a potential deficit that occurs when a new course is developed, fostering department-level investments in new, creative coursework.

**7.A.iv. Educational tool:** The current model, where resources are so directly linked to the success of the course and/or program, provides an educational tool to administrators and faculty. For example, the often-underappreciated linkage between market demand and course success cannot easily be ignored.

**7.B. Should the model be fine-tuned?** Given that the model is roughly correct, are there opportunities to fine-tune the model? We identified three boundary conditions that all need to be considered when thinking about changes to the model.

**7.B.i. Incentive:** It is important that the incentives currently in place to the units delivering Ecampus courses not be substantially diminished while attempting to enhance incentives to other stakeholders, in particular, the on-campus students.

**7.B.ii. Cost differential:** We heard repeatedly from students and faculty that the differential cost for on-campus students to take Ecampus courses is a concern. We also set as an overarching principle to make the Ecampus/ on-campus transition as seamless as possible. This cost differential is the most obvious disconnect from this principle of “seamlessness”. The tuition

plateau exacerbates this issue as Ecampus courses are exempted from the plateau—on campus tuition and Ecampus tuition are determined separately and then summed.

**7.B.iii. Overhead:** Another reoccurring issue was the need to determine a fair overhead for Ecampus to pay to central administration. Currently, about 7% of revenues managed by Ecampus (\$75/SCH + 10% of tuition returned to Ecampus) are returned to central administration to cover overhead costs. Recognizing that this is an “apples to oranges” comparison, about 35% of on campus E&G revenue goes to central administration for “overhead”.

With regard to dealing with the Cost Differential without decreasing incentive, the task force proposes implementation of a scholarship fund to cover all or some portion of the fee and/or tuition for on-campus students taking Ecampus courses. Doug Severs, Director of Scholarships and Financial Aid, indicated his office could manage such a program. A potential source of funds would be a portion of the \$75/SCH fee. \$10/SCH would generate a fund of close to \$1M/yr. This amount would be sufficient to fully fund one 4-credit Ecampus course each year for 1,000 students. We propose a scholarship program where on-campus students can apply for scholarships to cover the cost of Ecampus courses. (We note that Ecampus only students already have access to a similar program.) Criteria for awarding scholarships could be:

- Financial need
- Course required for timely program advancement
- Number of courses previously funded by Ecampus scholarships

With regard to overhead, we supported a policy where overhead for both Ecampus and on campus is consistent with actual costs, recognizing that this requires a more detailed analysis of overhead than we are prepared to undertake.

**7.C. The Underground economy:** The concern about an “underground economy” seems to come from a concern that units will create artificial reasons to use Ecampus courses instead of face-to-face courses so they can reap the financial rewards of the Ecampus business model. The committee did not see a great deal of evidence that such behavior was happening.

Ecampus revenues flow to units based on the 80% of tuition model and do involve large sums transferred to units. At first glance, this can appear to be a financial windfall. However, this is in large measure because all the direct and indirect costs of Ecampus instruction are not charged directly against Ecampus revenues. The costs of faculty who teach in-load, service and supply costs, GTA salary, administrative overhead, and staff overhead are real costs not assigned to the Ecampus revenue. A quick review of total costs and revenues in two Colleges (Science and Education) suggest that Ecampus revenues cover the actual costs, with a slight surplus in some areas, depending on discipline and course structure.

There were issues with units, or more often individuals, using Ecampus courses to secure excess additional compensation. The changes in overload and pay policy have largely corrected those excesses. The committee feels that application of the principles outlined here will prevent any consistent abuses of the Ecampus business model.



The strength of the model is that the predictability of the funding has encouraged units to be imaginative and entrepreneurial. There is always a risk that a few people will try to use such a system in a way that was not intended. However, the good work that has developed and the appropriate use of guiding principles has kept abuse of the approach to a minimum.

**8. What is the role of OSU's Extended Campus vis-à-vis the Oregon University System (e.g. ability to deliver courses/modules for other universities, particularly regional institutions)?**

OSU is a leader in the OUS system in credit-based online learning. EOU, SOU, WOU and OIT have active online programs. Eastern matches OSU in undergraduate programs. PSU has a strong Continuing Education program and is growing the number of online credit courses. And UO has a decentralized program with some individual strengths. But overall OSU is the leader--in full degree programs (grad and undergrad), total courses available, and total student credit hours.

OSU took the initiative to host a meeting last spring of all the OUS online, continuing ed, and summer session programs to promote more interaction and collaboration.

As an OUS system leader, it provides OSU an opportunity to provide input and leadership in developing a statewide collaboration for sharing course access. Other states and regions have similar efforts established and underway.

One example could be to institute a "home-institution" model where all institutions aggregate available online course listings in a common catalog. A student admitted to any OUS university could register for any course in the common catalog. The student would pay tuition and fees to their home institution. If the course originated at another institution, the home institution would keep 10% for administrative expenses and push 90% on to the originating institution for development and instruction expenses. Credit for the course would accrue at the student's home institution. Coordination for this enterprise could be established at the OUS System level or delegated to a member institution. Coordination cost could be shared among all member institutions as marketing expenses.

The task force views this option as an answer to the question posed, but looks with some trepidation at the possible issues raised. Although a "home institution" model as noted above is a simple system-wide approach, the real question is what value would this bring to OSU and our students? If the OUS system wishes to pursue a more integrated approach to online learning statewide, this could work. However the task force recommendation is to focus our attention on future growth and student satisfaction at OSU first.

#### **IV. Appendices**

- 1. Request for input**
- 2. Summary of input from community**
- 3. Success rates for Ecampus relative to on-campus courses**
- 4. Compensation policy from COS**
- 5. Compensation policy from CLA**
- 6. Compensation policy from Fisheries and Wildlife**
- 7. References describing the benefits of hybrid courses**
- 8. Ecampus compensation policies prior to and as of Winter Term 2011**
- 9. Distance Education Committee: 2010-2011 Annual Report**
- 10. Proposed policy for funding model for off-campus courses**

## 1. Request for input

Over the past five years, there has been a significant increase in the number of educational programs delivered through Ecampus and the number of students taking Ecampus courses, both on campus and off. Continuous increases in enrollment are adding pressure on units to effectively deliver their educational programs to large student audiences and more clearly define the role of providing courses via Ecampus for on-campus students.

In the context of Extended Campus' growth, course access issues, and the desire of many units to increase the reach and impact of their programs, it is important that the University ensures that the future Extended Campus agenda is aligned with the institution's educational priorities and goals for access, affordability, and quality of education programs and student experience.

To address these issues, a task force was appointed jointly by Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President, and Leslie Burns, President of the Faculty Senate. The Task Force was asked to address the following key issues:

- How large should Extended Campus grow over the next 3-5 years and where should the growth occur?
- What is the role of Ecampus and hybrid courses for on-campus students?
- How do we ensure faculty development and appropriate compensation for delivery of distance education courses?
- How do we address intellectual property issues surrounding distance education?
- What type of internal organization is needed to support the growth and leverage other available campus resources?
- What business model will incent appropriate growth yet avoid the development of an "underground economy?"
- What is the role of OSU's Extended Campus vis-à-vis the Oregon University System?

The task force now seeks your input on these issues. If you have comments about Ecampus that are relevant to the charge of the task force, please [do the following]. Your comments will be most useful to the task force if they are received by February 15.

### **TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP**

Dan Arp, University Honors College, (Chair)

Sherm Bloomer, College of Science

George Boehlert, Hatfield Marine Science Center

Susie Brubaker-Cole, Academic Success and Engagement

Bruce Dugger, Fisheries and Wildlife (& Chair FS Distance Education Committee)

Dave King, Outreach and Engagement

Roger Nielsen, Geosciences (& member of FS Distance Education Committee)

Kate Mactavish, Human Development and Family Studies (& member of FS Curriculum Council)

Tom Maness, Forest Engineering, Resources and Management

Brian Meara, Budget and Fiscal Planning

Brent Steel, Political Science

Jessica White, Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership (& member of FS Graduate Council)

*Staff: Lisa Templeton*



## 2. Summary of input from community

04/11

*The survey responses varied greatly. The following is a brief summary of the results and a few examples of some of the comments received:*

### **How large should Extended Campus grow over the next 3-5 years and where should the growth occur?**

A majority of respondents agreed that Extended Campus should be allowed to grow as needed to best serve the needs of student success. The emphasis on growth being a product of student functionality and not revenue generation was also echoed among the respondents.

“A limit should not be invoked, but growth should be a function of student need and registrations.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 3-5

“How Large...? I'd say \*large\* Although I don't like remote teaching and learning and believe we have to be extremely careful about offering a quality product, I think we'd better take advantage of this opportunity fully or risk being left behind. I received a phone call yesterday from someone in the Ivory Coast who wished to take one of our E-Campus courses. If we don't satisfy this kind of person someone else will.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 0

### **What is the role of Ecampus and hybrid courses for on-campus students?**

Most respondents believe the role of Ecampus and hybrid courses for on-campus students should not be to replace the brick and mortar class, but instead to be available as an alternate resource. Many respondents felt that most professors were already engaged in some form of hybrid teaching through the use of blackboard and other technology driven methods. Many respondents were adamant that students are given the option/opportunity to take courses online or on campus and are not forced to take required courses online via Ecampus. In addition some respondents reflected on the idea of on-campus students leading just as diverse and busy lives as distance students, which would also result in the need for them to take Ecampus courses.

“The role of Ecampus classes for on-campus students is all about access, preferences in pedagogy and flexibility.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 3-5

“On-campus students should have the option of taking online courses but not be forced to take them (they came to OSU & should be able to have face to face classes which many prefer).”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 1-2

“The increased use of Ecampus for on-campus students has the opportunity to unburden us from the enrollment limitations posed by inflexible, overbooked classroom space on campus.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 1-2

## **How do we ensure faculty development and appropriate compensation for delivery of distance education courses?**

In relation to ensuring faculty development and appropriate compensation there were a variety of responses and concerns.

“Release time or professional development funds could be an incentive for faculty to develop and deliver hybrid courses. Compensation should be in load—any other model distorts faculty activity in relation to the position description.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 0

If we were to limit E-Campus instruction to instructors paid on what is essentially a piece-work basis, then our E-Campus offerings aren't so different from those of the University of Phoenix and the like, except that the profits go to supporting our Research University rather than corporate shareholders. Perhaps that's a big enough difference if the demand exists, but we need to proceed with eyes open to the potential exploitation of piece-work instructors (who are, of course, already exploited in the delivery of high-enrollment face-to-face classes).

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 0

“Consider the # of credits and ways the course was developed for distance learning (i.e., the time invested) to develop compensation models. Some faculty don't do a lot to “teach” online classes and they should be compensated accordingly.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 1-2

“Faculty development and appropriate compensation for delivery are essential. In our department, this is done as an overload course and without reasonable development funds and salary, it would not happen.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 1-2

## **How do we address intellectual property issues surrounding distance education?**

Many respondents simply acknowledged that within the Ecampus course development agreement it stipulates that if OSU pays them to develop a class then the resulting property belongs to the university. A number of respondents believe that ownership of intellectual property is an issue for the legal department or that they do not know enough about the subject to give an informed opinion.

“I am not sufficiently knowledgeable about intellectual property issues to have suggestions or views on this matter.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 0

“Faculty should be required to adhere to copyright laws surrounding intellectual property just like we want students to.”

Number of Ecampus courses taught: 3-5

## **What type of internal organization is needed to support the growth and leverage other available campus resources?**

There were a variety of responses to this question.

“I would think that the current E-campus structure has a lot going for it. I would like to see course developers have better access to video and animation tools.”

Ecampus courses taught: 1-2

“Ecampus funds have been secured and will continue to be secured.”

Ecampus courses taught: 3-5

“Don't mess with that. It is a lean, efficient operation now, which is probably why it is the only one on campus that generates excess revenues. You need appropriate oversight from an academic standpoint and from business management standpoint but in my mind not much additional administration.”

Ecampus courses taught: 3-5

“I worry that Ecampus in particular is also concerned with the raising revenue as Ecampus generated funds appear to be more and more important to the operation of individual units. That is great, but I feel strongly that our paramount goal should always be the quality of the education that we deliver.”

Ecampus courses taught: 0

### **What business model will incent appropriate growth yet avoid the development of an "underground economy?"**

There was a broad range of responses. Many think the current Ecampus model works extremely well, others don't like it. Many did not understand what was meant by “underground economy”.

The ecampus is vibrant and growing and with good reason. It is a prime example of how incentives encourage excellence. Unlike the standard campus model where links between credit hours and departmental rewards are tenuous and less than obvious, the ecampus model provides direct rewards to departments and faculty based on the successes of online courses. More students translates to more money for departments. Any plan moving the ecampus forward must not tinker with this central element of the ecampus's success.

Ecampus courses taught 3

The best way to avoid an underground economy is to regard this effort as part of a normal teaching assignment, with corresponding reductions in other expectations (e.g. a reduced traditional teaching load).

Ecampus courses taught 0

When colleges rush to offer Ecampus courses for a life-sustaining stream of revenue, there should at least be mechanisms in place to ensure the Ecampus course is suitable. From mere observation it seems like the number of courses offered through Ecampus is rising exponentially, and the quality of the courses is stagnant at best. I understand the financial bottom line of these offerings, but I do not understand the human/educational bottom line.

Ecampus courses taught 0

### 3. Success rates for Ecampus relative to on-campus courses

**Oregon State University Success Rates by Site and Select Demographics: 2007-08 to Fall 2010**  
 (Lecture, Laboratory, Seminar, Recitation and online instruction types only)

CIP Code	Fall 2007-08			Fall 2008-09			Fall 2009-10			Summer 2010			4 year slope	
	Grade count	Grade % or better	GPA*	Grade count	Grade % or better	GPA*	Grade count	Grade % or better	GPA*	Grade count	Grade % or better	GPA*	Grade % or better	GPA*
All Undergraduates	181747	87.0%	2.52	183454	87.6%	2.51	202523	86.7%	2.53	81507	85.6%	2.50	-0.4%	-0.003
Freshmen	26114	80.6%	2.65	23617	80.4%	2.64	32025	80.3%	2.65	15512	83.7%	2.72	0.9%	0.022
Sophomore	31920	84.7%	2.56	30708	84.6%	2.57	32202	84.4%	2.58	17260	82.8%	2.57	0.6%	0.023
Junior	40130	86.0%	2.51	42115	86.7%	2.51	46254	86.2%	2.51	19448	84.4%	2.57	-0.7%	-0.012
Senior	71286	90.5%	2.42	72511	90.5%	2.42	78255	90.5%	2.42	29260	88.8%	2.46	0.0%	0.000
Female	81134	88.8%	2.61	86992	88.4%	2.60	99325	88.4%	2.62	39109	87.0%	2.57	-0.5%	-0.010
Male	100613	85.4%	2.48	96462	85.8%	2.49	103200	85.0%	2.49	42400	84.2%	2.44	0.4%	0.000
American Indian/Alaskan Native or Pacific Islander	1044	80.2%	2.62	1198	80.6%	2.67	1852	80.8%	2.69	721	80.3%	2.40	0.1%	0.117
Black/African American	2390	79.0%	2.47	2975	78.8%	2.54	2991	77.3%	2.52	1159	76.2%	2.51	-1.0%	0.010
Hispanic	402	83.8%	2.76	604	83.7%	2.71	1000	81.7%	2.70	408	81.7%	2.69	0.7%	0.022
Non-Resident Alien	3078	85.4%	2.54	3508	82.8%	2.89	4362	84.1%	2.86	2682	82.6%	2.83	-0.7%	-0.035
White, Non-Hispanic	17176	86.3%	2.49	19140	86.3%	2.49	21246	86.3%	2.49	9372	85.9%	2.49	0.3%	0.000
White, Non-Hispanic	130513	87.7%	2.45	132501	87.9%	2.45	149314	87.4%	2.45	59607	86.3%	2.62	-0.5%	-0.003
Athlete	6186	87.5%	2.62	5431	87.4%	2.61	5462	88.5%	2.65	2409	85.9%	2.79	-0.4%	-0.003

\* GPA calculated on grade point scale, with D+ grade as 2.0 and F as 0.0



Oregon State University E-Campus Success Rates by Student Enrollment Size and Credits 2007-08 to Fall 2010

E-campus (online) courses only

WSP/JF	2007-08			2008-09			2009-10			2010-11			5 year change	
	Grade E count	rate	WPA*	Grade E count	rate	WPA*	Grade E count	rate	WPA*	Grade E count	rate	WPA*		
Corvallis Students	7543	74.5%	2.72	8336	74.5%	2.68	9984	75.3%	2.74	5545	76.0%	2.78	0.5%	0.024
Kuskoosh Students	665	82.2%	2.83	566	77.0%	2.77	576	83.1%	2.80	347	73.7%	2.73	2.6%	0.013
E-campus only students	3744	85.2%	3.07	4976	84.3%	3.05	7025	80.8%	3.01	3415	81.0%	3.07	-1.6%	-0.004
<b>Total credits to date**</b>														
D				3364	80.5%		4975	78.1%		1495	79.7%		-0.4%	
D to E				5227	88.0%		5863	78.7%		1408	79.3%		6.0%	
E to 10				3908	75.8%		3798	77.1%		2166	75.6%		-0.1%	
10 to 15				2317	77.0%		2413	75.5%		1495	76.7%		0.2%	
15 to 18				50	82.0%		569	77.3%		161	75.8%		-3.1%	
18+							1	100.0%		43	76.7%			
<b>Total E-campus credits (attributed)</b>														
Corvallis (attributed)														
D	695	75.4%		869	71.8%		1048	71.6%		416	75.2%		0.0%	
D to E	139	69.0%		115	80.7%		155	61.1%		169	69.4%		0.1%	
E to 10	47	59.8%		80	67.9%		87	67.8%		47	76.1%		2.9%	
10 to 15	13	63.4%		66	61.9%		21	54.5%		29	76.0%		1.7%	
15 to 18	31	38.7%		25	24.0%		33	51.5%		33	72.7%		13.0%	
18+	0	10.7%		13	7.7%		10	56.7%		1	100.0%		11.8%	
Kuskoosh (attributed)														
D	189	80.8%		1873	81.8%		2274	81.3%		993	83.1%		0.7%	
D to E	552	81.5%		963	79.1%		911	78.5%		184	84.6%		6.9%	
E to 10	661	73.5%		806	79.0%		825	77.2%		521	80.8%		2.0%	
10 to 15	112	74.5%		165	71.8%		105	75.7%		168	71.3%		0.5%	
15 to 18	701	73.1%		545	73.3%		672	71.2%		454	73.7%		0.8%	
18+	107	53.8%		210	63.0%		181	89.8%		136	70.2%		2.0%	

\* WPA calculated on a credit-by-credit basis only - subject to audit - see OSU policy  
 \*\* Cumulative credits attributed to each student who has zero credits (D/M) listed

**Oregon State University Success Rates by Site and Select Demographics: 2007-08 to Fall 2010**  
 (Lecture, Laboratory, Seminar, Recitation and on-line instruction types only)

Table 1: Campus

GROUP	2007-08			2008-09			2009-10			2010-11			4 year change	
	Grade count	or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade count	or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade count	or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade count	or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>
All Undergraduates	11771	78.3%	2.85	13866	78.2%	2.82	17621	77.8%	2.85	9228	77.8%	2.89	-0.2%	0.015
Freshmen	474	50.1%	2.36	576	61.6%	2.24	761	67.3%	2.53	312	66.7%	2.43	-2.9%	0.080
Sophomores	3251	73.8%	2.71	3582	79.8%	2.62	3219	79.2%	2.62	3243	73.5%	2.73	6.2%	-0.003
Junior	2531	75.7%	2.79	3197	76.5%	2.74	4262	75.2%	2.81	3173	73.9%	2.79	-0.7%	0.003
Senior	2581	80.1%	2.83	2912	80.5%	2.84	3142	80.1%	2.89	3141	80.3%	2.84	0.1%	0.115
Female	6779	79.5%	2.90	8166	79.2%	2.84	10233	78.8%	2.90	5333	79.8%	2.84	0.1%	0.036
Male	5501	76.6%	2.77	5700	76.8%	2.74	7387	76.3%	2.79	3895	75.1%	2.81	0.5%	0.115
American Indian/Alaskan	168	68.3%	2.46	202	77.3%	2.69	304	71.7%	2.54	141	71.6%	2.59	0.6%	0.034
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	80.6%	2.88	242	85.1%	2.82	303	77.1%	2.77	167	75.4%	2.70	1.4%	-0.020
Black, African American	251	67.7%	2.33	396	67.5%	2.23	451	65.6%	2.32	319	65.2%	2.44	-0.9%	0.097
Hispanic	114	72.0%	2.45	153	74.1%	2.49	198	76.3%	2.65	165	73.6%	2.69	6.0%	0.228
Non-Resident Alien	138	79.7%	3.04	219	76.7%	2.89	273	82.4%	3.04	162	79.6%	3.10	0.5%	0.093
Hispanic/Multi-racial	115	79.0%	2.83	163	80.1%	2.81	161	80.3%	2.9	125	80.1%	2.88	6.2%	0.111
White, Non-Hispanic	8567	78.8%	2.86	9840	78.6%	2.84	12232	77.8%	2.88	6471	78.4%	2.91	-0.2%	0.019
All races	469	80.6%	2.89	473	74.6%	2.59	630	81.0%	2.73	158	81.8%	2.56	1.2%	0.044

<sup>a</sup> GPA calculated on grade count only, excluding D, D+, and F grades only

Table 2: Instruction Type

Table 3: Instruction Type

**Oregon State University Success Rates by Site and Select Demographics: 2007-08 to Fall 2010**  
**(Lecture, Laboratory, Seminar, Recitation and on-line instruction types only)**

Course Catalog: **Corvallis Campus**

GROUP	Fall 2007-08			Fall 2008-09			Fall 2009-10			Fall 2010-11			4 year average		
	Grade C- or better count	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade C- or better count	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade C- or better count	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade C- or better count	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	Grade C- or better rate	GPA <sup>a</sup>	
All Undergraduates	16731	87.5%	2.52	17089	87.6%	2.92	18253	87.5%	2.93	73404	86.5%	2.89	-0.3%	-0.003	
Freshman	31634	81.0%	2.65	30797	80.8%	2.65	31256	80.6%	2.65	15196	84.0%	2.72	0.9%	0.007	
Sophomore	30520	85.6%	2.86	30111	85.5%	2.83	30684	85.1%	2.83	11213	85.4%	2.77	0.2%	-0.008	
Junior	37113	87.3%	2.91	38507	87.4%	2.92	41426	87.2%	2.91	16996	85.7%	2.87	-0.5%	-0.011	
Senior	10794	91.8%	3.67	9356	92.4%	3.68	9671	92.4%	3.70	2181	90.6%	3.46	0.4%	0.001	
Female	78959	89.5%	3.01	77126	89.3%	3.01	83242	89.5%	3.03	33279	88.1%	2.97	-0.4%	-0.011	
Male	60352	85.7%	2.81	63663	86.7%	2.83	99291	86.8%	2.81	40124	85.2%	2.83	0.2%	-0.004	
American Indian/Alaskan	2804	83.1%	2.71	2176	84.8%	3.81	3082	86.0%	3.81	754	87.1%	3.87	1.2%	0.048	
Asian or Pacific Islander	15826	86.4%	2.85	15285	86.8%	2.84	17002	87.4%	2.90	6731	87.0%	2.81	0.2%	-0.004	
Black/African American	293	80.0%	2.48	2574	80.2%	2.57	2515	79.1%	2.54	944	78.6%	2.52	-0.5%	-0.009	
Hispanic	7421	84.4%	2.78	8284	84.7%	2.77	8794	84.6%	2.77	4163	84.5%	2.89	0.1%	0.001	
Non-Resident Alien	232	85.8%	2.94	3276	83.1%	2.89	4075	84.2%	2.85	2520	82.8%	2.82	-0.8%	-0.043	
Other/Not org.	14282	86.8%	2.83	16471	86.5%	2.84	17016	87.0%	2.83	6954	85.9%	2.88	0.2%	-0.001	
White Non-Hispanic	121881	88.2%	2.95	121723	88.4%	2.94	128056	88.2%	2.96	51466	87.1%	2.92	-0.4%	-0.008	
All races	5711	88.1%	2.83	4254	88.6%	2.84	5833	88.1%	2.86	2151	86.4%	2.70	0.5%	-0.013	

<sup>a</sup> GPA is calculated as the sum of all course grades divided by the number of courses.

OSU - Corvallis Campus

Page 1 of 1

#### 4. Compensation policy from COS

The University, in response to a review of OSU practices regarding compliance with Oregon Administrative rules, has implemented a new policy defining the procedures and practices regarding overload effort and compensation for that effort. A copy of those rules can be found at <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/word%20&%20xls/overload-policy.doc>

The key parts of the policy related to teaching concern the time commitment and compensation for overload effort:

- *Overload teaching is not to exceed, on average, the equivalent of one additional course per term. Further, overload teaching may not be assigned at any time when the quality of instruction may be jeopardized or when such overload work interferes with regularly assigned duties.*
- The allowable overload limits defined here are considered maximum loads. The appropriate dean, director, vice president, or vice provost may set a lower limit for overload work in cases where there are concerns that additional commitments would interfere with the full performance of an employee's normal duties.
- *Compensation for overload teaching is set by course, not by the number of students or student credit hours (SCH).*
- **Courses, whether delivered face-to-face or in an asynchronous mode, vary in complexity and the time they require from an instructor. Instructional faculty members are assigned to courses based upon their skills and their ability to provide a quality educational experience.**
- **Compensation for instructional work in the College of Science is not done on an hourly basis.**
- **Compensation provided for overload courses should be consistent with the compensation provided for similar courses delivered by instructional faculty in their normal duties. Academic unit supervisors or deans, in consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, are responsible for identifying an appropriate range for overload instruction in their units with a clear justification for how those compensation levels are set.**

These changes are specific to overload compensation but because they require that compensation is determined by the course (not the enrollment) the policy leads to the conclusion that we must establish clear and consistent guidelines for all compensation for Ecampus instruction (whether as salary or in other form) and that compensation for overload courses is consistent with that for similar courses delivered in other ways. The College of Science is committed to providing appropriate and consistent compensation for the development and delivery of courses at the undergraduate and graduate level, regardless of mode of delivery.

##### **Ecampus compensation schedule and process:**

A compensation schedule based on a "per course" standard does not require that every course be paid at the same rate. Course compensation may vary because of instructor qualifications (M.A./M.S., Ph.D.), credits, level of course (lower, upper division; graduate), workload (e.g., WIC versus non-WIC), time spent in contact with individual students, and discipline (market). There are also cases where the number of students enrolled or the mode of delivery of the material significantly increases or decreases the effort (i.e., hours per week) needed to deliver an Ecampus course, as compared to its face-to-face equivalent.

Ecampus compensation should be related to the effort required to deliver a course. Compensation rates should be consistent (considering the factors noted above) whether the course is delivered face-to-face or by Ecampus, or in-

load or as overload. The reasons for the differences in compensation for different delivery modes or courses should be clearly articulated.

The College of Science surveyed the compensation rates for recent Ecampus work (both in-load and overload) and compensation for similar face-to-face instruction. The compensation schedule provided below is based on that census and defines medians and ranges for course compensation at different levels and by instructors of different levels of experience. These rates will be revisited periodically as they are used and will be adjusted annually consistent with annual faculty salary raises. Exceptions to these rates can be requested if circumstances justifying significantly less, or more, effort occur for a particular class.

Some specific notes and expectations regarding course delivery and course development are noted in the following sections.

*Table 1: Ecampus salary schedule per course for the College of Science. Differences in disciplinary costs are within the ranges provided. Salary may vary within ranges for the experience of the instructor, specific issues of course delivery mode or student interaction, or other clearly identifiable criteria. The reasons for ranges in compensation for courses within a unit should be clearly documented. Salary for Ecampus course delivery may be set within the ranges by unit heads. The yellow boxes are “standard” teaching ranges for courses in the College. Use of the other salary ranges or compensation proposed outside the ranges requires consultation with the Dean. Note that use of the “seminar” and “reading and conference” ranges is restricted to the noted course numbers.*

<b>Rank/Type:</b>	<i>Instructor</i>	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
<b>Course Level:</b>				
Lower division (200-level and below)	\$4,800 3000-7000	\$6,000 5000-7500	\$7,000 6000-9000	\$9,000 7000-11000
Upper division (300- and 400-level)	same	same	same	same
Graduate	same	same	same	same
Lab/recitation or large enrollment salary supplement	\$960 700-1400	\$1,200 1000-1500	\$1,400 1200-1800	\$1,800 1400-2200
Seminar courses (399/499, 407/507, 408/508)	\$2,400 1500-3500	\$3,000 2500-3750	\$3,500 3000-4500	\$4,500 3500-5500
Reading and Conference (405/505)	\$1,200 750-1750	\$1,500 1250-1875	\$1,750 1500-2250	\$2,225 1775-2750

**Course delivery notes and procedures:**

- Compensation can vary with the qualifications and experience of the instructor
- Compensation within a range normally would reflect years of experience of the instructor within the rank or specific issues about the delivery of the course, relative to it’s face-to-face equivalent.
- Yellow highlighted areas indicate normal staffing rates. Most Ecampus courses will be compensated at instructor rates regardless of the rank of the instructor; courses that can be staffed by instructor rank faculty will be compensated at those rates even if a professorial rank faculty member chooses to deliver the course. Exceptions will need to be justified and approved by the Dean

- Compensation does not generally vary by the level of class; the demands and needs at different levels vary, but the aggregate effort is similar
- *Slash courses (4xx/5xx) are considered a single course and are compensated as such. Cross-listed courses (e.g. OC 103/GEO 103) are also considered a single course.*
- Undergraduate classes that exceed an enrollment of 25 or any class meeting the university minimum enrollment levels that includes a lab or recitation for which a graduate teaching assistant or other instructional assistance is not assigned may warrant additional compensation to reflect the additional load (as such effort is factored into the assignment of face-to-face course loads). Normally, it is preferred to add TA support to a course, rather than increasing the compensation for the instructor. Compensation that includes this addition must be approved by the Dean [*note we will work on defining more specific criteria for this in the future*]
- Seminars or reading and conference courses can be offered through Ecampus. Such courses are not normally counted as part of course loads for face-to-face delivery as we recognize that require less effort than a full “course”. We have set a standard of about 50% or 25% effort for such a small enrollment courses (relative to a regular course). The program head must approve the offering of such a course and there must be a clear programmatic reason for its delivery
- Units can offer courses that do not generate enough revenue to cover the costs of delivery. Such a decision might be for strategic reasons, for the development of a new program, or for a required course in a degree program. Some strategies for such situations include:
  - Departments subsidizing such courses from other revenues if there is a compelling programmatic need for the course
  - Building a subsidy into course development proposals funded by Ecampus for some number of years to allow new programs to grow and reach a steady-state
  - Requesting a subsidy from the College’s Ecampus development fund or from Ecampus to support a course as it grows
- All Ecampus course delivery whether as overload for salary, overload to a 201 account, or delivery in load should be consistent with this compensation schedule.
- OPE will also be paid from the appropriate accounts when the effort level requires it. When overload compensation is taken to a faculty 201 account, the compensation will equal the salary from the ranges above and may include an additional 25% (the average OPE contribution for salary overload) if a unit head considers it appropriate
- Units are responsible for the costs of Ecampus compensation, once unit heads have approved overload compensation or approved the offering of a course, regardless of actual enrollment.
- Ecampus revenues will return to the unit responsible for the course content (i.e. the owner of the course designator)
- The Department responsible for the course content will be responsible for identifying and compensating instructors for all courses carrying the unit's course designator
- Course compensation must be set prior to the delivery of the course.
- The estimate of course effort in position descriptions is normally in the range of 0.08 to 0.12 FTE. Normally, 0.10 FTE will be used as the effort for Ecampus courses.
- If an individual on a term-to-term appointment is to teach multiple sections over the course of the year, the salary and effort per course should generally be equivalent. The issue here is simply one of complexity in the appointment process. If units have concerns or questions about this, please consult with the Dean’s Office and the Business Center.

**Course development notes and procedures:**

Agreements for Ecampus course or program development must meet the same key conditions as course delivery: the aggregate effort in overload work cannot exceed the standards set in the overload policy and the compensation must be consistent with the effort required.

Course development compensation will normally be treated as the equivalent of one course. Unit heads will determine if the required effort meets that for a full course (development of an entirely new course) or a seminar course (i.e. revisions of an existing course). Development of particularly complex courses may extend for more than one term and the equivalent of more than one course. Note that course development counts towards the overload limit of no more than one course per term.

Program development normally involves the development of more than one course. If this work is done on an overload basis, the work must be structured such that it meets the requirements of the overload policy regarding management of effort and compensation. It is helpful in proposals for compensation for course development work to identify the effort in "course equivalents" of effort. This will aid the Dean and the Business Center in assessing the appropriate level of compensation.

<b>Ecampus Income Calculations for reference:</b>							
80% of the tuition revenue for Ecampus courses is passed to units							
RAM generated by Ecampus is passed in part to the Colleges; this varies but last year was about 9.7% of the tuition revenue returned to the College							
2011 Undergraduate tuition is \$160/SCH							
2011 Graduate tuition is \$386/SCH							
<u>Estimated income (before expenses) for a 3-SCH course at various enrollments:</u>							
		Enrollment					
		3	6	15	25	50	75
Undergraduate:	Tuition:	\$ 1,152	\$ 2,304	\$ 5,760	\$ 9,600	\$ 19,200	\$ 28,800
	RAM:	\$ 112	\$ 223	\$ 559	\$ 931	\$ 1,862	\$ 2,794
	Total:	\$ 1,264	\$ 2,527	\$ 6,319	\$ 10,531	\$ 21,062	\$ 31,594
Graduate:	Tuition:	\$ 2,779	\$ 5,558	\$ 13,896	\$ 23,160	\$ 46,320	\$ 69,480
	RAM:	\$ 270	\$ 539	\$ 1,348	\$ 2,247	\$ 4,493	\$ 6,740
	Total:	\$ 3,049	\$ 6,098	\$ 15,244	\$ 25,407	\$ 50,813	\$ 76,220
<u>Enrollment needed to meet total compensation (salary plus 25% OPE)</u>							
		Seminar-Ph.D. Instructor	Ph.D. Instructor (low end)	Ph.D. Instructor (with large course stipend)	Professor	Maximum \$ Instructor	Maximum \$ Professor
	Salary	\$ 2,400	\$ 4,000	\$ 5,760	\$ 9,000	\$ 7,960	\$ 12,800
	Total Cost:	\$ 3,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,200	\$ 11,250	\$ 9,950	\$ 16,000
Undergraduate:	Enrollment needed	8	12	18	27	24	38
	Income	\$ 3,370	\$ 5,055	\$ 7,582	\$ 11,374	\$ 10,110	\$ 16,007
Graduate:	Enrollment needed	3	4	6	9	8	13
	Income	\$ 3,049	\$ 4,065	\$ 6,098	\$ 9,146	\$ 8,130	\$ 13,211



## 5. Compensation Policy from CLA

### Background

The Oregon University System (OUS) has established rules and policies regarding overload pay (*OUS Fiscal Policy Manual 10.33*, *Oregon Administrative Rule 580-021-0025*, and *Oregon State University's (OSU) Conflict of Commitment Policy*). Oregon State University has issued its updated policy regarding Overload Compensation and Ecampus Instruction, effective September 16, 2010. This policy was mandated as a result of an internal audit. These policies have always been in effect and the audit process caused Oregon State University to address the audit findings. As a result, it is necessary, for all units to come into compliance with the overload policy upon the effective date and in-load Ecampus instruction beginning winter term, December 16, 2010.

The Internal Audit Division gave Oregon State University an opportunity to develop its own policy and to determine how pay rates would be established and enforced. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs (VPAA) convened a task force comprised of Deans, tenured administrators, professors and human resources staff who drafted the policy now in effect.

This document is intended to clarify the process and guide and inform academic unit supervisors as to how this policy should, and may, be implemented. Specifically, two aspects of the policy need to be emphasized.

- Faculty are permitted to engage in activities involving overload time not to exceed one day in a seven day week, on an average, or its equivalent during the academic year or other period of appointment, and that no full-time employee “shall engage in any outside employment that substantially interferes with duties.”
- For unclassified faculty, this restriction means that both overload effort and overload compensation is limited to an effective equivalent of no more than 8 hrs per week, 104 hours per term, or equivalent to 1 course a quarter. Internal audits have declared all overloads in excess of this amount to be in violation of OUS and OSU policy.

### Compensation for Instruction

- Overload compensation for tenure track faculty is based on the “standard rate of pay” for on-campus and Ecampus instruction.
- Student Credit Hours (SCH) cannot be used to justify compensation rates and is not subject to exemption (see below).
- Therefore, all instructor compensation will be based on a *per-course basis*.
- The “standard rate of pay” for any specific course, however, can be based on criteria such as: instructor qualifications (M.A./M.S., Ph.D.), credits, level of course (lower, upper division; graduate), workload (e.g., WIC versus non-WIC), and discipline (market).
- It is understood and accepted that compensation for all courses, including non lecture courses with no meeting times (e.g., doughnut courses, internships, etc.) should take into account the effort required to deliver the course. Although SCHs cannot be used exclusively to justify compensation rate, when the number of students enrolled dramatically impacts the effort (i.e., hours per week) needed to deliver a course, then compensation could reflect this.

### **Approval for Overload Pay**

A “request for overload pay” form will require at least three different signatures for approval, and will now be reviewed by the VPAA’s office before final approval can be granted.

Specifically, the order of signature approval is as follows:

1. Employee’s Supervisor (who will provide explanation and justification for compensation)
2. Employing College/Unit Authorized Representative (Dean’s Office)
3. Executive Officer or Authorized Representative (Optional: Needed if overload is for work outside the faculty’s member home academic unit).
4. Business Center HR Representative (Until CLA Business Center hires such an official, these will be forwarded to Jeri Hammer in HR).
5. Finally, all requests will then be reviewed by the VPAA’s office for final approval. Once a policy process is approved, only those requests outside these guidelines will need VPAA approval.

- **Criteria for approval at step #1 (academic unit supervisor).** OUS policy requires that no full-time employee “shall engage in any outside employment that substantially interferes with duties.” It is the responsibility of the academic unit supervisor to ensure that any overload duties do not interfere with the satisfactory execution of an employee’s in-load duties. The unit supervisor will review the employee’s performance based on his/her position description to determine whether adequate performance standards are being met in teaching, research and service. Meeting these standards is a prerequisite for teaching overload courses.
- **Criteria for approval at step #2 (Dean).** Each unit (school, department, program) in the College of Liberal Arts must submit a plan to the CLA Dean that is in compliance with OUS and OSU overload, instructor and Ecampus instructor policies.
- **Criteria for approval at step #3, which will be evaluated by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs.** The primary concern is compliance with Oregon State Law and Oregon University System (OUS) policy regarding overload and Ecampus instructor pay. The Oregon University System (OUS) has established rules and policies regarding overload pay (*OUS Fiscal Policy Manual 10.33, Oregon Administrative Rule 580-021-0025, and Oregon State University’s (OSU) Conflict of Commitment Policy*). These documents stipulate:
  - Activities involving overload time should not exceed, on average, the equivalent of one additional course per term.
  - Compensation for overload courses should be consistent with the compensation provided for similar course delivered by instructional faculty in their normal duties.
  - Academic unit supervisors or deans, in consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs are responsible for identifying an appropriate range for overload instruction in their units with a clear justification for how those compensation levels are set.
  - On-campus and Ecampus instructor compensation will from this time forward be based on a *per-course basis*. Compensation for overload teaching cannot be defined as a function of students or student credit hours.
  - Overload compensation for tenure track faculty is based on the “standard rate of pay” for on-campus and Ecampus instruction.

- The “standard rate of pay” for instructors and overload compensation can be based on: instructor qualifications (M.A./M.S., Ph.D.), credits (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), level of course (lower, upper division; graduate), workload (e.g., WIC versus non-WIC), and discipline (market). Student Credit Hours (SCH) cannot be used to justify compensation rates and is not subject to exemption (see below).
- The “standard rate of pay” should provide reasonable compensation for work and high quality instruction for students.
- Tenure-track faculty eligible for overload compensation must not be in violation of OSU’s “Conflict of Commitment” policy ([http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/documents/conflict\\_commitment\\_policy.pdf](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/documents/conflict_commitment_policy.pdf)).
- Exceptions to the policy for nascent courses, programs, certificates and degrees may be petitioned to the CLA Dean and VPAA (see **Exceptions to Policy** below). A three-year implementation period may be provided for course, program, certificate and degree development. At the end of the three-year period a formal review will be conducted to determine whether such activities should be terminated or continue to operate.

**New Policy Regarding Instructor Compensation (On-campus and Ecampus).**

- Tenure-track faculty may teach Ecampus courses in-load, but will not receive additional compensation.
- On-campus and Ecampus instructor compensation must now be based on a per-course basis.
- Student Credit Hours (SCH) cannot be used to justify compensation rates and is not grounds for an exception to the policy.
- The “standard rate of pay” for instructors can be based on: instructor qualifications (M.A./M.S., Ph.D.), credits (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), level of course (lower, upper division; graduate), workload (e.g., WIC versus non-WIC), and discipline (market).
- The “standard rate of pay” should provide reasonable compensation for work and high quality instruction for students.
- Instructors, both on campus and Ecampus, with a total appointment of at least .50 FTE will be provided benefits per OUS requirements.
  - When appointed by different academic units, the effective FTE will be the sum of all appointments.
  - When the total appointment entitles an instructor for benefits, the responsibilities of each academic unit for paying these benefits must be negotiated and explicitly stated before the appointment can be made.

**Suggestions for Setting Workloads and Compensation for Non Tenure-Track Faculty**

- As a rule of thumb, one course will be considered the effort equivalent of 0.20 FTE
- Academic Unit Supervisors, with the approval of the Dean, can determine alternative equivalents where appropriate. These exceptions will be reviewed by the VPAA’s Office.
  - For example, labor intensive courses requiring more hours per week to deliver than a representative course within that academic unit can have a higher FTE equivalent than other courses.

- Courses that, for whatever reason, do not require an effort equivalent to 0.20 FTE may be set at a lower FTE level. For example, it is possible to define a 2 credit course as being equivalent to only 0.10 FTE.
- “Standard rate of pay” does not mean that the compensation for every course at OSU is fixed at the same rate. Rather, it reflects a standard set of criteria that determines compensation in an equitable manner. For example, the actual compensation given for a course may vary as a result of:
  - Instructor credentials and degrees
  - Particular discipline
  - Course credits (e.g., 3 credits versus 4 credits)
  - Course level (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate)
  - Effort required to deliver it
- *Example:* An academic unit supervisor might determine that the effort required by an instructor to deliver a given course with very low enrollment (i.e., less than 5 students) via E-campus is actually much less than 0.20 FTE. Certain doughnut courses are a good example of this. In these instances, the FTE equivalent may be justifiably set at a lower rate (e.g., 0.10 FTE or even 0.05 FTE per course). In any case, the effort equivalence determined for a given course (or section) needs to be justified without relying on SCH.

### **Exceptions to Policy (VPAA)**

All requests for exceptions to the policy must be submitted to and approved by the VPPA’s Office before implementation. No exceptions will be granted to pay overload compensation or on-campus/E-campus instructors on a SCH basis. Exceptions to the standard rate of pay may be requested for such situations as:

- Critical program needs
- Ensuring student access to required courses
- Development of nascent courses, programs, certificates and degrees

## 6. Compensation policy from Fisheries and Wildlife

12 April 2011

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife maintains one of the highest quality undergraduate and graduate academic programs in fisheries and wildlife sciences in the nation. Our goal is to retain that preeminence by continuing to be innovative in the development and delivery our curricula. Maintaining a pool of quality instructors and offering fair and equitable compensation for curriculum development and delivery is paramount to this goal. This policy sets department compensation rates for curriculum development and instruction for both on- and off-campus instruction and for overload compensation. This policy is consistent with the OSU Policy on Overload Compensation dated 16 September 2010.

### Curriculum Development

The department's undergraduate and graduate curricula are the purview of department's Curriculum and Graduate committees, respectively. Service on those committees is an in-load expectation of the members of those committees. The development of new courses for on-campus instruction is an in-load expectation of the faculty developing the courses they are assigned to teach. However, the conversion of on-campus courses to online delivery formats is not an in-load expectation of our faculty. The department will compensate faculty for developing online courses in the form of a block grant (Table 1). The block grant approach is used because some faculty may prefer to engage graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) for one or two terms to assist in converting course materials to online formats, while other faculty will use the entire block grant on salary for themselves. A block grant based on credit hours for a course acknowledges that the amount of work for curriculum development is proportional to the number of "lectures" that must be prepared.

**Table 1. Compensation rates for development of online courses.**

Credit hours	Block grant amount
2	\$6,000
3	\$9,000
4	\$12,000
5	\$15,000

### Curriculum Delivery

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife employs instructors, research faculty and tenure track faculty on overload for delivery of curriculum on a per-section and per-term basis. Faculty on overload will teach a maximum of one section per term (OSU Policy on Overload Compensation dated 16 September 2010); instructors or research faculty may teach multiple sections per term. The majority of instruction covered under this policy will be at

less than 0.5 FTE. In cases where instructors or research faculty members exceed 0.5 FTE the department may elect to hire the instructor or faculty member on an annual contract for specific teaching and advising duties. Annual contracts will be individually negotiated at competitive rates where the department's intent is to provide long-term employment for high quality teachers and advisers. Compensation rates are based on 3-credit classes and will be adjusted proportionally for 2-, 4- or 5-credit classes. Compensation will be the same for online (Table 2) and on-campus (Table 3) instruction, but enrollment caps will differ between the two instruction modes. Enrollment caps are lower for online classes than for on-campus classes because of the large number of instructor-to-student interactions required when teaching online learners. Furthermore, when we hire an instructor to teach courses, all curricular materials are provided to the instructor requiring minimal class preparation time. In cases where on-campus instructors must develop substantial curricular materials additional compensation may be negotiated. Minimum enrollment numbers are consistent with OSU's minimum class size guidelines. Classes below the minimum may be canceled depending on student access to other classes.

**Table 2. Compensation rates for online course instruction for a 3-credit class<sup>a</sup>.**

Course Level	Compensation (per course section)			Class enrollment Maximum/minimum
	Instructors with < 3 years experience	Instructors with ≥ 3 years experience	Research or tenure-track faculty	
Graduate only (500 or 600)	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,290	15/6
Slash courses (400/500)	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$7,000	25 in aggregate/15
Upper Division (300 or 400)	\$5,100	\$6,000	\$6,500	25/15
Lower Division (100 or 200)	\$5,100	\$6,000	\$6,500	30/25

<sup>a</sup> Compensation rates are for 3-credit classes; 2-, 4- and 5-credit classes will be compensated at 0.66, 1.33 and 1.66 times the 3-credit rate, respectively.

**Table 3. Compensation rates for on-campus course instruction for a 3-credit class<sup>a</sup>.**

Course Level	Compensation (per course section)			Class enrollment Maximum/minimum
	Instructors with < 3 years experience	Instructors with ≥ 3 years experience	Research or tenure-track faculty	
Graduate only (500 or 600)	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,290	20/6
Slash courses (400/500)	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$7,000	50 in

				aggregate/15
Upper Division (300 or 400)	\$5,100	\$6,000	\$6,500	75/15
Lower Division (100 or 200)	\$5,100	\$6,000	\$6,500	100/25

<sup>a</sup> Compensation rates are for 3-credit classes; 2-, 4- and 5-credit classes will be compensated at 0.66, 1.33 and 1.66 times the 3-credit rate, respectively.

### **Compensation for Cross-listed Classes**

In cases where cross-listed classes are taught by faculty with home organizations in other departments, Fisheries and Wildlife will transfer funds to the home department consistent with the home organization's policy for instructional compensation and proportional to the number of Fisheries and Wildlife majors in the class. Thus, if a cross-listed was 75% Fisheries and Wildlife majors, we would transfer 75% of the instructor's pay and OPE for that class at the rate the home department has agreed to pay its instructor.

### **Supervision of Graduate Teaching Assistants for Online Delivery**

Many of our online classes are taught by GTAs supervised by a faculty member who is the instructor of record. Our model for funding graduate students to teach online classes has provided the department and individual faculty with numerous GTAs that we previously could not have funded. These GTA's, controlled by individual faculty for developing a DE course, are a significant benefit to those faculty members. Although not involved in the course on a day-to-day basis the instructor of record is responsible for insuring quality of the course and for resolving issues related to grades and academic dishonesty. In some cases, faculty must supervise a graduate student for whom they are not the student's major advisor. The department will pay faculty members \$500 per online course to supervise a graduate teaching assistant who is not one of their graduate students.

### **Additional Compensation or Support for Writing Intensive Courses**

Writing intensive classes (WIC) require substantial additional work for editing assignments and multiple drafts of research papers. WIC guidelines suggest that a GTA be assigned for WIC classes with enrollments greater than 30 students. The department will compensate instructors or faculty an additional 25% for teaching a WIC class and will assign a 0.49-FTE GTA for each 30 students when enrollments exceed 30 students.

### **Supervision of Professional Science Masters Graduate Student**

Supervision of non-thesis graduate students in Fisheries and Wildlife (Professional Science Master in Fisheries and Wildlife Administration) will require working with the student to develop their program of study, advising them on their internship and reading the resulting report or documents, and participating in the student's defense. We will provide faculty \$2,500 for supervision of a PSM graduate student when the student completes their degree.

### **Combination of Duties for Overload Compensation**

OSU's Policy on Overload Compensation restricts overload to no more than the equivalent of one course per quarter. The development of a course where the faculty member applies

the entire block grant to overload or the teaching of a course will qualify as one course under this policy; these activities cannot be combined during a quarter. Other duties such as supervising graduate students to teach online classes, supervising Professional Science Masters students or partial use of a course development block grant may be combined for a total overload compensation of \$7,000 per term, but these latter duties cannot be conducted while a faculty member is teaching for overload. The \$7,000 represents the maximum a faculty member might be compensated for teaching a 3 credit class for overload.

Authorizing Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_  
W. Daniel Edge  
Department Head  
\_\_\_\_\_ Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sonny Ramaswamy  
Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences  
\_\_\_\_\_ Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Becky Warner  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  
\_\_\_\_\_ Date



## 7. References describing the Benefits of Hybrid Courses

Dziuban, C., Hartman, J., & Moskal, P. (2004, March 30). [Blended learning](#). *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research Research Bulletin*.

Hensley, G. (2005). [Creating a hybrid college course: Instructional design notes and recommendations for beginners](#).

Humbert, J. & Vignare, K. (2005). [RIT introduces blended learning—successfully!](#) In J. C. Moore (ed.), *Elements of Quality Online Education: Engaging Communities, Wisdom from the Sloan Consortium, Volume 2 in the Wisdom Series*. Needham, MA: Sloan-C.

Martyn, M. (2003). [The hybrid online model: Good practice](#). *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 26 (1), 18-23.

Riffell, S.K., & Sibley, D.F. (2004). [Can hybrid course formats increase attendance in undergraduate environmental science courses?](#) *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education*, 33, 1-5.

Spilka, R., (2002, March). [Approximately "Real World" Learning with the Hybrid Model](#). *Teaching with Technology Today*, 8 (6).

Kaletka, R., Skibba, K. A., & Joosten, T. (In Press). Discovering, designing, and delivering hybrid courses. In A. Picciano & C. Dziuban (Eds.), *Blended learning: Research perspectives*. Needham, MA: The Sloan Consortium. (no online link available)

Reasons, Saxon G., Valadares, Kevin, & Slavkin, Michael. (2005). [Questioning the hybrid model: Student outcomes in different course formats](#). *Journal of Asynchronous Learning*, 9(1), 83-94.

Rovai, A.P., & Jordan, H.M. (2004). [Blended learning and sense of community: A comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses](#). *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*.

Utts, J., Sommer, B., Acredolo, C., Maher, W. M., & Matthews R. H. (2003). [A study comparing traditional and hybrid internet-based instruction in introductory statistics classes](#). *Journal of Statistics*, 11(3), np.

## 8. Ecampus compensation policies prior to and as of Winter Term 2011

Excerpted from the Extended Campus Web site:

### Instructor hire and pay effective Winter 2011

- **Effective Winter 2011, Extended Campus will no longer handle instructor pay arrangements. All instructor hiring and pay arrangements will be the responsibility of the hiring academic department. The department will establish the instructor's rate of pay and will take care of hiring paperwork, in collaboration with the College's Business Service Center.**
- Please contact your academic department Chair or your College's Business Service Center for details.

### Instructor hire and pay policy prior to Winter 2011

Prior to winter 2011, the academic department could choose to both hire and pay course instructors directly or elect to have Ecampus pay instructors who have been approved by the department. *The instructor wage and payroll benefit expenses processed by Ecampus were charged directly into budget indexes designated by each college.*

**Instructors were paid up to a maximum of 180 SCH per term (60 students in 3 credit courses; 45 students in 4 credit courses).**

- The 180 SCH limit was calculated per instructor, not per course.
- Pay rates remained the same: \$55 per undergraduate SCH and \$85 per graduate SCH.
- These SCH could have been a mix/match of undergraduate or graduate, but the maximum is 180 SCH.
- At 180 undergraduate SCH, the pay would equal \$9,900.
- If all 180 SCH were graduate level, the maximum pay would have been \$15,300 (very unlikely due to lower enrollments in graduate courses.)
- PEBB benefits (health insurance) would not have been initiated by Ecampus pay. (180 SCH were equivalent to 0.49 FTE)

**Compensation for overload instruction cannot exceed 104 hours per academic term at the instructor's current salary rate. Reference: OUS Fiscal Policy Manual, Personnel – Payroll Index (FASOM) 10.33, Overload Compensation ([http://www.ous.edu/content/div/fasom/sec10/10.00\\_10.71.pdf](http://www.ous.edu/content/div/fasom/sec10/10.00_10.71.pdf)). The academic department has the responsibility to work with the Human Resources office to ensure compliance with this policy.**

An OUS report, Distance Education Policy and Framework 2000

<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/other/ippde/report/index.html#a1>

Oregon Administrative Rules relevant to intellectual copyright issues

<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/other/ippde/report/index.html#a2>

## 9. Distance Education Committee: 2010-2011 Annual Report

### Membership

Bruce Dugger, '11 Chair	Fisheries & Wildlife
John Myers '11	Media Services
Dawn Anzinger '12	Forest Ecosystems & Society
John Edwards '13	Psychology
Roger Nielsen '13	Geosciences
Lisa Templeton '13	Ecampus

#### *Ex-Officios:*

Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee (TBA)  
Curriculum Council (TBA)  
Graduate Council (TBA)  
Library (Stephanie Buck)  
Extended Campus (TBA)

Student Members -

- Graduate (TBA)
- Undergraduate (TBA)

*Executive Committee Liaison – John Selker*

### Committee Charges for 2010-2011

At a meeting with the FS Exec Committee during summer 2010, the DEC Chair brought it to the attention of the FSEC that the need and purpose of the DEC was unclear (see 2009-2010 annual report). The standing rules no longer applied and it was clear that the FSEC had no clear role for the DEC. The conversation was productive (but we think unresolved) and resulted in the FSEC assigning the DEC a broad range of issues to prioritize and consider for the 2010-2011 academic year. The list of topics included:

0. Financial model for Ecampus – work with the University Budget Committee on recommendations as to the funding model
1. Goals for Ecampus from an academic perspective; what is the mission of Ecampus from an academic/educational perspective
2. Impact of distance education on P&T – how do distance education activities “count” – are policy statements needed?
3. Policy regarding on-campus students access to Ecampus courses both undergraduate and graduate
  - o one complaint we have heard from on-campus students is that required courses in their major are only available through Ecampus and so they have to pay extra

- tuition in order to take a required course. I have not verified to determine if this is actually true, but, if so, the DEC may want to explore a policy about this
- Graduate students on assistantship (who therefore need to be enrolled in 12 credits each term) cannot use Ecampus credits to count toward the 12 credits. This has been explained to me as a budget issue. DEC may want to explore alternative strategies or options for graduate assistants
4. Overload compensation policy – this new policy prohibits Ecampus faculty from getting paid based on the number of students/SCH generation because some faculty were abusing the system. I do not know how much faculty input there was to this policy. Maybe it did come to DEC prior to implementation, but if not, it should have been one that had come to the DEC for discussion prior to implementation.
  5. Faculty Development for distance education – recommendation to inform Ecampus as to the most effective faculty development opportunities
  6. Tuition levels of Ecampus compared to competitors – a recommendation from DEC to Ecampus
  7. Intellectual property policy surrounding distance education
  8. Course/program quality and assessment of distance courses and programs – what oversight is needed beyond the Curriculum Council review of new courses? What oversight is needed in terms of assessment strategies. Gita Ramaswamy, Director of Assessment, would be a good person to consult with regarding this issue.

We included on our agenda the recurring item of revision of standing rules and an additional item of considering changing the name of the committee. During spring term, the DEC was also asked by the FSEC for a report updating how OSU and Ecampus were progressing with meeting the requirements of the newly passed “State Authorization Rule”. Below is a summary of our progress on these items. Recommendations and action items are bold, italicized and highlighted in yellow.

### **2010 – 2011 Activities and Accomplishments**

The DEC met four times this year. I believe my committee members were prepared to meet more frequently; however, my schedule this year limited our productivity. At the first meeting, we spent some time debating and prioritizing the issues listed above to shape our agenda for the remainder of the academic year. The committee felt that items 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 were low priority or being dealt with by other committees. For example, several issues were being deliberated on by the Ecampus task force, created by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Provost. Three members of the DEC (B. Dugger, R. Nielsen, L. Templeton) served on the task force and we agree with the action items and guidelines produced in the Ecampus Task Force Report. We recommend the FSEC review that report.

1. Agenda item: Should the name of the Distance Education Committee be changed?

There was general agreement that the phrase “Distance Education” is outdated and fails to capture the evolving nature of online education at OSU. For example, 25-30% of our student credit hours at Ecampus are generated by on-campus students. Thus, the committee agreed that changing the name of the committee would be useful. *After consideration of several alternatives, the committee recommended its name be changed to the Online Education Committee.*

## 2. Revise the Standing Rules of the committee

In our 2009-2010 report we summarized our deliberations on the current list of standing rules. It was our committee’s recommendation that rules 1-4 be deleted and that rules 5 and 6 be modified. In retrospect, given the nature of the DEC Chair’s conversation with the FSEC during the summer of 2010, one standing rule seems sufficient. We spent relatively little time deliberating this issue, but have the following recommended standing rule:

*The OEC considers and provides recommendations to the Faculty Senate on a wide range of philosophical and technical issues considered important to faculty and students related to the role of online education in meeting the academic mission of Oregon State University.*

The rapidly changing role of Ecampus and other online learning opportunities at OSU would seem to require that the standing rules be flexible, so we see little value in being more prescriptive.

## 3. State Authorization for Ecampus programs

As part of the US Higher Education Act, there is a new requirement called the Program Integrity Rule (PIR). It appears targeted at irregularities associated with how “for profit” colleges are taking advantage of the student federal aid system to make profit, to the detriment of students. As is often the case, it appears to have a variety of unintended consequences for public universities like OSU. Alfonso Bradoch and Lisa Templeton of Ecampus provided an update on what’s being done to bring OSU Ecampus in compliance with this new rule.

The rule states:

“If an institution is offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a State in which it is not physically located, the institution must meet any State requirements for it to be legally offering postsecondary distance or correspondence education in that State. We are further providing that an institution must be able to document upon request by the Department that it has the applicable State approval.”

Twenty states currently have a similar requirement, but it is typically only applicable to universities that have a “physical presence” in the state. As you can imagine, the definition of physical presence varies and can be as limited as having exam proctors or internships. This new federal regulation has forced most other states that lack a current policy on regulating DE programs in general to consider adopting one.

Ecampus is taking the lead in assuring that OSU complies with the new rule. Unfortunately, complying appears rather onerous. Each program offered by OSU (not just the university as a whole) must be approved in each state each year. Ecampus has contacted each state to determine what it will take to come into compliance. The cost associated with meeting state regulations varies by state. OSU Ecampus is paying the costs associated with distance education approval and they estimate it will take \$150,000 to \$300,000 to get approval from all 50 states. Additionally, there will be recurring costs to maintain standing in each state each year. Because of the general problems that universities around the country are having meeting these requirements, the federal government extended the deadline from July 2011 to July 2014. Oregon’s congressional delegation and the OUS Chancellor’s office are aware of the problem with the PIR, and there is some hope that a political solution might be brokered.

We are fortunate that the considerable revenue generated by Ecampus has provided the funding needed to address the new regulation. Ecampus thinks that, if nothing changes, the cost of complying with this rule may stifle development of new online programs at other universities that lack such funding.

Lastly, the new rule also has implications for on campus programs that offer internships that are based in other states. There is a separate effort, headed by Becky Warner, to address this issue.

If you are interested in reading additional materials on this new rule, the following web sites are useful:

<http://wcet.wiche.edu/advance/state-approval>

#### 4. Undergraduate and Graduate access to Ecampus courses

We spent the remainder of our time this year dealing with this agenda item. As online education gains a more prominent role in meeting OSU’s educational mission a couple issues associated with equity and fairness to students have come up that need to be addressed.

1. Should undergraduates who are based on-campus be required to take Ecampus courses as part of the requirements for earning their degree?

This is an issue because the costs of Ecampus and oncampus courses can vary. This question was also being considered by the Ecampus Task Force. For the sake of efficiency, the ETF took the lead in crafting a policy recommendation (recall that several DEC members serve on the Task Force). The Ecampus Task Force outlined a guiding principle related to the delivery of instruction for oncampus students. It reads:

*“In considering the issues for on-campus students taking Ecampus courses or hybrid courses, we started with confirmation of a guiding principle for delivery of instruction for on-campus courses: Regardless of the mechanism of delivery of instruction, students paying Corvallis on-campus tuition and fees should have the ability to fulfill degree requirements without being expected to enroll in an Ecampus course. While there may be pedagogical reasons for delivering instruction to on-campus students via hybrid or on-line approaches, the costs of these experiences should be included in the on-campus tuition and fees. Corvallis campus students should have access to all needed courses at the Corvallis campus pricing structure. Students, of course, may choose to complete degree requirements by taking Ecampus courses and opt to pay extra for an Ecampus course.”*

This recommendation specifically excludes required field programs, most of which carry additional fees related to transportation, food and housing, and for which there is a longstanding pedagogical rationale.

***The DEC agrees with this guiding principle and we recommend the Faculty Senate adopt a resolution supporting this philosophy***

2. Graduate students on a GTA or GRA cannot use Ecampus credits to count toward the 12 credits they must enroll in to maintain their academic standing.

Faculty from multiple colleges on campus have complained about this issue and requested that it “be fixed”. Complaints have risen over the past few years as the availability of graduate courses offered through Ecampus has increased. This issue was an agenda item for not only the DEC in 2010-2011 but in varied forms for the University Budget Committee and the Ecampus Task Force. Because of other priorities, the UBC did not address this issue this year. The Ecampus Task Force considered the issue in a broad sense when they considered issues associated with access, equity and fairness for students, but they deferred to the DEC to consider this issue in detail.

It is not clear when this policy was instituted. Regardless, based on conversations with the Graduate School and University Budget Office, it does appear to have originated with the Provosts Office (it was not a Graduate School policy decision), and it was budget driven. The policy was implemented because of the fundamental difference between On-campus and Ecampus regarding how tuition dollars are dispersed. Currently, all graduate tuition is paid into

the university general fund, while tuition paid to Ecampus is largely returned directly to the academic units teaching the course.

The nature of the problem varies with the specific circumstance. Here are three examples.

1. Graduate students given tuition remissions as part of a GTA or GRA can not apply Ecampus courses towards meeting their 12 credit requirement.
2. Students willing to pay the Ecampus tuition cannot use Ecampus credits towards the graduate assistantship 12 credit hour (full time) requirement. This requires them to sign up for additional on campus credits in order to be considered “full time”. This has resulted in students carrying 15-21 credits a term, at considerable cost in time, effort and money.

This problem has also revealed that:

3. A PI is not allowed to use tuition money in a grant to pay Ecampus tuition.

***While there may be fiscal reasons for this policy, academically it makes no sense and the DEC recommends that the FSEC engage the Provost’s Office in discussions to change this policy.***

During discussions about how to resolve this problem with various entities on campus, the general statement that “...changing the policy will result in a loss of revenue to OSU’s general fund...” invariably was uttered. While this seems true, the magnitude of this impact is unknown and the statement alone is not sufficient to preclude searching for solutions or changing the policy.

During our deliberations, we felt solutions could differ depending on the specific scenario. Additionally, lacking specific information about the magnitude of the financial impact changing this policy would have on OSU, some data seem needed to help guide a long-term solution.

***We recommend a two step process for moving towards a resolution:***

- 1. The policy statement should be revised immediately to allow graduate students to pay Ecampus tuition and have those credit hours count towards the 12 credit hours required to maintain their academic standing. Second, PIs should be allowed to pay Ecampus tuition from a grant.***

If a student is paying their tuition they should have the right to select from the full range of course options at OSU. While keeping Ecampus separate from on campus might have made sense when Ecampus was a very small enterprise with a very limited course catalog, that is no longer the case, and we feel this artificial barrier between Ecampus and On-campus needs to be reconsidered. Similarly, a PI that raises tuition dollars through grants should be able to support



their graduate student in a way the PI and student feels best supports the student's academic development. ***Additionally, PIs should not be required to specifically identify "Ecampus tuition" as a line item in their grants.*** The need for students to take an Ecampus course will often not be planned in advance; rather, it will arise because of unforeseen consequences.

Changing the policy as recommended above will resolve part of the problem and provide an opportunity to collect data related to other parts of the problem. It was clear from conversations that resistance to adopting wholesale changes to the current policy in part stems from uncertainty about the market for Ecampus courses by on campus graduate students. Once some data have been gathered from step one, they can be used along with financial models to perform a more detailed analysis of the fiscal consequences associated with allowing graduate students broader access to Ecampus. The underlying principle behind this recommendation is that both cases represent "new monies" for OSU. It remains an administrative decision as to how they are to be distributed equitably. Towards that end,

- 2. We recommend that Faculty Senate request that OSU undertake a formal review of the fiscal consequences associated with allowing on campus graduate students who receive tuition remissions to count Ecampus courses towards maintaining their academic standing.***

Such a review would provide real fiscal data that could be used to discuss this issue more objectively with the faculty. We understand the issue of tuition remissions is more complicated because of the firewall between the OSU General Fund and Ecampus accounting. However, that logistical reality is inconsistent with an academic philosophy that values fairness and access to courses for all students at OSU. We recognize that nothing currently prevents all students from taking Ecampus courses, but the financial reality of requiring they pay more in effect serves that purpose. Finally,

***We recommend that the FSEC resist any effort by the administration to require academic departments to pay Ecampus tuition for graduate students.***

This "solution" has been discussed within the University Budget Committee, but we do not believe this is a feasible solution. The individual units already carry a large part of the burden of delivery of the courses. Such a mandate would stifle efforts to develop and deliver quality Ecampus programs and likely constrain access to Ecampus courses by graduate students.

## 10. Proposed policy for funding model for off-campus courses

June, 2011

### A proposal for funding the offering of multidisciplinary, field-oriented coursework at Oregon State University

**Summary:** Developing signature, experiential coursework at off-campus locations is hindered by financial constraints. A model allocating tuition to promote and support these courses is proposed using the OSU Summer Session (86/14) revenue-sharing approach. The goals are 1) to stimulate the development of unique, multidisciplinary coursework and educational outcomes consistent with the educational goals and metrics of OSU's strategic plan and 2) to free the development of those experiences from competing with high-demand, on-campus curricular programs for scarce resources.

#### Introduction and Need

National trends in recruitment, retention, and graduation in science and engineering are alarming, and call for new educational approaches.<sup>i</sup> Practical, hands-on courses that include field experience and interaction with practitioners and professionals are viewed as an important national need.<sup>ii</sup> Such courses can provide compelling student experiences and are powerful tools for recruitment and engagement. As Oregon's statewide university, OSU has widespread facilities and faculty that offer opportunities for such "immersion" learning. The experiences at these facilities include internships, residential coursework, experiential education, and research for OSU's undergraduate and graduate students; these provide unique opportunities that often represent a capstone in the OSU educational experience<sup>iii</sup>. Benefits of these programs include enhanced student success and competitiveness for jobs upon graduation as well as the visibility it brings OSU – with payoffs in student recruitment and retention.

Specific off-campus locations for OSU include the Hatfield Marine Science Center (HMSC), the Andrews Experimental Forest, the OSU Geosciences field station in Mitchell, OR, the Branch Stations of the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Astoria Seafood Laboratory. An additional site could include the Malheur Field Station in eastern Oregon. Although OSU-wide statistics on this topic are difficult to obtain, the past decade has seen a decline in the numbers of student credit hours in this kind of course. For example, student credit hours in OSU courses at the HMSC, declined by 35% from 1993 to 2004<sup>iv</sup>.

These types of educational offerings have been hindered by the relatively high cost of coursework. Class sizes are typically smaller, and costs for specialized laboratories, transportation, and instructors combine to serve as disincentives to those colleges or departments with an interest in these courses. Furthermore, incentives are not available to

encourage faculty to develop new course or curriculum offerings, especially for interdisciplinary teaching programs. The current budget allocation model lacks appropriate incentives, and instead puts the onus on individual colleges or departments to find ways to fund them. Often these high cost programs lose out to the demands for increased access in key “gateway” courses. This, in turn, makes it more difficult to achieve the OSU strategic plan’s objective of new, multidisciplinary courses that cross traditional department or college lines. Adding fees to already burdened students (who face their own financial challenges) has not proven to be an adequate solution. The net result is declining numbers of colleges or departments willing to invest in developing and offering these classes; units responsible for the facilities lack the needed incentives to entice departments to put them to full use.

## **Process**

HMSC and the Biology Program have been leading the discussion of this issue since 2004, using the Marine Biology Program as a model. The Provost provided provisional approval for using a dedicated revenue model for this course for the last seven (7) spring terms, but asked for a more comprehensive proposal. Mark Merickel, Extended Campus, was working on a report to form the basis of that proposal but left OSU in early 2008 before it was complete.

Later in 2008, a discussion was convened with representatives from HMSC, COAS, Science, Agricultural Science, Biology, and Extended Campus to review the history, rationale, and issues. The participants in the discussion included Mark Abbott, Carol Babcock, Martin Barry, Sherm Bloomer, George Boehlert, Stella Coakley, Bob Duncan, Nancy Heiligman, Rich Holdren, and Bob Mason. The group agreed to prepare a proposal for the Provost to consider.

A meeting subsequent to the above took place on April 15, 2011 with George Boehlert and members of Extended Campus: Dave King, Lisa Templeton, Maurine Powell and Alfonso Bradoch resulting in further refinement of this proposal.

## **The Pilot Model**

The OSU Marine Biology program has been using an approach for the past seven (7) spring terms which has provided stable funding for the program and allowed it to continue to provide a unique learning experience for students, but has not been the most efficient, cost effective model for students and the University alike. Some of the lessons from the pilot program include:

- This is a successful way to insure the programs have a stable revenue stream as long as enrollments meet an appropriate level.
- It provides units heads with an incentive to plan and organize these experiences.

- This model, applied to the Marine Biology (BI 450/451) course, has been administered by Extended Campus, utilizing both Ecampus and Summer Session personnel.
  - The model functioned under Ecampus, which waived the Ecampus per credit hour fees and charged tuition based on the academic year rates; but with tuition charged for all 16 credits (i.e., the model was not subjected to the existing on-campus tuition plateau).
  - Tuition revenue was distributed to the College of Science using the Summer Session revenue model (86/14), which required manual tracking/coding of students participating in the program and was extremely labor intensive.
- The standard 'on-campus' tuition plateau also created an enhanced discontinuity in the perceived cost to students. For a residential student taking 16 SCH, the *average cost* per 'on-campus' SCH was comparatively less than the same 16 SCH taken through Ecampus or Summer Session. For students resident off-campus at HMSC, this was less contentious in a program like Marine Biology, which requires a large number of credits, than it is for a single course.

## **The Proposed Model**

We propose to use the existing Extended Campus/Summer Session tuition revenue (86/14) distribution model for all experiential courses offered year-round at 'off-campus' locations. Only those courses that meet a rigorous set of criteria (as noted below) would be allowed to function under this model. This means that by using the Summer Session revenue sharing model in this manner, 86% of the tuition revenue would be distributed to the academic College/Unit delivering the program and 14% would remain with Summer Session. Those courses currently offered during the summer already have access to the Summer Session (86/14) revenue sharing model and thus the new model would only apply Fall through Spring quarters.

Students would be charged current (fiscal year) Summer Session tuition rates during all terms, while mandatory 'on-campus' summer term and academic year fees would be waived; with the exception of pre-approved course fees.

The College/Unit receiving funds would be expected to expend those funds directly for support of the course(s) and hosting facility resource costs. Excess revenues, if any, would be invested in course improvements (equipment, curricular development, expanded field trips, program expansion, recruitment, etc.).

Criteria to allow the use of this model would be approved by the Provost and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The approval process would be managed by Summer Session, coordinating approvals with cognizant Deans, program heads/chairs, and Directors of the 'off-campus' hosting facility/unit to be used.

## **Approval Criteria**

Courses would be allowed to use this funding model provided they meet all of the following criteria:

- 1) Delivery of an experience that is clearly different than a traditional 'on-campus' course such that it takes advantage of the unique attributes of the course's location and has specific outcomes defined that relate to that experience
- 2) The course is delivered entirely, or nearly entirely (in terms of student time), at a site away from the OSU Corvallis or Cascades Campuses. Such courses would normally have a residential or overnight component. This is not for internships.
- 3) The course is offered at the undergraduate level (100-499); funding for similar graduate experiences requires a different discussion because of the complexity of tuition waivers.

Courses that are delivered on the main campuses of OSU (Corvallis or Cascades) which include short day or weekend excursions, even if they are visiting an off-campus OSU facility, would not be considered as meeting the criteria for this funding mechanism.

### **Pluses and Minuses**

This approach provides:

- A clear way of supporting innovative educational experiences as well as an incentive to Colleges/Units to pursue and maintain them.
- An easier-to-manage approach for Extended Campus as this proposal aligns with the "normal" mode of doing business.
- Provides clear criteria for invoking this mechanism for funding.

Areas of concern include:

- This will be somewhat more expensive for students as long as OSU maintains a tuition plateau for 'on-campus' undergraduates. Possible mechanisms to address this might include:
  - Recognize that the majority of similar programs do charge a premium either as a fee or as differential tuition. Therefore some excess tuition is not unreasonable.
  - Provide some portion of the tuition proceeds as a fellowship fund that could return the cost difference between on-campus and Summer Session tuition to students that qualify.
- Automated billing processes (within Banner) during the academic year that identify these specific courses and charge tuition appropriately would need to be created to maintain accuracy and efficiency while eliminating/reducing manual tracking and coding requirements.

- Re-establish a new course section number that would identify courses under this model. This would aid in automating tuition billing and efficient revenue distribution.
- Revamp the OSU Catalog search engine to include an “All Campus” function as the primary default. This will allow students to locate courses offered outside the Corvallis campus. The current search functions default to “Corvallis Campus,” making it difficult (or cumbersome) for students to locate non-Corvallis campus courses. The search function should clearly identify the location of each course to minimize confusion and errors during the registration process.
- This approach does not work for graduate programs until we resolve the issue of tuition waivers and Ecampus (online) courses.
- Units may try to find imaginative ways to “qualify” courses to use this method. We believe that the work involved in creating and delivering these experiences, based on the stated criteria, will provide a check on such impulses.

### **Benefits to Oregon State University**

This plan to enhance experiential learning addresses many aspects of the OSU strategic plan. With more undergraduate students participating in experiential learning, it will clearly benefit both the first and second goals respectively, while remaining consistent with many of the metrics to achieve these goals.

- *“Goal 1: Providing outstanding academic programs that further strengthen performance and pre-eminence in the three Signature Areas of Distinction:...,”* and,
- *“Goal 2: Provide an excellent teaching and learning environment and achieve student access, persistence and success through graduation and beyond that matches the best land grant universities in the country.”*

The plan is also consistent with educational goals of many sub-unit strategic plans, including those from the College of Science, College of Agricultural Sciences, College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, College of Forestry, Oregon Sea Grant, and the Hatfield Marine Science Center (HMSC). Appendix B, of the OSU strategic plan calls for HMSC to “...develop signature instructional, research, and outreach programs that build upon and benefit from [its] unique location, environment, facilities, and partnerships.” (Goal 1, Strategy 7). HMSC’s strategic plan developed in response to this challenge highlights education as its first goal, and is consistent with the OSU strategic plan. In addition, Signature or Capstone Residential courses<sup>i</sup> will be developed in the broad area of marine and coastal science, cutting across traditional departmental and college lines. The plan calls for a three-fold increase in courses and students over a four-year period, along with enhanced undergraduate research and internship programs. Therefore, in light of OSU’s new divisional structure, this approach will encourage development of multidisciplinary coursework both within and among divisions.

From the broader educational perspective, such highly visible courses will benefit our students and OSU’s reputation for quality education. It will also encourage departments to

consider new, creative opportunities at off-campus sites, including multidisciplinary, and cutting edge courses. Creative programming combined with aggressive marketing will encourage non-OSU students to take new courses, increasing overall tuition revenue to the University. It will also expose OSU students to a greater number of professionals, including agency scientists, courtesy faculty, and industry practitioners, thus increasing our students' competitiveness in the job market.

### **Next steps**

We would like to request approval of this proposal by the Provost, after consultation with the Provost Council.

### **Strategy for implementation**

We propose developing the approach for implementation beginning Fall 2011 (201201).

### **Endnotes**

---

<sup>i</sup> "The Science And Engineering Workforce *Realizing America's Potential*." National Science Board, National Science Foundation NSB 03-69, 2003.

<sup>ii</sup> a. *Transforming Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology*. NAS Committee on Undergraduate Science Education. National Academies of Science, 1999.

b. *The Role of Biological Field Stations in Education and Recruitment into the Biological Sciences*. Report of a Workshop. Organization of Biological Field Stations. 2004.

Authors: M.J. Klug, J. Hodder, and H. Swain.

<sup>iii</sup> "Total Immersion – Enhancing the OSU Student Experience." *OSU Perspectives*, Vol. 1 (3). May, 2003.

<sup>iv</sup> The decline was even greater in 2003, when the Marine Biology course (BI 450/451) was cancelled due to financial constraints. It was offered in 2004 with funding from the Provost, and has since been offered with a variant of the model proposed here.