



Co-curricular Assessment Report

Program/Department Name: eStarkstate

Year of CAR Completion: 2016-17

CAR Cycle: 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17

Co-curricular Assessment Report

Organization of Program Review Materials:

- ◆ Component I: Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component II: Review of Assessment Data
- ◆ Component III: Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component IV: Recommendations and Executive Summary
- ◆ Appendix A: Co-curricular Program/Department Summary Work Plan

NOTE: Please spell out any acronym the first time it is used.

NOTE: Whenever possible, link answers to supplemental documentation that you are providing.

Component I

Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report

Based on your previous CAR review, identify strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and progress to date. (Please enter NA in these areas if this is your first CAR.) **If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.****

Program/Department: eStarkState

Strengths:

NA

Areas of improvement:

NA

Opportunities:

NA

Threats:

NA

Progress to Date:

NA

Component II

Review of Previous Assessment Data

***If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.*

1. What changes have been recommended that have had a positive effect on your program's outcomes? (Please be specific.)

NA

2. What changes to your program/department were made based on findings from the previous CAR?

NA

Component III

Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report

Criterion 1.0 Mission, Values and Goals

Mission: eStarkState promotes the achievement of students' educational goals by supporting faculty development in the areas of technology, best practices in teaching online, and student-centered course design through the creation of innovative, flexible learning spaces which provide unique opportunities for quality learning and student engagement.

Values: NA

Vision: eStarkState will be the leading provider of online learning in Northeast Ohio, by creating innovative learning environments focused on pedagogical quality, and student-centered learning, supported by well-trained and engaged faculty.

Goals:

- To increase access by supporting the development of web-based courses and programs.
- To partner with faculty in the design of engaging and efficient online courses.
- To improve online completion rates.
- To continuously enhance the quality of eStarkState services.

***Note if any changes have been made to the mission, values, and/or goals since the last CAR.**

Criterion 2.0 Baseline Data

1.) What baseline data has your Department collected during this CAR term?

eStarkState consistently measures the number of Web 2, 3 and 4 courses offered each semester. We track the number of online degrees, one-year and short-term certificates and the online courses.

The Quality Matters rubric is used as an evaluation tool as part of the course design process. The Quality Matters rubric is a national quality assurance rubric, comprising standards, which measures and guarantees the quality of an online course. As a final step in the Stark State College online course design process, the course is assessed to ensure the quality standard is met.

Student and faculty surveys are conducted as needed to assess learning experiences or to evaluate software or hardware tools.

The Student Evaluation of Instruction survey is conducted each semester. Periodically a

Web 3 vs. non-Web 3 comparative analysis is completed to compare online completion rates with like face-to-face courses. Subsequent course success rates are also tracked using Web 3 vs. non-Web 3 comparisons. full-time and part-time course persistence rates are also monitored.

The Support Services Effectiveness survey is offered every two years. eStarkState has been assessed twice. Results of those surveys are used to assess any need for changes in services offered.

Focus groups for faculty and students are conducted as needed.

2.) **How is that data used to evaluate the Program/Department?**

To increase access by supporting the development of web-based courses and programs

In order to increase access, eStarkState tracks the courses offered each semester by modality. That information is then used to evaluate the degrees. We analyze each degree to determine which degrees have a higher percentage of courses offered online. We then work with Department Chairs to determine whether remaining courses in the degree are suitable to one of the online modalities. If the department chair and faculty agree that a course could be offered online, they request approval from the Curriculum Committee and once granted, work with us to design the course for an online modality. This process has allowed us to grow the online degrees offered at Stark State to 16.

To partner with faculty in the design of engaging and efficient online courses

Course design involves a strong partnership between faculty and eStarkState. eStarkState constantly evaluates new technologies seeking tools and techniques which allow for the creation of more engaging and efficient learning environments for students. As we migrate to a new Learning Management System (LMS) in 2017, faculty were at the core of the selection process for the new LMS. One representative from each department (a total of 35 faculty at the time of evaluation) were included in the selection process. Faculty needs and wants were central to the evaluation process.

eStarkState uses Master Courses and Master Course templates to present students with unified course navigation structure. The basic course layout is the same for every course, allowing students to focus on the content.

Instructors are also encouraged to create courses, which allow the students to know that they are “present” in the course. Faculty introductions, pictures, focus on authentic assessments and feedback are all methods used by eStarkState to enhance online learning.

To improve online course completion rates

Data is periodically gathered and compared to ensure that the course completion rates between online and face-to-face classes remain comparable. Policies and Procedures have been put in place which require training for faculty designing courses, using the LMS and teaching online. Successful completion of the training courses are required in order for faculty to be considered eligible to teach online.

Policies are also in place to require students to complete an online orientation in order to gain access to their online courses. In addition to providing students with training in navigating the LMS, the orientation is designed to provide students with an online course experience. One purpose of the orientation is to allow students to decide if online learning is for them.

To continuously enhance the quality of eStarkState services

The staff in eStarkState is committed to continuous improvement. We constantly seek opportunities to improve course design and have implemented the Quality Matters rubric and Universal Design for Learning principles in course design. These nationally recognized standards encourage course design that supports the best learning experience for students.

Criterion 2.0 Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Program/Department Name: eStarkState
Individual Completing Report: Linda C. Morosko
Individual(s) Reviewing Report: Fedearia Nicholson
Date: 5/31/17

Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Purpose:

To self-identify the status of Program/Department in the outcomes assessment process as well as the action-steps and timetable for the development of assessment processes.

Procedure:

All programs and departments must complete the assessment process. A follow-up assessment report on the implementation of the assessment plan will be due at the end of the following academic year. Programs meeting effective assessment standards will be required to submit an assessment report on a three-year cycle (two years of assessment and one year of implementation).

Directions:

Mark the appropriate response to the Yes/No items with an X. Provide a brief summary of action steps to meet the Criteria (for example, the department will meet twice a month over the next term to develop goals). Please note that it is critical that due diligence is given to the development of goals and associated outcome measures.

Assessment Criteria

Goals:

Does the Department have specific student learning or academic/ student service goals which reflect the discipline or service area professional standards?

Yes X No

Outcome Measures:

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes X No

Research:

Is research systematically conducted to evaluate success or failure in achieving outcomes?

Yes X No

Findings:

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes X No

Review Process:

Are findings discussed and reviewed by appropriate groups and individuals and recommendations made for action?

Yes X No

Proposed Actions:

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes X No

Improvements:

Have actions resulted in documented improvements in student learning or academic/ student services?

Yes X No

Assessment Measures Inventory

***The matrix should contain all goals as they pertain to the CAR.**

Assessment Measures for Goals (Outcome measures from assessment report)	Is trend data available for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Has a performance benchmark(s) been identified for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Type of performance benchmark - SSC (internal), State-level (OACC, OBR, Etc.), National (Professional Org., accrediting group, etc.) List all that apply
Goal 1: Outcome Measure One: Course Modality Counts	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 1: Outcome Measure Two: Total Web-based programs and majors	Yes	Yes	SSC; State-Level
Goal 2: Outcome Measure One, Quality Matters	Yes	Yes	National
Goal 2: Outcome Measure Two, Student Survey (TBD)	NA		
Goal 2: Outcome Measure Three: Faculty LMS Survey	No	No	
Goal 2: Outcome Measure Four, Focus Groups Students	NA		
Goal 2: Outcome Measure Five: Faculty Evaluations	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 3: Outcome Measure One: Web 3 v. Non-web 3 comparative analysis (grade distributions)	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 3: Outcome Measure Two: Subsequent course success web 3/non-web into subsequent non-web courses	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 3: Outcome Measure Three: FT v PT faculty course persistence	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 4: Outcome Measure One: Support services effectiveness survey	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 4: Outcome Measure Two: Focus Groups faculty (LMS)	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 4: Outcome Measure Three: Focus Groups as needed, students	Yes	Yes	SSC

Criterion 3.0: Assessment Results Report

Purpose:

The report is a summary compilation of key assessment methods, findings, review processes, actions, and improvements related to the academic/student service or learning goals of the Program/Department on an annual basis. As an historical record of assessment activities, the report provides for and supports the *systematic* assessment of academic support outcomes.

Instructions:

Enter the outcome measure in the space provided. Please note that for each goal it is expected that a mix of quantitative and qualitative as well as direct and indirect measures are employed.

Provide a brief summary of baseline data collected by the Program/Department and how that data has been used during the current CAR cycle.

Provide a brief summary of *key findings*, either as bulleted points or in short paragraph form.

Provide a brief summary on the review committee/review process (for example, Findings are reviewed by the Director and staff on a per term basis and recommendations are forward to the VP for further review).

Provide a brief summary of any proposed actions for the next term/CAR cycle. Please note that not all findings result in actions.

Provide a brief summary of any improvements from the previous CAR cycle (this does not apply to new measures the first year).

Goal 1: To increase access by supporting the development of web-based courses and programs

Outcome Measure 1: Course Modality Counts

Terms of Assessment: Fall X Spring X Annual

Findings:

eStarkState Enrollment Data

3-Year - Fall

	% Change Fall 2014	Fall 2016 11/7/16	Fall 2015 11/6/15	Fall 2014 9/9/14 14th Day
W2 Sections Offered	35%	124	146	92
W3 Sections Offered	23%	407	402	332
W4 Sections Offered	750%	34	15	4
W2 + W3 + W4 Sections	32%	565	561	429
W2 Unduplicated HC	-10%	1,054	1,149	1,174
W3 Unduplicated HC	4%	4,598	4,838	4,424
W4 Unduplicated HC	383%	198	110	41
W2/W3/W4 Combined Unduplicated HC	1%	5,230	5,503	5,154
College Head Count	-16%	11,851	12,130	14,123
%HC (Combined/College)	21%	44%	45%	36%
Web Only Students	18%	1,773	1,785	1,502
W3 Out-of-State Students	31%	17	13	13

eStarkState Enrollment Data

3-Year - Spring

	% Change Spring 2015	Spring 2017 2/6/17	Spring 2016 2/10/2016	Spring 2015 2/2/2015
W2 Sections Offered	-25%	132	137	177
W3 Sections Offered	35%	429	413	318
W4 Sections Offered	127%	25	27	11
W2 + W3 + W4 Sections	16%	586	577	506
W2 Unduplicated HC	-19%	1,086	1,077	1,341
W3 Unduplicated HC	13%	4,851	5,060	4,303
W4 Unduplicated HC	-23%	111	150	145
W2/W3/W4 Combined Unduplicated HC	7%	5,516	5,681	5,150
College Head Count	-9%	11,141	11,598	12,161
%HC (Combined/College)	19%	50%	49%	42%
Web Only Students	34%	2,009	2,071	1,501
W3 Out-of-State Students	25%	20	17	16

Review Committee/Review Process:

Director of eSS reviews and tracks the number of online classes and provides this data to the Dean of Student Success for distribution to Academic Affairs and Executive Council. The Director of Institutional Research tracks and provides course completion and success rates to the Director of eStarkState, Academic Affairs and Executive Council.

Improvements:

Comparing semester-to-semester enrollment, there has been a 48 percent increase in online enrollment from Spring 2013 to Spring 2017 and a 57 percent increase from Fall 2012 to Fall 2016.

Goal 2: To partner with faculty in the design of engaging and efficient online courses

Outcome Measure 1: Quality Matters

Terms of Assessment: Fall X Spring X Annual

Findings:

eStarkState is part of Ohio’s Quality Matters Consortium and follows the QM rubric in Course design. See rubric standards attached.

Review Committee/Review Process:

As part of the online course design process, the Quality Matters rubric is used to assess courses prior to approval to be taught online. eStarkState uses the Quality Matters rubric to review the course designed by the faculty member to be sure that the course falls within the acceptable parameters established by Quality Matters.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 2: Student Survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall Spring Annual

Findings:

A student survey was part of the initial plan. It was not conducted during this timeframe.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Improvements:

Outcome Measure 3: Faculty LMS Survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall 2014 Spring Annual

Findings:

As the College searched for a new LMS, faculty were surveyed to determine what items were needed in a new LMS. From that survey, the LMS Review Rubric was created (attached). This comprehensive list included current features instructors wanted to retain and added a wish list of features.

Review Committee/Review Process:

The list was reviewed by the eStarkState staff and the 35-faculty member LMS Review team.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 4: Focus Groups Students

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings:

Did not conduct during this evaluation period. Will conduct after the implementation is completed. Feedback has been informally gathered during the pilot phase. The student response has been largely positive.

Review Committee/Review Process: NA

Improvements: NA

Goal 3: To improve online course completion rates

Outcome Measure 1: Web 3 v. Non-Web 3 Comparative Analysis (grade distribution)

Terms of Assessment: Fall __X__ Spring __X__ Annual _____

Findings:

The comparative analysis report is generated each semester by the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment. Report data consistently shows Web 3 numbers are comparable with Non-Web.

Fall 2012-Spring 2014 Web 3 v Non-Web 3 Grade Distribution by Course Level*

	Total A-W grades**	Pct. A	Pct. B	Pct. C	Pct. D	Pct. UC, UD, F	Pct. W	Pct. UC,UD,D,F, W Grades
<i>100 Level Courses</i>								
Non-Web 3	10,151	30.2%	20.1%	12.4%	5.8%	17.0%	14.5%	37.3%
Web 3	10,753	24.6%	19.4%	11.5%	5.2%	20.7%	18.5%	44.4%
Difference					-0.6%	3.7%	4.0%	7.1%
<i>200 Level Courses</i>								
Non-Web 3	4,567	33.4%	26.6%	13.6%	5.6%	9.9%	10.9%	26.4%
Web 3	4,057	29.6%	21.3%	13.4%	5.0%	13.3%	17.3%	35.6%
Difference					-0.6%	3.4%	6.4%	9.2%

Key Trends:

200 level courses did not have a higher DFW rate than 100 level courses over the time period

Within levels, Web-3 courses had higher F and W rates than Non-Web 3 courses (+3.7% & +3.4% F's, and +4% & +6.4% W's respectively by level)

There was a larger gap between modalities for 200 level courses than 100 level courses due to the larger W rate gap for 200 level courses

* Excludes Web-only or Face-to-Face only courses, includes courses matched by instructors across modalities

**Excludes NC, I, AU grades

Review Committee/Review Process:

This information is shared by the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment with the Director of eStarkState, and Academic Affairs for review.

eStarkState uses the data as part of course design review process. If the online version of a course has a high DFW or drop rate, the course design is examined to determine whether design or content issues exist.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 2: Subsequent course success web 3/non-web into subsequent non-web courses

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

As part of a periodic review of online student course outcomes, Institutional Research and Planning analyzed the success of students enrolled in introductory courses and subsequent courses within the same subject. The time period covered was from Fall 2012 through Spring 2015. Course outcomes of students enrolled in face-to-face sections of second courses were broken out into two groups: students who were enrolled in online sections and students who were enrolled in face-to-face sections of the first courses. Multiple previous assessments of paired Web 3 and face-to-face courses have not found any systematic skew in online course grades e.g. online course grades are not higher than face-to-face grades. Given these findings, subsequent course success was reviewed to evaluate the quality of online course grades with the expectation that both online and face-to-face students perform similarly in subsequent face-to-face courses. A limitation of the analysis was the lack of course pairs offered at the College e.g. Composition I&II, History I&II, etc.

The following course pairs were included in the study: ACC 132/ACC 221, CJS 121/CJS 221 (insufficient data), CPD 121/CPD 225 (insufficient data), CSE 122/ CSE 229 and CSE 231, ENG 124/ ENG 231, MGT 121/ MGT 221 & MGT 224, MKT 121/ MKT 221, PSY 121/ PSY 221, SOC 121/ SOC 225, and WDD 121/ WDD 221 & MGT 222. The aggregate percentage of students earning A-C grades in the second course across the study period are presented below for students earning A-C grades in the first course broken out by modality.

First Course	Pct. A-C Second Course F2F
Web 3	87.1%
F2F	85.6%

Results indicated that students who earned A-C grades online introductory courses performed *as well as* students who earned A-C in face-to-face sections of the same courses.

Review Committee/Review Process:

The Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment reviewed the results of this study with the Director of eStarkState.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 3: Course persistence in online courses by faculty status (FT v. PT)

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

In fall 2014, Institutional Research and Planning reviewed course grade outcomes by instructor status (full-time and part-time) for web 3 courses and provided comparative data for all courses. The time period covered was the previous three academic years: 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. The A-D rate for all courses taught over the time-period was 65.2%. For online courses, A-D rates were by instructor status. The rate for both types of instructors was slightly

lower due to a higher withdrawal rate for online courses. The A-D rate for full-time faculty was 62.5% and part-time faculty 63.1%. In summary, there was not a difference in A-D rates by instructor status for online courses, and the online A-D rate was comparable to the overall college A-D rate (which varied from 63.1% to 66.8% each term over the study time-period).

Review Committee/Review Process:

Study results were reviewed by the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment with the Director of eStarkState.

Improvements: NA

Goal 4: To continuously enhance the quality of eStarkState services

Outcome Measure 1: Support Services Effectiveness Survey

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings:

eStarkState	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner
2013	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2015	3.32	3.42	3.35	3.28	3.34	3.33	3.46	3.28
2017	3.47	3.51	3.44	3.39	3.46	3.38	3.53	3.47

eStarkState	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner
2013	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2015	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B+
2017	B+	A-	B+	B+	B+	B+	A-	B+

Employees have been surveyed twice. In 2015, the overall grade was a B+ and in 2017, grades improved.

Review Committee/Review Process:

This information is available on the portal for college-wide review. The Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment shares the information and reviews it with the Director of eStarkState.

Improvements: Employee ratings of customer service improved across the board: the GPA increased for every item from 2015 to 2017.

Outcome Measure 2: Focus Groups Faculty (LMS)

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring_2015____ Annual _____

Findings:

In preparation for the search for a new LMS, faculty focus groups were held during the Spring 2015 semester to gather faculty feedback on features they wanted to keep and see added. Once the small campus-wide groups met. A 35-faculty member course evaluation team was created to evaluate the learning management systems that were brought to campus. That process led to the selection of Blackboard for the new LMS.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 3: Focus Groups as needed, students

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring_____ Annual _____

Findings:

Focus groups were not conducted during this period.

Review Committee/Review Process: NA

Improvements: NA

Criterion 4.0 Program/Department members are qualified by professional background, experience, and continuing professional development and meet the needs of the Program/Department.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			4.1	Employee (full-time and part-time) credentials meet the program, college, state, and national accreditation requirements.
X			4.2	Annual Employee Performance Evaluations are on record in Human Resources.
X			4.3	Employees (full-time and part-time) are involved in professional organizations, presentations, and/or other scholarly works.
X			4.4	Employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

3. Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Describe how Performance Evaluations are being used to enhance the Program/Department.

Employees in the department are encouraged to seek Professional Development and educational opportunities to enhance their skills in course design and faculty and student engagement.

2. Describe how professional development benefits the program.

eStarkState employees regularly take advantage of webinars and other opportunities to enhance knowledge in software, course design, instructional design, student engagement, faculty engagement in order to improve the student experience in online classes.

3. Describe how employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

eStarkState is a small department which means that everyone is involved in supporting the department in meeting College Mission goals. When we find new techniques, software or philosophies, we read, research and discuss the merits of implementation. We evaluate all sides and come to consensus before introducing new ideas.

Criterion 5.0 Program/Department is responsive to changes in current technology and adequate resources.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			5.1	Program/Department changes are consistent with technological and scientific advances, and Program/Department content incorporates new developments in the field.
X			5.2	Employees work with supervisors to ensure adequate and current resources available for the Program/Department.
X			5.3	Employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Explain the changing conditions within the field.

Technology is constantly evolving. Increasing use of mobile devices and changes in technology present challenges in delivering online courses. Within the field, course design has shifted to the adoption of the Universal Design for Learning. A course design framework that supports learning environments that accommodate a variety of learning differences. These accommodations also support the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and include provisions for students with disabilities. All of these changes require more time in designing courses.

2. How are these changing conditions addressed within the Program/Department?

We work with faculty to be sure that current and proposed technologies work with our LMS and will not violate any ADA laws or prevent users from accessing course resources and information. We now are careful to include transcripts and closed captioning with any videos we create. All of these changes have added to the course development timeline.

3. Explain how employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

We work closely with Information Technology staff to be sure that information flows from the ERP system into the LMS. If we have hardware software needs in classrooms we coordinate those efforts with them.

Component IV

Recommendations and Executive Summary

Based on the results of this current CAR, list your strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and recommendations.

Program/Department: eStarkState

Strengths:

- Creative and collaborative staff
- Faculty and student focused
- Constant self-evaluation and willingness to update practices and improve processes
- Quantity/quality of online courses, programs and certificates
- eStarkState blog, <http://estarkstate.net/> is a resource that allows us to provide additional support to faculty.
- Training courses, Blackboard Basics (faculty) and Succeeding Online (students) provide faculty and students the tools they need to navigate the new Learning Management System (LMS).
- Consistent course design focus centers around course and program assessment and student success and engagement
- Work across all divisions
- Always seeking opportunities to contribute to the college
- Requiring training for faculty and students
- Provide abundant support resources
- QM certified staff
- Improved learning management system (LMS)
- Provide 24/7 support
- Information is available to entire team. OneNote notebook contains centralized location for departmental information and resources for running all aspects of the department.

Areas for improvement:

- Lack of staff. eSS has a staff of three supporting nearly 13,000 users.
- Learning curve for new LMS and volume of support and training requests.
- Hardware and software resources. We support students on mobile devices, PCs, Macs, etc. We support both Mac and Windows operating systems. We need to have hardware with the software we need to serve (e.g. we need to have a Mac, and a PC with Windows 10 on it). Lack of technology/web media/audio/visual support staff, space, software, and other tools.
- The demand of the new LMS has put other departmental obligations on hold. Online course review, ongoing course design, submitting courses to Quality Matters for assessment, Course Content Checklist review for faculty contracts, degree review, and other department tasks are delayed.

- Faculty and department chairs who are less than cooperative working with us to design and develop online classes. This includes following and using preferred templates and providing structure to the courses that supports student success and engagement.
- Faculty use our department as administrative and IT support, more than for a resource for course engagement and design.
- Perceived retention and success of online students. Many constantly state that the success is much lower than F2F, while it is lower; data does not support these claims.
- Marketing online programs and classes
- Rapidly changing technology - with frequent browser updates and many other technology changes, we have to constantly keep up with industry news
- Inability to track # of online graduates

Opportunities:

- Surviving the integration of the new LMS.
- New LMS provides better analytics to help faculty analyze courses and identify at-risk students.
- Getting courses QM certified.
- Designing courses/training for outside entities.
- Look for more opportunities for self-promotion (social media, newsletter to prospective students, etc.).
- Collaborating with other colleges to share online courses.
- Offer our online classes or parts of our online classes as CE for local employers.

Threats:

- Moving to the new LMS
- Lack of staff.
- Perceived retention/student success in online classes
- Online courses/degrees/certificates from other schools
- Time spent providing support is eclipsing the amount of time available to spend on course design and development and creating engaging learning environments. Each member of eStarkState has less than eight hours a week to spend on core departmental functions, including implementing and overseeing Quality Matters, course design and development, and increasing online degrees and certificates offered.
- Book publishers designing courses that require the use of an outside system that we cannot access, support, train or review. We are rarely consulted prior to the integration of new technology and we have to spend a lot of time learning and integrating solutions.
- Unrealistic timeline expectations of faculty - last minute design projects
- The quantity of classes created over the last couple of years vs. the quality of those classes.
- We do not have the staff or time to create engaging learning objects that would enhance student experiences and success.
- Support demands make participating in providing service to the college challenging.
- Courses designed that do not follow the template that do not meet QM or Universal Design for Learning (UDL) standards.
- Faculty who underestimate the time and challenges of teaching online. Despite the required training, there are many who struggle with the technology and do not put forth the time needed to engage students online.

- Poorly prepared students. The orientation does a good job of highlighting the pluses and minuses of learning online and the amount of time that students need to spend online. Despite that, there are students who do not possess the technical skill or take the time that online learning requires.
- College Credit Plus student understanding of what it means to be a college student.

Priority Recommendations: *(For each area listed below, please number all recommendations as they will be prioritized on the [Summary Work Plan - Appendix A](#). Sufficient support for the recommendations must be included, either by reference to responses in the components or specific Criterion or by additional information included with this program review.)*

Additional Information. On occasion, some programs may have additional documents that they feel should be included to complete the self-study. Supporting documents may include such things as program self-study reports, case study reports, survey statistics, focus group data, etc. All supporting documentation must be dated within this CAR period. Please list below the additional documents that you will be adding to this CAR in support of your recommendations.